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In the intervening century since the first "refugees" fled to America after the failure of the Revolutions which swept through Central Europe in 1848, the appellation "Forty-Eighter" has undergone an interesting development. Originally applied only to those persons who had participated in the European Revolutions and who then migrated to America because of personal disillusionment or the fear of government reprisal, the term has come to be used so loosely that some recent commemorative articles have regarded as "Forty-Eighters" certain intellectuals who came to America as early as 1833 and almost anyone who left Germany between 1848 and 1860. It is essential, however, that a study of any group of immigrants define the nature of that group clearly and exactly.

The question of delimiting the term "Forty-Eighter" is not new.

*Delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington on December 30, 1948.
Nine years ago Professor Marcus Hansen, after an exhaustive study of the numerous economic, social, political and personal factors which inspired Central Europeans to pull up stakes and turn towards America, concluded that "taken altogether, the political refugees who emigrated to America numbered only a few thousand." If we wish to include military veterans of the Revolutionary campaigns, who might have remained in Europe if they had preferred to do so, we should in all likelihood have to double Hansen's estimate.

The truth of this conclusion, at least as it applies to Jewish "Forty-Eighters," has become increasingly evident to the writer in

1Marcus L. Hansen, *The Atlantic Migration: 1607-1860*, Cambridge, 1940, p. 274. Hansen's estimate has been supported by the research of Professor A. E. Zucker of the University of Maryland and a number of other scholars who have collaborated on the preparation of *The Forty-Eighters*, a centenary volume to be published by Columbia University Press this fall. Restricting themselves to Revolutionary "Forty-Eighters" who came to the United States from German-speaking countries, the authors were able to locate only about three hundred persons of all denominations.

A number of reasons may be postulated to explain this comparatively small number of political refugees who came to America. Many of the supporters of the Revolutionary did not have to flee for their lives; unwilling to give up hope, they determined to remain and outwait the reactionary regimes. Others, including some who served out prison sentences or who fled to exile in nearby European havens, could not be diverted from their objectives by one failure; they were determined to stay at home, or at least in Europe, to continue to work for the triumph of liberal principles. Yet another reason which deterred many from making the trip to America was a fairly common conception of America as an uncultured outpost of civilization. And, finally, there were the natural inertia and reluctance to pull up stakes which characterize most people.

It cannot be denied, however, that the downfall of the Revolutionary regimes was responsible for increased emigration to America in the years after 1848. Thousands of persons who had taken no active role in the fighting were completely disillusioned with life in Europe after the return of the reactionaries to power; a factor which contributed to that disillusionment was the post-1848 economic slump. Although the events of 1848 were most assuredly responsible, in the final analysis, for this post-1848 emigration, the persons who composed it cannot accurately be called "Forty-Eighters."

Outbreaks of anti-Semitism during and after the Revolutions were a signal for schemes of mass emigration of Jews to America, suggested on both sides of the Atlantic. See the excerpts from the *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden*, by Isidor Busch, Leopold Kompert and others, cited by Professor Guido Kisch in "The Revolution of 1848 and the Jewish 'On to America' Movement," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society (=PAJHS)*, No. XXXVIII, Pt. 3 (March 1949), pp. 185-234. See also the letter by an enthusiastic Texan, calling for a mass exodus of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe to America, and particularly to Texas, where "thousands of acres of land can be bought, within the settled portions of the State, for the small sum of from 25 cents to $1 per acre; good arable, fertile land, where a man can make his living to his liking, and more independent than the Autocrat of Russia, or the Emperor of Austria themselves." *The Asmonean (=ASM)*, II, No. 10, p. 76, June 23, 1850.
his research into the background of literally thousands of German-Jewish immigrants. There is no evidence whatever for the commonly accepted supposition that large numbers of them came to the United States. Only in the homiletical sense that practically all German-Jewish immigrants, whether they arrived in 1835 or 1865, came to this country in search of the personal opportunity, economic freedom, and political equality which were denied to them in Europe, only in that sense did multitudes of Jewish "Forty-Eighters" come to America.

Indeed, this is only what we should expect. The failure of the Revolutions was no more than another blow to the Jews of Central Europe. They suffered repression, discrimination, and hostility all through the years, and needed no special political motivation for emigration. The year of their departure was, more often than not, purely coincidental. One of those who came to America in 1848, for instance, was Mayer Lehman, the founder of the great cotton and banking firm and father of Justice Irving and Governor Herbert Lehman. But it might just as well have been any other year, for his decision was utterly unconnected with the Revolution. He had merely been biding his time until he heard that his brothers Henry and Emanuel, who had preceded him to the United States, had successfully established themselves and were able to pay for his ocean passage. Lazarus Straus, founder of a prominent American-Jewish family famous for government service and the development of a great institution known as Macy's, also left Bavaria for economic reasons. He despairs of any future in his home and so set out in 1852 for the land of opportunity across the sea. The Brandeis-Wehle clan, whose story has been told so well, were by no means "Pilgrims of '48" in the sense of being political refugees. Economic opportunity in the new world was undoubtedly an important motivation in their leaving Prague. And so also with the Prussian family named Sutro who brought with them a twenty-year-old son named Adolph who was to build a tunnel called after his name and become mayor of San Francisco and own a sizeable portion of that city's real estate. The Sutro family had been in the cloth-manufacturing business, but the economic slump after the Revolution drove them into bankruptcy and forced their departure.

These were only a handful of the more than fifty thousand Jews who left Central Europe between 1848 and 1860 to come to the

---

2Letter from Governor Herbert Lehman to the writer, August 22, 1948.
3Manuscript Memoirs of Isidor Straus. American Jewish Historical Society Library
United States, and though many of them have been mistakenly called "Forty-Eighters," there is no record of their actual participation in the Revolutions. It is to another group of men that we must turn—the twenty-eight men whom it has been possible to isolate and identify as "Forty-Eighters" in the literal sense—a very small number, but not so small if we bear in mind Marcus Hansen's estimate. And yet, just because they constitute so small a group, it is possible to study them in some detail and to arrive at demonstrable conclusions about their experience in America. We tend to generalize very easily about multitudes. A group of twenty-eight men is small enough to permit a thorough study.

Most of our group of twenty-eight were, of course, not prominent Revolutionaries, but obscure young men who had followed the leadership of older men. They were as young and inexperienced with life and unheralded by fame as most other immigrants. It was in America that they lived the major portion of their lives and earned whatever success they ever came to achieve. There were two exceptions, however, two men whose names were familiar to those who had followed the course of the Revolutions: Abraham Jacobi and Joseph Goldmark. Goldmark had been a member of the student cabal which directed the course of the rebellion in Vienna. With the fall of the city in October of 1848 he had to flee to Switzerland to avoid trial and execution for treason.\(^6\) Jacobi had been an intimate of Carl Schurz and the other leaders in Baden. He was arrested in 1849 and suffered imprisonment for two years before a friendly warden permitted his escape to America.\(^7\)

Jacobi and Goldmark found a warm welcome awaiting them among the intellectual elite of the German-American community.\(^8\) They were regarded as heroes who had sacrificed all for the sake of liberty. Most of the others found no welcome, however, and had to join the hosts of other immigrants in adjusting to the life of their new home. Coming to the United States with family groups or friends, they scattered abroad throughout the country. Only a few stayed in New York. The others found their way to Philadelphia, Richmond, St. Louis, Watertown (Wisc), Indianapolis, and Hartford. Three, August Helbing, Moritz Meyer and William Langerman, arrived

\(^6\)Goldmark, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 168-70.


\(^8\)Goldmark's arrival in America was signalized by a lead editorial in \textit{ASM}, II, No. 20, p. 156, Sept. 6, 1850, which concluded with the hope "that his condition in this country may compensate him for what he has lost in the battles and struggles of the fatherland."
just in time to join the gold-attracted throngs who were making the arduous trip to California.9

Settled in new homes, they turned to the challenge of earning a living and carving a place for themselves in American society. The physicians and journalists, naturally, had less difficulty than their non-professional counterparts. American medicine was in sore need of trained recruits from Europe and the growing German-American population created many opportunities for publicists.

Abraham Jacobi's subsequent medical career in America completely overshadowed his revolutionary activities in Europe. Regarded by medical historians as “the father of pediatrics in America,” his contribution to American medicine was inestimable. The respect and affection in which he was held by his colleagues was demonstrated by the number of honors which they showered upon him. He was elected to the presidency of many medical societies, including the American Medical Association, and received honorary degrees from Michigan, Harvard, Yale, and Columbia Universities. During his lifetime he occupied chairs in pediatrics at the College of Surgeons and Physicians of N.Y., New York Medical College, Columbia University, and the City College of New York.10

Another medical “Forty-Eighter” to achieve prominence in America was Ernst Krackowitzer, who had been a lesser known member of the Viennese student council which directed various phases of the Revolution. In New York he became an outstanding surgeon, president of the Pathological Society, a contributor to the pioneer American medical journals and a leading staff member of many New York hospitals. Jacobi, who idolized Krackowitzer and named his son after him, called him “the most eminent American physician of European birth.”11

Joseph Lewi had been an intimate co-worker of the Austrian intellectuals who had inspired the Revolution, but emigrated even before the fall of Vienna because he was convinced that the revolt could not succeed. He settled in Albany and became one of the most popular physicians of that city, serving terms as President of the Albany County Medical Society and senior member of the Board of Censors of the New York State Medical Society. During the Civil War he was attached to the Albany board of medical examiners.12

---

10Medical Life, op. cit., pp. 214-258.
12Undated obituary clippings loaned to the writer by Miss Alice Lewi, Albany. Lewi died Dec. 19, 1897.
Both a physician and a journalist was Edward Morwitz, who had been a revolutionary propagandist in Konitz. He settled in Philadelphia and practiced both professions, establishing the German Dispensary in that city and serving as publisher-editor of the German-language Demokrat. After the Civil War he was instrumental in the creation of the German Press Association of Pennsylvania, and eventually owned a controlling interest in a large number of German-American newspapers and magazines.\(^\text{13}\)

Charles Bernays became associate editor of a St. Louis German paper;\(^\text{14}\) David Blumenfeld was a partner in the firm which published the first Watertown German paper, Der Anzeiger, which Carl Schurz edited in 1857;\(^\text{15}\) Michael Heilprin ultimately became one of the editors of Appleton’s New American Cyclopedia and a foreign affairs writer for the old Nation.\(^\text{16}\)

Isidor Busch, who had published and edited several of the Revolutionary newspapers in Vienna, founded a German-Jewish weekly in New York a short time after his arrival in 1849, but had to abandon the venture after a very few issues. He moved on to St. Louis and decided to go into business. He was, at various times, a banker, storekeeper and politician, as well as the first Missouri viticulturist.\(^\text{17}\)

Another professional was Isaac Hartman, who had edited the republican Observer of Eastern Franconia after a few years as head of a Jewish school in Kissingen, Bavaria. Imprisoned in Würzburg after the fall of the revolutionary party, he was fortunate enough to have friends who arranged for his escape—first to England, then on to America. Arrived in New York, he supported himself by teaching languages at various private schools, until advanced tuberculosis sent him into the newly-created Jews’ Hospital of New York, where he died on August 13, 1855.\(^\text{18}\)

The non-professional “Forty-Eighters” entered a variety of trades. Meyer Thalmessinger, who had taken part in the Parisian Revolution, eventually headed a prosperous printing and lithographing firm and was elected president of a New York bank.\(^\text{19}\) Joseph Goldmark gave up the practice of medicine and established a percussion-cap factory in New York.\(^\text{20}\) Tobias Kohn brought with him the latest European

