"Unless we Americanize them they will foreignize us" Pragmatism, Progressivism, and Americanization*

Matthew J. Brown† Sabrina Starnaman‡
Center for Values in Medicine, Science, and Technology
School of Arts and Humanities
The University of Texas at Dallas.

Abstract

The ideas and social work of pragmatist progressives John Dewey and Jane Addams have long been misrepresented by left multiculturalists, American literary and cultural studies scholars, and others. This is unfortunate, because Dewey and Addams have nuanced and interesting views on questions of immediate and significant importance, such as race relations, relations with immigrant communities, and their effect on democracy. We trace the history of a particular citation error that is the centerpiece of an attempt to paint Dewey and Addams as cultural assimilationists who urged the "Americanization" of immigrants and non-whites. We set the record straight through a careful look at the textual record and drawing the crucial distinction between the ideal of social integration versus the ideal of cultural assimilation. This story has lessons not only for the historiography of the Progressive Era but for citation and research ethics for humanities and historical scholars.

1 Introduction: Segregation, Integration, and Americanization

Today, racial tensions and conflict over immigration are at a high-water mark in the United States. Egregious police killings of (often unarmed) black men have been publicized by social media and have sparked protests nationwide under the heading "#BlackLivesMatter." White supremacist terrorism against blacks, immigrants, and non-Christians between 2002-2015 took more lives in the U.S. than jihadist terrorism(Bergen et al., 2016, Part IV). The last several years have seen many fights

*This paper has been submitted to and desk rejected by *American Literature*. We are currently seeking recommendations for an alternative venue for publication.

†mattbrown@utdallas.edu
‡sabrina.starnaman@utdallas.edu

over immigration, culminating in the election of a President on the childish promise to "build a wall" to keep foreign nationals from entering the country without government sanction. The integration of schools that began with *Brown v. Board of Education* largely ended in the 1980's, as courts lacked the will to enforce it, and schools have been resegregating ever since, in some cases to pre-*Brown* levels (Anderson, 2010; Orfield and Lee, 2004). From 2000-01 to 2013-14, the percentage of schools with majority poor black or Hispanic populations nearly doubled, from 9 to 16 percent (United States Government Accountability Office, 2016). Right-wing conservatives and left-wing multiculturalists alike have supported segregation of racial, ethnic, and immigrant groups, or at least failed to support integration. But equality and equity cannot be achieved through or despite segregation. Segregation is a root cause of racial and ethnic disadvantage and inequality, and it undermines democracy (Anderson, 2010).

Scholars of American history, thought, and culture can contribute to ameliorating these problems. Americans have been wrangling with questions of immigration and race relations since the beginning of our nation's history, if not before, and the roots of our present problems can be traced through that history. In considering our contemporary concerns, two eras stick out as particularly relevant sources: the Civil Rights Era of the mid-twentieth century, and the Progressive Era of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. This article focuses on the latter, and particularly on two key sources of thought about segregation and integration: the Social Settlement movement, especially as embodied in the thought and praxis of Jane Addams, and the political and educational thought of American philosopher John Dewey. Addams and Dewey are major figures in what we might call the pragmatist wing of progressivism, as both are regarded as important figures in both progressive thought and pragmatist philosophy.[1] Both have been frequently misunderstood and misinterpreted in the literature, and the latter in particular has been subject to severe misrepresentation by left multiculturalists[2] and contemporary American literary and cultural studies scholars. In particular, both have been misinterpreted as defenders of a kind of cultural assimilationism, a program of "Americanization."

We focus on one particular thread in this misrepresentation, a thread that has significant bearing not only for these questions about segregation, integration, and

[1] "Pragmatism" is a philosophical tradition with disputed boundaries, founded by William James and Charles Saunders Peirce, and thought to include such diverse figures as George Herbert Mead, Alain Locke, Clarence Irving Lewis, Richard Rorty, and Cornel West. Addams and Dewey were contemporaries whose mutual influence was significant, and were much more socially and politically engaged than James or Peirce.

[2] Jason Baber's unpublished work, "John Dewey and American Exceptionalism," aptly catalogues the left multiculturalist misrepresentations of Dewey.

Americanization, but also teaches an important lesson about research and citation ethics in the humanities. We trace the roots of the misrepresentation of Dewey in particular, set the record straight on Addams and Dewey on Americanization, and end with a word of caution for future researchers.

