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In 1947 German immigrants Ludwig and Ilse Levy moved from New York City to a century-old wooden farmhouse 150 miles upstate. Their relatives wrote them off ("except when they wanted a vacation") and their new farming neighbors eyed them "kind of funny. They had never heard of Jews who would work."

Even more so today than a quarter-century ago, most Jews are identified with urban or suburban environments. Jews are by far the most urbanized major religious group in the United States. Yet, according to Peter Rose:

There is . . . a scattered minority of American Jews living in little hamlets and rural villages who do not fully fit this urban image. Such people do not reside in old-style ghettos, in ethnic neighborhoods, or in modern homogeneous suburbs. Unlike their urban coreligionists, they are not members of on-going Jewish communities.

Rose proceeded to label these rural Jews "strangers in alien territory." Sociologist Eugen Schoenfeld, on the other hand, has

\[1\] Ludwig and Ilse Levy, Interview. (All subsequent direct quotations will be indicated in the text with no note.)

The author, a 1976 graduate of Princeton University, is a first-year student at Harvard University Law School.
concluded that the majority of small-town Jews are in fact “residents,” not “strangers.”

This essay will, in part, attempt to reconcile this “resident” or “stranger” question in the context of one rural Jewish community, that of Schoharie County, New York. It will in particular emphasize the special role of the Jewish farmers, a group even more rare than the small-town Jew. After discussing the background and experience of the Jewish farm families, including several in-depth case studies, this essay will attempt to analyze the formation and eventual disintegration of the Schoharie County Jewish Community Center. Through our examination of how and why a scattering of Jewish families united and then dissolved, some light may be shed on the resident—stranger question. The essay will evaluate demographic, socioeconomic, and cultural factors, and the relationship between the Jews and their Gentile neighbors.

Although Rose and Schoenfeld used both surveys and interviews in at least ten communities to develop their conclusions, this study draws primarily on intensive interviews with the Jews of one county and on the personal experience of the author. Thus its conclusions are somewhat speculative. But because the vast majority of research on Jews in America ignores the rural Jew, this approach may offer some fresh alternatives to the stereotypical picture of American Jews. For instance, the role of the Jewish farm wife hardly jibes with that of the classical suburban Jewish mother. Furthermore, the experience of Jewish families living and working in near-isolation from other Jews offers some insight into the historical strength of the Jewish tradition and the significance which Jews attach to maintaining that tradition. While the essay briefly follows through to the present situation of Schoharie County’s Jewish farmers and Jewish community, much of it takes a historical perspective, concentrating on the period from the end of World War II through the 1950’s.

**Success and Failure**

By 1935, when Harry Rubin became the first practicing Jew to buy a farm in Schoharie County, Jews had been trying to farm in

---

the United States for more than a century. Since 1820 a succession of Jewish agricultural colonies, scattered throughout the eastern and southern parts of the United States, had failed. The farmers, primarily immigrants, lacked training and experience in agriculture. Most of the sites were poor, and natural disasters aggravated the problems.

Nevertheless, a group of rabbis meeting in New York in 1882 encouraged Jewish immigrants to farm, the reasons being both patriotic and religious:

In colonizing them and settling them as agriculturalists, we feel, therefore, every moral assurance that they will become worthy American citizens repaying the protection and rights they have received by becoming faithful and loyal denizens of the soil, and forming a class of useful and honorable men who, adhering to their religious convictions, will also be imbued with the spirit of American institutions and contribute their full share toward the development of our country and the extension of its blessings, as freemen enjoying republican sturdiness and virtue.⁵

Jacob Gordin, a Russian immigrant to America, advocated Jewish agricultural colonies as a means of avoiding anti-Semitism in the United States. He maintained that it would decrease Jewish population in the cities and thus decrease the degree of economic competition between Gentiles and Jews.⁶

Despite good wages, a summer demand for farm workers, and good working conditions, few Jews turned to farming in the late nineteenth century. "The recent immigrants are not ideistically inclined," wrote Dr. George M. Price in 1891. "They migrated to America not for the sake of their people's rejuvenation, but for their own personal welfare."⁷ Price explained why the young Jewish immigrant could not follow a common American route to farming success. The aspiring Christian farmer worked as a laborer for a farmer for about five years while saving his wages; he married the farmer's daughter or a local factory girl, bought a small farm, and gradually worked into the farming establishment.

⁷Ibid, p. 287.
But the Jew's religion precluded his marriage to a Christian girl. Moreover,

... a family which is not accustomed to physical labor and is religiously observant cannot become farm-hands with an Irish or German farmer. ... Single members of the intelligentsia refuse to bury themselves in a strange village among people whose language, customs and religious views they neither understand nor share. They, therefore, prefer to work in shops and to learn a trade. 8

Some individual farmers remained after colonies folded in Kansas and the Dakotas. Several New Jersey colonies survived in the late nineteenth century. Since the turn of the century Jews have farmed in upstate New York, Connecticut, and Maine, and, later, throughout the country. The major force in promoting Jewish farming has been the Jewish Agricultural Society, founded by Baron Maurice de Hirsch in 1900. Initially, the society promoted group colonization, but soon shifted its focus to individual enterprise. It offered financial subsidies, placement service, and "scientific" guidance. The advice, as will be discussed later, was sometimes uninformed.

The peak number of Jewish farm families nationally, about 20,000 at the end of World War II, roughly coincided with the high point of Jewish farming in Schoharie County. Until shortly before the war, no Jews farmed in Schoharie County for many of the same reasons which Price had suggested in 1890, particularly the Gentile environment far from a Jewish community. Located about 150 miles north and slightly west of New York City, Schoharie County ranks 58th among New York's 62 counties in population with about 24,000 persons. The nearest metropolitan area is the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area, an average of 35 miles distant. Traditionally, agriculture and related or dependent occupations have dominated the local economy. In fact, the county's cow population exceeds the human population by about 20 per cent. 9

Attorney Jacob Wildove, whose parents became, in 1917, the first-known practicing Jews to settle permanently in Schoharie

8 Ibid. p. 304.
County, attributed the absence of Jewish farmers to both the nature of farming in the county and the farm’s isolation. There is evidence that several Jews settled in Schoharie County in the nineteenth century, but either they or their children denied any ties to Judaism. Most of the farms before World War II were small family operations—which extended up to seven generations back. Many were located in extremely isolated areas. As Wildove recalled, “the farmers were more isolated then. A Jewish family would really have been cutting themselves off to go out on a farm.”

Even Rubin, the first Jewish farmer, did not move to the county until after his daughter had been graduated from a Schenectady high school. She stated that:

“My mother was very old fashioned and felt since there were no Jewish families out here, she wouldn’t let her daughter grow up in a non-Jewish community. She made my father promise we would never move out of Schenectady until I graduated from high school.”

Like most Jewish immigrants, Harry Rubin settled in New York City when he arrived in the United States from Poland. An assistant to his father, a kosher butcher and cattle dealer in the Warsaw area, Rubin crossed the Atlantic probably in a cattle boat. His wife and one-year-old son were to join him four years later. After struggling to keep employed, Rubin, unlike many immigrants, left New York for Schenectady. There he found work digging ditches for General Electric at three to five dollars weekly wage.

When his sister married the son of a kosher butcher shop owner, Rubin began working for the butcher. His contacts with cattle dealers and kosher butchers eventually enabled him to form a partnership and begin a small cattle-dealing business in Cobleskill, a village of fewer than 3,000 persons. “How they picked Cobleskill I’ll never know,” his daughter said. The largest town in Schoharie County, Cobleskill’s entire Jewish population in the 1920’s consisted of one merchant family—who stayed for a few years—succeeded by another merchant family later in the decade. About fifteen miles away lived the Wildove family, also merchants, and a cattle dealer named “Dutch” Rubin (no relation to Harry Rubin),

---

10 Jacob Wildove Interview. (Subsequent quotations attributed in the text.)
11 Mrs. Sidney (Bea Rubin)/Wallace, Interview.
whose only known connection with Judaism was a Jewish funeral. Another Jewish merchant family moved into the area later in the decade.

At first Rubin and his partner, Sam Copeland, were strictly cattle dealers, not farmers. They would take a very early morning train from Schenectady to Cobleskill, buy cattle at an auction, and walk the animals about thirty miles on dirt roads and across fields to Schenectady for sale to Swift and Company and other butchering concerns. Eventually, the partners rented farms in Schoharie County on which they would keep their cows. By 1930 they were able to buy a small truck; they gradually traded for slightly bigger models until finally they could afford a truck which was large enough to transport all their daily quota of cows to Schenectady. This ended what Bea Wallace dubbed, "the schlepping era."

Working with a different partner, Rubin expanded his market to Albany, and finally bought his first farm in 1935. By this time he was selling cattle to markets as distant as Jersey City and renting other farms at Depression-era prices. With the end of World War II, Rubin and his son Sol became full-fledged farmers when they purchased a larger dairy farm near Cobleskill. Their cattle-dealing business continued, but shifted to the trading of dairy cows rather than beef.¹²

The saga of the second Jewish farmer in Schoharie County, Julius Westheimer, has little in common with the story of Harry Rubin. Born in Germany, Westheimer was the son of a prosperous farmer and cattle dealer. At age fourteen Westheimer went to trade school to learn bookkeeping. He then moved to Switzerland, where he operated a spring mattress factory for more than twenty years and married a Swiss Jewish woman. Still a German citizen, he felt pressured to leave Switzerland when Hitler seemed to pose a serious threat. After two years in New York City, he and his wife decided not to start a business, but rather to buy a farm. They found one through a New York Times advertisement, spent a few weeks boarding on a farm in the southern part of New York State to learn American agricultural methods, and settled on a dairy farm in the Schoharie Valley, an area once

¹²Wallace and Mrs. Harry (Bess) Rubin, Interview. (Subsequent quotations attributed in the text.)
known as the "bread basket of George Washington's army." Unlike most of the other Jews who tried to farm in Schoharie County, Westheimer began with a substantial amount of capital.

As in the Rubin case, the Westheimer farm continued into the second generation. Born in Switzerland, Paul Westheimer was thirteen when his father became a farmer. Paul enrolled at M. I. T. with no intention of remaining on the farm. But a back injury suffered by his father forced him to take a one-year leave of absence after his sophomore year. He did not return to M. I. T. even though he became allergic to cows. The Westheimers sold their cows in 1956 and concentrated on grain and vegetables instead. Today, in addition to growing a variety of vegetables, the Westheimers operate a packing plant which employs thirty women.13

Paul Westheimer married the sister of a Jewish woman whose family had settled in the Town of Carlisle, Schoharie County, after the war. This particular family, German refugees, named Wuerzburger, was advised by the Jewish Agricultural Society to grow corn. Unfortunately, the clay soil of the area was totally unsuitable for corn. They also tried raising chickens, supplemented by selling brooms, then scrap materials. Finally, Salo Wuerzburger became a barber and opened a shop in Cobleskill.14

The Wuerzburger experience is much more typical than that of the Rubins or the Westheimers. The latter two families were the first Jewish farmers in Schoharie County, and their second-generation sons are the only Jews still actively farming in the county. Two other Jewish families, however, farmed for at least twenty years, until the death of Sam Riss and the retirement of Ludwig Levy. Both men came to Carlisle in 1947 and bought farms within a few miles of each other. Ironically, they saw each other rarely.

Sam Riss and his wife grew up and were married in Austria. His father was a "very small" farmer. In 1933 Sam Riss was about to open a law office in Vienna when the couple decided to visit Mrs. Riss's brother, a rabbi, in Brooklyn. They liked America so well, Mrs. Riss recalled, that they stayed. Mr. Riss worked as a

13 Mr. and Mrs. Paul Westheimer, Interview. (Subsequent quotations attributed in the text.)
14 Westheimer and Levy, Interviews.
furrier and his wife taught Hebrew. After their two daughters were married and their twin sons, Simon and Ed, finished high school, a *New York Times* advertisement induced them to purchase a farm in Schoharie County. Their sons’ eligibility for the military draft (voided by a farm deferment) and Sam Riss’s desire to leave the city influenced their decision. They started with some cows bought from Julius Westheimer and a farmhouse so archaic that it had only a wood stove for cooking and heating.

Whether it was “sheer intelligence” which taught the Riss family to farm, as Mrs. Riss recalled, or intelligent use of special low-interest loans available to farmers (“deficit farming”), as Ludwig Levy maintained, the family persevered for more than twenty years. Although Simon Riss soon left the farm for Cornell and eventually returned to the New York City area, Ed Riss remained on the farm and carried much of the labor burden. After his father died, Ed Riss moved to Schenectady and operated a farm near the city limits.¹⁵

Like the Riss family, Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig Levy knew next to nothing about farming when they moved to Schoharie County. “We were so stupid we didn’t know one end of the cow from the other,” Mrs. Levy said. A “rich man’s daughter” in Germany, she had planned to become a social worker until the rise of Hitler forced her to emigrate at the age of twenty-three. Ludwig Levy came from more humble German origins. He arrived in the United States in 1928 as an apprentice banker with plans to stay for a few years to gain experience in order to land a better position in Europe.

Each held a variety of jobs in New York City until they left in 1946 to seek a new life as farmers. “If we knew what we would have to do, we wouldn’t have done it,” Mrs. Levy said. “All I knew was that I wanted to get out of New York.” After a partnership with a German refugee family in Orange County, New York, did not work out well, Mr. Levy traveled across New York State to search for a farm with good soil and a relatively inexpensive price tag. He found it about one half-mile off a Carlisle town road. He bought it without the help of the Jewish Agricultural Society (J. A. S.) because his $10,000 in savings disqualified him from receiving the Society’s aid.

¹⁵ Mrs. Sam Riss, Interview.
A Jewish farm scene in upper New York State
Sholam Road (Wasing, N.Y.) leading to the first Jewish farm settlement in the United States, 1837

Courtesy, Rabbi H. David Rutman, Milford, Mass.
Twice during their twenty-seven years of dairy and poultry farming (both because they found cow barns and chicken houses on their farms), the Levys tried to help farmers placed in Carlisle by the J. A. S. In the first instance, a New York City taxi driver named Moses bought a "very marginal farm." When his chicken operation floundered, Moses returned to New York City to drive a taxi and left his wife and small children to care for the chickens. The first snowstorm prompted Mrs. Moses to ask Mrs. Levy to drive her to the bus station in Schenectady. The neglected chickens thus became almost useless. Moses later tried raising beef cattle, but had neither the quality nor the quantity of land needed to succeed.

The second case demonstrates even more graphically what Levy called "the stupid" policy of the J. A. S., at least in Schoharie County. "They went from the premise of people who said they wanted to farm. They didn't consider capability," he said. A couple who had failed in a farm project in Israel purchased a "submarginal" farm in Carlisle. Aaron Apothaker's limited knowledge of Israeli farming was not applicable to the American version. He soon faced so many debts that he was forced to sell the ten cows he had purchased on chattel mortgage from Sol Rubin. When Rubin heard about Apothaker's illegal action, he paid him a visit. The slightly-built Rubin punched the six-foot-four-inch, 280-pound Apothaker in the nose. Apothaker countered with a one-two blow, breaking Rubin's jaw and several ribs.16

Generally, however, relations among the other Jews in Schoharie County were more cordial. By the early 1950's the county's Jewish population had swelled to more than twenty families. Of the farmers not previously discussed, only Fred Zusselman and his brother—who farmed for only a few years—helped organize the Schoharie County Jewish Community Center. One of the more successful Jewish farmers, Zusselman played a major role in the Center until he left about ten years of farming to teach science in a Long Island high school. Two other Jewish farms operated for several years before their owners gave up. In the mid-1950's the brother and brother-in-law team of Baum and Zoberman ran a dairy and poultry farm in the remote hill country around Summit. Refugees, as were the Zusselmans, Baum and

---

16 Levy.
Zoberman, participated in the Jewish Community Center. Recently a Jewish couple operated a farm in the equally remote Jefferson area, but had little interaction with other Jews in Schoharie County.

**Strangers In a Strange Land?**

Before examining how nine Jewish farm families and about a dozen non-farming families formed the Schoharie County Jewish Community Center in 1952, it is useful to look at the experience of the farm families in adjusting to life among the "goyim." Anti-Semitism, in general, was not a major problem. Bea (Rubin) Wallace found "not too much. As a matter of fact, we had more problems in Schenectady than out here," she said. Julius Westheimer, as the first Jewish farmer in the Schoharie Valley, had to shatter the stereotypical image of the Jew as an urban white-collar worker. A local dentist refused to believe that he was Jewish. "Jews don't work with their hands," he said, according to Paul Westheimer. The dentist "gave" Mrs. Westheimer "one year up here and then back to New York City."

Maine dairy farmer Earl Rabb recounted an experience similar to Westheimer's in 1949 in a *Commentary* article. "... an omniscient bartender in a coastal town... has a way of dropping an eyelid when we talk about dairying. He simply won't be convinced." Julius Westheimer convinced his fellow farmers by example. "He was out there throwing around hay bales with the hired help. This helped a lot," Paul Westheimer said. In his own experience, the younger Westheimer has found:

As far as the actual farming process, I can't see where Jewishness was any problem. Being in a decided minority, often a minority of one, indications are given at various meetings. It's surprising how many people do take it into consideration and omit any specific reference to Christ in invocations...

