

Defining and inculcating “the soul of America”: The Bureau of Naturalization and the Americanization movement, 1914-1919

In 1914 the U.S. Bureau of Naturalization entered into the crowded field of Americanization. Over the next five years the Bureau attempted to establish itself as a central player in the movement and tried to distinguish its work from that of social service organizations, racial, religious, and community groups, local and state agencies, and other federal agencies engaged in Americanization. The Bureau of Naturalization’s goals were bold, yet seemingly attainable given its unique place within the federal government. As the agency responsible for the naturalization of foreigners, the Bureau had unparalleled contact with, access to, and control over citizenship candidates across the country. Moreover, the Bureau felt it not only had the right, but the duty, to be a leading authority in the Americanization and citizenship education movement. With this understanding, the Bureau of Naturalization launched a nationwide effort to standardize citizenship education and the “making” of Americans.

Record numbers of southern and eastern European immigrants came to America during the last decades of the nineteenth and first decades of the twentieth century, prompting the creation of the Bureau of Naturalization and inspiring the Americanization movement. Many of these “new” immigrants did not speak English, were forced to live in overcrowded, unsanitary, and *de facto* segregated neighborhoods, and naturalized in smaller numbers than the “old” immigrants from northern and western Europe. The masses of unassimilated foreigners—the majority of whom lived in industrial cities—frightened many Americans, who came to question whether the “melting pot” still worked.

Groups emerged throughout the nation between the 1890s and 1910s in order to assimilate and Americanize immigrants. This work was largely educational in nature, as organizations set out to teach foreigners about American institutions, ideals, and customs.

However, Americanization efforts, methods, and content varied widely since no standards existed within the field. In his classic 1955 book, *Strangers in the Land*, historian John Higham described two opposite, yet at times overlapping, strands within Americanization: a liberal democratic movement driven by progressives who emphasized cohesion and integration, and a nativistic movement that insisted on conformity and “100 per cent Americanism.” World War I, Higham argues, was most responsible for the shift from the former to the latter, “from sympathy to fear, from cosmopolitan democracy to jealous nationalism.”¹

According to the Bureau, its citizenship education efforts represented “the first occasion in the history of America that the United States government had undertaken to inculcate the spirit and principles, as well as the soul of America.”² What did the Bureau mean by the “spirit,” “principles,” and “soul” of America? How and why did it seek to standardize and implement these ideals in both urban and rural communities throughout the nation? This paper will answer these questions by offering a brief history of the Bureau of Naturalization, followed by a lengthier discussion of its partnership with the nation’s public schools starting in 1915 and publication of its *Student’s Textbook* in 1918. These two aspects of the Bureau’s citizenship education program were essential to its national standardization campaign and will be analyzed in depth. Finally, this paper will highlight the significant role World War I played in shaping the Bureau of Naturalization’s Americanization efforts and federal government involvement in public education.

For the nation’s first 130 years, individual states made their own naturalization policies and laws. Rising immigration and fraudulent naturalization practices (often at election times) eventually led Congress to pass the Naturalization Act of June 29, 1906, which created the Division of Naturalization and transformed the fifteen-year-old Bureau of Immigration into the

Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization under the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Richard Kenna Campbell [Appendix A], solicitor of the Bureau of Immigration, was promoted to Chief of the new Division of Naturalization.³ In 1907, Raymond Fowler Crist [Appendix B] joined Campbell atop the newly created Division of Naturalization within the Bureau of Immigration as Assistant Chief.⁴

When the Act of March 4, 1913 split the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization also divided, and Campbell became the first Commissioner of Naturalization, reporting to the Secretary of Labor. Once again, Crist joined Campbell in the newly created Bureau, assuming the role of Deputy Commissioner.⁵ These two men, Richard K. Campbell and Raymond F. Crist, went on to be the two most important figures in the Bureau of Naturalization's 20-year existence, which ended when the Act of March 3, 1933 (and an Executive Order by President FDR) reunited the Bureaus of Immigration and Naturalization to form the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As the only two Commissioners in the Bureau's history, Campbell and Crist shaped the policies and direction of the Bureau throughout its lifetime, much of which focused on its efforts to define and standardize citizenship education and establish its place within the growing federal bureaucratic state.⁶

Crist first recommended federal involvement in citizenship education in a four-page memo to Campbell on April 20, 1914. However, it seems as if federal intervention into the field of citizenship education was not seriously considered until December 1914 when a letter from Clarence N. Goodwin, a naturalization judge from Chicago, sparked debate within the Bureau. Goodwin had presided over more than 5,000 naturalization cases and believed that the majority of petitioners—including those who passed—had little real knowledge of the government. Troubled by this fact, Goodwin wrote to Assistant Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, expressing

his belief that in the period immediately prior to naturalization, the federal government had a “golden opportunity” to ensure that petitioners had “a real and sympathetic knowledge of the processes of government, an understanding of the reciprocal duties of nation and citizen and a feeling of loyal devotion of the Government of which he is to become a part.” Moreover, “[o]nce lost, this opportunity can never be regained for after he [the candidate for citizenship] has passed inside the gate he does not come again into direct personal contact with the Naturalization Bureau or the Naturalization Courts.”⁷

Campbell’s and Crist’s responses to Goodwin’s letter differed. Campbell agreed that the merits of citizenship training, “preferably uniform in character,” could not be questioned. But, he also felt that “[h]ow that shall be done, and to what extent it should go, is a matter for the most careful consideration.” Campbell questioned how the work would be paid for and whether the federal government had the authority to enter into the field of citizenship education. He believed that the primary responsibility should fall to the states, since state boards of education already had “machinery for such work.”⁸

Crist, on the other hand, felt strongly that the Bureau should be at the center of the movement. He enthusiastically endorsed Goodwin’s recommendations without reservation, feeling that they “serve[d] as an amplification of [his] own ideas.” Describing the advantages of centralizing citizenship education efforts within the Bureau, Crist believed that no other organization would be able to garner the same level of support or contribute as much to the movement. “None are in such a position of peculiar advantage as the Bureau, where all phases of the question can be and are seen, which is not possible from the vantage point of any of the other organizations.” Crist continued, “In this the same principle is to be found as in the instances of

small commercial enterprises as compared with the centralization and unifying of forces in one large industrial plant.”⁹

Rather than usurping local and state powers, as Campbell feared, Crist recommended that the Bureau take on an advisory role and partner with local and state governments, public schools, organizations, the judiciary, and the public at large, all of which were “ripe for this undertaking.” These partners would act as the outreach arms of the Bureau, “connected in a concerted effort for the enlightenment, education, and uplift of the entire resident foreign population of this country.” By establishing partnerships and taking an “active and leading part . . . in the education of the alien body,” Crist hoped that the Bureau’s efforts would prepare petitioners not just for the naturalization exam, but also “for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship.”¹⁰

In January 1915, Crist traveled to the Midwest to assess the citizenship education efforts across the country and gauge local interest for federal involvement. At each stop Crist noted an “aroused state of the public mind on behalf of the candidates for citizenship” and the feedback was nearly unanimous: educators and naturalization examiners called for the establishment of night school citizenship classes for un-naturalized, foreign-born adults. Moreover, authorities believed that the Bureau “should take a leading part in this work.”¹¹

Although the Bureau of Naturalization’s records do not reflect immigrant demand for citizenship education classes, it is well documented elsewhere. Immigrant opinions regarding Americanization varied widely. Based on the findings of the Cleveland Education Survey of 1916, Julius Drachsler pointed out that some immigrants rejected Americanization because “America taught her foreign-born in terms they could not understand; in terms that were removed from the struggles of their daily life and still more distant from their hopes and for the future.”¹² Daniel Chauncey Brewer accurately asserted that some immigrants resented coercive

