

AUTHOR Harry Leonard Rosenfeld

TITLE "A Comparative Study: the Image of American Jewry as Reflected
in the Periodicals The London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and
Ha-Zefirah"

Master's [] Prize Essay []

- Note:** The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes no

Date 3/5/81

Mary L Rose self
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed _____
Date _____

Signature of Library Staff Member

A COMPARATIVE STUDY:
THE IMAGE OF AMERICAN JEWRY
AS REFLECTED IN THE PERIODICALS
THE LONDON JEWISH CHRONICLE,
HA-MELIZ, AND HA-ZEFIRAH

BY
HARRY LEONARD ROSENFELD

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ORDINATION

Hebrew Union College--
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
1981

Referee:
Prof. Jacob R. Marcus

DIGEST

This thesis attempts to determine what the European Jew thought about the American Jew, as reflected in the European Jewish press. Each of the papers studied--the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah--had its own subjective image of the American Jew and each paper reported the American Jewish experience based upon its own biases.

The Chronicle looked at American Jewry from its vantage point as one of the newspapers of the most influential Jewish community of its time. England was an expansionist nation with interests in every part of the world. The British Jewish community followed this global interest as reflected in governmental outlook, and served as the central organizing group for helping Jews in other parts of the world.

Ha-Meliz tended to avoid issues which would offend the Russian government's censors. It carried few reports about American Jewry, and the articles that were printed, did not emphasize the freedom of religion that the American Jewish community possessed.

Ha-Zefirah tried to be the scientific Hebrew journal of Eastern Europe. The information about American

Jewry found in its pages was generally presented without editorial comment. There were times, however, when an individual writer would criticize some aspect of American Jewry, saying that it was not Jewish enough.

The overall picture of American Jewry presented by these three journals is a positive one. They saw America as the hope of survival for Eastern European Jewry and perhaps even for the Jews of the world.

This thesis is dedicated to

הורי ומורי ציפרה בת משה ואיידה, ונחום בן צבי אריה הכהן ואנה ז"ל

Francis and Nathan Rosenfeld ז"ל

and their dreams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following without whom this thesis would not exist:

Dr. Jacob R. Marcus who helped me expand my appreciation and love of history. Of him it can truly be said: He is a scholar, a gentleman, and a Jew of the highest order;

Rabbi Philip Horowitz whose interest and care about me led me to the rabbinate;

Judith Miller who was always there to help me keep things in perspective;

George for his help in general;

My friends here and elsewhere whose patience, listening ears, and encouragement brought me to this day;

and אחריהן אחרון חביב, Lori Feldman for her editing, understanding, pushing, and most of all, for her friendship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter:

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	POPULATION	6
III	OCCUPATIONS	13
IV	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JEWS AND NON-JEWS	22
V	FREEDOM OF RELIGION.	33
VI	PHILANTHROPY	43
VII	IMMIGRATION	60
VIII	EDUCATION	68
IX	LEISURE	76
X	RELIGION: REFORM VERSES ORTHODOX	82
XI	RELIGION: ORGANIZATION	102
XII	CONCLUSION	112
	ENDNOTES	117
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

INTRODUCTION

In 1971 I took a trip to Israel. Upon my arrival, it quickly became evident to me that as an American, I faced certain problems. The average Israeli treated me differently when it became known that I was American. Suddenly, they became more distant. Once I realised this, I stopped telling people that I was an American. When asked, I would say that I was a Canadian.

While investigating possible thesis topics, the opportunity arose to research how people in other countries regarded American Jewry. Reflecting back upon my experience in Israel, the topic seemed very attractive.

The 19th Century was an important century in American Jewish History. During that century, the American Jewish community began to organize itself for religious, philanthropic, and defense reasons. The mass immigrations from Eastern Europe changed the character of the American Jewish population. These two phenomena helped shape the American Jewish community as we know it today.

It seemed a reasonable proposal to combine a look at American Jewry through foreign eyes and a study of American Jewry in the 19th Century. The problem was then to pick the means by which to make this study. When it was

suggested to me to use the periodicals, the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah¹ to determine the image of American Jewry in the eyes of European Jewry, I was intrigued. They seemed to be logical choices.

If one were to choose the country that reigned supreme in the 19th Century it was England. This was the age of Queen Victoria. It could truly be said: "The sun never sets on the British Empire."² This was also a good time for the Jews of England. In 1859, the Board of Jewish Guardians was formed.³ In 1866, it became legal for Jews to enter either House of Parliament.⁴ The Anglo-Jewish Association was founded in 1870,⁵ Sir Moses Montefiore was alive and active,⁶ and Lord Rothschild became the first Jewish peer of England.⁷

The London Jewish Chronicle was one of the voices of the British Jewish community. Founded in 1841, it is the "oldest Jewish periodical in existence,"⁸ a position it has maintained for about ninety years.⁹ Even though it was 1938 before the Chronicle sent a full-time correspondent to the United States (Louis Rittenberg),¹⁰ it carried news items that it gleaned from the American Jewish press. The papers they quoted included; The Jewish Messenger,¹¹ The Occident,¹² and the American Israelite.¹³ Many of the articles that the Chronicle carried about American Jewry came from a correspondent, who wrote a column called the "New York Letter" or "Our New York Letter".¹⁴ Often times

the reports concerning American Jewry have no citation. These were usually carried along with news of other countries or in topical articles. This diversity of sources and reporting styles I hoped would give me a good overall picture of the English view of American Jewry.

Above, I stated that the massive immigrations from Eastern Europe shaped the character of the American Jewish population. Even though there were East European Jews here before these immigrations (which started in the 1880's), these Jews were in the minority. Thousands fled to America and they soon outnumbered the German and Sephardic Jewish population that was already established here. The question in my mind was, what did these people know about the United States and its Jewish population that made them decide to make it their new home? To find this out, I decided to look at some of their periodical literature. Knowing no Russian or Yiddish, I found I had to accomplish my goal by using the Eastern European Hebrew press.

The first paper I studied was Ha-Meliz. The paper was founded in the city of Odessa in the year 1860 as a weekly journal. Later the paper became a semi-weekly and ended up as a daily paper. The paper moved its offices to the city of St. Petersburg in 1871. The paper was known as being pro-Russian and pro-Haskalah.¹⁵ There was not much material in Ha-Meliz concerning America during years

I cover in this thesis. It began carrying news about American Jewry in the 1870's in its columns on international Jewry. During this whole period, the paper was under the editorship of its founder, Alexander Zederbaum.¹⁶

I also used the weekly Hebrew periodical, Ha-Zefirah. Ha-Zefirah began publication in Warsaw in 1862 and was mainly devoted to science. It carried little news or feature articles until Nahum Sokolow became the editor of the paper replacing the founder of the paper, Hayyim Selig Slonimski, in the late 1870's.¹⁷ As opposed to the London Jewish Chronicle and Ha-Meliz, Ha-Zefirah carried some articles that were signed by their authors. One such author was Ezekiel Rosenberg.¹⁸

The original scope of this thesis was to cover the years 1860-1905. This is the time frame during which all three of the periodicals discussed were in print. Because of the amount of time required to work with the Hebrew material, I was only able to read the years 1860-1889 in the journals. In Ha-Meliz and Ha-Zefirah I covered all of the years available in newsprint form for the 1860's available in the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. In the papers from the 1870's and 1880's I picked two or three years of each journal trying to get a representative picture of the Eastern European view of American Jewry as presented in these periodicals.