That was not the case at a Dairyman's League meeting Ludwig Levy attended during a period of low milk prices. The president of the local chapter warned his fellow farmers, Levy recalled, "If we wouldn't be the watchdog, 'all those people with the long

---

17 Earl Rabb, "Report from the Farm." *Commentary* (June, 1949), 575.
hooked noses and beards' would put us out of business. Shattering applause followed.” Levy failed to get other Jews in the area to respond to this remark. But word passed through the rural grapevine that Levy would write the governor and bring in the Anti-Defamation League; the speaker appeared on Levy’s farm and he and his wife, from then on, were “overly friendly.” Although this incident occurred in the 1950’s, it closely parallels historian John Higham’s assessment of anti-Semitism in the early twentieth century:

... the “international Jew” as visualized from the 1890’s to the 1930’s was perhaps mostly a hobgoblin of the rural imagination, associated with all the insidious influences thought to emanate from faraway Eastern cities... thus ideological; anti-Semitism seems to have made its primary appeal to native Americans in areas of low Jewish density, where the supposed enemy was a remote and shadowy figure. ... Studies of small towns characteristically reveal complete acceptance of local Jews alongside negative stereotypes of “The Jew.”

One such study of small-town Jews in upstate New York (which may have included Schoharie County) concluded: “... while most (Jews) say they personally have not experienced anti-Semitism, many are of the opinion that they are being exempted from commonly held stereotypes about Jews.” Mrs. Levy told of hearing neighbors comment, “Them Jews—... I don’t mean you.” Anti-Semitism as such did not pose a serious problem for the Levys; their neighboring farmers were very helpful. But they did feel a social barrier. In large part, they believed it was because they were “newcomers” and because, as small as the community of Carlisle was (perhaps 250 families), it was ethnically diverse and divided. “When you moved into a small community like Carlisle, you were never considered a native. You never made it, even if you weren’t Jewish,” Mrs. Levy said.

Austrian-trained lawyer Sam Riss, however, did make it—at least to the extent that he was elected Justice of the Peace in Carlisle. “Sam got along so well with everybody,” his widow said. Paul Westheimer also succeeded in winning elective office.

---

19 Rose, p. 344.
He served on the Schoharie Central School Board of Education for thirteen years, including four as president. He is active in several farm and community organizations, as is Sol Rubin. Most of the non-farming Jews also have a record of deep community involvement. Schoenfeld observed a similar phenomenon in a study of small-town Jews in southern Illinois. "By and large, Jewish people in small towns seem to manifest the middle class characteristics of the 'joiner.'"20 Rose recorded similar findings, noting "few limitations on formal and informal social participation and interaction."21

Moreover, Rose found that small-town Jews, living as a tiny minority, are more conscious of being Jewish than urban Jews living among many other Jews. "In one form or other every respondent indicated that there are times when he is called upon to represent The Jews."22 This would certainly apply to the Jews of Schoharie County, whether it involved several women preparing a model seder for the Lutheran Church's "interfaith Sunday" or a fourth-grade pupil explaining Hanukkah to his class.

Possibly the only time small-town Jews were not "representing" the Jews is when they were together. For several years prior to the formation of the Schoharie County Jewish Community Center (SCJCC), one Jewish family would invite the entire Jewish community of the county to a party each month. Several parties were held on the Jewish farms, including the yearly end-of-summer picnic on the Riss farm. This group also gathered annually for a fund-raising party for the United Jewish Appeal. It is believed that a remark by the late Mrs. Meyer Wallace (mother-in-law of Bea Wallace) at one of these affairs sparked the birth of the SCJCC.23 Wildove recalled, "One of the things that generated the idea, the feeling that we should have something, was that we had had the UJA appeal. We felt we ought to do something as a unit. We all got together for that [the UJA]; it sort of led to the other thing."

About twenty families formed the SCJCC in 1952 with organizational help from a couple who had formed a similar Center in their home city, Oneonta (thirty-five miles southwest of Cobles-

---

20 Schoenfeld, p. 186.
21 Rose, p. 344.
22 Ibid.
23 Wallace, Rubin.
kill). Nearly half of the charter members were farmers, including one family from just outside the Schoharie County border. The Westheimer, Riss, Rubin, and Zusselman families were among the leaders. Other charter members included a college dairy instructor, two nursery-education college instructors, a dress manufacturer, an auto supply dealer, a jeweler, several scrap iron dealers, a gas station operator, a barber, an attorney (Wildove), and a dentist.

The demographic composition of the group offers some insight into why the Center was formed and why in 1952. Most of the charter members had migrated to Schoharie County and formed families after the end of World War II. About half had children who were born within two years of the Center’s formation, a factor which stimulated interest in developing a means to offer a Jewish education and experience outside of the home for the children. Four members were immigrants with married children. Only Wildove was a native of the county. Thus as new residents, and particularly as new Jewish residents, most faced a “settling-in” period during which, as Mrs. Levy noted, they were outsiders. It would be misleading to say that most Jews were not accepted. Most were, but it was a gradual process. The desire to hold religious services, to formalize and regularize a Jewish intellectual and communal gathering and to provide a Jewish experience for the children of the community, all contributed to the formation of the SCJCC.

Paradoxically, the founding of the SCJCC and the holding of bimonthly Friday night services helped the Jews assimilate into the community. As Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensman stated in their classic study *Small Town in Mass Society*, the church played a major role in the life of American small-town residents in the 1950’s. The social and communal aspects were at least as important as the religious services. It was normal, almost expected, for everyone to attend the “church” of one’s choosing in a small town. People respected fellow citizens who worshipped regularly and practiced their religion. One Jewish farmer told Rose:

> It’s funny, but though we’re really out of touch with Jews we’re the ones who try to keep up with the traditions. . . . We think of ourselves as more orthodox than anything. You know, the Gentile farmers around us are
pretty religious too. If you can’t go to church, then you have to bring religion into the home.  

Community acceptance and encouragement of the Jewish group were indicated in several ways. The weekly Cobleskill newspaper published the Center’s schedule under church notices. Although a church offered use of its facilities, the members held services in the Cobleskill American Legion Hall. The Legion, a major organization in the town at the time, graciously rented the room for a nominal fee. In a sense, the Center had the effect of “normalizing” the life-style of the Jewish families in the eyes of their Christian neighbors.

“Normal” meant periodic services, even though they were held on Friday nights, not on Sunday morning; it meant every other week, not weekly; and it meant being led by one of the older men on a rotating basis, not by a clergyman. For a brief period a retired cantor, who had moved to the area from Lawrence, Long Island, regularly conducted services. The entire Jewish community pitched in to help the cantor, who had unknowingly bought a house without water or heat in the hamlet of Lawyersville. After he moved to an even more remote area, the men took turns driving up in the hills to fetch him for services. This communal spirit was especially evident when one of the members was ill. A succession of visitors consoled him (or her). Often the group sent a specially prepared fruit basket, delivered by the corner grocery store owner. If a death occurred in the family of one of the Jews, even a relative living far away, a few phone calls quickly mobilized a minyan to sit shiva at the mourner’s home.

For five or six years the Center thrived on its small scale. The programs (which followed the services instead of a sermon) ranged from listening to Jewish music on records to discussing articles from Jewish newspapers or magazines. Members took turns organizing the programs, which were followed by a social hour, featuring home-baked cookies and cakes. For the children, the members set up a Sunday school which met in the apartment of a college nursery education instructor. In addition to housing a celebration of each Jewish holiday (except Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur), the Legion Hall was the setting for Bar Mitzvahs.

24 Rose, p. 340.
The Center and the Community

As the SCJCC prospered, the Jews of Schoharie County became more active and were accepted as an established part of their communities. Rose's observation about rural Jews fits many of the SCJCC members:

Complete assimilation into the Gentile community is not the goal. He (rural Jew) wants to remain a hyphenated American, sharing the "best of both." ... He is more a part of his community than he is apart from it. He is far more assimilated to the Gentile milieu than his urban cousin. But ... he remains a Jew.25

The Center's membership held fairly constant for about five years. Some of the charter members left the area; other Jews—including farmers Baum and Zoberman, a high school agriculture teacher, and the first Jewish teacher in the Methodist-dominated Cobleskill Central School—joined when they moved to the county. Local junior college students occasionally attended services. The Levys were one of the first charter members to stop participating. Mr. Levy explained:

The more we went there, the more we felt we were the fifth wheel on the wagon. We didn't have much in common. ... We drifted away. We felt like outsiders.

One of the few childless couples who belonged to the SCJCC, the Levys attributed part of the feeling of ill-ease to their German background (even though several other members were of German origin). They trace the coldness they felt from the several prominent Eastern European Jews in the community to the actions of Jews in Germany early in the twentieth century. Mr. Levy recounted a scene he had witnessed as a small boy in a German-Jewish store, which illustrated a lack of compassion for persecuted Russian Jews on the part of German Jews. "It backfired here in Cobleskill," he concluded. Moreover, because the Levys employed no help on their farm, the Friday services cut into their sixteen-hour work day. Mrs. Levy explained, "To us it was a sacrifice. We had to get through at 7 and wash. We didn't want to stink like a cow."

25 Ibid., p. 346.
She meant "we" since both Levys worked as full-time farmers. She emphatically stated:

I am a full-fledged farmer in my own right. You can ask any farmer. They would hire me. . . . I was never a housewife in my life. Now I'm a retired farmer and I enjoy it greatly.

Although Mrs. Levy probably ranked as the most active Jewish woman farmer in Schoharie County, most of the other farm wives took part in the farming operation. While this may have shattered stereotypical images of the Jewish woman, it certainly was common practice for the farmer's wife. Vidich and Bensman noted: "... the farmer's wife . . . is capable of making or breaking a successful farm operation by whether she works in the barn, the fields, or garden at critical moments and in critical seasons."26

Most of the other Jewish farm wives emphasized the ceremonial aspects of Judaism more than Mrs. Levy. Mrs. Riss, the former Brooklyn Hebrew teacher, took time off from her barn chores to teach Hebrew to a generation of Schoharie County Jewish boys. In groups of two or three they would ride the school bus to her farm for private instruction (and home-baked cookies and ice cream) in preparation for their Bar Mitzvahs at synagogues in Schenectady. In addition to the lessons, which continued long after the Center had been dissolved, Mrs. Riss organized many of the holiday celebrations for the Center. Mrs. Paul Westheimer, one of the more active Center members, has always tried to maintain "a Jewishness in the home, within the realm of possibility."

The Levys' resignation and, later, the decline in the number of Jewish farmers—Zusselman, Baum, and Zoberman all had left by 1960—adversely affected the Center's precarious critical mass. Because the membership never grew appreciably, each member's attendance was very important. This had its advantages in that it produced a far higher participation rate than most urban congregations could boast and contributed toward a very closely-knit communal spirit. But it also led to the downfall of the Center. In part the declining attendance of the late 1950's can be attributed to the replacement of some of the hard-core members, who

Jewish poultry farm in Farmingdale, N.J.
had left the area, with less enthusiastic Jewish families. "The new people in town were not as interested as the founders, who had felt the need for getting together. The new ones were more sophisticated, big cityish; they lacked religious feelings." In Schoenfeld's sociological framework these newcomers fit into the "stranger" category.

"The stranger" is an individual whose relationship with the community is primarily instrumental. He is a cosmopolite whose reference group is not the community in which he resides, whose ideologies are not those of the community, and who judges its residents in stereotyped particularistic terms.

The resident, the category which fits most of the small-town Jews Schoenfeld studied and which appears to fit most of the original members of the SCJCC, exhibits the opposite characteristics. Schoenfeld wrote, "Compared with urban and suburban Jews, these small-town Jews are more attached to their community."

This attachment to the community, which grew during the years the SCJCC functioned, contributed to the demise of the Center. Bea Wallace said:

"We had quite a Jewish social life. The couples were very, very close. But as time went on we drifted apart. . . . Today I feel I have as much social life with my Christian friends and my few Jewish friends here as I need."

The increased assimilation into the Gentile community had its direct effects on the Center. For instance, when a Jewish couple received an invitation from a Gentile friend to a Friday night party, they faced a dilemma. If they went to the party, regular church-goers would wonder why the Jews had skipped their services, and their fellow Jews would also be upset. "It was almost like you were expected to be there (services)." But if they repeatedly turned down invitations, the Jewish couples would cut themselves off from much of the community's social life. As more and more Jews decided, "we didn't feel the need to associate as one religious group any longer," the Center's position became more precarious.

27 Arnold Ruxin, Interview.
28 Schoenfeld, p. 179.
29 Sherle Ruxin, Interview.
30 Ruxin.
From Friday to Friday the gathering of a minyan became a touch-and-go situation. A continuing debate over whether to count women toward the minyan (they never were) added to the tension which had gradually built up during several years of petty bickering among the small group's members. The format of the services, a makeshift Conservative-Orthodox amalgam, and the life-style of the Sunday school teacher sparked debate. Furthermore, members, including the Westheimers and the Rubins, whose children had grown from pre-school to elementary-school age, preferred to join a synagogue in Schenectady or Albany.

As membership and participation declined, it exaggerated the internal tension. The increased assimilation into their local communities and a relaxing of social ties among the Jews—many of whom now had less in common with each other than with their Gentile friends—combined to dissolve the glue which had held the Center together. To the families with children closer to the Bar or Bat Mitzvah age, the larger urban synagogues—of whatever branch they chose—offered an attractive religious alternative. Thus, in 1960, using the funds accumulated from the fifteen-dollar annual membership fee, the members of the Schoharie County Jewish Community Center held their final affair—a feast on the "works" from a Schenectady delicatessen.

Many of the members joined congregations in Schenectady or Albany. The Rubins affiliated with an Orthodox synagogue, and the Westheimers with a Conservative one. The Westheimers have remained the most active members. They regularly drove their two daughters and a son to Hebrew school in Schenectady, an eighty-minute round trip. "In that respect living out here makes it more difficult," Mrs. Westheimer said. Yet, as attorney Wildove observed, "We've always done remarkably well in getting Jewish education for the kids. Most in the county have gone someplace or other." Several families, Orthodox and Reform members, formed a car pool to transport their children thirty-five miles to religious school in Schenectady each Sunday. Besides easing the burden on the parents, the car pool provided some group spirit and incentive to stimulate interest in Jewish education. Bea Wallace maintained, "Because one was Bar Mitzvah, the others had to be. There was just no two ways about it."

Today the car pools have gone the way of the Center as the
original members’ children have reached high school or college age or beyond. One remaining remnant of the community spirit is the shiva observance, ready to be mobilized by a few phone calls. Socially, the Jewish community of Schoharie County is fragmented. There are several groups of Jews who remain as close as, or closer than, they were twenty years ago. Others only rarely see each other. The Jewish community is more diversified in terms of life-style, religious practice, age, and almost every other characteristic. Only Paul Westheimer and Sol Rubin actively farm. Julius Westheimer and the Levys are retired; the others either have died or have left Schoharie County.\footnote{Since the completion of this article, Mrs. Ilse Levy has died.}

The future outlook, given the historical trend toward farm consolidation in Schoharie County as across the nation, appears to preclude any spectacular renaissance of Jewish farming. An occasional Jewish family may attempt to give the Schoharie County soil a go. Meanwhile, the third-generation Rubin, twenty-seven year old Alan, works with his father on the dairy farm, but concentrates almost totally on the farm machinery part of the agribusiness. Alan Westheimer, a sophomore at Cornell, studies agriculture and plans to join his father in their vegetable growing and packing business. Although Alan has met several Jewish agricultural students at Cornell, the cards may be stacked against him. In a course on rural sociology, he learned that the percentage of American farmers who are Jewish is zero.\footnote{The Encyclopaedia Judaica estimated that as of the late 1960’s there were fewer than 10,000 American Jewish farmers, or less than .1 per cent of all U.S. farmers were Jewish.}

Farmers like Alan Westheimer’s and Alan Rubin’s grandfathers, who came to Schoharie County between 1935 and 1955, successfully shattered the urban Jewish stereotype. Initially they were “strangers in an alien territory.” Most became “residents.” They showed that there is much that the Jew can receive from the American rural tradition, and it is easy for him to become part of it, without sacrificing one iota of his Jewishness.\footnote{Gerald M. Phillips. “Letter to the Editor.” Commentary (Feb., 1960), 163.}
The King-Crane Commission of 1919: The Articulation of Political Anti-Zionism

STUART E. KNEE

By the end of World War I, the idea of an “equitable” Near Eastern settlement had long been on the mind of Woodrow Wilson. The twelfth of President Wilson’s Fourteen Points favored popular sovereignty for resident subject nationalities within the Ottoman empire with appropriate opportunities for their development. There were, however, disturbing reports about certain portions of Ottoman Turkey. American observers reported the duplicity of Great Britain as an occupying power in Ottoman Palestine; it appeared that British officials were permitting Zionist propaganda to flourish, but at the same time were employing repressive measures to muzzle the Arab populace. It was rumored that Britain encouraged the situation “in order to attain certain political and military aims.” The United States Department of State received many communiqués suggesting that “in the Southern zone of Palestine, violent hatred of the Jews and Zionists and general dissatisfaction with British administration” would lead to civil war.¹

The other side of the coin was the Balfour Declaration. On November 2, 1917, the British Government, through Lord Arthur James Balfour, had expressed itself as looking with favor upon

¹ Initialed memorandum to the State Department, The William Yale Papers, Edward M. House Collection [hereafter WYP-EMHC], Yale University Library, No. 176, December 18, 1918, folder 122.
the "establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. . . ." If promises had been made to the Arabs, they had certainly been made to the Jews as well. In most instances, however, the promises to the two peoples were regarded as unequal. To one American negotiator, the Balfour Declaration represented a change in British policy "granting" to the "insistent Zionists" the Palestinian homeland, but in the opinion of President Wilson and the various state legislatures which endorsed it, the Declaration was an "open covenant fought for in the open." Among


3 Pre-1917 British policy with regard to the Near East and Palestine is contained within two documents. The first was the Husain-McMahon correspondence, a series of exchanges between the Hejazi Sharif Husain and Sir Henry McMahon, High Commissioner for Egypt, between July, 1915, and January, 1916. Subsequently, the Arabs were to claim that this series of notes constituted their "declaration of independence." By this correspondence, the British recognized Arab independence both in the Levant and in the Hejaz, in exchange for an Arab revolt against the Turks. McMahon, however, stipulated that certain areas were to be exempted from Arab control. The exemptions were later destined to complicate the Near Eastern peace. The Arab portions of the Ottoman empire were divided into administrative units, known as vilayets and sanjaks. Palestine, for example, was divided into the sanjaks of Acre and Nablus, both of which belonged to the vilayet of Beirut and the independent sanjak of Jerusalem. The areas exempted from Arab control by the McMahon notes included "Syria, west of the Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo." If, as the British later insisted, Damascus meant the vilayet and not the city, virtually all Palestine was excluded from Arab control. The Arabs claimed that "Damascus" meant the city of Damascus which left Palestine in their hands. The Arabs, however, did not question the British terms in 1916, and the tribes of Hejaz revolted in June: Howard M. Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (New York, 1958), pp. 370-71; George Antonius, The Arab Awakening (New York, 1965), pp. 163-85, 413-27, especially pp. 419-20.

