



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE EMANCIPATION OF
THE JEWS IN HOLLAND
Primarily as Reflected in

Dibre N'gidim

by

Zevi Hirsch of Illfeld

by

Wm. H. Rosenblatt

Thesis

Hebrew Union College

March 18, 1932.

Recd. 12/79

Refer. Dr. Marcus.

Contents

Chapter I.

Introduction:	Page
A. Purpose.....	1.
B. Form and Contents of <u>Dibre N'gidim</u>	1.

Chapter II.

Historical Background:

A. General.....	5.
B. Jewish.....	11.

Chapter III.

Emancipation:

A. History of Struggle for Emancipation.....	17.
B. Factors of Emancipation:	
1. Factors favoring Emancipation.....	21.
2. Factors retarding Emancipation.....	38.
C. Arguments concerning Jewish Emancipation as Reflected in <u>Dibre N'gidim</u> :	
1. Report of Hahn and Associates.....	43.
2. Arguments of Representatives of Assembly.....	55.
D. Results of Emancipation.....	70.

Chapter 1.

Introduction.

A. Purpose.

As the title of this thesis indicates, it is the purpose of the writer to deal with the Emancipation of the Jews primarily as reflected in the work of Zebi Hirsch of Illfeld, called Dibre N'gidim.

B. Form and contents of Dibre N'gidim.

The book, Dibre N'gidim was printed by the press of Solomon Abraham Proops, at Amsterdam in 1799. The author already mentioned was Zebi Hirsch, at this time a resident of Amsterdam.

The book itself is divided into five sections. The first part is an introduction by the author, "enlightening the people in the way of faith and its virtues." The second section gives us a short history of the emancipation of the Jews in the Batavian Republic. The third part, which forms the major portion of the book, is a translation from the Dutch of the speeches delivered by the representatives of the National Assembly, convened at the Hague, the capital, concerning the emancipation of the Jews as citizens. The fourth part of this work consists of a translation of the laws governing the

Batavian people, which were established by the "will of the people." The last section contains a glossary explaining unusual Hebrew words and rendering them into German, and some of them into French.(1)

The author explains that he has drawn his material from the daily record or minutes of the Assembly at the Hague, on all matters pertaining to the emancipation of the Jews. In order to give the reader a true picture of the struggle for Jewish rights, he has included the speeches of representatives, some favoring and some opposing Jewish emancipation.

The material itself he has not translated exactly from the original Dutch sources. For he found that there were three types of speeches which the various representatives delivered. First, that which was very long, well-expressed and fully expounded. Second, that which was short, and third, that which neither too short nor too long. In reference to the first type, the author found it necessary to shorten them in order not to burden the reader with a vast amount of unnecessary material and detail. In regard to the second type, he found it necessary to lengthen them in order that the reader may understand their contents. For in their original form they would have been understood only by scholars. Since it is the aim of the author to have this material made available for the masses, additions to this second type were necessary.

And finally, in dealing with the third type, the author merely translated the speeches from the Dutch into the Hebrew without emending the style or the nature of the contents.

Thus one may surmise that the account presented in Dibre N'gidim, although a contemporary account of Jewish emancipation in Holland, may not be exact in all its details because during the process of translation the material may have been altered to meet the fancy or view point of the author. This is merely a conjecture on my part which can only be substantiated or denied after a careful comparative study has been made with the original documents. However, the book as a whole presents a vivid description of the struggle for Jewish emancipation in Holland.(2)

The author called his work "Dibre N'gidim" because the contents of the book are "good words". And "wise or good words" in Hebrew are designated by the term "n'gidim." (See Prov. 8:6). Another reason for selecting this title for the book was that the men chosen to sit in the Assembly were called "N'gidim". In French such an official is called a representant and in Dutch, Volkesvertegenwoordiger.(3)

The major part of the book, consisting of speeches of various representatives of the National Assembly, is preceded by a short history concerning the emancipation of the Jews. This begins with the invasion of the French and continues to the present day.(1794-99). The purpose of this

historical sketch is to present the background of the period and thus enable the reader to better understand the contents of the speeches that follow. Another motive for this work is to have this book remain as a memorial for later generations.(4)

In the glossary, we find the words arranged in alphabetical order. The author also gives the explanation of Hebrew words not found in the Torah, and of those words which are not common in the Hebrew language. Likewise, explanations of some foreign ^{words} are rendered into German, and occasionally into French. (5)

Also, at the very end of the book we find a codification of the laws of Batavia that were enacted at this time. The purpose for including this material the author informs us, is to make this information available to the Jews who do not understand Dutch; and secondly, to have Israel recognize this fact: That the people of Batavia at this time chose laws of justice and righteousness because of their love of God and man.(6)

CHAPTER II

Historical Background

A. General.

The French Revolution had already been effected in France. A new government with liberal principles had been established. Even the Jews, long considered aliens, outcasts, and strangers, had gained a glorious victory by attaining their citizenship rights in 1791.

The Revolution did not stop there, but made its influence felt throughout the entire civilized world. Under Napoleon, the march of France continued. He wedged his way eastward conquering one country after another. One of his generals, Pichegru, with 100,000 men had already crossed the Meuse and gained possession of the chief places in Dutch Flanders. (7)

In December, 1794, the French troops crossed the frozen rivers of Brabant in order to attack the Netherlands. During the first days of January, 1795, they actually entered Dutch territory. (8) It was a most severe winter. Circumstances which usually retard the operations of war, in the present, became means of hurrying the conquest of the country. The sea hitherto defenses of Holland, now solid masses of ice, helped the invaders. (9) The French with the help of 30,000 refugees driven out in 1787 by Wilhelm V of Orange combined their forces, drove

out the Stadtholder Wilhelm in order to bring salvation to the lovers of freedom. Many of these refugees and leaders of a previous unsuccessful revolution had taken refuge in France. Here they had formed Batavian committees and no doubt were responsible for much of the French propaganda that was carried on by the various literary clubs of Leyden, Utrecht, and Amsterdam. Thus when the French invasion took place there were many who sided with the French and welcomed them in Holland. (10)

The warfare that ensued was of short duration. For the people of Holland, long discontented, welcomed the French as liberators. The French Army encountered but little resistance. The Republican party in Amsterdam acclaimed the French upon their entrance into the city. Gertruydenberg, Dort, Rotterdam, and Hague surrendered without a single gun being fired. (11)

This rather passive resistance to the French invasion may be explained by several factors. First, Wilhelm V, the last Stadtholder, had been unable to centralize the country and emancipate the middle classes, which for the last three centuries had been excluded from all political power. Second, the country itself was in turmoil. It was split up into several parties, each fighting the other for power and control. The Patriots, the mildly revolutionary party, since the middle of the eighteenth century were working for the centralization and a more representative form of government. This group

was composed of the professional and higher middle classes. In the New Batavian Assembly that was established later, we find them represented under the name of Unionists. Then there were the Regents, the old plutocratic oligarchy. They continually opposed this centralization of the government. When the country of Holland becomes the Batavian Republic we find that they play only a very insignificant role. Still another party, the Federalists, who combine all the opposition elements in the country, work to maintain the old decentralization.(12)

With this as the internal political situation we can readily understand that Holland could not present a united front to ward off the invasion of the French. Therefore, "Wherever the French came, the towns, and villages fell into their hands, and the few fortifications they met, in most instances, surrendered without the firing of a single gun. On January 16, 1795, the strong town of Utrecht opened its gates to the invaders. On the evening of the next day, the States General assembled in the Hague, decided that under the circumstances further opposition was impractical, and that complete surrender was the only alternative." (13) Also Wilhelm V, the Stadtholder, realized that further resistance was futile. On January, 18, at midnight, he rushed to the Hague, resigned his position in order to "save the country from further misery," and sailed for England.(14) As a climax to this crushing defeat, the French cavalry under

Moreau, "supported by a battery of horse artillery, pushed on to the Helder, found the river frozen hard, and riding sword in hand to the Island of Texel, captured the Dutch fleet"(15)

France, now actually in control of the country, probably to gain the support of the people, favored the establishment of a republic. Thus it was that on May 16, 1795, the Hague treaty was consummated. In this treaty France agreed to recognize Batavia as an independent republic which was to model its laws after those of France. Also the following was included in this pact. An "eternal peace " was to exist between the two countries; the Republic was to receive back its ships, artillery, and territory except "a just indemnification" for the conquest. As part of this indemnity, 1,100,000,000 guilders were to be paid to France. In addition to all this Holland was to maintain a French garrison in the country and was responsible for feeding and clothing it.(17)

The economic prestige ^{of Holland} had begun to dwindle even before the French invasion. The enormous profits of the great East India Company since 1774 were steadily declining because its mercantile system was antiquated. The many voices calling for reform were silenced by the rulers of Orange. Loan after loan was made to bolster up this great institution but to no avail. And now that Holland was busily engaged with a reorganization of the country, The Dutch East India Company was any easy prey for England.

The small remnant of Dutch commerce and wealth which Holland still possessed were now totally destroyed. Even the Dutch merchants had given up true commerce by putting their capital into the money business, and risking it in dangerous speculation. The numerous bankruptcies that were now prevalent had also inflicted a heavy blow on credit, "the soul of trade."

Likewise, Dutch industry since 1780 was steadily on the decline. Only a few trades remained steady, these being the salt works, oil mills, starch manufactures, and diamond-cutting. The cheaper wares imported from other countries, especially from France, crowded out many articles made in the country. France introduced her own wares into the Netherlands, duty free. Dutch goods at the same time were deliberately undersold in their own country, while France barred all Dutch goods, and denied them entrance to French markets. Also the high standard of living, the result of previous prosperity had raised wages and the prices of manufactured goods, so that it was very difficult for Holland to compete with foreign countries. (18)

Besides all this England had been remunerated for her assistance in the recent war. Had she not been Holland's ally, aiding the Dutch in their futile attempt to repulse the French Invasion? (19) In recognition of England's services, Holland was forced to cede to England all of Dutch Flanders, Maestricht, Venloo and their dependencies. And in addition, Holland had to grant both France and England

the right to navigate the Rhine, Meuse and the Scheldt.

Thus Holland drained of all sources of income, and deprived of much territory, was now in a deplorable condition. Under these circumstances great poverty began to show itself in many cities and villages. Many of the flourishing villages of North Holland--Schagen, Assendelft, Wormer, and Sloterdijk-- were characterized as "half-fallen." Poor houses rose up everywhere. People were now living on scanty wages and suffering from lack of bread. Under the weight of such burdens, with an ever increasing indebtedness, with all her former resources of trade and industry confiscated, Holland vainly sought relief from the various new governments that followed one another in rapid succession. First from the old States-General, then from the newly created National Assembly, and finally, in the early part of the nineteenth century from the Directory. (20)

B. Jewish.

The Jews or Maranos trying to escape the tortures of the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal sought a place of refuge. Some of them came to the Netherlands which had not yet become part of Spain and therefore ^{WPA} still free of the Inquisition. However, under Charles V, the Netherlands came under the domain of Spain. In 1522, he issued an edict expelling the Jews from the various cities of Holland. The magistrates fearing the introduction of the Inquisition complied with the order of Charles V.