I covered most of the London Jewish Chronicle available in newsprint in the library cited above, for the years 1860-1889.

Because of the nature of this thesis, most of the notes and citations are from the three above-mentioned periodicals. In order to make these notes as simple as possible, the following method has been used to note these three works. All material from the London Jewish Chronicle will be noted by the letters LJC, and the date of the issue. This will be followed by the page number the article may be found on.

Material cited from Ha-Meliz or Ha-Zefirah will be noted by the name of the periodical, followed by the issue number and date, and then the page number of the article cited. All other notes will follow the style recommended in A Manual of Style, published by the University of Chicago Press, 1969.

POPULATION

In order to truly understand the image of American Jewry that the European Jewish community had, one has to know who comprised American Jewry and how large the community was. Population figures are scarce in these journals during the 1860's. Early in the decade, the Chronicle reported that "there are at this moment 19 congregations at New York, each having its own synagogue. These places of worship are supported by about 2,500 members who are heads of families. We infer from this that there are at New York as many co-religionists as there are in the whole of the United Kingdom."¹ There was no commentary with this article. I assume though, that there being more Jews in the United States than in England, had little effect on their overall image of American Jewry. One may assume that the British knew there were more Jews in other places, such as Eastern Europe, which is why I conclude this.

The other references to population in the London Jewish Chronicle concern population movement. In New York City, Congregation Shearith Israel closed its building on Crosby Street because "it was no longer a central and convenient meeting place for the congregation who live for

the most part two or three miles above this locality."² Another reference to population movement in the Chronicle relates to the city of Newport. The paper reported that Newport once had a thriving Jewish Community, but now it has no Jews living in it. They report further that the synagogue and the cemetery still existed. The Chronicle, in commenting on this situation, says "the villagers are most friendly to the Jews, and would welcome them back with great pleasure."³ This would seem to indicate that the British Jews thought American Jews did not move from one place to another simply because of religious persecution.

The Chronicle at this time also expressed amazement at the speed with which a new Jewish community could grow. They report that Dr. E. Cohn was elected as the Rabbi of the Reform congregation in the city of San Francisco. They comment that this meant that "there are no less than three Jewish ministers in a community which, ten years ago numbered little more than a minyan!"⁴

In the 1870's, the London Jewish Chronicle paid more attention to population statistics. In 1875 the Chronicle reported that there were 200,000 Jews in the United States.⁵ They report that "The Jewish Messenger computes that there are at least 80,000 Jews in New York. During the recent holydays there were thirty synagogues crowded to excess, and there were at least twenty temporary

synagogues opened, all full to repletion."⁶ They often used this method of synagogue attendance or group membership to determine the overall population. The Rev. J. Wechsler pleaded in 1873 that there was a need for traveling Jewish preachers to go to the American countryside. He said: "All the larger cities of the United States have numerous Jewish congregations. In the rural parts, however, they are but very small in number. In 1870 Philadelphia had seven synagogues, 11 lodges of the 'Bené Berith'; with 1,195 members; 7 lodges of the 'Free Sons of Israel' with 600 members and 3 schools."⁷ Later in the same article it is reported that: "It is calculated that there are in America from 300 to 400 synagogues, and a Jewish population of five to six hundred thousand souls."⁸ This method of reporting population indicates that they assumed that nearly all Jews in America belonged to a synagogue or Jewish organization.

At this time there were attempts to report on the population of certain nationality groups among American Jewry. For example, the Chronicle reported on an attempt to send Jews coming from Roumania to Nebraska, where land had been acquired for them to establish farm colonies. There were estimates made, that up to 50,000 Roumanian Jews could be settled on this land. If this had been accomplished, the result would have been to "add nearly one-half to the population of that State, which the last

census reported at 122,000."⁹

This classification by nationality continued into the 1880's, facilitated by the immigration from Eastern Europe. Most of the immigrants were poor. Societies formed to help the new immigrants. These societies kept track of how many new immigrants came into the United States. The Chronicle reports that "Some idea of the enormous increase in the emigration of this class may be gathered from the fact that in 1872, 2,641 Russian Poles landed here, (in New York) in 1882, 20,993. Our Italian Emigration shows the same growth: in 1872, 4,144, in 1882, 32,077."¹⁰ The Chronicle also continued to report the number of Jews in the United States based on religious affiliation. An 1880 editorial reports that there were 80,000 Jews in New York and that at least one-half of them were Orthodox.¹¹

In 1878, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the American Board of Delegates conducted a census of the Jewish population of the United States. The London Jewish Chronicle reported many of the statistics of that survey. They reported that in 1878, there were 278 congregations in the United States with a membership of 12,546 people and 13,000 children in Religious school. There were 13 free schools for Hebrew and religious instruction, 5 Jewish Hospitals, 11 orphanages and homes for the elderly. The total amount of property owned by the Jewish

community was \$1,695,000 and synagogues owned property worth \$6,138,730. The survey also took into account the non-synagogue organizations. The Bnai Brith was the largest fraternal organization at the time having seven grand lodges, 302 lodges, and 23,000 members. The Keshet Shel Barzel had 5 grand lodges, 170 lodges and 10,000 members. The Independent Free Sons of Israel had 170 lodges and 8,604 members, and a split off group from the Independent Free Sons, The Improved Order of the Free Sons of Israel had one grand lodge, 44 lodges, and 2,849 members.¹²

The Hebrew, East European press had fewer references to the Jewish population of the United States. Ha-Meliz reported in 1861 a census of the Jews in New York City. The census revealed that there were 35,000 Jews living there. The survey also found that there were fifteen synagogues or congregations that had a combined membership of 2165 family units.¹³ I found no references in Ha-Meliz during the 1870's that discussed the American Jewish population but, in 1881, the paper did report that there were 500,000 Jews in America.¹⁴ The paper also reported the results of the 1878 Union of American Hebrew Congregation American Board of Delegates survey. The most interesting aspect of this report is that it lists the population of Jews in the United States as being only 250,000 people.¹⁵ This contrasts with the report above,

that appears three years before, that there were 500,000 Jews in America.¹⁶ This would seem to indicate that the Eastern European Jewish press may have suffered from a variety of reports on the same subject, some of which were incorrect.

The article differs in what it reports from the article in the London Jewish Chronicle on the same subject. The report in Ha-Meliz concentrates on the differences between the populations of different States. For example, the article lists that there were 52 congregations in New York City and that there were 80,000 people there of which 2,000 were children. The Jewish population of New York had about \$2,000,000 in property. They compare this to the city of Philadelphia which had 28 congregations, 12,000 people and 1,395 children in religious school. The State of Illinois had 10 congregations, 12,625 people and 625 children, Maryland had 14 congregations and 10,000 people and California had 12 congregations and 18,500 people spread throughout the State.¹⁷

Ha-Meliz printed one article that I could find that had report on the number of Russian immigrants. In 1882 it reported that 5,999 Russian immigrants arrived in New York during the year 1881.¹⁸

Ha-Zefirah seemed to have more population data in it. In 1862, the paper reported that there were 30,000 Jews in New York. These Jews, the paper reports, supported 20

synagogues, one hospital, one orphanage, two Sunday Schools, one Jewish newspaper, and many benevolent aid societies.¹⁹ Seventeen years later, this journal reported that there were only 20,000 Jews in New York of which 10,000 practiced their Judaism.²⁰ This discrepancy in population statistics may be accounted for by conflicting reports of the figures by different sources. Another possibility would be that there was simply a misprint in the paper.