The second document was the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which stipulated a parceling out of the Ottoman empire among several nations. It provided for an independent Arab State or confederation of states, for British, Russian and French acquisitions and for international control of Palestine. Neither the Arabs nor the Zionists knew of the pact when it was concluded in May, 1916. Faisal learned of it at the end of 1916; Weizmann in April, 1917. Presumably the Americans knew nothing of it until the Near East was discussed at the Peace Conference: Cohen, p. 72; Antonius, pp. 248-54, 428-30; Sachar, pp. 373-74; Chambers, pp. 51-52.


5 Ibid.
knowledgeable Americans, then, there existed a difference of opinion on the Balfour Declaration. Each of the opposing views was to be represented at Versailles.

Dinner with Lawrence and Faisal

In January, 1919, the delegates of the Great Powers converged upon Paris. Among the first to begin work was an American, William Linn Westermann, who was to play a key role in the Near Eastern peace settlement. He was a regional specialist for Western Asia and a professor of ancient history at the University of Wisconsin. He had been attached to the Inquiry, an organization formed by Colonel Edward M. House in the autumn of 1917 to collect information about the future peace. In January, 1919, the Inquiry was absorbed by the American Commission to Negotiate the Peace. By then, Westermann was no longer associated with the Inquiry. A few days after his arrival in France, he assumed control of the West Asia Division of the American Commission to Negotiate the Peace.7 The Balfour Declaration aroused Westermann's pessimism. Writing to William C. Bullitt, Chief of the Intelligence Reports Section of the American Commission, Westermann conveyed his grave misgivings. He thought that the Near Eastern situation, as it was presently unfolding, denied Wilson's views on self-determination. Jewish national ambitions, he felt, were misguided. The Zionists were looking forward to the establishment of a Jewish state, and he was troubled, therefore, by the plight of the Arabs. He believed that if Palestine became a Jewish state, a promise of equal rights for the Arabs should be exacted. Finally, he averred that the Sykes-Picot Agreement ought to be scrapped in favor of the Commission proposal suggested by Howard Bliss, the American missionary and president of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut. Bliss's plan called for the

6The members of the Inquiry were Sidney Mezes of City College of New York, director; Walter Lippmann, secretary; Attorney David H. Miller, treasurer; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, then of the American Geographic Society, chief territorial specialist; James T. Shotwell, of Columbia University, librarian and specialist in history; and Westermann: Esco, I, 244.

sending of an inter-Allied commission to Syria to determine the actual desires of the people. In Westermann’s estimation, the Bliss idea embodied the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. Westermann had admired the “undoubted idealism” of the Zionist movement at its inception. At the Peace Conference, however, he came to deplore its descent into the realm of internation politics. Before formal negotiations began, he met and took an immediate personal dislike to Chaim Weizmann. The following week, he dined with Colonel T. E. Lawrence and the Emir Faisal. He was so impressed with both men that he proclaimed his immediate conversion to the Arab cause.

Early in February, Westermann met William Yale, a man who probably knew more about the condition of the Near East than any other American at Paris. Yale had recently been released from his duties as United States observer in Cairo, where he was attached to the British Expeditionary Force. In an atmosphere saturated with idealistic talk concerning America’s postwar role as guardian of the Near East, Yale managed to remain immune. At Versailles, and again in Syria, Yale spoke against a proposed American mandate or political involvement in the Near East. After sixteen months in Egypt and Palestine, he had become anti-British and pro-French, and was optimistic as to the ultimate reconciliation and eventual cooperation between antagonistic Arab and Jewish nationalisms. Later, Yale would disagree with Henry Churchill King and Charles R. Crane on these very points.

8 Ibid., pp. 222-23.
9 Westermann to Marvin M. Lowenthal, April 12, 1944, Westermann Papers [hereafter WLW], Butler Library, Columbia University, Box 2.
11 Ibid., January 20, 1919, pp. 19, 25.
12 Ibid., February 12, 1919, p. 35. In ensuing years, Yale was a history professor at Boston University, and at the outbreak of World War II held the same position at the University of New Hampshire.
13 Although Yale proved to be much more equitable in his judgment of the Zionists than King or Crane, it must be emphasized that he was consistently pro-Arab and, if not openly opposed to Zionism, always suspicious of its leaders: Westermann to Harry N. Howard, September 6, 1940, WLW, Box 1; PDWLW, February 12, 1919, p. 35; Yale to the State Department, “Zionism and the Arab Movement,” Report No. 19, March 18, 1918,
Discussions began in earnest only when the President and his immediate staff were settled.\(^{14}\) The experts surrounding Wilson knew and cared little about Near Eastern affairs. Secretary of State Robert Lansing was convinced that America should remain aloof from European intrigue in the Near East. He feared that the Allies would attempt to ensnare the United States into assuming a protectorate in either Armenia or Palestine.\(^{15}\) Henry White, the designated but unimportant Republican on the Commission, was opposed to Jewish autonomy in Palestine. General Tasker Bliss had little interest in Zionism, although the few allusions he made were hostile.\(^{16}\) The last of Wilson’s team, Colonel House, conducted an interview with the Emir Faisal two days before the Arab leader’s scheduled appearance before the Council of Ten. House, who had wide experience with American Zionists, noted in his diary that he felt kindly disposed toward the Arabs: “My influence will be thrown in their direction whenever they are right.”\(^{17}\)

On February 6th Faisal, officially heading the Hejazi delegation but in truth spokesman for the entire Arab people, appeared before the Conference. He demanded hegemony over Asia Minor, excluding Palestine. Lansing was entranced with his dignified appearance and forceful presentation. He was “swept off his feet” by Faisal’s bold affirmation “that one hundred thousand men had joined his revolt” during the war.\(^{18}\) Exactly three weeks later,
the Zionists advanced their case before the Council. The fact that there were no American Zionists on the Commission may have reenforced the idea in the minds of the American negotiators that the movement was essentially foreign. In any event, Lansing was exposed to two opposing philosophies: the political Zionism of Weizmann and the nonnationalist vision of the Franco-Jewish culturalist, Sylvain Lévi. The Secretary of State was aware of Jewish division on the Zionist issue in America, and sought to stay clear of what he believed to be purely Jewish concerns. He felt that the testimony he had heard at Paris vindicated his old position.¹⁹

Not until March did the Great Powers decide to send a Commission to Syria. An investigation was not seriously considered until both sides had spoken. Besides, the thought of self-determination in an area whose fate had been secretly decided upon during the war was unacceptable to France and Great Britain. Neither of these nations had ever discussed the project with much enthusiasm.

Wilson’s Misjudgment Was Nearly Total

During February and March the peacemakers of the United States, including President Wilson, decided to take unilateral action. Wilson was close to the Zionist movement in America; he knew its leaders as well as its detractors. If he held Zionism in high esteem, a point about which there is little disagreement among historians, why did he authorize the selection of a group of men to question the Arab peoples concerning their desires? No scholar has shed any light on the subject. It appears that two ideas hard to reconcile existed simultaneously in the President’s mind: one dealing with Jewish redemption in Palestine, and the other with the self-determination of the Arab peoples. Perhaps in order to satisfy both requests and to justify his own sense of morality, he sent the Commission to ascertain the wishes of the indigenous peoples and, by employing a great deal of self-deception,

persuaded himself that their aspirations would coincide with his own unique vision.20

By mid-March, Wilson was accepting suggestions for commissioners. Ray Stannard Baker suggested Westermann, but Westermann declined.21 On March 20th, no commissioners had yet been designated, although Wilson had publicly acknowledged his sponsorship of an Allied, or mixed, commission.22 Nevertheless, the search for two qualified men, conducted only in Paris, was to bear fruit within a week. The President had precisely stated the requisite credentials for commission leadership. He wanted two men with liberal backgrounds and no previous contact with the Near East. He also desired that the choice be made from candidates then in Europe; hence, the preoccupation with haste narrowed the field considerably. As to the identities of the men, he had not a clue.23 On March 23rd, when discussing the inter-Allied commission, Westermann suggested that a thorough survey of the area would “take at least six months: that the men chosen must be of high political standing, whose positions will carry great weight.” Westermann further proposed that Henry Cabot Lodge be one of those men.24

On March 27th, the final selection was announced. Senator Lodge was not one of those chosen. The President’s ostensible choices were revealed by Henry White before a meeting of the American peace commissioner.25 Wilson thought that Henry Churchill King and Charles R. Crane were particularly qualified because “they knew nothing about” Syria; also, they were “ab-

20 A good summary and analysis of Wilson’s attitude toward Zionism is contained in Selig Adler, “The Palestine Question in the Wilson Era,” Jewish Social Studies, X (1948) 303-34.

21 Harry N. Howard; The King–Crane Commission; An American Inquiry in the Middle East (Beirut, 1963), p. 36 [hereafter King–Crane].


23 Esco, I, 215. It appears that the importance of “ready availability” among candidates was of greater moment than their abilities.

24 PDWLW, March 23, 1919, pp. 46-47. The person who made the suggestion to Westermann was Gertrude Bell. She had been attached to the British Intelligence Service in Egypt during the war. See Mousa, p. 8.

solutely disinterested." Crane, in particular, was "a very experienced and cosmopolitan man." 26

Wilson's misjudgment of these two men, their backgrounds, abilities, and incentives, was nearly total. One explanation for this inexcusable lapse appears to refute previous scholarship which generally affirms that Wilson selected the commissioners for the reasons he gave. 27 Another hypothesis, yet to be explored, is that Wilson, in fact, chose neither King nor Crane nor anyone else on the nine-man Commission. That they were actually selected by other highly interested individuals or groups and their appointment merely seconded by the President is not only plausible but provable. Finally, these two men were not, nor had they ever been, disinterested. Both had easily discernible prejudices—and it is, assuredly, because of these prejudices that they were chosen.

Henry Churchill King had three important sponsors: Ray Stannard Baker, Colonel House, and the State Department. In 1919,

26 PPC, 184. 00101/39, Minutes of Daily Meetings, Commissioners Plenipotentiary, March 27, 1919, USDSRPRFRUS: PPC, XI, 133; PPC, 180. 03041/22 1/2, Minutes of Daily Meetings, Council of Four, May 22, 1919, USDSRPRFRUS: PPC, V, 812. Woodrow Wilson later mentioned to Lloyd George that the Commission was unequivocally disinterested: Manuel, p. 245. M'Uarrokh al-Thawret al-Arabiyyeh, historian of the Arab revolt, offers an interesting commentary on the part played by Mrs. Wilson in the President's final decision to send a commission to the Near East: "Mrs. Wilson was in Paris when Emir Faisal arrived for the first time. She met him there and admired him ... and later wrote him several letters. She used to say that his face reflected the picture of Christ. ... I believe that she was instrumental in bringing about the decision to send out the King-Crane Commission to Syria"; see Mousa, p. 226n.

27 The King-Crane Report was suppressed for three years before it was finally made public in 1922, with the aid of Ray Stannard Baker, who was a progressive, a muckraker during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt and the editor of American Magazine (1906-1915). The report became a national cause célèbre, a symbol of bankrupt American idealism. It received favorable, almost sensational coverage by the American press. Historiographically, until the present time, no publication unfavorable to it has been well documented. For an in-depth survey of the King-Crane Report and the commentary on it from 1919 to 1972, the following, among others, should be consulted: Baker, Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement (New York, 1923), II, 213-16; "Against Palestine as a Jewish State," New York Times, August 20, 1922, Sec. 7, p. 4; Arthur S. Link, ed., Woodrow Wilson: A Profile (New York, 1968), p. 195; Robert J. Kern to Westermann, November 10, 1941, and Westermann to Kern, November 13, 1941, WLW, Box 2; Henry C. King and Charles R. Crane, Recommendations of the King-Crane Commission with Regard to Syria, Palestine and Iraq, in Antonius, pp. 443-58; Howard, King-Crane, and Howard, "An Experiment in Peacemaking: The King-Crane Commission," Moslem World (April, 1942), 122-46.
King was Director of Religious Work for the Paris-headquartered Y.M.C.A. division serving the needs of the American Expeditionary Force. The year before, while in Rome, he met Baker, who later recommended him to President Wilson for the Commission on Mandates in Turkey. Wilson's acquaintance with King seems to have been slight. It is also evident that Colonel House exercised some influence on King's behalf. House favored the sending of the Commission, and chafed at Wilson's lack of action. Felix Frankfurter's fears about the Commission stripping the Jews of Palestine, he believed, were utter nonsense. On March 23rd, the same day House saw Frankfurter, he interviewed King and apparently had the final say. The State Department "wired Oberlin, transmitting a cable from Colonel House which asked whether the College would release its President for a service which... would be... [of] uncertain duration." The College gave President King leave to act as he desired, and he accepted the nomination.

What were King's qualifications for this Near Eastern assignment? Was his knowledge of that area of the world and its peoples exceptional or was his mind particularly sensitive or responsive to its problems? Should he have attempted to shape the destiny of the Jewish and Arab peoples, or could he have done so, given the sum of his experiences and outlook before 1919? Prior to their selection, King and Crane had both been to the Near East. Obviously, then, Wilson's assertion that the men chosen should be novices was sidestepped. Furthermore, President King was unfamiliar with the Jewish national idea, and maintained friendships with the missionary Protestants who opposed it.