2 Tracing an Error in Scholarship

In "Cultures and Carriers: 'Typhoid Mary' and the Science of Social Control" Priscilla Wald writes:

> And the task of reproducing white America fell largely to the white American mother... The "social work" of the women in settlement houses, for example, entailed turning immigrant (and even wayward native) girls into American women (as opposed to "the American woman") and immigrant mothers into American mothers. In fact, as manuals written by settlement workers and educators regularly stressed, every generation needed to be Americanized anew, and the process of Americanization was largely parents' (and especially mothers') work. "If we do not Americanize them," progressive educator John Dewey had cautioned, "they will foreignize us." (Wald, 1997, p. 205)

The quotation appears also in her 1995 book, *Constituting Americans*, this time in the context of a more complicated discussion of Theodore Roosevelt's views on Americanization and lingering post-Civil War concerns of national integrity and sectionalism, rather than a discussion of the social settlement:

> Many turn-of-the-century narratives of the nation explicitly cast the challenge posed by heterogeneity to the integrity of America as a challenge to the existence of Americans. Memories of the Civil War invested immigrant ghettos and other pockets of racially or ethnically similar groups with a potentially treacherous national divisiveness... Educator and philosopher John Dewey similarly warns in a 1902 speech: "unless we Americanize them they will foreignize us." (Wald, 1995, p. 204)

In both pieces, Wald uses the quotation as a piece of evidence to link progressive thinkers and activists with the unpleasantness of the Americanization movement. No doubt, it is striking and challenging to read such a towering figure of progressivism, John Dewey, supposed defender of democracy, the top name in progressive education and pragmatist philosophy, and an intellectual ally of the social settlement movement, so firmly committed to Americanization.

The seeming importance of this troubling statement by Dewey as a piece of evidence in the evaluation of progressivism has led to many subsequent appearances of the quotation. Besides her 1995 book and 1997 *Social Text* article, Wald repeats the quotation in Wald (1999, p. 216) and (2002, p. 666). It is also used by Bramen (1997, p. 67) as evidence of the widespread drive to assimilation and fear of reverse assimilation, the "loss of a "distinctively American" character"(*ibid.*). Education scholars Thomas S. Popkewitz and Marianne N. Bloch in "Administering Freedom: A History of the Present: Rescuing the Parent to Rescue the Child for Society" (2001) repeat Wald's quotation:

> "Dewey was concerned, as were others of his time, with the heterogeneity as a challenge to the integrity of American identity. He spoke about the need to Americanize the new immigrants lest they "foreignize us" (quoted in Wald, 1995, p. 204)." (Popkewitz and Bloch, 2001, p. 95).

In apparent contradiction, however, immediately after, they point out that "Dewey was also concerned about the social disintegration of the immigrant family as children were Americanized too rapidly in the exchange of one family structure for another and one narrative of identity for one radically different"(ibid). Popkewitz also repeats the quotation in (2001, p. 185).

In terms of impact of this quotation, most important may be its repetition in *The Encyclopedia of American Studies* article on "Americanization," written by Priscilla Wald and Anne Curzan (2001). The importance of this reference document *may* explain the further spread of the quotation in the literature cited above.

There is a problem, however. Dewey never said anything remotely like the quotation in question; if anything, he said many things diametrically opposed to it. How can this be? We were familiar with Dewey's basic orientation on such questions, and so this quote struck us as very strange. Our first thought was that perhaps the quote was taken out of context, and looking at the full text might soften or reverse the meaning attributed to Dewey. In Dewey's work, he commonly discusses opposing views in great detail and without explicit citation; it is possible, we thought, that a reader less familiar with Dewey's style had mistaken the statement of an opponent's view for his own. But this was not the case either. Luckily for our investigation, Dewey's *Collected Works* (including many unpublished materials) have been made available in searchable electronic databases, available through many university libraries. A quick search revealed that the word "foreignize" appeared *nowhere* in Dewey's collected works, nor in the several volumes of correspondence similarly available.

The footnote to the Dewey quotation is the same in the book and the "Cultures and Carriers" paper:

> John Dewey, speech delivered to the National Education Association, 1902, cited in Robert A. Carlson, *The Quest for Conformity: Americanization through Education* (New York: John Wiley, 1975), 112.

Given Wald's footnote, it seems like the citation must be to Dewey's "The School as Social Center," (1902)[3] but the quote does not appear there, and the article seems to be saying just the opposite:

> Indeed, wise observers... have called attention to the fact that in some respects the children are too rapidly, I will not say Americanized, but too rapidly denationalized. They lose the positive and conservative value of their own native traditions... (MW 2:85)

References to "Americanization" appeared in a 1916 address to the National Education Association ("Nationalizing Education," MW 10), "The School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideals in Children," (1923, MW 15:152), and a few other places, and in each case, Dewey again seems to be saying quite the opposite of Wald's quotation suggests (see below).

Given the difficulty in finding Wald's quotation by searching Dewey's published corpus, we turned to her own source for the quotation, Carlson (1975). On p. 112, Carlson quotes the following passage from the 1912 Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) handbook, *Association Educational Work for Men and Boys*:

> Of late years, however... masses of suspicious clannish people from southern and southeastern Europe have swarmed to our already congested cities... It is not a question of whether we want them or not. They are here and their numbers are increasing... Unless we can assimilate, develop, train, and make good citizens out of them, they are certain to make ignorant, suspicious, and un-Americanized citizens out of us. *Unless we Americanize them they will foreignize us.* (pp. 175-176 Hodge, 1912, emphasis added).