\(^{\text{16}}\)Gustav Pollak, Michael Heilprin and His Sons, N. Y., 1912.
\(^{\text{17}}\)The Reformer and Jewish Times, X, No. 51, p. 3, Feb. 14, 1879.
\(^{\text{18}}\)ASM, XII, No. 10, p. 148, Aug. 24, 1855.
\(^{\text{19}}\)UJE, X, p. 259.
\(^{\text{20}}\)Goldmark, op. cit., p. 259.
Isidor Busch — Missouri Abolitionist
techniques in silk-manufacturing and opened a plant in Hartford.\textsuperscript{21} Helbing and Langerman opened stores in San Francisco. Julius Bien became one of the outstanding lithographers in America. For many years, it is said, "scarcely a major geographical or geological publication [was] issued by the federal government for which the maps were not engraved and printed by Bien." He received many medals for his work and served as president of the National Lithographers' Association for thirteen years.\textsuperscript{22}

Nathan Grossmayer, an Austrian who had been wounded in the street fighting in Paris, was one of the unluckiest of the "Forty-Eighters." On first coming to the United States he peddled his way through the South until he had enough money to open a store in Macon, Ga. Before his death in 1891, he had been in business in New York City, Hoboken, Baltimore, Washington, Houston and Galveston, Indianola (Tex.), Titusville (Pa.), and Denver. His successes were many—at one time he possessed a chain of five stores in various Texas localities, and at another time he owned a sizeable interest in some Pennsylvania oil fields—but some misfortune always defeated his enterprise and forced him to move on.\textsuperscript{23}

August Bondi was too smitten with a love of adventure to settle down for a long time after he came to the United States in 1848. He had been one of the youngest members of the students' corps in Vienna—fourteen years old! His family settled in St. Louis and he shifted from one unsatisfactory job to another, meanwhile looking for excitement. During a trip to Texas he attempted to enlist in the Lopez-Crittenden expedition to Cuba, and failing in that tried to obtain a berth in the Perry mission to Japan. Back in St. Louis, he finally decided to go to the Kansas frontier where there was adventure enough for a young boy. It was not long before he joined up with John Brown's men, taking part in every major engagement of the bloody border warfare. As Bondi was to write in his autobiography, "To use President Roosevelt's mode of expression, I was most anxious for a strenuous life. I was tired of the hum-drum life of a clerk. Any struggle, any hard work would be welcome to me. I thirsted for it, for adventure..."\textsuperscript{24} Small wonder that setting type, waiting on store, keeping books, or teaching in a backwoods school, all of which he tried during his first years, couldn't hold him down for very long.

It was not only the thirst for adventure, however, that stirred

\textsuperscript{21}UJE, VI, pp. 434-5.
\textsuperscript{22}UJE, II, pp. 350-1.
\textsuperscript{23}Information and documents provided by his son, Max Grossmayer. Deposited in American Jewish Archives.
\textsuperscript{24}Autobiography of August Bondi, Galesburg (Ill.), 1910, p. 33.
this young man, for August Bondi was indeed an inflamed liberal. He wrote of his Viennese days: "I became imbued with hatred of spiritual and governmental tyranny . . . [and with] devotion to humanity. We boys were fairly fanaticized with sympathy for the downtrodden of the globe." He fought with John Brown because he was convinced that the spread of slavery was a danger to the welfare of the western frontier, and, when the Civil War broke out, his liberal spirit again sent him into the military fray. He served for three years through many a difficult campaign.

Most of the Jewish "Forty-Eighters," like Bondi, maintained their devotion to liberal principles in America. Some became outspoken adherents of abolitionism almost as soon as they reached America. Michael Heilprin, who had been one of the propagandists for the Kossuth Hungarian Revolution, was almost mobbed at a Frémont meeting in Philadelphia when he delivered a fiery speech against the defenders of slavery. In 1861, he was the first to denounce Rabbi Morris J. Raphall for his attempt to prove that slavery had the sanction of the Jewish Bible. Isidor Busch, in St. Louis, was elected to the Missouri legislature for three terms during the Civil War, and, throughout the sessions, was one of the most extreme abolitionists in office.

Even if abolitionism did not draw them to its banners, most of the Jewish "Forty-Eighters" became ardent supporters of the Republican party. Joseph Goldmark was one of the organizers of the King's County Republican Club and Joseph Lewi was a founder of the Albany Union League. Sigismund Kaufmann was a Republican Presidential Elector in 1860 and wielded, it is said, much influence in the distribution of federal patronage throughout New York state. August Bondi's diary records the large number of early Republican meetings which he and his non-Jewish German friends attended in St. Louis. Nathan Grossmayer was a passionate devotee of Lincoln during the Civil War years, believing in him so deeply that, according to an early will, he bequeathed his all to the President for charitable purposes in the event that the war should still be raging when Grossmayer died.

What Jacobi wrote of his friend Krackowitzer probably characterized the majority of the Jewish "Forty-Eighters":

---

25Ibid, p. 27.
28Goldmark, op. cit., p. 283.
"He did not drift into politics; he was a born politician, for he lived, soul and heart, with the people, its development, growth, efforts, its happiness and unhappiness. . . . No oppression or injustice found grace before his eyes. Thus he was a free-soiler, thus he was an abolitionist; no matter whether the chains to be broken were those of color, or religion, or sex. . . . He supported Frémont, supported Lincoln, supported energetically the war for the Union. . . ." \(^{30}\)

The Civil War aroused not only the political passions of the "Forty-Eighters," but also their military bent. A war-time correspondent of the *Jewish Messenger* stated in one of his Washington dispatches that

"Some of the Jewish officers and privates told me that they had taken part in the Crimean, Hungarian and Italian wars, and that they followed the profession of arms from inclination, but not liking the dull routine of a soldier's life in times of peace, they eagerly availed themselves of every opportunity to return to their tents and the battlefield. This was the first time I had ever heard of the existence of such a class of military adventurers among our people." \(^{31}\)

Would that the Messenger's correspondent had taken the trouble to write down their names and stories, for we know only two of these "Forty-Eighters" who became soldiers of fortune.

One was Louis Schlessinger, a veteran of the Kossuth campaigns, who stayed in the United States only a short time before joining the Walker filibuster in Nicaragua. He was given the rank of colonel by his chief but must have had a severe dispute with him because after a few battles he was fighting for the legitimists, retaining his high rank, of course. After the conflict ended, Schlessinger moved to Guatemala and lived out his life as the owner of a coffee plantation. \(^{32}\)

The other was Adolphus Adler who was commissioned a colonel in the Confederate Army at the outbreak of the Civil War. Adler was a brusque, high-spirited adventurer with a nasty temper. When an anti-Jewish editorial appeared in the Richmond *Enquirer* he challenged its editor to a duel. The editor preferred to apologize rather than risk death. A little later, Adler's temper got him into a worse scrape. He became embroiled in a violent argument with a general in command of the Richmond fortifications and was thrown into prison on suspicion of being a Union sympathizer. This was more humiliation than an officer could bear, so he attempted to commit

---

\(^{30}\) Jacobi, *op. cit.*, p. 743.

\(^{31}\) The *Jewish Messenger*, XI, No. 5, p. 41, Feb. 7, 1862.

\(^{32}\) *UJE*, IX, p. 410.
suicide, but only ended up in a Richmond Hospital. Ashamed to stand trial, he escaped from the hospital and smuggled himself across the lines to the North. We next find him in Cincinnati, again under arrest, this time on the natural assumption that he was a Confederate spy. He convinced the authorities that he had given up the Confederate cause and then faded from sight. The Israelite advertised in vain that it had some letters for delivery to him; he was not heard from again. One cannot but regret that there is no record of his further experiences in America.33

The highest ranking Jewish officer of the Civil War was also a “Forty-Eighter.” Frederick Knefler had served with Kossuth in Hungary at the age of fifteen before moving to Indianapolis with his family. He volunteered for service with the Union Army a few days after Sumter and was commissioned a lieutenant. His superiors recognized his ability and promoted him so rapidly that he was a Colonel by the time of the great Chickamauga campaign in 1863. During that great battle he led two Indiana regiments up the slopes of Missionary Ridge, one of the most famous feats in all military history. His role in that battle earned him the further promotion to the rank of Brigadier General.34

Not all of the Jewish “Forty-Eighters” were passionate Republicans, of course. Abraham Jacobi, strangely enough, appears to have taken little interest in the Civil War, although his friendship with Schurz and other German-American leaders continued unabated. In practically every other important question, immigration restriction, Civil Service reform, slum clearance, to name only a few, Jacobi was always to be found on the side of the liberals and reformers.35 Edward Morwitz had become a Democrat immediately upon his arrival in Philadelphia and maintained his loyalty to that party all through the years of slavery agitation and war. Liberalism did not have the same meaning for all “Forty-Eighters.”

It is natural to think of “Forty-Eighters” as leaders in the life of the German-American community. The Jews among them were no exception. They belonged to the German societies and participated eagerly in their programs and activities. Busch was for twelve years president of the German Immigration Aid Society of St. Louis. Kauf-

33 Ella Lonn, Foreigners in the Confederacy, Chapel Hill, ’940, pp. 177-8; Frank Moore (ed.) Rebellion Record, N. Y. 1862, III, p. 51; The Israelite, IX, No. 24, p. 188, Dec. 19, 1862; X, No. 8, p. 59, Aug. 21, 1862.


mann was a founder of the N. Y. Turnverein and president of the German Society of New York. Krackowitzer was largely responsible for the founding of a German Dispensary in New York, as was Morwitz in Philadelphia. Jacobi was, year after year, a favorite speaker at German meetings and gatherings in New York. The journalists, of course, were even more closely involved in the life of the German community, because their professional work coincided with its activities.

These Jewish “Forty-Eighters” were, like their non-Jewish counterparts, deeply devoted to the culture and civilization which they left behind in Europe. Many of them never lost their ardent German nationalistic spirit, and the fact that certain aspects of American life appeared to be inferior to their European background helped keep them loyal to Germany. But that loyalty rarely overcame the bitter memories of the Revolutionary years. When Goldmark went back to Vienna in 1868-69 to clear his name and reputation, his Austrian friends begged him to remain. But he was firm in his decision to build his future in the United States. Abraham Jacobi, in his later years, was invited to occupy the chair in pediatrics in Berlin, a supreme tribute to his professional achievement, but he would not consider leaving America.

For some of the Jewish “Forty-Eighters” this ambivalent loyalty to German culture on the one hand and American life on the other did not leave much room for Judaism. Partly because they shared the antagonism of the German intellectual towards all religion, partly because they were convinced that all barriers between men should be broken down, some of them abandoned their Jewish background. Jacobi and Knefler lost almost all contact with Jews as Jews, and completed the process by intermarriage. Even though his sister was married to one of the rabbinical leaders of American Jewry — Bernhard Felsenthal of Chicago — David Blumenfeld took so little interest in Judaism that he permitted his children to attend services and classes in both Catholic and Protestant churches in Watertown. Charles Bernays, the St. Louis journalist, is the only Jewish “Forty-Eighter”

36 Jacobi’s only known affiliation with a Jewish institution was his service as an Attending Physician at the New York Jews’ Hospital and his continuing relationship to its staff after it became known as Mt. Sinai Hospital. The Story of the First Fifty Years of The Mount Sinai Hospital, 1852-1902, New York, 1944, pp. 29-31. Also Dr. Jacobi (possibly this one) lectured to the Maimonides Library Association of New York in 1855, on the subject, “A Solution of the Slavery Question,” Hyman B. Grinstein, The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York 1654-1860, Phila., 1945, p. 204.