Ha-Zefirah, like Ha-Meliz and the London Jewish Chronicle, reported statistics concerning the immigration of Russian Jews to the United States. They report that in 1880, 347,270 Jews arrived in New York. This figure, they report, increased to 366,120 in the year 1881. They state this in conjunction with a report that conditions were bad for the newcomers to America but, the government was trying to set up helping organizations for them.²¹

This attitude toward the condition of the immigrants to America may have been to try and dissuade others from leaving Russia and moving to America. They may have been trying to tell their readers that everything they heard about America being the perfect place to live, was not necessarily true. The streets may not have actually been paved with gold.

OCCUPATIONS

In 1875, the London Jewish Chronicle, reported that: "New York--The Hebrew Leader says: There are about 52 Hebrew ministers, 66 Jewish physicians and surgeons, and some 104 gentlemen who practice law and are Israelites, residing in the city of New York."¹ Another article in The Chronicle, referring to America, quoted: "We have many Jews to represent us in the clergy, the law, the press, finance, science, the fine arts, politics, etc., but there is absolutely no Jewish public lecturer who can attract large paying audiences."² Articles such as these indicate that European Jewry was interested in the various vocations and occupations held by the Jews in America.

American Jews were involved in a wide range of professions, businesses, and trades. It had often been said that Jews are bankers. In Europe, the House of Rothschild dominated this profession, and there were Jewish bankers in the United States as well. For example, the Chronicle reported that an American Jew, Haym Salomon, had loaned money to the United States Government to help finance the Revolutionary War.³ Another article, dated 1874, disclosed that an unidentified person in the City of New York was to receive a promotion to a key office within a major bank.⁴

The European Jewish press also included articles about Jews in the manufacturing industries. In 1860, the London Jewish Chronicle reported that a Jewish inventor had made improvements on the steam engine.⁵ Another account, pertaining to Jews in the transportation industry, referred to the railroads. In 1872, the United States Rolling Stock Company, owned by a Mr. Bischoffshein and a Mr. Goldschmidt, placed an advertisement in the London Jewish Chronicle. The advertisement offered to sell shares of stock to the English Jewish community and stated that: "The company was formed in 1871 for the purpose of acquiring and constructing locomotives, passenger carriages etc."⁶

Farming colonies in America built factories to provide extra income and to increase prosperity. One example was the Alliance Colony, a farming community which operated a rather successful cigar factory.⁷

There were also reports of Jews engaged in academia. One such article read:

Dr. Joseph Ranschoff, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, was installed on the 15th ult. as President of the Cincinnati Academy of Medicine. Dr. Zelikowich, a native of Russia, who is now settled in America, has been appointed Professor at the University in Philadelphia. Last month he delivered his first lecture, on Egyptian Antiquities, at the Franklin Institute.

Dr. Zelikowich was not alone in his study of the ancient New East, as the Chronicle reported that Jews were studying Orientalia on an advanced level.⁹

The Chronicle reported that many of the major newspapers in the United States, and specifically in New York, were Jewish,¹⁰ and that many Jews were employed by the Jewish press. In one article, the paper noted that Myer S. Isaacs had served as the editor of the Jewish Messenger at one time."

Some Jews earned their living by serving in the military, such as Commodore Uriah P. Levy. Levy's death was reported in the Russian Hebrew Press, and Ha-Meliz printed an account which stated that Levy had been the first Jew to command a fleet of the United States Navy. They commented that because he "removed the oppressive staff"¹² by eliminating the use of corporal punishment in his command, everyone who served under him "hearkened to the sound of his words."¹³ An article in Ha-Zefirah emphasized the respect that Levy had commanded, and reported that his funeral had been large and was attended by many sailors, dignitaries and loud mourners. The funeral was held in New York and included one of the longest funeral processions in the history of the city.¹⁴

The Chronicle printed one report of American Jews in the military. In 1873 a man was asked to resign from the New York State Militia when it was learned that he was a Jew. The Chronicle noted that: "the legality of this regulation in a regiment of the State Militia in the Free Republic of the United States is likely to be tested."¹⁵

Though few reports of Jews in the military were published it seems that Jews played a major role in changing military rules and regulations for the better.

The European Jewish press printed several items about Jewish merchants and peddlers. Ha-Zefirah reported that many Jews went to California during the 1849 gold rush, not as miners but rather as traders.¹⁶ These Jewish merchants and peddlers who traveled to the Western United States did not lead an easy life. In 1887 the Chronicle reported that: "A Jewish pedlar, named Dreeben, of Dallas, Texas, was murdered on the 20th ult. Robbery seems to have been at the bottom of the crime."¹⁷ In a comment related to the report from Ha-Zefirah, mentioned above, the Chronicle remarked that the Jews who went west were "without bridle or restraint, they were led astray."¹⁸

Jewish merchants took an active part in the life of their communities. In 1860 the Chronicle reported that forty-five Jewish businesses in Cincinnati had signed a resolution declaring that they would keep their stores closed on the Sabbath. The resolution also stated that these men would encourage other Jewish merchants to follow their example, in order to reaffirm the Sabbath as a fundamental part of Judaism.¹⁹ Seven months later, the Chronicle related that the Occident, in Philadelphia was supporting this movement of merchants encouraging each other to close on the Sabbath and on Jewish festivals.²⁰

American Jews were active in the professions of medicine and law. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Joseph Elson Ranschoff had been appointed as the head of the Cincinnati Academy of Medicine.²¹ The Chronicle carried a report of the first modern Jewish woman doctor. In 1860, Dr. Elson lectured about physiology in New York City after completing her education at Pennsylvania College. The Chronicle compared Dr. Elson to Rebecca, from the Book Ivanhoe, who had been described as a Jewish woman skilled in the art of healing.²²

In 1879, Ha-Zefirah reported that there were two hundred Jewish lawyers in the United States.²³ Two specific examples of American lawyers were given in the London Jewish Chronicle. The first was Myer S. Isaacs, who was a member of the New York bar and later was appointed as a Judge of the Marine Court.²⁴

The second more prominent example of a Jewish lawyer was Albert Cardoza. The Chronicle reported his eulogy as follows:

The Hon. Albert Cardoza, ex-Judge of the Supreme Court, died at New York on Sunday the 9th He was educated for the Bar and was elected in 1863 Judge of Common Pleas, when he was under thirty years of age. Several of his decisions spread his fame and made his name very popular. One of them was in a habeas corpus action brought by a Catholic father to recover his child from a Protestant institution. He decided that the father had the right to dictate the religious creed of his child He was elected a Judge of the Supreme Court in 1867 when he resigned.²⁵

While these Jews were upholding the law, some Jews

earned their livelihood by breaking it. The Chronicle reported in 1880 that:

Among the 1,600 prisoners in Sing Sing prison, there are only 30 Jews. In that year at St. Quentin the number is still less, there being only 5 Jewish prisoners amongst a total of about 2,600. The enemies of the Jews will do well to reflect on these figures.²⁶

These figures and commentary seem to indicate that the majority of Jews earned their living honestly.

