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It was one of New York Jewry’s most distinguished historians, Moses Rischen, who cautioned fellow researchers never to forget that “American Jewish history is not New York City Jewish history writ large.” Those who ignore Rischen’s counsel are quite likely to oversimplify the diverse historical character of American Jewry. Students of history must avoid drawing broad generalizations based exclusively on source materials derived from the nation’s five or six large urban Jewish centers. Although the importance of these major centers of Jewish life must never be understated, a robust understanding of the American Jewish experience must incorporate a discussion of Jewish life outside of the megalopolitan communities. What is the story of American Judaism and American Jewry in regions like the South, the Midwest, the Old Southwest, the western frontier, and the Pacific Northwest? Those who strive to reconstruct the nature of Jewish life in these localities contribute significantly to our understanding of the American Jewish past, and the study of the southern Jewish experience is a case in point.

In 1940, W.J. Cash published an important volume titled The Mind of the South, which argued that southerns possess a distinctive set of cultural and sociological values. The book constitutes a landmark publication that has sparked an ongoing historiographical controversy as to whether or not a “southern mindset” exists in the twentieth century and beyond. Although historians and sociologists continue to debate the uniqueness of southern culture, there is truth in the observation that “what makes the mind of the South different is that it thinks it.”

Jews in the American South have long been cognizant of their distinctive regional identity. In 1879, for example, one of America’s most colorful rabbis, Edward Benjamin Morris Browne (1844–1928), bitterly criticized the leadership of the nation’s first congregational alliance, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC), because of what he perceived to be its near total disregard for southern Jewry. In the pages of the Jewish South, another southern Jewish critic from Canton, Mississippi, advised his congregation not to join the UAHC (which he sneeringly transposed as an acronym for the ‘Union of Happy American Cacklers’) “until they shall evidence by their works they have an interest in our section.”

Historical interest in southern Jewry evolved slowly over the twentieth century. From the establishment of the American Jewish Historical Society in 1892 until the 1950s, relatively few studies focused on topics relating to the history of Jewish life in the South. These first fruits included biographical studies of southern Jews and pioneering reconstructions of sundry historical events that pertained to Jewish life in the American South. Many important
documentary analyses were published by so-called amateur historians, and their original research would eventually benefit the subsequent work of professionally trained historians who produced thematic studies on the region.

It is hardly a coincidence that the first critical and interpretive studies of Jewish life in the American South began to appear in the 1950s, shortly after the 1947 founding of the American Jewish Archives (AJA). The AJA’s founder, Jacob Rader Marcus (1896–1995), observed that the “library of the American Jewish Historical Society, situated in the city of New York, has an excellent collection of both manuscripts and printed records, but because of the accident of its geographic situation, [the AJHS] serves primarily, but by no means exclusively, those who dwell in the New York metropolitan area.” Therefore, Marcus declared, “the time [had] come to make provisions . . . to offer study opportunities to the 1,100,000 Jews living in the Mississippi basin.” The AJA quickly began to assemble a rich collection of primary source materials from communities located “between the Rockies and the Cumberland Plateau,” and within a few years Marcus and his protégés, Malcolm H. Stern (1915–1995), Bertram W. Korn (1918–1979), and Stanley Chyet (1931–2002), began to research and publish critical studies on Jewish life in the South and the Midwest.5

In the mid-1950s, a cadre of leaders of the American Jewish Historical Society who were particularly interested in studying Jewish life in the American South founded the Southern Jewish Historical Society. The new society began publishing a journal that appeared irregularly between 1958 and 1963.6 In retrospect, however, it seems as though the publication of Eli Evans’s *The Provincial* in 1973 greatly invigorated the study of southern Jewish history. Evans’s intensely personal account of Jewish life in Durham, North Carolina, was stimulating and insightful, and the book appealed to the scholarly and casual reader alike. Evans attributed the book’s popularity to the public’s fascination with what many perceived to be an exotic topic. “Non-Southerners” he noted “are stunned to learn that the South ever had any Jews at all.” In October 1976, Evans participated in a small gathering of scholars and independent researchers who were interested in revitalizing the field of southern Jewish history. This colloquium breathed new life into the Southern Jewish Historical Society, and the papers that were delivered at that conference were subsequently published.7 From that point forward, the academic field of southern Jewish history has experienced steady and impressive growth.

In recent decades, an increasing number of American Jewish historians have examined the story of Jewish life in the Land of Dixie, and the current issue of our journal powerfully demonstrates this remarkable efflorescence. Mark K. Bauman’s valuable historiographical essay, “A Century of Southern Jewish Historiography,” provides readers with a pioneering reconstruction of the history of southern Jewish scholarship. Dr. Bauman properly summarizes his analysis by observing that despite the many fine studies on southern Jewish
history that have appeared over the past three decades, much remains to be done in the years ahead.

In response to this challenge, we asked Professor Bauman to invite four scholars to contribute new documentary analyses that would enrich this issue’s focus on Southern Jewish history. Two of the four contributors selected documents—all of which are among the holdings of the American Jewish Archives—that enhance our understanding of the role of the rabbi in the South. Scott Langston’s analysis of Rabbi Morris Newfield’s letters written in Birmingham, Alabama, deepens our understanding of the delicate role the rabbi played as an ambassador to the non-Jewish southern community. Shuly Rubin Schwartz offers a fascinating look at some highly introspective correspondence of Paula Ackerman, an extraordinary woman who unexpectedly became the rabbi of Congregation Beth Israel in Meridian, Mississippi, after the death of her husband in 1950. Alan M. Kraut’s essay on the 1873 yellow fever epidemic in Memphis, Tennessee—based on a captivating diary that memorialized the experience—sheds light on the contributions of A.E. Frankland, who remained in the beleaguered community and ministered to the many sufferers, Jew and non-Jew alike. Judah P. Benjamin’s March 1858 Senate speech, examined by Maury Wiseman, provides readers with his nuanced and oftentimes paradoxical view on slavery, one that was as much rooted in British and American legal codes as it was in the implicit pragmatism of that society. We are deeply indebted to Dr. Bauman for his dedicated contributions to the development of this issue on the southern Jewish experience.

Today, the essential character of Jewish life in the South seems to be in the midst of a transformation. Southern Jewish baby boomers have abandoned their isolated rural hometowns in favor of larger urban centers. Consequently, many of the Jewish small-town communities in the Deep South have dried up. The Jewish populations of several large urban centers, on the other hand, have exploded. Still, the basic elements that have long typified Jewish life in the South prevail; it is a region that contains a small, thinly dispersed Jewish population that still tends to rely heavily on interregional collaboration to meet its Jewish needs. It is a Jewish lifestyle that differs, as one scholar observed, “both qualitatively and quantitatively from that of Northern Jewry,” and it is a modus vivendi that Jews who live in the sprawling megalopolitan centers on the coasts find quite difficult to fathom.8

Yet it may well be that this distinctive mode of existence has enabled the Jews of the South to fulfill their self-assigned role as custodians of an ancient tradition in spite of the many inharmonious societal realities that have characterized that particular section of the nation. The maintenance of a communal identification—the dogged attempt to preserve a civic link with other Jews—functions as a critical element in realizing what has of late been called “Jewish continuity.” It was Jacob Marcus who taught that the “leitmotif
of Jewish history in this country is the constant attempt, the determination, to create and further a distinct community with its synagogues, its schools, its charities. It is as simple as that. In Jewry where there is no community there is no history.”9 As this edition of our journal demonstrates, the unrelenting determination to preserve and promote Jewish life in the American South is a story that continues to spark keen historical interest.10

G.P.Z.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Notes

3Browne is better known by his nickname, “Alphabet” Browne, so named by his contemporaries because of his flagrant brandishing of his many academic degrees (i.e., Rabbi E.B.M. Browne, LLD, AM, BM, DD, MD). See Jacob R. Marcus, United States Jewry, Vol. III. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993), 127.
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A Century of Southern Jewish Historiography

Mark K. Bauman

The study of southern Jewish history is flourishing. As recently as twenty years ago, this seemed a neglected subfield attended to by few scholars. Now, however, it attracts numerous scholars from a variety of specialties. Graduate students are writing dissertations about the subject, and thousands are attending exhibits and conferences that draw speakers from throughout the United States, as well as Europe and the Middle East. From where have we come, where are we now, and what are some directions for future study?

I. Historians: The Early Decades

Overview

The study of southern Jewish history is as old as that of American Jewish history. Three out of the first sixteen presentations given at the first meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS) in 1892 and subsequently printed in the first volume of its *Publications* treated southern subjects; a fourth article fully integrated southern examples, as did many of the general pieces.¹

Several patterns appear surprising during the *Publications*’s early decades. First, although the quality is problematic, as discussed below, numerous articles were published on southern Jewish history, with at least one in almost every issue.² Second, the subject is treated as mainstream. In fact, contrasts with experiences in the North and the concept of southern distinctiveness are not even issues, in sharp contrast to current research and scholarly debate.³ Third, after World War II, the stream of articles on southern Jewish history continues, although at a slower pace. What does change is that the southern experience is not as typically integrated into broader articles.⁴

How can one explain these phenomena? A few explanations are possible for the earlier period. From the beginning, the AJHS had officers from the South, and more than 40 percent of the original membership listed southern addresses. These included rabbis Herman M. Bien of Vicksburg (formerly of Dallas), Edward N. Calisch of Richmond, Henry Cohen of Galveston, Moses J. Gries of Chattanooga, Adolph Gutmacher of Baltimore, Max Heller of New Orleans, Joseph Hertz of Columbus, Mississippi, Issac L. Leucht of New Orleans, Max Samfield of Memphis, Alfred G. Moses of Mobile, and Aaron J. Messing, Jr., of Montgomery as well as Rev. Dr. R. Farber of Macon. Some of these men gave presentations that were published.⁵ Yet the most prolific authors on the subject were not rabbis—Benjamin H. Hartogensis, J.H. Hollander, Leon Huhner, and Max J. Kohler. That these were national figures leads to a second possible explanation. The men who established the society and who were
writing about American Jewish history were born prior to the influx of Jews from eastern Europe after 1881. Their central European backgrounds offered a different view of Jewish America than those who wrote fifty or seventy years hence. The story of the ancestors that they recorded was of dispersal throughout America. The sizes of the Jewish communities North and South were not that different, and the major enclaves in New York and other northern cities were just achieving a position of hegemony as the historians grew up. In short, the experiences of Jews across regional lines did not appear to be significantly different. This was particularly so because most of the articles were simple descriptions of the origins of Jewish communities designed to establish early Jewish roots in America. Finally, issues such as slavery, racism, antisemitism, and Zionism that later fueled the debates over distinctiveness were viewed either differently or less significantly than they were later, or writers avoided them because they were considered too divisive.

From the 1890s through the 1920s, in an era of national reconciliation and heightened discrimination against African-Americans, the few articles that touch on slavery and the Civil War recognize Jewish slaveholding in the South while glorifying the role of U.S. Senator and Confederate Cabinet member, Judah P. Benjamin. They also note southerners, including David Einhorn and Solomon Heydenfeldt, who opposed slavery, as well as northerners, such as New York rabbi Morris J. Raphall, who supported it. None of the articles treats racism. The articles on discrimination against Jews in colonial Georgia and the struggle to gain full political rights in Maryland and North Carolina do not view southern gentiles as any more or less tolerant than those in the North. Historical discussion of American Zionism awaited the future, and the men who were writing the history likely would not have perceived substantial differences among themselves. Thus, for this first generation, the needs for a separate Southern Jewish Historical Society and a regional journal, *Southern Jewish History*, would have been inconceivable.

The earliest articles on American and southern Jewish history are typically filiopietistic. Their authors illustrated early roots and emphasized Jewish contributions while ignoring divisions and negative activities in order to foster their roles in an America that questioned the presence of immigrants in general and Jews in particular. Although this was typical, not all of the authors and articles fit neatly into this framework. Moreover, as Ira Robinson finds, the early work should be viewed in relation to what was happening in American historical scholarship as a whole. In this light, it reflected the “scientific” research of the era that emphasized documents to the neglect of themes and, following genteel tradition, avoided controversy. Unfortunately, as the study of American history became professionalized, the students of American Jewry failed to keep pace.

Robinson notes that Cyrus Adler, the key founder of the AJHS, worked closely with Herbert Baxter Adams, a founder of the American Historical...
Adams was a pioneer American history professor at Johns Hopkins University, and Adler—Arkansas-born founder of the Jewish Publication Society and the Smithsonian’s librarian—earned his doctorate in Assyriology at the same institution. As indicated below, two of the four most prolific authors in American and particularly southern Jewish history earned undergraduate degrees at Johns Hopkins, the premier graduate school in history during the period and a bridge between North and South. It is to the articles of these four that we now turn.

The Amateur Historians

Identifying patriot-heroes preoccupied these pioneer historians, who wanted to highlight the early and important Jewish loyalty to America. Leon Huhner’s article on Francis Salvador of South Carolina does this. His groundbreaking article on the test oath in North Carolina stands in vivid contrast to his filioptistic pieces on Jewry in early South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia. Although his article on early Georgia ends with a flourish highlighting Jewish contributions and quoting fellow contributor Charles C. Jones, who found that, “In the record of the Jews of the Colony of Georgia there is no stain,” Huhner uses the available primary and secondary sources in a critical fashion, disagrees with others, indicates where conclusions remained unclear, and emphasizes divisions between Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Essentially, Huhner’s article refutes and expands on the work of Jones, a gentile who was a respected historian of Georgia. While Jones claims that the Jews of colonial Georgia were never among the malcontents, Huhner documents Jewish support for slavery, which, he argues, was the reason many left for South Carolina, a slaveholding colony. Most contemporary historians have ignored Huhner’s lead and assumed that the Conversos of Iberian origin fled Georgia because of fear of returning under the Inquisition if Spain conquered the colony. Although some of his facts required correction, Huhner’s article remains a valuable contribution to the field.

Articles like Huhner’s lack analytic themes and ignore comparative perspective, but they did provide descriptive backgrounds that could serve as foundations for future work. His article on David Levy Yulee pulls no punches and is only now being fleshed out. He refutes an earlier article by Yulee’s son, shows conflicts with Yulee and his father and with Yulee and Jefferson Davis, and elaborates on Yulee’s proslavery and prosecessionist radicalism. Far from ignoring the tenuous ties with Judaism of this Florida state-builder and its first U.S. Senator, Huhner observes that “he can be regarded as a Jew by race only…”

At least one contemporary was clearly aware of Huhner’s failings and took him to task for errors. Barnett A. Elzas questioned how someone writing in New York could access the appropriate sources in South Carolina and accused Huhner of plagiarizing Elzas’s work. While rabbi of Charleston’s K.K. Beth Association (established 1884).
Elohim, Elzas wrote what became for half a century the standard history of South Carolina Jewry. That Elzas’s writings today seem as outmoded as those of his contemporaries does not detract from the fact that these historians were conscious of, and wanted to maintain standards of, what was then considered sound scholarship.17

J.H. Hollander’s work raises similar historiographic questions as Huhner’s. When describing *de jure* and *de facto* discrimination against Jews in Maryland, his writing style appears formal and stilted, and yet his diligent research unearthed substantial appropriate citations.18 Although he develops neither, Hollander’s documentary material on Jacob Lumbrozo of Maryland includes two main components. It begins with an analytic periodization scheme reflecting secular and Jewish themes and follows with a comparison of discrimination in Maryland in relation to other colonies. Although he utilizes primary records pre-dating the new social history of the 1960s, Hollander ultimately fails to deliver the sophisticated case study that the introduction promises and produces, instead, a basic narrative of an individual’s life in a highly sentimental style.19

Benjamin H. Hartogensis published descriptive articles based on primary sources. He wrote about a short-lived (1857–1860) Sephardic congregation, Beth Israel, in Baltimore and traced the influence of Isaac Leeser and of Richmond Jews on the congregation and the movement of the Sunday school from Rebecca Gratz’s Philadelphia south via Sarah N. Carvalho and Josephine Etting among others. These themes of central and peripheral Jewish communities and the movement of institutions and ideas remain important to historians today. He also discusses dissension within the congregation and the reasons for its decline. He looks at the important roles of women in an article on a night school for Jewish immigrants established by Henrietta Szold in 1889. Although not a modern demographer, he describes the students’ backgrounds. That Hartogensis had family and personal ties to both institutions (his father served as a reader of the congregation, his wife replaced Szold as superintendent, and he convinced the school superintendent to continue the program after the school’s demise) does not detract from the knowledge he imparts.20

Max J. Kohler wrote biographical pieces on Judah Touro, Judah P. Benjamin, and Isaac Harby, three important individuals significant for both southern and American Jewish history. Kohler’s florid prose, glorifying traits that Kohler and his contemporaries frequently described as “typical of what is best in the Jewish character,” and establishing a record of Jewish contributions ignored by gentile historians of the day place him in the filiopietists’ camp. One must also get past his characterization of Jews as a race, with unique racial characteristics, and his acceptance of slavery as a benign institution—all part of his milieu. His article on Benjamin has been partly refuted. Yet in it, he discusses Benjamin’s career before and after the Civil War and his roles especially in law, government, and diplomacy. Kohler recognizes Benjamin’s marriage to a Catholic, his lack of
association with Jewish institutions, and the failure of his policy toward England. Kohler’s article on Harby gives little insight into Reform Judaism in Charleston but instead refers readers to other published work on the subject. It does, however, describe the literary culture in Charleston and alludes to parallels with Mordecai M. Noah, both of which play a major part in the analytic biography of Harby written by Gary P. Zola sixty years later. Kohler, like most of these pioneers, integrates southern Jewry into his broader studies.

The usefulness of the articles written during the first fifty years of the AJHS is clearly limited, and one must always be aware of errors. Yet if these articles are ignored, historians run the risk of “discovering” history that is already part of the record. Moreover, unfortunately, too much of what has passed as southern Jewish history during the last fifty years has not surpassed the low level of sophistication of the earlier work. Still, we must return to the question of what prompted the early historians’ interest in the subject.

With Dutch roots, Benjamin Henry Hartogensis (1865–1939) graduated from Johns Hopkins and received a law degree from the University of Maryland. He served as associate editor of the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent, founder and president of the Baltimore branch of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, and president of the Hebrew Education Society of Baltimore. Hartogensis stands out among the other historians in that he came from a long line of Jewish religious traditionalists. He served as honorary counsel of the Federation of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of Baltimore City and was a founder and president of the Baltimore branch of the Jewish Territorial Organization. As has been shown, his deep roots in Baltimore relate directly to his research interests.

Born in Baltimore, Jacob Henry Hollander (1871–1940) also attended Johns Hopkins, where he received his undergraduate degree and a doctorate degree in economics. A professor of political economy at Amherst and Johns Hopkins (1894–1940), Hollander served as an economist for the federal government and received presidential appointments as treasurer of Puerto Rico and financial advisor to the Dominican Republic. A member of Har Sinai of Baltimore and a founder of the American Jewish Committee, he also presided over the American Economics Association (1921–1922). An academic economist, Hollander can still be classified as an amateur in terms of history, his avocation.
Max James Kohler (1871–1934), born in Detroit, was the son of Reform rabbi and Hebrew Union College (HUC) president Kaufmann Kohler and grandson of radical Reform rabbi and abolitionist David Einhorn. He graduated from City College of New York (CCNY) and obtained masters and bachelor of law degrees from Columbia University before entering the New York Bar in 1893. After serving as an assistant U.S. attorney, Kohler entered private practice, where he specialized in immigration cases. He served as president of the Judaeans, vice president of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, curator and vice-president of the American Jewish Historical Society, and secretary of the Baron de Hirsch Fund (1905–1934). He also helped found the American Jewish Committee, serving as a member of its executive committee and chairing its committee on immigration, and edited the Americana section of the Standard Jewish Encyclopedia. With the rise of Hitler to power in Germany, he worked with the Joint Consultative Committee of the American Jewish Committee, the B’nai B’rith, and the American Jewish Congress in an attempt to alleviate the persecution faced by Germany’s Jews. In this regard, the secretary of labor appointed him to the Ellis Island and Immigrant Relief Committee in 1933. Huhner described him as “a distinguished jurist, an effective communal worker, a careful historian, a noted publicist, a scholar, a useful citizen and always a patriotic American.”

Leon Huhner (1871–1957) was born in Berlin but moved to New York with his family in 1876. Like Kohler, he graduated from CCNY, earned law degrees at Columbia, and was a member of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences. A member of Shearith Israel in New York, he served as president of the North American Relief Society for the Indigent Jews of Palestine and, for half a century, as curator of the American Jewish Historical Society. In his thorough and insightful history of the society’s journal publications, Jeffrey Gurock calls Huhner the “most prolific contributor” to the journal during this apologetic era.

Numerous individuals wrote articles on Jews in the South from the 1890s to World War II. Yet the four described here were the most prolific and were also representative. Several patterns emerge from their profiles. One that stands out is their dates of birth. All, along with Lee M. Friedman (1871–1957), an attorney, author, and society president, and Herbert Friedenwald (1870–1944), long-time recording and corresponding secretary of the AJHS, were born between 1865 and 1871. These men grew up during an era of sectional reconciliation when the Old South image was embellished, the New South creed blurred regional distinctions, and racism rose to a national zenith. Acknowledging Jews as slaveholders or supporters of the Confederacy would not tarnish the patriotic image these men worked to establish. Moreover, these men started the society while in their twenties, an age when documenting the beginnings of Jewish communities would have been exciting detective work. Most were attorneys and
community activists for whom the study of discrimination against Jews came as naturally as their affiliation with the American Jewish Committee. Work on behalf of recent immigrants made the story of the eastern European Jews more current events than history. Affluent and well educated, these men, however unsuccessful in the eyes of a future generation, also attempted to attain the goals of then-acceptable “scientific” history. Either German or Dutch immigrants themselves or scions of older immigrant families, this generation of amateur historians found it logical to trace the roots of Judaism in America. For them, the role of Jews in the South was integral to that story. More remarkably, much of the history written during the mid-twentieth century and indeed today does not rise above their elementary level of analytic sophistication or that furthermore gradually the history of Jews in the South became marginalized or moved to the periphery.

II. Historians: Mid-Twentieth Century

When did the tide begin to turn in the quality of scholarship? Jacob R. Marcus points to the post-World War II era as the dividing line for American Jewish history. He offered the first graduate course in the field, founded the American Jewish Archives (AJA), and began the journal of the same name. Also, the National Jewish Welfare Board created Jewish History Week, a national conference on the subject was sponsored by Commentary, and PAJHS became the quarterly publication American Jewish History (AJH). Nathan Kaganoff traces the “watershed” in the AJHS and its publications to the presidency of Lee M. Friedman (1948–1952), who transformed the program and mission to include the study of the retention of tradition and identity along with adaptation and contributions. In so doing, the AJHS moved toward the mainstream of American historical scholarship. Friedman was followed by Salo Baron of Columbia University, David de Sola Pool, rabbi and historian of Shearith Israel in New York, Jacob R. Marcus, and Bertram W. Korn, all noted scholars.

After World War II and particularly after the AJHS and its journal were reorganized in 1954, interest in southern Jewry declined. Articles on the South, particularly those integrating southern into American Jewish history, appeared less frequently. Again, the historian searches for plausible explanations. Many of the early members of the society either died or grew older and were less involved. A new generation took their place including Baron, Marcus, Oscar Handlin of Harvard, and their students. As Jeffrey Gurock argues, a critical confrontation precipitated by Handlin also contributed to substantial change. Scholarship replaced defensive filiopietism, and expansive coverage began to fill numerous gaps.

However excellent the broader discussions of Gurock, Marcus, Kaganoff, and others, they ignore southern-specific issues. Student and faculty quotas aimed against Jews were becoming things of the past. Both the backgrounds
and interests of the historians shifted. Northern historians employed by northern universities predominated. Eastern European Jews and their descendents largely residing in northern industrial cities, especially New York, overwhelmed the descendents of the Jews from central Europe and those who lived outside of the northern metropolises. Concern now centered around the eastern European Jewish experience, labor unions, Zionism, and national organizations, all of which were situated in the North. The emphasis shifted away from the colonial era and nineteenth century to trace the origins of those now writing history. Jews in the South as well as the West did not seem to share this history. Those researching Jewish life in these regions generally concentrated on the period before 1881, to the neglect of eastern European Jewish history. Until the last thirty years and even more recently, one could read southern Jewish history virtually without being aware that eastern European Jews had entered the region and brought with them Zionism, socialism, Orthodoxy, and Yiddish culture.

Ironically, Marcus’s new publication, a competitor to the PAJHS and one of the catalysts for its improvement, did not neglect the region. When perusing the early pages of American Jewish Archives founded by Marcus in 1947, one is struck by the paucity of articles and the fact that their quality generally harkens back to the Dark Ages of the PAJHS. Primary sources without annotation and articles lacking authorship appeared regularly. Marcus may not have been at fault, however. Fred Krome, a recent managing editor, notes that Marcus complained of not having enough satisfactory manuscripts submitted. He published primary documents to encourage sound scholarship. The nature of the early journal conforms to Marcus’s stated mission for it. He wanted to use it to make people aware of the archive’s materials and to publish “at least one article of scientific caliber.” Marcus’s consciousness of mid-American Jewry had a positive impact on the coverage of southern Jewry, and articles and documents concerning it are numerous. Marcus integrated the South and West into his studies and apparently encouraged his protégés, including Bertram W. Korn, Stanley Chyet, and later Gary P. Zola, to do so as well. It is to Marcus, Korn, Chyet, and another of Marcus’s students and the fourth key historian/rabbi, Malcolm Stern, of this HUC nexus of midcentury that we now focus attention.

The Rabbi/Historians

Although the life of Jacob Rader Marcus (1896–1995), the acknowledged “Dean of American Jewish historians,” is well documented, his interest in the South has not been singled out. Besides this being reflected in his journal, Marcus’s documentary collections and monographs routinely integrated the southern experience into the field.

Because his vision was national and he stressed documents and descriptions, Marcus, like his predecessors, saw the South as part of the whole. Jews in the
South are frequently used as examples, and their experiences are not differentiated within his themes. Among his many contributions, Marcus pioneered social history. To him, the lives of women and the common people were pivotal to the understanding of an American Jewish past, one that included the South. Having said this, reading the southern documents in *Memoirs of American Jews*, along with Marcus’s fine introductions, one cannot avoid these people’s allegiance to slavery, the Confederacy, and the Lost Cause, even though—as Korn would do as well—he also pointed to defections on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

Marcus had several important ties to the South. He was from a small-town, Jewish family. His father, Aaron, moved from job to job and town to town after his emigration from Lithuania in 1889. In 1909, Aaron, his wife Jennie, and their children went from southwest Pennsylvania to Wheeling, West Virginia, where Aaron opened a small clothing store and became the president of an Orthodox congregation that he had helped establish. From 1909 to about 1926, Aaron Marcus ran a general store in Farmington, West Virginia.

The time in Wheeling was pivotal for Jacob. In the absence of an Orthodox congregation, he attended the Eoff Street Temple (Congregation LeShem Shomayim) Sunday school. There he became a protégé of Reform Rabbi Harry Levi. Levi offered young Marcus confirmation, then private lessons, and himself as a role model. Levi also suggested that he attend HUC, where he enrolled at the age of 15 in 1911. The college president was Kaufmann Kohler, Max Kohler’s father and one of the foremost spokespeople of Reform Judaism. Marcus’s studies were interrupted by service during World War I. After initial training, he was assigned to the base in Wetumka, near Montgomery, Alabama, before departure to France. Upon his return to college, Marcus was assigned a student pulpit in Lexington, Kentucky. He continued in this position for three years. In 1916, Marcus’s first published article, “America: The Spiritual Center of Jewry,” appeared in the *Wheeling Jewish Community Bulletin*. Soon after graduation and ordination in 1920, Marcus began his lifetime association with Hebrew Union College as a faculty member, only interrupted when he undertook four formative years of study in Berlin. He also resumed his functions in the Lexington congregation for four years.39

Marcus’s career is inexorably situated in the seminary of the Reform movement and in the archives he created in Cincinnati, located on the Ohio River.
directly across from Kentucky. From Cincinnati, Marcus’s students fanned out first as student rabbis and then in their own pulpits, as HUC students had been doing since the days of Isaac Mayer Wise. The college had always drawn donations and support from people in the heartland. Wise had traveled to the South and the Midwest encouraging the building and nurturance of congregations. His *American Israelite* sought circulation and printed stories of these far-flung communities, and his Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) also brought them together. Wise’s dream of a unified American Jewry contributed to his remaining silent in relation to the Civil War and slavery, even though he opposed the latter. The same vantage point for Marcus fostered an image of a different sort. Marcus would create a national history to forge the identity of a national Jewish American community. Although both he and his wife were of eastern European Orthodox parentage, Marcus became the president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) in 1948 and historian of a national Reform movement.