Wald got the quote from Carlson, but the attribution to Dewey is clearly a mistake. The very page that Wald quotes throughout her works, p. 112, attributes that quote

[3]Appears in volume 2 of the *Middle Works* of Dewey's collected works (Boydston, 1969-1991). Citations to the collected works will appear as parenthetical citations to according to sub-collection: *The Early Works: 1991-1898* (*EW*), *The Middle Works, 1899-1924* (*MW*), and *The Later Works, 1925-1953* (*LW*). Citations are made with these designations followed by volume and page number, along with essay or manuscript title where this is not clear from context.

to the YMCA, in the midst of fairly lengthy discussion of the YMCA's approach to Americanization.

Carlson also discusses Dewey in an easily accessible article, "Americanization as an Early 20th Century Adult Education Movement" (1970). There Carlson says the following about Dewey:

> There were those who stood *against* the Americanization flood. As early as 1916, John Dewey publicly fought the effort to identify certain cultural characterisitcs as American and to Americanize for national unity around these criteria. He argued that America was a composite of races and nationalities, with no single ethnic ideal. (Carlson, 1970, p. 453, emphasis mine)

Likewise, in this article we find the "...foreignize us" quote again attributed to the YMCA's 1912 handbook, which

> ...emphasized fear and social control... It warned that "Unless we can assimilate, develop, train and make good citizens out of them, they are certain to make ignorant, suspicious and un-Americanized citizens out of us. Unless we Americanize them they will foreignize us."(Carlson, 1970, p. 447)[4]

The Carlson article is now easily accessible on JSTOR.

Something else interesting about John Dewey can be found further on in Wald (1995), which seems to be inconsistent with the "...foreignize us" quotation:

> In 1902, for example, philosopher and educator John Dewey called attention to the too rapid "de-nationalization" of immigrant children: "They lose the the positive and conservative value of their own native traditions, their own native music, art, and literature. They do not get complete initiation into the customs of their new country, and so are frequently left floating and unstable between the two. They even learn to despise the dress, bearing, habits, language, and beliefs of their parents — many of which have more substance and worth than the superficial putting on of the newly adopted habits." (Wald, 1995, p. 247)

Here, the citation is to the aforementioned "The School as Social Center" (see Wald, 1995, p. 342n23).

[4]Carlson again refers to Hodge (1912, pp. 175–176).

It's likely that Wald made a simple mistake, crossing her references in her notes. Given that Wald quotes Dewey in the context of showing the assimilationist, homogenizing, perhaps even racist rhetoric of a number of other figures in the progressive movement, including Theodore Roosevelt, it may not have seemed out of place. It would be fruitless for us to speculate on the exact history of the error, but that it is an error is quite clear.

Returning to Carlson (1975), it is worth pointing out that he does discuss Dewey in that book, though the favorable reference to Dewey in his 1970 article (to Dewey's clear anti-Americanization statement of 1916) is absent. The references to Dewey in the book are rather lukewarm, on the one hand associating Dewey with Jane Addams and the social settlement movement and claiming that their ideas had been perverted for racist purposes (p. 117). On the other hand, Carlson argues that their emphasis on social harmony and cohesion amounted to a more humane approach towards assimilation and Americanization (more on this below). That Carlson associates Dewey with Americanization in the book, and that references to the YMCA statement and to Dewey appear so close in the book (p. 112 v. p. 117) provides further possible explanation for the mix-up. (We'll return to Carlson's assessment of Dewey and Addams below.)

Scholars make mistakes, and no doubt they can repeat the mistakes when relying on their notes and prior published works. But how has the mistake spread so widely? Part of the problem can be seen in the way that it is cited. Wald consistently refers to the quotation as "...cited in Robert A. Carlson..." Bramen cites Wald (1995, p. 204), using the notation "qtd. in *Wald*." Popkewitz and Bloch likewise refer to the quotation as "quoted in Wald, 1995." The *Encyclopedia of American Studies* case is especially unfortunate, since it virtually guarantees the continual repetition of this misquotaton of a sentiment that clearly contradicts many of Dewey's statements about the issue by American Studies students and scholars well into the future, as long as the record remains uncorrected. On the other hand, Demant (2011) is one of the few sources we have found that both cites Wald (1995) and references the '...foreignize us" quote, but manages to correctly attribute the quote to the YMCA, to her credit. Unfortunately, she does not point out Wald's error.[5]

It would appear that at some point recently, Priscilla Wald has realized her mistake, because she correctly attributes the quote to the YMCA in (2011, p. 467). Yet as far as we can find, no retraction or correction has appeared anywhere. It is thus important to set the record straight not only by pointing out the grievous error in this misquotation, but in general on the relationship between progressivism and

[5]We will return to the issue of the research and citation practices behind the propogation of this error in the Conclusion.