37 Blumenfeld, op. cit., p. 12; data provided by Rabbi Joseph L. Baron of Milwaukee.
actually known to have been converted to Christianity. Others, like the Goldmark family, drifted into a kind of vague cosmopolitanism which was frequently a secular "religion" among Jews who had no interest in religion. Thus, Joseph Goldmark's daughters married two Jewish youths who typified the liberalism of 1848, neither of whom was a Jew religiously: Felix Adler, the founder of the Ethical Culture movement, and Louis D. Brandeis, who was empty of any Jewish interest until the Zionist movement fired his spirit just before the first World War. Jacobi expressed this liberal philosophy when, during the heat of the Franco-Prussian War, he spoke on behalf of German physicians in this wise:

"These men speak the language of the human mind, they are the leading citizens of the universal world-republic of science to which we all, equal, free, and fraternal, have sworn allegiance. There is no blockade, no fire, no Franco-German War, that will ever disprove our belonging to the same community. The progress of one man, of one country, is at the present day the common property of all men, all countries, and an isolated civilization or science belongs to the past. Let us hope, and every one at his own wheel-work, that the unity of science may be but the precursor of the unity of mankind. . . ." 39

This indifference to Judaism was not typical of all of the "Forty-Eighers." John Proskauer joined a synagogue as soon as he settled in Richmond—and an orthodox congregation which observed the Spanish-Portuguese rites, at that! Known to have little personal interest in religion, his friends asked for an explanation. He really couldn't say what it was, but in a somewhat mystic manner he spoke of the preservation of ancient values and the maintenance of traditions, whether in accordance with the views of one man or not. 40

Years later his son became President of the congregation in Mobile, Alabama, and a grandson is honorary president of the American Jewish Committee. Isidor Busch was as violent a liberal as any other "Forty-Eighter," and yet Judaism had been supremely important to him in Europe and continued to be so in America. His editorship of the short-lived Israels Herold in New York was only the beginning

39Interestingly enough, Bernays became the central figure in a Jewish cause celebre despite his conversion. In 1862 he was appointed American consul at Zurich. The Swiss still maintained discriminatory legislation against Jews, and hesitated before accepting Bernays' credentials. This was only one of a long series of episodes in connection with the Swiss-American commercial treaty. See Sol M. Strook, "Switzerland and American Jews," PAJHS, No. XI (1903), p. 50.

40Data provided by John Proskauer's daughter, Miss Jenny Proskauer of St. Louis.
of years of devoted service to Jewish causes. One of his dominant interests was the B'nai B'rith Order, of which he was an active member on both a local and a national scale. An even more important figure in B'nai B'rith sprang from the ranks of the "Forty-Eighters," Julius Bien, during whose thirty-five years as President the brotherhood developed from a handful of lodges to one of the most powerful organizations in American Jewish life.

Dr. Joseph Lewi was an active member of the Albany congregation led by his friend, Isaac M. Wise, whom he had known in Radnitz, Bohemia, and, years later, sent his son Isidor to Cincinnati as an apprentice to Wise in the editorship of the Israelite. Sigismund Kaufmann served as a director of the New York Hebrew Orphan Asylum and of other Jewish philanthropic organizations. Michael Heilprin was one of the founders of the movement which organized agricultural settlements in America for refugees from the Russian pogroms of the 1880's, although throughout the previous years he had demonstrated only a faint intellectual interest in Judaism. August Bondi, out on the Kansas frontier, longed for the opportunity to attend Jewish services, and was greatly angered, according to his diary, when he discovered that the only two Jews in his Civil War regiment were not willing to acknowledge their background. In his will, he asked his children to perpetuate his name through a memorial at the Hebrew Union College. Edward Morwitz appears to have devoted far more time to general German activities than those of a Jewish nature, but in addition to his participation in Philadelphia Jewry's philanthropies, there is the record of his publication (at a heavy loss) of the Jewish Record for a period of eleven years, as evidence of his Jewish sympathies.

Among Jews, at least, the conception of "Forty-Eighters" as atheists and anti-religionists, therefore, requires some revision, especially in the light of the fact that there were four rabbis among our group of twenty-eight: Samuel Kalisch, Henry Hochheimer, Benjamin Szold and Adolph Huebsch. The first two had already entered the

41 Autobiography of August Bondi, pp. 87-8, 193.
43 Samuel Kalisch (ed.) Studies in Ancient and Modern Judaism... Selected Writings of Rabbi Isidor Kalisch, New York, 1928, p. 5.
46 Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch, Late Rabbi of the Ahawat Chesed Congregation, New York, A Memorial, New York, 1885, p. IV.
JULIUS BIEN — B'NAI B'RITH PRESIDENT
rabbinate before 1848, but left their pulpits to participate in the Revolutions, Kalisch as a journalist and Hochheimer as a soldier; Szold and Huebsch were students who, like thousands of others, dropped their books to join the hosts of Kossuth. All four became leaders among their colleagues in America. Kalisch was a partner with Isaac Mayer Wise in the summoning of the first American rabbinical conference at Cleveland, in 1855, and a co-author of the first American Reform prayerbook, the Minhag America. Each of the other three, by coincidence, also participated in the issuance of versions of the prayerbook. Szold and Hochheimer were collaborators in the editing of the only nineteenth century revision of the ritual which is still in use today, Abodath Yisrael, and Huebsch edited and published a special prayerbook for his New York congregation (1872). It is perhaps important to note that none of these four rabbis was an extreme radical theologically. All of them became moderate Reformers in America. Even in Europe their political views were more radical than their religious concepts, and no one of them appears to have taken an active political role in the United States. They were not political radicals because their personalities made them such, but because conditions in Europe had demanded it. America satisfied them; there was no need to be radical.

These, then, were the twenty-eight Jewish “Forty-Eighters” whom we have been able to identify.\textsuperscript{47} Even if double their number came to

\textsuperscript{47}Two more “Forty-Eighters” should, perhaps, be added, men who came to America as refugees from Europe but returned to their homes across the sea as soon as political conditions permitted: Rabbi Wolf Schlessinger and Fülöp Korn.

Schlessinger, co-author of a translation of Joseph Albo's Sefer Ikkarim (Frankfurt a. M. 1844), had been rabbi in Sulzbach, Bavaria, since 1842. He was arrested for preaching and speaking in behalf of the Revolution, but managed to escape to New York, where he preached and wrote until September, 1850, when he decided to return to Sulzbach. He was accorded a hearty welcome by American Jewry, in the twin role of political hero and Jewish scholar. The Occident, in addition to publishing news about him, printed his four-part article on “The Difference between Judaism and Christianity, Being a Refutation of the Pamphlet of the Rev. M. R. Miller, Entitled the ‘Identity of Judaism and Christianity,’” as well as “A Few Remarks on Dr. Wise’s Ideas on the Tetragrammaton.” Data on Schlessinger are to be found in The Occident and American Jewish Advocate, VII, No. 9, pp. 473-4, December 1849; No. 10, p. 513, January 1850; No. 11, pp. 529-42, February 1850; VIII, No. 1, pp. 29-30, April 1850; No. 6, pp. 297-306, 315-6, September 1850; No. 7, pp. 348-54, October 1850; No. 9, pp. 429-64, December 1850; No. 10, pp. 514-9, January 1851; Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, XIII (1849), p. 524; XIV (1850), p. 607; XXII (1858), p. 474.

Korn, a Pressburg book-seller who held the rank of captain in the revolutionary army, came to America by way of Turkey and England, and attempted to arouse support for the Kossuth cause. He remained here until 1863, when he returned to Hungary. Eventually he was converted to Christianity. UJE, VI, p. 455.
America, and were lost in obscurity, our conclusions would not have to undergo radical revision. The very fact that so small a number has survived in the documents and periodicals upon which we have based our study is an indication that the Jewish “Forty-Eighters” had no concerted, significant influence upon the life of the American-Jewish community or the German-American community. Never a homogeneous group—most of them not even acquainted with one another—scattered throughout the far reaches of the country—what influence could they have as a group?

Their personal, individual achievements and influence, on the other hand, were extremely important, for they were an exceptional group of men. They brought techniques and education, talents and ambitions, which served America in good stead. Some, like Jacobi and Bien, made contributions to America which will remain for generations to come. Others, like the rabbis and journalists, spent their talents in the service of their immediate generation. Still others contributed the talents and achievements of their children and grandchildren: Rabbi Szold’s daughter, Henrietta, founded the women’s Zionist organization, Hadassah; Blumenfeld’s son, Ralph, became the editor of the London Express; Rabbi Huebsch’s son, Benjamin, heads the publishing firm, Viking Press; Goldmark’s daughters were the helpmeets of two of America’s leading spirits, Brandeis and Felix Adler. Perhaps the exceedingly high level of their personal and familial achievement can be explained only in psychological terms: in Europe they had the vigor and fearlessness to join the fight against autocracy; in America their strength and creativity, their broad humanity and their faith in progress, found expression in terms other than revolt and battle. The Revolutions of 1848 had, as it were, chosen them from the masses as men of promise. That promise was fulfilled in America.

It is undoubtedly true that there was a larger proportion of intellectuals and men in the professions among the “Forty-Eighters” than among their compatriots who came to America in other years. Nevertheless, the “Forty-Eighters” were not different in the quality of their living and in the nature of their aspirations from the thousands of other German Jews who flocked to America during that age. The talents, imagination, and vigor which the “Forty-Eighters” brought to the United States were matched by the talents, imagination, and vigor of other German Jews who came in that period, and whose names have become part of the legend of America: August Belmont, banker and art connoisseur; Simon Bamberger, mine owner, railroad builder, first non-Mormon governor of Utah; Morris Flexner, Louisville merchant and father of Abraham and Simon; Adam Gimbel, peddler, merchant, and founder of a department store dynasty; Meyer Guggenheim, merchant and mining magnate; Albert Michelson, physicist and Nobel
Prize Winner; Adolph Lewisohn, copper mine magnate and philanthropist; the elder Henry Morgenthau, lawyer, financier and diplomat; Samuel Rosenwald, merchant and father of that Julius who established a great humanitarian foundation; the Seligman brothers, seven strong, who established a great name in commerce, banking, civic leadership and philanthropy. . . .

The American Jewish population grew from about 15,000 in 1825 to about a quarter of a million in 1875. All of those immigrants, like the "Forty-Eighters," came to America in search of personal opportunity, political justice, and economic freedom — here they struck their roots, found the country and its life to be good — and they, in turn, enriched America and enhanced its life with the fruit of labors which Europe had been too bigoted to accept.
The Struggle for Unity

Attempts at Union in American Jewish Life: 1654-1868

JOSEPH BUCHLER
Rabbi, Temple Judea, Chicago, Illinois

In 1790 the first six American Jewish congregations found themselves unable to agree on a text of the proposed joint letter of congratulation to President Washington on the occasion of his inauguration. Since that day the problem of establishing unity within the American Jewish community has continually been a vexing issue with almost as many failures as attempts. Only here and there can we point to occasions in which the American Jewish community was able to set aside inter-organizational rancor and personality clashes and establish some form of effective unity. It is the purpose of this study to examine the early efforts made in this direction, in order the better to understand later attempts to establish unity in American Jewish life.