In 1591, an unsuccessful attempt was made to settle a few Jews in the city of Middleburg allowing them religious freedom. Pallache, who sponsored this plan assured the city that it would benefit by the wealth and the commercial ability of the Jews who settled there. This plan was acceptable to the leaders of this city but they were forced to yield to the opposition of the Protestant Clergy. (21)

However under William of Orange there was a more liberal attitude toward the Jew. As a result in 1593, the first contingent of Maranos arrived in Amsterdam. At first these New-Christians were forced to practice their religion in secret because they were suspected of being papists. It was not until 1615 that the Jews were recognized as settlers and traders. From this time on numerous groups continued coming to Holland. (22)

The Jewish population by 1795 had increased to about 50,000, of which 20,000 alone resided in the important center of the country, Amsterdam. The Jews at this time constituted one-thirty-ninth part of the total population, and existed as "corporate bodies in the midst of larger ones."⁽²³⁾

Legally, the Jews had no political or economic rights whatsoever upon their entrance into the country, nor did they immediately seek such rights. The harrowing experiences of Spain and Portugal were still freshly imprinted upon their minds. They were grateful in having escaped the tortures of the Inquisition inflicted by a fanatical clergy. Now they felt safe and had the added joy of religious freedom. Since this concession was granted by the rulers of the House of Orange, the Jews out of gratitude, willingly cooperated with the rulers and remained loyal and devoted subjects to them to the bitter end. It has been suggested that because of the great wealth the Jews brought with them, they did not need to engage in the economic pursuits of the country, and for that reason did not seek entrance into the various professions and trades.

The House of Orange always tried to maintain this good-will toward the Jews. In return for their kindness, protecting the Jews and their property, and permitting them to worship in Hebrew, a tradition was established among the Jews that they should remain loyal to the House of Orange forever. This tradition was handed down from father

to sonboth among the Ashkenazim and Sephardim. ⁽²⁴⁾ The princes of the House of Orange even went further than merely offering the Jews a safe asylum in their country. They favored the Jews more than they did the Catholics by granting the Jews places of worship which were denied other denominations except that of the official religion--the Reformed Church. ⁽²⁵⁾

The Jews although given religious freedom were considered "as strangers in a foreign country." They were barred from the various trades in which the general masses were engaged; and also were disqualified in holding any governmental office. ⁽²⁶⁾ Before the Batavian Republic was established the Jews were excluded from all guilds, fraternities, etc, which controlled the membership of all professions. This law which was repealed officially in 1796, in reality, remained in effect until Holland was incorporated into the French Empire in 1811. It was then that the Jews for the first time were given the opportunity of entering these corporations. ⁽²⁷⁾ Restrictions placed upon the Jews before their emancipation were so severe, that even when it came to a simple matter of securing a marriage license there ^{were} definite discriminations against them. When a Jewish bride and groom came before the Magistrate for the purpose of securing a marriage license they were forced to wait until all others were served and ^{then} ^{and} their request was granted. In addition to this discrimination, the Jews were compelled to pay a registration fee double the amount paid by individuals of other faiths. ⁽²⁸⁾

Although the Jews were permitted to use their mode of worship and erect institutions for this purpose, they were not however exempt from paying their share of taxes for the support of the Reformed Church and its constituent institutions. This was the established Church of the country and all people living in Holland were obligated to contribute toward its support. ⁽²⁹⁾ The Jews, like all other non-Reformists had to bear the burden of governmental expenses although at the same time they were not considered citizens of the country. ⁽³⁰⁾

Thus the admission of the Jews to Holland was merely a matter of toleration, of permitting the Jews only the right of settlement. As a result the people of Holland still considered the Jews a "separate nation." Moreover, the ignorant rabble, and the "hot-headed priests" looked upon the Jews as the enemies of the Christains and therefore continued a hatred for the Jew which had been imbedded in the hearts of Christains for many centuries. ⁽³¹⁾

A large portion of the Jewish population was concentrated in Amsterdam. Here in the so-called "Joden Quartier" were 20,000. Those Jews who came to Holland with a large amount of wealth, had engaged in colonial trade and invested heavily in English stocks. One has had observed that the Jews who increased their wealth in these enterprises were given over to "luxury, levity and high play." As a result many rich Jews lost their fortunes, and on the other hand, many poor Jews became very wealthy. The Sephardim possessing more wealth than their Ashkenazic brethren seemed to

have been "more industrious, more reserved, and less addicted to gambling, levity and less polite."

In reference to the religious observances of these two groups we find that no important differences existed, save a difference in the pronounciation of Hebrew and in a few ceremonies. However, this fact is significant, a bitter enmity existed between them for the "German Jews cannot bear the pride of the Portuguese Jews."⁽³²⁾

In speaking of the relationship of the Jews to their leaders one has observed that the "Jews were easily led." The contempt of the Christians did not seem to bother the Jews as long as the Rabbis and Parnassim could convince the people that this was to be their lot in Golus. They therefore urged the Jews to be satisfied with their present condition until the Messiah would come, who would then set up their state and alleviate their suffering.⁽³³⁾ While the mass of Jewry thus suffered degradation, the Rabbiseim did not experience the same privations. They were generally "well-fed, well housed, and well-dressed." They could wait patiently for the coming of the Messiah, while their fellow-Jews were tormented by hunger and misery.⁽³⁴⁾ The Rabbis and Parnassim constituted an aristocratic minority, exercising a tremendous power over the Jews until the era of Enlightenment came, when some of the Jews rose up in rebellion against their authority.⁽³⁵⁾

In summing up the pitiful condition of the Jews and the causes for their degradation, the writer of this interest-

ing chronicle tells us "that the Christains through prejudice and self-interest have kept the Jew in a degraded condition. The Jew was not permitted in Christain society, barred him from any official position, and restrained him from participating in many trades. Besides this, the Christains continued and fostered religious prejudice. For the Christains still considered the Jew guilty of the murder of their Messiah and in consequence the Jew must suffer a just punishment." The Rabbis and Parnassim, he continues, added more to the woes of the Jews by "flattering the government and seeking no favours except to allow the poor Jews to beg in the Jewish Quarter."

CHAPTER III

Emancipation

A. History of Struggle for Emancipation.

The first important step taken toward securing the emancipation of the Jews of Holland was initiated by the members of the Felix Libertate. On March 29, 1796 they addressed a petition to the National Assembly, convened at the Hague, demanding that the Jews be given the right to exercise all privileges designated for citizens. The right of submitting such a petition, they claimed, was in accordance with an enactment of the National Assembly. For on March 1, 1796 the Assembly made a declaration which provided the following: That every inhabitant of Batavia has the right of submitting his request in writing to this body, whomever he may be. ⁽³⁷⁾

This petition based its claim for demanding the full exercise of citizenship rights upon the fact that this Assembly had already agreed to grant such rights to ALL inhabitants of Batavia without excluding any individuals or groups. ⁽³⁸⁾

After the petition was read to the National Assembly on March 29, it was put into the hands of a committee of seven representatives, with Hahn as Chairman. This committee was instructed to consider the contents of the petition, and return to this body a proposal on how this matter should be voted, taking into consideration the existing laws of the country. ⁽³⁹⁾

In the meantime, several members of the Felix Libertate published a pamphlet called "Words of Debate". They distributed copies of this pamphlet to every member of the Assembly. In this tract were described the claims the Jews had for demanding the full rights of citizenship. Also this work embodied refutations to opponents of Jewish emancipation. Later, during the discussion of Jewish emancipation in the National Assembly this pamphlet received the praise and commendation of many representatives who spoke on behalf of the Jewish cause. (40)

On August 1, 1796, representative Hahn, in the name of the committee appointed to investigate the above mentioned petition, presented a report to the National Assembly. In this report, Hahn presented the arguments for Jewish emancipation, and also took up the major objections. His report finally concluded with this fact: That the Jews should receive all the rights of citizenship. After hearing this report, the Assembly decided to publish it and in three weeks the Assembly was to reconvene to discuss its contents, and all the members were invited to express their opinion on the matter. (41)

On August 22, the Assembly convened and commenced deliberations on the petition of the Jews. (42) For eight full days, day and night, various representatives argued both sides of the question. Finally, the Assembly rendered this decision: That the rights of citizenship should be granted the Jews without any restrictions whatsoever. This decision of the Assembly was welcomed with great joy, and

received the tremendous applause of the Assembly. De Le Korat, the presiding officer of the Assembly at this time, appointed five representatives to formulate this decision into a formal decree and this committee was to return their work to the Assembly for final approval.

On September 2, 1796 the Assembly by a unanimous decision accepted the decree formulated by this committee. The Assembly also agreed to send a copy of this decree to the Jews who presented the petition on March 29, in order to inform the latter how the Assembly acted upon their request. When the Jewish community heard this report, the congregaetion Adath Jeshurun, proclaimed this day as a day of thanksgiving to God, to be celebrated with joy and song, (probably another Purim.)⁽⁴³⁾

The introduction of this formal decree first stated the following: That since the Jews are constitutionally considered citizens of Batavia and have exercised the rights of citizenship, they should be given the right to continue doing so and be permitted to enjoy this privilege to the fullest. Then it reviews the legislation of the Assembly to substantiate the legality of this contention. First, it points out that such rights were granted to individuals of Batavian Society irrespective of religious creed. This was definitely stated in the principles ratified by the Assembly on March 4, 1795, concerning the rights of individuals; and on August 5, when a complete separation of church

and state was established.

The actual decree declared the following: 1- No Jew is to be deprived of certain rights which are inexorably bound up with the privileges of the Batavian Citizens, which they wish to enjoy, with the proviso that he possesses all the qualifications and fulfills all duties demanded of citizens by the general constitution.

2. By a circular letter the highest constituted authorities of the different provinces and states are to be informed and admonished by this decree: To permit every Jew who so desires, to enjoy in so far as this is possible before the innovation of the constitution, the sanction which had been given to the clerical innovations of the Jews by previous provincial and state governments, but which have since the adoption of the present acknowledged laws been looked upon as null and void, and which opposes the decree of this Assembly of August 5.

3. Representative Schimmelpennink and associates are hereby asked and appointed to deliver to this Assembly as soon as possible a project for such a circular letter. (44)

B. Factors of Emancipation.

1. Factors favoring Emancipation.

a. French Revolution.

The French Revolution played a most important role in the emancipation of the Jews in Holland. The Revolution successfully culminated in France, moved eastward through Europe. Wherever it achieved military success in conquering various countries, it carried out a policy of instituting a new form of government in the vanquished countries. In Holland, as I have already shown, this new government was modeled after that of France.

Graetz's assertion that the "deliverance of the Jews advanced from one place to another through the victories of the French troops" is undoubtedly correct to a great extent.⁽⁴⁵⁾ For it was the invasion of the French in Holland that made possible the political changes culminating in the formation of the Batavian Republic, declaring the freedom of its inhabitants; and eventually leading to the emancipation of the Jews.

With the coming of the French in 1795, we have the departure of the Stadtholder, and the United Netherlands ceases to exist. The moderate spirit of France soon prevails, and men inspired by this spirit, with the aid of the French representative, begin to take over the reigns of government. Prominent among the leaders were Pieter Paulus of Rotterdam, and advocate Rutger Jan Schimmelpennick of Amsterdam.

The French representative in collaboration with these men laid the foundation of the later known Batavian Republic, and began making changes in the government.