One cannot understand colonial American Jewish history without knowledge of Savannah, Charleston, and the Southwest, nor the development of Reform Judaism in America without starting with Charleston and moving to Baltimore and New Orleans. No history of nineteenth-century American Jewry can be complete without adding Richmond and the other city and small-town experiences of the region. Moreover, Marcus and his AJA drew numerous collections from Reform congregations and organizations in the South as a result of the age and persistence of these communities and as a reflection of the influence of his graduates with pulpits there. Besides continuous association with these rabbis, Marcus’s students returned to Cincinnati from assignments as student rabbis in the South with information and stories of their experiences as well as greetings from the many laypeople Marcus knew in the area from his travels and speaking engagements.

Bertram Wallace Korn (1918–1979) was Marcus’s first associate editor and taught for a year at HUC before entering his pulpit career. Loyal to their mentor, Korn’s and Chyet’s articles in the early issues of *American Jewish Archives* stand out. When they began work as associate editors, the journal’s quality improved substantially, so that more and better articles supplemented the publication of the archive’s primary sources and records. Marcus was a legendary teacher, and students such as Korn and Chyet did justice to their mentor’s positive influence. As the correspondence between them demonstrates, Chyet reviewed Marcus’s manuscripts and Korn scouted for primary documents. Korn and his teacher corresponded frequently, with Korn always being addressed and signing his letters as “Pop,” the nickname Marcus had given him during his first class, and always addressing his mentor formally and with respect as “Dr. Marcus.” Stern, too, was an active and steady participant in the fellowship. The men constantly exchanged information and sources, and Stern’s interest in genealogy
is reflected in the others’ work. Korn earns the claim as the first academically trained historian to concentrate his scholarly output on southern Jewish history and whose work is of lasting significance. A biographical sketch about Korn provides background to better understand his publications.

After his ordination at the college in 1943, Korn accepted the pulpit at congregation Sha’arai Shomayim in Mobile. Although he remained only a year before entering the Navy chaplaincy, this stay began his foray into southern Jewish history. Upon his return from World War II service, he pursued a Doctorate of Hebrew Letters under Marcus while at the same time serving Temple Emanuel in Mansfield, Ohio. After a year as assistant professor and assistant to the president at HUC, Korn accepted the pulpit at Kenesseth Israel in Elkins Park, Pennsylvania, a position he held until his death. He continued part-time teaching at the college’s New York campus for two decades and, in the 1970s, assumed the same duties at Dropsie College in Philadelphia. Like Marcus and the early practitioners of American Jewish history, he was active in numerous pursuits.41

Korn’s dissertation, published as American Jewry and the Civil War,42 remains a well-balanced, standard work. In it, he carefully explains the positions of Jews in the North and South and delineates a complex picture of split loyalties and varied divisions. Like Marcus, Korn set the record straight, in part, to redefine contemporary Jewish identity through history and to combat antisemitism in his midst.43 In the preface to his volume on New Orleans, Korn traces his interest to his friendship with Rabbi Julian Feibelman and to trips he took to the city while serving the Mobile congregation. Rather than analyzing, he takes a biographical approach partly because of his interest and because the New Orleans Jewish community took so long to materialize. He concludes that, with a few exceptions, the city’s Jewish community developed similarly to other American cities by the 1830s. His New Orleans research contributed to an article on Florida as well as other works. His short work on the early Jews of Mobile was dedicated to his father and to the president of Sha’arai Shomayim, who had brought Korn to the congregation. Again, this book is more a chronicle with descriptive lists of early individuals, their successes and failures, than an analytic history. Typically, he sets the record straight, for example, on dates of the congregation’s founding, its first leaders, and its Ashkenazic as opposed to previously claimed Sephardic origins. He finds tremendous mobility and interaction with other Jewish com-
munities but fails to draw conclusions or to comment on the significance of information. Korn’s knowledge, his depth of research, and his placement of the Jewish material in context are formidable. Yet sometimes students display the negative as well as the positive traits of their mentors. Korn’s determination to provide every fact and tell history through endless anecdotes about individuals can read tendentiously. Like chronicles before and since, his city histories are more repositories of information than explications of themes, as exemplified by Korn’s section on the “The First Documented Jew in New Orleans.” This is also true of his inclination to identify every child and child’s age, a practice he clearly shared with his mentor and Malcolm Stern, and a practice reflected in their correspondence. Like the previous generation of historians, he was not above bestowing glittering praise on his subjects in flowery prose.44

A second Marcus student, Stanley Franklin Chyet (1931–2002), was born in Boston and received his bachelor’s degree in Near Eastern Civilizations and a Phi Beta Kappa key as a member of Brandeis University’s first graduating class in 1952. He followed this with a Bachelor’s of Hebrew Letters from Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR), New York. The Cincinnati campus awarded him a Master’s of Hebrew Letters, his doctorate, and rabbinic ordination. He held the Frank Research Fellowship in American Jewish History while pursuing his doctorate. His dissertation, subsequently published, was titled, “A Merchant of Eminence: The Story of Aaron Lopez.”45 He served as Marcus’s second associate editor of American Jewish Archives and as assistant director of the AJA for many years. In 1969 he became associate professor at the Los Angeles campus, where he spent the remainder of his career and held several administrative posts, including director of the Magnin School of Graduate Studies and assistant to the president of the Skirball Cultural Center. Totally dedicated to Marcus and the college, he continued his roles at the archives after moving to Los Angeles and also wrote a history of the archives from 1947–1961.46 From Marcus, Chyet learned the value of careful documentation, analysis, and interest in social history. Chyet served congregations for short periods in Fort Wayne, Indiana; Bradford, Pennsylvania; Alton, Illinois; three towns in Ohio; Trinidad, Colorado; and, most important for our understanding, Texarkana, Texas; and Welch, West Virginia. Thus, although born and raised in Boston and spending much of his adult life in Los Angeles, he gained Marcus-type exposure to the heartland’s small towns.47

Chyet, a poet, short story writer, and translator of Jewish literature, was especially drawn to Ludwig Lewisohn, a German immigrant who spent difficult and formative years in Charleston before attaining literary heights and becoming a Zionist and advocate of Jewish tradition. Lewisohn, Chyet’s mentor while at Brandeis, became the subject of his rabbinic thesis as well as numerous articles. He and his wife even named their son Michael Lewisohn. Chyet ably describes the famous author’s Charleston years of alienation from Judaism, exposure to
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antisemitism, and isolation in a closed social environment. By the time he enrolled in the College of Charleston, Lewisohn was well on his way to ill-fated adjustment that only bred further isolation. This theme of marginality—even for Jews in the South who tried to associate with the majority, as Lewisohn did—is of major significance in the understanding of southern Jewish history. Perhaps for Chyet, Lewisohn brought together the things dear to him: history and literature, and the redemptive powers of Zionism and Jewish tradition. Chyet’s interests in the arts and southern Jewry also brought Moses Jacob Ezekiel to his attention. Born in Richmond, Ezekiel attended the Virginia Military Academy and fought for the Confederacy. Ezekiel claimed exalted Sephardic ancestry, but, although family members owned and traded in slaves, he was brought up in poor circumstances. He maintained that he fought for state rights and not to defend slavery, a position of many southerners. His real claim to fame came as an expatriate sculptor. Chyet’s collection of documents, in keeping with Marcus’s schema, included memoirs by Texas rabbis Samuel L. Rosinger and G. George Fox.

Chyet did break from his mentor’s pattern in one important area. Marcus freely proclaimed his disdain for secondary literature. He concentrated on telling history from the sources instead of relating his findings to the arguments of other historians. Chyet wrote the first essay on the historiography of southern Jewry. In it, he refers to what he views as the highly distinctive experiences of Jews in the region, experiences he describes in tones of virtual dismissal. He gives credit to a new cadre of historians making major contributions but derides most of the contemporary studies as “episodic” and overly focused on the Old South. “What has resulted,” he writes, “is a certain provincialism in the presentation of Southern Jews and Southern Jewish history.”

Born in Philadelphia, Malcolm Stern (1915–1995) received his undergraduate degree at the University of Pennsylvania as well as three degrees and ordination at HUC and advanced training in Lausanne. He also took classes at Dropsie College for three semesters. While there, he took a course under Ismar Elbogen, one of Marcus’s teachers in Berlin. Stern had to search his family tree three
generations back for an immigrant stream in Germany as opposed to eastern Europe. On his mother’s side, he boasted two great uncles who were in HUC’s first graduating class. His mother helped establish the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom following World War I. As a child living on a suburban Philadelphia farm, he was exposed to antisemitism and racism, experiences reinforced in rabbinic student posts in West Point, Georgia, and Virginia. Stern became a chaplain in the Army Air Corps during World War II, spending time in Nashville and Montgomery. His military service interrupted his rabbinate at Congregation Keneseth Israel, where Korn later assumed the pulpit. Unlike the others, Stern spent substantial time in the South, serving as rabbi of Ohef Sholom Temple in Norfolk, Virginia, from 1947 to 1964. These were pivotal times for the rabbi and the region. Stern gained empathy for the people and the conditions in which they lived. He and many of his congregants were moderates with regard to civil rights for African-Americans in the face of massive resistance. These experiences influenced his writings.

From 1964 to 1980 he directed rabbinic placement for the CCAR, a position that then and later kept him in close contact with congregations and rabbis throughout the country. His work as staff genealogist (1949–1994) and his acquisition of primary documents for the AJA kept him in close contact with Marcus, Korn, and Chyet. As Stern was closer in age to Marcus, he addressed Marcus as “Jake” in correspondence, and Marcus in turn addressed Stern as “Mac.” Stern taught American Jewish history as an adjunct at the New York campus and supervised student pulpit work for almost fifteen years.52

Besides his direct contact with Virginia Jewry, Stern’s genealogical research drew him to the South. Jewish family ties from 1654 to 1840 knew no regional barriers. With so few Jewish mates available, the families intermarried with each other, or, as he also documented, individuals either chose to remain single or married out of the faith. These are patterns reinforced by recent genealogical studies cited below.53 From his experience and research, Stern wrote an important essay on the role of Reform rabbis in the South. This essay and important memoirs of his civil rights struggles in Norfolk.

Malcom Stern working on genealogies.
(Courtesy American Jewish Archives)
illustrate that Stern’s long-term residence in the South provided him with a more nuanced understanding than Chyet’s short-term assignments did. Steeped in documentation like his colleagues and, like Marcus, particularly interested in the Sheftall family, Stern also provided two critical articles concerning Savannah’s early history.54

Of the four rabbi/historians, some of Stern’s work stands up perhaps best. Korn and Marcus are noteworthy for impressive primary research and detail, but Stern offered more analysis. While Marcus’s use of waves of immigration was normative, it has required substantial revision in terms of variation and gradation.55 A good example is Stern’s “The 1820s: American Jewry Comes of Age,” appropriately published in a volume honoring Marcus and edited by Korn.56 Stern establishes the context in Europe and America and explains how emigration from England and Holland during the 1820s preceded the Germanic influx of the next decade. Making distinctions between Jews in small towns and cities, he develops the themes of acculturation, movement into the hinterland, and the changing relationship between Americanized Jews and the government. He concludes that the era witnessed a flowering for American Jewry with long-term consequences. Stern illustrates ties of business, interaction with the government, and the movement of religion unlimited by regional boundaries.

In sum, Marcus, Chyet, and Korn were of eastern European ancestry. They, along with Stern, had military experience and held doctorates in history as well as rabbinic ordinations. The three did not come from wealthy families, and they all experienced life in communities with smaller Jewish populations in the South and Midwest. Like their amateur historian predecessors, they, as well as Stern, were Reform; but the Reform movement underwent substantial changes before and during their careers. Hitler and the Holocaust had shattered complacency. As Marcus stated, the United States emerged as the center of world Jewry. With the Columbus Platform of 1937, the Reform rabbinate accepted Zionism, a position solidified with the establishment of Israel. Children of eastern European immigrants filled HUC, and families of eastern European descent were well on the road to acculturation and affluence. Stern’s family background differentiated him from the others, yet he benefited from many multicultural and small-town experiences that tended to lessen the distinctions. Thus, like their predecessors, Marcus and his students viewed American Jewish history from a holistic as opposed to a New-York-centered lens, but they did so for very different reasons.

Korn and Chyet appear to be the first to clearly delineate distinctively southern Jewish characteristics. Yet Marcus had marked the path by illustrating the allegiance of Jews in the South to slavery, the Civil War, and the Lost Cause. He demonstrated interest in Jews on both sides of the Civil War, as did his students.57
First and Second Generation Historians Compared and Contrasted

How far had we come? To what extent had we remained the same? Both the first and second generation of American and southern Jewish historians stressed the “scientific” nature of their work. Nonetheless, both were influenced by their times and their personal experiences even to the point of writing about family members. Both strove to be accurate, to base their research on the sources, to use a biographical approach, and to publish everything on a topic they could find. Both published primary documents to encourage further discussion and research. The second generation was far more successful in these areas than the first, which it sought to correct. The first, although with warnings, identified Jews based on last names and described Jews in racial terms—practices eschewed by their successors. The historians of the mid-twentieth century claimed as a major distinction to be analytic. Yet, in the cases of Marcus and Korn, as well as Stern’s genealogical work, so much of their writing is episodic and given to individual biography that their record on this score is mixed. Chyet is known for his Lopez biography, but his southern work is often forgotten or, as is the case with the Lewisohn material, superseded by the two-volume biography written by Ralph Melnick. The first generation of historians used history to combat antisemitism and establish the identity of Jews as loyal Americans. The second generation continued the fight against persecution and sought the unity of American Jewry. The first generation concentrated on the earliest presence of Jews in America and the ways in which Jews demonstrated loyalty—particularly during wars—to document a Jewish claim to equal citizenship. Besides preserving and publishing documentary records, Marcus’s greatest effort may have been his three volumes on the Jews of early America. Stern traced the first families, and Korn described the early histories of Mobile, New Orleans, and West Florida. Starting with the colonial era and emanating from the Reform movement, these first two generations of historians integrated the southern experience into their work.

III. Historians: 1968 to 1984

The Civil Rights Movement, Alex Haley’s Roots, cultural and social history from the bottom up, women’s rights, and the consequent movement to multiculturalism and ethnic sensitivity freed those interested in American Jewish history to pursue scholarly study for larger and more receptive academic and lay audiences. Certainly those responsible for opening the field include Marcus; Oscar Handlin of Harvard; and John Higham, Johns Hopkins University professor and author of important works on anti-immigrant discrimination and, especially, antisemitism. Since the 1960s, the historians involved are too numerous to list. Among the subjects that have dominated are national Jewish organizations and movements, Jews and socialism, American Jewry and the Holocaust, Zionism, Israel, and studies of northern Jewish communities.
The rich flourishing of American Jewish history from the late 1960s and 1970s took time to sink roots in the South and is taking even longer to reintegrate southern Jewry into the national picture. Images of southern racism, religious fundamentalism, conservatism, poverty, and the seeming lack of southern Jewish participation on the national arena raised questions about why and how Jews could live in the region. Failure of historical memory contributed to questions as to the very existence of Jews in the South. The history of southern Jewry has seemed unknown (were there really Jews in the South?), exotic (they must have been different to live in the South), and peripheral (these provincials were more influenced by the South than they influenced it). The earliest historiographic essays lamented the paucity of historians and production in the field and castigated much of the work as filiopietistic.59

The historiographic patterns both benefited and limited the study of southern Jewry. They encouraged a renaissance of interest and ultimately the establishment of southern Jewish history as a recognized subfield worthy of serious and extensive analysis. Yet the vibrant image of New York’s eastern European Jewry made popular by Irving Howe’s *World of Our Fathers* and embedded in the liberalism of twentieth century northern Jews was juxtaposed to the stereotype of a South dominated by “German” Jewish Classical Reformers equally given to accommodation to southern mores and opposition to political Zionism. Ignorance of the eastern European Jewish experience in the South, a scarcity of research in southern Jewish dissent, and a lack of in-depth comparative research contributed to the vivid contrast made between regions. Northern Jewish history is not New York Jewish history writ large, nor is southern Jewish history monolithic. This is not to argue that there are no regional differences, but rather that the search for such distinctiveness has been exaggerated and tends to retard the emergence of a more complete, nuanced, and accurate understanding of what it was like for various Jewish subcommunities to live in the South over time.

Nonetheless, the gradual coming of age of modern southern Jewish history can be traced to the transitional period from 1968 to 1984, when the rabbi/historians were joined by a plethora of enthusiasts. In 1968, Columbia University’s press published Leonard Dinnerstein’s dissertation on the Leo Frank case. The book, highlighting a pivotal event in southern and American Jewish history, has remained in print for forty years. Dinnerstein followed with research on antisemitism that integrated southern Jewry into the national story; he also coedited an anthology on southern Jewry. 60 In 1973, Eli N. Evans’s *The Provincials: A Personal History of the Jews in the South* appeared, a book so popular that it was reissued on its twenty-fifth anniversary and remains in print.61 His work, along with the award-winning plays by Alfred Uhry,62 several other publications, and institutional developments, deserve substantial credit for popularizing the history for a regional and national audience. Steven
Hertzberg’s revised University of Chicago dissertation, *Strangers Within the Gate City: The Jews of Atlanta, 1845–1915*, was published in 1978; it remains one of the two best city or state histories of Jews in the South, the other being Leonard Rogoff’s *Homelands*.\(^{63}\) Finally, in 1973 and 1983, *American Jewish History* published special issues on Jews in the South and in Georgia, respectively, and in 1979 the *Atlanta Historical Journal* printed a special volume on Georgia Jewish history.\(^{64}\) This record, impressive for the subfield, does not even take into account publication of individual articles and monographs.

Saul Viener, Louis Ginsberg, and Malcolm Stern, among others, established the Southern Jewish Historical Society (SJHS) during the mid-1950s. It published a journal irregularly between 1958 and 1963\(^{65}\) but discontinued activities shortly thereafter. The society was reborn in 1976 at a meeting and subsequent conference in Richmond called by Viener, Melvin I. Urofsky, Bernard Wax, and others, and cosponsored by the American Jewish Historical Society. Since that date it has published two anthologies,\(^{66}\) held annual conferences, supported grants and awards programs, issued a newsletter, and sponsored a peer-reviewed journal, *Southern Jewish History*. In all of these activities it has encouraged scholarship and helped create a core community of academics and laypeople interested in the field.\(^{67}\)

The anthologies and special issues of *American Jewish History* published during this era deserve attention. Both *Turn to the South*, edited by Kaganoff and Urofsky, and *Jews of the South*, edited by Proctor and Schmier with Stern, offer research first presented at SJHS conferences. Of the two, the first reflects better quality. It includes Chyet’s historiographical article and Stern’s piece on the role of the Reform rabbis as ambassadors to the gentiles, as well as analytic articles on the rabbinate by Gladys Rosen; on Arkansas politician Charles Jacobson by Raymond Arsenault; on African-American perceptions of Jews by Arnold Shankman; and on ethnicity, public policy, and values by John Shelton Reed, Alfred O. Hero, Jr., and Abraham D. Lavender, respectively. Novelist Ronald L. Bern added an article on literature, and Stephen J. Whitfield offered one of his many insightful essays. Prefatory remarks by Lawrence H. Fuchs and Urofsky and an overview by Evans established the framework of a distinctive southern Jewish history. With the exception of an article by Louis Schmier that demonstrates how eastern European Jews rejuvenated the Valdosta Jewish community after the departure of most of the earlier “German” Jews, all of the articles in the Proctor/Schmier anthology are biographical. These deal with Moses Elias Levy and his utopian community in Florida; Charleston poet Penina Moïse; Rabbi Bernard C. Ehrenreich of Montgomery; the Sheftalls of Savannah; Joseph Joel, whose memoir concentrates on his years in Richmond; Eugenia Levy Phillips and Philip Phillips, a politically influential couple with opposing views on the Confederacy; and Ludwig Lewisohn, the author with youthful ties to Charleston. A fourth anthology, edited by Abraham D. Lavender and
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published in 1977, includes a section perceiving southern Jewry through the sociologist’s lens. These articles by Lavender, Theodore Lowi, Harold Mehling, and Jerome A. Wolfe are complemented by essays in a section devoted to Jews in small towns.\textsuperscript{68}

Exemplars of the Transitional School of Historians

Most of those writing about southern Jewry during the transitional era, not unlike the earlier periods, did so as temporary departures from their broader interests. Two exemplars of this pattern are Leonard Dinnerstein and Stephen J. Whitfield. Born and raised in New York, Dinnerstein spent his academic career at the University of Arizona, where he spearheaded the creation of a Judaic studies program. Dinnerstein’s interests span from immigration to the study of antisemitism and the Holocaust. Of all of the scholars during this era, only Dinnerstein studied southern Jews as part of his graduate work—yet he did so in the form of his dissertation on the Leo Frank case, not as coursework.\textsuperscript{69} Whitfield was born in Houston and raised in Jacksonville, Florida, where Samuel Proctor was a role model. He has spent much of his career and adult life at Brandeis in Waltham, Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{70}

Eli N. Evans, like the pioneer practitioners, has sought to record his roots, and, by so doing, those of southern Jews generally. He was born and raised in Durham, North Carolina, where his father was a department store owner, long-time mayor, and supporter of black civil rights, and his mother a Hadassah organizer. Evans graduated from the University of North Carolina, where he was president of the student body and was deeply involved in numerous activities. He headed the Charles Revson Foundation in New York until his retirement.

While Evans and Whitfield have spent their adult lives in the North partly chronicling their southern heritage, Louis Schmier, like Dinnerstein, relocated from the sidewalks of New York and has practiced history while teaching at Valdosta State University. His sojourn in the southern Georgia town of Valdosta led him to the study of peddling and other Jewish experiences in local communities, a far cry from his graduate work in European history. Although he has been inactive in the field for more than a decade, Schmier served as an important force in the SJHS.

How does one evaluate the work of one’s contemporaries, many of whom are friends and all of whom are at least friendly acquaintances, without ruffling some feathers? Let us start with Leonard Dinnerstein. Dinnerstein’s book on the Leo Frank case, as indicated previously, was a pivotal element in the modern transformation of southern Jewish historiography. His detailed and even-handed analysis describes the antisemitic elements without exaggeration by placing the case squarely in reference to the socioeconomic conflicts of the time and place. He demonstrates variations in newspaper coverage and public opinion and takes Frank’s legal team and northerners to task for their many miscalculations. By
highlighting the trial and Frank’s lynching as a turning point in national Jewish communal affairs and in the rise of prejudice, Dinnerstein also placed events in the South squarely in the national arena and worthy of national attention. Only in recent years have historians expanded on Dinnerstein’s interpretation by relating it more directly to local labor union unrest, racism and the Atlanta race riot of 1906, long-term political conflict and alignments, and even to gender. That Steven Oney’s recent book supersedes it in detail and investigation of new elements, including the role of Jim Conley’s lawyer and the backgrounds and future paths of the likely lynching party, does not unduly detract from Dinnerstein’s accomplishment.

The anthology Dinnerstein coedited with Mary Dale Palsson ranks with the two anthologies discussed above and clearly helped mark the turning point in historiography. It mixes primary sources with both new and previously published articles. Although some of the selections have not stood the test of time, others—Bertram W. Korn’s essays on Jews, slavery, and Confederate anti-Semitism; Thomas D. Clark’s article on the post-Civil War southern economy; and Dinnerstein’s essay on the Leo Frank case—are classics. The sections on the twentieth century and on Jews and desegregation set the tone for discussions of those subjects virtually to the present. Far from an apologetic tone, Dinnerstein brought attention to anti-Semitism as well as blemishes on the image of Jewish accommodation to southern mores.

Eli N. Evans deserves more credit than any other individual for popularizing southern Jewish history through his writings, frequent speaking engagements, and active participation in important organizations. Two of his key works are intended for popular audiences and are inspired by his experiences. Based on limited primary research and secondary reading, The Provincials nonetheless offers stimulating insights and makes the story of southern Jewry come alive through Evans’s personal reflections. His is the eye of the journalist, and this comes out clearly in The Lonely Days Were Sundays, a collection of essays. Evans’s biography of Judah P. Benjamin, his most scholarly volume, provides details of the close relationship between this New Orleans lawyer and plantation owner, who served in the U.S. Senate and later in the Confederate Cabinet, and Confederate president Jefferson Davis. Yet Evans’s observations concerning the influence of Judaism on Benjamin seem questionable. Although he did not convert out of the faith, Benjamin married a Catholic and did not practice Judaism as an adult. While never intended as such, The Provincials has taken the place of the detailed, scholarly history of southern Jewry that remains to be written.

Stephen J. Whitfield’s research interests are perhaps broader than any of the other authors under review in this section. He brings to his work the keen perceptions of the American studies craft, and he writes vividly, using disparate cultural sources. His essays on southern Jewish literature and Tin Pan Alley
musical imagery of the South are striking in their creativity. Whitfield’s concept of the “braided identity” of southern, American, and Jewish has rightly entered the lexicon of the field. Nonetheless, like much of the rest of the historiography of this transition era, Whitfield’s work is more impressionistic than empirical. One comes away with a sense of southern Jewry rather than an in-depth analysis of real-life experiences. He contrasts the two prevailing perceptions of American Jewish life: the Classical Reform, “German” Jews in small southern towns, and the eastern European Jews in northern cities. Thus, he gives little recognition to the equally rich heritage, traditions, and institutions the eastern European Jews also nurtured in the South.

IV. The Historians: 1984 to the Present

Certainly many other historians deserve attention for their contributions during this period, but these four—Dinnerstein, Evans, Schmier, and Whitfield—stand out as probably the most significant exemplars. Nonetheless, the examples of Dinnerstein, Evans, and Whitfield point to a difficulty with this periodization schema because they and others remain active in the recent phase. Also problematic, many practitioners during the current breakthrough stage of historiography support the themes of the transitional school. Thus, two schools—the distinctiveness and the revisionist—currently coexist and frequently conflict.

So prevalent has the distinctiveness school been that it is easy to assume that it has always been the dominant paradigm. Yet a brief contrast between the conclusions of Bertram Korn, the rabbi/historian, with those of a prominent contemporary advocate, Mark I. Greenberg, highlights the differences. Korn points to southern Jewish distinctiveness without exaggerating its significance, whereas Greenberg tends to concentrate on it. In an article written while a graduate student at the University of Florida, where he earned his doctorate, Greenberg minimizes the impact of antisemitism in a Civil War incident in Georgia in which local Jews were branded as profiteers and ordered to leave. He found that few did so and that the outbreak was really a temporary aberration in the broader pattern of acceptance. Korn used the same example to document what he labeled southern Judeaophobia. While Korn stated that few Jews dueled in the South and that the vast majority was too busy making a living to give the practice even passing notice, Greenberg points to dueling as a key indicator of assimilation to southern mores and an important reason Jews gained political preferment during the last decades of the nineteenth century. Korn ended his book on New Orleans during the 1840s with a comment on how the city’s Jewish history was then entering the mainstream of historiography and showed little difference from other similar urban centers. Yet the next three decades were marked by proslavery and Confederate agitation in a city that would become a hotbed for southern Jewish Confederate sympathies, the most obvious
illustrations of Jewish adaptation to southern mores and institutions. Korn still visualized a national picture of economic, religious, and Jewish institutional progression as the dominant motif.74

These and other differences are small but telling. The distinctiveness paradigm emphasizes that Jews were more accepted in the South than in the North. The prevalence of racism and their image as people of the Bible to religious fundamentalists shielded Jews from prejudice. The Leo Frank case and lynching thus becomes the aberration that proves the rule. In response to such unprecedented acceptance and a desire to fit in so that they could succeed, Jews acculturated to southern mores. With acculturation came political preferment, dramatic economic and social ascent, and contributions to every aspect of southern improvement. But acculturation came at a high price. Southern Jews took the moral low road by owning, buying, and selling slaves; supporting slavery, secession, and the Confederacy; advocating the Lost Cause ideology; and remaining largely silent, if not segregationist, during the struggle for black civil rights. Striving to remain invisible, Jews in the South eschewed controversial issues. The toll impacted on religious practices as well. Southern Jews had a comparatively higher synagogue affiliation because churchgoing was the norm in the region, and their acceptance of the Classical Reform model was more widespread and long lasting than elsewhere. This included rejection of political Zionism and disproportionate support for the American Council for Judaism. According to this school, Zionism, Yiddish culture, and ethnic Judaism simply could not survive in this hostile environment. Jews did not so much influence the South as they were influenced by it. They got along by going along, and traditional Jewish values and identity were compromised. This was what survival and ascent in a convoluted region meant.75

Much of this interpretation can be documented and is correct. Where current scholars differ is in detail, emphasis, and comparative framework. Rather than concentrating on distinctiveness, the revisionist school attempts to gain what it sees as a more balanced understanding of experiences and institutions. Certainly there were regional differences, and at times Jews in the South identified as southerners. Yet such identification and influence masks the substantial amount of continuity and similarities between Jewish experiences in similar local environments. In terms of occupational structure and mobility patterns, educational and cultural values and attainments, and Jewish institutional development and identity with Jews elsewhere, what was remarkable, according to this interpretation, is not how much Jews acculturated but the surprising degree to which they fit Jewish national and even international norms as their Jewish identities evolved. One cannot compare the “German” Jewish experience in the South with that of eastern European Jews in New York as transition school advocates so frequently do, but one can and should compare the experiences of similar subcommunities in comparable local environments. Thus Wendy
Besmann, Leonard Rogoff, Deborah Weiner, Hollace Ava Weiner, and Lee Shai Weissbach find eastern European Jewish experiences in southern small towns and cities remarkably similar to those of Jews elsewhere. From these and other contemporary historians, as well as memoirists, knowledge of the lives of eastern European Jews in such towns and cities has grown exponentially. These immigrants emplaced Yiddish culture and Zionism as they did in similar environments throughout America. Clive Webb and others have observed differences between northern and southern Jewish reactions to the Civil Rights Movement but have also located far more similarities and activism than previously assumed. Currently, Webb is investigating antisemitism in the careers of John Kasper and others, concluding that prejudice was both more nuanced and endemic than previously thought. His conclusions are in accord with Melissa Fay Greene’s book, *The Temple Bombing*. Deborah Dash Moore links Los Angeles and Miami to understand the Jewish experience along modern, urban frontiers. Hasia Diner’s multicountry research on peddling emphasizes similarity with minor local variation. Elliot Ashkenazi sees little difference between business people and financiers across regions, conclusions compatible with Canter Brown, Jr.’s study of Florida politicians, community builders, and business people. Brown and others believe that Jews impacted the South far more than they were influenced by it. Again, although identifying regional distinctions, I have drawn similar conclusions in terms of Jewish social service agencies and role patterns concerning community builders, ethnic brokers, and women. Jews in the South did speak out on controversial issues but, as in so many areas, more in-depth, local research must be undertaken to record their stories. Finally, there is not one Jewish South but many. Acculturation experiences differed so dramatically across locations that these may be at least as significant as region-wide patterns.