Starting with the first half of the nineteenth century, as the Central European Jews began to join in ever-increasing numbers their Sephardic brothers in the United States, issues and problems which required

With this essay the Editors of the American Jewish Archives present the first of a series of précis of theses on American Jewish historical themes. Since the establishment of major courses in the field of American Jewish history at the Hebrew Union College a number of students have presented rabbinical and doctoral theses in partial fulfillment of the requirements for their degrees. Obviously the publication of a complete thesis has no place within the limited scope of this periodical. It is the intention of the Editors, therefore, to epitomize the best of these dissertations and to present them to our readers. Rabbi Buchler's study in its complete form numbers 163 pages and 324 notes. Inasmuch as his text has been recast, it has been found inadvisable, in this particular instance, to annotate this epitome in any detail. However, the completely documented thesis, based almost solely on primary sources, may be consulted in the Library of the Hebrew Union College. Among the basic reference materials and works carefully utilized by Rabbi Buchler are the following: the Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society; The Board of Delegates of American Israelites (an unpublished rabbinical thesis) by Allan Tarshish; The Rise of American Judaism (an unpublished doctoral thesis) by Allan Tarshish; The Occident (Vols. I-XXVI); The Asmonean (Vols. I-XVII), The Israelite (Vols. I-XIV), and The Jewish Messenger (Vols. I-VIII). This epitomization was prepared by Mr. Daniel Silver of the Hebrew Union College.—THE EDITORS.
the effective backing of the whole Jewish community, arose. Problems of adjustment of the new immigrant to a new society, language difficulties, economic hardships, and a social cleavage between the older Sephardic "aristocracy" and the recently-arrived Ashkenazic communities were but a few of the problems which began to complicate the picture of Jewish life in the United States. Later there was added the split in Jewish life caused by the growth of the Reform Movement. But most important, the few small Jewish communities of the eighteenth century grew and expanded until the lack of any unity began to react adversely on the Jewish group. Philanthropic and social welfare, the care of the poor, the burial of the dead, the collection of funds for Palestine, and the religious training of youth could effectively be dealt with only on a communal or national level. Yet, despite it all, by 1868 (when this thesis ends), Jewish life had taken only the first tentative steps toward order and cooperation. There was as yet no broad union of American Jews, no religious union, no central authority or board of control, no representative council or conference recognized as the authoritative spokesman for the mass of Jews in this country. There was a beginning certainly in the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, but for the rest, Jewish life was still in a chaotic, if not rampantly anarchic state.

To find out why is the purpose of this essay. We shall see that the answer can be formulated along these lines. American Israel, during the time of this study, though vaguely recognizing the many advantages of inner cooperation, had not as yet arrived at the stage where union was either imperative or pressing. A handful of far-sighted men might see the effect disorganization was having on Jewish life, but to the majority it was as yet of no consequence; its ill effects hardly touched their daily existence. To the measure that union was achieved, it was in those fields in which even the average Jew could recognize the need. Thus, in local charitable efforts, especially during periods of severe depression, the different congregations and societies met their immediate problems together. On a national scale, too, the direct threat which events in Damascus (1840) and in the Papal states (1858) seemed to hold over world Jewry was of sufficient strength to suppress some of the strong isolationist tendencies of the several communities, and out of this challenge the Board of Delegates was born (1859). But, generally, the period was one more of gestation than of actual birth and development.

**The Role of the Periodical**

Throughout the three middle decades of the nineteenth century, the Jewish periodicals exerted a two-fold influence on this problem which we are discussing, and we must now analyze their influence. The most
important, though the more subtle influence they rendered, was their aid in breaking down the barriers between the various groups and points of view in Jewish life. The facts they published gave the reader a much broader picture of Jewish life than he had ever had before. The subscriber, despite his limited experience within one congregation, one lodge, or one charity, began to understand and appreciate the problems of dozens of similar organizations in his own and other cities, and in this manner he came to realize how a union of organizations and talent would make for a much fuller, more productive — in fact, better — Jewish life.

Secondly, the editors as a group advocated and editorialized for closer contact, greater cooperation, and better understanding among the many different organizations and groups. They advocated concrete plans for union, and, if these failed, they pointed out the reasons so that the same mistake need not be repeated. Each had his own axe to grind, his own position to maintain; nevertheless, there was probably no greater force at work striving to bring a little order out of the existing chaos.

Isaac Leeser’s *Occident* began with its very first number (1843) to advocate a religious union along standard Orthodox lines. During its years of publication (1843-1868) this periodical was used to back any plan which seemed to further Leeser’s idea of an ecclesiastical authority to establish authoritative norms of practice for the growing American Jewish Community.

On the other hand, Robert Lyon’s *Asmonean* was not so much interested in a plan for a religious authority as in a broader union embracing all the secular aspects of Jewish life. During the nine years of its existence (1849-1858) Lyon devoted its pages primarily to the practical aspects of unity. The steady stream of immigrants, together with recurrent financial panics, convinced Lyon of the need for cooperation among the many philanthropic organizations, and he did all in his power in this direction:

“We strenuously advise consolidation, for in it lies strength and efficiency; while separation into nationalities fritters away the power a community like the Hebrews of New York are expected to exercise.”

Isaac M. Wise used his *Israelite* from the very beginning (1854) as a means of advocating a union of all groups along moderate Reform lines, and though he was willing to compromise in order to include all but the extremes on both sides, he knew from experience that only a union of those who had some point of view could be expected to succeed. So he bent all his efforts towards achieving a unity among

---

the Reform groups of the West. That is not to say that he did not advocate a broader union, for he took an active part in calling the Cleveland Conference of 1855; nevertheless, as failure followed failure (for want of any common ground between the Orthodox and Reform leaders) Wise turned his attention more and more towards a strengthening of Reform in the West:

“We, for our part, have not the least doubt that at least the western congregations (and the west grows fast), will in a few years be a united body with Synagogue, Synod, Orphan Asylum, and College.”

*The Jewish Messenger* (1857-1903), published under the aegis of the Rev. Samuel M. Isaacs of New York, advocated throughout its existence a strong national union along Orthodox religious lines. He emphasized the influence which the Jewish group might have in dealing with its own problems of existence and of security if the various Jewish groups were united:

“What better . . . than the feeling that we have contributed our portion to the amelioration of our own people, by uniting them for every purpose destined for their own welfare, and for entitling them to the respect of those among whom they are destined to dwell.”

These capable and influential men were all clearly aware of the need for unity, and were committed to the task of forging a bond of cooperation among the various groups. All were well qualified for these tasks, all had energy and imagination, as well as ability; yet they accomplished so little. For, though all had a genuine desire to see a broad union of all Jews, each wanted it organized along his own line of belief and practice. They reflected the many disagreements and factions which had split Jewish life. That they, the champions of the union idea, had difficulties combining for their much-desired union, shows that the need was not great enough to force a union. How much more so, then, for the average American Jew whose daily life hardly depended on the solution of this problem.

That these men could not even agree as to the line such a union should take is indicative of how loosely and how vaguely the need was felt. Should the union be for a better ordering of the religious life? To facilitate the collection and dispensing of charity? For political reasons? All these were issues which these men could not agree upon; yet such a decision would seem a necessary prerequisite to any effective planning for union.

---

2 *The Israelite*, III (1856), 196.

3 *The Jewish Messenger*, IV (1855), 140 ff.
Those broad problems, which the newspaper editors recognized as demanding some form of cooperation in American Jewish life, were the outgrowth of confusion and overlapping on the local level, much magnified. The existence of many congregations gave rise to conflicts of one kind or another. Ritual questions, the validity of divorces, shehitah (ritual slaughter of cattle), problems of dual membership, responsibility for aiding the poor and hungry, the burial of the dead—all required some consultation among the several congregations, and in all these issues certain common steps were taken during this period.

The coordination and consolidation of philanthropic activities was also attempted at this level. Robert Lyon had called attention in 1855 to the chaos and overlapping which existed among such organizations in New York City:

"We are obliged to acknowledge that no unity of action or interchange of sentiment exists among our societies. Each society is an independent organization, irresponsible to all, excepting its own members, and in a majority of cases assumes an indifference to outside impressions."4

Yet, despite his plea, the only concrete result was a combining of the two Ashkenazic Benevolent Associations, the Hebrew Benevolent and the German Hebrew Benevolent societies in 1859, and an "off again—on again" Passover Distribution Committee first established in 1855 which facilitated the distribution of unleavened bread to the poor. In August of 1858 The Jewish Messenger renewed the struggle for a union of charities, and called for one strong central charitable association, representing all the smaller organizations, which should establish a fair and effective system of dispensing relief. But in spite of the efforts of such able men as Isaacs and Lyon, no further concrete steps were taken at combining the New York social agencies during the remainder of our period (to 1868).

In Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Chicago, where there were fewer congregations, fewer charities, and proportionally fewer personality differences, the movement for a consolidation of charities was more successful. Thus, Philadelphia formed in 1858 a General Relief Association which, though only conceived as a temporary venture, worked so well that it was reorganized into a permanent organization. Cincinnati, under the leadership of the Rev. Dr. Max Lilienthal, organized in 1856 a society for the coordination of all relief work, with the hope that all charitable societies would eventually join; and Chicago

4The Asmonean, XI (1864), 156.
created its United Hebrew Relief Association in 1859, an organization which was probably the most efficient of all these councils.

There was one other area of fund-raising—the collection of funds for the Jews of Palestine—in which some measure of cooperation between the several congregations and communities was achieved. In the '30's a branch of the Terumat Ha-Kodesh (Society for the Offerings of the Sanctuary) was established in New York to transmit funds to Palestine without the loss incurred through supporting itinerant solicitors, and to get the various synagogues to subscribe a definite sum to Palestine relief. This organization, however, never clearly met these issues, and seems to have gone out of existence in the early '50's.

The year 1853-1854 saw a terrible famine in Palestine, and on an appeal from Chief Rabbi Adler and Sir Moses Montefiore of England, a national campaign was organized which collected over $5,000, and the North American Relief Society was organized:

"for the sole purpose and motive of affording permanent aid to poor [Palestinian] Israelites. . . and that they be supported by remitting now, and at stated periods, all amounts you and your congregations can spare for so necessary and sacred a cause. . ."\(^5\)

Thus, on the local level, whatever unity existed was achieved only when the average Jew could recognize the necessity, though even then not without a great deal of difficulty. Overlapping demands made on their pocketbooks by various agencies led to some measure of coordination, not only in the collection of funds for Palestinian Jewry, but even, in a modest way, in the establishment of joint religious schools. But more than this was not achieved inasmuch as the necessity of a more embracing union was not self-evident.

**Toward a Religious Union**

The first attempt at a permanent national religious union took place in 1841 when the Rev. Louis Salomon and the Rev. Isaac Leeser proposed to a meeting at the Beth Israel Synagogue of Philadelphia that a plan be worked out to unite the congregations of the country into one religious organization. A full plan was worked out for presentation to all congregations along a two-fold line: to establish an ecclesiastical authority to promote education, and to effect unity of action and arbitration of differences among the American Jewish congregations. The plan was both comprehensive and ambitious, but immediately aroused strong opposition from the infant Reform Movement. And, in truth, there can be no question that it was intended to strengthen orthodoxy. The Reformers argued that the ecclesiastical

\(^5\)The Asmonean, VIII (1853), 97-98.
authority was to be invested with such power "that it would easily exercise the most despotic hierarchical sway" and thus not only prevent the spread of reform, but even order abolition of whatever had already been achieved. In fact, Congregation Beth Elohim of Charleston, South Carolina, adopted the following resolution at a general meeting on August 10, 1841:

"Resolved that all conventions, founded or created for the establishment of any ecclesiastical authority whatever, . . . are alien to the spirit and genius of the age in which we live, and are wholly inconsistent with the spirit of American Liberty.

"Resolved that even if it were practical to unite the various views of the several congregations throughout the United States of North America, so as to establish for their government any union of action or plan of regulation, it would nevertheless be unwise and inexpedient to aid in the building up of a system that cannot be lasting, and which from its very nature must be hostile to the march of improvement, or the progress of enlightened and rational reform."6

Besides the Reform group, there were others who opposed this attempt at an ecclesiastical union. For instance, the Spanish-Portuguese Shearith Israel of New York refused to support the plan because they feared that the German Jews would outvote the Sephardim, and thus gain ascendancy in American Jewish life. This first attempt at Union was imaginatively conceived and carefully planned, but it came to naught as the result of fears within the Orthodox group itself and between it and the infant Reform, conflicts which were to become more and more pronounced as the century progressed, with a corresponding lessening of the chances for union.7

A brief and unsuccessful attempt to achieve some measure of religious unity was made by Dr. Max Lilienthal of New York in 1846. He invited Wise and one or two other men to join him in a Beth Din (court) which would offer its services as a religious advisory council to the American community. Various religious issues were to be aired, such as the agunah (remarriage for a deserted wife) and halizah (releasing a widow from marrying her deceased husband's brother) and the contents of Wise's Minhag America prayerbook, but when it came time to meet in 1847, all but Wise had lost interest, and the plan died a stillbirth.