The immediate action for a change took place on the very day that the French entered the city of Amsterdam. For on that day, January 19, 1795 the old governmental officials were ousted from their posts, and others, men who "would carry out the will of the people, who were lovers of freedom, took their places."⁽⁴⁶⁾ So from Amsterdam and the Hague, the capital, the slogan "for the maintenance of peace and replacement of Orange Regents" went forth from city to city. The changes for a time were limited merely to the replacement of Orange Regents by Patriots. The old States-General, although composed of new members, still continued to bear the old name. Likewise, changes took place in the provinces, changes being made only in the names of the governing boards which were now composed of Patriots. Thus citizen bodies were now communes, town councils were changed to municipalities, estates into assemblies of provisional representatives, and colleges into communities, all having for their motto "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."

All these changes took place under the direction of the patriotic clubs, now called the revolutionary committees. They instituted many celebrations around the "tree of liberty" painted in red, white and blue, the national colors. Also there were passionate speeches by the various leaders, meetings being held in the churches. There were illuminations

and display of flags; and shouts in honor of the Revolution reverberated throughout the country.

The Amsterdam Committee however, considered itself as the instigator of the Revolution in the Netherlands. They managed the affairs of the country for awhile by sending out delegates to the various provinces. On January 26, 1795 this committee took possession of the Hall of the Estates of Holland and chose Pieter Paulus president. This new body of commissioners established a military and financial committees. They also abolished the office of Council Pensionary and transferred his functions to the president. Likewise, they annihilated the class of nobility in Holland, and henceforth the country was to be represented by deputies. It also voted to have a national gathering of representatives of the whole people to settle upon a definite form of government.
(47)

b. French Liberalism.

A second factor favoring the impending emancipation of the Jews in Holland was what might be termed French Liberalism. The French Revolution itself was partly the result of this liberalism which had been disseminated throughout the country for almost fifty years before the Revolution actually took place.

The main substance of this liberalism consisted of a spirit of revolt against medievalism, its institutions, and thought. It came forward with an emphatic

declaration that human reason is the supreme criteria for human judgments. In the eighteenth century this liberalism bore fruit in the radical changes following in the wake of the French Revolution. It became an age of Enlightenment, of world views, of the recognition of the power of the human mind to solve problems, of trying to understand in an intelligent way human life, the state, religion, morality, and language. It was an age of a new philosophy, of courage, wherein free and independent thought is expressed boldly.

This type of thinking produced action, for it was concerned with the very welfare and elevation of all people. "In France, owing to the social, political and ecclesiastical oppression, the Enlightenment found its most radical utterance. It was here that its influence was greatest. Human reason was now exalted. The words of humanity, good-will, natural rights, liberty, equality, and brotherhood, became the watchwords of all human strivings. The revolt against mediaevalism produced the great political and social upheaval both in France and later in Holland. The old regimes gave way to a new social order. The new spirit demanded and achieved "liberty of conscience and worship, equality, economic freedom and representative government, and equality of all individuals before the law."

The chief proponents of this new spirit in France were Voltaire (1694-1778), Montesquieu (1685-1755) and Rousseau (1712-1778).

Voltaire popularized Lockian ideas after his return from England, and combined these ideas with Newton's natural philosophy and English Deism. He ruthlessly attacked superstition, bigotry, and especially the domination of the clergy over the masses. He fiercely combated all oppression and worked for religious, political and intellectual freedom.

Rousseau came forward with the slogan that men are equal by nature, but society through the institution of property has made them unequal. The result is that now we have "masters and slaves, cultured and uncultured, rich and poor." He therefore urges man to seek out the causes for such vices in society and to look for the "perfection of man in the improvement of society." To him the ideal government was one directed by the people. He insists upon equal rights not only for the third estate, like Voltaire, but also for the fourth estate, the laboring class. It was Rousseau's ideas that were later incorporated into the "Declaration of the Rights of Man," embodied in our constitution in 1789, also made part of the French constitution and later introduced into that of Holland. Rousseau was also the author of Social Contract, wherein he says "Natural Society is based on a contract in which the individual surrenders his individual freedom for the liberty of citizenship, which is limited by the general will of the people." Freedom thus becomes self-imposed law. Sovereignty lies with the people,

the general will--that is, the will of the people in so far as it aims at the common good--is the highest law. Government executes the commands of the people, who can limit or recall the power delegated to it. ⁽⁴⁸⁾

This liberalism of France had a great influence upon Holland. Although it was not an integral part of the country, yet there were many who were inspired and no doubt greatly influenced by the thoughts of the French philosophers. This influence showed itself immediately after France invaded Holland. It is especially noticeable in the work of the Revolutionary Committee, the States-General, ⁽⁴⁹⁾ and later in the National Assembly. Apparently the so-called enlightenment in Germany did not influence the Jews of Holland. They seemed to have remained untouched by this development in Germany. "The great Jews of Amsterdam were not influenced by Mendelssohn, but by the cosmopolitan ideas of France." ⁽⁵⁰⁾

The first tangible evidence of the influence of French liberalism is found in the declaration of the Amsterdam Committee calling for unity and good-will among the inhabitants of the country. On January 19, 1795, the day the French entered Amsterdam, the Revolutionary Committee sent out a proclamation to the people, admonishing them to live together in peace and brotherhood. This pronouncement was hailed with great joy by the populace. ⁽⁵¹⁾

Shortly thereafter, another proclamation was issued on January 31, by the Provisional Representatives, (Revolutionary)

tionary Committee) proclaiming "liberty of man". The substance of this decree recognized the validity of granting all people religious freedom. It stated that since all men are born free and equal such rights cannot be denied any man.

Then it followed with a definition of the three "magical words" Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Liberty was defined in terms of the "golden rule." Every man has the right to do that which he considers right in his own eyes providing he doesn't infringe upon the work of others. Therefore, every individual has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. The decree also stated that wealth and property cannot be confiscated as it meets the whims and fancies of any individual or groups, but only by due process of law.

After describing individual rights, the decree considers the rights given to the inhabitants of Holland. First, it informs those people who may vote. All those included as inhabitants are eligible to vote and to be elected as a representative to the Assembly. Furthermore, all inhabitants are expected to abide by the civil law in regard to the freedom that has been extended to individuals. The people in the forthcoming election are urged to elect representatives on the basis of their ability to function in this capacity. Every individual is likewise informed that he has the right to seek his request through his representative, who in collaboration with the other representatives determine the will of the people. Also this body of representatives (Nation-

al Representatives) possess the power of rendering the final decision in all matters. All the foregoing principles, the proclamation states, must be considered fundamental in establishing the future laws of the country. (52)

On March 4, 1795, a similar decree was issued by the States-General. This decree not only proclaims that Liberty, Equality and Fraternity are extended to all in religious matters but also enumerates the privileges and rights of the inhabitants of the country. It says by doing so, "we are surely carrying out the Will of God." Therefore when the new Assembly convenes they must take these principles as the starting point of their work, and must take cognizance of this fact: That it is impossible to change the same. The decree ends with instructions to have its contents published in all the seven provinces and in all the cities and villages of the country. (53)

On May 16, 1795, the ^{day} France recognized Holland as the Batavian Republic, a definite announcement was made concerning those eligible to vote. The Assembly agreed to make a census of the people of Batavia. Each voting district was to be composed of 500 people, and everyone above the age of twenty-one has the privilege of voting and the opportunity of becoming a member of the assemblies in the districts and also of the National Assembly. (54)

And finally, on August 5, 1795, the Assembly decided upon a most complete separation of Church and State. Formerly, as it has already been pointed out, the laws of the

State were inexorably bound up with those of the established Church--The Reformed Church. But henceforth this state of affairs was to be abolished. Individuals were no longer to be considered as members of a certain religious faith, but were only to be recognized as individual members of the Batavian Republic. To do otherwise, the decree states, would be to act contrary to the principle that had been established of extending Liberty, Equality and Fraternity (55) to all.

c. Liberal Organizations, etc.

The third important factor working for the emancipation of the Jews was the activity of various liberal organizations in Holland. There were several whose sole purpose was endeavoring to secure the rights of all oppressed people. Through their propaganda and activity they gained many adherents to the Jewish cause. Likewise, they were instrumental in creating a more sympathetic understanding between the various religious denominations. The most important and most potent organization among these was the Felix Libertate (החירות והצדק) "success in freedom."

The Felix Libertate was an organization composed of Jews and non-Jews of the city of Amsterdam. It was organized in February, 1795, and called the "People's Society" (56) with Moses Solomon Asser as its president. It had for its motto "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," which was later incorporated into the proclamation of the National Assembly, issued on March 4, 1795. (57) There were four prominent German

and two important Portuguese Jews among the membership. The four German Jews: Herz Bromet, for a time a citizen of Surinam, Moses Asser, a knight of the Belgian Order of the Lion, Carolus Asser and Isaac de Jonghe. The Portuguese Jews of importance were Herz de Lemon, an outstanding physician, and Jacob Sasportas. ⁽⁵⁸⁾ This organization was interested in gaining freedom for the people of the entire country, and particularly to promote the cause of the Jew in this connection. For until now the Jews had no political or economic rights whatsoever, but were considered in accordance with the law enforced at this time, "as strangers in a foreign country."

On March 3, 1795 this organization conducted a demonstration around the "Tree of Liberty," which was set up before the court-house in the city of Amsterdam. They encircled this tree with singing and dancing. The judges and magistrates led the procession and were followed by individuals representing various organizations. Included in this group were many Jewish members of the Felix Libertate. They were followed by two boys and girls representing the various religious denominations of the city, and among the latter were the children of both the Ashkenazic and Sephardic communities. ⁽⁵⁹⁾

The Felix Libertate also published many tracts and pamphlets refuting indictments made against Jews. At the same they insisted that the Jews be given the same right which other inhabitants of the country enjoyed. ⁽⁶⁰⁾ Despite continual attacks made by Christians, the Felix Libertate

carried out ^{it's} ~~set~~ program to a successful conclusion. Rabbi Moses Asser, the president, petitioned the Amsterdam committee to abrogate a custom that had been in force for a long time. Namely, the discrimination made against the Jewish bride and groom when they appeared at the registration bureau for their marriage license. They were forced to wait until all others were served, and in addition were compelled to pay a double fee for the service. Asser explained that this custom was contrary to the fundamental principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which were supposed to be the guiding principles governing the people of Batavia. His petition was presented on May 16, 1795 and the Committee acted favorably upon it. Thus this unjust practice was abolished. (61)

Also, I have already pointed out that the Felix Libertate had taken the first practical step in securing the emancipation of the Jews in Holland. On March 29, 1796, they presented a petition to the National Assembly, demanding the rights of citizenship. (see p.17)

The contents of this petition forms the basis for the major part of the discussion found in Dibre N'gidim. It begins by asserting that the Jews who are part of Batavia have been awakened by this call to freedom, and they voice their appreciation to France for the important innovations she has fostered in Holland. Why shouldn't the Jews rejoice, for they who have been persecuted and oppressed for two thousand years are now considered equal with all men. But

the petitioners point out the present paradoxical situation. For alas, the hopes of the Jews have been frustrated. For the "rights of all men," which was supposed to become the guiding principle underlying all the laws of Batavia, has not been firmly established. The Jews feel they have a right to be included in the category of "man" whose rights were to ~~be~~ be safe-guarded. Furthermore, since the Jews paid their share of expenses for the war that led to the establishment of the Batavian Republic, they feel they are entitled to receive some recognition for their assistance. Despite the fact that the Jews are still persecuted, they nevertheless are ready to forgive and forget if only this Assembly will rectify all wrongs. Not only did the Jews claim that they aided materially in the war, but that they have also exercised the power of enfranchisement by actually participating in the election of representatives for this Assembly. Moreover, the petitioners states, some Jews have even been elected to this Assembly, while others lacked only a few votes to become members.