Americanization efforts and consequently adopted an attitude of defiance.¹³ Immigrants overwhelmingly opposed Americanization, according to historian Gayle Gullett, and “voted with their feet” by not attending night school citizenship classes.¹⁴ Historian Maxine Seller corroborates this, stating that at its peak during World War I, night school enrollment was not more than 250,000 out of more than 13 million foreign-born residents.¹⁵ However, some immigrants saw citizenship classes—and especially learning English—as an opportunity for education and empowerment. An immigrant who arrived in the United States on January 15, 1914 and became a declarant on May 31, 1915 advocated for the creation of a night school:

‘I came to Christopher, Ill. There are two public schools here, but there is no night school, and we immigrants are in the dark. We saw an ad. Saying that the United States offer their services, which we accept with open hands. We immigrants want education and we wish voluntarily become Americans. We beseech you gentlemen to give us a helping hand to obtain education. We want education, we want citizenship. There is quite a number of us here.’¹⁶

A group of at least 75 immigrants from Dillonvale, Ohio emphasized the importance of free citizenship education courses:

We, the undersigned naturalized citizens and ‘future’ naturalized citizens of the U.S., living at present in Dillonvale, O., beg to inform you that we would very gladly learn the American language. But taking private lessons in the same is to heavy burden for us poor coal miners of Bohemian and Polish nativity, and we think that if a Free Evening School could be established in Dillonvale, O., for the foreign-born citizens just during the winter seasons, that it would greatly benefit not only ourselves, but the whole community.’¹⁷

Some expressed frustration about the lack of cooperation on the part of local officials:

‘I desire to learn the Inglesh language to read and write and to etend night school. There are quite a number would like to teend but the supentend is oppose to it and therefore I write you as we are all laborers we cannot etend during the day. Please please write the Superentend in regard to same. I wish you would do something for us, as I want to git out my maliniles papers out next year.’ [*sic*]¹⁸

Finally, others had the desire, but simply lacked the time to study. Madeleine Sweeney Miller’s July 1918 article “An Hour in a Naturalization Court” vividly illustrates this point. In the article, Miller tells the story of “an iron-built Russian of perhaps forty-five” who, “in his utter

confusion” and “to the amusement of the entire room,” responded “Yes, sir,” when the judge asked if he believed in polygamy or anarchy. “Every query led the poor fellow into worse blunders. He wrung his hands, as though his very life depended upon correct answers to the dazing questions.” Told by the judge to get a book, study, and return in three months, the “full-bearded giant” left the room “[w]ith a terrific groan ... passionately exclaiming, ‘All right, you fell’—you no see me again—too hard.’ ” As the man stormed out of the courtroom his friend spoke up on his behalf: “This man has been working fourteen hours a day, your Honor. He is a good chap but has had no chance for study.”¹⁹

Regardless of whether the Bureau was aware of the demands of (and challenges facing) the immigrant community, the findings from Crist’s Midwest trip were enough to win over Campbell. In a January 21, 1915 letter to Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson, Campbell advocated for the creation of Bureau-supported adult citizenship education classes. Even though citizenship education work was already underway throughout the country—in Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, New York City, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oregon among other places—it was being conducted without any overall coordination. A wide variety of groups, ranging from fraternal, social, religious and racial organizations to private individuals and lawyers, organized the classes.²⁰ According to *The Immigrants in America Review*, the federal, state, and local governments were conspicuously absent from the citizenship education process “[f]rom the time the immigrant arrives in this country until he files his petition for final citizenship papers.”²¹

For Crist, the consequences and implications were clear. “Each [Americanization organization] independently pursues its own course, and there must, therefore, be considerable variety, and the results attained must be as various.” Thus, “there must be some effort made by

the Bureau through its field service to aid in attaining such a unification of the systems of training, and such modifications of various systems.”²² Doing so, according to Crist, would ensure that all citizenship education classes met certain standards and therefore could be recognized as legitimate by naturalization courts. Concurring with his Deputy Commissioner, Campbell recommended to Wilson that the Bureau take up citizenship education because the “work need[ed] some organization for the correlation of their efforts and the standardizing of the course to be pursued.” Wilson responded in a hand-written note on the bottom of Campbell’s memo: “I am of the opinion that we have not yet investigated the subject sufficiently to determine whether a civics class is the proper course for us to follow.”²³

Wilson’s hesitation did not derail Campbell’s and Crist’s campaign to federalize citizenship education. Their motives for doing so must be understood in a larger context than centralizing and standardizing the movement. Although federal supervision had increased interest in naturalization law and raised the standards of admissibility, Crist believed that the public undervalued naturalization and citizenship in general. Madeleine Sweeney Miller’s experience in the naturalization court led her to the same conclusion: the formulaic practice of a judge in a naturalization court granting citizenship was “utterly devoid of that cordiality that means so much to the foreigner. There was not the suggestion of a patriotic thrill. It seemed as though there should have been someone there to slap the men on the back and tell them they were welcome.”²⁴ To remedy this, Crist recommended that naturalization become more public and performative in nature. Citizenship education classes held in public schools, patriotic addresses, playing and singing the national anthem at events, and holding public ceremonies to confer citizenship were meant “to raise from commonplace and routine in the public mind the responsibilities of citizenship and the process of the conferring of citizenship by naturalization to

that high plane on which in theory they have always been held.” Crist and Campbell hoped that such innovations would bring naturalization and citizenship—and the status of the Bureau—to a new level of national prominence.²⁵

On May 10, 1915, the Bureau of Naturalization held its first large-scale public event. Held in Philadelphia and attended by more than 15,000 people, the evening featured speeches by President Woodrow Wilson and Mayor Rudolph Blankenburg.²⁶ The Bureau organized the occasion “for the distinct and sole purpose of focusing the attention of the entire nation upon the necessity for a national undertaking that would deal adequately with the problems of the nation and its immigrant population.”²⁷ Four thousand newly naturalized citizens and their families were the guests of honor and sat in reserved seats toward the front. While Wilson’s appearance certainly would have resulted in some national press coverage, the loss of more than 100 American lives in the sinking of the *Lusitania* by a German U-boat three days earlier drew extra attention to the event.²⁸

Even though Wilson never mentioned the *Lusitania*, the sinking of the ship and the threat of war certainly influenced his speech. Speaking to the newly naturalized citizens, Wilson emphasized loyalty to their adopted country and complete assimilation as the keys to citizenship. “ ‘While you bring all countries with you, you come with a purpose of leaving all other countries behind you—bringing what is best of their spirit, but not looking over your shoulder or seeking to perpetuate what you leave in them.’ ” He continued, “ ‘You can’t be American if you think of yourself in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who considers himself as belonging to a national group is not yet an American.’ ” The capacity crowd frequently interrupted Wilson with “spontaneous outbursts of applause.”²⁹ Campbell would later refer to the speech as “the keynote for all the Americanization work.”³⁰

Laced with American exceptionalism, Wilson's speech reflected the common fear that anarchism and socialism would grow out of isolated immigrant communities. Crist feared that the harsh treatment of foreigners in their homelands made them more susceptible to "anarchy, disorder, and all of the forces destructive to the Government."³¹ The New York State Department of Education (NYSDE) and the National Americanization Committee (NAC), a leading organization in the field, drew attention to the fact that 25 percent of voting-aged males (6,646,817) were foreign-born and only 45 percent of those individuals were naturalized. These statistics, according to the NYSDE and the NAC, had serious implications for the country since "[w]henver there is in a democracy a large male population of voting age who have not a voice in the government there is not pure democracy but often fertile soil for the seeds of anarchy and violent socialism."³² The war only fueled these concerns and, like Wilson and Crist, many Americans came to believe that the assimilation of recent immigrants and newly naturalized citizens was essential to keeping the United States safe at home and out of war in Europe.