The second major attempt at a union of congregations took place

6Minutes of Congregation Beth Elohim of Charleston, South Carolina, August 10, 1841.
7Isaac Leeser's circular calling for a conference in 1841 is printed as Appendix I to this essay.
in the years 1848-1849, and failed for a reason just the converse of the reason of the first failure, that is, from a fear on the part of the ultra-orthodox group that Wise and his followers would use the union to further Reform ideas. And, indeed, though Wise was associated in this call for "a Chamber of Deputies of American Israelites" with such representative orthodox leaders as Leeser and Isaacs, he yet seemed to toy with the idea that all Jews could be united around his standard of Reform. This worried the ultra-orthodox groups no end, and their fears were increased when some radical Reformers in New York (inspired by some of Wise's remarks) organized a "Society of Friends of Light" which advocated both union and Reform. This frightened the orthodox congregations into believing that the union plan was a scheme of the Reformers to advance their own purpose. They charged that the society had come into being as a direct result of Wise's speaking in New York, and demanded that any established union be pledged to refuse to authorize any reforms. Though Wise publically disavowed the Society and offered to withdraw if it was felt this would help matters, the enthusiasm he had tried to evoke for the union had been taken over by the Society, and the more conservative wing naturally, therefore, identified the union proposals with the radical ideas of the Society. In addition, various personality conflicts arose, and agitation for this plan gradually lessened during 1849.8

It was Wise who renewed the call in 1855 for a religious union. He aroused interest in this plan by editorials in the Israelite advocating a private, unofficial meeting of rabbis to thrash out certain problems, to see what basis could be found for uniting all groups in a conference and a synod. He was more than willing to compromise, but he expected the Orthodox leaders to do as much. What he meant was that nothing would be done contrary to the Bible and the Talmud and which was not in keeping with the spirit of progress revealed in Mosaic legislation. Yet, though his ideas might actually already have found acceptance among Orthodox circles, the Orthodox leaders mistrusted Wise's basic intention, and many stayed away from the Cleveland meeting. They chose rather to fight the battle from the safety of their studies through the media of the printed word, and thus, in fact, doomed the Cleveland Conference as a failure from the outset so that it did not bring together all men representing the various facets of American Judaism.

Thus, when the Conference did convene on October 17, 1855, the Orthodox leaders present were outnumbered ten to six, though in

---

8 Isaac Leeser's circular appealing for support for the proposed Wise-Lilienthal conference in 1849 is reproduced as Appendix II. The call to the Cleveland conference in 1855 is reproduced as Appendix III.
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reality they represented a major share of American Jewry. This fact alone gave rise to a belief among Orthodox circles that Wise and the Reformers "pressured" their ideas by sheer force of numbers.

Wise showed a keen awareness of the basic split between the two groups when he presented the first paper of the Conference, a paper in which he stated that the Bible is the "revealed word of God, given to us by divine inspiration," and that the Talmud "contained the logical and legal development of Holy Scriptures, and that its decisions must bind us in all matters of practice and duty," that the Conference and all future synods should and would act in accordance with these principles, but that the "illiberal assertions of the Talmud are not the kind referred to, and have no binding force on us." The Orthodox were at first astonished, but then beamed with satisfaction. Leeser came forward and expressed his regret that his Orthodox colleagues did not know of this statement in advance, since some of them had stayed away out of fear of reform tendencies, and he suggested a future conference where they might be present.

But both Leeser and Wise were to be disappointed in the reaction of the Jewish community to this apparent agreement on basic issues which the Cleveland Conference had developed. Neither the Eastern Orthodox group nor the radical Reform leaders were at all satisfied. Wise and Leeser were both denounced as traitors: Wise for supposedly embracing Orthodoxy, and Leeser for endorsing, by his participation, Reform.

The happy compromise, which was achieved through Wise's speech, was based on each side's having its own idea of what the Talmud was. To the Orthodox it could only be the strict legal decisions as codified in the Shulhan Aruch, the established code, while for Wise and Lilienthal it was the spirit of progress and growth by which the Talmud had advanced Judaism beyond the Bible. Wise revealed this basic difference of approach when he presented to the Conference his Minhag America, and as men began to consider the Reform character of this work, this basic difference became clear. Then charges and counter-charges began to fly thick and fast. David Einhorn attacked Wise and was himself attacked by the Orthodox Rabbi Abraham Rice. Others also joined the fight, which was often conducted on a very personal level. Even Leeser, partly to defend his own position and partly out of disappointment, turned about and attacked the Conference, saying that the cause of union had been damaged because the Reformers had taken control of the project and had forced through a broad religious platform which, in essence, backed the spirit of Reform. Few men kept their heads, as did Lilienthal, who tried to point out that there was no real basis for all this agitation: that the Conference had only laid the foundation for future discussions and
that it had adopted a platform on which both parties should be able to agree; that the Conference's committees could, in the future, work out scientifically, and based on Talmudic principles, any necessary reforms; that the Conference had in fact cemented friendships, allayed suspicion, and had laid a foundation on which a great union of American Jewish Congregations could be erected.

Those Orthodox leaders who had stayed away from the Conference never realized the real sense of achievement which its meetings had evidenced, and they had no use for a platform even showing a tinge of Reform. On the other hand, the ultra-Reform Baltimore group felt that much too much of a concession had been made by Wise and Lilienthal to the Orthodox group in the interests of harmony; that a rational faith should not be encumbered with the spirit of Talmudic and Rabbinic legislation. In fact, even the moderate Reform wing was not solidly behind Wise, for they felt that the synod, if established, could compel congregations to accept decisions as to ritual which might be counter to the spirit of Reform and progress which they felt was basic to Judaism. Reform rabbis, like Mayer of Charleston, advised Wise to set up a workable synod of Reform congregations where this fear would not exist and where real constructive work might take place among like-minded congregations. Even Wise, bitterly disappointed by the Cleveland failure, came to recognize the validity of this point of view, and in the future directed his actions toward strengthening Reform.

The attempt of the religious Reformers to create a united American Jewry, then, ended in failure, in fact, in vituperation and active antipathy. From the point of view of an all-inclusive unity, the religious field was definitely beyond hope. The two sharply divided parties could not be drawn together on a religious basis. Union would take place after 1855 within each of the two groups, but could never be all-embracing.

Educational Projects—Spurs to Unity

To promote Jewish education, especially on a higher level, and to train ministers for the American Jewish community was considered by all parties as a national problem. There were schools attached to congregations, and, in some cities, attempts had been made to run a school that would serve several congregations. But, for the most part, such solutions were on an elementary level, and did not come to grips with the problem of promoting Jewish scholarship or of providing trained leaders for the American congregations. Any attempt to establish such a college, university, or seminary demanded some measure of national participation, for it was too much for a single congregation to undertake such a project.
It was Wise who first began to agitate for a seminary and college of advanced Jewish studies. He sought to “establish a college on the pattern of German universities, connected with a theological seminary, and a seminary for teachers, in order to promulgate science and the interests of Judaism among our fellow-citizens.”

In 1854 he founded in Cincinnati the Zion College Association which proceeded to call on other cities to aid in this project. Response was at first heartening and Wise's optimism was unbounded. Wherever he went he organized branches of the Z.C.A. and broadened the original scope of the plan until, in 1855, the Cincinnati Z.C.A. announced through Wise that it would open and finance, the coming year, a four-year preparatory school as a forerunner of whatever institution might eventually be established.

Such unilateral action by the Cincinnati group angered their sister societies in the East, though technically Wise could argue that the agreement among the several Z.C.A. chapters was with regard to a university, whereas the Zion College which they were establishing was only a preparatory school. Nevertheless, even Wise later came to recognize that it was an unwise decision, for the New York group, angered by this act, severed its relations with the Z.C.A. in order to reorganize independently as a new organization “for the moral and religious education of youth.”

Nevertheless, Zion College proudly opened its doors in the fall of 1855 to twelve Jewish and two Christian students. Only two years later it was forced to close because of financial difficulties. The Cincinnati Z.C.A. could not pay the costs of operation, and thus ended Wise's first attempt to establish a college. Its failure can principally be traced to Wise, who had failed to see that such an institution was more than any one community could carry, that it demanded the united support of at least a large segment of the American Jewish community.

Zion University was to be backed by all segments of American Jewry, but ended by being the project of the Reform Jewish community of Cincinnati. On the other hand, Maimonides College, which was set up in Philadelphia in 1867, was the handiwork of the Board of Delegates whose Orthodox leanings we shall discuss more fully in the next section. Ever since 1860 Leeser and Isaacs both urged the Board of Delegates to establish this school, but the Civil War prevented further progress. Finally, in 1866, the Board resolved to raise sufficient funds to establish both a rabbinical seminary and a general university in Philadelphia. The doors were opened in 1867 to four students

9The Israelite, I (1854), 99.
who, despite the financial crisis of that winter, continued their studies. The school was of very modest proportions and, in part for this reason, had very few antagonists. The exception was Wise, who opposed the College because it was organized in the East and not the West, because its leadership was Orthodox and not Reform, and mainly, because someone else, and not he, had been the chief agent in its creation.

There were several other even less successful attempts at organizing such a college on a national basis during our period. In 1864 the Jewish Library Societies of Baltimore tried to raise money for a Hebrew National College, but soon found that their resources were inadequate. In 1865 Temple Emanuel of New York decided to establish a theological seminary, but nothing more seems to have come out of this project during our period except that two students were given scholarships at Columbia. Similar projects were undertaken elsewhere. In New Orleans, St. Louis, and Savannah there were attempts at higher Jewish learning and institutions, but none of the projects seems to have materialized.

**THE FIRST REAL NEED — JEWISH DEFENSE**

Though the Jews could not seem to find ground on which to unite in the religious sphere, secular matters, particularly questions of civil rights at home and defense of co-religionists abroad tended to exert a cohesive force among the Jews. American Jews were made to realize that there was at least one area of danger which confronted all of them, and that was the danger of an anti-Jewish flare-up either in the United States or in the western world. Jews, by the second quarter of the nineteenth century, had come to believe that riots and anti-Jewish outbursts were a thing of the past; that the power of the medieval ruler would never be exercised as tyrannically as before; that those vestiges of legal discrimination which still remained would gradually disappear. But the Damascus affair in 1840, the Mortara Affair in 1858, and the question of the Swiss Treaty (1850-1874) were factors in awakening the Jew to the realization that “things were not what they seemed.” Despite all differences over ritual questions and philanthropic matters, despite the disputes between various personalities, these three manifestations of the validity and strength of anti-Jewish feeling did much to force upon the Jews of America a certain measure of unity.

The first time that the Jews of America joined with their European brethren in a matter of international defense was in 1840 when the Jews of Damascus were charged with the ritual murder of Father Thomas. Jews all over the world were shocked by the imprisonment of thirteen members of the Damascus Jewish community, by the tor-
ture they underwent as the government tried to gather from them confessions to the crime of ritual murder, and by the recommendation of the Moslem Governor of Damascus in favor of capital punishment for all of them. After three months of futile attempts to get consular agents of the European governments to intercede in behalf of the Jews, a meeting was held in London of the Board of Deputies of British Jews at which it was decided to dispatch Sir Moses Montefiore and Isaac Adolphe Crémieux to intervene directly with the Pasha of Egypt (June 15, 1840) to demand the release of those Jews who had survived the torture and were yet alive. The mission was crowned by the release of those unfortunates on September 6th.