The petitioners who come before this Assembly as men of a Republic declare that it is the responsibility of this body to carry out the will of the people. Included in this "will" is the "Declaration of the Rights of Man," and the right of exercising prerogatives associated with citizenship. It is therefore the duty of this Assembly to secure these rights for all men, and to work for the abolition of all yokes and oppressions that have been placed upon individuals by

the former rulers.

The petition concludes with a plea to consider the following: That the Jews who are already considered legally citizens of Batavia be allowed to serve as representatives in the Assemblies and be permitted to engage in the activities prescribed for citizens. For the Jews have been created equal with all other citizens and were supposed to be given these rights without ^{any} discrimination being made against them.

This petition dated March 29, 1796 was written in Amsterdam, and signed by H.L. Bromet, Isack de Jong Meyers, M. Asser, H. de H. Lemon, Jacob Sasportas, Joseph de Jongh and Carolus Asser.
(62)

Also the leaders and representatives of the province of Friesland were very sympathetic to the movement for Jewish emancipation. They sent a letter to the Felix Libertate commending this organization for their work which is "righteous and good," and urging them not to relinquish their ideal of securing freedom for the people in the country, and for the Jews in particular.
(63)

d. Individuals.

Not only were several organization working for Jewish emancipation but also individuals showed an interest in this fight. Both Jews and non-Jews espoused the cause of the Jew. Through various pamphlets which were issued, and by verbal enunciation, especially by the representatives of the National Assembly, Jewish emancipation was urgently requested.

David Friedrichsfeld in 1795, wrote a book called Investigations of Van Sweiden's Work in Reference to the Civil Rights of the Jews. This book was written in reply to an opponent of Jewish emancipation and included the major objections which Van Sweiden declared prevented the Jew from becoming part of the Batavian Republic. Among some objections stated were the character of the Jew, his religion, his belief in the Messiah, etc. (64)

Likewise we find a letter published in the Ha-Me'assef, (1796), sent from Amsterdam, calling the Jews to voice their appreciation to God for His goodness to them in this era when they are being considered for citizenship. It also calls upon the Jews to express their appreciation to representative Hahn for his efforts on behalf of the Jews. (Hahn was chairman of the committee appointed to investigate the petition of the Jews, March 29, 1796.) Likewise the following Jews are to be congratulated for their work in the Jewish cause: Bromet, Issac de Jonghe Meyers, Jacob Sasportas, M. Asser, H. de Lemon and Carolus Asser. (65)

Most interesting however, is the letter of David Nassy, a doctor who lived in Philadelphia, and later returned to Surinam. This letter was sent to the Hague. It aims at the emancipation of the Jews, and is a reply to the Dordrecht Club, an anti-Jewish organization, opposing Jewish emancipation. Nassy formulates the criticism leveled against the Jews into five accusations and makes a reply to each:

1. Dealing with separatism of the Jew.

"The Jews have always lived apart from other nations and do not look upon the Christains as their brethren. Hence they are forbidden to marry a person of another nation."

In reply to this Nassy relates that Biblical history reveals this fact: That hostilities were begun by the other nations, and not by the Jews. For the same reason marriage between the two races are forbidden. He points out that in the middle ages and later times the most severe punishments were imposed for the Jew who married a non-Jew. This being also sanctioned by the law of the land.

2. Disloyalty of Jew in their respective countries.

Titus and Nebuchadrezzer conquered Palestine because of the bad faith of the Jew. Also Hadrain banished them from the country for the same reason. "The Jews have always been suspected; and even if they turn Christains they will hide their Judaism for the advantage it gives them, as they did in Spain and Portugal."

Nassy replies that the historical facts have been misrepresented. He discusses the various revolutions and show that those who brought about the new order of things cannot be called unfaithful. This principle, he contends, holds true in the case of the Jew.

3. Jews are cowards and unpatriotic.

"The Jews have always exhibited themselves as toadies in distress." This is shown in their attitude toward Alexander the Great. The history of Holland, 1784-87, also reveals their unpatriotic order for they supported the House of Orange.

Nassy seems to evade this question. Without doubt the last part of this accusation is well-founded, for I have shown in an earlier part of this thesis that the Jews remained loyal to the House of Orange from the day they entered Holland until the French conquered the country. Nassy however, explains that the latter incident is too recent to bear impartial discussion. However, he makes this statement: "both Christians and Jews were to be found among the followers of the two parties."

4. The Jewish Messiah.

"The Jewish expectation of the Messiah is incongruous with Republican principles."

Nassy says, that if God wishes He will send the Messiah whether or not the Jews attain full citizenship rights. Since the Dordrecht Club is convinced that the Messiah has already come, why should they then fear the king of a lowly people?

5. Fear deluge of Jewish immigration after enfranchisement of the Jew.

"The pamphleteer fears that in the event Jewish emancipation is achieved in Holland there is a danger

of an invasion of German Jews.

Nassy contends that the situation of the Jews in Germany is not as repressed as it has been pictured, and that there would not be a great influx of Jews. Furthermore, Nassy concludes, that the Jews have shown their patriotism by serving in the navy of the Dutch and also during the American war, in which they received the "blessing of the rabbis of Amsterdam."

In the appendix Nassy summarizes the question of Jewish nationality. By substituting Dutchman and Jews for Frenchmen and Protestants, he declared the rule of conduct to be equality for all men, quite apart from the countries they inhabit and the religions they profess.

In the preface of this letter Nassy defines liberty in a political sense. He states, "all men must have equal rights, and equal privileges. Birth, religion, wealth and rank do not create inequality. Only virtue, talents, character, vices, and inabilities must form the basis of inequality among individual members of
(66)
a state."

e. Precedent for Jewish Emancipation;

Still another factor favoring Jewish emancipation was that a precedent for this had already been established. First, the Jews were given their rights in America in 1789, and then in France in 1791. The fact that Jewish emancipation was achieved in these two countries helped

the Jews in Holland. For instance, one of the arguments presented by Hahn and others in the National Assembly, was that the Jews were given their rights in these two countries and that these countries were benefited thereby. However, we find that some representatives stated the opposite view. One representative said, "that present conditions made it impossible to make a thorough investigation of this point because we have no definite authentic information concerning the Jews in these countries."⁽⁶⁷⁾

2. Factors retarding Jewish Emancipation.

a. Conservatism of the Dutch.

To be sure there was strong opposition to Jewish emancipation. The people of Holland were still under the sway of the fundamentalism that had been nurtured for many centuries. The liberalism that did appear was limited to a small group. In fact it was a French liberalism more or less imposed upon Holland by the French Ambassador and the few liberals who guided the destiny of the New Republican government.

Although changes in the government of a country may take place suddenly, the thought of the people in that particular country remains the same for some time thereafter. So it was natural that the Jews were to encounter difficulty in gaining their rights in Holland despite the fact that the liberal motto of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, that was flaunted everywhere. Age-old prejudices that had been fostered for centuries did not disappear over night. It was to be expected that many Christians would voice their op-

protest to Jewish emancipation even after the Batavian Republic was established. As a result we find that many tracts and pamphlets were published by Christians denouncing the movement for Jewish emancipation. The general theme that ran through all these publications was that they insisted that the Jew should have no portion in the rights of citizenship because he was a stranger and was to be reckoned as such. (69)

The Jew in Holland was still considered different from his neighbor. He could never become a staunch Republican. For his eyes were always turned toward Palestine, and his heart and mind were forever to remain loyal to the land of his birth. He was bidden therefore, to wait patiently for his Redeemer, the Messiah, who would at an appointed time return him safely and triumphantly to his own land. And again, the people of Holland being Christians still maintained that the Jew was guilty of the murder of their Messiah, and in consequence was to remain an outcast, the eternal witness to this unforgiveable sin.

It is also interesting to note that the representatives whose speeches are recorded in Dibre N'gidim invariably are willing to grant the Jew the "rights of man", but somehow or other they feel that the Jew because of his religion, customs, his nature, etc, cannot become a good citizen of Batavia.

Of the many hostile writings which expressed this sentiment, the most bitter in its attack against the Jew was that of Van Sweiden entitled Advice to the Representatives of the People. In this work, Van Sweiden asserts

most emphatically that the Jew because of his character, origin, history, belief in the Messiah, has remained a stranger in the land and cannot become a full-pledged citizen of the State. (69)

b. Anti- Jewish organizations and their propaganda.

Not only did various individuals voice their protest to Jewish emancipation, but also several groups were organized for this specific purpose and disseminated their views throughout the country. Opposition to Jewish emancipation was especially strong in Amsterdam, Couda, Diel and in Dordrecht. A large number of pamphlets were written in these places disclaiming the rights of the Jews to citizenship. The work published by the Dordrecht Club, which had for its motto "For the Maintenance of Liberty and Equality", bitterly denounced the Jews and opposed their emancipation. Their objection to Jewish emancipation I have already discussed. (70)

c. Opposition of Rabbis and Parnassim.

The Jews did not only have to contend with opposing forces from without but also from within the Jewish camp itself. The Rabbis and powerful Parnassim, who held the Jews under their control, strangely enough, supported such a work as that of Van Sneider. No doubt they feared a diminution of their power in the event that the Jews were emancipated. Likewise they saw what the consequences would be. It would mean a breakdown of Jewish solidarity and of the Jewish religion. Also when the Jews were

emancipated the government could then demand military service in fulfillment of their requirements for citizenship.

In order to forestall the achievement of Jewish emancipation therefore, the Rabbis officially and publicly renounced all Jewish claims to citizenship by saying that it was contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures. This they did by issuing a circular letter in which their position in this matter was stated most emphatically. To this letter they obtained many thousands of Jewish signatures as further substantiation that their claim was justified. They even went so far as to threaten any Jew who was actively engaged in the struggle for Jewish emancipation with expulsion from the Jewish community. (71)

d. Jews not ready for emancipation.

The mass of Jewry was not ready to engage in the activities of citizenship. First of all, very few Jews knew or understood Dutch. Secondly, they had remained in the Jewish Quarter for many years and could not very well associate with the other people of the country. Most important however, is the fact that they were culturally backward, because they had been denied the opportunities of a secular education which the other members of society enjoyed. This condition of the Jews was strikingly revealed when the first elections were held in Holland. It was found that only a very few Jews participated in these elections. The causes for this deplorable showing were summarized as follows: "Some Jews didn't understand or know that they were entitled to the privilege of voting. Then

again to some of them this privilege or so-called new freedom was deemed despicable, and was to be frowned upon and hated."⁽⁷²⁾

e. There was no official constitution adopted until 1798.

