
Purporting to write a new interpretation of Jewish history, Roberta S. Feuerlicht sees in the panorama of Jewish history a simple morality play. Her book is compelling not because she presents new evidence, but because she gives new life to the bitter struggle that raged in the tsarist Pale and in pre-Nazi Poland between Social Democrats and Zionists. On the surface, Feuerlicht writes like a contemporary, marshaling evidence against the evils of power. On a deeper level she reads the vision of Abraham Cahan and even Simon Dubnow into the past, and warns us of what rejection of their cosmopolitan vision portends for the Jewish future. Like most scholars she believes that the Jewish people is unique. For her, however, its distinctiveness lies not in concepts like montheism or chosenness, which other ancient peoples of the Middle East expressed. Instead, the Jews alone propounded an ethical imperative of social justice which asserted that society can be perfected through human will. It is the fate of the Jews, however, to be constantly tempted to follow the easy path of other nations, who have sought security through state power. Nevertheless, she reiterates, "The heritage of the Jews is not power, but ethics" (p. 5). Feuerlicht concedes the innocence of this vision, but without its moral fervor, she argues (borrowing in part from the French sociologist Georges Friedmann), one has an Israeli society without a Jewish people, and an American Jewry without a reason to exist.

Because Feuerlicht believes she must refute the subversion of Jewish values by political Zionism, she follows its truncated interpretation of Jewish history. Like the Zionists she dwells on the ancient kingdoms, skips the vast religious and cultural productivity of post-Roman Babylon, medieval Spain, and the kingdom of Poland, and alights in the era of Napoleonic emancipation. We learn of the evils of lecherous David
and his greedy successors, of the fanaticism of Judah Maccabee, and of the suicidal madness of the Zealots of Massada, all of whom have been glorified by the Zionists. Instead, Feuerlicht provides a counter-pantheon stemming from the prophetic tradition of Amos and Jeremiah, and including scholars like Ezra and Johanan ben Zakkai, who accepted political subordination as the price of ethical purity. Yet despite her one-sided revision of biblical and Second Temple history, she concludes with a theme that would have been accepted until 1948 as a central tenet of Jewish history—the legal tradition initiated by Johanan ben Zakkai "created an ethical sphere that made it possible for Jews to function anywhere" (p. 32).

Feuerlicht’s chapter on the diaspora provides the key to the book, for in it she moves rapidly to a discussion of socialism and the rise of the Bund in late-nineteenth-century Russia. Zionism enters her story not through Leo Pinsker and Hovevei Zion, which gave secular expression to a traditional religious longing, but as a bourgeois reaction to the Vilna student Marxists and later the Bund. While ignoring the idealists like A. D. Gordon who ventured to Palestine (as well as the non-Zionist Am Olam romantics who sought rural rejuvenation in America), she notes that Zionism appealed to the Russian secret police, who saw in it a means of exporting the “Jewish Problem,” and of undermining social revolution.

Her chapter on immigration to America does not retell the story, but settles on its implications for contemporary politics. Before winnowing a complex story to settle on the socialists of the Lower East Side, however, she explores a second theme which has vexed east coast Jewish communities, the origins of Jewish contacts with blacks. Here she is overwhelmed by the fact not only that some Jews were involved in the slave trade, and that others, like Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, condemned abolitionism, but that still others, like Judah Benjamin, owned slaves. While one can agree with her that such persons lacked a sense of social justice, one remains unenlightened about the values which welded transplanted German Jews into an American community. Nor can one appreciate how the evangelical tone of the abolitionist movement jarred the young Jewish merchants and their wives looking for a niche in an unsettled land. The balance of the chapter shifts from such bourgeois strivers to explain how socialist principles were transmitted to America. While Orthodox rabbis, she notes, remained in
Europe, where their authority would not be challenged, poor men of vision like Abraham Cahan, Morris Hillquit, Meyer London, and Sidney Hillman ventured to America. In the movement which they institutionalized through the Daily Forward, the United Hebrew Trades, the Workmen’s Circle, and the Socialist Party, Feuerlicht finds her authentic Jewish culture. Her loving portrayal must evoke admiration for a movement which even candid Zionists like Horace Kallen and Leon Simon recognized as the most democratic achievement in world Jewry. But even here she is unwilling to grant recognition to nonsocialists like Louis D. Brandeis, who negotiated the first major bargaining agreement in the needle-trades industry.