Traditionally, one of the most noble occupations has been agriculture, here a person could do an honest day's work and watch the fruits of his labor grow. Although this was a romanticised view of agriculture there were Jewish farmers in America. The European Jewish press concentrated its articles about agriculture in the United States on the farm colonies that were set up for new immigrants from Eastern Europe.

The Europeans did receive some indication that American farm life was not the absolute solution many thought it to be. Toward the beginning of the mass emigration from Russia in 1880, the London Jewish Chronicle printed a report about the colony Ararat. This agricultural colony, proposed by Mordecai Manuel Noah in the early 19th Century, was dedicated in 1825 on Grand Island in the Niagara River. The item in the Chronicle noted that the colony soon collapsed.²⁷

Another report in the Chronicle from the year 1880

dealt with a farmer who had written to the American Hebrew. In his letter, the farmer stated that being a Jew had caused him certain problems that a Christian would not have had. These troubles related to combining Jewish law with modern farming technology, such as the principle of not mixing different kinds of seeds, and the setting aside of the priestly tithe and the tithe for the Temple in Jerusalem.²⁸

Other difficulties involved with farming in the United States concerned money. The Chronicle reported that two Russian Jewish families were returned to Europe from America as paupers. The article stated that they "had entrusted their money to one of their travelling companions, who was separated from them at Castle Garden, and allowed to land whilst they were detained."²⁹ As a result, the families could not even reach their destination, a farm colony in the Dakotas.

Such negative news from the London Jewish Chronicle was heavily outweighed by the number of favorable reports concerning agriculture and the Jewish farming colonies in America. Two examples of the Chronicle's positive viewpoint were printed in the mid-1880's. The first item commented:

So rapid is the growth of wealth in America, so rapid the rise in the value of a district when settlement and agriculture seize upon it, that the workers have within sight and short distance of time not only the discharge of their obligations, but the prospect of substantive proprietorship for themselves. Their future is soon seen by them to be assured by even a

moderate degree of exertion.³⁰

A more specific account was presented in 1885, concerning the Alliance Colony. The Colony consisted of fifty farms, fifteen acres, and a cigar factory, and was so successful that the London Mansion House Committee assumed most of the Alliance Colony's debt.³¹

Most of the reports carried by the London Jewish Chronicle about agriculture in America referred to the farm colonies started for the Russian and East European immigrants who began to arrive in America in the 1880's. These colonies included one in Westchester County, New York,³² and one near New Orleans, Louisiana. The latter had the support of both the Jewish and non-Jewish citizens of the area,³³ and was reported to be the first agricultural colony in America for the Russian Jewish immigrants. Chartered by the State, the colony consisted of one hundred and twenty-one people, and was located on 2,800 acres for which the sponsors had paid seven dollars an acre.³⁴

Another colony was established at New Vineland, New Jersey, where the superintendent praised the Russian immigrants as both hard working and religious people.³⁵ Farther west, colonies were founded near St. Paul, Minnesota,³⁶ near Milwaukee, Wisconsin,³⁷ and in western Missouri.³⁸

Why were these colonies formed for the Russian

Jews who came to America? The answer to this question was discussed in the Chronicle as follows:

Our American coreligionists are ready to further with all their power the work of emigration to America . . . The majority of the Russian Jews whom they have seen are robust and industrious men, anxious to work and to gain an honourable living; but they do not know any trades, or they do not know enough of them to exercise them in America. If they should arrive in the United States in large numbers . . . heavy responsibilities would be cast upon the American Israelites. It is therefore necessary to seek the best means whereby, immediately on the arrival of the emigrants, the Board in New York may produce for them honourable occupations and a certainty of earning a living. The formation of agricultural colonies is the only means of attaining this end.⁴⁰

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JEWS AND NON-JEWS

The relationship between Jews and non-Jews in the United States was an area of concern for the European Jewish press. Jews in Europe were naturally curious about conditions in America, where there were no official religious restrictions, and were interested in comparing American religious co-existence with similar issues in their own countries.

The Eastern European press had less to report on this subject than did the London Jewish Chronicle. One article included in the Hebrew journals seems to sum up the opinion of this press. The article related that the Baptist and Jewish congregations of Baton Rouge, Louisiana shared the building in which they worshipped. The writer of the article, commenting about this fact seemed confused that this could happen, even though there was no anti-Semitism in the United States.¹

Despite a general feeling that the United States had little problem with anti-Semitism, the European Jewish press did report on some negative occurrences between Jews and non-Jews. One example concerned the "refusal in 1877 by a fashionable hotel in Saratoga, New York, to admit a prominent Jewish banker as a guest."² Henry Hilton, manager of the Grand Union Hotel in Saratoga, had refused

to allow Joseph Seligman to stay in the hotel.³ Soon after the incident occurred, it was reported in Ha-Meliz.⁴ Three years later Ha-Zefirah picked this story up and went on to relate that Jacob Zeebacher⁵ had introduced legislation before the New York State Legislature which would prohibit barring a person from a hotel because of his religious belief.⁶

The London Jewish Chronicle carried many articles on the subject of the relationship between Jews and Non-Jews in America, and covered many different aspects of this relationship. Some of these accounts described friendships between Jews and Non-Jews. One such piece referred to Rebecca Gratz, chosen by Sir Walter Scott as the model for Rebecca in his work, Ivanhoe, because of her friendship with Sir Walter's "'first, last, and only love," Miss Hoffman."⁷ There were, however, some reports that showed conflict between the Jewish and Non-Jewish communities.

The earliest reports of conflict took place in 1860 and involved the Mortara case.⁸ The first referred to the Rev. Raphall offering a prayer before the United States Congress. The article says Raphall was asked to lead the prayer, in order to show the American Jewish community and the world that Jews in the United States were completely equal citizens and fully accepted in every sense. The report continues that several of the Congressmen present

made disparaging remarks about a Jew giving the prayer.⁹

The second report, just a few months later, is about the Jews in Cincinnati putting on a play called "Mortara, or the Pope and the Inquisition."¹⁰

Another form of tension felt by the Jewish community was due to Christian attempts at conversion. The Chronicle reports several of these incidents. Most of them reflect the failure of Christian missionaries to convert the Jews. One such article described an Episcopal missionary to the Jews in Philadelphia who reported that "during the last year he made 234 visits; officiated on 264 occasions; distributed 22,000 pages of tracts at a large expense;--and yet he cannot rejoice in the turning of a single Jew to the faith of Jesus!"¹¹