During the last decade, much of the discussion has taken on the false dichotomy of distinctiveness versus nondistinctiveness. This debate has been false because all agree that there were regional influences; it is rather a matter of the nature and extent of the influence. Conflict over the issue of identity provides a case in point. Distinctiveness school practitioners maintain that if Jews in the South thought of themselves as different and unique and if this identity was reflected in areas such as food ways, historians should not discount such perceptions. Yet should not historians note the differences between perceptions and reality? Because someone thinks he or she is unique does not make it so. Furthermore, to state that southern Jews identified as southerners is too simplified. It appears that once one asks what that identity meant/means, people either give a vague answer or respond in diverse ways. Identity changed over time and varied from place to place and according to the background of the individual (for example, recent arrivals versus native southerners). Finally, what is the nature and degree of impact exerted by identity with the South? The debate can seem...
frustrating and counterproductive, but if it takes research to the next level by clarifying questions like these, it can serve a very useful purpose.

More than forty years ago, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Thomas Kuhn analyzed the nature of paradigms, the difficulties of challenging them, and the moving on to new paradigms. His discussion sheds light on the debate over southern Jewish distinctiveness. We may be reaching the stage where the debate is nonproductive and participants on both sides are too caught up in partisanship. Perhaps the best work today and in the future will stress nuance, ambiguity, depth and breadth of coverage, and truly comparative analysis, ultimately exploring new subjects and themes. What is needed is a new synthesis.79 To help climb that plateau, let us explore the scholars and scholarship of recent decades.

**Historians Medley**

The number of individuals involved, including their backgrounds and interests during the transition and formative stages, defies the relatively easy categorization of the two earlier periods. During the last thirty-five years, laypeople have joined academics with backgrounds in southern and American history, literature, American studies, religion, political science, and sociology. Rabbi/historians mix with Protestant descendents of colonial Jews and students of the southern ethos. Many are trained in American or even European history. Today, a significant group of students is emerging from the proliferating Jewish studies programs and from history departments where they take courses in American Jewish history and write dissertations on southern Jewish history. Some authors are Jews and others Christian; some from the North who live in the South and others from the South who have been transplanted to the North. Still others come from Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Israel, and South Africa. During the 1970s and into the 1980s, many individuals wrote about southern Jewry while concentrating on other areas, but only a few viewed it as their major concentration. Today, many specialize in southern Jewish history, and those integrating elements of that history into their broader national research push the number much higher. Prior to 2006, it had been more than two decades since a new anthology on southern Jewish history had been published, but two appeared in 2006.80

The apparent groundswell partly reflects growing interest in southern, ethnic, and American Jewish history in general. But again traversing from general to specific and using circular logic, growing interest and nurturance of the field is reflected in the writings of memoirists, novelists, Eli Evans, and playwright Alfred Uhry, as well as in the activities of historical societies and museums noted above. The historical societies offer networks for gifted lay and academic scholars, venues for presentations and publications, other patronage opportunities, and compilation of primary resources essential for sound research.
Whereas twenty-five years ago the University of Alabama Press was one of the few academic publishers open to the field, this new market has drawn numerous academic and commercial presses throughout the country to publication possibilities. With the emergence of a core of scholars engaged in exciting debates and uncovering fascinating new information and themes, graduate students naturally followed. Yet in a still wide-open field, their research also leads along the cutting edge. Courses in southern Jewish history have been taught at HUC-JIR, the College of Charleston, Duke, Emory, Georgia State, Stern College, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the University of North Texas, and the University of Virginia. As more Judaic studies programs and departments of history create positions in American Jewish history, one hopes the subfield of southern Jewish history will achieve the higher level of recognition it rightfully warrants.81

V. The State of the Field as Reflected in the Literature Since 1970

State, City, and Town

Histories of Jewish life on the state, city, and small-town level have emerged as key building blocks for the broader study of southern Jewry. Many of these have been written by dedicated laypeople whose work harks back to the filiopietism of the amateur phase of historiography. Typically, these begin with attempts to identify the first Jew in a location and continue with long lists of important people (usually men with women in a secondary role at best) and their contributions. They describe business successes, downplay conflicts both within and outside the community, and emulate genealogical logs. Rarely do they analyze key themes or place the information within historical context beyond adding paragraphs from secondary sources on general events in timeline-like mode. On the other hand, these accounts provide a wealth of factual material that readers can analyze and organize for synthesis.

Of the few state-level studies, exhibit catalogs written by trained historians and archivists are more analytic than the comprehensive volumes. Those on Florida, South Carolina, and Virginia emphasize the acceptance of Jews in these states, their disproportionate contributions, and examples of accommodation to southern mores.82 Only Arkansas and Texas boast full-scale chronicles. The most challenging of the state studies treats only the colonial period of Maryland’s history. Eric Goldstein relates his research to the earlier historiography, which he amends and corrects. He also develops themes of practical economic reality and adjustment and well-defined stages of community emergence. Eschewing filiopietism, Goldstein highlights the existence and roles of Jewish bonded laborers.83

City histories are more numerous and mixed in quality. Leonard Rogoff and Steven Hertzberg offer models. Hertzberg’s revised University of Chicago dissertation on Atlanta Jewry reflects the urban history issues of the 1970s.
Showing conflict and adjustment in a balanced fashion, it weaves census records, Dun and Company reports, city directories, and other statistical sources to develop patterns of geographic and economic mobility and occupation patterns in a comparative framework. This well-grounded social history treats interaction among Jewish subcommunities, black/Jewish relations, and the roles of women as part of an integrated picture. Rogoff’s study of Durham-Chapel Hill illustrates the same strengths as Hertzberg’s book but also focuses on recent questions. Besides delving into the issue of history and memory, Rogoff chooses as his theme mixed and constantly shifting identity. Whereas Hertzberg ends his study with the Leo Frank case in 1915, Rogoff opens new avenues of inquiry by bringing his story to the present. For city and small-town studies, historians will now deal with core and peripheral dynamics of religious dissemination and immigration and migration patterns since World War II; and they will relate these to factors such as military installations, the Civil Rights Movement, research/medical/educational centers, retirement communities, shopping centers, and the Walmartization of the hinterland.

Wendy Besmann’s study of Knoxville Jewry and Myron Berman’s book on Richmond are also noteworthy. Berman’s strength is with his description of the First Jewish Families of Virginia, as this elite may be described in similar terms to their Christian counterparts, and their tangled family/business connections with Jews throughout the country. His “German” Jews seem to dominate. Besmann, on the other hand, concentrates on the twentieth century, depicting vibrant eastern European Jewish communal life.

Hosting two out of the original five colonial congregations, the Savannah and Charleston Jewish communities have received substantial attention. Ending with the Civil War, James Hagy’s study of Charleston Jewry delves into conflict, divisions, and change, and does not blanch from documenting widespread slaveholding. He provides a well-balanced explanation of the differing interpretations of Reform Judaism. Saul Rubin’s volume on Savannah is largely a descriptive narrative of congregation K.K. Mickve Israel, where he served as rabbi. The materials on eastern European Jews and their congregations appear almost as an afterthought. A good social history of Savannah Jewry remains to be written, although Mark I. Greenberg’s dissertation offers promise of such a work. Charleston served as an incubator for Jewish communities elsewhere in the South and even the West, and some tantalizing lines of analysis are raised in the Theodore Rosengarten and Dale Rosengarten exhibit catalog of South Carolina that concentrates on Charleston. Still, a full-fledged history of Charleston since the Civil War should replace a dated chronicle.

Many articles have appeared treating short periods of time in a state’s or city’s Jewish history. My first article on southern Jewry starts where Hertzberg’s ends and describes the forces both unifying and dividing the Atlanta Jewish community for a decade and a half. Ronald Bayor analyzes Jewish ethnic population
clusters, a model true of most cities. Indeed, one of the patterns emerging is of neighborhoods where Jews and their institutions resided like those in northern cities. Such clusters moved yet persisted in southern cities through much of the twentieth century. Studies by Deborah Dash Moore examine the community of Miami as a suburban frontier. Hollace A. Weiner’s article on the genesis of the Fort Worth, Texas, Jewish community suggests that it illustrated a different type of frontier, that of the West. In so doing, the article implicitly challenges the very inclusion of at least parts of the Lone Star state in the mythical southern pantheon.87 The analytic insights of these specialized works should inform the writing of larger studies.

Although environmental diversity is the reality of southern and American Jewish history, small-town life dominates the image of the region’s Jewish history. Here, the historiography is rich, especially in terms of the rise and fall of such communities during the twentieth century. It becomes richer still with the publication of Lee Shai Weissbach’s history of small-town Jewish life in America, which integrates the southern story into the mainstream. Besides earlier essays, Weissbach contributed a chapter to We Call This Place Home: Jewish Life in Maryland’s Small Towns, edited by Karen Falk and Avi Y. Dector. This exhibit catalog also includes articles by Eric Goldstein and the editors. Goldstein makes distinctions between towns with relatively smaller and larger Jewish populations. Deborah Weiner’s studies of Jews in the Appalachian coalfields illustrate the ubiquitous presence of Jews throughout the region. These Jews of eastern European origin started the typical businesses and used various survival mechanisms to maintain Judaism and their identity as Jews. Although occasionally a Jewish community virtually disappeared only to be reborn later, most good studies illustrate patterns of population renewal characterized by conflicts between earlier and later inhabitants over power, methodology, and culture. Yet group survival, gradual acculturation of the newcomers, their regenerative influence on a community, and a sense of peoplehood often resulted in compromise and cooperation. Although some Jews moved to cities with larger Jewish enclaves and more religious, educational, cultural, and matchmaking opportunities, economics has been the driving force. Jews settled in small towns for economic opportunity. If the town prospered—something Jews were frequently a driving force behind—so did they. If it declined or Jews saw better opportunities elsewhere, then they departed. That each town had its own reasons for success or failure means that each new case study helps complete the picture.88

Today the Goldring/Woldenberg Institute of Southern Jewish Life, among other institutions, seeks to preserve the memories and artifacts of dead and dying Jewish communities and encourages their continued existence. It is not unusual for people to look back with nostalgia at small-town images. Yet there are other sides to the account. In a pulpit talk before the SJHS in October 2003, rabbi/historian Micah Greenstein noted different ways that Jews from small
towns impacted positively on the urban communities to which they migrated. Leonard Rogoff has pointed out in informal discussions the contemporary growth of a Jewish presence and community vibrancy in small towns in North Carolina, even as other communities fade. These stories, too, must be documented and may reflect the ebb and flow to Jewish life in cities and towns related to migration trends.

The following is a synthesis to be tested further, keeping in mind that chain migration marked these successive phenomena. It is obvious that port city residency in the colonial era preceded the move into interior cities and towns during the revolutionary and early national period. Another community-building era occurred in the decade after the Civil War. As numerous local studies illustrate, the war only delayed such development temporarily, and Reconstruction brought many Jews from the North who helped accelerate growth. The period from roughly 1890 to the 1930s may have been marked by several patterns. In some small towns and cities such as Valdosta, Georgia, and Durham, North Carolina, many long-time Jewish residents moved to cities with larger Jewish populations and greater economic opportunity. Sometimes these people were replaced, and those who remained were augmented by an influx of Jews from eastern Europe. In relatively new or rising urban centers such as Fort Worth, Texas, and Anniston, Alabama, second-generation and acculturated first-generation Jews arrived who skipped the Orthodox/traditional phase of congregation building and launched Reform congregations. These may be viewed as second-tier communities. Repeating the experience of “German” Jewish immigrants of a previous generation, eastern European immigrants—some of whom had lived elsewhere in the United States—settled in small towns and cities, thereby creating new Jewish enclaves. The impact of the Depression, the New Deal, World War II and, with it, the burgeoning of military installations, and postwar suburbanization on Jewish geography must be gauged thoroughly. The decline of Jewish life in some small towns and cities during the last half of the twentieth century seems to have been more than offset by growth in cities ranging from Atlanta, Houston, and Dallas to Charlotte, Miami, and, for that matter, much of Florida. The decline of small-town life in western Tennessee and surrounding areas translated into continued vibrancy in Memphis.

As with urban history in general, numerous factors typically influenced the success or failure of towns and cities: financing, the health of hinterlands, and vehicles for transportation, including rivers, railroads, street railways, highways, and airports. Anecdotal evidence suggests the involvement of Jews as promoters of infrastructure, booster/developers, and financial intermediaries. Little has been written on these areas in a systematic fashion.

This brief synthesis is designed to facilitate the creation of a complex picture of Jewish residential patterns in towns and cities. Cross-regional and national
studies of ethnic clustering in towns and cities, how and why such clusters moved, why these phenomena were stronger in some locations than in others, and how and why such patterns changed over time would greatly augment our understanding.

A minidebate over the place of Florida and particularly Miami and the southeast area is underway that sheds light on the foregoing thesis. Highly urbanized, largely composed of Jews from other sections of the country, and less acculturated to southern mores—essentially more a “Jewish” New York suburb—Stuart Rockoff argues for its exclusion, whereas Stephen J. Whitfield concludes that one cannot eliminate the major portion of the Jewish South from consideration.90

To exclude Miami-area Jewry from southern Jewish history is to define that history narrowly. Variations abound in the region, as do similarities. Jewish history differed even among cities such as Atlanta, Baltimore, Charlotte, New Orleans, and Savannah. Conversely, the impact of military installations during World War II, air conditioners, transportation improvements, retirement, recreation, medical, and university facilities—perhaps exaggerated in relation to the Miami-area’s Jewish population growth and the nature of the community—are elements that influenced numerous other communities as well and must be considered in writing the history of the last sixty years. The majority of Jews on the southeast coast of Florida came from elsewhere. Yet, as previously noted, southern Jewish communities have been continuously rejuvenated and redefined by in-migration. Separating southeast Florida from the region is to reject information that contradicts a preconceived historical construct rather than revising the construct itself given the counteracting data.

Social Services and Women

State and local histories universally chronicle the early development of community, often ending with the creation of federations of Jewish charities. Local federations started in Boston in the 1880s and spread throughout the country by the early twentieth century. The few detailed studies on Jewish social service agencies in the South open important avenues of inquiry concerning evolving needs and ways to meet them, alternative modes of identity, and shifts of power.91

Studies of the changing roles of Jewish women, their relationship with non-Jewish counterparts, and their importance have burgeoned during the last thirty years. Works by Sherry Blanton and Deborah Weiner highlight the pivotal role of Jewish women in small communities. Weiner and others also trace women’s economic contributions.92 Many local histories note the roles of individual women and organizations, including the National Council of Jewish Women and sisterhoods. Yet, compared to histories of Philadelphia and Kansas City, those on southern communities fail to provide the same in-depth study of
both women and social services. Much has been written on Henrietta Szold, founder of Hadassah, who was from Baltimore. Other than Eli N. Evans’s discussion in *The Provincials* of his mother’s role as a Hadassah leader, however, almost nothing has been written concerning the influence of the South on that organization or the Women’s Organization for Rehabilitation and Therapy (ORT). All of these are voids that should be remedied.

During the twentieth century in states where Jewish communities were small, few, and far between, one survival mechanism was the creation of statewide agencies to take the place of organizations that normally appeared on the city level. These include the Texas Kallah of Rabbis, the Arkansas Jewish Assembly, and the North Carolina Association of Jewish Women, which led to a rabbinical organization and a less active men’s group. Although state histories of Arkansas and Texas and one of the articles on southern Jewish women describe these groups, future studies may find that they impacted on stronger statewide identities as Jews. Seeking information on similar experiments elsewhere may help to gain a comparative perspective.

**Congregations, the Rabbinate, Theology, and Related Issues**

Because so many southern Jewish communities had only one or two lasting congregations until the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries, congregational histories often amount to community histories. Like those, the quality varies dramatically. The insightful volume by Richard and Belinda Gergel traces the Columbia, South Carolina, Jewish community from its Charleston roots to destruction wrought by the Civil War. Matched with Gary P. Zola’s broad-ranging Harby biography, one can trace the existence and movement of a Jewish professional class during the Jacksonian era, including its involvement with slavery and secession. Marc Lee Raphael’s excellent history of the Washington Hebrew Congregation explores the demographic background of its members, the virtually hegemonic roles of its rabbis, and the problematic issue of what constituted Reform Judaism during much of the nineteenth century. Hollace A. Weiner’s study of Fort Worth’s Beth-El traces chain migration and occupational patterns and integrates the roles of women more analytically than most state and local histories. The earliest settlers to Fort Worth arrived from elsewhere in the United States already acculturated. Coming to this frontier environment, they showed little interest in congregation building. The Orthodox congregation preceded the Reform by a decade. Although the Jewish population has not grown in proportion to the general or Jewish populations in Houston or Dallas, the two congregations have demonstrated substantial stability. What other communities, and how many of them, followed similar paths? Gerry Cristol’s volume on Dallas’s Emanu-El again points to the frontier environment as a point of origin. She traces the movement of Jews and their businesses from railroad terminus to terminus. Following Weiner and others, Cristol observes
interconnected family and business ties. Leonard Rogoff’s article on congregational adaptation to small-town life in North Carolina illustrates still other patterns of adaptation and change and, with Hollace Weiner’s study, continues an underlying theme of variety in southern Jewish history. Like many works on small-town life and Besmann’s history of Knoxville, it also brings attention to the often-neglected subject of Orthodoxy in the South.

Southern Jewish theological history followed, but also led, national patterns. The colonial congregations in Savannah and Charleston had their share of divisions but ultimately accepted Sephardic ritual even though Ashkenazim were among the leaders and overtook the former in number. Thus, a pattern became familiar from the outset: a pattern of division fraught by socioeconomic class and division along national lines and lines of religious practice, followed by accommodation to the realities of survival as a small minority. Both Kahal Kadosh (K.K.) Mickve Israel of Savannah (established in 1735) and Charleston’s K.K. Beth Elohim (1749) also experienced stops and starts as the result of wars and population movement.

Charleston’s Jewish population was the largest in the country from 1800 to about 1830. Home to middle- and upper-class Jews, many of whom were professionals or businesspeople whose families went back generations, it became the first American community to experiment with Reform Judaism. As such, it has come under considerable scholarly scrutiny. Since studies of Reform Judaism by Leon Jick and Michael Meyer, debates have ranged from whether the Reformed Society of Israelites can be classified as truly Reform or just a harbinger of things to come; whether Reform Judaism was indigenous or imported from the Germanic states; and whether changes in Charleston exerted significant impact on Reform Judaism elsewhere in America. The work of Gary P. Zola and others place Charleston on the cutting edge and have highlighted many factors, including the radicalism and experimental nature of the prayer book and the pivotal roles of women. Although Beth Elohim initially rejected the Reformed Society’s overtures and the society gradually disintegrated, traditionalist rabbi Gustavus Poznanski ultimately brought Reform Judaism to the main congregation. Yet change was not without conflict, and the conflict led to the launching of Shearith Israel, the first traditional congregation formed in reaction to Reform Judaism. B’rith Sholom followed after another split in 1851. Jeffrey Gurock has written a 150th anniversary history of B’rith Sholom-Beth Israel, the congregation formed when the two offshoots united. He sees the story as a case study depicting national patterns.

As some of the sources cited above and others indicate, women were important players in these and future changes. Linked by ties of sisterhood and family, they followed Rebecca Gratz’s lead in forming Sunday schools and benevolent societies. They raised money to support synagogues and attended services. Penina Moïse of Charleston, the first female American Jewish poet,
composed hymns for Beth Elohim, and many of the reforms reflected the rising influence of women, even where they lacked power.  

New Orleans, the fifth-largest American Jewish community in 1860, and border city Baltimore were two critical centers of nineteenth-century Jewry. Baltimore served as an economic and religious entrepôt, while New Orleans was partly an outpost for Charleston Jewry. Besides Korn’s study of the former (which ends with the beginning of Jewish community building) and a dated chronicle and popular works on the latter, one must resort to specialized articles to piece together a picture of New Orleans Jewish history. Similarly only a dated chronicle, popular works, and congregational histories addressed the Baltimore Jewish story.  

Baltimore became a hotbed of innovation and division during the mid-nineteenth century. It served as the home of the first congregation begun as Reform in continued existence, Har Sinai Verein (1842), and it was the base of radical Reform rabbi, David Einhorn, on his arrival from the Germanic states. The first ordained rabbi to serve an American congregation, Abraham Rice, experienced a short-term, rocky career in the city. On the other hand, one of the first American-born ordained rabbis, Henry W. Schneebberger, enjoyed a successful career at Chizuk Amuno (1871), a traditional offshoot of Baltimore Hebrew Congregation when the latter turned Reform. A student of Israel Hildesheimer’s Positive Historicism Judaism, Schneebberger participated in the formation of the Jewish Theological Seminary. Schneebberger’s synagogue still trailed Oheb Shalom (1853), led for decades by the influential Benjamin Szold, as the first congregation organized with a quasi-Conservative stand.  

Listing initial occurrences can be reduced to an exercise in filiopietism. I do it here to introduce the questions of why Baltimore was the scene of so many “firsts” and the location of such denominational variety. Are the answers related to the movement of people in and out of the city because it served as an economic hub for peddlers and merchants elsewhere? And, if so, how?  

Nonetheless, in some ways, Baltimore serves as a microcosm of what was happening elsewhere in America and specifically in the South. Historians of Richmond, Atlanta, and Birmingham Jewry recount the multiple story lines, and Atlanta also benefits from solid congregational histories. All of these writings depict conflicts and divisions within and between congregations over Reform Judaism and degrees of change, and between rabbinical figures (not all of whom were ordained) and congregations over power and policies. The writings also reflect the rise of rabbinical egos and competition. Views range from James K. Gutheim’s moderate Reform to traditionalist Bernard Illowy to quasi-Conservative E.B.M. Browne. Browne, like other contemporaries attempting to establish name recognition, a platform for their ideas, and supplementary income, edited a Jewish newspaper. Another source of income noted in numerous local and congregational studies but not studied in their
own right were English-Hebrew-German academies. Frequently founded under congregational auspices and welcoming non-Jews, these academies provided education until they were replaced by public schools. Their curricula reflected the multicultural background of their founders and supporters even as they eased acculturation into the mainstream.99

Charleston, Baltimore, and Richmond, like a few other cities, served as religious centers for numerous other communities. This concept of center/periphery has been touched on by a few scholars100 but begs for further research.

Two intriguing figures important in religious history who were not rabbis/ministers are Jacob Mordecai and Gershom Kursheedt. Much has been written on Mordecai and his family, partly because of the extensive holdings at the University of North Carolina. With family links throughout Virginia and to the North, Mordecai chose to settle in a small town where he and his children ran a girls’ academy. His descendents were important and fascinating because their stories enhance our knowledge of the Civil War, acculturation, and much else. Emily Bingham’s challenging study investigates the conversion experience of several Mordecai children and Jacob’s struggles with faith. By the 1820s, conversion was rampant among scions of colonial families. Acculturated, affluent, and well educated, they were viewed as worthy mates among Protestants of the same class and, eschewing marriage with new Jewish immigrants and lacking sufficient numbers of Jewish prospects from their own backgrounds, intermarriage was widespread. Yet Mordecai’s children chose conversion out of conviction and not as a consequence of marriage. Bingham identifies them as one American family. How typical or unique their behavior was remains to be tested. Studies of the Minis family of Savannah and of the Seixas-Kursheedt family reinforce Dianne Ashton’s findings for Rebecca Gratz’s family. In the decades before the Civil War, these people exercised a range of choices: They married fellow Jews if suitable partners were available, they intermarried, or they remained single. Although genealogical in nature, these works provide the grist for historians to trace cross-sectional networks that elucidate success and interaction.101

Gershom Kursheedt was from a family significant for its impact on New York Jewish religious history, yet he chose to settle in New Orleans and opened a successful business there. The book on his family is less analytic than Bingham’s study, and he would be an excellent candidate for a thorough biography. Both Kursheedt and Mordecai (later in life when he emerged as a key leader at Richmond’s Beth Ahabah) served as exemplars and spokespeople for traditional Judaism. Mordecai and others in Richmond exerted substantial influence on Isaac Leeser, who secured a Philadelphia pulpit and emerged as the key opponent of Reform Judaism. Leeser, along with Isaac Mayer Wise, traveled from community to community encouraging the building of congregations; they also created Jewish periodicals as media for national networking. Kursheedt
influenced Judah Touro to become the first major Jewish benefactor. In his will, Touro contributed to the building of Jewish institutions throughout the country. With a strong sense of peoplehood, Jews in the South joined with Jews from throughout America and overseas to fight antisemitism abroad. Kursheedt provided key leadership in response to the Mortara case, in which a young Jewish boy was taken by Vatican authorities to be raised as a Catholic after it was discovered that a maid had secretly had him baptized. Kursheedt represented numerous American congregations when he visited the Vatican to protest with Moses Montefiore, the great British leader whom he also accompanied to the Holy Land to administer part of Touro’s bequest.