From this high-minded generation, regrettably, we have marched steadily downhill into the professions and the suburbs. Indeed, because Jews have abandoned their Yiddish culture and working-class origins, their commitment to social equality in America has become superficial, and their relationship with blacks has degenerated into a defense of jobs. The anti-Semitism of blacks, she argues from many secondary sources, has grown from their exploitation by Jewish landlords and storekeepers, and the mistreatment of black children in schools administered by Jews. American Jewry, she demonstrates, has indeed moved steadily to the right politically, and even the “New Left” she finds a collection of drug-wielding hippies who substituted personal fulfillment for social revolution.

Her concluding chapter on Jews and Israel rejects the heroic view of Zionism as a “national liberation movement.” Instead, she cites observations made initially by Hannah Arendt and Judah Magnes, that Zionism rode on the coattails of British imperialism to expropriate the Arab majority. This view has more recently been provided with an ideological gloss by Maxime Rodinson and Edward Said, who see the yishuv as a “colonial settler state.” Herzl, Weizmann, Ben-Gurion, and Jabotinsky all justified their venture by expounding a European ethnocentrism which saw the Arabs as inferior “orientals” who were unworthy of the land. This “Ashkenazi” racism now is extended to Israel’s Sephardic underclass, she notes. The charges against political Zionists, all of which have appeared elsewhere, mount and mount: the Irgun sought collaboration with the Nazis to garner settlers for Palestine; Zionists fomented tension between Muslims and Jews in Morocco and Iraq to gain immigrants; the Israeli government has ignored the
persecuted Falashas of Ethiopia because it shuns blacks, while it exaggerates the needs of Russian Jews in order to gain white settlers; and Israeli soldiers terrorize West Bank Arabs to prevent resistance to new Jewish settlements and to foster emigration. American Jews have ignored this record, because, having forgotten their ethical heritage and having replaced it with guilt over the Holocaust, they see in Israel's survival a personal atonement. Finally, Jewish institutional leadership in America reinforces this collective amnesia because it can remain viable only by collecting funds for Israel or for Holocaust memorials.

This is a horrifying image of contemporary Jewry, but one which is in part verifiable and which is being entertained by many Jewish intellectuals, especially younger ones. Feuerlicht has reminded us of the evils that follow when a community flees its roots and capitulates to the manipulative psychology of a state power that exploits its guilts. But rather than accept her hopeless jeremiad of declension from the socialist vision, one must recapture those elements missing from both the socialist and the Zionist visions of Jewish history. Only in this way can one resynthesize a moral framework which includes both the legitimate use of state power and dissent. For without such a vision it becomes too easy to evade the responsibility for what actually exists: the economic power of American Jewry and the political and military power of Israel. Feuerlicht herself never questions the right of Israel to exist, and in fact she also provides some clues to the basis for a new Jewish dialogue. Although she disdains the rabbinate as greedy civil servants, she admires Mordecai Kaplan as a pioneer in adapting religious traditions to new communal dilemmas. And among Zionists she respects Ahad Ha-Am because in his emphasis on a spiritual center he rejected exploitation of Arabs. Both men denied the importance of a state to the revitalization of Judaism, but both promoted an autonomous Jewish presence in Palestine. American Zionists like Horace Kallen and Israeli scholars like Gershom Scholem also denied that diaspora Jews were in spiritual exile, and demanded a dialogue between the two communities to avoid the smug ghettoization of the yishuv. The problem has been to demythologize Zionism so that the diaspora and the yishuv might talk frankly. Toward this end an American committee reexamining responsibility for the Holocaust has released a report written largely by Arthur Hertzberg. By setting limits to what could have been done and by recounting what specific agen-
cies and groups actually attempted, Hertzberg has freed American Jewry from a free-floating collective guilt, so that it might be more critical of the Israeli state than it was of the Roosevelt administration. By the same token a book of interviews with Israeli Sephardim by Amos Oz verifies Ashkenazic ethnocentrism and permits a more frank analysis of the moral foundations of state policy. One would hope that the two major centers of Jewry, having examined their respective moral failings, might be prepared finally for a more equal and searching dialogue. To it Feuerlicht has contributed a strident but very useful voice.