This fact prevented some Jews from exercising the privileges of voting although such privileges had been granted them by the National Assembly. For on the day when Holland became the Batavian Republic, a law was passed by the National Assembly stating that in cases where the new laws do not cover all matters, the old law was to remain in effect. Thus the Assembly had no power to change many of the laws of the various sections of the country, or to compel the leaders of these districts to change them unless it was the will of the people to do so. As a result, the laws of the various provinces and cities restricting the Jews were still in effect. And in many instances these laws prohibited the Jews from voting and enjoying the privileges associated with citizenship.⁽⁷³⁾

C. Arguments concerning Jewish emancipation as reflected in Dibre N'gidim.

The major part of Dibre N'gidim deals with speeches of the various representatives in the National Assembly. Commencing on August 22, and continuing for eight full days, various members of the Assembly stated their views concerning the report of Hahn and his associates which had been presented on August 1, 1796, after investigating the petition of the Jews. Since most of the comments of these representatives are made on the basis of the Hahn report, it would therefore be advisable to first give an analysis of this report and then present the different arguments given by the representatives.

1. The "Report of Hahn and Associates" presented August 1, 1796.

Hahn begins his report by reviewing the petition of the Jews demanding all the rights of citizenship. He first states the case of the Jew. Since the Jews, he says, have already exercised the rights of citizenship in that they participated in the election of the representatives to this Assembly, they feel that the other rights that go with citizenship, which other citizens enjoy, should also be granted them.

Then Hahn continues with an emotional appeal for Jewish emancipation. "It is needless to recount all the oppressions and atrocities perpetrated upon the Jews during the past two thousand years by men like ourselves. These crimes certainly contradict the teachings of the Christian

faith, and are contrary to the principle of regarding as sacred the "natural rights of man." Surely it is impossible to reflect upon these cruelties without experiencing much pain and grief. Because the Jews have remained faithful to the Laws of Moses they have been despised and abhorred by the Christians. The Christians furthermore have increased their hatred for the Jew by continually slandering him. Is it not therefore the will of this Assembly to rectify these wrongs? Therefore, the committee appointed by you to investigate the petition of the Jews wishes to make the following report."

Hahn then proceeds to present the reason why the Jews should be emancipated. Frequently in his discourse he includes answers to the opponents of Jewish emancipation.

a. First Hahn considers why the Jews, even until this day, have remained loyal to the House of Orange whose only kindness had been shown in the fact that they distributed money to the poor and needy. This being merely the usual custom of all the rulers of Orange. (74)

Hahn answers this by saying that when the Jews came from Spain and Portugal to Holland they were wealthy and their only thought was to seek religious freedom. The Jews at that time had no desire to seek admission to the various trades or to partake of the opportunities which the other inhabitants enjoyed. Since the ruler of Holland granted the Jews religious freedom, by allowing them to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, the Jews in

recognition of this privilege became devoted followers of Orange. Therefore the Jews were ever eager to help the House of Orange whenever the occasion arose, or whenever any enemy rose up against them. In this manner the House of Orange obtained the good-will of the Jews and the Jews in return evinced a devoted loyalty to the rulers. This loyalty became an established tradition among the Jews, and was handed down from father to son both among the Ashkenazim and Sephardim. Their children were taught they they are obligated to the rulers of the country because of their goodness toward the Jews, and they (their children) were instructed to do all possible to further the cause of Orange.

"ahn by applying the past situation to the present, points out this fact. "If we now consider the Jews as brethren and citizens and deliver them from oppression, the eyes of the 50,000 Jews in the country will be opened to the blessings of freedom and the country will be benefited thereby. For among the Jews there are many of intelligence who would become good citizens, and in the end the nation will profit and be rewarded for their action in this matter." ⁽⁷⁵⁾ As further proof that this will be the result, Hahn cites the prosperity of America and France, the two countries where the Jews are ⁽⁷⁶⁾ now considered full citizens.

b. The second reason Hahn gives for Jewish emancipation is that the Jews are part of the people of Batavia, and also, that Jewish emancipation is in accord with the fundamental principles established in the country.

the Jews, he says, are an integral part of the people of Batavia and granting them full rights of citizenship is the right thing for us to do, because these rights were supposed to be extended to all the people. "Can one therefore speak of justice and yet oppose it? The fundamental thesis upon which our government is founded is granting men his natural rights and citizenship rights. For such rights are to be granted to all the people of Batavia.

Hahn asserts that the Jews are part of the "will of the people", in whose hand is supposed to rest the power of the final decision in all matters. If this is so, says Hahn, who shall deny this fact, that the Jews are included in the category of man as well as the non-Jews, and therefore form part of this will. "Has not one God created us all? He judges and forgives us all. And they (the Jews) are born, live, and die like the rest of us. Also are they not likewise included in the prayer invoked upon the people of this Assembly?"
(77)

c. As a matter of justice the Jews should be emancipated.

For the Jews like all others are obligated to help defray the expenses of running the government and help repair the damage done in the country. Therefore the Jews should be granted all the opportunities and liberties of the country without restricting or limiting them in any way.
(78)

- d. The Jews are part of the "general will." The final power of decision rests in all the people of Batavia, and thus must include the Jews.

Hahn says, "Are not the Jews a 39th part of the people? And all parts are necessary to form the whole. Therefore it is impossible to have one part lacking and still speak of the final power of decision residing in ALL the people."⁽⁷⁹⁾

- e. Jews were included in the census taken for the purpose of enumerating those eligible to vote in the first election held in Holland.

Hahn reminds the National Assembly that in order to elect this body present at the Hague, it was commanded to make a census of the people of Batavia in general. Thus the Jews must have been included in this census as were the Catholics, Lutherans, Quakers, etc.⁽⁸⁰⁾

- f. Jews have already exercised the voting privilege.

It was the will of the people to permit the Jews to vote, and in consequence they participated in the election held for selecting the representatives for the Assemblies. Also many Jews themselves were elected to these Assemblies. Likewise many representatives found in them were elected partly by the votes of the Jews. Therefore, if the Jews do not have the rights of citizenship then this Assembly has not been elected in accordance with the laws enacted by the will of the people, and in consequence this body has no legal status. If this is the case, then this Assembly is

(81)
powerless to carry on its activity.

Furthermore, Hahn insists that the Jews not only receive citizenship rights in the country at large, but also that these rights must be granted the Jews in the various provinces and cities. For if we agree that the Jews are entitled to these rights in the country in general, surely they must have the same rights in the provinces and cities, which when combined constitute the whole country. For if the Jews are denied these privileges anywhere, then we can no longer speak of the "country in general" or of "as a whole," for some part is then lacking. Therefore it follows, that the Jews must be permitted to enter the various trades and guilds and be given the opportunities granted to the people of Batavia. We must also allow the Jews to peddle in any place so that the poor among them may at least earn enough money to secure the necessities of life. (82)

Hahn then proceeds to give the reason for Jewish oppression and why the Jews have been denied the rights of citizenship. He says, for centuries libelous statements have been manufactured against the Jew. These have been disseminated through the medium of propagandistic writings of the learned of other faiths. These anti-Jewish writings as a result have affected the thinking of all Europe. Thus many intelligent men have expressed the opinion that there is no cure for the condition of the Jews because the Jews refuse to be assimilated. Numbered among the proponents of such ideas, Hahn points out, are men like Rousseau and Voltaire who have spoken in a derogatory manner concern-

ing the Jews. Even among the Jews themselves we find Moses Mendelssohn (the German Plato), and the Sephardic Jew Pinto, have blasphemed the members of their race. Such derisions and evils have for years been implanted in the hearts of men, and Jewish hatred is the natural result. (F3)

Hahn in summing up the foregoing says, "that from all we have said this truth must follow: That the Jews are human beings like ourselves, that their actions testify of their participation in the election of the representatives of this Assembly gathered here in the name of all the people; and also, that the Jews were included in the pact we made with the French Republic wherein we learn that the Jews were given the rights and opportunities which were extended to all the inhabitants of the country.

Now Hahn continues his report by stating that the Assembly will grant the full emancipation of the Jews after he makes clear that the accusations hurled against the Jews are false and have no true basis.

- a. The Jews only recognize Palestine as their country. Some have said that the Jews were driven out of Canaan and hope to return to the land of their fathers. Therefore, they are to be considered as strangers in other lands and in consequence cannot become citizens of a republic. For they are willing to wait for the coming of the Messiah, a great King, who will then lead them back to Palestine.

To this accusation Hahn replies: Why should

the children of these Jews, who are now scattered throughout all lands, suffer on this account? Have they not received upon themselves the responsibility of accepting the laws of our country? Do they not also help defray the expense incurred in the operation of the ⁽⁸⁵⁾ Government?

b. The Jews are a nation.

Hahn upon investigating this matter finds that the Jews constitute a religious society as do the Lutherans, Calvinists, etc. Furthermore, the Jews cannot be considered a nation because they have no fixed country for ⁽⁸⁶⁾ themselves.

c. The Jewish belief in the coming of the Messiah is contrary to the principles of a Republican form of government. How then is it possible for the Jews to become citizens? For a Republic is founded upon this fundamental thesis--freedom in the full exercise of the natural rights of man. But according to the Jewish faith it is obligatory for the Jew to believe in the coming of the Messiah. A Messiah that will rule as a king over them in their land. Consequently, the Jews are obligated by the word of God to despise the laws of a Republic.

Hahn in his reply to this accusation says, If the Messiah does come as predicted by the Jewish faith why should this cause us any anxiety? Would it not be clear that it is the Will of God that this should come about?

Furthermore, to say that it is the Will of God to influence the heart of the Jew in doing things contrary to the natural rights of men is mere foolishness. ⁽⁸⁷⁾

To substantiate his point of view in this matter he quotes David Friedlander's book, Messiah of the Jews which points out this fact: According to the Torah and Talmud, the Jews are forbidden to do anything to hasten the coming of the Messiah. If they act contrary to this dictum they will incur a penalty which will result in a greater delay of his coming. According to this then, says Hahn, man is powerless ⁽⁸⁸⁾ to bring about the coming of the Messiah.

- d. The Jews shun military service. It is inherent in the nature of the Jew not to join the army for war. For this is forbidden according to the tenets of their faith. How then can the Jews become citizens of a Republic? (the obvious implication being that they will refuse to defend the country.) Also because of the customs and practices of the Jew he cannot join in brotherhood with the non-Jews.

Hahn refutes the above argument by first stating that this is not so. There is nothing, he says, in the Jewish faith that would prohibit the above mentioned things. To prove his point he reviews Jewish history and shows that in many instances the Jews served as men of war. First, under Moses they served as men of war. Also under Alexander, of Egypt, and in other countries. Furthermore, Roman history

testifies to the deeds of the Jews who were skilled in warfare. They "were men of valor and fought with all their hearts and strength." The Jews continued to serve as men of war for 400 continuous years, until the time of King Honorius, who then commanded that the Jews should no longer serve in the army. Moreover, when Rome conquered Israel, they allowed the Jews freedom in their own country and even appointed many Jews as officers.⁽⁸⁹⁾

- e. The Jews refuse to fight on Sabbath. It has been said that the Rabbis have declared that Jewish law forbids them to fight on Sabbath and Holy days.

Hahn in response to this says, "that anyone who understand Jewish law knows this to be false. There are many proofs in the Talmud to refute this statement. Also the facts concerning the many Jews who served in the Austrian army contradicts the above statement. We find that under Joseph II (1780-90) of Austria, there were many Jews enrolled in his army during the war with the Turks. Even in our own country there were Jews in various place of the country fighting along side of other inhabitants. Besides this, there were many Jews in the French army."⁽⁹⁰⁾

- f. The nature of the Jew, his language, customs, etc, prevent him from fraternizing with others. It is therefore impossible to have the Jews fraternize with other people because of his present condition, nature, language, uncleanliness, and other negative qualities that are

found among the Jews.