Unprecedented levels of national interest in citizenship and citizenship education characterized the period immediately after the May 10, 1915 Philadelphia citizenship event. Writing in the 1916 Annual Report, Campbell noted that "[t]he public response and indorsement given to this reception and educational announcement were beyond all expectations of the bureau."³³ Building on the momentum of the Philadelphia event and its focus on assimilation, Campbell and Crist put forth a comprehensive plan for the Bureau to enter into citizenship education by forming a partnership with the nation's public schools. Outlining the plan in a July 12 letter, Crist described a tripartite system in which the Bureau would 1) send the names of petitioners for citizenship to the public schools; 2) send a letter to the petitioners describing the benefits of attending citizenship education classes; and 3) send a letter to the schools advising

them of the Bureau's overall plan. "By the adoption of this course it is believed that there will result a scientific method of assimilation of the foreign body, as well as a practical method of more rapid accomplishment of this end." Unlike the Department of Labor's response six months prior, this time Assistant Secretary of Labor Post signed off on Crist's proposed plan.³⁴ By the start of the 1915 school year, the Bureau of Naturalization's collaboration with the nation's public schools had begun.³⁵

The Bureau's partnerships with cities, towns, and rural communities across the country expanded rapidly over the course of the next four years. Crist traveled extensively and worked tirelessly to publicize and expand the Bureau's partnerships with public schools. During his trip to the West Coast in August 1915 a *Los Angeles Times* article described him as a "missionary of the Federal government, carrying the gospel of an improved American citizenship."³⁶ The Bureau's work also caught the attention of other Americanization organizations. Frank Trumbull, chairman of the NAC, noted in the fall of 1915 that the Bureau "shows this year an increased interest not only in the naturalization of immigrants but in the ways in which they are to prepare for it."³⁷ Although only 38 communities were partnered with the Bureau at the start of the 1915-1916 school year, 613 were on-board by the end of that same year.³⁸ The following year brought an increase of 186%, with the number of cooperating communities rising to 1,754 by June 30, 1917. After a temporary slowdown in 1917-1918 due to the United States' entry into the war, the number of communities partnering with the Bureau swelled to 2,157 by June 30, 1919.³⁹

[Appendix C and Appendix D]

The Bureau of Naturalization's burgeoning partnership with the nation's public schools provided it with thousands of sites across the country where its standardized citizenship education program could be implemented. Needing a vehicle to deliver these ideas, the Bureau

set out to create a standardized citizenship textbook. Starting in 1914, the creation of such a textbook became Crist's personal mission, although it is not clear whether he originated the idea. For, soon after its creation in 1913, the Bureau began receiving requests from across the country for a definitive, Bureau-authored textbook on citizenship education. During his West Coast trip in 1915-16 to assess the state of citizenship education, Crist discovered that educators, administrators, businessmen, judges, fraternal organizations, clergymen, newspaper and magazine editors, and Congressional Representatives all supported the creation of a Bureau-authored text.⁴⁰ Letters calling for a standardized textbook flooded the Bureau and the D.C. Society of the Sons of the American Revolution passed a resolution on November 17, 1915 "urgently request[ing]" that the Bureau "prepare, publish and distribute at as early a date as possible a manual on citizenship."⁴¹

Individuals and organizations looked to the Bureau of Naturalization to publish an authoritative textbook because of its unique authority. As the agency responsible for all matters related to naturalization, the Bureau was in a position to publish accurate, up-to-date textbooks that were aligned with federal naturalization law and the naturalization examination. Most of the citizenship pamphlets and books that already existed when the Bureau began receiving requests for a standardized textbook in 1914 were flawed in some way. In a March 1915 letter to Campbell, Henry B. Hazard, a naturalization examiner in Portland, Oregon, noted that some court clerks and private individuals were selling or giving away citizenship books that were "poorly prepared" and described their value as "problematical." After a local librarian asked Hazard to review some of the citizenship education books stocked on the shelves and frequently used by immigrants, Hazard was disturbed to discover "much misleading matter therein as well as many absolute misstatements concerning the naturalization law requirements." Hazard found

one of the publications to be so “misleading and valueless” that he had it removed from the library’s shelves.⁴²

Recognizing both the demand and the need for a reliable, standardized course in citizenship for use in classes around the country, the Bureau published the *Outline Course in Citizenship* in 1916. From September 1914 until January 1916 Crist worked on creating the *Outline Course* “constantly, at all hours, in the office and out of it, on trains, in hotels, and in my own home.”⁴³ The twenty-eight-page *Outline Course* offered a framework that could be used to lead citizenship education classes and included sections on reading, writing, arithmetic, government, and hygiene. In short, it was meant to “transform” immigrants “from the ignorant and more or less helpless alien resident to a thinking, producing, and loyal and patriotic American citizen.”⁴⁴

At the same time, Campbell and Crist recognized that the *Outline Course* was a work in progress, “admitted to have imperfections” and “open to criticism.”⁴⁵ On January 29, 1916, Campbell sent a memo to all naturalization examiners soliciting feedback on the *Outline Course*. Dozens of naturalization examiners responded and their letters indicated a clear appreciation of the Bureau’s first effort at creating a standardized course in citizenship. Frederick C. Emmerich, an examiner in Colorado, applauded the *Outline Course* because it created “uniformity of instruction throughout the country,” adding that it will “make the teacher’s work more effective than would be the case if no definite course were followed.”⁴⁶ Paul Armstrong, a naturalization examiner in Salt Lake City, Utah, lauded the *Outline Course*, but felt that it was too much of an outline. “What the superintendents, principals, and teachers desire, so far as my investigations have gone, is a real course. They are, mostly, groping in the dark...I believe that the book proposed to be printed should be published and made ready for distribution at the earliest

possible moment.”⁴⁷ “No other work is as urgently needed,” wrote R.K. Doe, the Chief Naturalization Examiner of St. Paul, Minnesota. For Doe, the creation of a standardized text “proves that we carry the ideals of the framers of the constitution in our hearts and are trying to build on the foundations laid by them.”⁴⁸ J.M. Berkey, Chief Naturalization Examiner of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, wrote to express his opinion that even though “[m]any good things are being brought out now along this line...I still feel that the Naturalization Bureau ought to be the first source of practical and helpful information.”⁴⁹ Calls for a full-length textbook also came from ordinary citizens around the country. Between July 1916 and June 1917, more than 115 towns held mass meetings on citizenship education and identified the creation of a textbook on citizenship by the Bureau of Naturalization as a top priority.⁵⁰

Although the Bureau of Naturalization felt the need to respond to the widespread requests for a more substantial textbook, it did not pretend to be an educational organization with pedagogical expertise. Rather, the Bureau hoped to serve as a “clearing house of methods in the instruction of the foreigner in citizenship responsibilities.”⁵¹ For that reason, and in order to garner support for its overall program, the Bureau called upon educators and superintendents from around the country to help revise and perfect a standardized citizenship education textbook. In April 1916 Campbell sent a circular to school superintendents asking them to submit any pre-existing courses used or recommendations as to what should be included in an all-encompassing citizenship education text.⁵² By soliciting input from professional educators the Bureau not only tried to produce the best possible textbook, but also attempted to preempt potential criticism that a federal bureau was encroaching on what was typically a local or state issue—education. With these goals in mind, the Bureau invited the nation’s superintendents and naturalization officials to Washington, D.C. for the First Citizenship Convention, to be held from July 10-15, 1916.