—William Toll


For decades, Americans have been vaguely aware of a powerful Jewish presence in Hollywood as performers, writers, directors, union leaders, and "moguls." And yet the Hollywood community gossip was always larded with stories of efforts to disguise Jewish activity at the center of world cinema—tales of changed names, altered facial features, refusals to depict Jewish themes in movies, marriages across ethnic lines, and the like. Indeed, those on the inside of the studios sometimes expressed the Jewish role in Hollywood negatively, as in lunchtime references to 20th Century–Fox as "the goy studio."

But in the last decade or so, a number of scholars have begun to probe behind this self-imposed veil. Randall M. Miller's Ethnic Images in American Film and Television (1978) contained no less than four essays on Jewish roles in American movies, while his second collection of essays, The Kaleidoscopic Lens: How Hollywood Views Ethnic Groups (1980), included Patricia Erens's piece on the historic ambiguity of the place of Jews in the movie industry. By the 1980's two more scholars had written books that placed Jews in a worldwide filmmaking context: Judith N. Goldberg did Laughter Through Tears: The Yiddish Cinema (1983), and Annette Insdorf wrote Indelible Shadows: Film and the Holocaust (1983). Taken together with a scattering of magazine and journal articles and rumors of still more books, they represent a kind of literary growth industry where there had once been silence and evasion.

Lester Friedman's Hollywood's Image of the Jew stands out as the best single introduction to the new literature. The book grew out of the author's nightly introductions to a synagogue film-series on the Holocaust which, in turn, drew him to the problem of how German cinema depicted Jews as such depraved parasites that Germans could participate in or share knowledge of a national policy of genocide. From that point his interests moved to the treatment of Jews in American movies.
From the very beginning of American movies at the turn of the century, Jews found a place on the screen. Ranging from comic vaudeville turns densely packed with ethnic humor to generational and ethnic conflicts, such as D. W. Griffith’s *The Romance of a Jewess* (1911), audiences saw Jews as part of the fabric of American life.

Friedman’s factually detailed book, although politically and socially limited in scope, provides a useful compendium of film titles in a straightforward narrative that touches on all but a few fugitive films. He is at his best in the period of the 1920’s, a moment when immigration had all but ceased and the “new Americans” of the pre–World War I era had raised their crop of newly minted American children. Hollywood movies took up the theme of assimilation that had animated stage dramas such as Israel Zangwill’s *The Melting Pot* and Anne Nichols’s *Abie’s Irish Rose*.

Films in this era were crammed with stories of intermarriage between Christians and Jews, value-laden biblical tales, and comic rivalries between Jewish and Irish families. In many of them, audiences were presented with a metaphorical choice between ethnicity and assimilation in the form of two opposing sets of characters, one of them cranky, old-fashioned, and speaking in fractured English and vestigial Yiddish; the other bright, young, in love, and, as reviewers sometimes said, “clean-cut,” meaning that they did not look “Jewish” (or “Irish”). Friedman gives an admirably full treatment to the best of this genre, the famous *The Jazz Singer*.

With the coming of sound film in the 1930’s, Friedman says, “Jews virtually disappeared from America’s movie screens,” with a few exceptions, such as *The House of Rothschild*, the Alfred Dreyfus segment of *The Life of Emile Zola*, and scattered other moments. Attributing this disappearance to offscreen trends, such as the Jewish migration to the suburbs and a decline in social cohesiveness, as expressed in a waning interest in the Yiddish press and theatre and of religious observance, Friedman may have neglected an important development. Correctly pointing out the decline in major Jewish roles, Friedman might have examined a less exciting trend in the form of the many Jewish bits in movies that were strongly assimilationist in tone. Not until World War II, when national unity across ethnic lines became a part of Office of War Information propaganda, does Friedman pay heed to what he calls a “melting pot mentality.”
In the postwar generation of *Goodbye Columbus* and *Marjorie Morningstar*, Friedman grows more surehanded in dealing with the social setting in which films were produced and seen. He describes the last thirty years "of unparalleled range," when "the Jew, in effect, became the Everyman," with increasing control of his material and with increasingly sophisticated judgment.