---


30 Rabinowitz, p. 97.


32 Howard, p. 39.

33 Morton Tenzer, "The Jews," in Joseph P. O'Grady, ed., *The Immigrants' Influence*
Charles S. Crane:
Member of the King-Crane Commission of 1919

Courtesy, Thomas S. Crane, Woods Hole, Mass.
Henry Churchill King
Member of the King-Crane Commission of 1919
fact that King was well-disposed to the missionary element at Versailles is understandable. In 1877, the year that he had been a freshman at Oberlin, the College still occupied a distinctive position for its missionary zeal. In February, 1884, Oberlin's president wrote that the institution "represents not so much a kind of theology as a kind of aggressive Christianity." President King's "early religious life was of the intense, evangelical type," and he maintained his deep faith until he died. In the early 1880's, he was interested in doing missionary work in China, but then reconsidered and continued his studies at Oberlin. At the turn of the century, King was a major religious thinker and liberal theologian whose ideas were in harmony with post-Darwinian progressivism. He advocated not an unknowable God but a man-centered faith and emphasized a personal God rather than sterile ceremony. "Christian revelation was a progressive movement which could only gain by the new scholarship which might be added to it through fearless truth-seeking scholarship." Donald M. Love, King's biographer, further stresses the similarity in ethical thought between King and Oberlin's first president, Charles Grandison Finney. Nor did King's concern with missionary activities ever abate. In 1906 and 1907, he continued his membership on the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In 1909-1910, he took a leave of absence and, under the auspices of the American Board, spent four months observing missionary work in the Orient, including China, Burma, Ceylon, and Japan. In 1912 and 1913, King made twenty-three miscellaneous addresses, "educational and missionary. . . ." In 1920, after his work in Palestine ended, he served as president of the American Missionary Association. When World War I began, neither President King nor Oberlin College was interested. King, probably regarding the hostilities as a strictly European affair, did not encourage his students to gain a better understanding of the issues. During the war, King evolved toward a position of internationalism "through


34 Love, pp. 3-4, 20.
35 King was partial to the writings of Paul and, for that matter, to the Gospels in general. See Love, pp. 27-28.
36 Ibid., pp. 169-70, 187-89.
37 Ibid., pp. 165-66, 228.
the universal application of moral principles," and by 1917 had become an interventionist, but on purely moral grounds—that is, German culpability.38

Testimony in the Congressional Record suggests that the second Wilson appointee, Charles R. Crane, was a political choice of the Democratic Party.39 In the eyes of the Democrats, Crane's past services merited his appointment. He was a progressive, an associate of Wilson's rather than a personal friend, and vice-chairman of the Finance Committee of Wilson's 1912 campaign.40 In 1909, Crane was appointed minister to China, "although the appointment was cancelled by Secretary of State Philander C. Knox because of an 'indiscreet speech' in which Crane had predicted war with Japan on the eve of his departure for China."41 [Editor's Note. Another version of Crane's recall is referred to in Rabbi David Philipson's memoir: "Another very interesting contact that I had with Mr. Taft took place in November, 1909, the fall after he had been elected President of the United States. . . . During the interview the President told me a most interesting story which had never been published. The name of a certain Charles Crane had been sent to the Senate as Minister to China. The Senate had confirmed the nomination. The gentleman had started for China, but when he reached California, he was recalled by the President. During our conversation the President asked me if I had noted the incident. Upon my answer in the affirmative, he asked me further whether I know the reason for the recall. When I told him of my utter ignorance of that reason, he told me without in any way binding me to silence that the reason for his rather unprecedented action was the following. After Crane had started to enter upon

41 Howard, King-Crane, p. 39.
his mission, the President had been told by a very reliable author-
ity that after he had been elected to the presidency, Crane had
said in a company of men, 'Well, now that Taft is President, I
suppose that Jake Schiff and his Jew crowd will have a great deal
to say in our national affairs.' Then, said the President to me: 'I
felt that a man who entertained such prejudices is not fitted to
represent the United States as minister to a foreign country.
Therefore, I recalled him.'"—My Life as an American Jew—An
Autobiography, by David Philipson. (Cincinnati: John G. Kidd &
Sons, Inc. pp. 173-74.) In 1920, he was once again nominated—and
this time served—as minister to China. Early in the 1890's, Crane
had visited some of the Russian-held portions of the Ottoman
empire.42 Before World War I, he had journeyed extensively
throughout Turkey and had many Near Eastern interests. He was
on the board of trustees of the Constantinople College for Women,
and treasurer of the Armenian and Syrian Relief Committee,
organized in the United States in November, 1915.43 Far more
significant than his charitable works as a determinative factor of
his state of mind was his lifelong devotion to Arab lore and the
Arab people. Crane was of the Unitarian faith; in an undated
letter to Mrs. August Belmont, he had admiringly called the
Arabs "Unitarians of the desert."44

The Opportunity of the Zionist Commission

For days following Wilson's announcement of his choices, the
fate of the Commission was in jeopardy. It became increasingly
apparent that France would not participate. Britain had already
chosen her commissioners, but demurred at the last moment
because of Clemenceau's declination. The Inter-Allied Com-
mission on Turkish Mandates thus became a purely American
enterprise.45 Westermann, who had initially favored the sending

42 Westermann to his wife, April 27, 1919, PDWLT, p. 68.
43 Barton, pp. 6, 381.
44 Charles R. Crane to Eleanor Robson Belmont, August 30 (n.y.), Belmont Collec-
tion, Special Mss., Butler Library, Columbia University. Little is known of Crane's
actual feelings toward the Jews prior to World War I. The only correspondence which I
discovered antedated the Peace Conference.
45 The official name of the King-Crane Commission was the American Section of
the Inter-Allied Commission on Turkish Mandates.
of an international commission, was now frankly opposed, probably because he disliked the possibility of identifying unilateral American participation with the European imperialist game.\textsuperscript{46} Another possibility is that his position toward Zionists, if not toward Zionism, had softened. He had always admired the romanticism of the agronomist Aaron Aaronsohn and, while at Paris, was interested in the thinking of the Italian Zionist, Bianchini, and in that of the American Zionists Felix Frankfurter and Julian W. Mack.\textsuperscript{47}

Upon the selection of King and Crane, no immediate adverse response was forthcoming from the Zionists. Frankfurter had even wired Louis D. Brandeis to congratulate Crane officially, "assuming of course . . . that he will . . . consult with the United States in detail as to the Zionist bearings of the problem."\textsuperscript{48} There is no record of Crane's consulting with any Zionists or obtaining any Zionist opinion. On April 4th, Westermann noted that Crane "does not seem to be interested and is said to be loath to go because he is interested in the Bulgarian matters."\textsuperscript{49} More than the Zionists, Westermann seemed to be cognizant of the Commission's weaknesses. Within three weeks, he had proffered two names and both were approved for Commission membership.\textsuperscript{50} The first of these was George Montgomery, a Ph.D. from Yale and a Protestant missionary who had resided in the Near East for a number of years.\textsuperscript{51} The second was William Yale, whose views Westermann shared and whose experience with the Allied forces had very recently taken him to Egypt and Palestine for a long tour of duty. From 1915 to 1917, Yale was the Standard Oil Company representative in Palestine. On August 17, 1917, he was appointed a special agent of the State Department and ordered to Egypt,\textsuperscript{52} where he was attached to Allenby's forces as an American observer.

\textsuperscript{46}Westermann to Harry N. Howard, September 6, 1940, WLW, Box 1; Westermann to Robert J. Kerner, November 13, 1941, WLW, Box 2.
\textsuperscript{47}PDWLW, May 7 and 17, 1919, pp. 71, 76-78.
\textsuperscript{48}Frankfurter to Brandeis, and Brandeis to Crane, March 29, 1919, Brandeis Papers.
\textsuperscript{49}PDWLW, April 4, 1919, pp. 54-55.
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and intelligence reporter in Cairo. In June, 1918, he was transferred to the British Egyptian Expeditionary Force in Palestine, where he served a like function. In January, 1919, he was transferred to Paris as technical adviser to the American delegation.

Yale had a consummate knowledge of British policy in the Near East. He witnessed adverse Arab reaction to the Balfour Declaration at first hand, was favorably impressed with T.E. Lawrence, and scrutinized the growth of Jewish settlements. Of all the commissioners, he was the only one to have had personal contact with Chaim Weizmann. He had been in Palestine when the Weizmann Commission arrived in April, 1918. His understanding of Near Eastern politics was shrewd, and his insights into Jewish and Arab nationalism were penetrating. Yale was no admirer of organized religious bodies; he excoriated both Jews and Christians for living off the bounty of their coreligionists. His religious views help explain why he diverged from the missionary-oriented King-Crane Commission.

He was heavily influenced by the Cairo Syrians, who favored a French mandate, and was opposed to the British because of their intransigent response to Arab supplications after the promulgation of the Balfour Declaration. Yale believed that the Zionist Organization had, by 1914, carried out the major objectives of the 1897 Basle Program and that, consequently, the Balfour Declaration was simply the product of new Zionist ambitions. He also made some interesting observations on the nature of Jews in America, relating these to the dilemma of Palestine. He declared, with the assurance that it was a positive good, that "the melting pot in America," with its democratic influences, had "trampled" on Jewish particularism and had broken down the
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53 Byrne, WYP-EMHC, pp. 75, 84, 89; Yale's exact words were that "Major Lawrence knew his onions." See also O. J. Campbell, "A Report on Zionism," Addendum, p. 10, marginal note. WYP-EMHC, folder 143; Manuel, p. 189.

54 Yale to the State Department, Report No. 20, WYPLC.

55 Yale had said that "the Judaism of many of the Orthodox Jews of Eastern Europe is as intolerant as the Islamism of the fanatical Moslems, as the Christianity of the Middle Ages and the Puritanism of the Seventeenth Century. And the nationalism of the enthusiasts among the Eastern European Jews is tinged with wild socialism and anarchistic ideas and a fierce chauvinism." He also thought that if the Orthodox and nationalistic Jews were not held in check, Zionism would arouse a world-wide movement against it. See Manuel, pp. 199-200, 203.

56 Byrne, WYP-EMHC, pp. 75, 89-90.
barriers which had nourished the "Zionist hopes" of the Orthodox Jews of Europe. But, he implied, dark forces were at work in America: "Powerful agencies are at work to... intensify national consciousness of the Jews, to make them feel and realize they are a different race... set apart from the people among whom they live."57

Yale detected the taint of Bolshevism within young Zionist Jews from Russia "who have been arrogant in their treatment of the fellahen [in Palestine]."58 He feared that the Arabs would desert to the Turks over Zionism. Although he disliked the British, his dispatches were popular with British officials because, at least on this point, they thought identically.59 On the eve of the Weizmann visit, Yale wrote to the State Department of his concern for the native population and his suspicion of the Allies and the Zionists.60 Direct talks with Weizmann may have served to ameliorate his attitude toward some Zionists, but not to the movement as a whole. Weizmann he thought sincere in his desire to conciliate the Arabs, but he doubted the Jewish leader's ability to keep aggressive and belligerent subordinates in check. For a fleeting instant, Yale believed that the conflicting Arab and Jewish nationalisms could coalesce. Jewish nationalism, he commented, had direction; embryonic Arab nationalism was as yet directionless. "Herein lies the opportunity of the Zionist Commission to calm the fears of the Arabs and to create a feeling of confidence in the attitude of the Zionists and in the policy of Great Britain."61 He remarked that none of the Allied Powers, not even Britain with its Balfour pledge, was capable of calling the Jewish dream into existence. The Jews in concert with the Arabs must shape their own destiny. Although it seemed unjust to force a Jewish majority on the Arabs through immigration, he reasoned that the Jews could honorably request "the right to freely emigrate and

57 Yale to the State Department, "Zionism and Palestine," Report No. 24, April 22, 1918, WYPLC.
58 Byrne, WYP-EMHC, p. 84.
59 Manuel, p. 189.
60 Yale to the State Department, Report No. 19, WYPLC.
61 Yale to the State Department, "The Zionist Commission and the Syrians in Egypt," Report No. 22, April 8, 1918; Yale to the State Department, Report No. 20.
settle in Palestine, to acquire land and to be protected in their rights.”

**House Halted the Drifting**

On his arrival at Paris, Yale was opposed to a Zionist state, but not to immigration. His anger was aroused by what he interpreted as a Zionist attempt to include within the boundaries of Palestine the purely Arab-inhabited territory of Transjordania. This, in addition to the Brandeisian features of public ownership of utilities and public works—which, to Yale, smacked of Russian socialism—resulted in the destructive attitude which he adopted toward a proposed mandate scheme drawn up by Frankfurter at the Peace Conference.

King and Crane secured the approval of some individuals they had suggested. King personally selected Captain Donald M. Brodie to serve as secretary-treasurer and Professor Albert Howe Lybyer whom King had labeled an “expert” in Balkan

---

62 This was, in fact, the extent of the Zionist demands at Paris. Yale to the State Department, Report No. 24.

63 The Frankfurter mandate proposal, as conceived, was impressive because it had been “handled, perfected and amended by so many people.” Yale red-penciled it until it was unrecognizable: (1) the words “historic title of the Jewish people” were questioned; (2) in a provision which read “it is the wish of the inhabitants of Palestine and of the Jews that the government be conferred upon Great Britain as mandatory,” the words “of the inhabitants of Palestine” were deleted; (3) section II of the Frankfurter proposal began with the words, “The establishment of Palestine as the Jewish National Home . . . .” Yale and his unnamed assistant rephrased it so that it would read precisely according to the Balfour Declaration phraseology, “a national home” for the Jews in Palestine; (4) section IIa, committing the mandatory power to promoting immigration, was cut out, presumably because of Yale’s belief that Jewish immigration into Palestine should be the sole concern of the Jews; (5) sections Ie and f, relating to public ownership of utilities, public works, land and natural resources, all part of the Brandeis program adopted at Pittsburgh in 1918, was marked “socialization of land on the lines of Zionist social views”; (6) Yale wanted omitted an entire subsection which dealt with cooperation of a Jewish agency with the mandatory; (7) he underlined the section involving the introduction of Hebrew into Palestine as an official language; (8) he questioned the desirability of permitting Jews free access to certain Moslem holy places containing venerated, historic Jewish relics and remains. See Manuel, pp. 232-33; Howard, King-Crane, p. 101.

Dr. Lybyer was in 1919 a history professor at the University of Illinois. Woodrow Wilson may have known of him because he was a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary. There is reason to believe that he was not a random choice by King because Lybyer’s teaching career included a stint at Oberlin. Lybyer had also been an instructor at an important missionary institution, Robert College in Constantinople. Before his appointment to the King-Crane Commission, he had served in Westermann’s West Asia Division. Upon his selection, Westermann questioned the wisdom of King’s choice of experts. Lybyer, he said, “did not know much about Syria.”

In any case, unlike Crane, King displayed an ardent interest in his assignment. He worked hard to increase his understanding of the Near East, and was a daily visitor at Westermann’s office to receive additional material. Accumulation of data, however, is a poor substitute for experience. Prior to 1919, there is little evidence that King had any contact with Jews, although he had known American missionaries to the Arabs. At Paris, he was influenced by the highly persuasive but biased arguments of the anti-Zionist Henry Morgenthau, Sr.

Eventually, King began to think that Morgenthau was what he had erroneously represented himself to be: spokesman for the overwhelming majority of America’s Jews.

By April 23rd, it was certain that no one was going to Syria except the Americans. The King-Crane Commission might have left immediately if it had not been told to wait. “King said that the British stated openly that Faisal must have two weeks to prepare the ground in Syria.” If Westermann’s quotation of King is accurate, the meaning of Faisal’s hasty departure is obvious: it was planned by the anti-Zionist British officers in Palestine and American missionaries at Versailles as soon as they were positive that the Commission would depart. It was expected that the Arab leader would activate Syrian nationalism for the benefit

---

65 PDWLW, April 15, 1919, p. 60; Love, p. 283.
66 PDWLW, April 15, 1919, p. 60; Adler in Jewish Social Studies, X, 325.
67 PDWLW, April 4, 1919, pp. 54-55.
68 On April 25th, King had “rather long talks with Mr. Morgenthau . . . and Mr. White. . . .” Quoted from the diary King kept while abroad in war service in 1918 and 1919, by Love, pp. 285-86.
69 PDWLW, April 23, 1919, p. 67.
of the Americans. The fact that the Allies would not be participating in the survey of Palestine precluded unanimity among the American peacemakers. The fear that Americans were going to be entrapped in the maze of European politics was pervasive. Tasker Bliss and Henry White felt it inadvisable to send an exclusively American body to Syria because it might create the idea of a special United States interest in that area. The Zionists, now better informed on the personalities and interests of King and Crane, sought personal reassurances from Wilson. Felix Frankfurter volunteered to go to Palestine to ease the apprehensions of the Jewish population. The President believed that Frankfurter's misgivings were unfounded, but, nevertheless, reaffirmed his support for the creation of a Jewish National Home.

It was also at this time that Wilson, unintentionally emphasizing his ambiguous position, conveyed assurances to the Emir Faisal that the Commission would definitely be sent. The confusion was heightened by Westermann's assertion to Bliss that he thought the King-Crane Commission without British and French representation could only cause harm.

The drifting which preceded the Commission's departure was dramatically halted by Colonel House. On May 20th, he advised the President that the Commission would depart the following week; the next day Wilson announced in the Council of Four that his men were leaving for Syria. Preparatory to his quitting Paris, King met with the Syrian Commission, which "instructed" him to fight against a Zionist state. It seems that King made no parallel
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70 Howard, King-Crane, p. 49.
71 Tenzer, p. 314; Howard, King-Crane, pp. 73-74.
72 Mousa, p. 226.
74 Evans, p. 146.
75 The exact citation is as follows: "Kg. [King] and advisers" met "with the Syrian Commission, less Rihbany [an American Arab] who went home. They do not want a Zionist State—no instructions beyond." It seems that the Commission had been "instructed" to fight against a Zionist state; there is no other apparent interpretation for Lybyer's strange but meaningful phrasing. It opens the possibility that by the time of their departure, the commissioners were nothing more than rubber stamps for Arab opinion and that their findings were predetermined days before they left. See Albert Lybyer diary [hereafter ALD], unpublished, University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Ill., May 28, 1919.
attempt to ascertain the wishes of the Zionists. At the time of its departure, the King-Crane Commission was staffed by a total of nine people. Aside from the leaders there were Dr. Albert Lybyer as technical adviser; Dr. George Montgomery as expert on the northern regions of the Ottoman Empire; William Yale as expert on the southern regions; Captain Donald M. Brodie of the U.S. Army, as secretary and treasurer; Dr. Sami Haddad, instructor at the School of Medicine of the Syrian Protestant College, as physician and interpreter; Laurence S. Moore as business manager; and Major Paul Toren as stenographer. The character of the Commission was thus established: three seminarians, an Arab, and a possible political appointee began a six-week journey which, by a conservative estimate made to Westermann in March, should have taken six months. Yale was the lone dissenter from the prevailing mood of the King-Crane Commission. Jews and Zionists were unrepresented.