While these events were taking place, a protest meeting was held in New York under the leadership of S. I. Joseph and supported by all the synagogues and important societies which framed a letter to President Van Buren (August 19, 1840) requesting that the American Consul in Egypt cooperate with all other consular agents to obtain a fair trial for all Jews involved. Shortly thereafter an answer was received from Secretary of State Forsyth that action had already been taken along these lines. Richmond and Philadelphia also held similar meetings. In aiding the victims of the Damascus Affair, American Jewish action was of little significance, due to its tardiness. Any action by the government resulting therefrom would have taken place after the release had already been effected. Nevertheless, it did have a great effect on the subsequent attitude of the Jews towards the question of seeking governmental assistance in such matters. The prompt action taken by the government was cited again and again, and the techniques of mass protests, petitions, and even joint action were bound to be a highly successful means of political pressure.

In 1850 a treaty was negotiated by the American representative in Basle, Mr. A. Dudley Mann, with the Swiss Confederation, providing for a mutual trade agreement. President Fillmore transmitted the treaty draft to the Senate in February 1851, specifically objecting, however, to a clause in the first article which provided that Christians alone were to be entitled to the privileges guaranteed by the Swiss Confederation. Individual Jews immediately registered protests and urged strong opposition to the ratification of this clause. Cries arose for protest meetings, petitions, political pressure of all types to induce the government to assure equal rights for all American citizens abroad, regardless of religion. Some — Robert Lyon, for instance — even advocated the establishment of societies to promote the emigration and resettlement of Swiss Jews who had been disenfranchised by the constitution of 1840. Under the leadership of Alexander Kursheedt of New York, there was circulated a petition from the American Jews to the Senate requesting that reciprocal religious privileges be assured all nationals abroad,
regardless of the religion they professed. This petition was presented to the Senate by Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan on April 19, 1854. As a result, the Senate declined to ratify the treaty as it stood, and amended it, removing certain objectionable clauses, though still not preventing the Swiss from discrimination against American Jews.

Things were quiet for a year and a half until an American Jew, A. H. Gootman, was expelled from one of the Swiss cantons. A swarm of protests swept over the country and a widespread feeling was abroad to induce the Senate and President to abrogate the treaty unless the restrictive clauses were stricken. In response to appeals from both Wise and Leeser, protest meetings were held in all the large cities, memorials were drafted, and a need was felt for joint action by the American Jewish communities; in fact, Baltimore called for a national convention of delegates from all cities to meet and discuss this issue. However, the conference in September to meet the following month was both too hastily and too poorly planned, and this, combined with old personal antagonisms, kept all but five cities away. (Charleston, Washington, and Philadelphia even presented separate petitions to the President.) Nevertheless the Baltimore Conference opened on October 25th, elected Wise as Chairman, drafted a memorial to the President and proceeded to meet Buchanan in Washington on the following day. In an interview with him they received the answer that instructions had already been sent to effect a modification of the treaty to meet their objections; he also promised to use his good offices to effectuate the wishes of the delegates.

No sooner had this triumph been achieved than those delegates who were sorry they had not attended—together with embittered rivals—began to air the whole issue of the legality and representative character of the Baltimore convention in the Jewish periodicals. Arnold of Baltimore attacked Wise, claiming he had capitalized on the whole issue for his own ends. Herzburg answered Arnold, and so on. At Louisville a business man, Gerstle, well summed up this situation:

"It is a shame, that every public demonstration, every action undertaken for the welfare of our nation, turns out to be a personal affair. . . . Such men as Dr. Arnold and Dr. Wise would be an honor to Judaism, if their abilities would not be used to lower one another in the estimation of the Jewish nation."10

Actually the Swiss treaty issue was not settled until 1874 when the Swiss Constitution, not the treaty, was changed. During the intervening years, however, no attempts at further united action was taken.

In late 1858 news came from Europe that a Jewish child who had

10The Asmonean, XVII (1858), 93.
been converted secretly by his Catholic nurse in Bologna (Papal States) had forcibly been taken from the parents by agents of the Church. The news of this affair reached the United States via the press, together with letters and appeals for aid from Montefiore and the British Board of Deputies. The Central Consistoire of France, the British Board of Deputies, the Consistoire of Sardinia, and also groups of German Jews addressed petitions to their respective governments to intervene on behalf of the distressed parents. The Jews of the United States were urged to add their protests.

The Cincinnati community met in October under Lilienthal and addressed a petition to the Pope to be forwarded through the State Department, but no action was proposed on a national scale. It was Philadelphia with Leeser at the helm which issued a call on November 18th for a national convention of delegates and national action, but there was still no response, and the Philadelphia delegates met the President alone on January 9th. New York, in the meantime, had set up its own permanent Board of Representatives under Dr. Raphall to handle such affairs as the Mortara incident and had already been told by the President that he could not interfere in the internal affairs of another state. The Philadelphia delegation, of course, accused the New York group of having caused this unfavorable answer by spiking its attempt at calling a national convention, and much bitterness ensued. Actually, President Buchanan was unwilling to antagonize the large American Catholic population.

The Philadelphia delegation, disappointed by its experiences, recommended, in order to prevent the recurrence of such abortive action, that:

"the different congregations throughout the Union take into consideration the propriety of electing delegates to represent them in the future, so as to form a body similar to the Board of Deputies of British Jews in London."11

They hoped for the establishment of a board or federation which could unite all Jewish congregational, philanthropic, mutual benefit, or fraternal organizations into a body that would deal with matters of civil and religious rights both at home and abroad, whenever the occasion required it. It was to fulfill this very pressing need that the Board of Delegates was organized.

The Board of Delegates—The First Successful Union Plan

The more conservative religious groups were very much disturbed by the Mortara Affair. They did not anticipate, as did Wise and the German Reformers, the imminence of a Messianic era of freedom; they

11The Occident, XVI (1859), 541-542.
could not reconcile themselves to the “melancholy idea of Galuth” (the Diaspora) with its implication of insecurity for the Jews; they felt that the Reform group was too optimistic about the present. It was out of this feeling that the Board of Delegates was conceived.

It will be recalled that New York had organized a permanent Board of Representatives during the Mortara Affair to deal with whatever problems of this type might confront the New York community. Men like the Rev. S. M. Isaacs urged that other communities establish similar boards, that these local units then elect delegates to a national organization which would watch over the general welfare of American Jews, as well as cooperate with similar European bodies in matters of world-wide importance for Jewry. Spontaneous action by individual congregations had proven too ineffective; some national organization must provide the leadership.

Isaacs first had to reorganize the New York Board of Representatives and persuade it to take the initiative in calling a national conference. After many preliminary meetings during the spring of 1859, a meeting was held on October 9th by seven of the congregations, at which time it was decided to send every congregation in the United States an invitation to participate in the establishment of a national Board of Representatives. Response among the Orthodox groups was fairly good—-even Leeser endorsed the plan, though he argued that the Board should also supervise religious affairs—-but the real opposition came chiefly from the Reform group. Fearing that any union established might venture to throttle Reform, the religious liberals were led into opposition by Wise, who again objected because the Board was an Eastern organization not of his own creation. As it turned out, the Orthodox leaders who were present at the first meeting of the Board soundly defeated a measure by Leeser to set up an ecclesiastical authority.

Congregations all over the country began electing delegates until on November 27, 1859, forty-six delegates, representing twenty-five congregations in thirteen different cities met at Cooper Institute and went about the business of creating “The Board of Delegates of American Israelites” as a permanent organization designed to: (1) gather statistical information; (2) promote Jewish education and literature; (3) promote charity; (4) watch over occurrences at home and abroad relative to Israelites; (5) establish arbitration procedures for disputes between congregations.

An Executive Committee was created to meet in New York periodically and supervise the work of the organization. Officers were elected and the Board signified that it was ready for action. Its first business was to raise funds for certain refugees from Morocco who had taken refuge in Gibraltar during the war between Spain and Morocco. Some
$7,000 was raised despite Wise and Einhorn, who refused to acknowledge the Board as a legal fund-raiser for such appeals.

In spite of opposition the Board grew in strength, and within four months of its organization represented thirty congregations. Isaacs and Leeser answered ably the charges leveled against it of "politics" and "anti-Reform." In August of 1860 the Board held its first annual meeting when its scope was broadened to include the establishment of a high school to train teachers and ministers when the funds should be available. Again Leeser attempted to establish some sort of religious authority, and again the Board, though Orthodox, voted him down.

The Board was prevented by the Civil War from meeting during the next five years, but it survived the difficulty due to the energy and ability of its Executive Committee. This group dealt with diplomatic problems like the Swiss treaty, relief for Jews in Palestine and for victims of Moroccan persecution, sent memorials and protests to Washington, and spoke out strongly whenever Jewish rights were in danger. On the chaplaincy issue, Grant's discriminatory General Order No. 11 against Jews, and the proposed amendment to the Constitution establishing Christianity as the recognized religion of the land, it took direct and constructive action. Though men like Wise, Lilienthal and Einhorn remained in vigorous opposition, nevertheless, when the full Board of Delegates met again after the war on June 11, 1865, forty-two congregations were on its rolls, and by May of 1868, when this study ends, fifty-four of the 180 odd congregations in the United States were members.

The Board was thus the first success, though a limited one, because its range of activities was rigidly circumscribed, in the long movement toward unity among American Jews. It was successful in whatever measure it undertook because it fulfilled a need recognized by the average Jew. Up to 1868 the Board had grown each year, and it seemed likely that it would continue to grow. If it kept refusing Leeser's demands for an ecclesiastical authority, the suspicion of its anti-Reform tendencies would be allayed, and Reform congregations might even join its ranks.

In retrospect, then, by 1868 there was the prospect of an eventual stabilization of Jewish life in America. Charities were beginning to be unified along local lines, the Board of Delegates was growing in stature, and the two religious groups were beginning to organize within themselves rather than attempt the impossible, and establish a common religious union. By 1868 Jewish life had already begun to show a certain resourcefulness, some ability to meet situations of challenge. There was, it seemed, good reason to appear hopeful and confident, that whatever problems would face the Jewish community, the necessary reserves of strength and courage were there to meet them.
A meeting of Israelites of all the different congregations in the City and County of Philadelphia, was held pursuant to public notice, on Sunday the 27th day of June, 1841, corresponding with the 8th day of Tamuz, 5601, at the Synagogue Beth Israel, to take into consideration the plan for establishing a religious union among the Israelites of America, proposed by the Rev. Louis Salomon, minister of the congregation, Rodef Shalom, and Isaac Leeser of the congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia.

Lewis Allen, Esq., President of the congregation of Mikveh Israel, was called to the chair, and Mr. Henry Cohen, Treasurer of the congregation Beth Israel, was appointed Secretary.

Mr. Leeser then addressed the meeting on the utility of such union, and offered a resolution that a committee be appointed to take the plan into consideration and report to a future meeting.

The resolution having been amended on motion of Joseph S. Cohen, Esq., as follows:

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to consider the propriety of endeavouring to establish a plan of religious union of the different congregations of America, and that they report a plan for obtaining the views of the several congregations as to such union, and such other matters as may be thought necessary to carry the union into effect, and that the plan submitted by the Rev. Messrs. Salomon and Leeser, be referred to that committee," was carried; and it having been further resolved, that the committee should consist of seven, exclusive of Messrs. Salomon and Leeser; the chair appointed Messrs. A. Hart, J. L. Hackenburg, Lewis Bomeisler, Frederic Samuel, Hyman Gratz, Zadok A. Davis, and Hyman Polock, on said committee.

The committee met, pursuant to notice of A. Hart, Esq., Chairman, at the house of Mr. Allen, on Thursday evening, the 1st of July, and appointed a sub-committee, consisting of Messrs. Hackenburg, Davis and Leeser, with directions to report on Thursday evening following.