—Thomas Cripps

Thomas Cripps is Professor of History at Morgan State University in Baltimore. He is the author of *Slow Fade to Black: The Negro in American Film* and *Black Film as Genre*. 
On June 19, 1953, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were put to death in the electric chair at Sing Sing Prison for having been convicted of passing United States atomic secrets to the Soviet Union during the 1940's. Their execution brought a judicial end to the most highly publicized and controversial cause célèbre in American history but failed to close the doors of bitter discussion among pro- and anti-Rosenberg partisans, who would continue to debate the issue of their guilt and innocence for the next thirty years.

Were the Rosenbergs top-level espionage agents who had willfully transmitted classified information to an "unfriendly power," or were they merely self-professed Communist sympathizers arbitrarily singled out as expendable pawns for persecution by "capitalist justice" during the height of the Cold War? For the political right, the Rosenbergs symbolized the ultimate in domestic treachery and subversion. The dissenting left, however, viewed the young couple as martyrs, sacrificial lambs in effect, who died to satisfy the expedient needs of an administration hell-bent on showing the nation (and the world at large) that it was not "soft on communism."

The panoramic sweep of America's experiment with democracy has seen the procession of many famous courtroom battles. Sacco and Vanzetti, John T. Scopes, and the Scottsboro boys are but some of the famous names which immediately conjure up enough images to trigger flashbacks of a past whose actors have long departed the stage of history. The trial of the Rosenbergs, however, touched off events and reactions unseen in the United States for centuries. Not since the Salem witchcraft trials of 1692-1693 did a legal case capture the popular imagination and polarize American society to such an enormous extent. Why? From the very outset, the judicial proceedings against the Rosenbergs amounted to much more than a strictly technical exercise in law. At stake were the reputation and credibility of conservative
and radical ideologies (those "fighting creeds," as philosopher Michael Polanyi called them) and everything that they stood for.

Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton are not interested in promoting the success of either protagonist. The authors, who openly endorse their personal allegiance to the tenets underlying the political left, argue that ideological jousting cannot under any set of circumstances stand in the way of impartial historical investigation, even if its findings provide armor and weapons to one's archrivals. Their commitment to court history's pleasure by pruning truth from the protective thickets that shield ideological gladiators is a moral act of the highest standing and one which does them great honor.

Radosh and Milton began their study with the assumption that Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were innocent. Naturally this was a correcting starting point, but after poring over thousands of FBI files (declassified and released under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act) and a range of allied documents from other federal agencies, the authors reached a number of disturbing conclusions which they probably did not initially expect to find.

Among these are that Julius Rosenberg was clearly guilty of espionage despite repeatedly perjured testimony to the contrary. Ethel Rosenberg, at the very least, knew of his activities as a clandestine underground mole but was not directly involved in her husband's illegalities even though she may have typed the stolen information which he later passed on. Some of the evidence on which Ethel Rosenberg was convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage was, however, circumstantial, while other documentary exhibits introduced by the prosecution against her were almost certainly bogus. The Federal Bureau of Investigation magnified Ethel Rosenberg's relatively minor role in the spy scandal and blew it completely out of sane proportion. In reality, the FBI was well aware of Mrs. Rosenberg's limited participation in the affair but deliberately exaggerated it, and insisted that federal prosecutors impose the maximum penalty on her, in order to increase the bureau's leverage on her husband to spill everything he knew about the murky world of Soviet espionage in the United States.