Despite the fact that one of the Convention's main objectives was to create a "textbook for the use of the candidate for citizenship who attends public schools," no records of such discussions exist. According to Crist, the majority of the attendees participated, but "[i]t was impossible to make a stenographic report." However, Crist did comment on the participants' general sentiments and recommendations: "all showed the necessity for a standard course in citizenship instruction, and the bureau was urged to prepare for publication the subject matter it received."⁵³ The Bureau sent thousands of copies of the proceedings of the First Citizenship Convention to public schools throughout the nation.⁵⁴

As the First Citizenship Convention came to a close, the Bureau of Naturalization set an ambitious goal of collating the educators' recommendations and publishing its standardized textbook by the start of the 1916 school year.⁵⁵ But, a major obstacle stood in its way: Congressional approval and funding for such a project. To the dismay of citizenship educators and naturalization officials across the country, this obstacle proved insurmountable in the summer of 1916 and delayed the textbook's publication. Responding to an inquiry from a school superintendent eagerly awaiting the textbook's completion, Campbell wrote that it had been postponed due to "circumstances over which this Bureau has no control, and it is impossible to say when it will be ready for distribution."⁵⁶

Undeterred by the temporary setback, the Bureau of Naturalization launched a far-reaching lobbying campaign in hopes of receiving authorization from Congress to print a standardized textbook. On October 16, 1916, Campbell wrote a letter to all Chief Naturalization Examiners with the intention of drumming up support for Congressional appropriations. In the letter Campbell explained how the textbook could be funded at no additional cost to taxpayers. Since its creation in 1913, the naturalization fees collected by the Bureau (\$5.00 per candidate)

had exceeded expenses, resulting in an average yearly surplus of \$65,000. In Campbell's estimation, the Bureau only needed \$30,000 to publish its textbook. Thus, enough textbooks could be published for every adult foreigner in public school citizenship classes, regardless of whether he or she was a candidate for citizenship, and there would still be a \$35,000 yearly surplus.⁵⁷ This surplus, however, was deposited into the United States Treasury and was not accessible to the Bureau without Congressional approval. By recouping excess naturalization fees the Bureau had devised a system in which "[a]ll of this reconstruction work, this work of reclaiming these human souls, minds, and bodies, [would be] paid for by the millions of foreigners themselves."⁵⁸

Chief Naturalization Examiners across the country enthusiastically took up Campbell's charge, enlisting a diverse group of their constituents to write to their Congressional representatives in support of Senate Bill 7909. The bill, which had been introduced by Senator William J. Stone of Missouri, called for the allocation of \$30,000 to the Bureau of Naturalization for the printing and binding of its textbook. What is most notable about the lobbying effort is that such a wide variety of individuals, from all sectors, industries, and parts of the country, supported a standardized citizenship textbook. Missouri Senator James A. Reed received letters in support of the bill from both a bank president and the secretary of a labor organization.⁵⁹ In Illinois, B.W. Edwards, Secretary of a manufacturing organization representing more than thirty companies, wrote to Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, indicating that the manufacturers were "tremendously interested in the immediate publication of this book" in order to make their workers "better employees and better citizens."⁶⁰ John G. Imel, Superintendent of City Schools in Portland, Oregon, wrote to his senators, George Chamberlain and Harry Lane, urging them to endorse the bill, in part because "teachers are very anxious to have a uniform textbook on

citizenship that can be distributed among the night schools students, that will set forth properly the principles of citizenship.” Referring specifically to the Bureau, Imel added, “We have found the publications from the Bureau of Naturalization most helpful and hope they will be able to carry out this very important plan.”⁶¹ Federal, state, and local judges from New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio wrote their Senators and Congressmen. In Pittsburgh, the Rotary Club, Hebrew Relief Association, Congress of Women’s Clubs, and other social and civic organizations lobbied on behalf of the bill.⁶² Despite the considerable lobbying campaign, the Senate did not enact Bill 7909.⁶³ It was not until the following year, 1918, that Congress appropriated funds through another bill and gave the Bureau of Naturalization the power to publish its textbook.

The United States’ entry into the war in Europe increased xenophobic and patriotic sentiment and had a significant impact on Congress’ decision to pass the Act of May 9, 1918. According to Edward G. Hartmann, the war heightened national consciousness and gave the Bureau of Naturalization and other Americanizers the leeway to push their programs to previously unknown levels.⁶⁴ The war’s influence on the Act of May 9, 1918 is undeniable. The realization that a significant percentage of soldiers fighting for the U.S. were not citizens, coupled with the fact that many were illiterate, led to growing fears of subversion from within the military. Thus, in hopes of maximizing and ensuring loyalty to the U.S., the act offered immediate naturalization—eliminating the declaration of intention, residency requirement, and fee—to aliens serving in, or honorably discharged from, the military or navy. Nearly 64,000 soldiers took advantage of this provision and naturalized between May 9 and June 30, 1918.⁶⁵

[Appendix E]

Just as significant for the Bureau, however, were the long-term implications of Section Nine of the Act of May 9, 1918. Section Nine authorized the Treasury to remit excess naturalization fees to cover the cost of printing and binding a citizenship textbook to be prepared and distributed by the Bureau of Naturalization and given free of charge to candidates for citizenship who were at least 18 years old and enrolled in public school classes.⁶⁶ This marked the first time Congress had given the Bureau explicit approval to take up any form of citizenship education work and resulted in the publication of the *Student's Textbook*.

[A fifteen-page section on the Bureau's Americanization philosophy and the Student's Textbook left out due to space considerations. I will briefly discuss this section during the DCC workshop.]

While most Americanizers focused their efforts on urban centers, the *Student's Textbook* allowed the Bureau to extend its influence into rural areas, where immigrants tended to be more isolated and smaller in number. Where classes were offered, they were not easily accessible. Some students and teachers made considerable sacrifices to attend classes, many traveling miles on foot in extreme conditions. For the most part, however, small general populations, lack of funding, and lack of interest on behalf of citizens and non-citizens resulted in few—if any—naturalization classes in most rural communities.⁶⁷

With war raging in Europe, the near-total isolation of many rural communities led many Americans to fear that small pockets of disloyal foreigners, unaffected by the Americanization and assimilation movements, were forming across the country. Speaking at an Americanization Conference in Washington, D.C. in April 1918, Iowa Senator Lafayette Young told the audience of “thousands of schools in the Northwest, where every day's session ends with the singing of ‘Deutschland Ueber Allos,’ ” and “where ‘Die Wacht am Rhein’ is better known than ‘The Star Spangled Banner.’ ”⁶⁸ Joseph Smith, Chief Naturalization Examiner in Seattle, Washington,

expressed similar concerns in a letter to Campbell, telling of towns in Nebraska and Montana “where the American national anthem was unknown up to thirty days ago.”⁶⁹ Russian and German beet farmers, homesteaders, and camps of coal miners lived in relative seclusion throughout Eastern Colorado and Eastern Wyoming. Examiner Del Sullivan wrote to Campbell that the only way to reach these groups “is by disseminating information concerning our form of government, ideals, etc., through the means of pamphlets.”⁷⁰ A letter from Campbell to a Colorado naturalization examiner indicates that the Bureau had recognized the potential benefit of distributing the textbook to rural communities as early as the spring of 1916.⁷¹

After the Act of May 9, 1918 was passed, the Bureau wasted no time in distributing its new *Student's Textbook* to both urban and rural areas. By October, five months after the first printing, the supply of textbooks had been “completely exhausted” and Campbell urged all Chief Naturalization Examiners to conserve supplies and recover unused texts from schools within their district.⁷² The Bureau distributed 95,303 copies of the *Student's Textbook* in the first fiscal year alone and had printed 200,000 copies by October 1919.⁷³

Urgent requests for the *Student's Textbook* poured in from across the country. The Chief Naturalization Examiner in Chicago wrote to Campbell acknowledging the receipt of 250 textbooks and requesting 3,000 additional copies.⁷⁴ In Minnesota, more than 1,000 copies of the *Student's Textbook* were in use in St. Paul, while more than 1,500 were needed in Minneapolis.⁷⁵ The Supervising Principal of Evening Schools in San Francisco, California requested 500 textbooks from the Bureau and added that an additional 1,000 copies would be needed later.⁷⁶ Crystal City, Missouri, a suburb of St. Louis, received 300 copies of the textbook.⁷⁷