Americanization, and especially the pragmatist progressivism represented by John Dewey and Jane Addams.

3 Setting the Record Straight on Pragmatism, Progressivism, and Americanization

It is not our goal to attack or embarrass Priscilla Wald. Rather, our goal is to set the record straight on John Dewey's views on assimilation and Americanization of immigrants (he was against it) and, more broadly, on the progressive movement broadly (it was complicated) and the social settlement in particular (it depends on the particular settlement, but assimilationism was anethema to the projects of the earliest and most important social settlements in America). John Dewey and Jane Addams in particular, who we might call the "pragmatist progressives," held careful, nuanced views that combined cultural pluralism with the importance of a democratically-engaged public. Of course, many in the progressive movement, and specifically the social settlement movement, lacked this level of nuance, even among Dewey's and Addams' followers. Nevertheless, we have noticed that many scholars of the Progressive Era, especially from literature and American studies backgrounds, treat progressivism in general and the social settlement movement specifically as ideologically homogenous on an assimilationist, conformist, cultural imperialist, nationalist, and racist agenda. While this is unquestionably a thread within progressivism, the reality is far more complex than these scholars would have us believe.

The best start to considering the case against Dewey and Addams may be found by starting with Carlson's own arguments in *The Quest for Conformity*. There, Carlson argues that Dewey and Addams represent a kind of "humane" approach to assimilating or Americanizing immigrants. Carlson's statements about John Dewey are brief. He refers to Dewey's statement that the social settlement should be model for the public school. Quoting Dewey:

> I suppose, whenever we are framing our ideals of the school as a social centre, what we think of is particularly the better class of social settlements. *What we want is to see* the school, *every public school, doing something of the same sort of work that is now done by a settlement or two scattered at wide distances through the city.* (1902, MW 2: 91, emphasis added where (Carlson, 1975) has quoted.)

According to Carlson, the social settlement movement was aimed at Americanization of immigrants, and Dewey argues that schools should be more like the social settlement.

In considering Carlson's argument, it is important to recognize that the social settlement movement was a decentralized and heterogeneous movement. It was not a unified enterprise, and Dewey and Addams did not set policy for it. As we see in the part of the quotation above that Carlson omitted, Dewey was clearly familiar with this variance, explicitly referencing "the better class of social settlements." Some settlements were certainly more problematic than others, and Dewey and Addams both knew it. According to (Carlson, 1975), the social settlement workers were "the most kindly of Americanizers," who were sympathetic to the immigrants, "willing to mix with... and learn from them," but who still "did expect eventual acceptance by the newcomers of the prevailing American ideology and patterns of life" (p. 12). But Dewey and Addams did not regard these expectations as proper for the social settlements, though not every settlement house lived up to their model.

Addams insisted that the social settlement should be a space of cross-cultural and cross-class collaboration, and not a space of uni-direction power relations, as exemplified by the following practice she reports in *Twenty Years at Hull House:* "I never addressed a Chicago audience on the subject of the Settlement and its vicinity without inviting a neighbor to go with me, that I might curb my hasty generalization by the consciousness that I had an auditor who knew the conditions more intimately than I could hope to do" (Addams, 1910, p. 96). This is evidence that Addams believes that her knowledge is not inherently superior, but that the neighbors' knowledge is authentic, vital, and sometimes takes precedence over her own, which is anathema to the assimilationist project. Furthermore, in interpreting the social settlement, it is crucial to distinguish between *cooperation* and *participation* in a shared culture, which is obviously a necessity in a pluralistic democracy and *assimilation* to common culture, to be imposed on immigrants in particular. The former does not require a push for cultural homogeneity that makes the push for Americanization so problematic. The latter assimilationist position was very much in conflict with Dewey, Addams, and the theory behind Hull House and many other social settlements.

I have claimed that Dewey commonly references the importance of pluralism, and even of the dangers of cultural conformity. We have seen as early as 1902 that Dewey decried the "de-nationalization" of the children of immigrants by American schools. In a 1916 address to the National Education Association, Dewey again seems to be arguing against any kind of assimilationist program:

> I want to mention only two elements in the nationalism which our education should cultivate. The first is that the American nation is itself complex and compound. Strictly speaking it is interracial and international in its make-up. It is composed of a multitude of peoples speaking

> different tongues, inheriting diverse traditions, cherishing varying ideals of life. This fact is basic to our nationalism as distinct from that of other peoples. Our national motto, "One from Many," cuts deep and extends far. It denotes a fact which doubtless adds to the difficulty of getting a genuine unity. But it also immensely enriches the possibilities of the result to be attained. No matter how loudly any one proclaims his Americanism, if he assumes that any one racial strain, any one component culture, no matter how early settled it was in our territory, or how effective it has proved in its own land, is to furnish a pattern to which all other strains and cultures are to conform, he is a traitor to an American nationalism. Our unity cannot be a homogeneous thing like that of the separate states of Europe from which our population is drawn; it must be a unity created by drawing out and composing into a harmonious whole the best, the most characteristic which each contributing race and people has to offer. ("Nationalizing Education," MW 10:205)