The sentences Julius and Ethel Rosenberg received, contend the authors, were far too severe. The double execution, they fairly point out, were a gross and savage overreaction by the United States government, especially in light of the fact that no other previously convicted
spies were put to death, although some received very long prison terms. The Rosenbergs, Radosh and Milton argue persuasively, were randomly selected to meet a harsher mortal end in order to apply pressure on them to confess. The Federal Bureau of Investigation sincerely came to believe that both husband and wife would come clean rather than face certain death. The Rosenbergs, for their part, more than likely remained convinced, probably until the very last hours of their life on earth, that as long as they maintained their pleas of innocence history would undoubtedly vindicate them of all charges. Yet even while they were miles apart on a final resolution to the "war of nerves," the Rosenbergs and the FBI had ironically something in common. When all was said and done, both the accused and the accusers were proven wrong in their assessment of the tragic situation.

From here Radosh and Milton go on to tabulate an interpretive synthesis of their immensely thought-provoking findings. They have particularly angry words of condemnation for the way government officials went about falsely manipulating Ethel Rosenberg's legal rights. This shameful practice was a "vindictive treatment" which bore no relationship to the dictates of law. The death sentence imposed on both parties was, however, "the greatest injustice of all" (p. 451). While there is no longer any serious reservation that the Rosenberg spy ring "managed over a period of years to become... an extensive espionage operation whose contacts were well placed to pass on information on top-secret military projects in the fields of radar and aeronautics," it is no less true that the network "was never the primary conduit of U.S. atomic secrets to the Soviets."

The real reasons the federal prosecutors, the FBI, and the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission] wanted the Rosenbergs' case pursued to the limits of the law had little to do with the precise nature of the crime at hand. There was the expectation, first of all, that Julius Rosenberg could provide the names of other amateur spies in important positions—though not necessarily connected to atomic research. And, secondly, there was the very real desire to frighten other individuals who might potentially lend themselves to such activities in the future. . . .

So, while the Rosenbergs were not the victims of a frame-up, they were indeed hapless scapegoats of a propaganda war—a war in which their deaths would be counted as a victory for both sides. (pp. 451-452)

The FBI and the Justice Department, which bore the brunt of the American government's case against the Rosenbergs, are not the only
participants in the drama to get severely rapped over the knuckles with a stiff reprimand. The Rosenbergs themselves receive a generally uncomplimentary portrait. Far from being politically enlightened citizens with noble ideals, “the Rosenbergs were not admirable people.” Imbued with the mythological impression that the Soviet system was the land of socialist milk and honey, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg “were so captive to their blind adulation of Stalinist Russia that they failed to perceive the true implications of their espionage, much less to comprehend how their actions would discredit the Left in the eyes of their fellow Americans” (p. 453).

Those who openly supported the verdict handed down to the Rosenbergs likewise do not escape the dragnet of criticism. Conservatives and other right-wing travelers who applauded the Rosenbergs’ sentence “were oblivious to the fact that the danger to national security from ideologically motivated amateur spies—already a vanishing breed by the time of the trial—was far less than the damage that would be done by allowing American justice to appear to serve as a handmaiden to Cold War politics” (p. 453).

There is every reason to believe that The Rosenberg File will attract praise and denunciation from adherents of virtually all political shades. But whether Radosh and Milton have succeeded in changing the sharply drawn diatribes of those manning both sides of the barricades is an issue which continues to hang in the balance. For many, the Rosenberg legacy is an article of faith which is solidly carved in stone. Fresh evidence disproving their cherished beliefs one way or the other will go disregarded or unnoticed. Hopefully, The Rosenberg File will promote a more sophisticated and tolerant discussion than has heretofore been witnessed. The final outcome, of course, will depend on whether calm reason or excited emotion form the basis of sober dialogue.

Personal predilections aside, few who take the effort to read the book in its entirety will deny that this is a great accomplishment which directs massive bursts of scholarly energy into every nook and cranny of the subject. The result is an impeccably honest and objective pronouncement which deserves a standing ovation for its meticulous adherence to all the traditional virtues of the historian’s craft. Those who are still so entrenched in their own provincial (and parochial) understanding of the Rosenberg affair that they cannot admit this for them-
selves might do well to heed the soothing words of Emile Zola: “Truth is on the march and nothing can stop it.”