In addition to larger metropolitan centers, demand for the Bureau's textbook existed in smaller blue-collar communities, such as Scranton, Pennsylvania. Four months after requesting

24 copies of the *Student's Textbook* for the start of the fall 1918 school year, S.E. Weber, Superintendent of Schools in Scranton, sent a telegram to the Bureau asking them to “[p]lease send at once 300 Crist’s Students’ Textbook.”⁷⁸ The Bureau also distributed the *Student's Textbook* to remote states not considered to be immigrant hubs, such as North Dakota and Alaska, which requested 450 copies of the textbook.⁷⁹

Some states adopted statewide measures calling for the use of the *Student's Textbook*. In Utah, the state legislature passed an Americanization Act and the Salt Lake City naturalization office requested the “rushed” shipment of 10,000 copies of the *Student's Textbook* and 500 copies of the *Teacher's Manual* for immediate incorporation into citizenship education classes.⁸⁰ The state of Oklahoma passed legislation authorizing an official partnership with the Bureau of Naturalization and the exclusive use of the *Student's Textbook* in Americanization classes that were part of the state curriculum. The state Board of Education also incorporated the textbook into normal schools and teacher training programs at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Oklahoma, in Stillwater.⁸¹ For the first time, foreigners in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and other densely populated large cities were using the same citizenship education textbook as those in the rural mining towns and homestead areas of North Dakota, Utah, and Oklahoma. The Bureau’s nationwide standardization movement had achieved a new level of prominence.

The *Student's Textbook* was well received by many educators and politicians. Most of the letters the Bureau received in 1918 concerned the content and largely positive reception of the textbook, with one leading authority declaring “the books as a ‘thousand times better’ than any heretofore available.”⁸² The governor of Arkansas, Charles H. Brough, thanked Crist for preparing the textbook and referred to it as “a very valuable publication on citizenship training

for the public schools throughout the United States.”⁸³ J.C. Tjaden, Acting Director of the Extension Division of the University of South Dakota, wrote a letter thanking the Bureau, indicated that the *Student's Textbook* would definitely be used, and offered to help in any way possible.⁸⁴ An educator in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania believed the *Student's Textbook* and *Teacher's Manual* to be “excellent works” and requested 50 copies for immediate use.⁸⁵ Robert A. Greene of the State Norman School in Geneseo, New York, expressed a similar sentiment, saying that the two books were “just what we need for use in our school,” and even offered to pay for the books if necessary.⁸⁶

The Bureau of Naturalization also received positive feedback from both industry and labor unions. The Bureau had long tried to enter into a partnership with the industrial sector and recognized the power and suasion—not to mention daily contact—employers had over their foreign-born workers. Some reformers believed that factories offered the most effective means to Americanize immigrants. One New York State social organization made this case based on their belief that many immigrants came to the United States because steamship agents lured them across the Atlantic with the promise of employment.⁸⁷ An October 24, 1915 *New York Times* article, entitled “To Americanize Foreign-Born Who Live Here,” described the coercive methods used by industry in Detroit to encourage citizenship education. Amongst the strategies employed were refusing to hire or promote workers who were not citizens or were not in the process of obtaining citizenship, threatening to fire all non-citizens, and offering higher pay to citizens and those in the process of acquiring citizenship.⁸⁸ Historian Stephen Meyer described such efforts as the “darker side” of Americanization, with the ultimate goal of adapting immigrants to “new system[s] of mass production” in order to maximize output.⁸⁹ However, in many cases, these tactics proved effective because, as Ralph Philip Boas put it, “The advantages of our political

democracy mean little to the man whose outlook is primarily economic. Congress is hundreds of miles away, but the factory is round the corner.”⁹⁰

Recognizing this reality, the Bureau happily provided copies of the *Student's Textbook* to classes taught in factories as long as public school authorities supervised them. To the Bureau's delight, in 1918 Chicago public school officials assigned 1,000 instructors to teach classes held in factories, all of which would incorporate the *Student's Textbook*.⁹¹ The Bethlehem Steel Company, located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania and employer of 8,000 to 10,000 foreign-born un-naturalized workers, strongly endorsed the Bureau's latest publication. J.F. Mulligan, part of the division of labor and safety and supervisor of all educational activities, lauded the *Student's Textbook* and requested 500 copies and 30 copies of the *Teacher's Manual*.⁹²

Across the country, in Lehigh, Montana, the Local Union No. 703 of the United Mine Workers of America offered their support for the *Student's Textbook* in a letter to their Congressional Representative, Carl W. Riddick.⁹³ The Bureau also partnered with the loggers of Washington State, known as the Loyal Legion of Loggers and Lumbermen, or “Four Ls,” to create in more than 450 branches throughout logging sections of the country.⁹⁴ Crist's testimony before the Congressional Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in October 1919 offers evidence of additional support from national trade councils and labor unions.⁹⁵

Newspapers publicized and, for the most part, praised the Bureau of Naturalization's new textbook. The *Chicago Daily Tribune* and the *Los Angeles Times* described the textbook as a “shortcut to knowledge” and each paper also noted that more than 2,000 schools were using the *Student's Textbook* as of the spring of 1919.⁹⁶ The Schenectady, New York *Gazette* published a lengthy article on the Bureau's textbook, describing it as “a liberal education in English composition, writing, arithmetic, spelling, American geography, civics and domestic hygiene.”

According to the *Gazette*, those who study the *Student's Textbook* would get “sound fundamental knowledge of the essential things of life.”⁹⁷

The book had its critics as well. Most of the criticism focused on the content of the book, rather than the Bureau's involvement in the movement. Public school teachers felt that the book was “inexpedient and impractical” in its arrangement. Teachers using the book in the classroom suggested splitting the text into three parts: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. Doing so, they argued, would allow for more differentiation based on each student's individual level of education and thus be more effective.⁹⁸ Reflecting back on the original *Student's Textbook* in 1923, Joseph Speed Smith, Chief Naturalization Examiner in Seattle, Washington, wrote to Campbell that it did not compare favorably to many of the “clever” and “ingenious” privately produced books because of its “method of treatment of the subject matter.”⁹⁹

The harshest criticism of Crist's textbook came from two works that were part of an 11-volume series on Americanization sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation. The first, Frank Victor Thompson's *Schooling of the Immigrant*, published in 1920, offered the most extensive and scathing indictment of the *Student's Textbook*. Thompson disparaged the *Student's Textbook* for being difficult to use, “abstract,” and “altogether unsuited to the understanding of the men and women for whom it is intended.” In Thompson's opinion, the section of the book on English language instruction was “wholly unscientific and practically unusable.” Thompson also found the book to be juvenile in its overall treatment of civics, noting that the Bureau's textbook did not incorporate any advanced material being used in schools. Moreover, a survey conducted by Thompson indicated that, despite the Bureau's great efforts to get schools to use the *Student's Textbook*, none of the schools in the survey were using the book. Instead, the majority of the schools surveyed relied upon textbooks produced by local Americanization organizations, such

as those printed by the Detroit Board of Commerce, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, or Cleveland Americanization Committee.¹⁰⁰ While many of Thompson's criticisms may be valid, his assertion that the no schools used the *Student's Textbook* must be questioned given the extensive documentation in the Bureau of Naturalization's records. The second critical work was John Palmer Gavit's *Americans by Choice*, which came out two years after Thompson's study. Gavit's criticism was no less severe even though it was not as extensive. Like Thompson, Gavit believed the *Student's Textbook* to be "appallingly elaborate and diffuse" and among the worst of the hundreds of Americanization textbooks in print at the time.¹⁰¹