A book by Bertram Korn and a documentary article by this author address the roles of southern Jews in the Mortara case. The lack of unified and effective response resulted in the creation of the Board of Delegates of American Israelites. Although Gutheim was deeply involved in this first, long-term national Jewish defense agency and one of its key issues was obtaining full political rights for Jews in North Carolina, no in-depth study relating the board to southern Jewry is available. On the other hand, southern Jewish influence in the creation of the CCAR through the Southern Rabbinical Association has received careful attention from Gary P. Zola.102

From 1850 to the 1890s, peripatetic rabbinical careers were somewhat typical. Browne, Illowy, Julius Eckman,103 and others traveled from congregation to congregation because of clashes over personality, power, and religious practices. But many of the rabbis entering Reform pulpits in the 1890s and thereafter served the same congregations for decades. Four overlapping characterizations have been offered to explain these men’s roles. Malcolm Stern views them as ambassadors who represented their congregants and religion to the broader gentile society, their outreach role far surpassing Jewish tradition and ritual in importance to their affluent, acculturated congregants. Hollace A. Weiner uses the term “mixers” for Texas frontier rabbis in much the same way. Arnold Shankman and I use them as examples of community builders and ethnic brokers who build Jewish institutions while bridging gaps within and outside of the Jewish community. Biographies of Max Heller of New Orleans and Morris Newfield by Bobbie S. Malone and Mark Cowett, respectively, and numerous articles on other individual rabbis, point to the influence of the Pittsburgh Platform on the prophetic social justice agenda of these men and how they relate to the Progressive movement. The local environment could have a somewhat limiting impact, as it did on Newfield, or it could empower, as it did David Marx in Atlanta. Nonetheless, the roles of rabbis and Jewish laypeople in creating and nurturing secular community chests (forerunner of the United Way) well into the twentieth century cannot be ignored. Although Heller espoused Zionism, most Reform rabbis were either non- or anti-Zionist. Following national trends, they viewed their home as America and feared
charges of dual loyalty. Besides local and congregational histories, numerous articles on individual rabbis support these patterns, and yet a unified history remains to be written.\textsuperscript{104}

The literature on Orthodox and, even more so, Conservative rabbis and congregations in the South is relatively new and sparse. As previously indicated, much of it is becoming available through the study of small towns and cities and through congregational histories. As eastern European immigrants entered the region due to the Russian pogroms of 1881 and thereafter, they started congregations and self-help institutions, as had earlier immigrants on their arrival. Where Jewish populations were small, Reform and Orthodox sometimes shared buildings and rabbis, and differences seemed less important than survival and identity as Jews. Larger size allowed greater diversity and division not only between Reform and Orthodox but also between Orthodox from different areas of Europe, who formed \textit{landslayt} shuls. One of the more intriguing of the latter is Anshe Sfard congregations founded especially by Romanian Jews. These Ashkenazic congregations integrate elements of Sephardic liturgy to create the Orthodox/Hasidic ritual Nusach Sefard. The ritual is also known as Nusach Ari, after sixteenth-century Kabbalist Rabbi Isaac Luria (the Ari) of Safed, the first to mix Sephardic elements into Ashkenazic services. Some eastern European Hasidic congregations that followed the Baal Shem Tov adopted Nusach Sefard. Typically very small, most of these lack congregational histories.\textsuperscript{105} Because of the difficulties small congregations faced to survive, some merged with other Orthodox congregations. Southern cities such as Atlanta, Baltimore, Memphis, Knoxville, and New Orleans mirrored the national experience: urban areas with concentrated Jewish populations that supported multiple congregations, Yiddish culture, ethnic businesses, loan societies, Arbeiter Rings/Workmen’s Circles, Farbands, and Zionism. Since these people were not typically admitted into the “German” Reform concordia/harmony societies/standard clubs, they formed progressive clubs for social outlets. The few studies of Orthodox rabbis illustrated further division between earlier, more acculturated and established congregations and newer, poorer, and more traditional shuls. The rabbis serving the latter had to maintain a balancing act between tradition and modernity, Yiddish and English, that led many to Conservative ranks shortly before and after World War II, although in some cases even earlier.\textsuperscript{106} These are preliminary patterns requiring far more research. Factors to consider include the closing of America’s doors to immigration, socioeconomic changes, the Depression, the Holocaust, World War II, the creation of Israel, and the changing roles and influence of women.

Sephardim from the Ottoman Empire made their way to Atlanta and Montgomery early in the twentieth century. Speaking Ladino (a mixture of Spanish and Hebrew), following different liturgy, enjoying different foods and customs, and fewer in number, these people also founded congregations and
voluntary, self-help societies. The story of how Sephardim in the two cities worked with each other and their counterparts in the North and, at the same time, limited their interaction with other Jewish subcommunities has been documented. However, studies are needed concerning their roles as Zionists, their positions within federations of Jewish charities, and their rise and gradual integration. The latter would include discussion of Ashkenazim and Sephardim intermarrying beginning around World War II and the blurring of congregational membership, as well as the recent merger in Montgomery of Sephardic and Ashkenazic congregations.

Some of the local and congregational studies and a small number of the rabbinical biographies previously discussed bring the religious history to the present, but sporadically. Again, more such work and state- and region-wide patterns require documentation. What was the role of rabbinical students in keeping small-town congregations alive? How did the experiences influence the rabbis’ future careers? The flourishing of synagogue building after World War II reflected affluence and suburbanization. What did it reflect in terms of ritual, worship, and the changing position of the rabbi? During the 1950s and 1960s, some Reform congregations became more traditional and Conservative congregations less observant. In what ways did southern congregations conform or diverge from national patterns? Why? What influence did national ecclesiastical figures, institutions, and movements have on the region and vice versa? In Atlanta, a new Orthodox congregation, Beth Jacob, was founded during the mid-1940s. Did this happen in other southern cities? What void were such congregations attempting to fill? How did the rejuvenation of Orthodoxy in the South transpire, including the late-twentieth-century emergence of Young Israel and Chabad congregations? What about the growth and impact of Jewish day schools and havurot? From the late 1960s to the present, the establishment of congregations with and without affiliations to the national Jewish movements in metropolitan areas skyrocketed. How many of these emerged from older congregations that refused to move to new areas or expand membership? How many were created by young couples, many of whom were well-educated professionals, streaming from the North for economic opportunity in Sunbelt suburbs? What has been the impact of newer waves of immigrants from Iran, Russia, Cuba, Israel, South Africa, and other areas on congregation building and theology?

Holocaust memorials and centers have sprung up throughout the South as they have in the rest of the country. A very recent phenomenon has been the writing of Holocaust memoirs by individuals who moved to the South from Europe. Thus, these poignant studies also point to how the survivors adjusted to, and were received by, the region. A biography of Anne Levy, a survivor who settled in New Orleans, written by Lawrence Powell, makes the Holocaust experience of one individual and her family come alive. Powell’s research in
Europe and the scope of his analysis is exceptional. The book also discusses Levy’s experiences adjusting to life in Louisiana and especially her response and the responses of fellow survivors against first George Lincoln Rockwell’s visit to the city and then David Duke’s campaign for election. Powell illuminates the conflict between the views and reactions of the survivors to these hate-mongers with those of the established Jewish community.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{Economics, Governance, and Civic Affairs}

As in numerous areas, local and congregational histories previously cited provide anecdotal and sometimes sophisticated coverage of Jewish participation in political, civic, and economic affairs. Typically, coverage involves basic descriptions of Jewish businesses and their owners and what amount to lists of Jewish officeholders and Jews who were involved in civic life through appointed positions and organizational activities promoting infrastructure, schools, symphonies, hospitals, and the like. Such descriptions illustrate acceptance of Jews and Jewish contributions to society. The better studies document occupational and mobility patterns and other quantifiable socioeconomic trends by using census returns, city directories, credit reports, and similar sources. They also analyzed perceptions Jews and gentiles had of each other. Coverage through specialized studies varies dramatically, from numerous economic works—albeit with large holes remaining to be filled—to almost nothing in terms of government and civic affairs.

The general outline in these areas is familiar and runs through the literature. During the colonial era, American Jews participated in an international economic network.\textsuperscript{111} With experiences in foreign languages and travel, and having served as intermediaries for business in their countries of origin, young Jewish men went from place to place trading goods. They settled in port cities such as Savannah, Charleston, New Orleans, and Mobile, or moved among those cities, the Caribbean islands, New York, and Philadelphia. Business, family, and religion extending from those areas to London and Amsterdam tied them together.\textsuperscript{112} A few traded with Native Americans and worked as translators for Native American agents. Some accounts point to bankruptcies, but far less is written about failure than success.

With some notable exceptions, especially in Rhode Island and New York, Jews in the British colonies overwhelmingly supported and actively participated in the American Revolution. They subsequently held numerous and varied political offices and joined elite charity societies and clubs. Scions of the early families became professionals, supported cultural and philanthropic endeavors, and organized private schools. They mirrored Jonathan Sarna’s portrayal of Jacksonian Jews in his biography of Mordecai Noah. Newcomers from the Germanic states, Alsace-Lorraine, and elsewhere in Europe began as peddlers and rose as small shopkeepers in partnership with or employing family mem-
bers and fellow countrymen. As they would do from generation to generation, Jews filled important economic niches left void by most other groups, made contacts who would provide them with goods and credit, and readily relocated for economic opportunity.

An article by Richard Hawkins indicates that some arrived with money and connections and so bypassed the peddler stage. Stories of the Monsantos, Sheftalls, Levy/Yulees, Lehmans and Seligmans, Levys and Phillips, and Judah P. Benjamin stand out. Works already cited by Bertram Korn trace the Monsanto business empire from Louisiana across the Gulf Coast to Florida. In articles and a biography that provides a model for depth of coverage and complex understanding, Chris Monaco brought Moses Elias Levy from the Caribbean to Florida, where he established the first Jewish agricultural utopian community in what subsequently became the United States. He experimented with sugar production, and he and his son David promoted land development and railroads. A firebrand for southern secession, David Levy/Yulee advocated Florida statehood and became the state’s first U.S. Senator. Among the first Jewish families of colonial Savannah, the Sheftalls advanced in business and trade, ran the British blockade and otherwise served the Revolutionary cause, entered the professions, helped start and maintain the third congregation in British colonial America, and joined the first elite charity society in Georgia. In the only published systematic, economic study of one of several southern subregions, Elliott Ashkenazi traces a complex network of trade and connections across political boundaries that facilitated Jewish business success. Philip Phillips, a successful attorney and congressman, helped negotiate the Kansas-Nebraska Act. He supported the Union while his wife, Eugenia Levy Phillips, was an ardent Confederate. Her sister, Phoebe Levy Yates Pember, gained fame as the matron of Chimborazo Hospital in Confederate Richmond.113

Beyond the sparse studies and local histories previously noted, few economic works have appeared in print for the era spanning Reconstruction into the twentieth century. Jewish involvement with the crop lien system, changes in land ownership, credit, and business cry for research. Hasia Diner’s transcontinental study of peddlers and their impact mixes economics with immigration and social history. Few books that concentrate on the building of department stores meet a similar standard.114 Depicting a family business empire, Harold Hyman’s study of the Kempners of Texas illustrates the creation of a conglomerate partly geared toward the varied strengths of family members. The Kempner interests extend from complex brokerage dealings to insurance, agricultural experimentation, and land development. Coupled with a study of the Ochs newspapers and a recent autobiography by Bernard Rapoport, the outlines of a picture emerge of generational continuity and change, networking within and between family businesses, and adaptation. Eastern European Jews replicated the patterns of their predecessors but were more likely to start grocery and
liquor stores, secondhand and cheap clothing establishments, pawn shops, and scrap metal businesses. They showed a willingness to bargain with customers and sell for low prices. Sephardim established grocery stores and delicatessens, shoe repair shops, and clothes- and hat-cleaning firms. Both east Europeans and Sephardim benefited from family ties, credit from Jewish wholesalers, free loan associations, and Morris Plan banks, from which an individual without collateral could obtain a loan if two people vouched for him or her. Investments in real estate helped move families into the middle class. Stories of Zales jewelers and Stein Marts show twentieth-century chain store success emanating over generations from small-town and small-store origins. Since the mid-1970s, large federations of stores have purchased many of the original department stores, and their names are disappearing. This has given rise to fertile areas for future study: the development and impact of such commercial giants and the changing roles of Jewish businesspeople in the new enterprises; the impact of retail chains, national credit card companies, and malls; and the tremendous economic diversity that has marked the last half century.

Immigration restriction laws went into effect during the 1920s that essentially halted new arrivals until the coming of small numbers of refugees from Nazi oppression. Lacking a new influx, a Jewish lower middle class gradually disappeared. Beth Wenger’s study demonstrates that the Depression impacted New York Jews in different neighborhoods and from different socioeconomic backgrounds to varying degrees. The few references to the Depression on the Jewish South are generalized. It clearly hurt businesses, and many people had difficulty supporting Jewish institutions. Yet the impact on southern Jewish businesses may have been relatively minor and temporary. By the late 1930s, prosperity appears to have resumed in cities, only to be temporarily delayed again by World War II for those who went into military service. Yet the war also acted as a catalyst. The expansion of military bases throughout the South fostered jobs and business growth. Soldiers stationed at these bases during the war returned to spouses and economic opportunities afterward. Children of immigrants moved into new neighborhoods even before the war and started chain stores. With the preponderance of Jews in business and the professions, and with few in factory employment, an investigation using Wenger’s complex model could prove fruitful. Work should be done on Jews in the professions and their roles as leaders of professional organizations; on Jews in real estate and construction, such as Ben Massell, who is credited with revitalizing the Atlanta skyline during the 1940s and 1950s; and on Jews in chambers of commerce and other civic organizations.

In contrast to the regional norm, southern Jewish involvement in agriculture was limited, since most Jews went into business. Nonetheless, scattered evidence indicates that Jews played important roles in agribusiness innovation: from the sugar production of Moses E. Levy and the Kempners to Raphael J. Moses’s
commercialization of the peach industry in Georgia, from the herb trade of the Wallace brothers in North Carolina to the influence of Rosana Dyer Osterman on Gail Borden, Jr. and condensed milk production. Moses E. Levy’s short-lived agricultural utopia was the forerunner of many that sought to root poor, immigrant Jews in the soil and away from the cities. Few of these colonies are traced in articles. The Immigration Removal Office, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, and especially the Galveston Movement spread eastern European immigrants into the heartland to lessen antisemitism in New York and elsewhere in the North and to provide economic options for the newcomers. Yet Bernard Marinbach’s sound book on the Galveston Movement and Hollace Weiner’s specialized study on Fort Worth, which stresses chain migration patterns and local influence, are the only works directly concerned with these important organizations and programs.

Jewish women’s business activities have been barely discussed in local histories and in the few general studies of women in the South. Women filled roles as sole traders and took positions as buyers, salespeople, bookkeepers, shop owners, teachers, and academy heads. They also earned money by renting rooms and running boardinghouses. Benevolent activities helped expand women’s sphere and prepared them for entrance into social work and teaching in the twentieth century. Many women also became lawyers, specializing in workers’, children’s, and women’s issues before and after the passage of the nineteenth amendment. The few specialized articles show great potential for enhancing our understanding, but all of these areas require substantial additional research.

Jews held numerous state and national offices leading up to the Civil War, but beyond support for the Revolution, the South, and secession, there are few analyses of their policies or politics, even into the recent period. Sparse anecdotal references indicate that Jews were found on both sides of the Reconstruction and Redemption conflicts. During the late 1800s and early 1900s, Jews served as mayors, city aldermen, and school board members in numerous cities. Leonard Dinnerstein argues that in the aftermath of the lynching of Leo Frank such opportunities were greatly curtailed. When, why, and how did this change? Does Dinnerstein’s conclusion hold true in small towns, where Jews frequently were elected mayors? Hyman’s work on Isaac Kempner depicts him as a consummate businessman/reformer instrumental in creating the commission plan of urban government. Is it possible that Jews helped pioneer and lead progressive, good government reform in the South? Works by Canter Brown, Jr., and Mark I. Greenberg tentatively support this conclusion. Progressivism in the region was often marked by racism, as were the governments of the next several decades. Clive Webb and Raymond Arsenault show a complex picture but suggest that at least some Jewish politicians followed regional mores in this regard and even served demagogues. Yet numerous works—including Margaret Armbrester’s study of Samuel Ullman of Birmingham; Phillip J. Johnson’s article that touches
on Monroe, Louisiana mayor Arnold Bernstein, who opposed the Klan and supported black rights, and more contemporary autobiographies by Morris Abram, Harriet Keyserling, and Bernard Rapoport—argue that Jews broke from the norm. In a study of ethnic politics in Atlanta up to 1915, I found that Jews joined a faction of the Democratic Party and were welcomed because of their business success and civic contributions. Since they tended to cluster in residential patterns, their votes were also concentrated in a few wards. Consequently, certain seats on the school board, city council, and even World War I draft board became “Jewish seats.” Cristol’s study of the Reform congregation in Dallas describes a similar phenomenon. It is likely that comparable patterns emerged in New Orleans, Memphis, Baltimore, and other cities. Only further research will help transcend generalities concerning these issues. As in so many areas, cross-regional studies should prove to be particularly fruitful. Since there were numerous Jewish officeholders, including mayors, in the West, for example, acceptance and contributions can be viewed more as an American than a regional phenomenon. Analyses of actual policies, voting patterns, and alliances would determine whether the similarities are superficial or substantive.

Anecdotal evidence points to important Jewish contributions to music, culture, and education. Several of the rabbis from Hollace Weiner’s *Jewish Stars in Texas* introduced classical music into their communities; state and local histories often touch on this in passing. Jews have been involved in the country-music industry and have even commissioned important religious works. As previously indicated, Jewish women went into the teaching profession. But what about Jews such as David Mayer of Atlanta, who helped found the public school system? Or Annie Teitelbaum Wise, a noted high school principal? Interaction with Others

Jews interacted with others in every area discussed thus far, and the interaction was bidirectional and symbiotic. As examples, Jews were governed by others but also participated actively in governance and influenced government decisions on issues such as school prayer and extension of the franchise to women. Reform Judaism borrowed from Christian models, while Reform rabbis effectively advocated prophetic social change and ecumenicism. Jewish businesspeople were directly impacted by the nature and state of the local economy and transportation networks, but they also opened a national consumer culture and credit system to their clientele. This section will concentrate on the issues of antisemitism, or the relative lack thereof; interaction with other minority groups, particularly African-Americans; and image and identity.

A. Antisemitism and Acceptance

How much antisemitism was there in the South, and what was the nature of it? What has been its ebb and flow, and what factors influenced it? Much has been written on these questions, and the topic was the subject of a penetrating
historiographical essay by Howard Rabinowitz. The general classic studies on the subject with a bearing on the South include John Higham’s *Send These To Me: Jews and Other Immigrants in Urban America*, as well as his *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925*; Leonard Dinnerstein’s *Uneasy at Home: Antisemitism and the American Jewish Experience* and *Antisemitism in America*; and Morton Borden’s, *Jews, Turks, and Infidels.*

Rabinowitz’s article offers a good starting point for discussion. His essay correctly begins with a comparative perspective. In contrast to antisemitism in European history and to treatment of African-Americans or Catholics in America (Native Americans and other immigrant groups should be added as well), Jews have found an extremely hospitable home in America. Following Higham and others, he notes that, although antisemitism existed in America virtually from the outset, “the birth of modern, systematic antisemitism in this country clearly dates to the late nineteenth century.” Although Dinnerstein is more sanguine in his view on antisemitism in the region and views the Leo Frank case as a turning point (an interpretation downplayed by Rabinowitz), Rabinowitz initially concurs with the literature that suggests that the South “did not depart from the national pattern.” Nonetheless, he quickly demurs: “[T]hose few historians who have looked at the subject and especially Southern Jews themselves, claim that in fact the South has been more receptive to Jews and has exhibited less antisemitism than the nation as a whole, certainly less than the East and Midwest … [A]side from the West, the South has been the least anti-Semitic region in the country.” He points to extensive officeholding, paucity of systematic economic discrimination, and relatively open social relations, especially in small towns and in college admissions. He then asks why this would be so. Contradicting Harry Golden, he argues that the region’s evangelical Protestantism could have led to antisemitism as easily as it did to philo-Semitism and that the small-town, rural environment could have bred “heightened parochialism and suspicion of outsiders.” Rabinowitz posits “three general reasons why the South, if not the least anti-Semitic region in the nation, can at least lay claim to being no worse than the norm.” First, he names structural factors that worked in Jews’ favor: the relatively small number of Jews in the region and their rural settlement pattern, their early arrival, the comparative stability of Jewish communities given a much smaller relative influx of eastern European immigrants, and, most important, the fact that Jews did not enter occupations or businesses in which they competed with “already entrenched Gentile interests.” Second, Rabinowitz reasons that southern hatreds of Catholics and, especially, African-Americans—“more threatening groups”—shielded Jews. Third, and most important, he maintains that Jews accepted southern mores and institutions, especially those dealing with race, and did their utmost to conform. With the modern Civil Rights Movement, Jews in the South behaved and thought differently than those in the North. Thus, southern Jews “are
classically marginal men … more liberal than Gentile white southerners but less so than northern Jews.” Fear partly caused this Jewish response, but the response also came at a price. Jews “had to know their place.”

This summary does not do justice to Rabinowitz’s nuances. Yet questions must be raised concerning the conclusions he drew from the literature. As noted, Rabinowitz was not sure if antisemitism in the South was slightly less or the same as elsewhere. The conundrum created a problem in his argument. If antisemitism did not differ markedly from area to area, then can it be argued logically that real or assumed regional differences had a measurable impact? Perhaps instead, the seemingly regional differences had at least parallels elsewhere. For example, anti-Asian prejudice likely shielded Jews in California, and anti-Latino discrimination deflected hatred of Jews in the Southwest.

What about the assumed differences? Although Jews were always a tiny minority, they were disproportionately visible because of their business and civic activities. They did not typically compete with southern Christians (in some cases, such as in certain banking locations, this may have been the result of discrimination), yet the economic niches they filled could have sparked antagonism. As peddlers and merchants often catering to rural folk, including African-Americans, Jews were vulnerable to charges of excessive profiteering—charges that Rabinowitz noted—which clearly took place during the Civil War. Perceptions of such activities could also breed hatred and even violence. Department stores that bore Jewish names and lined downtown shopping avenues could have been viewed as monopolistic. Factory ownership during the early twentieth century and the association with capitalist exploitation of rural, poor whites obviously formed the backdrop of the Leo Frank case. Strikes against Jacob Elsas’s Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill had antisemitic overtones and contributed to the climate in Atlanta fomenting the case. By catering to African-Americans, Jews also bent if not broke racial taboos. A Jew was murdered in Tennessee and another in Florida after the Civil War at least partly due to their business/racial positions. If Jews obtained land as merchant/lenders during Reconstruction, it seems likely that this would have created antagonism. What about Jewish ownership of rental property? Although Jews resided in specific locations for long periods of time, this was also true in other regions. How much was officeholding and civic involvement really different in the South? Is it just that historians have asked and answered different questions across regional lines? Can similar patterns of officeholding be found in comparative communities elsewhere?

Since Rabinowitz’s untimely death, numerous studies have demonstrated the greater presence and impact of eastern European Jewish immigrants on communities in the South. Even among earlier immigrants, there was substantial internal migration so that seemingly stable Jewish enclaves were actually transformed repeatedly by both internal and external population movements.
How did this impact on regional identity, and what does it say about the nature and significance of that identity? And what of Rabinowitz’s assertion that persecution of Catholics and African-Americans shielded Jews? Why, then, did times of great racism coincide with times of heightened antisemitism? Even the high degree of conformity among southern Jews is now being questioned. Jews were active in the drive to obtain voting rights for women, and researchers have documented an even deeper and larger role in the modern Civil Rights Movement since publication of Rabinowitz’s article. Jews opposed Prohibition, advocated separation of religion and state in the public schools, and opposed the war in Vietnam, among other areas in which they confronted the southern mainstream. From another perspective, the argument for conformity as a counteraction to persecution implies that the actions of the victim can negate or, conversely, instigate the actions of the perpetrator. However, this was not the case. Some synagogues where rabbis did not speak out on behalf of civil rights were bombed, while others where Jews were outspoken were left alone. If southern Jews conformed so well and were so well accepted, why did antisemitism rise? In fact, regardless of how much Jews assimilated, as indicated by the cases of Judah P. Benjamin and David Levy/Yulee, they were always viewed as Jews and could always be castigated as such.

The questions raised here are not so much a challenge to Rabinowitz, the messenger, but to the underlying historiography that he summarized. My gut reaction coincides with his. There are always variations that should not be ignored, but the similarities concerning both acceptance and persecution in similar locations far outweigh the differences. Obviously, Jews in the South gained a great degree of tolerance if not acceptance, and they flourished. Nonetheless, they were always vulnerable and subject to real and imagined persecution. They could be admired as “our Jews” as opposed to the alien Jews elsewhere, but even that concept set them apart. In the end, many of the current assumptions concerning the relatively high degree of acceptance and acculturation among southern Jews may be documented. Yet, at this stage, what is needed is a new look at assumptions and evidence.

B. Interaction, Identity, and Black/Jewish Relations

The few studies of theological discourse between Jews and Christians reveal exciting potential for understanding interaction. Scott Langston explores the ways rabbis and Protestant clergy defined themselves and each other in nineteenth-century New Orleans. Some Reform Jews during the early twentieth century sought spirituality in Christian Science. Ellen Umansky shows how Rabbi Alfred Geiger Moses of Mobile reacted by developing a Jewish Science alternative that generated offshoots in New York. Eliza McGraw explains that Southern Baptists partly defined themselves through a changing message for missions to convert Jews. Little has been done on rabbis’ using the National
Council of Christians and Jews as an agency to explain Judaism to Christians and thereby attempt to overcome prejudice. Rabbis used radio broadcasts, newspaper columns, and college classes, among other media, to accomplish the same purpose. They also joined local ministerial associations and held leadership positions. In addition to fostering understanding, the associations also became venues to advocate for social reform.\(^{133}\)

Langston raises the issue of the rabbis’ identities as Jews and Americans. Here the debate begins with Steven J. Whitfield’s essay on the braided identity of southern Jews that overlaps with the discussion of southern distinctiveness as analyzed previously. Virtually everywhere in America, Jews identify with their location to a greater or lesser degree, and Jews in the South were no exception. But the more nuanced questions include how and why the identity changed over time and what impact did the identity have on decision-making. How important are identity and sense of place if Jews relocate so readily? Leonard Rogoff leads the discussion of the changing identity of Jews in Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, in *Homelands*, and Bryan E. Stone and Seth L. Wolitz deal with these questions as they relate to Texas Jews. In Stone’s article on Edgar Goldberg, he discusses a conflict over leadership and power in which the New York Jewish elite apparently remained unaware and unconcerned that they were being confronted. Texas Jews were defining themselves in relation to this hegemonic “other.” Did Jews in other locations outside of the South react in the same fashion? If so, this may elucidate American Jewish history and start to confront the notion that New York has really been the unique area of Jewish residence since the era of eastern European Jewish immigration. To complicate matters further, Jewish Texans identified with both the West and the South, and Jews in parts of Oklahoma thought of themselves as southerners. Students in the future should confront these questions, account for the complexity of the issue, and thereby avoid the broad, brushstroke approach.\(^{134}\)

Different people at different times have defined Jewish identity beyond religion, nationality, location, or association with Israel. The amateur historians of a century ago and their contemporaries defined Jews, in part, as a race. Leonard Rogoff has traced this concept in the South, finding little difference with the concept’s use elsewhere in America. Eric L. Goldstein, on the other hand, sees a change toward the use of race as a category in the late nineteenth century, especially among Jewish men—even as they struggled to be identified as “white.” Goldstein finds similarities and differences between the North and South and emphasizes the differences. Despite the awards his book has received, one wonders if his evidence warrants his broad conclusions.\(^{135}\) Identity has also been expressed as a shared sense of peoplehood, common historical experience, socializing via sectarian clubs, philanthropy, and even food ways.\(^{136}\) Historians will continue to debate the importance and impact of each of these.
Jews interacted with numerous immigrant/minority groups in the South. Often these groups came from the same country of origin and thus reflected national identity. This was especially true of the French and Germans during the nineteenth century, and Cuban refugees since Castro’s rise to power in 1959. First-generation eastern European and Sephardic immigrants tended to live near other immigrants in the cities. Little has appeared concerning these phenomena.\(^{137}\)

Although the historiography harks back to early descriptions of Jewish involvement in slavery, conflicts between African-Americans and Jews since the mid-1960s served as the catalyst for extensive attention to black/Jewish relations. The southern historiography is a subcategory of the larger literature. Clive Webb’s award-winning *Fight Against Fear: Southern Jews and Black Civil Rights* and the anthology I edited with Berkley Kalin, *Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights, 1880s to 1990s*, provide complete introductions to the subject and discussions of the literature. In virtually every instance, Jewish involvement in blacks’ rights represented a broader commitment to social reform.\(^{138}\) Nonetheless, the relationship between African-Americans and Jews was not always rosy. Individuals in both groups harbored prejudices against the other, and some Jews were ardent segregationists. Indeed, perhaps the best case for southern Jewish distinctiveness can be made in the area of African-American civil rights.\(^{139}\) Few Jews in the region marched or demonstrated, and most discouraged the national Jewish organizations from doing so. Except for a minority of rabbis, most of whom were either pushed out or voluntarily separated from their congregations, most rabbis—even the larger number of outspoken ones—preferred working behind the scenes through ministerial associations. Additional material has appeared since the publications of these works. Jonathan Bass augments Terry Barr’s chapter in *Quiet Voices* on Rabbi Milton Grafman. Bass and others offer an understanding portrait of those in Birmingham who believed that the city was on the brink of change. Bass argues that King used the city and relatively moderate clergy in a strategic maneuver to reinvigorate the Civil Rights Movement. Debra L. Schultz’s *Going South* discusses the motivation and experiences of mostly northern Jewish women who fought for black civil rights in the region. Raymond Mohl provides primary sources from two Jewish women activists in Miami and places their efforts in perspective.\(^{140}\)

Appropriately, much of the research has stressed the grass-roots level, and each new study illustrates the tremendous variety of experiences and responses. Rabbis and women have fared relatively well with the appraisal and Jewish business leaders less so. Few business people spoke out because they feared retribution, because they played more conservative roles in society, and because they were often on the front line in confrontations with sit-in protestors. Little has been written on black/Jewish relations in the South since 1970. Did Jewish and black reactions in the region differ from their northern counterparts as conflicts...
arose in the late 1960s and 1970s? What about black/Jewish coalitions formed in many cities in the 1980s? What about black/Jewish political interaction as officeholding for both groups expanded? Turning back in time, more studies should be undertaken for the period from the Civil War through the 1940s. At least some Jews took moderate and even relatively outspoken positions in favor of black rights during the era. How widespread was this, and what forms did they take?