The Chronicle, unlike the Eastern European Hebrew press, was aware of anti-Jewish feeling in America, but knew that the Jews did not just sit back and take the abuse thrust upon them. In 1860, the paper reported that the Jewish members of Masonic lodges had protested the offering of Christian prayers at their meetings. The Jews explained their dissent by comments, "whereby masonry, instead of being cosmopolitan, must necessarily become sectarian."¹² The Chronicle continued its report, taken from the American Israelite, noting that the lodges answered that the Jews should say Jewish prayers in their Jewish lodges. The Jews however, were not satisfied with

this answer and planned to take the matter all the way to the Grand Lodge.¹³

It was not uncommon for prominent Jews to take up the cause of Jewish defense. In 1860, Max Lilienthal, a Cincinnati Rabbi, wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Cincinnati. In the letter he protested the insistence of some priests to refuse absolution to Catholics who were working for Jews, and were advising their parishioners to quit their jobs. Lilienthal went on to state that if those conditions continued, Jewish employers would dismiss all of their Catholic employees.¹⁴

Another example was reported in 1887. In response to an attempt to missionize among the Jews, the London Jewish Chronicle published the following:

The Rev. Dr. Gottheil of Temple Emanuel, has reprinted from the Unitarian Review, an open letter, under the heading of 'The Great Refusal,' which he addressed to the Rev. S.B. Calthrop in reply to that clergyman's article 'Israel's Last Word.' The Christian clergyman had charged the Jews with refusing the greatest inspiration. Dr. Gottheil protests that what Jews refused to accept was no more than that which all good Unitarians and many other Christians now openly deny and silently drop from their creeds."¹⁵

Just as the Eastern European Jewish press, the Chronicle noted the Hilton-Seligman incident cited earlier, this confrontation prompted the Chronicle to report on similar situations:

The intolerant proceedings of Judge Hilton in refusing to admit Jewish visitors to his hotel at Saratoga, which caused such great excitement in Jewish circles a summer or two ago have been imitated by an hotel

keeper at Staten Island, near New York, who would not receive a certain Mrs. Jacobi, because she was the wife of a Jew."¹⁶

The Chronicle completed the story started in Ha-Zefirah concerning a law to prevent such occurrences from happening again. It reported that: "The Assembly for the State of New York has passed a law by which a hotel-keeper or publican, who refuses to serve a Jew or accommodate him with lodgings on account of his race or religion, will render himself liable to a fine of at least 25 dollars."¹⁷

Articles which dealt with negative aspects of the relationship of Jews and Non-Jews in the United States were far out-numbered by articles reporting on positive aspects of the relationship. For example, in 1882 the Chronicle printed this example: It is stated by the American daily press, that Judge Hilton who refused Jews admission to the Grand Union Hotel at Saratoga, has offered to give ten thousand dollars to the Russian refugee fund."¹⁸ The American non-Jewish community's concern for Jewish welfare in other countries was documented in the pages of the Chronicle. As early as 1860, the paper reported that a Non-Jew had offered to contribute \$100.00 if Captain Charles L. Moses would master a ship with provisions to take to Gibraltar for the relief of the Jewish refugees there from the Spanish war in Morocco.¹⁹

Another example of the Christian defense of Jews also occurred in 1860, when the Chronicle stated that a

non-Jew had written a letter to an American newspaper, apologizing for the image of Shylock in Shakespeare's play, The Merchant of Venice.²⁰

Twenty years later, the Chronicle noted that:

The New York Times states that a widespread movement is now on foot in America to enter a protest from the pulpits of the land against the anti-Jewish agitation in Germany. On a Sunday morning three distinguished preachers of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian denominations touched on the subject in their sermons. The Rev. Heber Newton said that public sentiment in the furthest part of Christendom should be directed against such a persecution, and that Christian America should make her voice heard.²¹

The American Christian community often expressed an interest in having Jews live among them. The London Jewish Chronicle reported that the citizens of the city of Newport, Rhode Island, where Jews no longer lived, would welcome any Jews that wanted to live there.²² The Chronicle also published accounts of compliments directed toward the Jewish community:

The Rev. J. Everist Cathell, Rector of St. John's Church, Oneida, delivered a lecture in Chickering Hall, New York, on the 7th., on 'Jews and Jewelry.' In his closing remarks, Mr. Cathell paid an eloquent tribute to the lofty character of the Jewish race, and strongly denounced the hostility shown towards it.²³

American Jews welcomed Christians to live in their midst. As noted by the Chronicle: "It is proposed to admit non-Jews to the recently founded Montefiore Home (in New York). The idea has the unanimous support of the Board of Management."²⁴

American Jews spoke at Christian gatherings, and at events that were not specifically Jewish in orientation. In late 1859 and early 1860, Jews were invited to speak at festivals honoring Johann Christoph Friedrich Von Schiller for what would have been the 100th anniversary of his birth.²⁵ The Chronicle related that Jews also spoke in Cincinnati, St. Louis, New Orleans, and New York, and the editor, remarking on this fact, thought it strange that Jews would speak at these public, Non-Jewish occasions.²⁶

Christians and Jews would attend each other's functions. One article reported that: At New York there exists a 'Hebrew Litarary Union' to which the Rev. Dr. Fischel, delivered a lecture, the first in the season on 'the history of the Jews in America.' It was well attended, by Jews and Christians."²⁷ Similarly, in the 1880's a Christian clergyman attended a Brit Milah ceremony and gave a lecture on the meaning of the event and the symbols of the ceremony.²⁸

The major opportunity for Jews and Non-Jews to speak to each other was at a pulpit exchange. The Chronicle published several reports of this type of event. In 1872, a Christian minister and Dr. Max Lilienthal together dedicated a new synagogue building in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.²⁹ This practice seems to have become more frequent as time passed. By 1873, the Chronicle commented that there were

a large number of Rabbis who were doing pulpit exchanges with Christian and Unitarian clergy.³⁰

The Chronicle, after printing Isaac M. Wise's statement that he found nothing wrong with Jews and Methodists exchanging pulpits at times, complimented Wise for his consistency of policy.³¹

The 1880's was a time when the American Jew appeared to be extremely close to the American Non-Jew, and the relationship extended through many levels of contact. It was not uncommon for a Jewish congregation in need of a building to purchase a former church and convert it into a synagogue, often redecorating as necessary. An example of this took place in Peoria, Illinois, where congregation Anshi Emeth bought St. John's Episcopal church and redecorated it to make it "into an elegant building, antique and oriental in external appearance, and elaborate and elegant in internal decoration."³² Another example occurred in Boston, where congregation Ohabi Sholem wanted to sell its building for \$27,000 so that it could buy the Congregational Church and convert it for use as its new synagogue building.³³ In Chicago as well, a congregation bought a Unitarian church and converted it into a synagogue.³⁴

A still closer relationship was formed when a church and a synagogue shared one building. The first reference of this type was printed in the Chronicle in 1873. In an article entitled "Reform in Chicago,"³⁵ the Jewish

Messenger reported that a synagogue and a church were sharing a building in which to worship. That year, there was a conflict when the Jewish holiday of Shavuot³⁶ fell on a Sunday. In a generous compromise the Jews moved their celebration of the holiday to the afternoon so that the church could hold its regular Sunday morning worship service.³⁷

The next reference to this type of arrangement was printed in 1882. That year: "The Church of the Incarnation having been burnt down, he (Gottheil) offered the use of his place of worship of 'the Temple' (Emanuel in New York) . . . for their use, of course with the consent of his trustees. His colleagues, however, one and all condemn his action."³⁸ Such dissent would indicate that not all of the Jews in America were in favor of this type of arrangement, or that the Chronicle's correspondent from New York wanted his English readers to believe that Gottheil and the Reformers were in the minority.