Hahn points out that many of these things are merely accidental and can be alleviated. He insists that they are not part of the nature of the Jew or of his faith. All these accusations, he claims, are the inventions of Christians who oppose the Jews and hate them, although such hatred is contrary to the principles of the Christian religion. Evils such as forcing the Jews into ghettos, and into certain quarters are still practices today. As a result the Jews have developed these so-called negative characteristics because they have been denied the opportunities of studies which are beneficial to mankind. The arts, sciences, etc are closed to the Jews; and their children have not had the same opportunities that were granted to the children of other religions. Is it not natural therefore that there should be differences in these respects between the Jew and non-Jew? Therefore, Hahn says that the Christians are obligated to draw the Jew closer to them; and by fraternizing with them in every possible way many of these negative qualities which the Jews possess will soon disappear. ⁽⁹¹⁾

- g. The dietary laws of the Jew hinder his association with non-Jews, for the Jew refuses to dine and drink with Christians.

Hahn comments upon this by saying that he doesn't see how this prevents the Jew from becoming a good citizen in a free society. This refusal on the part of the Jew is due to one of the tenets of his religious faith. Namely,

the Jew doesn't know whether or not the food and drink offered to him would be kosher. "Surely one would not say that the Catholics are detrimental to society because they refuse to eat meat on their fast days? So ^{why} should we say the same thing about the Jews who do not wish to eat at non-Jewish tables?" (92)

h. The Jews refuse to intermarry with the Christains.

Hahn asks, What crime is this? The Jews are merely fulfilling a law of their Torah. Also this fact in no way would prevent the Jew from becoming a good member of the community. Do not the Quakers also refuse to intermarry with other faiths? Moreover, this law "do not intermarry with them", cannot refer to the Christains. For the Christains were not yet in existence at the time when this law was made. It refers to the Canaanites whom the Jews hated. (93)

1. In the event that the full rights of citizenship are granted the Jews they will flock to Batavia in large numbers, especially from Poland and Germany. This would be detrimental to the well-being of the country.

Hahn emphasizes that this would not be the result. He points to the prosperity which America and France are now enjoying, and states that in these two countries where the Jews have been granted their rights, they have not flocked there in large numbers. Also a review of Jewish history will prove the above statement or accusation

false. Hahn cites the time of Cyrus, when the king gave the the Jews permission to return to Palestine in order to rebuild the Temple. Yet many thousands of Jews remained in the country where they were dwelling at the time. Hahn concludes his refutation of this point with this statement; "In truth it is not in the nature of man to hastily uproot himself from his dwelling place and start out on a new adventure, especially from a place in which he has been living for some time."⁽⁹⁴⁾

Hahn at the conclusion of his report sums up his arguments by saying, that after investigating the foregoing questions he finds there is nothing that would prevent the Jew from becoming a full-pledged citizen. He appeals to the Assembly that it should render a judgment in this matter that will be in accordance with the fundamental principles upon which the Republic is founded. He concludes: "There is nothing whatsoever, from the point of view of the Jewish faith that would prevent the Jew from becoming a good citizen. The Jew should not only be included in the category of citizens of Batavia, but also should be granted equality in all matters pertaining to the opportunities and obligations of the community."⁽⁹⁵⁾

2. Arguments of Representatives of National Assembly.

After studying the report of Hahn for three weeks the various representatives of the Assembly commenced giving their opinions on this report, and also expressing themselves on the question of Jewish emancipation. These discussions, as I have already explained began on August 22, 1796 and con-

tinued for eight days. The question of Jewish emancipation was discussed from every conceivable angle. The representatives discussed the Jew as a human being, and as a nation. They investigated his customs and laws. They argued on the legality of recognizing the Jews as a group. They pointed out the distinction ^{between} ~~of~~ natural rights and citizenship rights. They questioned the fact that emancipation was earnestly requested by the majority of the Jews. They discussed also, the loyalty of the Jew to the House of Orange, to his country, to the laws of the Republic; and the impending dangers to the country in emancipating such a large body at one time. These topics and many more were discussed a number of times, with constant repetition of arguments purporting to the same question. For this reason I have selected only a few of the outstanding questions which I believe will help the reader understand the struggle that took place for Jewish emancipation. It would also be impossible in a work of this kind to go into details. Therefore I will list a number of subjects and give a brief summary of each.

a. Humanitarian.

The Jews are men like ourselves. It is time that we should protect the Jews from all evils and oppressions that have been placed upon them by men like ourselves. It is our duty to rectify these wrongs and despicable deeds. Many there are, who have called the Jews crafty, cheats, robbers, etc., and in this manner have attributed the characteristics of a few to the general mass of Jewry. Such statements and accusations are false and are indeed contrary

(96)

to the teachings of the Christian faith.

b. Laws and customs of Jews.

1- The laws and customs of the Jews are contrary to those of the country. An example-- the law of the country forbids "marrying of brother's widow whether children were born or not," and the Jewish law commands the opposite. Thus they have the commandment: *וְיָשָׁבְתָה אִתּוֹ אִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְאֶחָד*
This is sufficient proof that the Jews have other laws that
(97)
are contrary to the laws of the country.

2- Every faith is entitled to have its own customs and practices, but those of the Jews are of such nature that it is impossible to change them in order to have
(98)
the Jews become part of Batavian society.

3. Jews should be granted emancipation, that is, those who wish it, on condition that they depart from any of their laws which would prevent them from becoming part of
(99)
Batavian society.

4. The Jews remain loyal to the Torah of Moses and therefore it is impossible for them to become citizens. For the laws of their faith are bound up with the laws of a people, and the Jews form the people called Israel. In this way their laws are to be considered as contrary to
(100)
those of the country. (for refutation cf. p.50(b) of thesis)

5. Every individual should receive the rights of citizenship who accepts the laws of the country and contributes toward the support of the government. However, this cannot be applied to the Jew. Although he helps defray the expenses of the government, he has not accepted the

customs and practices of the country in good faith. But on the contrary he still clings tenaciously to the customs and practices of his fathers, and therefore dwells in our midst as a stranger. ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ (Refutation, cf. report of Hahn, p. 55)

6. Some have asserted that since the Jews refuse to fight on Sabbath, they would not be able to defend the country in time of need. However, we find that the Jews did fight on Sabbath in the Army of France, and fought valiantly. ⁽¹⁰²⁾

c. Jews are strangers.

1. The accusation has been made that the Jews are strangers in the country. To this Vonck replies: "When I hear such words, I cry out, O God, is it right that a great people like the Jews who have lived in our midst for two hundred years, who have brought to our country much commerce and trade, the greatest prosperity we have ever experienced, who paid their share of the expenses of the government, and for the gain of freedom; that even after the Jews did all this are they to be reckoned as strangers in the land?" ⁽¹⁰³⁾

d. Legality of Jewish emancipation.

1. This Assembly has only the power to deal with the fixed laws which it has created. It has no right to interfere with the laws in force in the various provinces and cities. Legislation concerning religious bodies and trades is fixed by the latter and not by the National Assembly. Therefore at this time we have no right to demand a change in these laws, but must wait until a

a constitution has been adopted which will give the National Assembly jurisdiction over such matters. Therefore, it follows that at present, the granting of Jewish emancipation is not within the power of this body. (104)

2. This Assembly has established a law whereby a request for citizenship can come only from an individual and not from a group, (petition of Jews presented in the name of Jews) and only on condition that the individual is willing to accept the responsibility of carrying out the obligations of citizenship. Anyone seeking such rights must also understand this fact, no matter to which religious faith he belongs: That he shall have no portion, or is to be bound to any people except to Batavia. (105)

3. Jewish emancipation has already been established. This Assembly has no right to discuss whether the Jews should be given their rights, because we have already agreed to extend such rights of citizenship to every inhabitant, whether he be Jew, Gentile, Ishmaelite, or Idolater. In view of this fact we find that the Jews have already exercised the privilege of voting. If there is any reason why this privilege should be denied the Jews, then this fact must be established by the National Assembly. (106)

4. It is true that the Jews cannot seek emancipation as a religious body, this being contrary to the law of the country. However, there are some Jews who seek this privilege not as a member of a religious faith, but as a individual member of Batavian society. Such individuals should not be denied these rights. (107)

e. True Jews do not seek emancipation.

1. Those who oppose emancipation have said that the true Jew cannot seek emancipation because it is contrary to his faith. The Jew is obligated to wait for the coming of the Messiah, who will bring redemption. Those Jews who do seek emancipation are not true Jews, but only Jewish philosophers. (108)

2. In answer to the above accusation Vonck replies; "Such talk is mere foolishness, the true Jews does desire emancipation." (109)

3. Is it possible for the Jew to remain a loyal member of his faith when he is raised to the status of a citizen. Flch contends, that if Hahn's assertion is correct, namely, that the Jews who live in Batavia are part of the people, then this question has no place here. However, Flch insists that the matter is not so. He continues, "For many years the Jews have come to our country. They built synagogues, paid their share of taxes, etc. In return for this they recieved protection, and were allowed to dwell here unmolested. But this fact doesn't necessarily mean that the Jews are part of Batavia. For when the question is put directly to the Jew, asking him if he considers himself part of Batavia, the true Jew will say, " I am not included in the category of the "people of Batavaia." I only dwell in your midst as long as it is the will of God to keep the Jew in exile. I consider it an honor to belong to the people of Israel, chosen of God. Even though I do not dwell in my own land at present, I do not recognize any other country,

or sovereign, but only wait to have my heart's desire fulfilled. For the time when our exiles shall be gathered together as an honored people under the king our Messiah, who shall then raise our horn above all peoples." If this matter is so, and to me it is, then the Jews who dwell in our country are not part of Batavia. They are only part of a scattered people, who came to our country to sojourn for awhile, and who look forward to the time when they ^{will} again be gathered as a people. They are not part of Batavia, since they do not wish to be (110) considered as such.

f. Jews are part of Batavia and should be granted emancipation.

1. The Jews paid part of the 100,000 florins that were given to France as part of the indemnity. They were also included in the pact made with France whereby independence was granted to Holland and liberties given to (111) the inhabitants.

2. Why should the Jews be denied the rights of citizenship. Were they not made free with us and did they not help pay the necessary expenses of the country? (112)

3. Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood were proclaimed for all people, and shall the Jews still be kept in servitude? Indeed we are obligated to carry out the responsibilities placed upon us. We must not rob one portion of the people of the "good" and distribute it among the other thirty-eight parts. (the Jews constituting one-thirty-ninth part of the total population of the country.) (113)

4. Argument presented in Words of Debate

which the Jews sent to the Assembly stated, "Since this Assembly was invested with the right to make the laws of the country by the will of ALL the people in gneral, it therefore cannot veto the emancipation of the Jews. (The implication being that the Jews are included in this "will". Lublink de Jong replies to the above by saying , that the Jews would have presented a stronger argument had they said, that it was within the power of the various provinces and cities to withhold the emanicipation of the Jews which was supposed to have been granted by this "will". (114)

f. We have been sent to the Assembly as representatives of both Christains and Jews and therefore are obligated to see that justice is done to both groups. The day when we grant the Jews their citizenship rights will be a "wonderful day", a day upon which we shall have acted in accordance with justice and truth. (115)

g. Good will be repaid in kind.