And in 1923,

> We all know that many of us feel like blushing every time we hear the term "Americanization," because to such an extent the idea has been seized upon by certain groups as a means of forcing their own conception of American life upon other people. ("The School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideals in Children," MW 15:152)[6]

Is there a "humane" version of assimilation or Americanization of immigrants in Dewey's views? Dewey here and elsewhere argues at length against cultural conformity and homogeneity, against imposing one culture or conception of the good life on any group. However, Dewey does make positive references to creating a "unity" or "harmonious whole" in American society. Perhaps Dewey is smuggling a problematic assimilationism in the back door.

We can see that Dewey is doing not such thing by considering his account of the ideal of democracy. According to Dewey, democracy is not a formal set of procedures, such as voting in elections, those such procedures can be useful tools for enacting democracy. Democracy at its core for Dewey involves communication and cooperation: "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (*Democracy and Education* MW 9:93). On Dewey's conception of democracy, arbitrary valuation of one culture, class, or race above the others is inimical to the aims of democracy:

[6]Also quoted in J. Christopher Eisele (1975) (independently verified).

> The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. (*ibid.*)

It is well known that Dewey regards public participation, consultation, and deliberation as central to democratic governance, and all depend upon communication (this is the core concern of *The Public and Its Problems* (1927)). Any barriers in the way of sharing experiences and communicating problems is thus a barrier to democracy, on Dewey's account. What's more, democracy involves cooperative social inquiry aimed at addressing shared social problems and forming shared conceptions of the public interest (Bohman, 1999); barriers to consultation and participation in these processes are thus further ways of undemocratically marginalizing and excluding groups. When Dewey talks about "unity" or "harmony" in democratic society, it is breaking down barriers to participation, and not nationalistic assimilation, to which Dewey refers.[7] Rather than assimilation to a preexisting culture, Dewey hopes for cooperative, mutual formation of a community.

Carlson's case against Addams is equally problematic. He discusses the nutritional program at Hull House, where residents encouraged Italian immigrants to feed their children oatmeal and cod liver oil rather than "pieces of bread soaked in tea or wine" as a kindly attempt to "bring American middle class culture and customs into the tenements" (1975, p. 83), even though, as he himself says, the immigrant children's breakfast cause "calcium and vitamin D deficiencies that induced rickets" and the educational methods employed by Hull House succeeded in overcoming the problem (ibid.). Worse, according to Carlson,

> Even Jane Addams, perhaps the most humanitarian and open-minded of all the social settlement workers, showed condescension in asking Americans not to expect "the same human development of an Italian peasant and a New England scholar." (1975, p. 84)

The quotation is from "The Subtle Problems of Charity" (Addams, 1899). But in context, Addams clearly means "development" in the psychological, not the ethical sense. If we consider again the further context of the quotation:

[7] In other places, Dewey's writings explicitly eschews nationalism, defending the idea of international democratic community. Jason Baber's unpublished paper aptly defends Dewey's liberal internationalism against its critics.

> A man who would hesitate to pronounce an opinion upon the stones lying by the wayside because he has a suspicion that they are "geological specimens," . . . will, without a moment's hesitation, dogmatize about the delicate problems of human conduct, and will assert that one man is a scoundrel and another an honorable gentleman, without in the least considering the ethical epochs to which the two belong. He disregards the temptations and *environment* to which they have been subjected, and requires *the same human development of an Italian peasant and a New England scholar.*
>
> Is this again a mark of our democracy or of our lack of science? We are singularly slow to apply the evolutionary principle to human affairs in general, although it is fast being applied to the education of children. We are at last learning to follow *the development of the child*; to expect certain traits under certain conditions; to adapt methods and matter to his growing mind. No "advanced educator" can allow himself to be so absorbed in the question of what a child ought to be as to exclude the discovery of what he is. But, in our charitable efforts, we think much more of what a man ought to be than of what he is or of what he may become; and *we ruthlessly force our conventions and standards upon him*, with a sternness which we would consider stupid, indeed, did an educator use it in forcing his mature intellectual convictions upon an undeveloped mind. (p. 177, emphasis added)

Addams is not here asserting the cultural superiority of the "New England scholar" to the "Italian peasant." Rather, she is asserting precisely their cultural differences, due to cultural environment and developmental history, and resisting the chauvinistic comparison that would have us "ruthlessly force our conventions and standards upon him." Carlson's reading here is uncharitable.