Once again, the Chronicle referred to Reform Jewry's acceptance of sharing with non-Jews by quoting the leader of the movement, Isaac M. Wise who, "looks with no unfavorable eyes even upon a synagogue being obligingly lent for a few Sundays to a Christian congregation."³⁹

What did the English Jewish community really think about this policy of a synagogue sharing its facilities with a Christian church? Insight into this question may

be found in two articles printed by the Chronicle in 1887.

The Temple Emanuel of San Francisco has offered the use of the Synagogue to the members of the First Unitarian Society during the construction of their new place of worship, and the B'nai El congregation of St. Louis have lent their synagogue to the Rev. Dr. Wilson's Methodist Episcopal congregation. The Jewish Times of San Francisco declares that 'An exchange of courtesies of that nature can only tend to bring the denominations into closer communion socially, and that is greatly to be desired. . . . An act of this kind has absolutely no religious significance. It will make Hebrews believe not one whit more, nor Christians one iota less.'"40

On the same day, the attitude of the Jewish Times was echoed by the London Jewish Chronicle in an editorial which said:

American Jews afford remarkable contrasts to their English brethren. We have frequently referred to the manner in which American synagogues are somewhat freely lent to Christian congregations in temporary need of a place of worship. In England we set out faces against special Jewish clubs, but two of the Jewish clubs in New York (the members of which are entirely composed of Jews) are now expending nearly a million of dollars on new club houses. The membership of the Jewish "orders" ("Beni B'rith," "Keshet shel Barzel," and "Sons of Benjamin") is supposed to exceed the membership of the synagogues. The Beni B'rith Order is certainly a marvellous organisation both in point of numbers and far-reaching influence. The English prejudice against such exclusively Jewish "Orders" is shown by the circumstance that no effort has been made to establish in England branches of the Beni B'rith or any similar organisation. In so-called "Jewish" Masonic Lodges in England, not one of them is composed exclusively of Jews, and in several the Christian members form quite a large proportion. The Order of Foresters has also several "Jewish" Courts ("Sons of Israel," "Solomon's Temple," "Jacob's Pride," etc.), but they do not count, as they are merely branches of the large organisation to which Jews attach themselves principally to secure allowance during Shiva, and not all from any exclusive feeling.41

One may conclude from this that while the English did not approve of segregating themselves from the non-Jewish community in social setting, they did not approve of the sharing of religious facilities with their Christian community.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the separation of Church and State. This gave the American Jew the same rights and privileges as all other American citizens. In most other countries, this situation did not exist. For example, English Jews were not permitted to serve in the British Parliament until the year 1866.¹ How did the Jewish people of England and Eastern Europe regard American freedom of religion?

In general, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah did not report the freedom enjoyed by American Jewry. There was only one article in Ha-Meliz. This article related that the New York City Council voted to give the Jews of New York a parcel of land worth \$20,000, to be used for the construction of a Jewish orphanage.² This reference to an official body of the State helping the Jews may not appear very significant. To people who were use to the State restricting the Jews, this would seem to be a very significant event.

Ha-Zefirah carried two articles by Ezekiel Rosenberg regarding religious freedom in America. The first dealt with a speech made by David Einhorn on the occasion of the merger of two New York congregations. A large

portion of the lecture lauded America as a land ruled by the principle of freedom of religion. For Einhorn, that meant that the government could not interfere with a person's method of worshipping.³

Rosenberg's second article written soon after the Russian pogroms of 1881, was a review of the history of the Jews in America, from the first voyage of Columbus in 1492 through the year 1746. He presented his material to prove that America, with its freedom of religion, had always been and would continue to be the "great place of refuge for Jews."⁴

The London Jewish Chronicle devoted space to the issue of American freedom of religion and the relationship of Jews to the United States government. The viewpoint of the Chronicle in these areas is represented by two articles. In 1860, the Chronicle reported that American Jewish fraternal organizations were very successful and attributed this success to "the unparalleled liberty enjoyed by the citizens in the United States."⁵ Twenty-six years later, the Chronicle repeated its positive regard of American freedom of religion by reprinting the letter that Moses Seixas and the Jewish congregation in Newport, Rhode Island had sent to George Washington, congratulating him on his election as the first President of the United States. Washington's reply was reprinted as well. The Chronicle used these letters as an example of America's leadership

in the area of religious liberty, and went on to compliment the United States for policies helpful not only for improving the condition of Jews in America but in Europe as well.⁶

The Chronicle was fair in its evaluation of the religious freedom in America in the late 1800's and also reported cases of religious intolerance. One article described movements in New Hampshire and North Carolina to change the State constitutions each of which denied certain rights to Jews. That same year the Chronicle printed an account of one of the most notable cases of lack of separation between Church and State. "The son of the Rev. Isidor Kalisch, at New York, was expelled from a public school for having as a Jew refused to join in the 'Lord's Prayer,' with which the school's exercises begin."⁹

A third report in the Chronicle dated 1873 informed its readers that another attempt was made to ammend the United States Constitution in order to make America a Christian nation. The same article reported that it was illegal in the State of Tennessee for a Jew to offer the opening prayer for the State Legislature.⁹ At that time it was common for a minister to give the opening prayer in the various State Legislatures, and the Chronicle often reported occasions when Jews were invited to offer these prayers.

Much of the Chronicle's interest in this area was

sparked by a report that the Rev. Dr. Raphall was the first Jewish minister invited to open the daily session of Congress with a prayer. The report had indicated that the Congressmen had paid close attention to his prayer.¹⁰ One week later the paper pointed out that although some Congressmen had made negative comments concerning Rev. Raphall's prayer, it was still a fine example of the equality of Jews in the United States.¹¹ The Chronicle continued to report similar instances as in 1860 when Isaac Mayer Wise gave the opening prayer before the New York legislature¹² and the Rev. Dr. Eckman offered the prayer in Virginia.¹³

Asking Jewish ministers to lead the opening prayer was not the only way in which the legislative branch of government recognized the rights of Jews. In 1850, Congress considered a petition by the heirs of Haym Salomon to collect monies owed to Salomon since the days of the Revolutionary War.¹⁴ A Senate committee stated: "Haym Salomon gave great assistance to the Government by loans of money and advancing liberally of his means to sustain the men engaged in the struggle for independence."¹⁵ In a broader gesture, the United States Senate considered measures to protect American Jews wherever they might be situated. In 1860 for example the Senate considered the problems of American Jews in Switzerland,¹⁶ and tried to enact a treaty that would alleviate restrictions placed on

them by the Swiss government.¹⁷

The Chronicle reported two incidents enacted at the State level which were beneficial to the Jews. The first was a law passed by Tennessee which allowed Jewish ministers to give the opening prayer to the State Legislature.¹⁸