The committee met that evening, absent Messrs. Samuel and Gratz, when the sub-committee laid their draft on the table, which was examined by sections, altered and amended that same evening, Sunday morning and Monday evening, absent the above together with Mr. Polock, when the whole having being gone through, it was ordered to be transcribed and to be reported on the following Sunday, to the adjourned general meeting.

At an adjourned meeting of Israelites, held on Sunday the 18th of July, at the Masonic Hall, L. Allen, Esq., in the chair, Mr. H. Cohen, Secretary, the committee made the following report, accompanied with the plan they had agreed upon.

To the Israelites of the City and County of Philadelphia.

The Committee appointed at a general meeting, held on the 27th of June, have taken the plan proposed by Messrs. Salomon and Leeser, into consideration, and offer the accompanying rules and regulations, together with the preamble, to your favorable notice and adoption; the whole of which is

Respectfully submitted,

J. L. HACKENBURG,
L. BOMEISLER,
Z. A. DAVIS,
DR. L. SALOMON,
ISAAC LEESER.

Committee.

LEWIS ALLEN,
Chairman of the Meeting.

Philadelphia, 12th July, 5601.
PREAMBLE
The Israelites of Philadelphia, in common with their brethren in other places of America, have long since been alive to the many evils under which they labour in the great downfall of religious observance, and the want of proper religious education among them. But deeming it their duty to leave no means untried to counteract the deplorable state of want of proper observance, and to promote a due knowledge of the blessed religion they have received from their fathers: they have resolved to propose a union of all Israelites residing in America, to effect by a common and united effort, that which would evidently be beyond the power of accomplishing by any one of the small congregations in which the Israelites of this country are divided; they therefore offer the following suggestions, which they hope will forward greatly the desired result; in first establishing a competent ecclesiastical authority, agreeably to the injunction of the law in Deuteronomy xvi. 18: "Judges and officers shall thou appoint for thyself in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee throughout thy tribes;" secondly, by establishing schools for general and religious education under Jewish Superintendence, as commanded in Deut. vi. 7: "And thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children;" and thirdly, by promoting harmony and a concert of action among all their brethren scattered over the Western Hemisphere, in accordance with the lofty aspiration of the Psalmist who says (cxxxiii. 1), "Behold how good and how pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in unity." With these views the committee recommend the adoption of the following rules and regulations for the government and action of the Israelites in America.

PLAN.
 ARTICLE I.
The Ecclesiastical Authority.

SECTION 1. The delegates of the different congregations, as hereinafter described, or of so many as may come into the measure, shall elect at their first meeting, or as soon after as practicable, three gentlemen of undoubted moral and religious character, who are duly learned in the written and oral law, who shall have the authority conferred upon them, by their election, to act in, and to decide on all cases of religious inquiry, and to determine all questions laid before them, according to the law, and the approved rabbinical authorities: the members of this Central Religious Council not to be at any time subject to any authority abroad, nor under the control of any congregation, except in cases of misdemeanour, and willful false decisions, in which cases, one or all of such offending parties, are to be removed by the delegates of the Union as above; and a majority of the delegates present shall be required for a vote of suspension for a period of from three to twelve months, and a majority of two-thirds for a suspension for a longer period, or expulsion from office.

SECT. 2. Whenever any case for adjudication comes before any one of the Board hereby constituted, he may decide for himself only, if the emergency will not permit him to consult his colleagues; but if otherwise he is bound to consult them, either in person or in writing, before he gives any answer; in order to insure that the laws of God be properly expounded, and strictly obeyed, as far as lies in the power of the Board herewith proposed.

SECT. 3. In case a decision is made by one member in the absence of his colleagues in any emergency, the said decision must be transmitted without delay to the President of this Union, for the approbation of the other members of the Central Religious Council, and a copy of all decisions is to be forwarded to the recording secretary, as hereinafter described.

SECT. 4. The Hazanim [cantors] of all the congregations of this Union, are to be ex officio associates of the Board, provided always, that nothing is to prevent the delegates from electing a Hazan to
be a member of the Central Religious Council, if he duly qualified for the office in character and capacity.

SECT. 5. In a place where no one of the members of the Central Religious Council resides, the Hazan, or Hazanim, or other persons, in whom the community have confidence, may decide in any emergency, but the decision must also at once be transmitted to the Central Religious Council for their approbation.

SECT. 6. Any party deeming himself aggrieved by the decision of any one member of the Board, or any other person acting under an emergency, may appeal to the whole Central Religious Council, whose decision by a majority shall be final.

SECT. 7. The associates, as above provided, shall merely have power to speak at a meeting of the members of the Central Religious Council, but not to vote.

SECT. 8. One of the three members as above shall be the President of the Board, and shall be specially elected for this purpose by the delegates. He shall have the power to convene the Board, whenever he may deem the public good requires it, and have a general supervision of strictly ecclesiastical matters in this Union.

SECT. 9. As the authority herewith delegated is merely advisory, the Central Religious Council shall never exercise the power of excommunicating any one, for any offence whatever; nor to possess the right of summoning any individual who, in their opinion, might be guilty of any transgression of the Mosaic Law; but shall merely designate the offences which of right deprive any offender from the usual Jewish rights and privileges.

SECT. 10. The privilege of performing the marriage ceremony being the right of each congregation, the customary authority heretofore exercised by the Hazanim remains inviolate; nevertheless the party to be married has the option of selecting the Hazan or any member of the Central Religious Council to perform said ceremony.

SECT. 11. The Congregations belonging to this Union shall not elect any Shochet [slaughterer] who has not been examined as to qualifications by one or more members of the Central Religious Council; and it shall be the duty of the respective Shochetim belonging to this Union, to be examined once at least in three years by one or more of the Central Religious Council, for which examination no fee whatever is to be required.

SECT. 12. No Shochet is to be suspended for frivolous reasons; and if any member of the Central Religious Council should find it his duty to exercise this prerogative, he must state the reason for so doing in writing to the person so suspended.

SECT. 13. It is expected that the Central Religious Council will watch over the state of religion, and use every proper occasion to exhort the people in sermons or lectures; and whenever any member of the Central Religious Council wishes to address any congregation, he shall have the privilege so to do, upon giving notice to the Parnass of said congregation.

SECT. 14. Whenever a new Hazan is to be elected, he must be examined as to his qualifications by one or more members of the Central Religious Council, so as to prevent any incompetent person being forced upon the respective congregations; and if any congregation should elect a Hazan who has not obtained a certificate of the Board, or who has been rejected by them, such Hazan shall not be admitted an associate of the Central Religious Council.

SECT. 15. The superintendence of the schools is herewith vested in the Central Religious Council and the above associates, and it is made their duty to report any delinquency in the teachers to the Board of Control, as hereinafter mentioned.

ARTICLE II.

The Schools.

SECTION 1. As soon as practicable, schools for both sexes are to be established in
every town where Israelites reside, and the teachers are to be paid out of a common local fund, and on no account to receive any pay or fee whatever from the parents.

SECT. 2. Whatever rates for education it may be necessary to charge, are to be paid to the local treasurer of this Union, who is to pay the amount of salary which may be agreed upon, to the teachers, upon warrant of the local president.

SECT. 3. The system of education is to be strictly Jewish, and is to embrace:

a. Hebrew reading, grammar, translation, catechism, Biblical commentaries, and at least an introduction to the Jewish Oral Law, and if possible, an elementary knowledge of the Talmud.


c. For the higher classes, in addition to the above, Hebrew composition, Talmud, general Jewish literature, Latin, Greek, French, German, Spanish, mathematics, natural history, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, political economy, and chemistry.

d. Any other useful matters to be added, as occasion may require.

SECT. 4. The government of the schools is to be moral throughout, and on no account can any cruel punishment be permitted.

SECT. 5. A High School for education in the higher branches, is to be established in some central point whenever practicable, in which the branches enumerated under c are to be taught; and where young men are to be educated in such a manner, that they may be fit for the office of Hazan, lecturer, and teacher; and young women be educated for the high calling of female instructors; and all persons educated in our schools, are to have the preference if any vacancy occurs, for any office in the gift of this Union.

SECT. 6. No teacher to be appointed, whether Jew or gentile, who has not been examined, by one or more members of the Central Religious Council in the first instance, and afterwards by the local President, Treasurer, Secretary, and Hazan, as to capacity and moral worth: Provided, That the distance from one of the members of the Central Religious Council be not above 900 miles, in which latter case, the local authorities may temporarily appoint a teacher or teachers, till one of the members of the Central Religious Council visits the place, when the teacher or teachers must be examined by him; and if an Israelite, he is to be examined also as regards religious knowledge and conformity.

SECT. 7. Though it may be found requisite to charge for education to those able to pay — yet no person, who brings evidence of his inability to pay, shall have his children or wards refused admission into our schools, provided he or she sign a pledge to send them regularly to school at least three months in the spring, and four months in the winter.

SECT. 8. Whatever regards books to be used and other regulations, is to be left to the Central Religious Council and to the Central Board of Control for their action and advisement.

ARTICLE III.

The Union.

SECTION 1. It is recommended that all regularly organized congregations in America do elect delegates to meet at Philadelphia on the 7th day of November, 1841, for the purpose of carrying the above recommendations into effect.

SECT. 2. The ratio of representation to be as follows: Every congregation numbering fifty male seat-holders or under, to send one delegate; from 50 to 150, two delegates; from 150 to 300, three delegates; and one additional for every 200 additional seat holders.

SECT. 3. All votes of delegates shall be decided by the majority, under the usual parliamentary restrictions and regulations.

SECT. 4. The delegates shall be empowered to elect, in the first instance, the members of the Central Religious Council, and to fill all vacancies therein.
from time to time, provided always, that
the persons to be elected be duly qual-
ified.

SECT. 5. They shall assemble, after the
first organization, every two years, on
the 4th Sunday after the first day of the
Passover, and remain in session, by daily
adjournments, till all the business before
them be duly transacted, or postponed
to another meeting.

SECT. 6. An extra meeting may be
called whenever the majority of dele-
gates, or a sufficient number of congre-
gations entitled to send a majority of all
the delegates, shall require it; in which
case they are to notify the President of
the Central Board of Control, who is
then to issue general notices, and sum-
mon the delegation, by giving them at
least sixty days notice.

SECT. 7. The delegates shall be ap-
pointed by the respective congregations
in the manner they may themselves
direct.

SECT. 8. The delegates shall elect a
President to preside over them, and a
Secretary to keep the minutes, whose
offices are to continue till the next gen-
eral meeting.

SECT. 9. In addition to the above two
officers, they shall elect, at every biennial
meeting,

One Vice-President,
One Corresponding Secretary,
One Treasurer,
Four Councillors,

Who, together with the President and
Recording Secretary, shall constitute a
Board of Control to direct the affairs of
the Union in the vacation of the as-
sembly.

SECT. 10. In addition to the above
Central Board, each town shall elect
a President, Treasurer, and Secretary,
to take charge of all local matters and
moneys for local school purposes, but it
shall be their duty to report every six
months in full to the Central Board of
Control.

SECT. 11. The biennial meetings shall
be held alternately, unless otherwise or-
dered; first at Philadelphia, next at New
York, and lastly at Baltimore.

SECT. 12. The Central Board shall sit
in Philadelphia unless otherwise ordered;
and if the President of the delegation
should not be a resident of the place
where the Central Board meets, then the
Vice-President shall act for him, unless
the President happen to be present,
when he has the precedence as a mat-
ter of course; the same rule applies to
the Recording Secretary, whose place, in
his absence for the above or any other
reason, shall be supplied by one of the
Councillors.

SECT. 13. The records shall always be
open to every Israelite belonging to this
Union who desires to inspect them, but
they are never to be taken out of the
possession of the Recording Secretary
or his substitute; and any Israelite, as
aforesaid, is to be at liberty to procure
a copy of any of the records.