—Andre G. Kuczewski

Andre G. Kuczewski is an historian in the Department of Administration and Policy Studies at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. He is completing a major study on the origins and impact of American educational policy in occupied Japan.
Brief Notices


For as long as the United States has been a sovereign nation, American Jews have celebrated the religious and political freedoms which have been part and parcel of the American Jewish dream. American Jews are the freest Jews in history. But that status and those freedoms did not come easily. They were the result of efforts by both Jews and Christians, extraordinary men and women of vision, who understood America's potential for good. Yet beneath the surface of religious and political rights secured, there lurked a deep antipathy to "Jews, Turks, and Infidels," who were accepted as part of the American social fabric in terms of religious freedom but not in terms of the right to political participation. Efforts to "baptize" the Constitution and to make America a Christian nation dotted the first century and a half of American independence. Individuals, organizations, and state governments were reluctant to grant American Jews their full political rights as American citizens until well into the beginning of the twentieth century. Morton Borden has made an effective beginning in detailing the "mixed signals" of the American government in its understanding of the separation of church and state and the "mixed signals" of American Jews to the most important principle governing their existence as Jews and as Americans.


Contemporary Orthodox Judaism in America has been called a "sleeping giant" which has not only stirred but has awakened to the full realization of its strength and influence. Of the major religious movements within American Judaism, the least is known or understood about Orthodoxy. It is the most diverse of the major movements, and the spectrum of its beliefs, symbols, and rituals is spread over a wide area of American Judaism. Finally, no one is quite certain as to the number of Orthodox Jews in the United States, so that the term "sleeping giant" is perhaps more symbolic than real.

Yet for all its diversity, its lack of precise numbers, and its general unfamiliarity to non-Orthodox American Jews, Orthodox Judaism is an integral part of American Jewish life, learning, and culture. *Dimensions of Orthodox Judaism* is an important book, presenting nearly forty articles, many of them previously published elsewhere, by leading American Jewish thinkers on the many aspects of American Orthodoxy.


This is a book of extraordinary quality and importance. In tracing the encounter of Jews (the chosen people) and America (the chosen nation), and the accommodation of the chosen people to the chosen nation in the three generations of an active American Judaism, Arnold B.
Eisen has given the American Jewish community a new understanding of itself. Eisen demonstrates clearly that the concept of chosenness declined from a theology to an ideology (the Reform mission) and a sociology before returning to an affirmation of election within the context of an American Judaism influenced and affected by the Holocaust and the State of Israel. By itself, Eisen’s skill in demonstrating the efforts of American Jewish thinkers to deal with the concept of chosenness within the American context would merit the highest praises. But he has achieved something beyond that. He has given American Jews the sense that chosenness is an important part of their identity. As Eisen writes, “chosenness ‘succeeded’ when other ideas ‘failed’ because it possessed both coherence and relevance to American Jews.” Indeed, no American Jewish identity is complete without the incorporation of the Holocaust and the State of Israel. Both possess “coherence” and “relevance.” But the American Jewish identity is made up of numerous factors, and Arnold Eisen must be congratulated for demonstrating this fact to the American Jewish community. One can only hope, for the sake of its future, that American Jewry will understand the significance of that message.


Otto Mears (1840–1931) was one of those large-than-life figures possible only in the wild and untamed West of nineteenth-century America. Mears was indeed paradoxical: larger than life, he stood only five feet tall; though born of Jewish parents in Kurland, Russia, and a supporter and member of Jewish organizations, he was variously identified as a Quaker, and a Christian Scientist, and was buried in an Episcopal service; a picture of marital bliss, he was involved in numerous extramarital affairs; a successful businessman who made millions, he had no love for money. Beyond the paradoxical, Mears was an achiever of significant proportions. As a “merchant, road builder, farmer, businessman, miner, politician, promoter, railroad owner, unofficial Indian agent,” Otto Mears was a founding father of Colorado and a symbol of the American enterprise system.