The second report came from the state of New York, where the State Assembly passed a law which made it illegal for a hotel to refuse service or lodging to a person because of their race or religion.¹⁹

In the eyes of the English, the judiciary played a major role in the life of American Jewry. The Chronicle reported several cases of American courts settling legal matters between Jews or for congregations. The first case reported in the paper dealt with a suit against the Board of Trustees of a congregation. The Board had wanted to sell a portion of the congregation's cemetery in order to raise money.²⁰ Two other cases of suits between congregants and Boards of Trustees were related in the Chronicle. Both suits were brought by people who felt that they had been wronged because their congregations had reallocated seats in the synagogues.²¹ The later of these cases also involved a suit to stop the congregation from making reforms in its rituals.²²

That suit was not the only one which involved a congregation introducing reforms. In 1875, the Chronicle

made the following comment: "We infer from a paragraph in the Jewish Messenger that efforts are being made to bring about a conference of conservative rabbis. The late decision of a court of law which sanctioned certain innovations in one of the oldest synagogues seem to have given rise to the movement for a rabbinical conference."²³ Whereas this incident was probably seen by some as unwarranted interference by the court into the area of religion, an important decision had been made and its possible impact could have changed the course of American Judaism.

Another type of case brought before the judiciary involved a congregation suing the estate of a person whom the congregation had buried. The congregation sought to recover expenses for the funeral and the final preparation of the body. As reported in the Chronicle, the court decided in vavor of the congregation but lowered the amount of the fee to be paid by the estate.²⁴ In a similar case, the court decided to uphold a will which assigned a large part of the estate to a charitable organization.²⁵

A major area of court decision involved the Sunday Laws. Because these laws forbade work on Sunday, they were considered discriminatory by practicing Jews because it meant that they could not work on either Saturday or Sunday. As compared with their Christian neighbors, Jewish businessmen were deprived of an extra day's profits.

The Chronicle regarded cases of this sort with interest, and they reported two instances of people brought up on charges of breaking these laws. The first was a case presented before the Ohio Supreme Court. This court ruled that Sunday Laws which did not except "cases of necessity and charity... persons who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath" were illegal and void.²⁶

The second article carried by the Chronicle related that the mayor of Pittsburgh had had the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania's coach driver arrested for driving the Chief Justice to Church on Sunday, in violation of the Sunday Laws. The London Jewish Chronicle felt that this action was quite appropriate, as the Chief Justice's own court had decided that: "in spite of the organic law of the land, that Christianity is part of the common law of the State, which of course ignores the constitutional right of every Hebrew citizen, and renders him liable to pains and penalties for not observing the customs and observances of other religious persuasions."²⁷

Jews also took a direct role in the process of government in the United States. The Chronicle reported that American Jews served in the various branches of government and were regarded as a political group to be appealed to for its vote.

The first reference in the Chronicle concerning

such political activity appeared in 1860. That year, the Chronicle printed a report about a Jewish man who had been elected to serve as the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Louisiana.²⁸ In 1880 an article noted that in the Forty-sixth United States congress there were three Jewish Congressmen and one Jewish Senator.²⁹ The Jewish Senator was Mr. Benjamin Franklin Jonas. A Londoner, identified only as "O", gave a history of Mr. Jonas' family and its activities in both the Jewish community and the American secular community.³⁰ In a similar report, another London writer known as "D" wrote: "A coreligionist Mr. Edgar Johnson, Attorney and Councillor-at-Law, has been nominated for the distinguished office of Lieutenant-Governor of the State of Ohio."³¹

Jews also served as judges. The death of former Supreme Court Justice, Albert Cardoza, who served on the bench 1867-1872,³² was reported in the London Jewish Chronicle.

American Jews occupied positions that were appointments as well as elected. For example, Benjamin Peixotto was appointed as the Consul General for the United States to Roumania,³³ and Oscar Straus served as a minister to the government of Turkey.³⁴

The readers of the Chronicle may have had the impression that Jews in the United States were reluctant to serve in public office. In 1880, the paper printed a

report from a New York correspondent that confirmed this feeling. The report said: "The fear is so great among some of our coreligionists here that the Jewish name must not be risked by Jewish politicians that several declined to vote in favour of two respectable Israelites."³⁵ The article continues, noting that because of this reason there were "few judges of inferior courts, aldermen, here and there a mayor, a county clerk, a member of the State Legislature, but the proportion is decidedly small. There is no Jew in Congress."³⁶

In response to charges that Jews were excluded from American public office, the Chronicle printed a report in 1882 by the Central Committee of the Alliance Israelite showing that "there are, or have been in recent years, three Jewish Senators, seven Congressmen, nine Judges, two State Governors, five Mayors, two Collectors of the Port, two Brigadier-Generals, and several other officers of all grades in both arms of the services."³⁷

Indirectly, Jews were actively involved in the Presidential election of 1872, when Ulysses S. Grant ran against Horace Greeley. One of the issues in the campaign was the feelings of each of the candidates with respect to the Jews. Some Jews opposed Grant because he had issued General Order number 11,³⁸ and because his running mate, a Mr. Henry Wilson, had made a speech in which he attacked Judah Benjamin, the former Secretary of State for the

Confederacy, as an example of the Jews who killed Jesus. This information was revealed to the Chronicle by a man in the United States who was upset that the Jews were not uniting to defeat the Grant-Wilson ticket.³⁹ Greeley, on the other hand, played on these anti-Grant sentiments and gave a speech in Poughkeepsie, New York during which he spoke out against the anti-Jewish feelings that many Americans seemed to have.⁴⁰

As reprinted in the Chronicle, the Jewish Messenger had taken the position that one's religion should affect neither how one votes nor one's level of patriotism, and had protested such insinuations.⁴¹ Two months later, the Chronicle noted in an editorial that the Grant-Greeley campaign was splitting the American Jewish community. It was pointed out that the Orthodox community seemed to be supporting Grant, based on reports from the Jewish Messenger in New York, whereas Reform Jews in America seemed to support Greeley, as indicated in reports and articles from the American Israelite in Cincinnati.⁴²

One can see from these pages that American Jewry, as viewed by the Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah enjoyed the same rights and privileges as all other Americans, and American Jewry participated in all aspects of American political life.