Americanization and its relationship to democracy was a frequent topic for Jane Addams in public addresses, articles and the work of Hull House. Addams decried forces that destroyed immigrants' sense of a unique personal identity amid a diverse multitude of fellow citizens or schools that sought to turn their children into homogenous American citizens. Democracy for Addams, as for Dewey, was not a form of elective government or an ideal that had no place in reality, but a social force and set of ethical practices, which required mutual respect for difference among its members. From this position she advocated throughout her life against forces of Americanization and for the power of a pluralistic and cosmopolitan understanding of what it means to be American.

The public schools may have been an central force for the work of Americaniza-

tion since it is an almost universal entry point for young immigrants or the children of immigrant families, even a more effective mechanism for Americanization than organizations like the YMCA. Undoubtedly, many Progressive thinkers lauded the educational and acculturation work of the public schools. However, when Jane Addams addressed the National Educational Association in 1908 she argued that educators needed not only recognize the damage done when children are alienated from their immigrant parents by shortsighted educators, but to see the cultural background of the family as a rich resource. Ever diplomatic, Jane Addams begins her critique with a qualified compliment: "Many of us feel that, splendid as the public schools are in their relation to the immigrant child, they do not understand all of the moral and emotional perplexities which constantly harass him" (Addams, 1908, 238). But then she delivers the crux of her argument, delivered in a concrete example so common to her rhetorical approach:

> The children long that the school teacher should know something about the lives their parents lead and should be able to reprove the hooting children who make fun of the Italian mother because she wears a kerchief on her head, not only because they are rude but also because they are stupid. We send young people to Europe to see Italy, but we do not utilize Italy when it lies about the schoolhouse. If the body of teachers in our great cities could take hold of the immigrant colonies, could bring out of them their handicrafts and occupations, their traditions, their folk songs and folk lore, the beautiful stories which every immigrant colony is ready to tell and translate; could get the children to bring these things into school as the material from which culture is made and the material upon which culture is based, [the teachers] would discover that by comparison that which [the teachers] give [the students] now is a poor meretricious and vulgar thing. (Addams, 1908, 238)

Addams couches this indictment with statements that she is loath to tell trained educators how to do their difficult work and an appeal to science from the quantitative research done by other speakers at the event, which shows that native-born citizens commit more crimes than immigrants. However, she pulls no punches when she tells the collective body of educators that the Americanizing work of the public school has destructive consequences, not just for the individual family but also for community and the United States as a whole.

It is one thing to make general statements about the dangers of Americanization in published essays, but Addams truly walks the walk when she identifies the damage that public education does in the name "making Americans" at the National

Education Association conference or builds a Labor Museum so that immigrants in Chicago can have a venue to display their unique skills and artistic mastery. The Labor Museum at Hull House went beyond decrying Americanization to honoring the knowledge that immigrants bring to the US, which led to University of Chicago scholars from the University of Chicago to come to Halstead Street to learn from the Settlement's neighbors (Addams, 1910, 245-57).[8]

The texts described above are from 1908 and 1910, when Addams was more optimistic about our nation's ability to recognize the dangers of fear of immigrants. According to Addams, she argued in 1907 that any explanation of the just workings of a constitutional government is for naught if the government treats refugee populations with disregard for their rights and humanity. She warns that the immigrant or "alien" learns about America and its institutions from the way that they are treated by the government. She cautions that "[t]he only method by which a reasonable and loyal conception of the government may be substituted for the one formed upon Russian experiences is that the actual experience of refugees with government in America shall gradually demonstrate what a very different thing government means here" (Addams, 1919, 245). This selection essentially pleads with official representatives of immigration, policing, and the justice system to rethink their treatment of immigrants in the US. Twelve years later in a 1919 essay published in the journal of the American Sociological Society entitled "Americanization," she observes that in the present day "to advocate the restraint of overzealous officialism as a method of Americanizing the alien would indeed be considered strange doctrine" (Addams, 1919, 245). The US, Addams argues, has joined an international move toward nationalism and fear of refugees.

In this article Addams recounts the international move from a pluralist inclusive nationalism of late nineteenth-century Europe and America to post-war world in which this new nationalism has created countries that "demand worship and devotion for its own sake, as if it existed irrespective of the tests of reality. It requires unqualified obedience, denounces all who differ as heretics, insists that [the nation] alone has the truth, and exhibits all the well-known signs of dogmatism" (Addams, 1919, 242-3). Addams compare the state and state universities to theological institutions that engage in a national missionary work spreading the righteousness ideology

[8]Addams notes in this section of *Twenty Years at Hull-House* that the development of the Labor Museum was not only consistent with John Dewey's thoughts about education and experience, but that her encounter with a skilled immigrant woman and her dismissive American teenage daughter was, "followed by many talks with Dr. Dewey and with one of the teachers in his school who was a resident at Hull House. Within a month a room was fitted up to which we might invite those of our neighbors who were possessed of old crafts and who were eager to use them" (Addams, 1910, 248). This single room evolved into the Hull House Labor Museum.

of nation and obedience (Addams, 1919, 243).