But the Bureau of Naturalization never claimed that the *Student's Textbook* was perfect. On page two of the *Textbook* Crist asked teachers to undertake the "patriotic public service" of writing to the Bureau with any suggestions for future editions.¹⁰² In March 1919, less than a year after the publication of the original textbook, a committee of 12 educators from public schools and universities across the country began revising the book based on critics' feedback. It can be inferred, based on the composition of the revision committee, that one of the criticisms of the 1918 textbook was that it came from a federal agency (whose responsibility was not education, but naturalization), rather than professional educators. Thus, by having 12 independent, professional educators work on the revisions, the Bureau hoped that future editions would be perceived more as the product and thinking of the education profession instead of the Bureau.¹⁰³

In spite of the Bureau's extensive efforts, public school adult citizenship education attendance remained low throughout the 1910s and 1920s and while some readily adopted the *Student's Textbook*, many others did not. Moreover, Americanization took place just as much—if not more—outside the classroom as inside the classroom, with immigrants being socialized

through their places of employment, social, racial, and fraternal organizations, labor unions, at public lectures and libraries, and in dance halls, movie theaters, and saloons.¹⁰⁴

Regardless, the significance of the Bureau of Naturalization's citizenship education efforts should not be overlooked. First, even though the results of the Bureau of Naturalization's campaign to standardize citizenship education were decidedly mixed, they did not end in the early 1920s when most other Americanization efforts ceased. The Bureau published multiple editions and versions of the *Student's Textbook*, which was renamed the *Federal Textbook on Citizenship* in 1921, last revised in the 1980s, and is still in use today. Second, the history of the Bureau's Americanization work reveals the important role war played in enabling the federal government's involvement in a public education initiative. World War I influenced and furthered the Bureau's work at almost every critical juncture: Wilson's speech in Philadelphia three days after the sinking of the *Lusitania* resulted in unprecedented levels of national interest in citizenship education, which, in turn, allowed the Bureau to form its first partnerships with the nation's public schools just months later; heightened levels of wartime xenophobia and the fear that socialist and anarchist ideas were flourishing in isolated, immigrant communities led to increased demand for a standardized citizenship textbook that could be used in rural parts of the country; and, the realization that hundreds of thousands of U.S. soldiers fighting in WWI were illiterate and un-naturalized pushed Congress to pass the Act of May 9, 1918, which allocated funds for the publication of the *Student's Textbook*. Had it not been for WWI, it is questionable whether the Bureau's citizenship education program—and especially the *Student's Textbook*—would have developed as rapidly, if at all. Finally, the Bureau of Naturalization's campaign represented something new within the Americanization movement of the early twentieth century:

an attempt by the federal government to standardize the widespread, yet diffuse citizenship education efforts taking place in urban and rural communities throughout the nation.

Appendix A

Richard K. Campbell, date unknown.

Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/service/pnp/hec/20300/20385v.jpg>.

Appendix B

Raymond F. Crist, January 2, 1923.

Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/service/pnp/npcc/23700/23725v.jpg>.

Appendix C

Bureau of Naturalization citizenship education class, sometime between 1918 and 1928.

Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/service/pnp/npcc/33200/33256v.jpg>.

Appendix D

Bureau of Naturalization citizenship education class with men and women, sometime between

1918 and 1928. Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/service/pnp/npcc/33200/33257v.jpg>.

Appendix E

Raymond Crist (center) with a small group of soldiers petitioning for citizenship on June 6, 1919. Of special note is the black soldier one row behind Crist and to his left. During this period blacks were largely excluded from full citizenship, though some soldiers sought to further their rights through their service in the war.

Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/service/pnp/npcc/00300/00337v.jpg>.

Endnotes

Note on sources: Primary sources from Entry 30, Record Group 85, Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Services, at the National Archives and Records Administration in Washington, D.C., abbreviated NARA RG85 followed by the file, and folder numbers when available. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Naturalization to the Secretary of Labor* abbreviated AR followed by the year. Testimony of Raymond F. Crist as part of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Proposed Changes in Naturalization Laws*, 66th Congress, 1st sess., 1919, abbreviated Hearings followed by the page number. Two frequently used newspapers are abbreviated as follows: *The New York Times* (NYT) and *Los Angeles Times* (LAT). Newspaper articles were accessed through Proquest and journal articles were accessed through JSTOR.

¹ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (1955; repr., New York: Atheneum, 1965), 234-63, esp. 247. Edward G. Hartmann also put forth this dichotomous view. Hartmann, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant* (1948; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1967). Otis L. Graham, Jr. and Elizabeth Koed have argued that historians have largely misread Higham and Hartmann, overlooking the liberal democratic strand and thus overemphasizing the nativistic elements of the movement. Graham and Koed, "Americanizing the Immigrant, Past and Future: History and Implications of a Social Movement," *The Public Historian* 15 (Autumn, 1993): 24-49.

²Memorandum by Raymond F. Crist to A.M. Simmons, 15 May 1918, NARA RG85, 27671/4839.

³ Re: Naturalization Act of 6/29/1906 see "Ancestry of USCIS," USCIS History Office & Library, 2007.; Re: Campbell's appointment and biography see "Two Promotions by President," *LAT*, 10 July 1906, 11.; "New Immigration Division," *NYT*, 7 July 1906, 5.; and Susan M. Gordon, "Immigrant to Citizen: Naturalization Education in the United States, 1914-1973," PhD diss., UChicago, 2004, 59. Originally from Lynchburg, Virginia, Campbell was born in 1853, earned a law degree from the University of Maryland at the age of 21, and after working in private practice for two years he returned to Virginia and lived as a farmer for nearly two decades. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, Campbell became a lawyer for the Bureau of Immigration and in 1905 he served as a member of the Presidential Commission on Naturalization. Many of the basic recommendations made by the Commission were written into the Naturalization Act of 1906.

⁴ James M. Cattell ed., "Crist, Dr. Raymond Fowler," in *Leaders in Education: A Biographical Directory*, 1941, p. 228.; "Has Shortcut to Knowledge," *LAT*, 21 April 1919, 12. Born in El Paso, Illinois on August 7, 1871, Crist attended Columbia College, received a degree in dentistry from Howard University in 1897, and would receive a law degree from Washington College of Law later in his career in 1917. Crist entered the government as a messenger boy, worked as the private secretary for the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in 1904-05, and then as a commerce agent to Japan, China, and Africa within the Department of Commerce and Labor until becoming Assistant Chief of the Division of Naturalization.

⁵ Re: Naturalization Act of 3/4/1913 see "Ancestry of USCIS," USCIS History Office & Library, 2007.; Re: Campbell as Commissioner see Gordon, "Immigrant to Citizen," 59.; Re: Crist as Deputy Commissioner see Cattell, *Leaders in Education*, 228.

⁶ Campbell acted as Commissioner from 1913 until 1922 and Crist from 1923 until 1933. As a side note, letters between Campbell and Crist seem to indicate that they were friendly on a personal level.

⁷ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell, 20 April 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/23-25. Crist's testimony before the Congressional Committee on I&N on 10/16/1919 corroborates the claim that citizenship education and a partnership with the public schools was first recommended in April 1914.; Clarence N. Goodwin to Louis F. Post, 16 December 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/25. Goodwin was active in the Americanization movement and although he believed the Bureau of Naturalization had to play a central role in the movement, he also thought that "the cooperation of the Bureau of Education [was] essential" since education, in his opinion, was at the root of the problem. Clarence Norton Goodwin, "National Americanization," *The Immigrants in America Review*, April 1916, 27-31.

⁸ Memorandum by Campbell to Louis F. Post re: Goodwin's letter, 22 December 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/25.

⁹ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell re: Goodwin's letter, 23 December 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/25.

Memorandum was later forwarded to Asst. Sec. of Labor Post.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Memorandum by Campbell to W.B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, 21 January 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25. Crist's comments at the National Education Association meeting in the summer of 1916 in NYC corroborate this. Crist, "The Education of Foreigners for American Citizenship," NEA Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting Held at New York City, 1-8 July 1916, 1048.