A Great Arab Kingdom

On June 10, 1919, the King-Crane Commission landed at Jaffa. Crane's enthusiasm for Islam provided some of the shipboard diversion, especially for Lybyer, who was apparently not so well versed on the subject. The evening they arrived, the group dined with the American consul in Jerusalem, the Reverend Otis Glazebrook, and a Red Cross official, Captain Logan. Glazebrook, a Protestant minister who had been won over to Wilsonian progressivism in 1910, outlined his own plan for the Turkish domain during the course of the meal. He favored unity of the Ottoman
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76 Manuel, p. 245; Howard, King-Crane, p. 40; Esco, I, 215; USDSPRFRUS: PPC, XII, 752.
77 Evans, p. 153; Howard, King-Crane, pp. 88-89.
78 ALD, June 6, 1919. Crane's fascination for Islam is further elucidated in the next decade. For example see Crane to Mrs. Belmont, August 9, 1926, Belmont Collection, Special Mss.
79 Otis A. Glazebrook, born at Richmond, Virginia, in 1845, had participated in missionary work in Virginia before he finally settled in Elizabeth, New Jersey, as a church pastor. "It was while tending his flock in the latter city that he made . . . an impassioned prayer at the convention which nominated the President of Princeton as the Governor of New Jersey." In 1914, Glazebrook was appointed consul at Jerusalem. See Adler in Jewish Social Studies, X, 331.
empire under a United States mandate, and decried the plans and capabilities of the Zionists. Glazebrook's project envisioned no national sovereignty for any people, but the transformation of the late Turkish empire into a vast theatre for American missionary enterprise; it was never undertaken or seriously considered by any of the chief negotiators at Versailles. What direct effect Glazebrook had on the findings of the Commission cannot be precisely determined. Some circumstantial evidence, however, including King's discussions with Morgenthau and with the Syrians, can be brought to bear in support of the contention that the consul had confirmed what had been believed by King and Crane before they ever sailed. After it was shown that they would meet no resistance, the two leading commissioners dropped the veneer of impartial inquiry and conducted an opinion poll which reflected the attitudes of neither Arabs nor Jews, but of the Christians resident in Palestine.

After a single day in the Holy Land, King and Crane dispatched to Paris a telegram which said that it would be impossible to carry out the Zionist program without the presence of a large army. It was hardly likely that the Commission had conducted a careful inquiry in twenty-four hours. The fact that until June 12th the only official they spoke to was Glazebrook casts a deep shadow of suspicion on their impartiality at the time of their arrival. Yale, on hearing of the cablegram, instantly cabled Westermann to discount its alarming features. After June 13th, when the Commission spent the greater part of the day visiting Zionist agricultural settlements on the way to Jerusalem, almost nothing is recorded of further Jewish encounters. In Jerusalem, on June 16th, the King-Crane Commission interviewed a Zionist deputation. Among the American contingent were four important Zionists: Dr. Harry Friedenwald, a Baltimore ophthalmologist; Dr. David de Sola Pool, rabbi of Shearith Israel, the Spanish-Portuguese Synagogue in New York City; E. W. Lewin-Epstein, of New York; and a Brandeis lieutenant, Robert Szold, of Washington, D.C. The statement of Zionist aims presented to King and
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81 Esco, I, 216; Howard, King-Crane, p. 92.
82 Howard, King-Crane, p. 93.
83 ALD, June 13, 1919.
Crane was essentially what the Zionist Commission had advanced at Versailles.\textsuperscript{84} The Commission's response to the Zionists is unknown.

Over a period of two weeks, the King-Crane Commission attended a number of anti-Zionist gatherings and, in an informal party-dinner atmosphere, socialized with anti-Zionist British officers, Arab nationalists, and resident Christians. After calling on King and Crane that morning, Glazebrook entertained them on the evening of June 14th at a "twelve course dinner, where the principal guests were a Frenchman who favored a unified Turkey" and two anti-Zionist British officials, Sir Ronald Storrs, the military governor of Jerusalem, and General Arthur Money, the military governor of Palestine. The sentiments they conveyed were implanted successfully in the minds of the commissioners. Albert Lybyer for one recorded his view of the Zionists; all of them were unscrupulous and "all Americans and Britons oppose them," he wrote after having been in Palestine only four days.\textsuperscript{85} In another six days, Lybyer approved of a constitution for Palestine prepared by a British colonel, a constitution which modified Zionist demands in the "direction of fairness."\textsuperscript{86} On June 20th, the first of three official reports to the American peace delegation was transmitted. It read, in part: "Here, the older inhabitants, both Moslem and Christian, take a united and . . . hostile attitude toward any exclusive Jewish immigration or toward any effort to establish Jewish sovereignty over them. We doubt if any British or American official believes that it is possible to carry out the Zionist program except through the support of a large army."\textsuperscript{87}

On June 21st, King, Crane, and Lybyer dined with the British; Lybyer was seated near the anti-Zionist, anti-French Colonel Watson. The people at dinner were "nearly all Moslems. . . ."\textsuperscript{88} Indeed, there was no reason to suffer the Zionist entreaties if all of one's dinner companions and acquaintances were of an opposite persuasion.

\textsuperscript{84} Howard, \textit{King-Crane}, p. 96.

\textsuperscript{85} ALD, June 14, 1919.

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Ibid.}, June 20, 1919.

\textsuperscript{87} Crane and King to the Commission to Negotiate the Peace, PPC, 867N/91 telegram, June 20, 1919, \textit{USDSPRFRUS: PPC}, XII, p. 748.

\textsuperscript{88} ALD, June 21, 1919.
Before departing the Holy Land, Charles Crane befriended General Money and the anti-Zionist John H. Finley, then supervisor of American Red Cross work in Palestine. On June 27th, King and Crane held an informal interview with Frederick Bliss, son of the president of the American Protestant College. Having now concluded their business in Palestine; they sped to Damascus, reaching that city in time for the opening session of the Syrian National Congress—with whose resolutions they appeared to be in perfect accord. On July 11th they sent another telegram to Paris, describing the “unexpectedly strong expressions of national feeling in Syria opposing both a French mandate and Zionist plans in Palestine.” Both King and Crane manifested outright sympathy for a Great Arab Kingdom ruled by Faisal as an American protectorate. Faisal even seemed willing to allow the establishment of an American women’s college in forbidden Mecca. No zealous missionaries could have asked for more. . . . With the French and Vatican beaten and the Jews out of the way, their missions would flower in the desert under American protection. The third and last of the reports to Paris demanded strong curbs on Jewish immigration, the erection of a unified Syrian state including Palestine, and the administration of the holy places by an international commission. Montgomery and Yale, however, disagreed with the majority report of King, Crane, and Lybyer. Montgomery suggested that Palestine be placed under a separate British mandate, that Mount Lebanon be autonomous under a French mandate, and that Syria be governed by a joint Anglo-French mandate with Faisal as king. He further claimed that, at least

89 Arthur Money to John H. Finley, May 1, and August 5, 1920, John H. Finley Papers, New York Public Library, Box 75. Interesting reference is made to Crane and the members of “his” commission. The idea that Crane’s influence on the Commission was predominant has also been advanced by Sir Ronald Storrs, the military official subordinate only to Money. See John Noble, “American Imperialism Turns to Zionism,” Jewish Voice, I (May, 1941), 15-16.
90 ALD, June 27, 1919.
91 Crane and King to the Commission to Negotiate the Peace, PPC, 181. 9102/3 telegram, July 10, 1919, USDSPRFRUS: PPC, XII, 750. Included in this telegram is a confirmation of their previous Zionist assessment. The people “vigorously oppose Zionist plan and Jewish immigration” and were protesting against the Balfour Declaration.
92 Manuel, p. 248.
with regard to Palestine, Arab antagonism was to be expected, but that eventually the development of Jewish industry would benefit the Near East. The Jews, however, should not be led to believe that a Palestinian homeland would solve the world-wide problem of anti-Semitism, an issue which was still being discussed at Paris by the Christian nations.93

America Should Withdraw

His experience with the King-Crane Commission profoundly altered Yale's attitude.94 As the weeks passed, he became increasingly disillusioned with the Commission's work and mode of inquiry. It must be remembered that the avowed purpose of the Commission had been to ascertain the political wishes of the Near Eastern peoples. Instead, the reverse occurred. By mid-July, 1919, King and Crane were not only accepting petitions, they were also "investigating certain industrial questions" in Syria.95 Thus, for the second time in a month, the commissioners had been unable to maintain Wilson's high standard. In Palestine, they were traduced by a manipulative Anglo-American clique; in Syria, they were again diverted. It was at this time that Yale wrote his minority report, an attempt, on the one hand, to disengage himself from the findings of the King-Crane Commission and, on the other, to outline a plan that would effectively deal with the social and political realities of the Near East as he conceived them.

The arrival of the Commission in Palestine and Syria aroused a strong national sentiment.96 Yale was astounded by the inability of the King-Crane Commission to see the hand of Britain in the Arab uprising of 1919. Realizing that Britain did not want Syria to fall into the hands of the French, he perceived that Britain must have had a hand in encouraging the "spontaneous Arab nationalism" of 1919 for a unified Syria under a British rather

93Esco, I, 216; Adler in Jewish Social Studies, X, 327; Howard, King-Crane, pp. 100-101.
94Westermann to Howard, September 6, 1940, WLW, Box 1.
95They had not been charged to do this either by Wilson or by any of the Allies. They had clearly overstepped the bounds of their investigation. See William T. Ellis, "Impossible to Give Palestine to the Jews," American Hebrew, CV (July 18, 1919), 231.
96Yale, p. 336.
than a French mandate. It was Yale’s impression that the Arabs did not want a national home for the Jews in Palestine, but that Arab nationalism was too recent to be anything but “artificially cultivated.” The promise of the Balfour Declaration ought to be kept, he believed, since the entire Near East would benefit from Jewish enterprise. Great Britain, he concluded, would be the best mandatory for Palestine, which should be separated from Syria and developed in conformity with the wishes of the Zionists. He stated that there was no reason for United States participation because England, the nation most responsible for the Balfour Declaration, should now be charged with the obligation of carrying it out. Yale recommended the following divisions: to France, Lebanon; to a joint Anglo-French protectorate, Syria; to Britain, Palestine; and nothing for the United States. He believed that through his solution, everyone—Jews, Moslems, Christians, France, and England—had been taken into consideration. The wisest course for the United States was to withdraw, since assigning America a mandate would result for her in unnecessary strife with the European powers. Shortly after submitting his report, Yale resigned from the Commission. King and Crane, undaunted, moved on with the assistance of a grant from the State Department for additional salaries and expenses. By August 16th, however, their work had also been concluded.

97 Adler in *Jewish Social Studies*, X, 328.
98 Eisner, p. 10; Esco, I, 216; Yale, “Recommendations as to the Future Disposition of Palestine, Syria and Mount Lebanon, July 26, 1919,” WYP—EMHC, folder 130. Yale began to adopt a more sympathetic stand toward Zionism because he had become convinced that Palestine would be developed on a Western model, in accordance with American ideals. He thought that the biggest contributors toward the renascence of Palestine would be the American Jews, to whom he had recently taken an increased liking. See Ben V. Cohen to Brandeis, September 12, 1919, Brandeis Papers. By October, 1919, Yale thought that Zionism’s vital force was waning and, consequently, that the Jews would have to accept the idea of a “limited Palestine,” less the Hauran, the valley of the Litany, and Transjordan. In the future, he felt, the fate of the Jews would be dependent on a British mandate under which Palestine would be established as a national home for the Jewish people. Zionism, he implied, no longer had the stature to self-determine its fate: Yale, “The Significance and Import of the Clemenceau-Lloyd George Agreement,” October 21, 1919, WYP—EMHC, folder 125; Adler in *Jewish Social Studies*, X, 329.
100 American Commission to Negotiate the Peace, Minutes of Daily Meetings of
The findings of the King-Crane Commission were not shrouded in secrecy. On August 28th, its report was submitted to Undersecretary Polk, then head of the American peace delegation in Paris.\textsuperscript{101} Within forty-eight hours of his return to America, Charles R. Crane had personally cabled Wilson as to the contents of the report.\textsuperscript{102} By August 30th, both King and Crane had spoken to representatives of the \textit{New York Tribune} and the \textit{New York Herald}; they discussed their findings with Associated Press reporters—and mentioned the "overwhelming desire" of the Arabs "for the United States as mandatory in most of the Near East." The only portions of the report not discussed were specific mandate recommendations for certain areas of the Ottoman empire. Aside from that, the contents of the report were revealed entirely in 1919, including references to Syrian opposition to a Zionist state.\textsuperscript{103}

Donald M. Brodie arrived at the White House with the text of the King-Crane Report on September 27th. At the time, Wilson was stump ing the country, trying to arouse support for the League of Nations; he fell ill before his return to Washington.\textsuperscript{104} The report's overt hostility to the French necessitated its deliberate exclusion from the Paris Peace Conference. There is a strong possibility that Wilson never saw the report. Except for personal correspondence and eyewitness accounts,\textsuperscript{105} it remained outside the public eye for three years. Crane, who was in the Near East at the time, wrote to Woodrow Wilson on January 23, 1923, that the report "is looked upon as a serious, careful and sympathetic effort to apply the principles you had enunciated and for which America went to war."\textsuperscript{106} Did the report rise to the high
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\textsuperscript{101}Evans, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{102}Zeine, p. 220, n. 3.
\textsuperscript{104}Howard, "An Experiment in Peacemaking: The King-Crane Commission," 136.
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idealism desired by both Wilson and its framers, or was it a grossly misleading, inaccurate tabulation of figures and data which would have served merely to discredit its authors had it only been publicized sooner?

The Irregularities Offset One Another

The Commission findings were no scientific survey, but pieces of political propaganda remarkably coinciding with the program of Howard Bliss and the Syrian nationalists. Some of the very obvious irregularities were apologized for at the outset. First, the number of petitions was not proportional to the respective populations. For example, in Palestine, the area designated as O. E. T. A. South, a total of two hundred sixty petitions were submitted, but in O. E. T. A. East—Syria—more than four times that number were submitted, although the latter population was only slightly greater than twice that of the former. Second, the number of petitions from different religious groups was not proportional to the numerical strength of the religious faith. In more precise terms, as will be seen shortly, this means that the total number of petitions received from Moslems fell far short of the total number received from Christians, although nearly three-quarters of the Near Eastern peoples under consideration by the Commission were of the Moslem faith. So inordinate a recognition of Christian primacy was tied to the missionary interests of the Commissioners, who were only casually committed to the fate of the Moslem majority. Third, a number of petitions displayed the influence

read a statement prepared by Crane, and quoted the latter as saying: "... The high hopes of the Arab people... have been disappointed... all the Arabs... into the remotest oasis... revere [the King-Crane Report]"; Howard, *King-Crane*, pp. 315, 319-20.

107Esco, I, 218.

108The designation O. E. T. A. stands for Occupied Enemy Territory Administration. O. E. T. A. North was Cilicia, O. E. T. A. East was Syria, O. E. T. A. West was Lebanon, and O. E. T. A. South was Palestine, including Acre, Beersheba, Haifa, Jaffa, Jenin, Jerusalem, Nablus, Nazareth, Safed, Tiberias, Rishon Le-Zion and Tel Aviv. The South was under British military administration, the North and West were under the French, and the East was controlled by the Arabs. *PPC*, 181. 9102/9, "Report of the American Section of the International Commission on Mandates in Turkey," August 28, 1919, *USDPRFRUS: PPC*, XII, 756.
of organized propaganda through the similarity of their phrasing or their identical wording. Fourth, many of the petitions were fraudulent. Last, the value of a petition was not necessarily determined by the number of signatures. In terms of public opinion, King and Crane arbitrarily assumed that a petition signed by thousands of villagers may have had less value than one signed by a municipal council. With characteristic gloss, the commissioners asserted that the "great majority of the irregularities offset one another."109

The charts and tables presented by the Commission in support of its findings were deceptive. Under the first Roman numeral, political groups, no Jewish organizations were listed. Significantly, Jews were cited only under the third Roman numeral, religious groups.110 In addition, throughout the entire 118-page report, the Balfour Declaration was mentioned only five times. The reason behind this near omission is unclear: because of it one might assume that neither King nor Crane viewed Zionism in political terms, but this is untrue. No religious or social arguments were leveled against the Jews; although they were not represented as a political group, they were attacked in none other than political terms. They were, in the estimate of King and Crane, a people with a "Zionistic" scheme: an aggressive, imperialistic people "who would not be content with hegemony over Palestine." The manner of description in these pages was conspiratorial and probably received its inspiration from Crane, a man with previous knowledge of supposed Jewish "plots." The Jews were seen as subjecting the Arab population to Zionist immigration plans and "steady financial and social pressure to surrender the land. . . . The Zionists look forward to a complete dispossession of the . . . non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine." Furthermore, the Jews could not be trusted to guard the Christian and Moslem holy places because "these sites are not only not sacred to the Jews but abhorrent to them. . . ."111

109 Ibid., 763-64.
110 There is also no listing for Jews under petitions received from economic groups. See tables, ibid., 756-57.
111 Ibid., 773, 792-94. The Zionist "scheme" was accurately enough delineated, but the phrasing of the report made it sound particularly unsavory, e.g., (1) " . . . Palestine. . . . to be set aside at once as a 'national home for the Jews.' " (2) Sooner or later, the political rule of the land "will become organized as a 'Jewish Commonwealth.' " (3)
In O. E. T. A. South—Palestine—lived the fewest people, 79.4 percent of them Moslems, and it is worth noting that Jews outnumbered Christians by 2,500. Yet of all the petitions collected—they were given right into the hands of King and Crane by the interested parties—only fourteen (16.4 percent) were from Jewish delegations, while fifty-three (nearly 60 percent) were from Christian organizations. The Moslems, nearly four-fifths of the population, were represented in only eighteen (20.5 percent) of the total of eighty-eight petitions. The suggestion of Albert Lybyer, that “because of the numerous sub-divisions of the Christians . . . it was inevitable from the beginning the Commission would give a disproportionate number of interviews and amount of time to them,” is unsatisfactory. This is a bold admission of the overriding importance to King, Crane, and Lybyer of Christian opinion in the overall solution to the Near Eastern problem, an importance entirely out of proportion to the numerical population. The concern with Christian sensibilities was also paramount in O.E.T.A. East and O.E.T.A. West. In the former, a total of 56 percent of the petitions were from Christian sects, although they comprised but 8.3 percent of the population; 38.1 percent of the petitions were from Moslems, though they totaled five-sixths of the population, and only three petitions were collected from Jews. In the latter, where Christians totaled 36 percent of the population, they turned in 54 percent of the requests; Moslems were 54 percent of the population and submitted 35 percent of the total number. Of equal importance to the King-Crane Commission were the Jews and the Nusairiyeh religious sect: from both were collected five petitions.