In 1933, two years after Addams wins the Nobel Peace Prize, the *University of Chicago Magazine* published "Our National Self-Righteousness." In this essay Addams enumerates that an American sense of superiority and ultra-nationalism has resulted in: "opposing governmental measures for workman's compensation, for unemployment insurance, and for old-age security" was considered patriotic because these labor policies benefit immigrant laborers, a "widespread belief that differing opinions may be controlled by force" leading to the violent suppression of worker protest because "European immigrants have been held responsible for strikes and other industrial disorders", an indifference toward "the protection of human life" because we do not care about finding justice for murdered immigrants or protecting the foreigner because of our "national attitude toward the immigrant", a pattern in which the "Simon-pure[9] American... often voted for laws which he would like to see enforced upon others," the negro and immigrant laborers according to Addams, "without any intentions of keeping them himself," and lastly she argues we have come to "demand for conformity on pain of being denounced as a 'red' or a 'traitor'" ("National Self-Righteousness" 443-445). Across the decades of her life, Addams became ever more stridently outspoken against all nationalism by any country, nativist prejudice against foreign-born and black Americans, and efforts to Americanize immigrants. Her sentiments are as timely today as they were 84 years ago.

Whatever the merits and problems with Dewey's and Addam's outlooks, whatever the limitations and failings of their ideas, they have not been captured by typical discussions of them in the context of Americanization by left multiculturalists and contemporary American literary and cultural studies scholars. Dewey and Addams held nuanced views in these with much to recommend them, views that have hardly received adequate analysis. Their position in progressive era American politics and culture show that the progressive movement is a much more complex, intellecual diverse field that previously appreciated.

What the issue comes down to, in a sense, is the difference between *assimilation*, the problematic goal behind the Progressive Era drive for "Americanization," and *integration*, an ideal that Dewey, Addams, as well as many later figures in the Civil Rights Movement and in contemporary thought on social justice. Elizabeth Anderson draws this distinction explicitly in *The Imperative of Integration:*

> 'The ideal of integration has often been confused with assimilation. As-

[9] "Simon–pure" means "authentic" in this context, but it is used in a sarcastic manner suggesting that these Simon–pure Americans *believe* they represent true Americans, as opposed to foreign-born or black Americans.

> similation takes a dominant social group as fixed and demands that other groups join it by abandoning their distinct group identities and conforming to what the dominant group takes to be its defining norms, practices, and virtues. . . Unlike the ideal of assimilation, integration does not view disadvantaged communities as the only ones that need to change. Integration aims to transform the habits of the dominant group. It is a tool for breaking down stigmatization, stereotypes, and discrimination. Most important, it aims at constructing a superordinate group identity through which its members regard one another as equals, pool the local knowledge they have acquired in more parochial settings to solve shared problems, and hold one another to account. (Anderson, 2010, p. 114-16)[10]

The merits of integration remain debatable, though the existing social science data raise serious problems for a commitment to segregation, whether it result from law or practice. Nevertheless, we think it clear that the difference between assimilation and integration is historiographically, politically, and philosophically significant irrespective of the merits or problems with integration as an ideal.

4 Conclusion

We can, of course, understand why reference to this quotation was so attractive: it is shocking coming from a venerable philosopher and progressive educator, but it did not raise red flags; after all, it was a statement by a dead, white man. What's more, the quotation confirms a fashionable view about the progressives which does fit many figures in that diverse movement. The only problem, of course, is that it is a mistake. John Dewey never said any such thing about Americanization; he made many statements to the contrary.

The view that the progressive reformers were all assimilationists and racists, while fashionable, is an oversimplification, contradicted by evidence from the writings of John Dewey and the historical record of the social settlement movement, especially Jane Addams' Hull House. It prevents us from learning much-needed lessons from these thinkers that careful, responsible scholarship might provide. We have only hinted at the work remaining to be done in exploring these lessons.

There is also a methodological and pedagogical point to be made about this case. In the case of the original misquotation of Dewey in Wald's book, we observe what we believe is a defective practice: including references or quotations which are cited in some other secondary source, without tracking down the primary sources.

[10] Anderson herself explicitly takes inspiration from Dewey.

This practice fails to meet standards of rigorous scholarship that editors, referees, and readers ought to demand and scholars of all stripes ought to practice. Had Wald tracked down the Dewey source cited by Carlson in the course of editing her manuscript, this harmful chain of errors would never have arisen. But by no means can the blame be placed on Wald alone. Editors and referees should raise red flags at "as cited in" or "quoted by" in a paper's references, as should careful readers, especially when they go on to use the source themselves.