At the Sixth Biennial Scholars Conference on American Jewish History in Charleston in June 2006, sociologist John Sheldon Reed noted that in the 1968 presidential election, 80 percent of northern Jews voted for Hubert Humphrey, while only 60 percent of southern Jews did so. This indicates that southern Jews were more conservative than their northern counterparts. Yet only 3 percent of southern Jews voted for George Wallace, which was a voting pattern closer to that of southern blacks than any other group. These statistics are clearly not a litmus test for southern Jewish attitudes toward integration since they date to 1968—not when the civil rights movement was in its heyday during the mid-1950s and early 1960s—but they may come as close to a comparative statistical reflection of Jewish relations to southern mores on the issue of integration as historians are likely to get.

VI. Conclusion

Having studied southern Jewish history for thirty years, I am still struck by how much remains to be done. Beyond a few state, local, and congregational histories, little has been written, for example, on southern Jewry during the last fifty years. Only recently have cross-regional articles and books appeared harking back to the integration of the amateur historian phase.141 Research of a truly comparative perspective has been undertaken with some success, but this has not been done sufficiently.142 Historians in the field must read about Jewish history elsewhere in the United States, in Europe, and in other countries that drew Jewish immigrants. They also must integrate secular history into their understanding to transcend parochialism. More comparisons must be made with other minority groups as well as with the majority. Questions and findings from urban, social, economic, religious, women’s, immigrant/ethnic, and other fields must be applied and compared and contrasted with southern Jewish history. Other immigrant/ethnic groups, for example, apparently went from peddling to dry-goods store ownership. Exploring their history may shed a different perspective on what is viewed within the field as a Jewish success story. Besides African-Americans, other groups experienced varying degrees of acceptance and persecution. Some rabbis and Jewish women openly opposed lynching and the later closing of public schools, but they always worked with non-Jews. Full recognition of such comparisons and interaction could put Jewish activities in a different perspective, one in which they might be both more and less unique.
Although historians of American Jewry are gaining greater exposure to the southern Jewish past, it remains a terra incognita to most historians of southern and American history. A chapter on southern Jews is becoming a more regular feature of regional anthologies, as are panels at history and religion conferences, but these represent tokenism rather than real integration. Cross-pollination would be healthy for both directions.

After reviewing the literature and suggesting numerous areas ripe for research, I am equally struck by the output of so many scholars during these three decades. We have a long way to go, but we have also traveled far.


The idea for this essay was first broached in 1999 by Fred Krome, then managing editor of *The American Jewish Archives Journal*, when I applied for my first fellowship at the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives. I undertook the project four years later when Gary Zola and Kevin Proffitt, on behalf of the archives, generously provided a director’s fellowship. Kevin brought the correspondence between Jacob Rader Marcus and Bertram W. Korn, Stanley Chyet, and Malcolm Stern to my attention, as well as other materials. I benefited greatly from discussions with Fred as I hashed out ideas. Dana Herman, Fred’s successor, greatly facilitated final publication. The staff at the archives is always friendly and helpful. I also benefited greatly from insightful critiques by David Geffen, Leonard Rogoff, Bryan E. Stone, Hollace A. Weiner, and Stephen J. Whitfield. To all I give sincere thanks.

Readers should realize that as complete as I have attempted to make this article, it is not inclusive; this is true especially of congregational and local histories and memoirs. Many of these can be found in the bibliographies of the volumes cited herein.

Besides being an observer, I have been an active participant in the field. Although many of my publications are listed in citations and occasionally referred to specifically in the text, it is left to other historians to judge my role and contributions for whatever they have been worth.
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A Century of Southern Jewish Historiography • 71
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141 These include a few of the studies cited above on Jews, civil rights, and race; on Jewish women; Lee Shai Weissbach’s work on Jews in small towns; and the work of William Toll, including “Jewish Families and the Intergenerational Transition in the American Hinterland,”
Rabbi Morris Newfield: Ambassador to the Gentiles, a Balancing Act

Scott M. Langston

Morris Newfield served as rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in Birmingham, Alabama, from 1895 to 1940. During his tenure, he distinguished himself in several ways, one of which was in his relations with the local Christian population. Scholars have often described Reform rabbis as serving as “ambassadors to the gentiles” or “ethnic brokers,” and Newfield has certainly been cast in this mode. Two documents housed in the American Jewish Archives (AJA) illustrate the balancing act rabbis like Newfield have undertaken when attempting to fill this role. Acting as spokespeople for their Jewish communities, they have attempted to forge common grounds and alliances, shown similarities between Christians and Jews, and actively contributed to civic reform and uplift.

Additionally, especially as the representative Jew in smaller Jewish enclaves, they have had to defend the community against insensitive remarks and overt antisemitism without fomenting further antagonism.¹

Jews had resided in Birmingham almost since its founding in 1871, when a few moved there to open businesses. By the end of the city’s first decade, Jews constituted about 1 percent of the population, and in 1882 some of them formed Temple Emanu-el. Many played prominent roles in the business community, held positions as aldermen, served on various city boards, and as a whole did not experience overt antisemitism, although they were excluded from the most prestigious social clubs. The 1910s, however, presented considerable challenges to the Jewish community. With the annexation of several suburbs, many “pietistic Protestants” entered the city’s voting pool. At the same time, Birmingham changed its government from an aldermanic system with elections by individual wards to a three-member commission elected at large, thereby lessening Jews’ chances of being elected to these positions. During this decade the “moral elements” and the “liberal elements” also battled over a number of
issues, including Prohibition, prostitution, and movies shown on Sundays. This latter issue provoked Rabbi Newfield to challenge the “pietistic Protestants.”

Using American Identity to Challenge Christians

The first document reprinted here is a letter written on 27 April 1918 to the Reverend P.B. Wells, chair of the publicity committee of Birmingham’s Pastors’ Union, as part of a struggle over whether movies should be shown in the city on Sundays. In 1915 the city had allowed labor unions and small theaters to show Sunday movies, prompting protest from the Pastors’ Union, the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, and other Christian organizations. The issue came to a head in 1918, when it was referred to the city’s voters. During the days leading up to the referendum, the Pastors’ Union, composed primarily of Protestant pastors, charged in a newspaper advertisement that a petition circulating in favor of Sunday movies included the names of every prominent Jew in the city. To thwart this support, Wells sent a letter (17 April) on behalf of the Union to Jewish voters urging them not to vote, repeatedly emphasizing that the election was “strictly a Christian issue” over “a Christian institution.”

Wells noted that the Union represented more than one hundred churches and almost fifty thousand people and that Jewish participation in the matter would “undoubtedly create an undesirable end” and “most unfortunate friction.” He closed by assuring his Jewish readers that “we have the most kindly feeling for our Jewish friends.” Given that the Union had publicly raised the issue of Jewish participation, Newfield responded with a letter (20 April) published in the paper wherein he challenged the notion that Jews should not vote in the election, as well as the assertion that every prominent Jew in the city supported showing Sunday movies. Newfield assured Wells that he had congregants who supported both sides and that he had discovered “numbers of the most prominent men of my congregation who did not sign the petition.” Wells then issued another public letter (25 April), affirming the Jewish right to vote and characterizing the Union’s appeal as merely “a friendly suggestion of one religious faith to another,” while also asserting that the United States was a Christian nation, Christianity was “the secret of America’s greatness,” and the Christian Sabbath was “fundamental to the Christian faith.” The pastor reminded the rabbi that he had immigrated to the United States and “sought a refuge in the land of the Christian Sabbath and the Protestant Christian faith.” Two days later, Newfield, a native of Hungary who had arrived in the United States in 1891, wrote the letter reprinted below.

The letter is brief and to the point, but it illustrates an important—and sometimes overlooked—concept pertaining to rabbis being ambassadors to the gentiles, namely, Newfield’s willingness to challenge Christians both publicly and privately. As has been well chronicled, Jews living in areas where Christian fundamentalism exerted tremendous influence could quickly find themselves
in a precarious situation. Such was the case with Newfield and his congregants. According to Mark Cowett, Newfield’s biographer, many of Birmingham’s evangelical Protestants had “mixed emotions about Jewish merchants,” valuing their economic contributions to the city but also being suspicious of their status as non-Christians. When threatened, these Christians could react negatively, making it risky for Jews to issue challenges. Newfield, however, took the risk, most often addressing these concerns in sermons delivered at Temple Emanu-El.\textsuperscript{5} Though these were public settings, most who heard his views were Jews rather than Christians. There certainly were risks involved in making controversial statements from his pulpit, but at least in those settings he addressed a somewhat friendly audience. The setting in which Newfield dealt with the Sunday movies issue, however, was much more risky. He now addressed Christians directly, both publicly through his letter in the newspaper and privately through his letter to Wells, who was an important representative of the Christian majority and in this case acted basically as an ambassador to the Jews, albeit one on a mission to exert Christian hegemony. Furthermore, by responding in the newspaper, Newfield immediately publicized his views to a much larger audience. In one letter he received from “A Christian,” he was congratulated on having failed “to deliver our Christian Sabbath into the hands of her enemies—Anti-Christians and Non-Christians.” The anonymous correspondent reminded Newfield that, “The Jews have come to this our Christian country with its Christian Sabbath, and have prospered through the kindness and patronage of Christian people, and it seems to many of us very unkind in them & in you their pastor & advisor to join with the forces opposed to the retention of our sacred institutions.” He then concluded, “We as Christians know better now where you stand, your attitude toward our ideals, and are better prepared to place you.”\textsuperscript{6}

The arguments Newfield made in his final response to Wells are noteworthy because they demonstrate how the rabbi tried to balance cooperating with Christians while defending Jews. In the second paragraph, he disavows having been the instigator of the public challenge but notes that he responded in the forum Wells himself chose. In the following paragraph, he denies interest in the outcome of the election as a motivating factor for his response. Instead, he focuses on the equal status of Jews in civic matters. In other words, this was not a Christian issue, as Wells had asserted, but a civil matter, something on which the Jews of Birmingham had just as much right to vote as Christians. Newfield thus challenged Wells’s efforts essentially to disenfranchise Jews on this particular matter. Newfield was treading the precarious ground of politics and religion, but as an ambassador to the gentiles he felt it necessary to risk challenging Christians. For Newfield, acting in this role not only carried with it the responsibility of educating Christians about Jews and smoothing the way for better Jewish-Christian relations, but it also meant defending Jewish rights as American citizens. The differences between Jewish and Christian
Sabbath observance—Friday night/Saturday versus Sunday—were obvious in this instance and could easily have driven a wedge between the two communities. The rabbi, however, attempted to ameliorate the repercussions of his challenge when he tried to refocus the pastor’s attention on their commonality as Americans. This meant that both shared a concern for “our country” and working together during the time of its “great need” (that is, World War I). Thus, Newfield used the status of Jews as Americans to challenge Christians, as well as overcome differences.

Ultimately, Birmingham’s voters prohibited showing movies on Sunday. Rabbi Newfield had still taken the opportunity to remind Birmingham’s Christians that, although differences existed in their religious beliefs and observances, nothing separated them when it came to exercising their rights and responsibilities as citizens. While he may not have succeeded in convincing many of this equality, he nonetheless illustrated that being an ambassador to the gentiles sometimes meant challenging Christians and even making religious differences explicit.

**Using the Bible to Work with Christians**

The second document reprinted below is the text of remarks that Newfield made to the Conference of Social Workers of Alabama. Although undated, clues exist concerning the date he delivered the address. The letterhead on which the remarks are printed identifies the rabbi as holding a Doctor of Letters degree (Lit.D), an honorary title that the University of Alabama awarded him in 1921. Newfield was also quite active in various social work organizations. In the spring of 1921, the Conference of Social Workers of Alabama, better known as the Alabama Conference of Social Work, held its annual meeting in Montgomery and elected Newfield as its president. The roots of this organization stretched back to 1901, and
Newfield had been involved since its inception. In 1922, the conference met in Birmingham from 26–28 May, with Newfield remaining as president. In the document reprinted here, Newfield thanked the pastor and members of the Independent Presbyterian Church for “graciously tendering to us this their place of evening-worship.” The Independent Presbyterian Church had been meeting in Temple Emanu-El’s facilities since its founding in 1915, as well as holding evening services in the Lyric Theater. Its pastor, the Reverend Henry M. Edmonds, was a close friend of Newfield’s and had organized the church after resigning from the Presbytery of North Alabama over theological disputes. Newfield almost immediately offered use of Temple Emanu-El to the fledgling church. As the Social Work Conference met, the church was nearing completion of its own building but was still holding services in Temple Emanu-El and the Lyric Theater, a vaudeville-era theater and movie house opened in 1914. Thus, it appears likely that Newfield’s remarks were made in 1922 at the Alabama Conference of Social Work annual meeting in Birmingham. The program included Jane Addams, the founder of Chicago’s Hull House, as a speaker.8

Newfield sought to promote unity and strong ties with Christians in several ways. His friendship with Edmonds is implied in his address and reflected in how each supported the other by offering their facilities for purposes with which the other was involved.9 Newfield also joined in common causes with Christians, in this case, social issues. The Alabama Conference of Social Work certainly included religious personnel, but its members came from various fields, reflecting its character as more than purely religious. Knowing the religious setting of the meeting place and revealing his own Reform ideology/theology, Newfield emphasized the connection between religion and social work.

Rather than simply arguing from the general nature of religion, Newfield used the Bible as a tool to cross the boundaries between Jews and Christians. Asserting that Judaism and Christianity expressed themselves supremely in social work—a theme affirmed by the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform, as well as the Social Gospel movement—he pointed to the example of the prophets as contained in “our Bible.”10 This emphasis on meeting social needs, therefore, was not unique to Reform Judaism; according to the rabbi, it was the hallmark of “the faith” and “the Scriptures,” something Jew and Christian shared. Newfield also invoked the Ten Commandments, a favorite text of both religions, as well as other passages in the “Pentateuch,” a term more familiar to Christians than its synonym, the “Torah.” After using the Bible to construct a bridge between the two groups, Newfield added further reinforcement by referencing the common challenge they faced to “our civilization.”

Newfield had invoked various commonalities to overcome differences with Christians, but it was the Bible in this instance that he emphasized primarily. The Bible was a powerful and influential text among many Americans and
could easily be used to divide Jews and Christians, something that Newfield readily recognized and admitted. Yet the rabbi also knew that it could provide a common vocabulary, ideology, and platform on which to work together. He therefore capitalized on the Bible's status and influence in American culture to promote Jewish-Christian harmony, and in doing so, demonstrated another function he performed as ambassador to the gentiles—that of facilitating interfaith understanding and cooperation.

The Skilled Ambassador

These two documents illustrate the balance that Newfield attempted to maintain in dealing with Christians, and they also reveal the complexity of being an ambassador to the gentiles. He was not simply dealing generically with Christians; he had to recognize and react to the differences among Christians themselves. Rev. Wells represented the “pietistic Protestants,” or those who held views about the Bible and social issues that differed somewhat from liberal Christians like Rev. Edmonds. Newfield and Edmonds formed a close friendship and more than once banded together to combat what they perceived to be threats from Christian groups like the Pastors’ Union. Newfield also maintained good associations with others who were amenable to his views.11 Even though, in keeping with his Reform ideology/theology, Newfield embraced tolerance and endorsed values that transcended specific religions, he still did not hesitate to challenge religious expressions he deemed as dangerous. Rather than publicly challenge the Pastors’ Union on the biblical interpretation of the Sabbath—a debate that may have proven difficult to win, given the centrality and symbolism of Sunday observance in Christianity, especially among many of Birmingham’s Christians—Newfield emphasized their commonality as American citizens. Yet when joining with more compatible Christians to address social problems, he selected certain biblical texts on whose interpretation both generally agreed, thereby solidifying mutual goodwill. His interaction with Christians, therefore, had to be skillfully shaped in light of the peculiarities of each situation, demonstrating the difficulties and risks involved in such undertakings.

Scott M. Langston has taught American history and religious and biblical studies at the undergraduate and graduate levels for about twenty years. He has written numerous essays and books, including most recently, Exodus Through the Centuries (Blackwell Publishing, 2006) and “Interaction and Identity: Jews and Christians In Nineteenth Century New Orleans,” reprinted in Dixie Diaspora: An Anthology of Southern Jewish History, edited by Mark Bauman (University of Alabama Press, 2006). He is currently president of the Southern Jewish Historical Society and a Lecturer in Religion at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas.
Letter from Morris Newfield to Reverend P. B. Wells, 27 April 1918.
(Courtesy American Jewish Archives)
Text of remarks made by Morris Newfield to the Conference of Social Workers of Alabama, ca. 1922.

(Courtesy American Jewish Archives)
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A.E. Frankland’s History of the 1873 Yellow Fever Epidemic in Memphis, Tennessee

Alan M. Kraut

It began with a seemingly harmless mosquito bite. Three to six days later, the victim ran a fever of 102–104 degrees. The pulse became rapid but later slowed. The face was flushed, the eyes sunken, the tongue ringed in red and furred at the center. Soon the nausea, vomiting, and constipation began. The skin took on a yellow tinge and the vomit darkened. The smell was unmistakable. Many patients died within a week, the latest victims of yellow fever.

This disease was the perennial scourge of American communities prior to the twentieth century. Every summer those living near rivers and oceans were menaced by an epidemic disease that no one understood in an era prior to germ theory. Some blamed miasmas arising from decaying organic matter, while others were convinced that poor sanitation was to blame. Care, not cure, was all that physicians and those who assisted them could offer. In an era when governments played a limited role, if any, in battling epidemics and providing for the public health of communities, private organizations collected resources, and dedicated individuals put their lives on the line to help their neighbors.

In 1873, a yellow fever epidemic swept through Memphis, Tennessee. Thousands died in this bustling commercial city on the Mississippi River. Along with their Christian neighbors, Memphis’s Jewish community sprang into action to care for its own and others.

Because of its prominence as a commercial hub, Memphis had a significant Jewish community numbering 2,100 before the Civil War. During the war the city’s Jews were loyal to the Confederacy. One fiercely loyal partisan was A.E. Frankland, a partner in a firm of auctioneers and commission merchants dealing in “real estate, negroes, merchandise, furniture, groceries, in city and county.” Later he wrote, “It was quite natural, they sided with the section that was their home.” In 1873, Frankland, now a real estate businessman, a Reform Jew, a leader in the Jewish community’s International Order of B’nai Brith lodge, and President of the Hebrew Hospital Relief Association, did not flee the city, but risked his life daily to help others during the epidemic. After the scourge passed, Frankland scribbled in his own hand, “History, Yellow Fever Epidemic Memphis, 1873.” Lengthy excerpts of the original document and collected data were later printed as a pamphlet.

Yellow fever is a viral disease of short duration transmitted to humans by various genera of mosquitoes. The disease can be mild or malignant. The urban form of the virus is transmitted from human to human by the *Aedes aegypti*, while the jungle form (sylvatic) is transmitted to humans by *Haemagogus* and other forest mosquitoes that have acquired the virus from wild primates.
Yellow fever is endemic in the tropical regions of Africa and the Americas. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, periodic epidemics of urban yellow fever swept through the American South and, at times, northern ports such as Boston and Philadelphia in the summertime, killing tens of thousands. Epidemics such as the one that descended upon Memphis’s population were quite dramatic in their effects. Those bitten by a mosquito carrying the virus ran a high temperature accompanied by a headache, jaundice, and high protein content in their urine. There was hemorrhaging in the stomach and intestines. The disease’s name derived from the jaundice. Those who called the disease “black vomit,” or vomito negro, were observing results of bleeding into the stomach. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, mortality rates were high, sometimes reaching 70 percent. Today, medical scientists know that the mortality rate was actually much lower, because those with milder forms of the disease were often overlooked and not diagnosed. Not until the late nineteenth century did researchers finally make progress against yellow fever.7

Although there were lesser outbreaks in earlier summers, Memphis experienced its first major yellow fever epidemic in 1855, when 250 cases and 134 deaths were reported. The number of whites and blacks were not reported separately. However, blacks possessed a genetic resistance to the disease such that they suffered milder forms of the disease and dramatically lower rates of mortality, so yellow fever took its greatest toll among whites.8 Until 1855, some believed that Memphis was above the yellow fever zone of the Mississippi Valley and therefore protected from the disease. Later medical observers speculated that increasing river traffic from New Orleans, Vicksburg, and Natchez likely transported mosquito vectors to Memphis. The town was swampy, and the Mississippi flooded annually. It was drained by a winding creek, Bayou Gayoso, which emptied into the Mississippi by way of a tributary, the Wolf River. Over the years prior to the Civil War, as Memphis grew and prospered, the bayou became little more than a slow-moving, open sewer, which not infrequently overflowed into nearby low-lying neighborhoods. It was a perfect breeding ground for mosquitoes. And, as often happens, the poor lived at the lower levels of the topography, grouped in communities such as Pinch, where Irish immigrants lived.9

In 1873, eighteen years after that first large epidemic, the city was again besieged by disease. The year began badly for Memphis. Its horse and mule population was stricken by epizootic meningitis, paralyzing the transportation system. An especially severe freeze required that river traffic be suspended for a month, causing great financial loss. A smallpox epidemic swept the city in the first months of the year, followed by a mild visitation of Asiatic cholera. The city was still reeling when yellow fever arrived in September.10

In his characteristically florid prose, A.E. Frankland compared the beginning of the yellow fever epidemic to the opening of a play. It was September,
1873. Frankland had just returned from a trip to recover from the trauma and hard work of aiding those who suffered from the earlier diseases of the year. Then a “friend and neighbor Dr. J. Joseph Williams” mentioned in the course of a buggy ride, “I have several sick people now, but I have no idea of there being any yellow fever—near the town—and insisted on my going with him to see two of his patients both of whom were friends of mine…. It was the smell that told Frankland immediately that yellow fever was present. When they stopped at the residence of a Mr. H. Wolf, his appearance left no doubt: “his tongue of sole leather, his red glaring eye, watery & glassy skin, dry and hard as a flint, the pores of which seemed hermetically sealed, all these symptoms told us alas too plainly, we were not mistaken in smell…. ”

While it may have been obvious to Frankland, “neither Dr. Williams nor the faculty of Memphis [perhaps Memphis Medical College] that we were intimate with” immediately agreed. Frankland noted that “Each Doctor gave it their own name, some Miasmatic—Billious—Malarial Spotted—Typhoid—in fact every thing but yellow fever.” But Frankland could not be persuaded and “finally the faculty became vexed, their patients died—then came hurried consultations—and consternation while they denied…. And the reason for the denial, according to Frankland, was “‘because the merchant princes were afraid it would kill trade’—they doubted at last delirium—hemorrhages [sic]—vomito—stared them in the face— the press were buttonholed ‘for God’s sake do not publish anything’—keep it out the papers, or our trade is ruined. Say nothing about it, tis only a little sickness among the ‘Irish in Pinch.’ …” There was no doubt in Frankland’s mind that the business community of Memphis hoped to shape the diagnosis to fit their interests—a pattern not uncommon in the social history of epidemic disease. Frankland did not hesitate to mock those who cared so little for the yellow fever’s victims: “‘What’s sickness to us?’ Why do you let the hearses and burial carts go down Main St.? Why don’t they go some other street? You don’t see them in the business part of New York, Philadelphia or Boston … such charitable remarks beset you on every side—and were not silent but outspoken.” He was especially outraged by the indifference to the suffering of the poor, “what was the life of the poor to them compared to their money making and money getting…. ”

Frankland saw this fearful and selfish behavior as epitomizing the worst in human character: “Do we not know a sister who turned her own brother out of doors—and sent him in a dray after us—so as she could avoid the danger of having him in the house. We placed him in [the] infirmary and in twenty-four hours in his grave!” Others fled, “leaving their own flesh and blood behind them to be nursed and cared for, and in many cases to die…. ” only to later return and wail in grief. Finally, on 14 September 1873, the physicians of Memphis “were at length compelled to declare [a] Yellow Fever Epidemic.”
Frankland was quite certain that passengers on the steamboat Bee from New Orleans had brought the sickness with them on the bodies of passengers of the “poorest class.”

Frankland thanked God for sparing his life so that he might bear witness to such suffering as he hoped never to see again. Though his observations made him somewhat cynical of his neighbors, they did not inhibit his efforts to help those he could. He became a member and secretary of the Citizens Executive Committee, which was “clothed with full power to beg and borrow what means they could and to do and perform such deeds, as the occasion might require….” Because Memphis’s treasury was “depleted,” the committee sought discounters for the city’s notes, but they could raise little revenue. However, a broad appeal “to the charitable all over the United States” met with better results, and funds arrived “by the barrel full.” Now Frankland and some of his colleagues “went out to work among the sick, dying and dead….,”

Although the Howard Association, a charitable organization named after a British philanthropist, is often given credit for significantly helping the suffering, Frankland thought the Howards (as he called them) a bit too reticent to visit the sick. They were trying to do philanthropy from the safety of their office. However, eventually they, too, “done their duty—nobly!” Not all of the citizens of Memphis rose to the occasion. Some threatened to burn down an infirmary that had been established in the commandant’s house at the Navy Yard, even though it was filled with the city’s sick.

Frankland, along with a number of other Memphis Jews, organized the Hebrew Hospital Relief Association (HHRA). He was its president, Lewis Wechsler its secretary, and Jonathan Rice the treasurer. The organization joined the German Benevolent Association, the Knights of Pythias, Odd Fellows, and Masons, among others, in bringing relief to the sick. Frankland made certain that each group was given adequate funding. He now wore many organizational hats. In addition to being Secretary of the Citizens Executive Committee and President of the HHRA, he was on the executive committee of the Howard Association and was Grand Nassi AB. [District President] of Grand District Lodge No. 7 of the International Order of B’nai B’rith. When the HHRA rented a house for an infirmary, neighbors protested, and Frankland was “called out of bed by a delegation of citizens” and told that, if patients were lodged in the house, it would be burned to the ground. The project had to be abandoned. Still, so successful was Frankland in recruiting both contributions and volunteers that he soon found himself in charge of aiding the sick not just in his ward, but throughout the city.

Frankland had high praise for the priests, nuns, and ministers, as well as the rabbis, who ministered to the sick. He described Rabbi Max Samfield as being “even at the dying bed of the Prostitute Jew or Gentile no difference to him[;] he was everywhere. Even at the dead hour of midnight you could have found
him amidst the lurid glare of the pine torch reciting the burial service while the rain poured down in torrents and the sobs of remaining friends, broken, by retracing our steps from the resting place of the dead.”

Frankland himself worked from five o’clock in the morning until midnight most days. In addition to the distribution of funds and other administrative tasks, he labored directly among the sick, many of whom were “the poorest of the poor,” but “respectable and hardworking.” At one point 135 individuals were sick and required daily visits for weeks. Some of the ill were afraid of doctors, resisted efforts to go to the infirmary, and had to be persuaded or forced to get treatment.

Frankland did not escape the epidemic unscathed. He survived, but his beloved son, Walter, did not. Near the end of the epidemic the child fell sick for four days, with his father at his bedside until the end. Even the death of his son did not keep Frankland from aiding others. Indeed, his words suggest that Frankland needed to keep active for his own emotional health. Both of his sons, Morris and Walter, had actively cared for the sick, but it was Walter who had gone every day with Dr. Williams until the physician died. Even then, Walter continued to visit the sick because he hoped one day to be a physician, as well. Frankland recalled how he had remonstrated with the boy because of “the danger he ran” and how the lad had laughed at his father, who he thought “wished to make a coward of him.” Frankland sought solace in faith, writing that “God [had] seen fit to take him and we dare not repine. ‘What He does is well done,’ we have said it so often to others. We must practice it ourselves now. He is better off removed from this sphere of suffering and trials. Who shall not say his spirit has its rewards.”