A Pro-Christian Document

The outspoken missionary character of the document seems, in no small part, to have been lent by President King, especially the

“The Great Powers of the world have declared in favor of the scheme which merely awaits execution.” (4) In reference to the ancient Jewish mode of life which the writer feared might be restored, such words as “exclusivism” and “particularism” were employed.

See the tables on population estimates and religious groups, *ibid.*, 756-57, 771. For the number of petitions per group and percentages, calculations are based only on table III, or religious groups. If economic and political groups (tables I and II) were also included, the imbalance would be even more striking with reference to the Jews.

Refer to table III—religious groups, *ibid.*, 757.
assertion that the United States ought to be the recipient of a mandate because of the spirit of American educational institutions in Syria, notably "the College of Beirut." The report reflected the morality and rhetoric of Wilson, acquired by King when he became an interventionist:

In the first place . . . the Syrian people [recognize] that at the foundation of the common life of America were to be found certain great convictions. . . . They saw that she had a passion for peace . . . and that to bring righteous peace nearer she entered the war. They saw she had a passion for democracy . . . they knew too that with a high religious idealism, America . . . combined a belief in the separation of Church and State . . . for the highest good . . . both of religion . . . [and] the State.

The Syrian people, continued the report, believed in the unselfish motives which the United States had espoused upon entering the war; America did not seek the spoils of war, but the fruit of peace. "It may be doubtful . . . if America could do anything so significant for the human race today as to prove she had not forgotten her own high ideals" by undertaking the Syrian mandate.114

There was little left to be said for the Jews because only they "supported the Zionistic scheme. The Jews are distinctly for Britain as a mandatory power because of the Balfour Declaration, though many think that if the scheme goes ahead, American Jews will become its chief promoters. . . ." The Commission's final recommendations on Zionism were predicated on the assumption that the historic claims of the Jews were invalid and that any influx of their coreligionists into Palestine would be granted to them as a privilege rather than a right. The idea of a Jewish state would have to be abandoned and immigration severely limited. The commissioners claimed that they had begun their study "as favorable to Zionism," but had been "driven to the reverse view." They were aware of Zionist achievements in Palestine, but, in accordance with the Balfour Declaration, the "extreme Zionist program" would have to be modified. The rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine, they concluded, should not be trampled upon. Credence was given to the idea of aroused Arab nationalism taking a sanguinary path against the Jews to amelior-

114Ibid., 844-47.
ate its frustration.\textsuperscript{115} The petitions presented to the King-Crane Commission in reference to the implementation of the Zionist program are misleading, however. In O. E. T. A. South, 222 of the total of 260 petitions (or about 85.3 percent) were opposed to the Zionist program, but these figures do not necessarily reveal the climate of opinion of the majority Moslem population, since, as has already been observed, most of the petitions originated from Christian denominations. In O. E. T. A. East, 90 percent (1,040 petitions) were against Zionism, but 56 percent of the entreaties were from Christian sects and only 38 percent from Moslems. Again, it must be noted that Christians composed only 8 percent of the total Syrian population.\textsuperscript{116} Thus, to say that the wishes of the majority Moslem population were presented in the King-Crane Report is fallacious. There was also too little contact with Jews and Zionism to validate their contention that the movement was "pernicious" and that Jewish immigration ought to be "restricted."

Only the Christian population remains to be considered. A New York Times correspondent and critic of Zionism commented that "Palestine Christians are more bitterly against the mandate... than the Moslems...."\textsuperscript{117} The accuracy of this statement would lead to the conclusion that King and Crane drew their anti-Zionist consensus from a vindictive minority population. Far from being an

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., 779, 792-94. In a report written for the Inquiry at the close of 1918, Crosby Butler Howard claimed, as had William Yale, that Arab nationalism hardly existed. Butler had been to the Near East and averred that "it would be impossible to apply any theory of self-determination... because it would be impossible to discover what any large number of these peoples desire and even if this were possible, it might easily turn out that they desired something which would be disastrous to their well-being." Excluding Syria proper, the Arab peoples "have no real national consciousness. Particularism... takes the place of nationalism...": Butler, "Report on the Proposals for an Independent Arab State or States," WYP—EMHC, folder 142, p. 37. Yale recounts an incident in which Crane asked the Arabs of Hebron whom they wished as mandatory. They replied that "all governments were evil." A moment later, they asked Crane to return to Paris and "tell the Peace Conference and your President we want Allah to rule over us." These replies fail to demonstrate the presence of a viable Arab nationalism; on the contrary, they serve to reinforce Butler's conclusion. See Yale, p. 337.


\textsuperscript{117}Ibid., 749-50, 785, 792, 859; T. Walter Williams, "Palestine Still a Land of Problems," New York Times, July 10, 1921, Sec. 2, p. 3.
"experiment in peacemaking," the King-Crane Report was a pro-Christian document. Its findings should never have been suppressed; had America known she had nothing to fear from France and Britain, they probably would not have been. As it developed the palpable tragedy of the King-Crane Commission was not its failure to cause an impact at Paris, but that the legendary aura surrounding its members and findings had no substance. Nevertheless, during the interwar period, the chimera of King and Crane continued to exercise its influence over those American interest groups which decried Zionism and its policies.

118 Howard, "An Experiment in Peacemaking: The King-Crane Commission," 122-46. In the 1930's, Howard was an Anglophobe and purveyor of the "international Jewry" mystique. See his The Partition of Turkey (New York, 1966), p. 197.

LOAN EXHIBITS
Over sixty exhibit items dealing, for the most part, with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The American Jewish Archives will be pleased to make these exhibit items available on loan, free of charge, for a two week period, to any institution in North America. A selection of twenty to twenty-five items makes an adequate exhibit. The only expenses involved are the shipping costs.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Director of the American Jewish Archives, Clifton Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220.
The Genesis of a Communal History: The Columbus Jewish History Project

MARC LEE RAPHAEL

Early in 1974, in Columbus, Ohio, a unique partnership was consummated—one whose implications for the writing of local Jewish history, and thus for understanding the American Jewish experience, are significant. The Columbus Jewish Federation, whose fiftieth anniversary of organized activities occurs in America's bicentennial year, felt that a full history of Columbus Jewry would be a distinguished commemoration of the Federation's golden anniversary. Simultaneously, the Ohio Historical Society's Archives-Library Division, having decided to initiate an ethnic history project, was taking tentative steps towards exploring the resources of Columbus Jewry. Thus, when the Ohio Historical Society's oral historian met the Columbus Jewish Federation's executive director, it was immediately obvious that the goals of each party could be greatly assisted through mutual cooperation, and the Columbus Jewish history project was begun.

For its part, the Ohio Historical Society saw a splendid opportunity to collect large quantities of personal, organizational, and institutional documents, to have Jewish communal assistance in such a project, and to obtain cooperation in initiating a large-scale oral history program within Columbus Jewry. Toward this end the Ohio Historical Society agreed to supervise an acquisition program which would develop lead files and obtain materials, organize the inventorying and cataloging of all documents received, bring the skills of its conservation specialist to written and pictorial documentation needing cleaning, deacidifying, laminating, mending or binding before it could be utilized, microfilm especially valuable collections, and provide the equipment necessary for, and even typed transcripts of, the forty-five to sixty oral interviews it would supervise.

As for the Columbus Jewish Federation, it agreed to publicize

Dr. Raphael is Professor of History at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
actively and continuously the attempt to locate, collect, and deposit in the Ohio Historical Society the records of Columbus' Jewish past. This meant not only the need to contact a wide group of persons and organizations, not only to encourage them to make public "lost," hidden, or confidential records, but also to convince these individuals and groups of the value in permanently depositing their collections at the Ohio Historical Society.

The Federation and Society next agreed to constitute a nine-person advisory board and sought to involve the Ohio State University in the project by proposing to the chairman of the Jewish studies program that he and two other scholars sit on the board. The shared purposes of inviting the Ohio State University into the project were advice on choosing an historian and guiding the collecting of documents, the infusion of academicians into the project, and the sense that university persons might help solve potential conflicts over scholarly autonomy.

The advisory board's first task was to hire an historian, and after completing the task by choosing this author, a detailed "flow-chart" was constructed. The collecting of documents, the completion of the oral histories, and the major portion of research were to be completed by the end of 1975. The following year was to be devoted to the writing of the History of the Jews of Columbus, Ohio, 1840-1975, with a completed manuscript to be submitted to the advisory board by the end of 1976. All the parties signed a contract which not only confirmed this but granted the author "absolute scholarly independence." The latter was the unanimous consensus of the advisory board.

Although at the time of this writing (spring, 1975) the project is not even half completed, several hopes voiced by the organizing groups have already been realized, while the completion of several more can be viewed with much optimism. In the first place, it was the hope of the Ohio Historical Society and the Columbus Jewish Federation that the document collection would be both quantitatively and qualitatively impressive. This seems to be indeed the case. Family photographs, diaries, scrapbooks and other memorabilia (a large portion from the nineteenth century) have been deposited with such regularity that the problem in writing family history, for example, is to decide upon which of the many possible families actually to focus. Large individual collections have also
been processed, ranging from the correspondence and records of a businessman to the manuscript sermons and other writings of local rabbis. And most valuable of all has been the vast accumulation of institutional and organizational records, including 126 linear feet of Ohio State University Hillel Foundation records, 10,600 items from the Columbus Branch of the National Council of Jewish Women, 64,000 items from the Jewish Family Service, the minute books of Temple Israel (1868-1955), and tens of thousands of items from the Columbus Jewish Federation.

Documents, alas, no matter how abundant, are only the stuff from which history is written. The advisory board, together with the historian, had to hammer out some of the objectives of the history.

Anonymous Persons and Quantification

As the collections of institutional records, newspaper clippings, and biographical materials grow in size, the historian finds it difficult to resist the temptation to write an “elitist” history—one which concentrates on the most articulate members of the community. Indeed, one wonders why it has taken so long for the general revolution in the writing of American urban and ethnic history to penetrate to American Jewish historical writing, for of the more than 125 published Jewish communal histories, not one has attempted to utilize sparse records dealing with hundreds of individuals to study the inarticulate rather than verbose elites recorded in the Anglo-Jewish press. Perhaps to blame is smug confidence in the universal applicability of the style of intellectual and biographical approaches pioneered by the first generation of serious American Jewish historians, perhaps it is simply the feeling that “the really important things cannot be quantified,” or perhaps it is the failure of writers of American Jewish history to learn new methods, for the rudiments of quantitative technique (until quite recently) were acquired by frustratingly slow self-teaching. Whatever the reason, the student of American Jewish life has now an exceedingly large number of models to consult if he or she

is interested in quantitative analysis of social structure (internal family behavior, geographic and social mobility, intergroup relationships, community structure, demography and biography). It has been the expressed objective of the Columbus Jewish history project to devote serious attention to persons, trends, and events ignored by an exclusive concentration upon conventional documentation.

Neglected Sources

Conventional documents need no discussion, for they are the sources from which every Jewish communal history has been written and constitute the major focus of the combined efforts of the Columbus Jewish Federation and the Ohio Historical Society. The latter, however, is also the repository of a vast amount of little used public records potentially of great use to the local Jewish historian. Among the most valuable are Federal (manuscript popu-


lation schedules of the United States Census, naturalization records, passenger vessel lists of persons), state (precinct and ward voting abstracts), county (tax duplicates, wills, voter registration lists), and city (student transcripts, public school registers, arrest lists) records, but much more is available. The possible uses, moreover, when two or more types of records are linked, are almost without limit.

The manuscript population schedules of the United States census permit the reconstruction of nineteenth-century city wards and much detailed information about the Jews therein. They also make possible the tracing of families or individuals who move outside one geographic area, for Soundex indexes to the United States Census population schedules of 1880 (2,367 microfilm reels) permit the tracing and linking of persons from a variety of other records. It is easy enough, for example, to compile a list of all Jews married in Columbus between 1870-1879, and through the indexes and city directories to trace these couples and discover their city of residence, family constellation, occupations, and personal and property totals in 1880. Given the massive turnover rates in the American past slowly being demonstrated by mobility researchers, as well as the paucity of available information on nineteenth-century American Jewish communities, we are concerned not only with using the census schedules to explore the demographic profile of Jews who persisted in late nineteenth-century Columbus (their birth processes, economic relationships, family planning fertility rates), but also in determining how many chose to strike out for careers in new locations, where they settled if they left, and what their spatial relationship was to the parental generation.

9 We have discussed elsewhere the variety of public documents available and their potentiality; see Raphael, "The Utilization of public local and federal sources for reconstructing American Jewish history: the Jews of Columbus, Ohio, in 1880 and 1912," American Jewish Historical Quarterly (in press).


11 On population turnover, see Howard Chudacoff, Mobile Americans: Residential and Social Mobility in Omaha, 1880-1920 (New York, 1972), and Peter R. Knights, The Plain People of Boston, 1830-1860 (New York, 1971).

12 The best introduction to demographic models is Demography, a quarterly published by the University of Chicago's Department of Sociology.
Oral History

"Doc," William Foote Whyte's principal informant for his classic study of Boston's Italians, said to Whyte: "If people accept you, you can just hang around and you'll learn the answers without even having to ask questions." Whyte commented:

I found that this was true. As I sat and listened, I learned the answers to questions that I would not even have had the sense to ask if I had been getting information solely on an interviewing basis. I did not abandon questioning altogether of course. I simply learned to judge how and when to question.¹³

These reflections touch the two tracks being pursued by the oral history series of the Columbus Jewish History Project. In the first mode, the tape recorder and interviewer are passive listeners, attempting to preserve a permanent record of unfolding events. These have included:

(a) Committee (long-range planning), board (monthly), and congregational (semi-annual) meetings of a small synagogue (100 families) trying to decide whether to build a new structure or purchase an existing building, and the implications of both choices upon the informality and quality of the current worship and education programs.

(b) The heated community feud over the woman's role in the worship service, sparked by a local conference on the role of the Jewish woman, an Orthodox rabbi at the Ohio State University Hillel Foundation and a Conservative congregation in Columbus calling women to the Torah for aliyyot, and the strong public denunciation of the above events by a popular Orthodox rabbi in Columbus.

(c) Placing the recorder on a table in the midst of a group of elderly immigrant Jews as they tell stories, anecdotes, legends, and jokes about the transition from Europe to America and the shock which attended the transference of Old-World cultural patterns to the New World.

Secondly, the author of the History has conducted more than fifty full-length (one and a half to two hours) interviews with a

"representative" group of Columbus Jews. These have included institutional and organizational leaders (secular and religious), immigrants (East European, German, Soviet), suburban housewives, and persons whose involvement in, or rejection of, the Jewish community was felt to be of significance. We were pleasantly surprised to discover how many men and women are well informed on themes of interest to us: decision making in a Jewish family and a Jewish community, controversy over the founding of a Jewish day-school (1950's), intra-ethnic hostility (Germans vs. East Europeans, Reform vs. Orthodox), synagogue competition for members, quality of early Jewish education in Columbus, the role of the Jews in the city's social and political life, and Jewish social life between the World Wars.

The oral history series has not only been strengthened by the advice, equipment, and facilities of the Ohio Historical Society, but, in addition, the Society is permanently storing all the tapes and transcribing the most valuable. It is the hope of the Columbus Jewish History Project that these tapes will both supplement what does exist and replace what does not exist in the written records.\textsuperscript{14}

**Surveys and Questionnaires**

With the severe limitations of time imposed by the assigned completion date of the manuscript, the advisory board urged the formulation of surveys and questionnaires designed to explore both past and present facets of Columbus Jewish life. Such tools have offered the opportunity to probe themes previously untouched by local Jewish historians as well as to contact a reservoir of persons who would otherwise be ignored. Some of the areas we are currently investigating might prove suggestive to students of Jewish communities in America.