1. We are obligated as Christains to do good to all. I am sure that the Jews will receive our goodness with a willing heart. The past has shown that the Jews respond to goodness in a favorable way. We must therefore, deal graciously with them, for they too are human beings like ourselves. The Jews in return for our goodness will further the prosperity and welfare of our country. (116)

2. Who wonders at the fact that the Jews recognized goodness immediately? It has been correctly stated that many of them have remained loyal to the House of Orange. For these leaders were good to the Jews. The good-

ness of these rulers is only a small fraction of what the Jews really deserve. In our time we have associated all sorts of evils with the Jew, and in consequence, the goodness of the House of Orange is still remembered by them. (117)

h. Nature of the Jew.

1. But as far as allowing the Jews the privileges of citizenship that is a different matter. For the Jews have certain negative qualities which are characteristic of oriental peoples. (118)

i. Emancipation, not will of the Jews.

1. Jews should not be granted rights of citizenship because we have no assurance that it is the will of the Jews in general to seek it, and if they know how to regard the use thereof. (119)

2. Jews as a solid group do not wish to become citizens of Batavia. Only a few of them seek this right. (120)

3. I am sure that the majority of the Jews do not seek the rights of citizenship. (121)

j. Jews a nation.

1. The Jews constitute a separate people. We cannot call the Jews Batavians, as we speak of the Catholic and Reformers of Batavia. This is not the case in reference to the Jews. For they are spoken of as a nation. Likewise, the Jews themselves use this term in speaking of Israel. This shows they are a distinct people and not in-

cluded in the category of the "nation of Batavia."^{64.}
(122)

2. The Jews form a separate people because of their belief in the Messiah. Although the Jews have no fixed land of their own, having been driven out of Palestine and scattered among the nations, yet they remain a nation and a separate people. For they continually long and hope to return to their own country, the land of Canaan.⁽¹²³⁾

3. In reference to the Jewish faith we find that their laws of worship are bound up with the customs of their country (Palestine). The Jews therefore should be called a distinct nation (people). They are not on the same footing as the other faiths, the Lutherans, Calvinists, etc. The latter have no customs connected with a distinct country.

4. Precedent cited that Jews are a nation. When Jacob and his family came to Egypt they sojourned there as a separate people, and were considered as such by the Egyptians. This was at a time when the Jews did not as yet have a land of their own. Even while here they looked forward to acquiring Palestine as their own land.

5. There is divided opinion on the question: Do Jews constitute a nation? Some speakers have said that the Jews are a nation while others have denied this fact. It is really not within our power to settle this issue. In order to obviate this situation, it would be advisable to consult the Jews and have them give us a definite answer. However, there is another solution to this problem.

Let us declare that any individual who wishes to become part of the citizenry of the country must acknowledge this fact: That he is not to be bound to any nation except that
(125)
of Batavia.

6. The accusation has been made that because the majority of the Jews believe in the Messiah, that this makes them a separate nation. Since this belief obligates the Jew to remain a separate people; and the coming of the Messiah will mean that the Jew will have dominion over all peoples. Despite all this, says Lockhorst, we know that there is divided opinion on this point even among the Jews, as the works of Words of Debate and the Messiah of the Jews
(126)
which we representatives received testify.

j. Separatism of Jew.

1. It is impossible for the Jew to seek the rights of citizenship because the substance of the Jewish faith makes it imperative that the Jew ally himself exclusively with the Jewish people, and that his people remain apart from all other peoples. Thus it is impossible for the Jew to join us as "one people".(127)

2. Even before the Jews came to Egypt they were a separate nation. Also while in Canaan they maintained their separate identity. Today, although scattered all over the world, they still persist in their
(128)
separatism.

3. The Jews cannot participate whole-heartedly in the matters of citizenship because they cannot become "one with us" on account of their qualities, customs, laws, etc., which are different from all other peoples. (129)

4. There is separatism even in Jewry. Even though the Jews form a separate nation, they themselves are divided into separate groups, each with a different nature. Thus Pinto, the Sephardic Jew, has pointed out that the Jews who live in London are not like the Jews who live in Constantinople. The Sephardic Jews of Bordeaux are not like the Ashkenazic Jews of Metz. (130)

5. Voltaire on separatism within Jewry. The Sephardic Jews will not mix with the Ashkenazic Jews. They will not even intermarry with them. The Sephardic Jew of Holland and England who intermarries with the Ashkenazic Jew shall be excommunicated from the Sephardic congregation. He will have no portion or inheritance in the Sephardic congregation, and will not be buried with them when he dies. (131)

k. Natural rights of man not denied the Jews. The representatives without exception have expressed themselves as favoring the extension of natural rights of man to the Jew.

1. All natural rights of man should be granted the Jews, and the National Assembly should do all in its power to see that these rights are established for the Jew. (132)

2. Jews are men and our brethren. The rights which are suitable for those called "men" should be granted them. The heart of the Christian should become

faint when he conjures up a picture of all the evils done to the Jews in ~~many~~ places. Evils done by Christians, who ironically enough seek the love of man and have as an ideal, the brotherhood of man. (133)

3. The Jews were given their natural rights. We must make a distinction between the rights of man and the rights and privileges that go with citizenship. The Jews when they came to Holland were not denied the natural rights but only those of citizenship. This was done because the Jews were considered as strangers and treated as such. Illustrating that the Jews were granted natural rights, the representative enumerates the privileges which the Jews enjoyed. They received protection from bodily injury, their property was safe-guarded. They were granted permission to engage in trades in order to earn a livelihood (that is those trades which were open to strangers.) They were permitted to construct houses of worship, observe the Sabbath, holy days, and other occasions without any restrictions placed upon these. In short, the Jews received every privilege that was accorded strangers. (134)

4. Religious freedom without doubt should be granted the Jews. For this is supposed to be extended to all religious groups that dwell in Batavia. In this matter they are to be considered as human beings like ourselves. (135)

1. Jews should be granted citizenship upon this oath of allegiance:

I will accept that which it is right

for citizens to accept: To recognize that the final power resides in the "will of the people", and in the power delegated to the leaders and officers of the National Assembly. And I will not recognize any other leaders, how much the more, appointed leaders or those who have inherited their positions. Nor will I help the latter through deed or by word of mouth. I will only follow in the way that is befitting a citizen of Batavia: To observe and establish in all faithfulness the laws of the country, and to be "as one" with the people. Also I will do everything in my power to cause the country to prosper. Such an oath, Quesnel thinks, the Jew will be willing to accept, and if he does, then the rights of citizenship should not be withheld from him. (136)

m. Loyalty to the House of Orange decried.

1. The loyalty which the Jews show to the House of Orange is detrimental to the welfare of the country. "For the Jews do everything possible to negate the prosperity of the country in order to strengthen the welfare of the House of Orange." (137)

n. Precedent for Jewish emancipation cited.

1. All those who have visited France will attest to this fact: That the prosperity of the country has increased since the Jews were given their rights. Especially is this true of the district of Alsace where a large number of Jews live. We also find that the Jews went to war on a Sabbath in order to fight for the country. (138)

2. The present state of affairs in France makes it impossible to give an accurate picture of

of the Jewish situation there. Still less is it possible for us to gain a knowledge of the condition of the Jews in North America in order to learn whether they have been conducting themselves properly, and if they have contributed to the prosperity of the country, and if they have taken an active part in the government. In all these matters we are not well informed. On the other hand, I should like to call to your attention an authentic document sent from the city of New York in September 1793. Herein it states that all the Jews of North America number about 500. Of these 200 reside in New York City. But there are very few who occupy any official position. In fact one Jew was chosen to fill the office of
(139)
Alderman, and he declined to serve.

D. Results of Emancipation.

On September 2, 1796 the Jews of Holland were given their full rights as citizens. Granting the Jews these rights improved the condition of the Jew culturally, politically, economically and socially. It meant the breakdown of the ghetto wall and an active Jewish participation in the life of the country.

It had been observed that the condition of the Jew improved steadily with the granting of liberties and emancipation. Meyer, a Jewish judge of Amsterdam, reported the following. "I procured a list of all the convicts here for a great number of years. Numerous as were formerly the sentences passed on convicts of the Jewish persuasion, so rare are (proportionately to the population) the Jewish convicts now-a-days, as they are in law on equal footing with all Christians."⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ The Jews after their emancipation gradually raised their cultural level "by reading good books, and showing a greater interest in learning and in science." Taste was now made available to the Jew and he took advantage of it. Also, we find the Jews on a higher social level, for the spirit at the end of the 18th century was conducive to more social intercourse between Jew and Gentile.⁽¹⁴¹⁾

Another writer tells us that "because of the enlightenment a few sensible men among the Jews in 1796 established a new congregation despite the fact that they were opposed in this venture by both Jew and Christian. Some of these men (Jews) would have been an ornament to Christianity, if fate had permitted Christian parents to have given them birth."

Some Jews were now devoted to the study of letters and attained prominence despite the disadvantages of education and social ostracism. For we find that the Jews were still barred from some organization. They were not permitted to be admitted to the "Tot nut van het algemien" (for the benefit of the community at large). Also they were barred from the Felix Meritus(happy through merit), the name of the first literary institution for the cultivation of the fine arts in Amsterdam. (142)

The Jews now began to enter into the political life of the country. After 1796, many Jews were elected to office in many sections of Batavia, and served with distinction. When the election of August 1, 1797 was completed it was found that two Jews, Hirsh Bromet and Hirsh de Lemon were elected as representatives to the National Assembly. (143) On September 1, 1797, the day set aside for this Assembly to convene at the Hague, many Jews went to the capital to witness the honor that had been bestowed upon these two Jews. These two men we are informed, distinguished themselves while in office, and commanded the respect of their fellow-representatives. They remained in office until January 12, 1798, when a new Assembly was chosen. (144) Also, on March 16, 1798, the well-known Rabbi Moses Moresco was chosen as a representative of Amsterdam. Likewise Isaac de Costa Atlas, a member of the Sephardic congregation was elected to the National Assembly. Earlier in the year he was a representative in the Assembly of Amsterdam. (145)

The Jews besides serving as representatives in the various

assemblies were appointed to positions of trust and were found now in almost every profession. Moses Ass^{er} was for many years secretary to the Minister of Justice. There were many Jewish barristers. Jews were now members of large corporations, magistrates of every rank, assistant justices and even chief justices. On numerous occasions the Jews served as soldiers in the army in proportion to their numbers; and a few attained a high rank in the military service. Also many Jews had taken an active part in the war with Belgium as members of the garrison of Antwerp. General Chasse, the commanding officer here stated, "that the Jews had shown remarkable valour, fully equal to that displayed by other portions of his troops, in the obstinate defence of that fortress against the French." (146)

Those Jews who were placed in eminent positions after 1795 "were honorable, loyal to the country, adhered to the principles of reason and carried out their oath of duty. Thus the fear that opening the door to all Jews would mean that the Jews who did not merit such positions would force themselves in-- was a ridiculous fear-- for the Jews themselves would have curbed this tendency." (147)

But there is still another important result of Jewish emancipation to be considered. The religious life of the Jews was affected. Jewish solidarity was broken. Even before emancipation was attained there had been a division of the Jewish community. I have already explained that the Rabbis and powerful Parnassim dealt severely with those Jews who participated in the struggle to secure the rights of

citizenship for the Jews. Rabbi Jacob Moses Lowenstein, chief rabbi of the Ashkenazic community, and David Acohen de Azevedo, of the Portuguese group, proposed to expel the members of the Felix Libertate from their respective communities because of their activity in the emancipation struggle. In response to this threat, the members of the Felix Libertate in 1796, voluntarily withdrew from these groups and organized their own congregation, Adath Jeshurun with Isaac Graanbaum as their rabbi. They dedicated their new house of worship on September 27, 1798. The fight however did not cease with this mere separation and formation of a new congregation. Both sides continued their fight by publishing numerous tracts in Judeo German, each attacking the methods and religious practices of the other. (148)

On March 19, 1799, the leaders of the congregation Adath Jeshurun requested the Assembly to permit the schools which they had erected to go untaxed as did those of other denominations. This petition was granted by the Assembly. (149)

This new group, Adath Jeshurun, also instituted a few reforms, all of a harmless nature. They struck out of their ritual the formula of imprecation (v' la-Malshinim), which had been directed against the apostate Jewish Christians. They abolished the practices of hastily burying the dead, and erected a new, clean communal bath--innocent reforms, which however, were regarded by the strict Orthodox group as grave offenses against Judaism. Also they succeeded in having the fanatical leaders of the German community, who

were more inconsiderate than the Portuguese in their opposition to those who had withdrawn from their midst, removed from their posts, probably through the action of the French Ambassador, Noel."