¹² Julius Drachler, *Democracy and assimilation, the blending of immigrant heritages in America* (1920; repr., Westport: Negro Universities Press, 1970), 60-2.

¹³ Daniel Chauncey Brewer, *The Peril of the Republic: Are We Facing Revolution in the United States* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1922), 209-15. Brewer vehemently opposed Americanization, in part because he felt "it suggests patronage of superiority on the part of those exercising the process," "it is coercive and at odds with the traditions of the Republic," and "[b]ecause of abundant facts showing that it is resented by the persons to be Americanized."

¹⁴ Gayle Gullett, "Women Progressives and the Politics of Americanization in California, 1915-1920," *The Pacific Historical Review* 64 (Feb 1995): 89-90. See Hartmann, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant*, 253-66. Hartmann largely relies on foreign-language newspapers to capture immigrant resistance. See also Dorothee Schneider, "Naturalization and United States Citizenship in Two Periods of Mass Migration: 1894-1930, 1965-2000," *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Fall 2001): 61.

¹⁵ Maxine Seller, "The Education of the Immigrant Woman: 1900-1935," *Journal of Urban History* IV (1978). As described in Gullett, "Women Progressives and the Politics of Americanization in California, 1915-1920," 89-90.

¹⁶ *The Immigrants in America Review*, April 1916, 36. *The Immigrants in America Review* was a publication of the National Americanization Committee, a leading organization in the field.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.* Original text as is. Spelling errors not modified in order to maintain authenticity.

¹⁹ Madeleine Sweeny Miller, "An Hour in a Naturalization Court," *The Survey*, July 6, 1918, 393-4.

²⁰ Memorandum by Campbell to W.B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor. 21 January 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25.; Jerome C. Shaw to Campbell, 23 March 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25.

²¹ *The Immigrants in America Review*, March 1915, 75. The article specifically called out the Bureau, stating, "The Federal Bureau of Naturalization publishes no instructions regarding the manner of securing final papers."

²² Memorandum by Crist, "The Matter of Obtaining Satisfactory Assurance That Applications for Citizenship are Attached to the Principles of the Constitution of the United States," 11 February 1915, NARA RG85, Entry 30, 27671/25.

²³ Memorandum by Campbell to W.B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor. 21 January 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25.

²⁴ Miller, "An Hour in a Naturalization Court," 393.

²⁵ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell, 20 April 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/22-25. The Bureau of Naturalization and Bureau of Education, located within the Department of the Interior, fought a highly contested battle for control of the federal leadership of Americanization from 1914 until 1919. Naturalization outlasted the Bureau of Education when the latter's outside funding dried up after a Congressional act was passed prohibiting such sources of funding. Naturalization's national network of examiners and judges also contributed to the Bureau's longevity. For the definitive account of this see John F. McClymer, "The Federal Government and the Americanization Movement, 1915-1924," *Prologue* 10 (1978). McClymer's article influenced my thinking re: the Bureau's motives for being involved in the movement (discussed later). See also Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 259.

²⁶ "Course of America Defined by President," *LAT*, 11 May 1915, II.; "Crowds Cheer President," *NYT*, 11 May 1915, 2.; AR, 1918, 26. In the 1918 Annual Report Campbell puts the attendance at 20,000, but the *LAT* estimated the crowd to be 15,000. I have privileged the latter figure, assuming it is more objective.

²⁷ Raymond F. Crist, "The Federal Plan of Americanization Work with the Foreign-Born," NEA Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting Held at Milwaukee, WI, 28 June-5 July 1920, 472-3.

²⁸ "Course of America Defined by President," *LAT*, 11 May 1915, II.; "Crowds Cheer President," *NYT*, 11 May 1915, 2.; AR, 1918, 26.

²⁹ "Course of America Defined by President," *LAT*, 11 May 1915, II.

³⁰ AR, 1918, 26.

³¹ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell re: Goodwin's letter, 23 December 1914, NARA RG85, 27671/25. In the 1917 Annual Report, Campbell emphasized that unassimilated immigrants posed a serious threat to the U.S. since some remained loyal to their home countries and were "inimical in their hearts to the well-being of this country." AR, 1917, 78.

³² "Citizenship Syllabus Now Being Distributed," *NYT*, 2 April 1916, X4.

³³ AR, 1916, 36-7. John Higham reinforces this point, noting that other Americanization organizations used the momentum from the Philadelphia event to further their own work. Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 243.

³⁴ Crist to Campbell, 12 July 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25. Post's consent is evident from his initials marked next to each item in Crist's proposal.

³⁵ AR1916, 35.

-
- ³⁶ “Will Stir Up Melting Pot,” *LAT*, 13 August 1915, III.
- ³⁷ “To Americanize Foreign-Born Who Live Here,” *NYT*, 24 October 1915, SM8.
- ³⁸ AR, 1916, 48.
- ³⁹ AR, 1917, 60.; Crist, “The Federal Plan of Americanization Work with the Foreign-Born,” NEA Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Seventh Annual Meeting Held at Milwaukee, WI, June 28-July 5, 1919, 474.
- ⁴⁰ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell, 12 January 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/789.
- ⁴¹ Memorandum by John B. Torbert, Sec. of DC Society of SAR, to W.B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, 22 November 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/591.
- ⁴² Henry B. Hazard to Campbell, 29 March 1915, NARA RG85, 27671/25.
- ⁴³ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell, 12 January 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/789.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵ Crist, “The Education of Foreigners for American Citizenship,” NEA Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting Held at New York City, 1-8 July 1916, 1048.
- ⁴⁶ Memorandum by Frederick C. Emmerich to Campbell, 28 April 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁴⁷ Memorandum by Paul Armstrong to Campbell, 19 April 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁴⁸ R.K. Doe to Campbell, 2 March 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁴⁹ J.M. Berkey to Crist, 13 February 1917, NARA RG85, 27671/1959. J. A.G. Stitzer, an examiner in Pittsburgh, also responded to the Bureau’s request for feedback. Stitzer recommended creating a textbook for three grade levels. J.A.G. Stitzer to Campbell, 24 April 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁵⁰ AR, 1917, 61-62.
- ⁵¹ AR, 1916, 68-69.
- ⁵² Campbell to City Superintendent of Schools in Whiting, IN, 1 April 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/420. The Bureau of Naturalization also received support from private organizations such as the Russell Sage Foundation, whose acting director, Arthur H. Richardson, wrote to Campbell in March 1916 that RSF would help “in any way possible in formulating your standard text book for instructing aliens in citizenship.” Arthur H. Richardson to Campbell, 31 March 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1681.
- ⁵³ AR, 1916, 76-7. ;Crist, “Opening Address” and “Chairman’s Note,” in *Proceedings of the First Citizenship Convention*, 7 and 34.
- ⁵⁴ AR, 1917, 59.
- ⁵⁵ AR, 1916, 40.
- ⁵⁶ Campbell to W.R. Matthews, Superintendent of Schools, Superior, WY, 7 December 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1910.
- ⁵⁷ Campbell to all Chief Naturalization Examiners, 16 October 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/2243. In October 1919, Crist testified that since its inception in 1906 the Bureau had taken in \$4,648,768.44 in naturalization fees and only spent \$3,923,447.67. The resultant aggregate surplus of \$725,320.77 over 13 years equaled out to be just under \$56,000 per year. Hearings, 27.
- ⁵⁸ Hearings, 5-8.
- ⁵⁹ Walker Hill, President of Mechanics-American National Bank of St. Louis, to Senator James A. Reed, 29 December 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/2243.; Owen Miller, Secretary of the American Federation of Musicians, to Senator James A. Reed, 4 January 1917, NARA RG85, 27671/2243.
- ⁶⁰ B.W. Edwards to Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, 1 February 1917, NARA RG85, 27671/2243.
- ⁶¹ John G. Imel to Henry B. Hazard, Chief Naturalization Examiner, Portland, Oregon, 15 February 1917, NARA RG85, 27671/2243.
- ⁶² William Ragsdale, Chief Naturalization Examiner, Pittsburgh, to Campbell, 10 February 1917, NARA RG85, 27671/2243. Ragsdale’s three-page letter summarized lobbying activity in support of Bill 7909.
- ⁶³ McClymer, “The Federal Government and the Americanization Movement, 1915-24,” 36.
- ⁶⁴ Hartmann, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant*, 162-4.
- ⁶⁵ AR, 1918, 30-3. Campbell also noted that this change in the naturalization law disrupted the Bureau’s work since all examiners were needed to naturalize soldiers.; Darryl Hevenor Smith, *The Bureau of Naturalization: its history, activities, and organization* (1926; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1974), 13-4. Between 1918 and 1922 a total of 271,404 foreigners serving in the military were naturalized this way.
- ⁶⁶ “Act of May 9, 1918, Sec. 9,” found in *Laws Applicable to Immigration and Nationality* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1953), 837.
- ⁶⁷ AR, 1916. 61.