A. Jewish sorority life at the Ohio State University in the 1920's

From *The National Jewish Blue Book: An Elite Directory of 1927* (Philadelphia, 1927), we were able to compile a list of Sigma Delta Tau alumnae and members at the Ohio State University.

\textsuperscript{14} I have made a fuller attempt to develop a methodology, as well as to explore some of the pitfalls and advantages of this new craft, in my as yet unpublished paper, "Oral History in a Jewish Community: The Problems and the Promise."
After eliminating the coeds from cities other than Columbus, we located twenty-five women to whom we sent questionnaires. Among our questions were: Detail your parents’ occupational and educational backgrounds. Why did you choose your sorority? How did you pay for the sorority? Were you aware of any non-Jews in S.D.T. or any Jewish girls in a “non-Jewish” sorority? Were there any identifiably Jewish activities at S. D. T. (Sabbath meal and kiddush, programs with the Hillel Foundation, a seder)? Did you meet your spouse via your sorority? At the very least, the responses have enabled us to compare and contrast Jewish sorority life at the Ohio State University fifty years apart.

B. The “sexual revolution”

Some of our attention has been focused on the “sexual revolution,” which we narrowly defined as a substantial sustained increase in nonmarital coitus. Sociologists typically place the significant beginnings of a sexual revolution for white American women during the 1920’s and conclude that between the 1920’s and the early 1960’s no marked increase in premarital coitus occurred (although there was a liberalization of attitudes about, and an increase in, noncoital sexual activity such as necking and petting). During the 1960’s, with a jump in the level of premarital intercourse, a new phase of the sexual revolution was initiated.

We have been testing this hypothesis by sending a questionnaire to every traceable Jewish high school graduate of the years 1918, 1928, 1938, 1948, 1958, and 1968, and asking for impressions, first-hand accounts, case studies, stories, and experiences. Not surprisingly, these anonymous recollections have not only been providing useful insights into changing patterns of premarital sexual behavior among Columbus Jewry, but have been stimulating reading as well.15

C. German Jewish refugees of the 1930’s

The Living History series of Brandeis University made us

15 A suggestive study of the same subject is that of Lena Thomas, “The Relationship Between Premarital Sexual Behavior and Certain Personal and Religious Background Factors of a Sample of University Students,” Journal of the American College of Health Association, XXI:5 (June, 1973), 460-64.
aware of a substantial group of German and Austrian Jews living in Columbus, almost all of whom left Europe in the 1930's. Our questions, to these thirty-five persons, included: When, how, and why did you leave Europe? What were you doing prior to your departure? Why did you come to Columbus? Included as well were several queries about the processes of adjustment and Americanization in Columbus and in the midst of Columbus Jewry.16

D. Three generations of Jewish identity

One of our two most ambitious projects has been an attempt to discover how measurable indexes of Jewish identity have changed over several generations and the extent to which generational status (rather than parental patterns or life cycle influences) determines religiosity.

To this end we devised a questionnaire which, among its items, asks about Jewish identity in the childhood home of the respondents and in their own adult home, and about Jewish education in their youth and their plans for their own children.17

Our sample consists of every person confirmed in Columbus between 1945 and 1965 (there was, coincidentally, one class from each denomination during these years), and hence the need to trace more than 1,000 individuals in order to find their current addresses. Not only have changing patterns of Jewish identity emerged,18 but the patterns of persistency and mobility for the overwhelming majority of Columbus Jewish teenagers over a twenty-year period are easily calculated, as well as intermarriage rates, fertility patterns, synagogue affiliation, and several other useful facts.

16 For information on Brandeis University's national program of Living History, designed to record the recollections of European Jews now in America, write Executive Director, Brandeis University, National Women's Committee, Waltham, Mass. 02154.
17 Thoughtful insights and warnings about age group cohorts are in Alan B. Spitzer, "The Historical Problem of Generations," American Historical Review, LXXVIII:5 (December, 1973), 1353-85. For a questionnaire, write to Columbus Jewish History Project, Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio 43211.
18 Intergenerational reflections on Jewish identity are skillfully presented in Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier (New York, 1967).
E. A Community Survey
For our most detailed questionnaire (sixty questions), a sample of 550 households has been selected by a random probability process from approximately 5,500 Jewish households in Franklin County. The master list of the Columbus Jewish Federation contains about 5,000 of these, and 500 or so have been added as a result of cross-checking membership lists from every secular and religious organization and institution, as well as from our own awareness of Jewish persons not on any membership lists.

Our survey is not only a general demographic profile, but also requires persons to rank their priorities for distribution of Jewish communal monies, inquires about their perception of the power structure of the Jewish community, asks about how one enters the "elite" of Columbus Jewry, about Israel, politics, Jewish books, and education, as well as several areas of Jewish communal discussion (kashrut, philanthropy, divorced persons, etc.). We are hopeful that the data will enable us to document the texture and perception of a contemporary suburban Jewish community.

Sports

"Unless you can play baseball, you'll never get to be a rabbi in America."—Solomon Schechter


While the history of sports has finally come into its own as part of the burgeoning social history movement, American Jewish historians have continued to direct their attention to the more traditional avenues of historical inquiry such as synagogue life, biographies, and intellectual pursuits. Yet, a careful study of the role of sports in a Jewish community, as well as of the Jewish athletes, might yield much information about Americanization and the impact of American culture upon the immigrants.

With the aid of high school records, private scrapbooks, community newspapers, and interviews, we have uncovered a great amount of information on local Jewish athletes, including Leah Thall (nine times U. S. Women’s Singles table tennis champion), Moses (“The Rabbi of Swat”) Solomon, and Mauri Rose (three-time winner of the Memorial Day 500 at the Indianapolis Speedway). They and the sports pursued by them and other local favorites suggest much about leisure time activities, changing sentiments and life styles, the dynamics of Americanization, and Jewish parental attitudes towards their children’s athletic activities in the Columbus Jewish community.

Rabbinical Thought

More than sixty rabbis have served the six Columbus synagogues (three Orthodox, two Reform, one Conservative) during the past 125 years, and the Columbus Jewish History Project has made an exhaustive effort to locate, collect, and catalogue all their extant manuscripts and publications, as well as to record representative sermons and lectures. The sound recording is rather easy, and the search for published articles and books only moderately difficult (Rabbi Leopold Greenwald, who served in Columbus from 1925-1955, published more than 500 articles in several languages), but the attempt to discover unpublished manuscript collections has been both tedious and rewarding.

Only Louis Weiss, a Reform rabbi who served in Columbus during the 1890’s, has his manuscripts in an archives; his more than 200 handwritten sermons, located in the American Jewish

Archives, provide a rich source of rabbinical thought on the eve of the twentieth century. With Weiss’s deceased colleagues, our efforts have been directed to identifying and locating their relatives (usually children), and attempting to persuade the latter to begin to search for, and then permit us to borrow (for copying) or accession (for permanent deposit) the collections. Here, the results of our efforts have been significant. Several dozen Hebrew sermons of Rabbi Morris Taxon (1912-17) have been preserved by his son Jordan; a similar number of radio broadcasts by Rabbi Jacob Tarshish (1922-32; “The Lamplighter”) are in the possession of his son; and the son of Rabbi Mordechai Hirschsprung (1932-48) has kept several manuscript responsa. The youngest son of Rabbi Greenwald was even more resourceful, compiling a voluminous scrapbook of Hebrew, Yiddish, and English reviews of a large number of Greenwald’s forty-five published books. Additionally, several sons and daughters have phonograph recordings of their father’s sermons and addresses.

We are utilizing these manuscript and printed sources in several ways. One useful approach has been a comparative study of the sermons of a Columbus rabbi and a contemporaneous non-Jewish Columbus preacher (Rabbi Louis Weiss—the Rev. Washington Gladden); another method of analyzing the content of the writings has been to compare them with American rabbis of the same denomination and period; while a final thrust has been a careful investigation of the sources (rabbinic vs. Victorian poetry), themes (success; thrift; happiness vs. Torah, mitzvot, and Zionism), and message. Our hope is to advance our understanding of Jewish thought in one specific community, and to investigate the relationship between Jewish thought and American values.24

Business

Students of American Jewish communal history have not ignored the rich field of business or, in general, economic life, but they usually overcome their readers with tedium by merely identifying the first peddlers and listing the Jewish businesses. This is a serious

24 We undertook such a task earlier; see Raphael, “Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger of San Francisco on Jews and Judaism: The Implications of the Pittsburgh Platform,” American Jewish Historical Quarterly, LXIII: 2 (December, 1973), 185-203.
Simon Lazarus
The first volunteer rabbi of the Columbus Jewish Community
oversight, for marketing and distribution, to take but two examples of Jewish activity in American cities, have played important roles in the social and economic development of the United States. Jewish peddlers in mid-nineteenth-century American communities, Jewish-owned country, specialty, and department stores, as well as Jewish wholesalers, jobbers and manufacturers' representatives, rank high among the dynamic forces that have moved products from farm, and factories to consumers. With this and other aims in mind, the Ohio Historical Society has attempted to identify Jewish businesses, inventory their records, and advise the firms how to organize and preserve their documents.

Since the advisory board has urged the consideration of both Jews and Judaism in our research, those areas of non-Judaic activity pursued by Columbus Jews active in Jewish life are also of interest to us. Simon Lazarus, who nineteenth-century sources claim was the founder and first “minister” of Congregation B’nai Israel (established in 1851), expanded his small clothing store during the 1860’s and 1870’s until, upon his death in 1877, F. & R. Lazarus & Co. had $15,260.40 worth of merchandise, $33,528.60 in assets, and only $1,436.88 in liabilities. His sons were certainly to take advantage of his healthy start; by 1914 annual sales were to pass $1,000,000. The story of the unfolding of Columbus’ most important retail store and its significance for the city must be as integral to our project as the deep involvement of the Lazarus family in Columbus Jewish life.

The Family in Historical Perspective

Complete and fully developed family histories—covering three generations or more, exhausting available oral and documentary sources, describing “anonymous” persons as well as a community’s elite, and demonstrating an awareness of secondary literature—add greatly to our understanding of social history. We are in the process of writing several such histories, giving particular attention to questions that are critical to an understanding of American Jewish

history. Such areas include those moments, decisions, and turning points in a family's history that were marked by movement from Europe to America, from state to state, country to city, and city to suburb; the organization, decision making, leisure time, and life cycle experiences of the family; educational and occupational mobility; religious and political affiliations and expressions; husband-wife relations, child-rearing, and the roles of women and men.26

This field of research lends itself to satisfying the strong interest among many Columbus Jews to help with the Project. They have been kept busy collecting family trees and, after we have made the decision about which families to interview, doing preliminary research on the family (vital records, city directories, local newspapers, etc.). Then, our lengthy questionnaire and a tape recorder in hand, they are prepared to interview the members of the family. Our preliminary emphasis has been on German Jewish families who have resided in Columbus for over a century, and on East European Jewish families who have been in Columbus for three-quarters of a century. But this certainly does not exhaust the possibilities for family history.27

Women

No matter how intensive the search for documents is in a community, it is inevitable that it will yield sources almost exclusively by or about males. Rare is a diary from the pen of a woman, a scrapbook about a prominent female, a biographical essay about anyone other than a distinguished man.28 Even the availability of long ignored public records (directories, tax duplicates, lists of property acquisitions and sales) proves of little use, for women without occupations are absent from directories and almost all legal documents are in the name of the husband. Additionally,

26 For copies of a guide to writing the social history of a family, write to Anonymous Family History Project, Department of History, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.
28 An exception in Columbus was Elma Ehrlich Levinger (1887-1958), the author of more than two dozen volumes of Jewish content; see Raphael, "Portraits Out of the Past," Ohio Jewish Chronicle, March 6, 1975, p. 2.
the fact that women change their names upon marriage makes them virtually impossible to trace and thus excludes them from studies of residential, occupational, and educational mobility.

All of this, of course, is true as well in Jewish-oriented research, and perhaps even more true, for we have noticed in one communal history after another how men dominate every area of communal elite activity, from synagogue to federation boards, from scholarship to education. Since no non-elitist Jewish communal history has so far appeared, it is not surprising that no serious attention has been devoted to Jewish women. And yet, opportunities for such emphasis abound. For nineteenth-century discussions, the Federal manuscript census provides abundant information on women (including literacy), while indexes to birth, marriage, divorce, death, and will records make badly needed collective feminine biographies realistic.

In the twentieth century, organizational records and the tape recorder combine to tantalize us with previously ignored possibilities. Hadassah, the Council of Jewish Women, Brandeis and B’nai B’rith Women, Federation Women’s Divisions, and sisterhoods all offer extant record collections and hence the opportunity to discover what it means for a woman to be Jewish in America. Madame Hadassah president is potentially as banal or as important as Mr. Temple president; since “joining” an organization is perhaps the most obvious manifestation of being Jewish today (joining means paying dues—providing sufficient funds so that other people may be hired to carry out the purposes of the organization), and since Jewish women join more organizations than Jewish men, Jewish women may be even more significant for the student of recent Jewish life in America.

Not only do written records provide the possibility of exploring how contemporary women express their Jewishness, but the availability of oral history makes inexcusable any longer the general neglect of the role of women in the writing of Jewish communal

29 It is not only a qualitative matter, but one of quantity as well; 841 men and 208 women are listed in the index to B. G. Rudolph, From Minyan to a Community: A History of the Jews of Syracuse (Syracuse, 1970).

history. Women leave fewer written records of their own, but there are scores of women in any Jewish community whose recollections are at least as important as those of men. A Sunday school teacher for eighteen years in the same institution may say more about the quality of Jewish education than the rabbi of the synagogue, while suburban housewives may hold the key to decisions (and their implementation; don't underestimate the carpool!) about participation in much of Jewish family and communal life. At the very least, Jewish women deserve the same consideration that we have all previously brought to the study of American Jewish men.

Conclusion

It is safe, I believe, to suggest that the writing of serious American Jewish communal history is still in its infancy. Major centers of Jewish life in the United States still lack historical studies (Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, and San Francisco are notable examples); the number of university-trained historians with graduate degrees in history who have written Jewish communal histories can be counted on one hand; and the utilization of the methods, conceptual tools, and concerns of students of American urban, ethnic, and religious history has been generously ignored.

Furthermore, there has yet to emerge a Jewish historian who has attempted a synthesis of the American Jewish past. Possessing no survey of American Jewish history, we cannot determine the role of communal histories in such a synthesis. Will they be the stuff from which a history will (or should) be written? Are they, indeed, "universal history writ large?" And if not, why? Are local historians asking the wrong questions, avoiding the crucial questions, or not asking questions at all? To ask questions is to determine the focus of a study, and local history demands that hard questions not be subordinated to lists of facts.

Finally, I think it is unnecessary to justify a local study by pointing to its representativeness. It seems to me that such studies are valuable for the insights they offer into particular historical processes, for the information they offer indirectly about a society, and for the questions they raise about similar cases.
Nevertheless, we search for the meaning of the *American* as well as the Columbus Jewish experience, but few models, if any, offer any guidance for our dual investigation. It is imperative that both American Jewish as well as local Jewish historians begin to ask the kinds of questions that will make possible tentative answers. We are not only without answers but virtually without questions.

ARCHIVES POSTERS

The latest addition to our popular series of multi-colored posters dealing with the Jew on the American scene focuses on the adoption of the first constitution of New York State on April 20, 1977. Article XXXVIII of this document completely emancipated a segment of Jews in the Diaspora for the first time in history.

This poster as well as the earlier series:

- Jewish participation in the Civil War (6)
- Immigrants from Eastern Europe (3)
- Episodes in eighteenth-century American Jewish Life (3)
- Abba Hillel Silver at the United Nations (1)
- Jews and the American Revolution (6)
- Distinguished American Jewish women (8)

are available without charge for display by all schools, libraries, congregations, and organizations interested in American Jewish history.

When properly matted and mounted on heavy cardboard, these posters make an interesting and attractive exhibit.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Director of the American Jewish Archives, Clifton Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
Brief Notices


In an era more dedicated to turning out female "flappers" than professional women, Fanny Holtzmann, Jewish and Brooklyn-born, found herself the only girl in the Fordham Law night school class of 1922. In a true labor of love, her nephew, Ted Berkman, has drawn a vivid portrait of the "Greta Garbo of the Bar." To Berkman, Fanny Holtzmann was "an elfin creature, with huge innocent eyes, who stilled the roar of the MGM lion. In her prime, tales of her legal wizardry were whispered from her native Brooklyn to the chancelleries of the Orient..." Despite such fame and notoriety, Fanny Holtzmann did not forget the Jewish people. She played a leading role in the prewar efforts to remove Jews from threatened Europe. Appointed a "special counsel to the Republic of China" at the founding of the U. N., she used her skills to influence some of the most important votes needed for the creation of Israel.


Though it has remained divided in many of its other aspects, Jewry has always found a common ground in the institution known as the synagogue. There the concepts of worship, scholarship, social life, and shelter were components that differed little throughout time and place. Dr. Eisenberg's beautifully illustrated volume and its well-written text trace the history of the synagogue in such a manner as to emphasize its inseparability from the history of the Jewish people.