(1f0)

Notes.

1. Hirsch, Z. Dibre N'gidim, Amsterdam, 1799, cf. title page.
2. Ibid. pp. 2a-b
3. Ibid. p. 2b
4. Ibid. p. 2b
5. Ibid. p. 2b
6. Ibid. p. 2b
7. Grattan, The Netherlands, London, 1830. p. 319.
8. Cambridge Modern History, New York, 1908, Vol. 8, p. 436.
9. Grattan, p. 319; cf. Hirsch, 11b.
10. Cambridge Mod. Hist., Vol. 8, p. 727; cf. Hirsch, 11b; Blok, J. A History of the People of the Netherlands, N.Y. and London, 1912, Vol. 5, pp. 276-77.
11. Grattan, p. 320; Cambridge Mod. Hist. p. 436.
12. cf. Blok, pp. 224-225; Van Loon, H. Rise of Dutch Republic, New York, 1915, Ch. I.
13. cf. Blok, pp. 281-89; Van Loon, H. The Fall of Dutch Republic, Boston, 1924, Ch. I.
14. cf. Grattan, p. 320; Blok, p. 288.
15. Cambridge Mod. Hist.; p. 436.
16. Grattan, p. 320.
17. Blok, p. 295, 297-98.
18. Ibid. p. 187-190.
19. cf. Hirsch, p. 11b
20. cf. Grattan, Ch. 22; Blok, p. 190.
21. Graetz, H. History of Jews, Vol. IV, pp. 652-68.
22. Abbott, G. F. Israel in Europe, London, 1907, pp. 246-49.
23. Cf. Graetz, Vol. V, p. 452ff.

24. Cf. Hirsch, p.15b; Also State of Jews at Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, translated from Dutch of P. Humert, by Jackson, London, 1825, Letter I, p.19-20
25. cf. Jackson, p.20.
26. cf. Hirsch, p.12b.
27. Goldsmid, F. H. Civil Disabilities of British Jews, London, 1831, First Extract, p.32.
28. Cf. Hirsch, p.12b.
29. Ibid. p. 13b.
- 30 Ibid. p. 14b.
31. cf. Jackson, Letter I, p.21.
32. Ibid. pp.13-17.
33. Ibid. Letter II, p.25.
34. Ibid. p.26.
35. Ibid. p.28-30.
36. Ibid. p. 30-31.
37. cf. Hirsch, p.13a.
38. Ibid. p.12a
39. Ibid. p.1fa.
40. Ibid. p. 13b.
41. Ibid. p. 15aff.
42. Ibid. p.18b.
43. Ibid.p.13b.
44. Ha-Me'assef, 1794-96, Vol. 7, Part 3. Art. "Equality of Jews with other Citizens of Batavia," 1796, p. 25-28; Also Dibre N'gidim, 62a-63b.
45. cf. Graetz, Vol. V. p.452.
46. cf. Hirsch, p.12a.
47. Blok, pp.291ff.

48. Whilly, History of Philosophy, New York, 1924, pp. 382-290; cf. Blok, p. 172-177.
49. cf. Hirsch, p. 12a.
50. Simonsen, J. Festskrift, Kobenhavn, 1923, Art. "Die Juden in Holland, Eine Charakteristik", by Seeligmann, p. 257.
51. cf. Hirsch, p. 12a
52. Ibid. p. 12a.
53. Ibid. p. 12a-b
54. Ibid. p. 12b.
55. Ibid. p. 13b.
56. Jew. Ency., Vol. I, art. "Amsterdam", p. 537.
57. cf. Graetz, Vol. V, pp. 452-58; also cf. Hirsch, p. 12a-b.
58. cf. Graetz, pp. 452-458.
59. cf. Hirsch, p. 12b.
60. Ibid. p. 12b.
61. Ibid. p. 12b-13a.
62. Ibid. p. 14b-15a. It is interesting to note that Graetz, Vol. V., p. 454, states there were six signers to petition while Dibre N'gidim enumerates seven. (Joseph de Jong missing in Graetz listing.)
63. Cf. Hirsch, p. 12b.
64. cf. Graetz, Vol. V, pp. 452-58.
65. Ha-Me'assef, art. "Hisotry Notes", 1796, p. 392. (Vol. 7, part 3.)
66. American Jewish Historical Society, Baltimore, 1914, No. 22, art. "David Nassy of Surinam" by Sigmund Seeligmann, p. 29ff.
67. cf. Hirsch, speech of Hahn p. 18a, and of Jong, p. 26a.
68. Ibid. p. 12b.
69. cf. Graetz, Vol. V, 452-458.
70. Am. Jew. Hist. Soc., p. 29ff in No. 22.
71. Jew. Ency. Vol I, art. "Amsterdam", p. 537; also Graetz, Vol. V, pp. 452-458.

72. cf. Hirsch, p.13b.
73. Ibid. p.12b.
74. Ibid. p.15a-b.
75. Ibid. p.15b.
76. Ibid. p.15b; France Jews emancipated in 1791, America-1798.
77. Ibid. p.16a.
78. Ibid. p.16a.
79. Ibid. p.16a.
80. Ibid. p.16a.
81. Ibid. p.16a-b.
82. Ibid. p.16b.
83. Ibid. p.16b.
84. Ibid. p.16b.
85. Ibid. p. 17a.
86. Ibid. p. 17a.
87. Ibid. p. 17a.
88. Ibid. p. 17a.
89. Ibid. p. 17b, Honorius, Emperor Western Roman Empire, (395-423) "On April 22, 402, he decreed at Rome that no Jews and Samaritans should be admitted into the army." (Codex Theodosianus XVI,8:16) Jew. Ency. Vol. VI, p.458.
90. Ibid. p.17b.
91. Ibid. p.17b.
92. Ibid. p.18a.
93. Ibid. p.18a.
94. Ibid. p.18a-b.
95. Ibid. p.18b.
96. Ibid. Lublink de Jong, p.22b; Gulik, p.53a-b., Gervers, p.51b.

97. Ibid. Breekpot, p. 30a.
98. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p.20a.
99. Ibid. Breekpot, p.30a.
100. Ibid. Van Hameslveld, p.20a.
101. Ibid. Teding V. Bernhout, p.51a.
102. Ibid. Gervers, p.51b; Van Hamelsveld, p 20b.
103. Ibid. Vonck, p.55b.
104. Ibid. De Leew, p.55a; Stoffenberg, p. 54a.
105. Ibid. De Vos Steenwyk, p. 59a; de Mist, p.52b.
106. Ibid. Kantelaar, p. 34a.
107. ^{Ibid.} Schimmelpenninck, p.42b.
108. Ibid. Schonegevel, p. 54b.
109. Ibid. Vonck, p. 56a.
110. Ibid. Floh, p. 57b.
111. Ibid. Vonck, p. 56a.
112. Ibid. Gulik, p. 53b.
113. Ibid. Vonck, p.57a.
114. Ibid. Lublink de Jong, p.23a
115. Ibid. Zubli, p.29b.
116. Ibid. Zubli, p.29b.
117. Ibid. Floh, p. 26b.
118. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p.20a.
119. Ibid. Breekpot, p.30a.
120. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p.20a.
121. Ibid. de Mist, 52b.
122. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p.19b-20a.
123. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p.20a.
124. Ibid. Lublink de Jong, p.23a.

125. Ibid. de Vos Steenwyk, p. f8b.
126. *Ibid. Lockhorst, p. 33a-b.
127. Ibid. Breekpot, p. 30a.
128. Ibid. Stoffenberg, p. 54a.
129. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p. 19a.
130. Ibid. Lublink de Jong, p. 23b.
131. Ibid. Lublink de Jong, p. 23b.
132. Ibid. Breekpot, p. 29b.
133. Ibid. Floh, p. 26b.
134. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p. 18b; Cohlmschate, p. 30b.
135. Ibid. Van Hamelsveld, p. 19a.
136. Ibid. Quesnel, p. 53a.
137. Ibid. Cohlmschate, p. 30b.
138. Ibid. Venck, p. 57a; Gulik, f3a.
139. Lublink de Jong, p. 26a.
140. Goldsmid, F.H. Civil Disabilities of British Jews, London, 1831, p. 32. (Second Extract)
141. Jackson, State of Jews, etc., Letter II, p. 23-24.
142. Ibid. p. 32-40.
143. Hirsch, p. 13b.
144. Ibid. p. 14a
145. Ibid. p. 14a.
146. Goldsmid, F.H. Disabilities of Jews, London, 1831. --- p. 33-35.
147. Jackson, State of Jews, etc., Letter II, p. 40.
148. Jew. Ency., Vol. I, art. "Amsterdam" p. 537.
149. cf. Hirsch, p. 14b.
150. cf. Graetz, Vol. V. p. 457.

Bibliography.

- Abbott, G.F. Israel in Europe, London, 1907.
- Amelander, M. Shearith Yisrael, Zhitomir, 1873, Ch.29.
- American Jewish Historical Society, Baltimore, 1914, No.22.
- Blok, Johannes, P. History of the People of the Netherlands, Part V, London, 1912.
- Cambridge Modern History, Vol.8, New York, 1908.
- Goldsmid, F.H. Disabilities of British Jews, London, 1831.
- Goldsmid, F. H. Civil Disabilities of the Jew, London, 1831.
- Graetz, H. History of Jews, Philadelphia, 1894, Vol.IV,V.
- Ma-Me'assef, Vol.7, Part 3, Breslau and Berlin, 1796.
- Hirsch, Zevi, Dibre M'gidim, Amsterdam, 1799.
- Grattan, The Netherlands, London, 1830.
- Jackson, State of Jews at Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, translated from Dutch of F. Humert, London, 1828.
- Jew. Ency. Vol. I, art. "Amsterdam"; Vol.VI, art."Konigius".
- Van Loon, H. Rise of Dutch Republic, New York, 1915.
- Van Loon, H. Fall of Dutch Republic, Boston, 1924.
- Simonsen, J. Festskrift, Kobenhavn, 1923, Art."Die Juden in Holland. Eine Charakteristik," by S. Seeligmann.
- Thilly.F.History of Philosophy, New York, 1914.