SECT. 14. The delegates in general as-
sembly shall have power to deliberate on
all subjects, which may tend to the gen-
eral welfare of the Israelites, with the
exception of matters properly belonging
to legal points of the Mosaic law, which
shall be left, as is reasonable, with the
Central Religious Council.

SECT. 15. They shall devise ways and
means to defray the expenses attending
the execution of this plan, and to fix
salaries and other outlays properly com-
ning under the object of the Union.

SECT. 16. They shall not interfere di-
rectly or indirectly in the internal af-
fairs of the congregations, except to offer
their advice when any thing should be
undertaken in opposition to the law and
the commandments, and to judge be-
tween contending parties, if such should
unfortunately arise in our congregations.

* * * * *

The report having been read, Mr.
Lazarus Arnold moved that the same be
adopted, which, after some debate, was
carried by a large majority.

Mr. Jacob Ulman then moved that the
report and plan be printed, which was
unanimously adopted.

On motion of Mr. A. Hart, it was
resolved that 750 copies in English, and
500 in German, be printed for general distribution.

On motion of Mr. Z. A. Davis, a committee of correspondence of five members, with power to fill vacancies, was ordered to be appointed by the chair; and the President and Secretary were, on motion, added to the above five. Whereupon the chair appointed Messrs. J. L. Hackenburg, Isaac Leeser, Joseph M. Asch, Simon Elfelt, and Mayer Arnold.

On motion of Mr. Leeser, Mr. A. Hart was unanimously elected Local Treasurer, in accordance with the above plan, and Mr. Allen was also elected Local President, and Mr. H. Cohen, Local Secretary pro tem.

It was further resolved, that the Israelites of Philadelphia, be requested to meet in general meeting, on the 5th of September, the second Sunday before the New Year, to elect local officers; and that no one who is not attached to one of the Congregations of Philadelphia, either as Member or Seatholder, shall be allowed to vote.

LEWIS ALLEN, Chairman.

H. COHEN, Secretary.

Have the goodness to give this plan an extensive circulation among your friends, and use your personal influence to promote its being carried into effect.

CIRCULAR

Philadelphia, Ab, 5601, July, 1841.

To the President and Members of the Congregation——— at———-the Israelites of Philadelphia, send greeting:

Brethren!

May long life and spiritual and temporal prosperity be your portion from our Father in heaven, and may He, the most High, move your hearts to piety to Himself, and good will towards all Israel your brethren. Amen.

In the full confidence that you will favourably entertain our plan for a general union, we, on the part of the Israelites of this vicinity, affectionately in-vite you to deliberate well on the proposition and regulations which accompany this, and to elect without delay suitable persons for delegates, to meet us in general convention, on the first Sunday in November, being the 7th of that month, corresponding with the 23rd day of Mar-cheshvan, 5602, at Philadelphia.

We deem it scarcely requisite to admonish you to select men who have the fear of God before their eyes, whose interest in the welfare of the House of Jacob is of an abiding nature, whose moral character is unblemished, and who are of sufficient intelligence to judge with impartiality and reasonable conviction, and of such men there are doubtless many among your number; and have the goodness to instruct them, without exacting pledges, with regard to the measures you wish proposed, and what persons elected for the high stations embraced in our plan, that they who are chosen may step abroad with the seal of public approbation stamped upon them and their characters.

Although we can scarcely believe that any congregation, who are duly impressed with the paramount obligation to uphold our blessed faith, can refuse uniting with us in a measure which evidently promises so much general good: we would, nevertheless, thank you to let us hear from you with the least possible delay, if you decline the union we herewith offer to you.

In the full confidence of a favourable issue, and a fervent hope that you will be found united with us in a common effort to spread the kingdom of Heaven, we remain,

Beloved brethren, your friends and servants in the Lord.

J. L. HACKENBURG, LEWIS ALLEN, ISAAC LEESER, SIMON ELFELT, MAYER ARNOLD, HENRY COHEN, JACOB ULMAN. Committee.
Many persons and communities who have read in the Occident communications from Dr. Wise, and others, relative to a meeting of our people, having for its object the adoption of measures for our spiritual and temporal welfare, although highly approving of the suggestion, still hold back from taking any active measures towards carrying it out, not being in possession of sufficiently definite information as to the nature of the objects contemplated. It having, moreover, been represented that the method at first suggested for bringing together the desired meeting, is open to various and weighty objections, this circular is put forth, which will be found to comprise:

1st. A brief exposition of the evils existing among us.
2d. Proposed measures of remedy.
3d. Mode of organization for the first meeting.

The evils existing among us will be found to exist of,

1st. A want of proper concert.
2d. The fact that our teachers have, in many cases, but few necessary qualifications.
3d. A great want of schools of any worth.
4th. No means of correct information on our ancient and present history and our religion.
5th. No constituted authority to which we can refer questions of doubt or contingency.
6th. No means or medium to supply our poor and our children with proper books of devotion and instruction.
7th. A want of proper devotion, alike in our houses and our Synagogues, amounting in some cases to a departure from the true principles of our faith.

The remedy proposed is to call a meeting or convention of Jews in the United States, having for its object, 1st. A union of all the congregations by delegation and stated meetings.
2d. Education of youth.
3d. Instruction of all classes by the establishment of schools and publication of books, informing our people of their destiny, their religion, their duties, and their history.
4th. The discussion of such other subjects as may be brought to the notice of the assembly by petitions from congregations.

The proper mode of representation and assembly is,

1st. A meeting of Jews shall be held in New York.
2d. It shall consist of none but delegates to be elected by any Jewish congregation in the United States, each congregation sending one delegate; and if more than one delegate should be present from any one body, then such whole delegation shall have but one vote.
3d. Every delegate shall bring a certificate of his election, signed by the president and secretary of the congregation sending him.
4th. The number of delegates for the first meeting shall not be less than 20.
5th. Any congregation agreeing to this plan shall notify the same to the Rev. Isaac Leeser, who, when 20 congregations have so signified to him, shall have power to appoint the day of meeting, and arrange other required preliminaries.

Arise, O Israel! you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation, saith the Lord.

This circular is issued under the auspices of Rev. Dr. Wise, of Albany, N. Y., and Dr. Lilienthal, of New York, and it is requested that all persons into whose hands it may fall, will present it to their friends and ask the cooperation of their respective synagogues.

You will confer a favour by informing
the subscriber, Corresponding Secretary pro tempore, of the determination of your body with respect to the election of delegates, whether favourable or not. In case you resolve to attend the proposed meeting, you will then state the name of the person or persons elected to represent your congregation. The subscriber will duly inform you whether a sufficient number of congregations have joined, and it is hoped that the meeting may convene at New York on the Third Monday in Sivan next ensuing, corresponding with the 11th of June.

ISAAC LEESER, Cor. Sec. pro tem
Philadelphia, Adar 5th, 5609.
[February 28, 1849.]

APPENDIX III

שלום על ישראל
[Peace be unto Israel]

The First Conference

In the name of Israel's God and Israel's religion, the ministers and delegates of the Israelitish congregations are respectfully requested to assemble in a conference, to take place the 17th day of October 5616 A. M. [1855] in the City of Cleveland, Ohio, to deliberate on the following points:

Firstly. The Articles of Union of American Israel in theory and practice.

Secondly. A plan to organize a regular synod, consisting of delegates chosen by the congregations and societies, whose powers, privileges and duties shall be defined, to be sent to the several congregations for their approbation.

Thirdly. To discuss and refer to a committee a plan for a Minhag America [an American liturgy], to be reported to the synod at its first session.

Fourthly. A plan for scholastic education in the lower and higher branches of learning.

Fifthly. Other propositions either sent in by congregations, or made by the ministers or delegates at the conference.

By order of the American rabbis, Rev. Doctors Cohn of Albany, Guenzburg of Baltimore, Hochheimer do. Illowy of St. Louis, Kalish of Cleveland, Lilienthal of Cincinnati, Merzbacher of New York, Rothenheim of Cincinnati, Wise of Cincinnati.

ISAAC M. WISE, CORRESP. SEC'y.
News of the Archives

The American Jewish Archives is now comfortably ensconced in its own quarters in the Bernheim Library Building on the campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion on Clifton Avenue. It shares these spacious quarters—including stack room for 50,000 volumes—with the Jewish Museum recently established in Cincinnati. An attractive display case has been specially built and now contains an exhibit on the Jews during the Civil War. The papers displayed and described here were collected by Prof. B. W. Korn and utilized in his forthcoming book on *American Jewry and the Civil War*. Most of these materials now on exhibition are photostats of notable documents and letters: correspondence from the Robert T. Lincoln Collection in the Library of Congress, items on slavery, records of the Civil War, pictures and reports of Jewish chaplains, and the like.

The American Jewish Archives will be happy to lend this collection to any institution interested in borrowing it for purposes of display. Arrangements for the loan of this material may be made by writing to the Director of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati 20, Ohio.

* * *

Through the generosity of Margaret K. Kahn this issue of the *American Jewish Archives* is dedicated to the memory of her late husband, Julius Kahn. Mr. Kahn was a distinguished civil engineer and industrialist who was the organizer of the Truscon Steel Company of Youngstown, Ohio, and its president for thirty-three years. His interests in philanthropy and culture were broad and genuine.

* * *

We wish to record our appreciation to Mr. Abraham Brachman and Mr. Sol Brachman, of Fort Worth, Texas, for their interest and cooperation evidenced by their support of the program of the Archives.

* * *

The editors of the *American Jewish Archives* take this opportunity to express their cordial thanks to Mr. Arthur Friedman, Mr. Leo Friedman, and to Mr. Bernard J. Starkoff, of Cleveland, Ohio, for the interest and generosity which they have evinced towards our work. They have been Patrons of this periodical since its publication and, through their kindness and understanding, have helped further the study and research in which we are engaged.
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All manuscript additions to the Archives collection acquired since January, 1949, will be listed and described in the winter issue of this journal.

However, the editors cannot refrain from giving a brief description, at this time, of a collection which has just been acquired. These are the Moses Myers papers.

Moses Myers was one of the outstanding Virginia merchants of the late-eighteenth century. Originally, he was a member of the firm of Isaac Moses & Co. of New York and Philadelphia which carried on business with Europe and the West Indies during the days of the Revolution. After the War, when Moses Myers and his associates dissolved their partnership, Myers went to Norfolk and engaged extensively in commerce and shipping. The firm prospered—he built a beautiful home, still standing—and Myers and his sons, who were associated with him in business, became well known for their enterprise and integrity. For many years he served in Norfolk as the financial representative of the French and Batavian Republics, as superintendent of the local branch of the Bank of Richmond, and as business agent for Thomas Jefferson, Wilson Cary Nicholas, and other well-known Virginia families. Unfortunately, the panic of 1819 brought about the fall of this business house, as it did for many others. The Myers', in partnership or alone as individuals, continued in business well into the nineteenth century.

In his late years Moses Myers was successful in securing appointment to a political post. He became Collector of the Customs for the District of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia (1828). Several years later, in 1832, he ran afoul of Henry Clay who, resenting the action of Myers in lobbying against the current tariff bill, attacked him publicly in the Senate as a "Jew." Some of Clay's Jewish friends and admirers took umbrage at this form of address; one of them, Sol Etting, wrote and asked the Kentucky statesman for an explanation. The correspondence between Clay and Etting may be found in the Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, XVII (1909); 81-88.

Through the courtesy of some friends, the Archives have been enriched with a series of letter-books, ledgers, etc., which give us a great deal of information on the business activities of this notable firm from 1785 on into the next century. A study of this material will no doubt be very useful in any investigation of the post-Revolution merchant-shippers of the South.