Frankland, so critical of those who would not assist the sick, never failed to credit those who did. One was his beloved driver and assistant, David Thilman, who survived the epidemic and whom Frankland, the warden of the Reform Jewish cemetery, appointed as assistant warden. In his memoir of the epidemic, Frankland sought to explain his actions that had been questioned by his critics. Among these was his giving a gold cross to a nurse, Loula Wilkinson. While some of Frankland’s co-religionists may have been critical of his purchase and presentation of a Christian religious symbol, Frankland explained that this brave and tireless woman had refused payment and other rewards for the many risks she took and so “knowing her to be a Catholic we purchased an Elegant Gold Cross for her and engraved her name upon it. Knowing she would not refuse the emblem of her faith—in this case we were correct. She accepted same on her knees, breathing a prayer for the donors.” She, too, caught the fever but recovered. Later, the proprietor of the store where the cross was bought revealed the purchase to Vincent Collyer, President of New York’s YMCA, who wished to reimburse Frankland and thereby become the donor. However, Frankland explained to him, “No Sir, the Jew gave you a Christ that placed a value on the
Cross. They give you the ‘Cross too’ to make the value complete.” Later, Collyer described the episode in an essay sent to the New York press titled “[The] Jew and the Cross,” making the entire matter public and Frankland a somewhat reluctant hero. The best part of the episode, according to Frankland, was that the young lady came to the attention of a wealthy gentleman whom she later married.23

The frost of autumn brought the end of the 1873 yellow fever epidemic. Frankland wrote with some bitterness that those who had fled returned “to get back to business.” Because of the human loss, “every association had to re-organize,” bringing “order out of chaos.” Official reports listed more than 5,000 individuals with the fever; more than 2,000 died within two months. However, Frankland believed the latter total to be closer to 2,500 because “many a body was buried ‘unknown’ and ‘uncounted.’”24 The Jewish community was reduced to 300 by emigration and death. Based on internments at the Reform and Orthodox cemeteries, respectively, Frankland calculated that 94 Jews had died, leaving behind 31 widows, 11 widowers, and 181 orphans.25

While the physical danger to Frankland disappeared with the epidemic, his reputation was threatened when he refused to turn over the remaining relief funds collected from the Jewish community to the B’nai B’rith lodge for its endowment fund. Instead, determined that the donations continue to help the neediest, as they were intended to do, he reported the finances only to his own District Grand Lodge no. 7 and placed the remaining $2,000 in the sinking fund of the Cleveland Orphan Asylum.26 Frankland appropriately concluded his memoir by thanking God “for his mercy to us,” although he acknowledged that “time alone will efface our recollections of these dreadful things.”27

In 1878, Carlos Juan Finlay of Cuba identified the insect vector that spread yellow fever as the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito (also called *Stegomyia fasciata*). The theory was confirmed in 1900 with the use of human volunteers in Havana by Walter Reed, James Carroll, Aristedes Agramonte, and Jesse Lazear of the U.S. Army Yellow Fever Commission. Later researchers learned how best to rid the environment of the conditions in which the mosquito flourished.

Frankland’s memoir of the 1873 yellow fever epidemic suggests a Jewish community that contributed enthusias-
tically to both the economic and civic life of its city—a community evidently accepted by its gentile neighbors. Frankland and other Memphis Jews had remained loyal to the South during the Civil War, and during the epidemic crisis they continued to fight shoulder to shoulder with gentiles. Granted, Memphis Jews channeled their resources to their own organizations, such as the Hebrew Hospital Relief Association; however, Jewish organizations assisted non-Jews, as well, and prominent individuals such as Frankland held leadership positions in both Jewish and non-Jewish aid organizations.

At the same time that Jews were integrated into the public life of Memphis, ample evidence shows that they retained a strong sense of their distinctive identity and maintained their own institutions reflecting Reform and Orthodox practices, respectively. The concern that arose about the propriety of Frankland’s purchase of a gold cross to reward a non-Jewish nurse suggests sensitivity to appearances among members of a self-conscious religious minority. However, Frankland’s good-humored but firm response to Reverend Collyer and the latter’s generous praise of Frankland’s gesture reflects an ease and openness of discourse that is only possible when religious communities are on good terms with each other.

Frankland’s perspective is strikingly consistent with the historical research on the Memphis Jewish community as well as many of the studies of Jewish communities in other southern cities. The relationship between southern Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors in the post-Civil War South was often cordial and cooperative in the public sector. Jews were integrated into the community economically. Many had not opposed slavery and had fought for the South in the Civil War. Jews and their gentile neighbors worshipped separately, and intermarriage was discouraged by both groups. However, modestly sized Jewish populations that provided for their own and did not publicly challenge
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the South’s social system, including its racial hierarchy, posed little social threat. Jews could routinely participate in the cultural and civic life of their community; and when a crisis arose, such as an epidemic, their ready assistance was offered freely and accepted gratefully.

Frankland’s motives for his sacrifice during the epidemic appear to have been genuinely altruistic, but medical assistance, especially the creation of medical institutions by philanthropic members of Jewish communities, was also a well-trodden path to Jewish social acceptance and integration into the broader community. By the time of the 1873 epidemic, Jews had already opened hospitals to care for their own and other members of the community in Cincinnati, New York, New Orleans, Baltimore, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Chicago. Often women took the lead in organizing and fundraising. In Denver, The Hebrew Ladies’ Benevolent Society, especially Frances Weisbatt Jacobs, led in establishing National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, a non-sectarian institution, although many of its tuberculosis patients were indigent eastern European Jews sent by their labor unions, or landsmannshaften. After 1900, many more Jewish hospitals were founded in congested, industrial cities to care for industrial workers and their families. In Newark, New Jersey, the Daughters of Israel led the fundraising to build Newark Beth Israel Hospital, a nondenominational hospital under Jewish auspices. Over the decades, Newark’s Jews sustained the hospital as their gift to the people of Newark in the spirit of tikkun olam (healing the world).

The story of the Memphis yellow fever epidemic as told by Frankland demonstrates how religious and ethnic minorities, such as the Jews of Memphis, hampered by scant resources and the imperfect scientific understanding of their day, nevertheless united with their neighbors to “take arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them.” It is, then, also a tale of compassion and heroism repeated time and again in the annals of the history of American medicine and American Jewry.
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The option mentioned by Hamlet in Shakespeare’s play.
One of the most moving episodes in the history of the struggle for women’s ordination can be found in the short-lived rabbinic career of Paula Herskovitz Ackerman. A rebbetzin who served as rabbi for three years after her husband’s sudden death, Ackerman’s struggles provide a window into the challenges and possibilities initially associated with the pulpit rabbinate as a career for women. Born in Pensacola, Florida, in 1893, Paula Ackerman had a traditional upbringing and played an active role in her congregation, Beth El. She was confirmed there and also studied Hebrew privately with a local Orthodox rabbi. Though Ackerman hoped to study medicine, her father bristled at the idea, and when the family needed her financial assistance, she began giving music lessons and teaching at the local high school. At that time she met William Ackerman, who was then serving as Beth El’s rabbi. They married in 1919. After two years in Natchez, Mississippi, where their only child, William Jr., was born, the Ackermans moved to Meridian, Mississippi, in 1922, where William served as the rabbi of Temple Beth Israel.1

An active rebbetzin for almost three decades, Ackerman taught Sunday school and preconfirmation classes at Beth Israel. She also served as board member of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods and gained valuable public speaking experience by lecturing on behalf of the organization to local sisterhoods. This helped her comfortably substitute for her husband on the pulpit when he was away or ill.2

William Ackerman died on 30 November 1950, and the synagogue president asked Paula to take her husband’s place as spiritual leader until a replacement could be found. Thanks to the following letters, in which she shares her thinking with her childhood rabbi, Jacob D. Schwarz, then national director of synagogue activities for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC), we learn Ackerman’s rationale for accepting the invitation to serve as interim rabbi. We also gain insight into the hurdles that she faced and the external factors that influenced her choice.
In the first letter, dated less than two weeks after William’s death, Ackerman describes the synagogue board’s request that she take over her husband’s position:

Dec. 12, 1950

Dear Friend, 3

Thank you for your comforting messages and prayers. I think there is comfort in the universal sharing of a great loss and I do realize how much Bill meant to so many people everywhere. We shared so much together—he and I—and both you and he taught me to make God very real in my life. Now He is truly my salvation—my staff and my support.

Our people here too, are being so wonderful to me. I don’t know if Dr. Eisendrath 4 has told you of the unanimous action of the Board here to ask me to continue in Bill’s place but I do want you to know it even before I come to some decision in the matter. I’m so well aware of my inadequacy but they’ve presented it to me in so considerate a manner—they know that the only training I’ve had is experience—but they want me to give them what I have and they will help me with the rest.

I also know how revolutionary the idea is—therefore it seems to be a challenge that I pray I can meet. If I can just plant a seed for the Jewish woman’s larger participation—if perhaps it will open a way for women students to train for congregational leadership then my life would have some meaning.

I do have to have a complete physical check-up before I can plan for anything. Yet I would like to hear if you are as enthusiastic over the idea as Mr. Kay (our president) tells me Rabbi Eisendrath is.

These clippings will interest you. We all forgot to list Bill’s war time activities and he did give a great deal of himself to them—he was a chaplain in Pensacola during World War I & Civilian Chaplain here at Key Fie[l]d5 during World War II—he received many official commendations for his work here & really made an outstanding contribution.

I’m not quite up to letter writing so please forgive my errors & inconsistencies—write me when you can.

Most Sincerely,

Paula

Please thank Jo Schoenbrun, Rabbis Egelson 6 and Zepin 7 for me until I can do so formally.
Even in this first letter, so soon after her husband’s death, in the midst of weighing the very personal costs and benefits of accepting this invitation, Ackerman understood the larger symbolic significance of her decision. By choosing to fill in for her husband at this small, southern temple, Ackerman would be taking a “revolutionary” stance, for her new role would open up the possibility of women serving as rabbis in the future.

In the second letter to Schwarz, written three weeks later, one already sees the impact of public opinion on Ackerman’s thinking. First, she addresses those—including Schwarz—who question her qualifications for the position. In response, she invokes her rebbetzin credentials, reminding Schwarz that she and her husband had served the congregation together for twenty-seven years. Assuming the role of rabbi was the logical extension of the two-person rabbinate that she had shared with her husband in that community for more than two decades. Ackerman reminds Schwarz how Jewishly knowledgeable she is, chiding him for doubting her abilities since he was the rabbi who had confirmed her and she had worked in his religious school after confirmation. Though she concedes her limitations as a preacher, Ackerman challenges Schwarz to recommend books to help her better prepare. Ackerman worries about the adequacy of her rudimentary Hebrew knowledge, but she recognizes that what congregants most want is for her to speak from her heart.

Second, Ackerman underplays her role. Even though she had acknowledged in her earlier letter that taking over as rabbi would have huge symbolic significance, in this letter, in response to criticism, Ackerman mutes the importance of her decision, emphasizing that she is only considering this on an interim basis, “until they can find a suitable Rabbi,” and that she is not embarking on a new career. This gendered response serves to downplay the importance of her decision without overturning it.

Third, Ackerman explains her very pragmatic reasons for taking on the role. From the congregation’s perspective, she knew how difficult it would be to find a qualified rabbi for such a small congregation. From a personal standpoint, Ackerman lived in a parsonage. Unless she became the rabbi, she would need to find a new place to live. By taking over the pulpit, Ackerman and the congregation both stood to gain a sense of security. She admits that it would also be emotionally beneficial, for it would keep her “so beautifully occupied at the time I need it most.”

Fourth, Ackerman strengthens her arguments in favor of accepting the position by pointing to the positive reception garnered from the gentile community. She notes the “enthusiastic” support of the non-Jewish population and the fact that the state of Mississippi would recognize her as a legal officiant at weddings and funerals. For Jews living as a minority in a majority culture that they revered, invoking the endorsement of the non-Jewish world served to enhance one’s legitimacy among one’s fellow Jews.
Jan. 9, 1951
Dear Friend,

Please forgive my long delay in answering your fine letter. I do want to thank you for presenting the picture to me so thoroughly—for taking the time to discuss it with me in such detail.

I agree with so much that you’ve said—yet there are some things that I feel you do not quite understand.

For one thing I have no idea or intention of embarking on a career at my age or state of health. There is no congregation in the whole country that I’d even consider serving as “Rabbi” except Meridian where Bill & I worked together so happily for 27 years. The fact that they want me so whole-heartedly & unanimously (and the non-Jewish population is as enthusiastic) gives me the courage to try to lead them (and here’s an important point) until they can find a suitable Rabbi.

For my part I’m considering it wholly on an interim basis. My interest in this congregation is such that if I felt it was slipping with me at the helm I’d quickly retire & insist that they find some-one. I know as well as they that it won’t be easy to find the sort of man Bill was. Oh, I know there are some “misfits” available but they don’t want that type. Nor can they offer enough, either in congregational activity or financial assets to make this pulpit attractive to the right man.

Do you know how many children we have in our Religious School? Sixteen! Do you think that will present a problem too big for me to handle? Especially after I’ve done it since you confirmed me! As for the Youth activities that you say takes trained leadership. It does—but our problem here is that we have no youth.

As for the sermons—I don’t intend to preach philosophy or higher criticism of the Bible—they’ve asked me merely to give them some of the faith I have in my own heart—the Jewish way of life that I’ve lived every day of my life—that shouldn’t be too hard. Bill has a wonderful library which I intend to give to the congregation as a memorial to him. Perhaps you too can help me out with available subject material—I know there’s plenty.

I’m wondering too, if there isn’t a little book of ethical stories or Talmud Tales suitable for little talks to the Sabbath School. If there is tell me about it. Or anything else you have to suggest.

As for marriages & funerals—well the State of Mississippi will let me do them legally. I shall however, make it known to the Congregation that if they wish the services of a neighboring Rabbi for such occasions I would welcome them freely.

The thing that worries me most is my very meager knowledge of Hebrew—you know how little I know—I can read the Services—have done it many times but the Torah is another thing. They don’t seem to want too much Hebrew—I rather think we’ll be able to work something out there too, for the time being.
If I can carry on here for a few months it would be so wonderful for me. With Mama's condition so precarious it means much to me to continue on here in this home which is a parsonage you know. As for my own state of mind I know of nothing that could keep me so beautifully occupied at the time I need it most. So pray with me and for me that God will give me the powers equal to the task. I shall need His blessings and His gifts sublime. I truly feel that it is a call and that like Samuel I must answer: “Here am I”.

Most sincerely,
Paula

In his reply, Schwarz reassures Ackerman that he supports her decision and offers her concrete suggestions for sermonic and story material. He also offers several options for how to conduct the Torah reading service. In Ackerman’s third letter, below, she thanks him for his approval and suggestions, but she also reveals her anger at Eisendrath. He initially supported Ackerman’s appointment but later publicly denied having done so. He claimed that the UAHC could not endorse her appointment because she had not been ordained as a rabbi. In a letter to the synagogue president, Eisendrath conceded that, as a rabbi’s wife, Ackerman had the “opportunity and the privilege of being at his [her husband’s] side for many years as a helpmate in every high sense.” Yet he withdrew his endorsement because he worried about the ripple effect of her taking on a rabbinic role. Conflating the issue of gender with that of ordination, Eisendrath focused his disapproval on the fact that Ackerman was not a rabbi, but, of course, no woman could earn ordination at that time, guaranteeing that his opposition to lay leadership would also undermine the possibility of women serving as rabbis. In fact, his criticism did attack Ackerman’s gender, even if not explicitly. Eisendrath noted that many rabbis’ wives served with distinction, and he admitted concern that Ackerman’s precedent might inspire other rebbetzins to emulate her. Ackerman’s hurtful tone reflects her sense of betrayal, since she insists that she had already assured him that it was not her intention to call herself a rabbi, nor did she want or expect ordination or a career. Ackerman feels burdened by the weight of this decision, and she asks Schwarz to pray for her.

Jan. 23, 1951

Dear Jake [Jacob D. Schwarz],

Thank you, dear friend, for your understanding letter of approval and for your helpful suggestions. I am sure you know how distasteful and distressing all this publicity is to me, particularly the news that has been so distorted and inaccurate. Yet, I sincerely feel that Dr. Eisendrath could have handled it very much better than he did. Some day I’ll tell you all about it.
This much I want you to know now. Mr. Kay did not make one single move without consulting Eisendrath first. Before he spoke to me, he called Eisendrath, told him how members of the Congregation from every cross-section had, simultaneously with him, suggested my carrying on in Bill’s place if it could be done—and Eisendrath told him he thought it a wonderful idea. He did mention the question of “qualifications”—Mr. Kay told him they were aware of my lack of formal training but they wanted me & felt I could satisfy their needs. He further asked Eisendrath to coin a title for me, since there didn’t seem to be one that would fit.

It took me a full month to make a decision but we certainly did think we had Eisendrath’s blessing as the enclosed letter indicates.

Again, before Mr. Kay released the publicity he called Eisendrath & asked for the signal to go ahead, saying he only wished to give it to the local paper one day ahead but if Eisendrath wished he could handle the Nat’l end. Because Eisendrath did give us the impression that he wanted the pioneering idea to take root.

Of course there were deplorable inaccuracies & I do regret whatever embarrassment they caused but I feel very much hurt that after Eisendrath called me & I assured him that it was not my intention to call myself a Rabbi—nor did I want or expect ordination—nor was I seeking a career etc. etc. yet he completely reversed his stand without any consideration whatsoever of my innate sincerity & humble desire to serve the cause of Judaism. Dr. Glueck was very much more understanding & considerate of me and Dr. Goldenson wrote me a letter that I shall treasure all my life.

It makes me very, very humble to have our Congregation here as well as the entire non-Jewish community—so confident that I can serve—so whole heartedly with me. I cannot help but feel that it is the Lord’s doings and that He will somehow show me the way.

And of course, tho’ they haven’t asked it of me, I feel it to be an interim service—I hope they can get a Rabbi soon.

Mr. Kay has told me of his conversations with Rabbi Egelson & Dr. Goldenson—if Dr. Goldenson can come for the installation I would indeed feel it a sacred consecration and I could courageously stand up against whatever criticism there was of my purest intentions.

I need your prayers tho’ more than ever—

With warm greetings—

Most Sincerely,

Paula

I have already put May 2nd on my calendar.

Please send the enclosed letters back to me—the yellow copy was one Sydney wrote to help Eisendrath justify himself. The editorial I’m enclosing just to show you the non-Jewish reaction here.
Ackerman served as rabbi of Beth El Congregation in Meridian from January 1951 until September 1953. She later recalled this as three “wonderful years!” Nine years later, her childhood congregation in Pensacola invited her to serve for six months until the congregation could find a new rabbi, an experience that she also enjoyed. Thanks to her own words and to her sense of history, which led her both to preserve her letters and then donate them to the American Jewish Archives, we are able to glimpse the internal deliberations that led Ackerman to become the first American Jewish woman to take on the role of rabbi.

What can we learn from Ackerman’s experience? Do the letters indicate that the members of Beth El Congregation were a foresighted, progressive group who wanted to blaze a trail for Jewish women to the pulpit? According to Ackerman, the congregation as a whole seemed more open to the idea of female rabbinic leadership than the religious establishment as articulated by Eisendrath was, but it seemed driven more by pragmatic reasons than by feminist ones. These letters may tell us more about the challenges of small Jewish communities than they do about gender. We learn that the congregants wanted a religious leader who cared about them, and they were less concerned about the textual fluency or erudition—or gender—of their leader than they were about his/her dedication and commitment to Judaism and to their community.

As for Ackerman, we learn that she felt comfortable serving despite her inadequacies in Hebrew and in traditional texts, because she knew how relatively unimportant these qualities were for her congregants and how limited her job options were at the time. Yet while she remained focused on the practical, she never lost sight of the larger significance of service to her congregation. She understood that the motivations for religious leadership are both lofty and mundane and that the key to success as a congregational rabbi lies not in gender but rather in fostering relationships between the laity and the leader.

Despite the angst that she experienced at the time, Ackerman believed that God “called” her to serve. She also correctly perceived that her 1951 decision to fill in as rabbi would help pave the way for women’s ordination decades later. Thrust into the rabbinic role by life’s circumstances, Ackerman succeeded through her seriousness of purpose, courage, talent, and perseverance in providing a model of inspiring religious leadership for rabbis—both male and female—in generations to come.14

Shuly Rubin Schwartz is the Irving Lehrman Research Associate Professor of American Jewish History at The Jewish Theological Seminary and dean of its undergraduate school, the Albert A. List College of Jewish Studies. Her latest book, The Rabbi’s Wife: The Rebbetzin in American Jewish Life, won the 2006 National Jewish Book Award in the area of modern Jewish thought.
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Judah P. Benjamin and Slavery

Maury Wiseman

Judah Phillip Benjamin was one of the first Jewish senators in the United States. Representing the state of Louisiana and later the Confederate States of America, Benjamin was also an adherent of the South’s peculiar institution of slavery. That Benjamin supported slavery should not be surprising considering that he was born, raised, and lived most of his life in slave societies, yet historians have only cursorily examined his views on this subject. Benjamin’s 11 March 1858 Senate speech advocating the adoption of the Lecompton constitution in the Kansas territory—the Kansas Bill—provides the most comprehensive articulation of his views on slavery.

Born on St. Croix in 1811, Judah Benjamin’s parents, Rebecca and Philip, immigrated to the southern United States in 1813. Stopping first in Wilmington, North Carolina, they continued on to Charleston, South Carolina, where they resided amid a thriving Jewish community. Benjamin’s intellectual precociousness earned him the financial backing to attend Yale University, but he left after only a brief stay. He returned to Charleston and, opting to descend further into slave territory rather than leave it behind, then moved to New Orleans, where he began studying law.¹

Benjamin was admitted to the Louisiana Bar in 1832. His career advanced quickly, even while his personal life was often filled with turmoil. He married Natalie St. Martin, the daughter of a prominent local Creole family the following year. Their marriage, however, was
tumultuous, and despite the birth of their only child, Ninette, in 1843, Natalie separated from him in 1845 and moved to Paris, France. They never divorced, eventually developing a closer relationship following his arrival in England in 1865.

Despite these personal issues, Benjamin’s legal reputation grew dramatically, and by the late 1840s he was admitted to the Bar of the United States Supreme Court. Securing a place in politics with the help of two powerful Louisiana Whigs, John and Thomas Slidell, he was elected to represent New Orleans in the Louisiana House of Representatives in 1842 and participated in the state constitutional convention of 1844–1845. In 1852, Benjamin sought and won election to the U.S. Senate. Declining a nomination for the U.S. Supreme Court, he served in the Senate until 1861, first representing Louisiana’s Whig constituency, then joining the Democratic ticket in 1856 after the demise of the Whig party.

The basis of Benjamin’s political success was his advocacy of states’ rights and slavery alongside his promotion of commercial development and internal improvements. Although he was an ardent sectionalist, he preferred the moderate Baltimore Convention over the more radical Charleston Convention during the secession crisis of 1860–1861. When negotiators failed to secure a compromise to save the union, Benjamin heeded his constituents’ demands and, on 26 January 1861, Louisiana became the fourth state to secede from the union. Benjamin resigned his Senate seat soon thereafter.

Organizational ability and political experience made Benjamin a candidate for many available administrative and diplomatic positions in the new Confederate States of America. Initially appointed Attorney-General, in October 1861 he was installed as the Secretary of War. He lacked a military background, however, and his efforts often transgressed military codes and procedures; he personally clashed with several prominent Confederate generals, including Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson and Joseph Johnston. Internally strife-ridden and constantly assailed in the southern press, his tenure as Secretary of War culminated in the military debacle at Raleigh, North Carolina, in late 1861. The defeat forced Benjamin out of office, but he was quickly reappointed as Secretary of State in March 1862. Tireless efforts to manage Confederate intelligence operations and secure foreign aid and recognition went unrewarded as the Confederacy began crumbling, and he was forced to flee Richmond as the Confederate capital collapsed in April 1865. He evaded federal troops on his flight south through Florida and managed a harrowing escape to the Bahamas before proceeding to Havana, Cuba. From there, he made his way to London in early September 1865.

Benjamin began rebuilding his legal career immediately upon his arrival in England. Not yet a British citizen and retaining invalid American legal credentials, Benjamin’s route to legal practice in England began inauspiciously
enough at the Benchers of Lincoln’s Inn in late 1865. Within a year, however, he was granted special permission to apply for admission to the Bar in May 1866. Working with the same diligence and utilizing his same talent in foreign language, rhetoric, and diplomacy that marked his career in the United States, Benjamin quickly won praise in England. In August 1868 he published a famous legal treatise widely known as “Benjamin on Sales.” Later, he was named Queens Counsel for Lancashire County and became a barrister at his English alma mater before retiring from public life in 1883. He spent his remaining time with Natalie and Ninette in Paris before succumbing to illness on 6 May 1884.

Benjamin’s views on slavery are complex and often ambiguous. His biographers and historians of southern Jewish history have noted that Benjamin was not a “proslavery ideologue” or a “fanatical defender of slavery.” Robert D. Meade claimed that Benjamin “viewed Africans as human beings not resigned to their lot as commonly perceived in the South.” Although Benjamin vigorously defended slavery on the Senate floor as the voice of his constituency, he did not engage in a personalized “fist-pounding, red-faced, blowhard defense of it.” Benjamin’s slaves, according to Pierce Butler and repeated by every biographer since, had “none but kindly memories, and romantic legends of the days of glory on the old place.” We may, however, attribute the fond memories former slaves retained for their master to the restrictive social context perpetuating the “Old South” myth throughout the Jim Crow South.

Slavery held a pragmatic appeal to Benjamin in that slaves were legally sanctioned sources of status, capital, and labor. Benjamin was a slave owner who did not inherit his slaves but consciously purchased them as an adult, willingly overlooking any moral dilemmas and instead appealing to the social status ascribed to slave ownership. He worked more than one hundred slaves
on his Bellechasse plantation in the notoriously grueling sugar industry that he was trying to advance in Louisiana. He understood the financial investment of slavery and, like most southern planters, faced financial disaster in the event of uncompensated emancipation. Like many other white southerners, Benjamin feared “the gravest of social perils” in the southern states if millions of slaves were suddenly freed. He was not opposed to emancipation, alluding to this possibility in his Kansas Bill speech, but only if it occurred gradually and with just compensation as it did in England. He did not anticipate former slaves to be a part of America’s future, for which reason he favored the efforts of the African Colonization Society.

Foremost a legalist, Benjamin grounded his convictions about slavery in British and American legal codes. To him, the laws of nations determined the legal status of slavery, a point he established as early as 1842, while providing the legal counsel for various defendants in the widely discussed and controversial “Creole cases.” The Creole was a slave trader ship whose human cargo mutinied, killing the owners’ agent and forcing the vessel to sail for the Bahamas. British authorities arrested the ringleaders but granted the remaining passengers freedom in the Bahamas. During the ensuing legal battles, Benjamin argued on behalf of the insurance companies that the former slaves’ masters, and not the underwriters, were responsible for their property. The liberation of the slaves was not due to “foreign interference” covered by the policy, but by “the force and effect of the law of nature and of nations on the relations of the parties against which no insurance was or could be legally made.…[S]lavery is against the law of nature; and although sanctioned by the law of nations it is so sanctioned as a local or municipal institution of binding force within the limits of the nation that chooses to establish it and on the vessels of such nation on the high seas but as having no force or binding effect beyond the jurisdiction of such nation.”

The laws of nature may be binding, but the laws of nations were open to deliberation. These laws dictated the status of slaves respective only to that nation and deferred to the laws of other nations when in their jurisdiction. Benjamin continued by claiming that the slaveholders and the crew instigated the revolt because of their unnecessary cruelties toward their tightly packed human cargo. This argument illuminates one of the paradoxes of Benjamin’s views on slavery. Although providing a humanitarian defense for slaves and legally validating their emancipation, Benjamin also suggested their inferiority to whites and advised that they be securely bound and guarded because of their limited emotional and psychological development and to secure them as human property.

Emancipation occurred in the Creole case because British jurisdiction prohibited slavery, but under United States jurisdiction Benjamin asserted in the Senate in the wake of the Creole case that “slaves are, by our laws, nothing but property.” Benjamin expanded on this legal opinion in his 11 March 1858 Senate speech on the Kansas Bill, which provided a comprehensive antebellum
southern legal defense of slavery. In 1858, the Kansas territory suffered internal strife over the slavery issue that eerily foreshadowed the impending national crisis. The territory’s proslavery faction supported an elected government seated in Lecompton, Kansas. Claiming overwhelming voter fraud and intimidation, the antislavery section of the territory elected its own government, located in Topeka. While the citizens of Kansas fought each other on the ground, the competing legislatures appealed to Congress for legal recognition. Quickly organizing a radical proslavery state constitution, the Lecompton government petitioned Congress for admission into the union as a slave state. President James Buchanan, eager to smooth over the boiling tensions, pushed this “Kansas Bill” into Congress, where it was hotly contested in the Senate.

Benjamin evaded the dubious political situation in the territory by focusing on the unavoidable issue of slavery and the widening rift that institution was creating in the United States. Dismissing charges of fraud and voter intimidation as the tactics of northern abolitionists, Benjamin argued that the citizens of Kansas employed their popular sovereignty, an idea proposed by Senator Stephen A. Douglass of Illinois, to approve slavery in their state constitution. However, the “non-slaveholding States of the Confederacy” refused to acknowledge this proslavery constitution, the vehicle of popular will, and would vote against the admission of Kansas as a slave state even “if the whole people of the Territory should establish a constitution recognizing that institution.”