- ⁶⁸ “Americanization,” *NYT*, 5 April 1918, 14. George M. Stephenson claimed that anti-German sentiments had deep roots. In hopes of proving their loyalty, throngs of German-Americans joined the National German-American Alliance, whose membership skyrocketed to nearly three million before the United States’ entry into the war. Stephenson, *A History of American Immigration, 1820-1924*, 210.
- ⁶⁹ Joseph Smith to Campbell, 5 April 1918, NARA RG85, 27671/4832. Clearly, the war in Europe influenced and enhanced the fears described by Young and Smith. Germans were the most vilified nationality in the press and a common target of Americanizers in the 1910s and 1920s.
- ⁷⁰ Del L. Sullivan to Campbell, 30 April 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁷¹ Campbell to Frederick C. Emmerich, 15 June 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/1714.
- ⁷² Campbell to all Chief Examiners, 17 October 1918, NARA RG85, 27671/1966.
- ⁷³ Re: # of copies in FY 1918-19 see AR, 1920, 78.; Re: # of copies by October 1919 see Hearings, 96.; On average, each textbook cost ten cents to print. Hearings, 122.
- ⁷⁴ W.H. Wagner to Campbell, 10 October 1918, NARA RG85, 27671/1966.
- ⁷⁵ Thomas S. Griffing, CNE St. Paul, MN, to Campbell. 8 October 1918, found in appendix to Hearings, 142.
- ⁷⁶ George Crutchfield, CNE San Francisco, CA, to Campbell. 31 August 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 129.
- ⁷⁷ Crist to W. Roy Groce, Supt. Schools, Crystal City, MO. 13 September 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 150.
- ⁷⁸ S.E. Weber, Supt. Schools, Scranton, PA, to Campbell, 27 September 1918, found in appendix to Hearings, 183.; Telegram by S.E. Weber to Campbell, 4 February 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 191.
- ⁷⁹ Re: North Dakota, see Charlotte A. Jones, Supt. of Schools, Cavalier, ND, to Commissioner of Naturalization, 3 July 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 163.; Re: Alaska, see Crist to Lester D. Henderson, Commissioner of Education, Alaska, 8 August 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 123-4.
- ⁸⁰ Telegram by Paul Armstrong, Colorado Examiner, to Bureau of Naturalization, 5 September 1919, found in the appendix to Hearings, 212. Crist sent a telegram responding to Armstrong on the same day, offering congratulations and saying that the matter “will receive personal expeditious attention.” Two weeks later, on 19 October 1919, Armstrong sent a letter to Crist indicating that the 10,000 textbooks had arrived, but they were still waiting for the teacher’s manuals. See Hearings, 213.; See also, Crist’s testimony from Hearings, 95.
- ⁸¹ Hearings, 94.; See also “Support of the Division of Citizenship Training in Oklahoma,” found in appendix to Hearings, 174. And Irene F. Hickey to M.R. Bevington, CNE St. Louis, MO. 19 May 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 168.
- ⁸² AR, 1918, 43-4.
- ⁸³ Charles H. Brough to Crist, 12 September 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 127. The Bureau of Naturalization had sent out copies of the *Student’s Textbook* to every governor in the country and some governors, including Brough, acknowledged receipt of the textbook and responded to Crist’s letter.
- ⁸⁴ J.C. Tjaden to the Commissioner of Naturalization, 17 February 1919, found in the appendix to Hearings, 206.
- ⁸⁵ “Report of examiner H.A. Wilson re: work in Wilkes-Barre, PA,” 2 February 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 203.; Eight months later, on 10/9/1919, H.H. Zeiser, Superintendent of Schools in Wilkes-Barre, sent a telegram to Crist saying, “We urgently need” 100 additional textbooks. Found in appendix to Hearings, 203.
- ⁸⁶ Robert A. Greene to Bureau of Naturalization, 15 October 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 160.
- ⁸⁷ “How to Make Americans,” *The Survey*, 28 June 1919, 485-6.
- ⁸⁸ Crist to employers willing to help foreign-born workers, 1916, NARA RG85, 27671/2243. Re: Detroit and Americanization in factories see James R. Barrett, “Americanization from the Bottom Up: Immigration and the Remaking of the Working Class in the United States, 1880-1930,” *The Journal of American History* 79 (1992): 996-1020.; Stephen Meyer, “Adapting the Immigrant to the Line: Americanization in the Ford Factory, 1914-1921,” *Journal of Social History* 14 (1980): 67-82.; Detroit Board of Commerce and Board of Education, *Americanizing a City: The Campaign for the Detroit Night Schools*, 1915.; and June Granatir Alexander, *Daily Life in Immigrant America, 1870-1920* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007), 221-3.
- ⁸⁹ Meyer, *Adapting the Immigrant to the Line: Americanization in the Ford Factory, 1914-1921*, 67.
- ⁹⁰ Boas, “Americanization a Community Problem,” *NYT*, 2 February 1919, 39.
- ⁹¹ AR, 1918, 42-3.; See also Hearings, 99.
- ⁹² Report by J.M. Gurnett, CNE Philadelphia, PA, 5 January 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 195.
- ⁹³ J. Smith, CNE Seattle, to Annie E. Lowell, County Supt. of Schools, Terry, MT, 23 September 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 157.
- ⁹⁴ Hearings, 101.
- ⁹⁵ Hearings, 98-99.

⁹⁶ "U.S. Textbook A Short Course in Citizenship," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 21 April 1919, found in NARA RG85, 27671/1966.; "Has Short Cut To Knowledge," *LAT*, 21 April 1919, I2.

⁹⁷ "Citizenship Course of Labor Department," *Gazette*, 22 May 1919, found in NARA RG85, 27671/1966.

⁹⁸ Memorandum by Crist to Campbell. 21 April 1922, NARA RG85, Entry 30, 27671/1966.

⁹⁹ J. Smith to Commissioner of Naturalization, 14 November 1923, NARA RG85, Entry 30, E2.

¹⁰⁰ Frank Victor Thompson, *Schooling the Immigrant* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1920), 345-9.

¹⁰¹ John Palmer Gavit, *Americans By Choice* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1922), 174.

¹⁰² Crist, *Student's Textbook*, 2.

¹⁰³ Hearings, 96.; Crist to Lester D. Henderson, Commissioner of Education, Alaska, 8 August 1919, found in appendix to Hearings, 123-4.

¹⁰⁴ Barrett, "Americanization from the Bottom Up: Immigration and the Remaking of the Working Class in the United States, 1880-1930," 996-1020.; Meyer, "Adapting the Immigrant to the Line: Americanization in the Ford Factory, 1914-1921," 67-82.; and Kathy Lee Peiss, *Cheap amusements : working women and leisure in New York City, 1880 to 1920* (Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1986), 11-33. Peiss pays particular attention to the differences between how men and women were Americanized outside of the workplace.