Eliahu Elath was a member of the Jewish Agency for Palestine delegation which attended the founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco. His diaries, recorded during the late spring of 1945, provide great insight into the politics of that international body at a time when the horrors of the Holocaust were still largely unknown. Elath's mission was to pressure the Great Powers—and especially Great Britain—and especially Great Britain—into carrying through the pronouncements of the Balfour Declaration of early November, 1917, with regard to the creation of a Jewish homeland. The Jewish Agency was an unofficial participant with little at its command beyond sheer determination. Its opposition was made up of the Arab League states
and a host of British and American diplomats concerned even then with placating the Arabs for the sake of "national interests."

Elath paints a vivid picture of the American Zionists from Stephen S. Wise to Abba Hillel Silver. He also shows that a dialogue—however ineffective—was actually carried on between Palestinian Jews and Arab diplomats. Sadly, Elath's diaries give a rather negative impression of American Zionism: "As a matter of fact, in all the American Zionist bodies represented here, I have not yet met a single person with the requisite level of either background or practical experience in Arab or Middle Eastern affairs." It was not the illustrious American names that produced badly-needed concessions from American and British diplomats, but rather the Palestinian Jews, already committed to residence in the Middle East and in many cases stung by the brutality of European anti-Semitism. Perhaps the most damaging portrayal of these ideologically rabid yet politically impotent American Zionists comes from Howard M. Sachar in the Foreword: "An agglomeration of American Jewish organizations and their rotating presidents would continue to arrogate to themselves the privilege of defending Israel's cause in clamorous public rallies and near-hysterical full-page newspaper advertisements—thereby reviving precisely the image of a hyphenated and aggressive Jewish conspiracy that a sovereign Jewish nation had been established to dissipate."


Market Street, Nashville, Tennessee, was, from the 1860's to the turn-of-the-century, an area of intense Jewish activity. Many Jews were born there, worshipped in its synagogues and temples and left it when their economic status warranted the move. Fedora Small Frank has chronicled those four decades in the history of this street, its Jewish inhabitants, and the city within which it lay. In her study, she has told a story not unlike many others that took place in the American Jewish experience. It is the story of Jewish immigrants facing language barriers, economic difficulties, and nativist hostility. It is to the credit of Nashville's Jewry that it succeeded in building a stable Jewish community and winning a place among its fellow Nashvillians. Fedora Small Frank must also merit much credit, for she has recounted those early struggles using many of the historians' most important tools: statistical charts, genealogical tables, and a keen sense of understanding. The book contains an introduction by Jacob R. Marcus.


Dr. Rudolf Glanz is an author with a taste for the slightly unusual in Jewish life. Previous to the appearance of this work, Glanz studied relations between American Jewry and several ethnic and religious groups. He has investigated the significance of the Jew as an object of American legend and humor. He has even written of a strain of German-Jewry—thieves, beggars, and vagabonds—rarely considered in the otherwise illustrious history of that group. Now Glanz has turned his attention to the Jewish woman in America, a subject hardly unusual now that woman's history has achieved
a position of respect, except that Glanz is interested in a type of Jewish woman-immigrant, unmarried and working—that does not fit our image of today's suburban lady of leisure. In the first of two volumes on female Jewish immigrants between 1820 and 1929, he deals with women from Eastern Europe (mainly Russia), the institutions that catered to their problems as newcomers, their efforts to unionize, and their relationship to family and Jewish cultural life in America. The book contains several illustrations and an interesting bibliography.

The second volume of Glanz's study of female Jewish immigration to the United States deals with the German Jewish woman. Her experience in the new land was a far less difficult one than that of her Eastern European counterpart. Unlike the largely rural and proletarian Russian woman, she possessed a more urban, educated and middle-class background. Her group status, deserved or otherwise, as the "aristocracy" of American Jewry gave her a class-consciousness that long hampered a close association with Eastern European women in an institutional or personal sense. By the beginning of the twentieth century, however, a rapprochement of sorts was slowly being reached and the American Jewish woman began to develop a united sense of the role she was to play in both American and Jewish society.


The author, chief diplomatic correspondent for the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz,* chronicles the diplomatic activities of American Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger from the beginning of the Arab-Israeli War in 1973 to the disengagement talks in Geneva. He finds that Kissinger's discussions with Arab and Israeli leaders reveal "a pattern of deception and broken promises that would have made even Kissinger's heroes, Metternich and Castlereagh, blush."


"In this extraordinarily erudite volume," writes Louis Finkelstein, Chancellor Emeritus of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in the Introduction, "Dr. Israel M. Goldman... has given the reader a most delightful, scholarly, and comprehensive account of the role which study played in adult life among Jews across the ages." Perhaps most interesting of all is Goldman's description of adult Jews, faced with impending danger, even death, ignoring all to devote their time to Torah. The "People of the Book" did not earn their title easily. This book contains a multilingual bibliography.


It is the hope of the editors that the ten studies presented in this book "will stimulate a deeper awareness of the rich heritage of Jewish art and will encourage
further exploration of the fascinating and constantly expanding role of the visual arts in Jewish life." The papers deal with "various concepts and traditions of the visual arts in the Jewish historical experience. . . . " Among the authors are Benno Jacob, Eugene Mihaly, Boaz Cohen, Stephen S. Kayser, and Cecil Roth.


The new edition of the *Jewish Book Annual* contains interesting articles by, among others, Sol Liptzin on a century of Jewish writers in America, Abraham J. Karp on early prayer books in America, and Stanley Nash on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Ahad Ha'am. There are also numerous bibliographies of new books on Jewish subjects.


Professor Jick rejects two long-standing notions about German-Jewish immigration to America in the decades following 1830. He attempts first to demonstrate that rapid assimilation was not strictly the result of German Jewry's former contact with a secularized and Westernized German culture. Jick then sees as unconvincing the argument that Reform liberal Judaism in America was a German import. What he finds, based upon congregational minute books and other contemporary sources, is a "steady process of Americanization," with German-Jewish immigrants "gradually shedding both their Jewish and German mores, to which they had first clung." This was especially true with Reform Judaism in America, which was the product of a uniquely American innovation, emerging only after German Jews struggled to maintain many Orthodox and traditional practices. "The new American Judaism of the 1870's," he concludes, "was not an importation from abroad and not the creation of rabbis." The book is enhanced by a useful bibliography.

**Karff, Samuel E.** Edited by. *Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion At One Hundred Years.* Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1976. xviii, 501 pp. $20.00

According to Alfred Gottschalk, president of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, there are many ways to read this book, which celebrates the hundred-year history of the world's oldest existing rabbinical seminary. "One way to read it," states Gottschalk, "is as the unfolding story of an amazing academic achievement. . . . " Another way "is to read the book as a record of how the vision of one man [Isaac M. Wise], against all odds, reached beyond the restrictions and the limited means of his contemporary fellow-Jews to become a center of American Jewish learning from which a great Jewish community would benefit." There are, no doubt, further ways to read it, as Gottschalk goes on to suggest. Yet any kind of reading will not dim the quality of essays written by Sheldon H. Blank, Lewis M. Barth, Lou M. Silberman, Martin A. Cohen, and Ezra Spicehandler. Especially outstanding is the long and detailed essay written by Michael A. Meyer, recording the centennial history of the College-Institute. Rabbi Samuel E. Karff, in his introduction to the book, describes Meyer's contribution as a "multidimensional account of the development of a Jewish institution against the backdrop of an expanding American Jewish community and a turbulent world." Meyer's lucid and scientific interpretation allows
the reader to understand the often dramatic changes and subtle continuities that have marked a century of the College-Institute’s existence.


Jacob Rader Marcus has personally witnessed eighty years of American history. Yet he has made up for not being present during the first hundred and twenty by being, simply, one of the most knowledgeable and prolific interpreters of the period he has missed. This is especially true in his chosen field of early American Jewry. “His achievement,” writes Bertram Wallace Korn in the preface, “has been as monumental as his knowledge is encyclopedic.” Now in Marcus’ eighty-first year and America’s two hundredth, more than thirty-five historians (many of them former students of Marcus) have honored the “dean of American Jewish historians” with a *Festschrift* that reflects Professor Marcus’ ability to inject into others the scientific scholarship he has so rigorously adhered to during a lifetime of work.


The Seltzers published works by the (now) famed novelist during the 1920’s under the imprint of Thomas Seltzer Inc. Lawrence’s work was controversial at the time—and for long afterwards—and legal difficulties faced his publishers. On one occasion, he told Seltzer that the latter’s willingness to publish *Women in Love* “has made us friends for life....” The volume also contains “The Seltzers and D. H. Lawrence: A Biographical Narrative” by Alexandra L. and Lawrence L. Levin, and letters from the Seltzers to Robert Mountsier and Dorothy Hoskins. A bibliography and a listing of manuscripts and photographs enhance this handsome publication.


Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr., of the Peale Museum, considered Henrietta Szold (1860-1945) “one of Baltimore’s greatest historical personages.” This sketch of her life, a bicentennial publication of the Jewish Historical Society of Maryland, includes a bibliography.


Among all its intellectual pursuits, early European Jewry, especially its eastern elements, was not especially noted for artists and sculptors. There were several reasons for this, the least of which were socioeconomic and religious in origin. Yet a spirit of enlightenment which swept across the continent in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century penetrated even the rarefied atmosphere of the *shtetl*. From this artistic vacuum, a group of artists and sculptors emerged, now forgotten, but at the time pathfinders towards a new vision of Eastern European life. Hyman Lewbin has recreated their lives in a work that stands as a monument to their contributions.

Louis Lipsky was "the most characteristic leader of American Zionism, and of a major part of American Jewry, for two generations." This book deals with a half-century of Zionist activities in the United States and with the individuals and events that shaped the evolution of Zionism in America. Very little of the book is a personal memoir. In fact, Lipsky readily admits that "I am incapable of writing a personal memoir with myself occupying center stage." Instead, he seems to see people "moving about on a stage, and it is only then that I can record my impressions of them." Accordingly, this book is filled with reports, articles, addresses, and sketches which bring to life Zionist leaders from Europe and America and demonstrate Louis Lipsky's important contributions to the movement and the idea which he helped bring to fruition.


This is the annual edition of a very useful publication. It is filled with names, dates, and events connected with world Zionism, and includes short articles on Golda Meir, the Chaim Weizmann centenary, and Paul Goodman.


A fact little known to laymen, Jewish law—*halakhah*—has played a significant role, since Puritan times, in influencing secular common law in America. First introduced when cases involving Jews came before the courts, Jewish law has often set a pattern of precedents which would be decisive in future decisions involving all Americans. Attorney Meislin has considered this phenomenon in a unique and original study. This is a scholarly work, outstanding in its documentation.


A participant in the development of American Zionism, Emanuel Neumann was also an observer, as is evident from the detail he provides in this autobiographical memoir. Now eighty-three years of age, Neumann retains the gift of expression that allows more than half a century of history to remain as fresh and vital as the author's intense dedication to the Zionist ideal.


In this novel of New York's Lower East Side during the early part of the century, Hugh Nissenson offers the reader the memoir of one Jake Brody, now a man in his sixties. Brody grows to sexual and spiritual maturity amidst the atmosphere of a now-vanished era, when a Jewish and an American identity still struggled to exist in separate—but steadily merging—worlds.

Dr. David Polish, a past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, was a key figure in the drive for the Reform movement’s acceptance of Zionism. In this collection of his essays and addresses on Zionism, Dr. Polish discusses the ongoing relationship between the State of Israel and the Diaspora (or the Galut, as he chooses to define it). One of his most important conclusions is that the relationship between the Galut and Israel “must be one of tension, in which each acts as a corrective and deterrent to the other.” While Israel and the Zionist ideal wish to end the Galut, “its dynamic influence upon the Galut has always exerted a compulsion to survive.” But equally as important, the Galut, and especially the American one, “can serve as a deterrent to nationalism run riot. In a world where the state is deified... the holy can become demonic, and this applies to Israel as well as to any sacred entity.” In this sense, then, American Jewry is its brother’s keeper.


What happens to the concentration camp survivor when that person leaves the “gates of no return”? How much of the experience has one internalized, and to what degree can one adjust to “normal” life? Dorothy Rabinowitz is concerned with the survivor in America. Intertwined with an ongoing description of the trial of the former Maidanek and Ravensbrueck camp Vice-Kommandant, Hermine Braunsteiner Ryan, are sketches of survivors and their new lives in the United States. What emerges is a tale of triumph and sorrow, always tempered by an inability on the part of the survivors to forget or comprehend the tragedy that shaped the remainder of their years.


Historians have finally realized that, before it disappears from our midst forever, the tone and flavor of the recent Jewish past deserve to be recorded for posterity. This book is concerned with the oral/folk history of Jewry and how one can best capture the essence of that history. The first section of the book includes “historical and philosophical discussions of the oral/folk history tradition... and its values in terms of Jewish continuity and identity.” The second part is a “how-to” of oral history as well as a useful guide to media utilization, technology, and financing. It is filled with photographs, quotes, and other aspects of Jewish folklore.


This is a monumental book. In it, the distinguished historian, Howard M. Sachar, has traced the evolution of Israel from the first pangs of an eighteenth-century Jewish nationalism to the creation of an expatriate Israeli community in America which by 1975 numbered 300,000. Between these points of reference, he has told a story with a kind of skill and mastery that is indeed enviable. Sachar’s inclusion of both an internal and an external look at Israel the state and Israel the people makes his contribution all the more significant. Despite its size, the book is not laborious to the point of boredom, nor is it a simple “rewrite job” that fails to unearth the essential points of such an inquiry. It is enhanced by a very useful index.

In this historical sociology of modern Judaism, Stephen Sharot has attempted "a comparative analysis of a single religiously distinctive ethnic group in a number of societies." It is a useful overview of basic trends in European and American Jewry over the past two centuries. The book contains several appendices and an index.


This volume of twenty-one essays and articles is meant to present a dialogue among Jewish thinkers of many differing shades of opinion. The question considered is political Zionism, and the examination of this controversial issue is made through the writings of such notable personalities as Hans Kohn, Hannah Arendt, Martin Buber, Ahad Ha'am, Elmer Berger, I.S. Stone, Uri Avnery, and Jakob J. Petuchowski.


This is a *Festschrift* in honor of the Reverend Dr. Julius Mark, who served for twenty-five years as the senior rabbi of Reform Temple Emanu-El of New York, and several terms as president of the Jewish Conciliation Board of America. Papers presented in his honor include those by Abba Eban, Louis Finkelstein, Solomon B. Freehof, Alexander Guttmann, and Samuel Sandmel.


The new "Hitler wave" of the 1970's seems to have abated, although hastily written efforts dealing with Hitler the man and political leader still find their way to the reviewer's desk. Why such a "wave" should have arisen thirty years after the Fuehrer's death has not been fully answered. Is it simply nostalgia? Or is it, more hopefully, that the proper number of years has passed to allow a more scientifically critical and less subjective analysis? Fortunately, John Toland's book, despite its preponderance of pages, need not be questioned—it is a legitimate piece of scholarship. Much is new about the book, including the incorporation of findings based upon documentation never before used in a study of Hitler's life. One of the most significant points raised by Toland is Hitler's fanatical obsession with the question of his own ancestry. His fear of a Jewish "connection" was so great that Hitler ordered a confidential investigation into the matter in 1931. The report "concluded regretfully that the possibility could not be dismissed that Hitler's father was half-Jewish." To what extent this factor was influential in contributing to his further obsession in "cleansing Europe of Jews" remains a point of conjecture. What is so shocking, however, is the possibility that millions may have been sacrificed so that one madman could purge his psyche of an uncertain and unwanted past. The book contains an excellent set of photographs, and is well-documented and indexed.

This book of over 200 photographs describes visually the various features of Orthodox Jewish life in New York. Confined to neighborhoods such as Williamsburg and Brooklyn, the Orthodox (many of them Lubavitcher Hasidim) appear far removed from the mainstream of American life. Yet the pictures of pious-looking young boys playing baseball and attending summer camp testify to the fact that American life has made an inroad of sorts.


In 1952, when Jewish community relations were still in an early stage of development, professionals in the field were advised to pursue three objectives: "(1) to serve and give expression to the needs of Jews; (2) to sensitize Jews to the needs of others in the general community; and (3) to educate and mobilize Jews for personal involvement in community activities." Then, the problem was anti-Semitic agitators like Gerald L. K. Smith. Two decades later, the objectives were much the same, but, as Alan D. Kandel saw it, the problems were decidedly different: "[Today we are] summoned to come to grips with the urban crisis, poverty, welfare, the racially disadvantaged, model cities, urban renewal, housing construction and rehabilitation, education, urban financing, and other problems." This book presents fifty authors who trace the development of Jewish community relations from the "then" of a concern with anti-Semitism to the "now" of a need to remedy the eroding social fabric of our society.


Rabbi Samuel H. Goldenson was a distinguished name in Reform Judaism. He served as president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and as senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York and of Rodef Shalom Congregation of Pittsburgh, among others. Now, several years after his death, Rodef Shalom Congregation, still vividly aware of Goldenson's contributions to its spiritual life, has collected his sermons, essays, and writings under one cover.
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