The northern states’ denial of popular sovereignty contravened legislation sanctioned by the Supreme Court’s *Dred Scott* decision and incensed Benjamin. Responding that “as long as the constitution of my country endures,” he considered it his “constitutional duty to perform the most sacred of all obligations” by defending the constitutional right to property and by abjuring the American legal system to uphold those rights. To Benjamin, an attack on private property was an assault on the keystone of a free society. Consequently, a defense of private property was a defense of the individual liberties of free individuals protected in the federal constitution.

Benjamin attacked the antislavery proposition that “slavery is the creature of the statute law of the several states where it was established.” Providing an extensive history of slavery’s prevalence in the British colonies and its protection under colonial common law, he contended that this was the legal structure employed until the American Revolution severed the colonies from England, resulting in the consummation of a new federal constitution informed by established common law. Although emancipation had already begun in Great Britain, those policies did not apply to British colonies operating under the assumptions of colonial common law. In North America, common law dictated that “a negro [sic] … was merchandise, was property, was a slave, and that he could only extricate himself from that status stamped upon him by the common law of the country by positive proof of manumission. No man was bound to
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show title to his negro [sic] slave. The slave was bound to show manumission under which he had acquired freedom by the common law of the colony.”16

According to Benjamin, the U.S. Constitution was created with this common law assumption in mind. He agreed with northern senators that slaves only exist as property in title unless provisions enforced that title beyond state borders, but for this reason he argued that the constitution provided a fugitive slave clause acknowledging slavery’s legitimacy. Limited in its address of the slavery issue, the constitution simply “guarantees to the South the sanctity of its peculiar property” while protecting the North against “any abnormal augmentation” of southern population statistics affecting national representation.17 Judge John McLean, a dissenting party in the Dred Scott case, validated the fugitive slave clause, recognizing that it “was designed to protect the rights of the master against the people and legislation of other States.”18 From this perspective, it was the responsibility of antislavery advocates to initiate “positive acts of legislation” forbidding slavery. Many northern states amended their state constitutions and called for gradual emancipation, but northern slave owners sold their slaves to southern planters, who northerners now demanded must abolish the institution they helped construct and entrench.

After eliciting constitutional sanctioning for slavery, Benjamin aggressively defended the legal precedents upholding this interpretation. A staunch proponent of the Dred Scott decision, Benjamin defended Chief Justice Roger Taney and the Supreme Court’s actions as the standard procedure of justices acknowledging their jurisdiction over a case’s merits before stating a decision based on those merits. He rejected Senator William Fessenden’s (Maine) claim that slavery was not constitutionally recognized by rhetorically asking why Congress would allow the continuing importation of slaves following the American Revolution and then reject those imports as illegal property. Moreover, if slaves were not constitutionally recognized, why were they the subject of heated congressional debates over representation, and why are there provisions for slaves as part of the population? Benjamin then responded to Senator Jacob Collamer’s (Vermont) statement that slavery can only exist as property within state limits. According to Collamer, if slaves were ordinary property subject to standard property law, as many southerners argued, then why were there special provisions for slavery in the constitution? Benjamin contested this understanding of the law by separating title in property from the ability to enforce that title, which Collamer conflated into one idea. “Slaves, if you please, are not property like other property in this: that you can easily rob us of them; but as to the right in them, that man has to overthrow the whole history of the world, he has to overthrow every treatise on jurisprudence … ere he can reach the conclusion that the person who owns a slave, in a country where slavery has been established for ages, has no other property in that slave than the mere title which is given by the statute law of the land where it is found.”19
Benjamin reserved only a segment at the conclusion of his speech for the actual events in Kansas. He condemned Kansas free-soilers for repudiating the Lecompton government and then asking for their Topeka constitution to be recognized as the state’s legitimate constitution after the Lecompton government had already submitted a constitution to Congress. When congress addressed the Lecompton constitution and amended it to protect the rights of free-soilers, Topeka rejected it. Because the Topeka government had not requested, and already rejected, federal assistance, there was no reason for federal troops to protect them. Topeka’s rejection of federal assistance and its attempts to contravene legal procedure made members of this group, in Benjamin’s view, little more than a “miserable rabble of insurgents.”

While Benjamin was never wed to the peculiar institution, an analysis of his speech on the Kansas Bill depicts an individual firmly bound to its legal sanctity. Benjamin’s views on slavery resonated with the Talmudic expression, “the law of the land is the Law,” and they corresponded to those of many white southerners, including southern Jews. Those views were guided by historical precedents that culminated, as Benjamin believed, in the legislative protection provided by the U.S. Constitution. He remained committed to this conviction and to the political sentiments of his constituency, even as the Kansas Bill floundered in Congress and as the issue of slavery festered before finally exploding in the American Civil War.

Maury Wiseman is a doctoral candidate at the University of Florida. His dissertation is titled “Fire-eater, railroad baron, and ‘the alien Jew’: the life and memory of David Levy Yulee” and focuses on the different ways in which Yulee, representing the state of Florida as the first Jewish Senator in the United States, has been remembered in textual and public spaces. Wiseman currently resides in Ocala, Florida.
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Jeanne E. Abrams’s *Jewish Women Pioneering the Frontier Trail* is a welcome addition to the bookshelves of students and scholars in the fields with which she is clearly engaged: American Jewish, American religious, ethnic, and immigration history, and of course, women’s history and history of the American West.

The arc of Abrams’s story, from the middle of the nineteenth century to the first decades of the twentieth, maps Jewish women’s westward migration, where they established civic and religious institutions, stabilized and built religious community life, and ultimately expanded the possibilities for women’s work by entering the professions and pushing political boundaries. Her narrative of upward mobility, enfranchisement, class, and cultural integration pins the crown of Jewish women’s achievement on politics—the book’s final chapter—affirming Earl Pomeroy’s observation that “where immigrants established themselves economically, they also established themselves politically” (5).

At its heart the book pairs two themes: pioneering and nurturance. The pioneering theme is manifested by the book’s focus on opening opportunities. The words “first,” “role,” and “achievement” appear dozens of times. In this way the book is compensatory and, as accomplishment history, it is more celebratory than critical in tone. The theme of nurturance is driven home by the way in which women practiced a politics of “maternalism,” taking advantage of the expectation that they nurture to expand possibilities for themselves and to cultivate Jewish communal and American civic institutions (social work, health, charitable organizations, etc.). Abrams’s West is a West freer of social constraint than its Eastern or Southern counterparts; her West is nurturing soil.

That *Jewish Women Pioneering* is organized in conventional categories—immigration, community life, religion, work, and politics—is both a strength and a weakness. This scheme gives the book great utility, for no other volume synthesizes as much valuable material on Jewish women in western America. However, it also keeps the subjects from coming to life. Yet what it lacks in lifeblood, flair, and controversy (not a single chapter is organized around a problem or paradox), it makes up for in resourcefulness. The author’s breadth of research and detail, from both ordinary and exemplary Jewish women’s lives, is impressive.

Readers seeking detail or analysis on domestic life, subjectivity, affect, or moral complexity will be disappointed in this book. Likewise, there is little cultural history here—no readings of plays or novels, poetry, dance, or films that engage, reflect, or shape ideas about what a Jewish (or Western) woman was or ought to have been. Abrams minimizes the extent to which Western...
Jewish women disagreed with one another, despite her own hints at significant disagreement over important issues such as suffrage, the pace and nature of religious reform, and even federal voting. She similarly sidelines conflict; from her reading, there appears to be very little tension whatsoever between Western American Jewish women with women of different ethnic or religious persuasion, or with men Jewish or otherwise.

But her chapter on westward migration adds rich texture to the immigrant experience, and her discussions of Jewish women’s philanthropy, administration, business, education, social life, and political reform, are upstanding. Abrams likewise excels in her accounts of religious observance and community building, where women became the “primary communicators of Jewish identity, ethnicity, community, and spirituality,” combining “traditional Jewish” and American Victorian bourgeois ideal for the upwardly mobile (94).

Ultimately, Abrams achieves her own central goal: “to bring balance to the larger picture of American Jewish women’s experience [by] examining local and regional stories with their special circumstances and patterns within a comparative national framework” (4).

David S. Koffman is a doctoral candidate at NYU’s Department of History and the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies. His research explores encounters between Jews and Native Americans. He is an educational consultant for the Network for the Teaching of Jewish History and a Wexner Graduate Fellow.


As the twenty-two-year old Aaron Domnitz arrived in Ellis Island from his native Byelorussia in 1906, he noted that the immigration officials were laughing at him. But they soon let him in and years later Domnitz recounted his first impression of America: “People are good-natured here and they were joking. I liked the reception” (139). Bertha (Brukhe) Fox, who came to America in 1922, summarized her twenty-odd years in the country by writing, “And what did I find in America? A great deal: material contentment, free schooling, free lectures in all languages, and, above all, calm. Calm” (204–205).

In May 1942 the Yiddish Scientific Institute (Known by its Yiddish acronym YIVO) held among Jewish immigrants an autobiographical writing contest, whose theme was “Why I left Europe and what I have accomplished in America.” Domnitz and Fox were among more than two hundred Jewish immigrants—housewives, shopkeepers, blue-collar workers, communal activists, and writers—who sent their life stories in response. The autobiographical accounts came from across the United States and Canada, as well as a few from Argentina, Cuba, and Mexico. The vast majority of the participants were
between the ages of fifty-one and seventy, hailing from all over eastern Europe as well as from Germany and Palestine. Ninety percent of the autobiographies were written in Yiddish, with the rest in English, German, and Hebrew.

Historians Jocelyn Cohen and Daniel Soyer have meticulously edited and translated from Yiddish the autobiographies of five women and four men (among them Ben Reisman, who won the first prize in the contest) and added a succinct introduction, notes, and a useful glossary. Since such an anthology can present only a fraction of the more than two hundred manuscripts, Cohen and Soyer mention three main criteria for selection: first, they have chosen the autobiographies that make “good stories.” Second, the manuscripts had to touch on the larger events, changes, and dislocations that engulfed the Jewish society in eastern Europe and America, like the breakdown of traditional Jewish communities, the rise of Jewish nationalism and socialism, the advent of pogroms, and deepening acculturation, to name but a few. Third, the editors have selected a reasonably representative sample of the general immigrant population in terms of gender, age, place of origin, class, political and religious orientation, and time of migration. In fact, two of the autobiographers in this collection, Chaim and Minnie Kusnetz, were a married couple; thus their accounts offer an unusual opportunity to look at gender relations from the angles of both husband and wife.

As Cohen and Soyer rightly remind us, the more famous published Jewish memoirists, like Mary Antin (The Promised Land, 1912) and Rose Cohen (Out of the Shadow, 1918), arrived in the country as children and wrote primarily for a gentile, English-speaking audience. By contrast, the YIVO autobiographers wrote in Yiddish for a Yiddish-speaking audience and therefore were richer in detail and nuance. Furthermore, most of the YIVO contestants came to America as adults, and their experiences differed from those of younger, more assimilated memoirists such as Antin and Cohen.

That the YIVO autobiographers wrote to a Yiddish-speaking audience contributes much to this anthology’s richness in anecdotes and folklore. The stories of these nine immigrants convey the experiences of many more: the effect of eastern Europe’s economic dislocations, the pattern of chain migration, and the amazement when confronted with America’s strange ways. When Chaim Kusnetz came to America in 1923, he was astonished to see how a storekeeper left the newspapers unguarded on a stand outside, while the customers left a few pennies on the stand, took a paper and left. Kusnetz concluded that “America is not only a blessed land, but also a land of pure saints” (262). A different common theme was World War II and the destruction of European Jewry, which loomed over most of the autobiographies: the Warsaw-born Minnie Goldstein advised “every Jew” to read Adolph Hitler’s Mein Kampf “to see what that mad dog is barking at the Jews” (33), while the ritual slaughterer, Shmuel Krone, ended his account with “May Hitler be erased from the world” (122).
To be sure, these narratives reflect, to a certain extent, the history of a self-selected group—those who answered YIVO’s call to write about themselves. Moreover, like other autobiographers and memoirists, many contestants—consciously or unconsciously—gave interpretive twists to their life stories in order to express a larger meaning. Cohen and Soyer mention that the official theme of the contest, which required the contestants to describe what they had “accomplished” in America, probably contributed to some writers’ tendency to characterize themselves as Jewish Horatio Algers: people who pulled themselves up by their bootstraps to achieve economic success and personal improvement. That type of narrative coexisted—uneasily—with the Bildungsroman-like socialist autobiography, which was also greatly represented in the contest: a young worker remains unaware of capitalist inequities until she/he encounters socialist ideas or speakers that “convert” him/her to a lifelong commitment to socialism. In addition, the influence of later events on the description of earlier events is quite clear. For example, Zionist writer Rose Schoenfeld recounted that upon arriving in New York from Galicia in 1912, she purportedly told her relatives, “War is in the air. The anti-Semitic Poles are sharpening their teeth to settle with the Jews” (184). One may question Schoenfeld’s wording, and not only due to a lapse of memory: It is much more probable that Polish violence against Jews during and after World War I (not to mention in 1942, as she was writing her autobiography) had modified her version.

The autobiographies that Cohen and Soyer selected are indeed engaging and cover the spectrum of Jewish society. Unquestionably, one could have chosen other manuscripts from the YIVO collection, which reveal much about the immigrants’ first impressions of their new fellow citizens—like that of Sam Carasik, who arrived in Baltimore (in 1906) from his native Bobrojsk. Upon seeing a black man for the first time, Carasik said that the man looked like a “polished boot.” Another immigrant, Max Feigan, who worked as a street cleaner, concluded that, “the majority of the Irish Gentiles are big antisemites.”

This remark notwithstanding, Cohen and Soyer have skillfully translated and selected a characteristic sample of immigrants. Their commendable work opens a window for English-language readers into the lives of Jewish immigrants. This anthology is a must for both scholars and anyone who is interested not only in Jewish history, but in the history of immigration as well.

Gil Ribak teaches American Jewish history as the Lewin Postdoctoral Fellow at Washington University in St. Louis. His dissertation, written at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, is about the images of gentiles among Jewish immigrants in New York City between 1890 and 1920.

Notes

1Sam Carasik, autobiography #173, American-Jewish Autobiographies Collection (YIVO), 64. Max Feigan, autobiography #4, ibid (YIVO), 23.
In this fine work, Kirsten Fermaglich establishes herself in the vanguard of a new approach to critiquing the well-known thesis that Holocaust consciousness in the United States only emerged in the 1970s, when the Jewish community mobilized it for an ostensibly narrow communal agenda. Hasia Diner and Lawrence Baron have conducted important, wide-ranging surveys to show numerous examples of works of history, acts of commemoration, and presentations in the mass media in the two decades after the close of World War II. Fermaglich’s method is to mark out a narrower terrain and dig deep. She studies four figures—historian Stanley Elkins, feminist journalist Betty Friedan, experimental psychologist Stanley Milgram, and psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton—to show how the Holocaust already had significant meanings and implications by the mid-1960s.

The author describes how all four individuals used comparisons to Nazi Germany in the service of “universal” understanding and causes. Elkins compared the inmates at concentration camps to slaves, both oppressed and both responding to those extreme environments with similar behaviors. Friedan discerned a cycle of Cold War marginalization of women and women’s internalization of these prejudices. She hoped to stop the destructive process, in part by comparing the plight of the suburban housewife to victimization in concentration camps. Milgram saw obedience to authority as a universal behavior, where the particular differences between a Nazi concentration camp and America were of little significance. Lifton looked at survivors of Hiroshima and the concentration camps and discerned behaviors, such as psychic numbing, that are adaptive in those extreme situations but self-destructive if they persist. For Lifton, all Americans were survivors, as all—not just soldiers—suffered from the disastrous American policies in Southeast Asia.

grew up in Peoria, Illinois, and attended Smith College, both sites with few Jews but no shortage of prejudice and self-hatred.

Fermaglich’s discussion of the universal concerns of the four as a Jewish characteristic is an important contribution to our understanding of American Jewish history at the time. She also demonstrates how issues in the public sphere—debates over the America in a post-Cold-War era, America in the age of Vietnam—and the various forms of liberalism affected their research and the universalization of the images of Nazi Germany, which in turn affected, in direct and indirect ways, American public life.

Today, the Holocaust comparisons of these four authors are viewed as insensitive. Betty Friedan herself admitted that she was “ashamed of that analogy. The American suburb was no concentration camp” (58). By effectively using a wide range of contemporary documents, Fermaglich rightly dismisses these post hoc accusations and apologies. The authors’ letters, personal notes, and drafts of books all attest to why and how these comparisons were important to them at the time. The drafts of Friedan’s The Feminine Mystique and the private musings of Milgram are particularly revealing. Fermaglich also uses contemporary reviews and the public’s correspondence with the authors to show the often enthusiastic, rarely negative, reactions to the Holocaust-related analogies and the authors’ intellectual and political agenda.

Implicitly and explicitly, we learn from American Dreams and Nazi Nightmare that there is room for more important work on the postwar years. Some figures—most notably Bruno Bettelheim—recur but are not completely part of the story. The author summarizes one aspect of her study by saying, “[T]here is more historical work to be done in exploring an early period of ‘Holocaust consciousness’ among Jews at the turn of the 1960s, and even earlier” (122–123, my emphasis). Perhaps Fermaglich will herself turn to that subject. It is hard to imagine few, if any, who could do a better job.

Richard Menkis is Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia, cross-appointed to the departments of History and Religious Studies. He is the founding editor of the journal Canadian Jewish Studies, co-editor (with Harold Troper) of the entries on Canada in the second edition of the Encyclopaedia Judaica, and co-editor (with Norman Ravvin) of The Canadian Jewish Studies Reader (2004), which won a Canadian Jewish Book Award. He is currently working on a monograph on the production and circulation of narratives of Canadian Jewish history.
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2Although the order of these words can be disputed, I think it is overall a designation that captures the collective significance of the four more than Fermaglich’s “social scientists.”
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Today, when the United States and Israel are seen as natural allies on the international scene and when many American Jews view the Jewish State as an extension of their own identity, one could easily assume that this state of affairs was true sixty years ago when the State of Israel was established. But as Zvi Ganin reveals in this meticulously researched book, the relationship between American Jews and the Jewish State in the years immediately following Israel’s independence was indeed uneasy. *An Uneasy Relationship* focuses on the leaders of American Judaism and their complex attitudes toward Israel. Ganin explores the variety of American Jewish approaches to Zionism and the State of Israel, focusing mainly on the tensions between the vehement anti-Zionism of the American Council for Judaism and the more practical position of the non-Zionist American Jewish Committee. (The American Zionists occupy only a small portion of the book.)

The chief protagonist of *An Uneasy Relationship* is Jacob Blaustein, who headed the American Jewish Committee (AJC) in the critical years after the founding of Israel; it is by analyzing his dealings with the Israeli leadership, especially prime minister David Ben Gurion, that Ganin is able to provide a vivid and intriguing portrayal of the complex issues that American Jews confronted with the establishment of a Jewish State. Ganin contrasts the Israeli (and Ben Gurion’s) position that Zionism and support for Israel ultimately meant immigration to Israel and adoption of a pioneering ethos, with the position that Blaustein and a plurality of American Jews championed at the time that called for political and financial support for Israel, while remaining completely loyal to America. In the book’s final section, Ganin also explores the important, but ultimately limited, role that Blaustein and other American Jewish leaders played in influencing American foreign policy vis-à-vis Israel during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

Ganin’s prose is clear and lively; it combines historical analysis with vivid depictions of main players in this historical drama. At times, however, Ganin makes assertions that are at best questionable. For example, in the introduction he describes the birth of Israel in 1948 as a miracle—but today, after two decades of New History of the 1948 War and the Arab-Jewish conflict that preceded it, few scholars, regardless of their ideological or methodological persuasions, would make such a characterization of the events of 1948. Also, several times Ganin refers to Ben Gurion as a radical and militant Zionist. Most people would agree that Ben Gurion was impulsive, abrasive, even vindictive. But calling the man, who was criticized both from the left and from the right for being too pragmatic in his political approach, a radical and a militant requires further clarification, which Ganin, unfortunately, does not provide.
An Uneasy Relationship will be especially useful for students of modern American Jewish experience and for those who are interested in the origins of United States-Israeli relations and the role that the American Jewish leadership played in influencing them. The book’s focus is rather narrow and does not provide an overview of the scholarship in this field, but it does rely on extensive archival research. Furthermore, Ganin’s easy prose makes it highly accessible.

Eran Kaplan teaches Jewish history at the University of Cincinnati. He is the author of The Jewish Radical Right: Revisionist Zionism and its Ideological Legacy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005).


The American Jewish historian, Hasia Diner, once discerned that the way in which Jews understood their own racial identity and their placement within the American racial imagination merited intense scholarly research. Historian and Jewish scholar Eric L. Goldstein seeks to address the abyss Diner spoke of by presenting The Price of Whiteness not “as a study of how Jews became white, but as one that explores how Jews negotiated their place in a complex racial world” (5). To do this, he looks at the span of time from the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the midpoint of the twentieth century. Goldstein’s discourse on the emerging racial identities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in relation to black-Jewish relations and the Jewish struggle over self-definition is at times insightful, perceptive, and astute. The result, drawing on the efforts “of historians working in the field of American Jewish history,” and augmenting the impressive “recent literature on whiteness as a social construction” (4), is an engaging book that examines the meaning of being Jewish in a nation preoccupied with the categories of black and white.

Appraising some distinct characteristics that reflect Jewish identity in America—race and Jewish self-definition, Jewishness between race and religion, confronting Jewish difference, and the transformation of Jewish racial identity—Goldstein addresses his primary arguments: that the history of ethnic groups in America, which function more as an ideology than as a “description of social reality” (3), cannot be reduced to a story of black and white and cannot conceal the central dissension inherit within the mindset of white Americans over race. His well-chosen topics and contentions validate that the arguments were addressed and taken seriously. Goldstein provides a creditable line of reasoning that Jewish attempts to “avoid the tensions between acceptance and group assertion,” along with the struggles of “conflicting impulses for inclusion and distinctiveness” (239), will continue to invoke a provocative exchange of ideas on the meaning of Jewish identity.
Goldstein’s narrative begins by establishing the context of social boundaries under which Jews promoted a discourse of racial self-definition. The salient points here are race, gender, and rabbinate influence on the verbal interchange on American Jewish identity, and Goldstein draws a connection among these factors effortlessly. He laments the challenges that Jews faced at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, namely, “clarifying their attachment to Jewishness in the face of (American) social trends they feared were eroding Jewish cohesiveness” (15). In other words, some Jews, although lethargic in accommodating the Semitic genesis used to identify their group’s status, were, nonetheless, aware that race (employed differently by Jewish men and Jewish women) played a primary role in their emotional relationship to Jewish difference. The same could not be said of rabbis. Their roles as intellectuals allowed them to focus on “the emerging program of Reform Judaism.” The importance here, of course, was that Reform Judaism marked “universal religious principles,” not race, “as the hallmark of Jewish identity” (26).

“Jews and the Black-White Dichotomy,” “Acculturated Jews and Whiteness in the North,” “Interrmarriage and the ‘Melting Pot’,” and “Protecting Jews’ Legal Claim to Whiteness” are the most intriguing and provocative selections under “Part II: Jews in Black and White, 1896–1918.” The appeal of Goldstein’s discourse lies in the subtle way in which he explains the nonthreatening, but ambivalent, position Jews presented to the white American social order during the Progressive Era. He uses this subtly to provide a framework for revealing how Jews constructed the idea of identity while simultaneously constructing themselves.

Case in point: During the first decades of the twentieth century, white anxiety over Jewish racial identification led white scholars to equate Jews to African-Americans. This classification, however, proved very disconcerting to acculturated and American-born Jews, who were focused not only on disentangling themselves from the social links to African-Americans but also on constructing a path that would lead to an unqualified connection to white Americans.

Goldstein subsequently notes the conflicting manner in which both upper-class and working-class Jews pursued a similar strategy to speed their social acceptance by emphasizing Jews’ whiteness. While examples of Jewish involvement in the American minstrel show tradition and Jewish life in segregated neighborhoods are used to support this contention, he ascertains that the social ideas of intermarriage and Jewish legal status in the United States sparked the most expressive debate within Jewish circles. The particulars of intermarriage exposed “the strong emotional attachment Jews still had to a racial self-understanding” (102), and the rejection of government officials classifying Jews racially as “Hebrews” uncovered “the inability of Jews to reconcile
their unshakable racial self-image with their desire for full acceptance in white American society” (108).

In “Confronting Jewish Difference,” Goldstein chronicles the perplexing position Jews and white Americans found themselves in when America’s racial discourse during the interwar years situated Jews as a “problem” in American society. Jews struggled with their placement in American society because they were unable to construct a “distinctive identity in a society organized around the categories,” once again, “of black and white” (190). Despite the incredible levels of advancement Jews attained, white Americans were perplexed by the Jewish race because they were “unable to place Jews beyond the pale of whiteness or fully embrace them as undifferentiated whites” (125).

Throughout the remainder of the book, Goldstein provides an informative examination of how Jews asserted their whiteness within the context of racial liberalism and ethnic and religious definitions of Jewishness—although neither resolved Jews’ uncomfortable association with America’s racial culture. As such, the reader is left with an awkward realization that “Jewish acceptance into mainstream American society” during the first half of the twentieth-century “could only be achieved through the dissolution of the dominant culture of which Jews have long strived to be a part” (239).

The Price of Whiteness—an improvement over Karen Brodkin’s How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race In America (1999) and a satisfying complement to David R. Roediger’s work, especially Working Toward Whiteness (2006)—is directed generally to the academic, scholarly, and intellectual audience. The book is technically solid, with insightful writing and organization. Focusing on two arguments, Goldstein nicely balances more general social and political polemics with well-timed accounts from members of the Jewish intellectual community. My minor objection is that the book could have benefited from more comparative analysis on black and Jewish relations and connection to the national and even global Jewish scene, which is to say that perhaps The Price of Whiteness is even more relevant than Goldstein is willing to claim. This is a highly readable, well-researched, and equitable examination of one of the most interesting topics in American Jewish history and a book worthy of consideration for course adoption in this field.

Glen Anthony Harris is Associate Professor of History at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. His dissertation, “Intellectual Struggles Between Blacks and Jews From the 1940s Through the 1960s: A Prelude to the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Conflict,” examines the roles black and Jewish intellectuals played in the characterization of black-Jewish relations vis-à-vis the 1968 school conflict. Dr. Harris is currently revising his dissertation for publication.
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Although it is marketed as a new work, the volume reviewed here is essentially an updated and revised edition of Kurtz’s 1985 publication Nazi Contraband: American Policy on the Return of European Cultural Treasures, 1945–1955 (Garland, 1985). That being said, Kurtz skillfully fleshed out certain material and provides more detail than in his previous publication. Moreover, he offers a lengthier, but still not exhaustive, bibliography, and more illustrations.

Kurtz states in this introduction that after the 1985 book he thought the issue of Holocaust-era reparations and restitution was somewhat settled. Only with the renewed interest and activity during the last decade did he consider producing this volume so as to provide “a framework in which to understand and evaluate actions that may, or may not, occur” (x). Furthermore, in his last chapter, Kurtz bemoans the recent lull in Holocaust restitution activity. Although not explicitly stated, perhaps Kurtz feels that the new publication will help usher in a revival of sorts. His two concluding sentences highlight his role as activist: “Though it will never be possible to return every item stolen or rectify every evil that was perpetrated, good will come from the effort to try. Each item restituted or historical wrong faced is an act of remembrance that will, hopefully, help prevent another Holocaust” (237). More important, he calls upon America to once more provide the leadership that it did during the immediate postwar years and in the 1990s.

This work, like Kurtz’s earlier one, primarily aims to demonstrate the important role the United States played in mobilizing recovery, restoration, and restitution activities after World War II. Thus, he spends the first two-thirds of the book highlighting the efforts of key individuals, including Generals John Hildring and Lucius D. Clay, members of the Roberts Commission and, most important, officers of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives department (MFAA), who labored in often harrowing conditions to ensure that cultural property was preserved and ultimately returned to its rightful owners. It was the U.S. government that took the first step in dealing with the delicate and problematic issues such as the return of heirless Jewish cultural property. The Soviets, as Kurtz rightly points out, did nothing, and the British and French efforts, “lagged further behind [the Americans] and were limited at best” (162).
Perhaps such a statement would stand on more solid footing, though, had he provided more context. Surprisingly, he does not mention the formation of the Jewish Trust Corporation (JTC) in the British Zone in 1948 and the French branch in 1951 to deal with Jewish property located in their respective zones.