In this well-researched book, Marvin Miller has analyzed the activities and personalities associated with Camp Siegfried, a German-American Bund camp located in Yaphank, Long Island. Miller’s emphasis is on the development of the Nazi movement in the United States during the 1930’s and 1940’s. In this endeavor, he covers much the same ground as Sander A. Diamond’s important book on the Bund. Yet Miller offers a most comprehensive view of the New York situation during the crucial years of Bund activity, its relation to the Nazi movement in Germany, and of American governmental and Jewish organizational opposition to the growth of fascism in the United States.


*Jews of the South* is the second volume of essays to be published under the aegis of the Southern Jewish Historical Society. While not as full or penetrating a volume as the first one, entitled “Turn to the South”: *Essays on Southern Jewry* (1979), the present set of essays
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highlights a number of important Southern Jews, each of whom is worthy of the scholarly attention he or she has received from the authors. The essays cover the lives and times of Moses Elias Levy, who sought and failed to establish an agricultural colony for Jews in Florida, and whose son, David Levy Yulee, would go on to become the first American senator of Jewish origin; Penina Moise, the first American Jewish woman to achieve some distinction in American literature; Rabbi Bernard C. Ehrenreich, a northerner who became an influential progressive force in Montgomery, Alabama; the Sheftalls of Savannah, Georgia, one of the first Jewish families in that state and heroes of the Revolutionary War; Eugenia and Philip Phillips, she a fiery Confederate who was banished to a lonely island for her anti-Union sentiments and he perhaps the outstanding Supreme Court lawyer in American history; and, finally, the writer Ludwig Lewisohn, who sought to merge his soul with the essence of the South by becoming a Christian and a romantic. There is also a memoir by Joseph Joel, a Richmond Jew born in Europe, and a portrait of Jewish-Gentile relations in Valdosta, Georgia.


Dr. Herbert Rosenblum, who has written an important unpublished dissertation on the formation of the United Synagogue of America (USA) in 1913, has now published a concise history of the Conservative Jewish movement in America on the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the USA by Solomon Schechter. The volume is not intended to replace the older, much larger works of Moshe Davis, Herbert Parzen, and Marshall Sklare. It does, however, discuss the most recent history of Conservative Judaism in the past two decades as well as the major issues which confront it.


In 1927, Charles A. Levine became the first Jew to fly across the Atlantic nonstop, as a passenger of Clarence Chamberlin, a well-known pilot. A delighted American Jewish community memorialized this feat in a Yiddish tune entitled “Levine and His Flying Machine.” One of the translated stanzas went as follows: “Levine, Levine, you’re the hero of your race / Levine, Levine, you’re the greatest Hebrew ace / We got a thrill when Chamberlin flew / But you were right there too, we’re proud of you.”

In a sense this song, with its celebration of the Jewish role in a unique American achievement, brought to a close a distinct period of Jewish immigrant music which had lasted for nearly half a century. Mark Slobin’s volume recounts the history of Jewish immigrant popular music in America. He finds in this music “a cultural adhesive” which helped to give Jewish immigrants a sense of identity, and reflected “the energy of people hungry for direction and hoping for the best.”


Edward Wagenknecht, professor emeritus at Boston University, has written a charming, if terribly abbreviated, book which highlights the lives of six important Jewish women of the past two centuries. One of the women, Amy Levy, a poet and novelist, was British, but the
other women are well known to students of the American Jewish experience. Wagenknecht's portraits of Rebecca Gratz, Emma Lazarus, Lillian D. Wald, Emma Goldman, and Henrietta Szold are highly original and delve deeply into the American, Jewish, and female consciousnesses of his subjects.


The essays in this volume were among a number given in 1978 at the highly regarded Duquesne History Forum, an annual conference which attracts historians from across the United States and Canada. Of special interest to scholars of the American Jewish experience are essays by Oscar Handlin on education and the European immigrant, 1820–1920; John and Selma Appel on the use of symbolism in the ideological debates concerning the admission and education of immigrants; Selma Berrol on public schools and the immigrant experience in New York City; and Leonard Dinnerstein on education and the advancement of American Jews.

Correction

In the April 1984 issue the brief notice of Chaim Waxman's book, America's Jews in Transition, on page 77 should read (line six from the bottom of the review), "Waxman does not see the decline of Judaism." American Jewish Archives regrets the error.