In the subsequent essays and encyclopedia articles where Wald repeats the misquotation of Dewey, the problem is compounded by a failure to re-check prior work, relying on old research. Furthermore, it is irresponsible of Bramen, Popkewitz, and Bloch to provide a reference to the quote as "quoted in Wald," when Wald herself says "cited in Carlson." That's three degrees of separation away from the primary source, and frankly unacceptable for the authors, editors, and referees involved. We hope that this example will deter the practice in the future.

What does it take to verify sources in the way we're talking about? In 2008, we sought to verify the quote in Carlson, and had to order the book through Interlibrary Loan, because the book was not widely available. Still, the entire process of ordering the book, receiving it, and checking for the quotation took about a week to complete. And certainly, today, with the advent of digital services like the electronic version of Dewey's *Collected Works*, Google Books, and Google Scholar, it is much easier to double-check and avoid such mistakes. Such fact-checking would have been difficult for Wald in 1995, but we can easily do better today.

References

Addams, Jane (1899). "The Subtle Problems of Charity." *The Atlantic Monthly*, 83(496): 163–78.

——— (1908). "The Public School and the Immigrant Child." In Jean Bethke Elshtain (ed.), *The Jane Addams Reader*, Basic Books, 2002. pp. 235–239. Originally published in the National Education Assocation's *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*.

——— (1910). *Twenty Years at Hull-House with Autobiographical Notes*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

——— (1919). "Americanization." In Jean Bethke Elshtain (ed.), *The Jane Addams Reader*, Basic Books, 2002. pp. 240–247. Originally published in the American Sociological Society's *Publications*.

Anderson, Elizabeth (2010). *The imperative of integration*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bergen, Peter, Albert Ford, Alyssa Sims, and David Stermen (2016). "Terrorism in America After 9/11." *Tech. rep.*, New America.
URL https://www.newamerica.org/in-depth/terrorism-in-america/

Bohman, James (1999). "Democracy as inquiry, inquiry as democratic: pragmatism, social science, and the cognitive division of labor." *American Journal of Political Science*, 43(2): 590–607.

Boydston, Jo Ann (ed.) (1969-1991). *The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882-1953 (37 volumes)*. Southern Illinois UP. Electronic edition 2003, edited Larry Hickman, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA: InteLex Corporation, 2003.

Bramen, Carrie Tirado (1997). "The Americanization of Theron Ware." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 31(1).

Carlson, Robert A. (1970). "Americanization as an early twentieth-century adult education movement." *History of Education Quarterly*, 10(4): 440–464.

——— (1975). *The quest for conformity: Americanization through education*. Wiley.

Curzan, Anne and Priscilla Wald (2001). In G.T. Kurian (ed.), *Encyclopedia of American Studies*, Grolier Educational.

Demant, Tarah Ann (2011). *Impossible whiteness: Race, gender, and American identity in early twentieth-century American literature*. Ph.D. thesis, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS.

Dewey, John (1902). "The school as social center." *The Elementary School Teacher*, 3(2): 73–86.

——— (1927). *The Public and Its Problems*, vol. 2 of *The Later Works of John Dewey*. Southern Illinois UP, 1986/2008.

Eisele, J. Christopher (1975). "John Dewey and the Immigrants." *History of Education Quarterly*, 15(1).
URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/367821

Hodge, George B. (1912). *Association Educational Work for Men and Boys: A Handbook of Principles, Policies and Methods for Meeting The Educational Needs of Men and Boys, Day or Night, Inside or Outside The Association Building. The Results or Twenty Years Of Association Experience*. New York: Association Press.

Orfield, Gary and Chungmei Lee (2004). *Brown at 50: King's Dream or Plessy's Nightmare?* Cambridge, Mass.: Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

Popkewitz, Thomas S (2001). "Rethinking the political: reconstituting national imaginaries and producing difference." *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2-3): 179–207.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. and Marianne N. Bloch (2001). "Administering Freedom: A History of the Present: Rescuing the Parent to Rescue the Child for Society." In Kenneth Hultqvist and Gunilla Dahlberg (eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium*, Routledge. pp. 85–118.

United States Government Accountability Office (2016). "K-12 Education: Better Use of Information Could Help Agencies Identify Disparities and Address Racial Discrimination." *Tech. Rep. GAO-16-345*.

Wald, Priscilla (1995). *Constituting Americans: Cultural anxiety and narrative form*. Duke University Press Books.

——— (1997). "Cultures and Carriers: 'Typhoid Mary' and the Science of Social Control." *Social Text*, 52/53.

——— (1999). "Geographics: Writing the Shtetl into the Ghetto." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 39: 209–27.

——— (2002). "Communicable Americanism: Contagion, Geographic Fictions, and the Sociological Legacy of Robert E. Park." *American Literary History*, 14(4): 653–685.

——— (2011). "Reading Culture through a Literary Lens." *Novel*, 44(3): 467–470.