However, Kurtz does a fine job at discussing the general European context of restitution and cultural reconstruction—showing not only how delicate and provocative such issues were on an international level but also how long a history they had, reaching as far back as before the turn of the century. While other current publications deal with the restitution of looted art objects, none do so from the vantage point of the American military government, and it is this more than anything else that makes Kurtz’s volume such a contribution to the field. One of his major achievements is in showing how the cultural policy of the American government, both in Washington and in Germany, was often more nuanced and dictated by outside international forces and circumstances unique to its zone in Germany. Cultural issues were, at times, of peripheral interest in a postwar arena where the onset of the Cold War was a pressing concern.

As assistant archivist for Records Services in Washington, DC, Kurtz has the enviable position of having the records of the American military government close at hand, and he has made very good use of them. Additionally, he has been directly involved in a number of Holocaust-related issues in recent years (most notably as chair of the Nazi War Criminal Records Interagency Working Group [IWG]). It is no surprise, then, that he speaks with much authority on American efforts in the last decade involving restitution. In discussion of these latest activities, he emphasizes the efforts of significant players such as Edgar Bronfman and Israel Singer, formerly of the World Jewish Congress, and most notably of Stuart Eizenstat, former Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business, and Agricultural Affairs during the Clinton administration. It was Eizenstat who led the way in the 1990s in investigating the looting of Holocaust-era assets. In fact, Kurtz goes as far as to nominate Eizenstat to resume leadership in this field and urges museum groups, Jewish organizations, international councils, and governments to address a number of needs that he deems urgent, such as calling for archives in all countries to be opened and made available to researchers (236–237). A tall order to fill, but one that Kurtz, judging by this book, truly believes should be on the world’s agenda.

*America and the Return of Nazi Contraband* adds much to Kurtz’s earlier volume. For example, his discussion of Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (JCR, Inc.) was pioneering when it first appeared in 1985. He elaborated on it further in an article for the *Cardozo Law Review* in 1998. In this current volume, he synthesizes the valuable efforts of JCR, Inc. with the work that Jewish groups such as the World Jewish Congress have done in the last decade in relation to Holocaust reparations. Such a synthesis ties in quite succinctly to his view on the current state of affairs. This book comes at a time of renewed interest in
the field, and it is to both Kurtz’s and Cambridge University Press’s credit that they have made the work available to a much wider audience.

Dana Herman is a doctoral candidate in modern Jewish history at McGill University, Montreal. She is writing her dissertation on Jewish Cultural Reconstruction, Inc. She currently serves as interim managing editor of The American Jewish Archives Journal.


“Camp is magic.” So writes Michael Zeldin in his analysis of informal education in Jewish summer camps, and, after reading Michael M. Lorge and Gary P. Zola’s edited volume on Reform Jewish camping, this does not seem far from the truth. These seven chapters remind religious scholars of the significance of camps as sites for cultivating religious identity during the past century.

It is this rich history of Jewish camping that is the book’s greatest surprise. Although focused on Reform Jewish camping, chapters by the editors and Jonathan Sarna explain the connections among the histories of Jewish camping (in all denominations) and American camping, as well as European Jewish youth movements. The Progressive era impulse toward social betterment found a natural target for its goals in the back-to-nature milieu of summer camps, and early twentieth century Jewish summer camp leaders were similarly inspired to inculcate a pioneering spirit in their charges—all the more so as they sought to combat antisemitic stereotypes of Jews as weak, urban denizens. Sarna notes that in the first few decades of Jewish camping, it was not uncommon for the broadening of Reform campers’ horizons to be accompanied by a narrowing of the focus on religion: “Judaism was reduced to a whisper” as Reform camps promoted a universalistic spirituality. This changed in the 1940s—what Sarna identifies as the “crucial decade in Jewish camping”—when the trend of philanthropic and community-based camps was replaced by educational and religiously oriented camps. Perhaps this is where we find that the “magic” truly begins.

Benedict Anderson did not have Jewish summer camp in mind when he wrote about “imagined communities,” but his insights into how “belongingness” influences members’ perceptions of their communities are connected to the subject at hand, especially in the postwar period when Reform Judaism focused intensely on Jewish peoplehood and culture. Many of the chapters in A Place of Our Own begin with personal reminiscences of Reform summer camp and the manifold ways it created Jewish identities through ritual, tradition, and even the creation of a camp language. One such anecdote recalls how camp was the setting for a rare sight in a postwar Reform upbringing: an Israeli flag. Sue Ellen Lorge Schwartz notes, “We did not see the Israeli flag that often when we were growing up…. It was simply one more way that camp made us ask in a personal way, ‘What does it mean to be a Jew living in America?’”
Reform camps were also exceptional within their denomination when it came to Hebrew. “The Best Kept Secret” is what Hillel Gamoran calls the Reform Chalutzim program, one of the most successful and enduring Hebrew-language camping programs in America. Creativity in prayer and song is the better-known attribute of Reform camps. Chapters by Donald Splansky and Judah Cohen on these topics demonstrate that the now-mainstream Debbie Friedman style of worship in synagogues had its origin in Reform camps.

Indeed, creativity may be the main theme in this history of Reform Jewish camping. This volume is a valuable addition to the study of American Judaism, and it promises to renew scholars’ interest in Jewish camping.

Rachel Gordan is a doctoral candidate in American religious history at Harvard University. She is working on a dissertation on post-World War II American Judaism.


*A Fire in Their Hearts* is an exciting book. Michels’s provocative claim that the ideology, form, and even language of the Jewish labor movement spread from west to east, from New World to Old World, breaks new ground in our understanding of modern Jewish history. He challenges the romantic notion of turn-of-the-century immigrant Jews arriving in the United States as fully developed radicals and focuses on poor, working-class Jews without assuming that socialism was only a temporary stop on the path toward upward mobility and middle-class values. Rooted deeply in a wide range of Yiddish sources, *A Fire in Their Hearts* explores a number of understudied issues, including the relationship between German American socialists and Russian Jewish intellectuals; radical leaders’ conscious decision to shape Yiddish into both the language and the culture of socialism in America; and the tensions between Jewish and socialist identities. For those who need one, the book makes a strong case for the critical importance of American Jewish history: The radical Jewish movements so central to the narrative of modern Jewish history are literally impossible to understand without the American Jewish experience.

In Michels’s capable hands a unique cast of characters comes to life. The spotlight he turns on familiar figures such as Abraham Cahan and Chaim Zhitlovsky reveals them in new ways. Arguments over the kind of Yiddish necessary to arouse a population that was not as literate as generally assumed take on a new meaning in the context of leaders who hoped that creating a particularist Yiddish culture would lead working-class Jews toward a more universalist labor movement and leftist political stance. Michels carefully leads the reader through the welter of Yiddish newspapers, lectures, public forums, and schools. These institutions appeared in other centers of Jewish life but nowhere to the same extent as in New York, unique in its masses of Jewish immigrants, numbers of
manufacturing jobs, multilingual labor movement, intense class conflict, and uncontested leadership of a radical elite.

Though *A Fire in Their Hearts* deserves all the praise it has received, there are a few lacunae in its sharp analysis and impressive research. One is the lack of attention to gender, all the more surprising given that, as Michels points out, labor and women’s historians are among the few who have devoted scholarly attention to the Jewish labor movement since the 1970s. Michels mentions women from time to time, noting that Yiddish periodicals covered “women’s issues” such as suffrage, but as political actors for whom gender was an additional complicating factor, women are strangely absent here. In addition, Michels seems to operate with a rather narrow definition of “radicalism” as confined to either labor activism or possibly party politics. Jewish working-class communities embraced a broad array of activist causes, from support for birth control to opposition to anti-immigration laws to Zionism. To overlook the whole spectrum of radicalism is to undercut the rich political and cultural life that the book so convincingly argues shaped several generations. The omissions also beg the question of how and why American Jews who achieved varying levels of economic success often retained radical beliefs and behaviors that did not always match their class status. Still, *A Fire in Their Hearts* is a dazzling achievement overall, one that paves the way for many avenues of inquiry into American Jewish life.

Melissa R. Klapper is Associate Professor of History at Rowan University, where she teaches courses on American, Jewish, and women’s history. She is the author of *Jewish Girls Coming of Age in America, 1860–1920* (New York: New York University Press, 2005) and *Small Strangers: The Experiences of Immigrant Children in the United States, 1880–1925* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007). Her current work on American Jewish women’s pre-World War II activism in the suffrage, birth control, and peace movements has been awarded numerous fellowships and grants, including a Lowenstein-Weiner Fellowship from the American Jewish Archives.


Between 1900 and 1940, Canada’s Jewish population increased from 16,000 to almost 170,000, due largely to eastern European immigration. Most of these immigrants were working class, Yiddish speaking, and traditional in their religious observance. While Canadian Jewry included visible radical elements that were drawn to the left-wing and nascent Zionist movements, a significant segment was Jews who strove to adhere to traditional Judaism. This segment has largely fallen below the radars of scholarly as well as popular discourse. As one of the few studies of the early immigrant Orthodox rabbinate in North America, *Rabbis & Their Community* focuses on the Jewish community in Montreal,
Canada’s largest Jewish center, in the decades before World War II. The work’s close studies of interconnected key figures from the city’s Yiddish-speaking Orthodox milieu, the network of lasting institutions that they built, and the challenges they faced offer new insight into the Canadian Jewish experience as well as the wider immigrant experience. In the process, the book calls into question the widely held assumption that this immigration was characterized predominately by a movement away from tradition.

*Rabbis & their Community* examines the significant population of Orthodox Jews who were engaged in a struggle to establish Jewish authority in the New World. This struggle expressed itself in published writings, the “kosher meat wars” of the 1920s, and the Jewish Community Council of Montreal (Va’ad ha-Ir). Robinson presents the lives and ventures of rabbis vying for leadership in Montreal’s emerging Orthodox community—Rabbi Hirsh Cohen, his rival for the chief rabbinate Rabbi Simon Glazer, and Glazer’s successor Rabbi Yudel Rosenberg—as well as that of community activist Hirsch Wolofsky, editor of Montreal’s community-wide Yiddish daily *Keneder Adler (Canadian Jewish Eagle)*. Robinson’s easy, conversational style, contextualization, and glossary render the world of Yiddish-speaking Orthodox Judaism accessible to a general readership.

This work contributes to righting a longstanding imbalance in the historical scholarship of North American immigrant communities and its emphasis on processes of transformation and change rather than resistance and maintenance of Jewish tradition. For example, Wolofsky’s memoirs that address the immigrant experience in Montreal have been translated into both English and French and received wide attention, while his collections of Torah homilies have been neglected. This disparity is due partly to the particular skill set required: knowledge of Yiddish and rabbinic Hebrew-Aramaic, as well as history and a vast body of rabbinic literature. It is also due to a bias among historians to chronicle the Jews who understood themselves as “making history” rather than those attempting to transfer a centuries-old tradition of Judaism to the New World.

Robinson’s extensive research into the Orthodox component of eastern European Canadian Jewish immigration has gone against the grain of Canadian Jewish Studies, whose focus has been on the more secular expressions of Jewish immigration, such as the left wing and labour movements, Zionism, and Yiddish culture. His research provides a more complete picture of the Montreal Jewish immigrant experience and brings to the fore figures and institutions that have been marginalized and neglected in both the scholarship and historical memory. This slim volume leaves the reader anticipating Robinson’s forthcoming biography on Rabbi Yudel Rosenberg, the research for which marked the genesis of this book.

*Rebecca Margolis is Assistant Professor in the Vered Jewish Canadian Studies Program at the University of Ottawa. Her research focuses on Yiddish culture in Montreal.*

About four and a half decades ago, as a master’s student at Columbia University, I was a party to a conversation between two Jewish colleagues. One told of his mother’s spending an hour on the phone with a relative, bemoaning the loss of numerous family members during World War II to the Nazi extermination program. He was, he said, sick and tired of hearing about it. It was over. Nothing could be done about it. His friend agreed. I must admit the attitude seemed to make sense to me also. During the conversation, the word “Holocaust” was never spoken. It was not yet in common use as a proper noun that described Nazi anti-Jewish genocide exclusively—never, never to refer to any other human disaster.

My friends, secular-minded and upwardly mobile, could plausibly anticipate a secure and satisfying career in American higher education. Antisemitism was at most a social phenomenon, never openly practiced in New York and relatively inconsequential nationally. (I had grown up in what many New Yorkers considered darkest rural mid-America without ever encountering significant anti-Jewish feeling.)

A conversation deploring an obsession with the Holocaust is much less likely today—despite the fact that the event is far more distant than in the early 1960s, despite the even greater security and prominence of Jews in American life. Just why that is may be a bit murky, but we all know of forces that surely had much to do with it—the Six Day and Yom Kippur wars, the Arab oil embargo of 1973–1974, Palestinian terrorism, the militant Islamic revival.

The term “Holocaust” emerged out of this maelstrom, along with a sense that it could happen again, this time in the Middle East, perhaps the day after tomorrow. One byproduct was a major Holocaust museum in Washington, D.C. (Why Washington? Why not Berlin?) By then, a large body of literature had emerged. Some writers saw the Holocaust as primarily an expression of a widely felt antisemitism still widespread today. Others regarded it as modern history’s example of industrialized mass murder at its worst, with universal implications in a nuclear world.

Robert N. Rosen’s *Saving the Jews* engages with the first approach. It responds to a number of writers who blame Franklin D. Roosevelt and a small number of aides for not taking actions that could have prevented or at least mitigated the horror that swept out of Germany and across Europe during World War II. Rosen—a Charleston, South Carolina attorney and amateur historian—is specific about his targets. They include Arthur Morse (*While Six Million Died*), Herbert Drucks (*The Failure to Rescue*), Monty Penkower (*The Jews Were Expendable*), William Rubenstein (*The Myth of Rescue*), Saul Friedman (*No Haven for the Oppressed*), Henry Feingold (*Bearing Witness, The Politics of Rescue*), and David Wyman (*Paper Walls: America and the Refugee...*)
This group consists mostly of scholars with far more impressive historical credentials than the author’s Harvard master of arts degree, but Rosen’s work comes with endorsements from academic superstars who have written on Roosevelt and/or World War II—James MacGregor Burns, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Gerhard Weinberg. (Noted Harvard law professor and controversialist Alan Dershowitz weighs in with an approving afterward.) In fact, this book is an adequate piece of historical scholarship, although its strength lies more in its measured assessment of its antagonists than in original research.

Over the years, these antagonists have developed a multicount indictment of the Roosevelt administration, and Roosevelt himself, as callously indifferent to the fate of European Jewry. The charge has come close to being incorporated into the conventional narrative of official U.S. reactions to Nazi Germany during the 1930s and American prosecution of World War II. Rosen, displaying all the instincts of an attorney representing a client charged with numerous felonies, responds to every count, one by one. A vigorous advocate, he has no interest in a plea bargain. In general, he argues that Roosevelt was intensely concerned with the persecution of the Jews but was constrained by law or public opinion, at times misled by antisemitic subordinates, and rendered helpless by the exigencies of global war. Moreover, he was considerably more effective than his critics understand. The specific counts and Rosen’s defense follow:

1. **Roosevelt failed to secure changes to (or circumvent) restrictive immigration quotas.** The law was the law. Public opinion during the Great Depression was strongly opposed to increased immigration of any sort. However, most German immigration to the United States after the Nazis came to power was Jewish; after the Anschluss of 1938, the Austrian quota was added to that of Germany. The immigration quota for the two countries was second only to that of Great Britain. In all, Rosen asserts, the United States accepted about 200,000 of the 300,000 refugees who managed to get out of Germany before the start of war in Europe, 1 September 1939. After that date, immigration to the United States (technically neutral until December 1941) was sharply restricted in the interests of national security.

2. **Roosevelt failed dreadfully by failing to admit into the United States the nine hundred Jewish refugees on the St. Louis after Cuba turned away most for invalid visas in June, 1939.** The immigration laws made no provision for special cases. The Roosevelt administration facilitated arrangements by which the passengers were divided among Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium. None had to return to Germany. It was impossible to predict that some would later fall into German custody and become Holocaust victims.
3. **Roosevelt failed to denounce the Holocaust.** The “Final Solution” was not settled German policy until early 1942 and not evident to the outside world for some time thereafter. Still, at the end of 1942, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin signed an allied statement condemning the mass slaughter of the Jews. It was “front-page news in the *New York Times* and throughout the world” (452). Other declarations attacking Nazi genocidal activities followed, including a presidential denunciation in 1944 of “one of the blackest crimes of all history . . . the wholesale systematic murder of the Jews of Europe” (455). However, words could not deter the Nazis and may even have provoked them to redouble their efforts.

4. **Once the war was on, Roosevelt failed to implement a plan of rescue—specifically, the U.S.-British Bermuda Conference (June 1943) on refugees failed to develop one.** Given the military situation at the time, no rescue plan was feasible. That does not mean that the United States had no interest in one.

5. **The creation of the War Refugee Board in January 1944 was simply window dressing.** The board, funded jointly by Jewish organizations and government appropriations, had no spectacular public successes, but, working in the shadows, it enabled the escape of numerous Eastern European Jews to Turkey and other neutral destinations. It funded, for example, the work of Raoul Wallenberg in Hungary. Even one of Roosevelt’s critics, Haskel Lookstein, concedes that it saved the lives of 200,000 Jews but faults him for not creating it two years earlier and saving perhaps tenfold that number (465–466).

6. **The United States wrongly refrained from bombing Auschwitz.** The window of opportunity to do so was short—fewer than six months in late 1944—and even then, Auschwitz was on the outer fringe of American bomber range. The United States would have had to forgo other targets of greater military importance. Little could have been achieved by making the attempt, other than surely killing some Jews.

Most of Rosen’s points stand up pretty well. Specialists argue about just how many refugee Jews managed to get to the United States before the start of war in Europe. (Rosen’s critics claim that “only” 100,000, not twice that figure, made it.) Whatever the case, presidential fiat could not simply suspend immigration laws. One may well feel, however, that Roosevelt could have found ways to bend regulations enough to take in the desperate *St. Louis* passengers. It is worth remembering that those German and Austrian Jews who were the object of persecution before 1 September 1939 could get out of Germany and find refuge somewhere. Of course, not all did so; giving up everything, even in dire circumstances, for an uncertain future in a foreign country was not an easy choice. No one, as Rosen reminds us, could predict that even the *Kristallnacht* Germany of late 1938 would metastasize into the Final Solution Germany of 1942.
From the beginning of his first administration to the end of his fourth, Franklin Roosevelt was more open to Jews than any other American president. This was evidenced in his appointments of Supreme Court justices, influential policy makers, and close advisers. Two months before his death, he met with the king of Saudi Arabia to plead the case for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. But once Hitler’s armies had overrun most of Europe, it is hard to see what any American president could have done for the Jews other than to defeat Hitler and put an end to Nazism. Roosevelt pursued this objective single-mindedly and with enormous success through the greatest war in history. He did so with venomous antisemites at home as well as in Germany, arguing (falsely, of course) that he was doing it all simply in the interest of the Jews. If at times he muted his concerns, there was a reason.

The charge that Roosevelt failed to stop the Holocaust seems akin to criticizing a police officer who has gunned down a homicidal maniac for not preventing the crimes in the first place. The passion with which it often is expressed is no doubt heavily motivated by an elemental anger that such a thing could be perpetrated in a civilized world. Yet in truth, the Holocaust was only the most immense of many genocidal campaigns in history; the phenomenon of evil in human nature has found many targets.

The Holocaust’s lasting impact is understandable and perhaps inevitable. One might regret all the same that so accomplished a people seem to have made it the touchstone of their contemporary identity. If one consults the website of the David Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies (http://www.wymaninstitute.org/), one finds an organization obsessed not simply with the Holocaust but with a sense that a virulent antisemitism lurks around every corner of American life. The site also contains a press release signed by fifty-five scholars of varying degrees of prominence, characterizing Robert Rosen as a “divorce attorney,” accusing him of making “false allegations against reputable historians,” misrepresenting “key historical facts,” and engaging in plagiarism. Strong, passionate stuff. Is it just the result of a historical argument about what might have been done during World War II? Or does it reflect a wider rift within the Jewish community?

Rosen dedicates his work to his father and father-in-law, citing their service in the U.S. armed forces during World War II. In case anyone misses the point, he is very explicit in his sense that they were Americans first, Jews second, and that the war was at least as much about protecting the United States as saving the Jews. He is especially contemptuous of the Irgun leader Peter Bergson and his Orthodox Eastern European followers. The Wyman Institute seems to see America as a dangerous place, one in which not even a Roosevelt can be counted on for succor. Its website complains that Rosen maligns the Bergson group. Such attitudes, I suspect, reflect a larger argument between secular/Reform and Orthodox Jews about the nature and purpose of Zionism: Is Israel to be defended...
as a representation of the liberal and democratic ideals of the Enlightenment or as destiny’s homeland for a chosen people?

On these issues, Rosen speaks clearly. On the debate about Roosevelt and the Holocaust, which serves as a proxy for the larger questions, he seems to me to display more perspective than his critics. World War II was not just about saving the Jews. It was about saving humanity.


Notes

1For what it is worth, Rosen represents his practice as consisting of “Family Law; Civil Litigation; Commercial Litigation; Administrative Law; Zoning Law; Government.” http://www.rosen-law-firm.com/jsp2652083.jsp


Through Shuly Rubin Schwartz’s The Rabbi’s Wife: The Rebbetzin in American Jewish Life, we learn not only of the multifaceted roles of rabbis’ wives over the past century, but also of the changing landscape of American Judaism. By serving their communities, rabbis’ wives played an instrumental though unpaid role in the functioning of the synagogue and in Jewish communal life generally—a role often carried out today by a sizeable staff. Thus Schwartz contends throughout that the “American rabbinate was—for most of the twentieth century—a two-person career” (5). In many cases, rabbis’ wives also helped in the transmission of Jewish practice and ritual through their writing and formal or informal teaching. They also established synagogue sisterhoods and founded the American Jewish denominational women’s organizations. Schwartz characterizes them as outstanding women, often before and then throughout marriage, who held a uniquely powerful yet unthreatening position in the leadership of American Judaism.

This role remained largely unexamined until The Rabbi’s Wife. While this book presents a nearly definitive analysis of the changing role and the “evolving consciousness” (6) of these women, by examining the discourse surrounding the rabbi’s wife, Schwartz also offers a new perspective from which to view American Jewish history. Additionally, turning our attention to rabbis’ wives further allows us to recognize “the centrality of women to American religious history” (5). In the case of American Judaism, Schwartz argues rebbetzins “accelerate[d] the expansion of American Jewish synagogue life” (217), though the presumably central role of mass immigration remains overlooked in this study. A more transnational approach would have added contextual insight to
Schwartz begins in the 1890s with the major expansion of American Judaism and the pioneering careers of Carrie Simon, Mathilde Schechter, and Rebecca Goldstein—wives of Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox renowned rabbis, respectively. These women each founded their denomination’s national women’s organization while also aiding their husbands—even enabling aspects of their multiple and demanding positions as clergymen and communal leaders. The three women also actively participated in social aid and philanthropic endeavors and promoted observance of Jewish ritual. These trailblazers thereby “established the infrastructure for women’s religious leadership in the United States” and “embodied for twentieth-century American women a prototype of the American rabbi’s wife” (28). Simon, Schechter, and Goldstein maximized their potential by operating within prevailing gender paradigms, even as they began to blur distinctions between public and private realms and carve the way for future generations.

While rebbetzins up to the 1920s “saw themselves working as their husbands’ helpmates,” by the 1930s and 1940s “maverick rebbetzins” emerged and “stretched the boundaries of the role in a more public direction” (87), particularly as the millions of children of east European Jewish immigrants came of age, a critical historical aspect curiously missing from this otherwise erudite analysis. Schwartz highlights outstanding examples such as Mignon Rubenovitz, a Columbia-educated rabbi’s wife and “prolific” writer on Jewish custom and ceremony (96), and Rebecca Brickner, also a well-educated woman highly active in Hadassah who lectured the congregation on Jewish history and Zionism and was known to lead services in her husband’s absence. Yet as we learn about these outstanding women, one wonders how representative they are, particularly when Schwartz states numerous times that these women “exemplified” the role of the rabbi’s wife in the mid-twentieth century (126). What of the experiences of the majority of rabbis’ wives—perhaps not all such outstanding leaders or visionaries—in the first half of the twentieth century?

Only in the postwar era do we come to a broader assessment of the ambivalence attached to the role, perhaps the result of more readily available source material and living subjects. “Rebbetzins also became more visible as a group during this time” (128), even with formalized training for rabbis’ wives.
Discourse surrounding their role in the Jewish community exploded with the mushrooming of American Jewry in this period. Contradictory messages idealizing domesticity yet promoting individual achievement only increased with time, causing generational rifts by the 1970s. While some rabbis’ wives took advantage of the increasing mobility and carried their work further into the public realm—even within Orthodoxy, as the examples of Blu Greenberg and Esther Jungreis demonstrate—feminists criticized the position of the rabbi’s wife, deeming it exploitative (although rabbis’ wives are far from the only women in Jewish history to have labored in public or private realms without pay).

With career options now wide open and the rabbinate not operating under a “two for the price of one” scenario, most rabbis’ wives have officially disengaged from synagogue life, particularly with the professionalization of the jobs they were once expected to fulfill (167). However, Orthodoxy remains the minority exception, where the rebbetzin role still thrives today, particularly among the outreach-oriented Lubavitcher Hasidim (215). Within the Reform and Conservative movements, however, recent years have increasingly witnessed a new outgrowth of the earlier leadership in the form of female ordination—and the consequent arrival of a comparatively new phenomenon in Jewish history: rabbis’ husbands.

Lara Rabinovitch is a joint doctoral candidate at NYU’s Department of History and the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies, where she specializes in modern Jewish history and food. Her work has been featured in Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History, and Gastronomica: The Journal of Food and Culture. She is also Managing Editor of Cuizine: The Journal of Canadian Food Cultures / Revue des cultures culinaires au Canada.


For the first time since the publication of Deborah Dash Moore’s 1981 study, a historian has provided us with a thorough analysis of the origins and the influence of the first nation-wide Jewish organization in the United States, the Independent Order of B’nai B’rith. Wilhelm enhances our understanding of 19th-century Jewish associational life by combining the history of the B’nai B’rith with that of its female counterpart, the Independent Order of True Sisters.

Drawing from a large variety of printed and archival sources, Wilhelm presents us with a meticulously researched history of both orders. She has reconstructed their early days from memoirs, correspondences, and the press, and clearly lays out changes in ritual and structure over time, including conflicts over the B’nai B’rith’s democratization and gradual elimination of some early rites. Wilhelm points out the well-known influence of Gentile fraternal
orders, yet questions the view that Jews founded their own orders merely as a reaction to anti-Jewish prejudice in the latter. Moreover, she highlights the B’nai B’rith’s inspiration by a German association, the Lichtfreunde, a so far little explored connection.

As Wilhelm emphasizes, both orders tried to provide their members with a modern, civic identity that allowed them to express themselves as American citizens and as Jews. At times, though, their desire to be more than mutual-aid or charitable organizations was at odds with their wish to avoid the pitfalls of religious commitment. Leaning heavily towards Reform Judaism, the B’nai B’rith’s self-understanding as an alternative to congregational life was in constant tension with its distinctly religious elements. Steering clear from official affiliation with any branch of Judaism, the order strove to unify Jews in a way religion could not, but was initially troubled by opposition of its Western District Grand Lodges against domination by the East. This opposition, reflecting the friction between radical and moderate Reform, was further complicated by infighting within the Western lodges. In contrast, the organizational life of the more selective and much less numerous True Sisters was quite harmonious.

Another source of problems arose from the tension between the B’nai B’rith’s universalist ideals and the retention of its Jewish character. The admission of Gentiles, though allowed in principle, conflicted with the order’s wish to maintain its Jewish identity in order to fulfill its “mission,” though what exactly that mission was remained a matter of dispute. In the mid-1870s, the claim to represent American Jewry became more elusive with the establishment of rival fraternal and national organizations and the increasing internationalization of the order, and was sabotaged by its insistence on secrecy, suspicious in the eyes of many non-members. However, despite the permanent conflicts between its leaders, the order’s ideals were successfully translated into educational and philanthropic institutions on the local level. These, according to the author, fostered American Jews’ pride in a common, public, and modern identity, which was the lasting contribution of the B’nai B’rith and the True Sisters.

Wilhelm’s book will be indispensable for scholars of Jewish-American organizations and of 19th-century American Jewish history. It is also of great relevance to students of general American associational life.

Sonja L. Mekel is a doctoral student at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Her dissertation analyzes the relationship between Germans and German Jews in Chicago and Milwaukee in the 19th century.
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