PHILANTHROPY

The European Jewish community looked at the American Jewish community and saw that it was generous with its money and help. The London Jewish Chronicle discussed American Jewry in 1875 stating that "it is a fact that they spend over £2,500 annually in charities and over £3,500 annually in synagogues and Temples."¹ Five weeks later, the Chronicle corrected these figures, and reported that the American Jewish community actually spent £25,000 per year in charity and £35,000 per year on their synagogues.² In an article five years later, the Chronicle expanded on this and stated that American Jewry went to extremes in many areas, including philanthropy.³

These articles were written without regard for events taking place in America. At times, the American Jewish community extended itself to meet conditions that were unusually adverse. For example the winters of 1874 and 1875 were extremely cold. The Chronicle related that during 1874 philanthropy rose in New York City to help the people buy fuel and bury their dead.⁴ A report from the following year noted that a "Young Ladies' Charitable Union" had been formed that winter to provide shoes for the poor. A similar society was formed to sew and distribute clothing.⁵

The European Jewish press pointed out two major ways in which monies were collected to support the philanthropic work of American Jewry. The first method involved raising money at a social event. This often took place at the annual Purim Ball. In 1881, the Chronicle reported that \$20,000 was raised at such events in New York alone.⁶ The same article stated that at, times, special balls were held for a specific charity.⁷ Four years later, in 1885, the Chronicle carried the following comment about Purim: "the real meaning of Purim, remembrance of the poor, relief of the destitute."⁸

The general custom of giving on Purim to aid philanthropic causes was greatly supplemented by the second method of many individuals who contributed their money. The Chronicle reported that Joseph Seligman had helped to create a chair in Hebrew and Oriental Studies at Cornell University. This chair was established to help support Dr. Felix Adler.⁹ One of the praises bestowed upon Albert Cardoza, the former Supreme Court Judge, in his obituary from the Chronicle was that: "His contributions to charities were large."¹⁰

It was not uncommon for a person to donate money to charity in a will. "According to a clause in the will of the late Dr. Simon Abraham, of New York, 25,000 dollars fell lately due to the Har Sinai Hospital, and an equal amount to the Jewish Orphan House of Jew York."¹¹

The Rev. Dr. David Stern stipulated in his suicide note that: "Whatever money or gold jewellery is found on my person I bequeath to the poor."¹² Isaac Hochster left his money to several different institutions, both Jewish and Non-Jewish.¹³

Occasionally, a will was challenged in court by the relatives of the deceased. The Chronicle reported one instance in which the court upheld the person's will.

AN AMERICAN LEGACY IN AID OF PALESTINE

Judge Andrews, of the Supreme Court in New York, has given a decision in a case recently heard before him, the results of which will have an important bearing on the improvement of the Jews in Palestine. The late Mr. Nathan Simson, of New York, was the founder and first President of the North American Society for the Relief of Indigent Jews in Palestine, and at the time of his death he bequeathed the sum of \$50,000 to a corporation whose aim it should be to ameliorate the condition of the Jews in the Holy Land by promoting among them education in arts and sciences, and in mechanical and agriculture vocations. The testator, however, stipulated that his nephew should enjoy the interest during his lifetime. His nephew died in 1885, and some of the relatives contested that portion of the will which had reference to the legacy for Palestine. The North American Society claimed the gift on the ground that it is already engaged in the philanthropic work which the testator had in view. Judge Andrews, in delivering judgment, argued that if the money did not go to the North American Relief Society, the charitable purpose of Mr. Simson would be defeated. In his opinion that Society was the corporation which the generous donor had in view, and no other body or private individuals could claim the legacy. Judgment was therefore given for the Society. An appeal against the decision of the Judge has been threatened, but it is expected that the Higher Court will confirm the judgment. The Society was represented by the Hon. Adolph Sanger, and by Judge Myer S. Isaacs, one of the Trustees.¹⁴

Non-Jews also contributed to the various Jewish philanthropic causes. The London Jewish Chronicle reported two such cases. One article said: "The Hon. Carter H. Harrison has presented to the Michael Reese (Jewish) Hospital in Chicago, in memory of his wife, \$1,500, with which to establish a perpetual fund in her name. This gift is the more noteworthy coming as it does from a Christian."¹⁵

The second report in the Chronicle was presented with a bit of amazement. This report read: "Judge Hilton who refused Jews admission to the Grand Union Hotel at Saratoga, has offered to give then thousand dollars to the Russian refugee fund."¹⁶

The money that the American Jewish community collected was spent in many different ways. It was not unusual for an individual to come to a Jewish community and ask them for money. In 1860, a meeting was held in Cincinnati to raise money for a Mr. Benjamin. Benjamin was a world traveller who wanted the Cincinnati Jewish community to subsidize his trip to China to investigate the Jewish congregations there, which he thought: "Have never come into contact with any European."¹⁷

At times, representatives of European Jewish communities would travel to the United States to raise money for their own causes. In 1886, Ha-Zefirah reported that two Russian Jews had gone to Chicago to ask the

American Jews for money to help them rebuild their city, Grodna, which had been burned in a pogrom.¹⁸

For the most part, cases such as these were the exception as reported in the European periodicals, since Jews in America usually supported well established causes. Organizations were formed to raise and distribute philanthropic money. One of these was the United Hebrew Charities. In 1875, this group raised \$30,000 for the Jewish poor of New York to help alleviate the cold winter.¹⁹ The same organization raised \$41,313 and distributed \$35,632 during 1879.²⁰

The American Board of Delegates was another organization that participated in philanthropic work. The London Jewish Chronicle carried a report of the Board of Delegates' annual meeting of 1872. That year, it gave money to a community in Jerusalem to agricultural communities in Jaffa and Persia, and to Maimonides College.²¹

Some of the ways in which philanthropic monies were used have already been discussed. There were, however, several major areas on which the American Jewish community spent its charitable dollars. One of these was the synagogue. In 1873, the London Jewish Chronicle reprinted an article from the Jewish Messenger which commented on the large amount of money spent on synagogues.²² The following year, the Chronicle printed an article which said that the Jews in New York would spend

\$50,000 to \$400,000 for their places of worship.²³

Not only did the Jews in America contribute money to their synagogues, but they donated items owned by the synagogue to other groups. The Chronicle reported that in 1874 Temple Emanuel of New York donated one-half of its library, approximately 1,500 volumes, to the newly formed Young Men's Hebrew Association.²⁴

American Jewry also supported its educational institutions. Ha-Meliz reported that when the Hebrew Union College was dedicated in Cincinnati, Ohio, congregations throughout America had donated \$27,000 toward its first year's operating expenses.²⁵

The American Jewish community also supported another rabbinic seminary. In 1887, Mr. Jesse Seligman endowed the school in New York with four fellowships.²⁶ It was also supported by the congregations and rabbis of New York, and the Chronicle reported that they had collected \$10,000 for the school. The Jews wanted to collect another \$100,000 so that the Seminary could have its own building.²⁷

Much of the philanthropic work of American Jewry was concentrated in the area of health care. In regard to this subject, the English Jewish press and the Eastern European Hebrew press reported from different viewpoints.

The London Jewish Chronicle concentrated its

reports on health care institutions. An example is the articles on Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. In 1872, the Chronicle devoted space to the rebuilding and dedication of a new structure for the hospital, and reported that \$80,000 was raised to pay for the project.²⁸ The Chronicle's interest in Mount Sinai Hospital continued through 1875, when the paper reported: "A fair on a large scale is being organized in aid of Mount Sinai Hospital. The most influential ladies of the community are interesting themselves in the movement. The Hospital is well conducted, and seems to be a favourite charity."²⁹

Ha-Meliz and Ha-Zefirah did not report on American health care institutions. Rather they discuss efforts to help sick individuals. The only organization noted by these papers was a group in Chicago sponsored by B'nai Brith to visit Jews who were sick.³⁰

In 1862, Ha-Zefirah reported that a Jewish traveller from the western United States, resting while en route to New Orleans, was wounded by savages. When he arrived at his destination he was very sick from the wound and was given free medical care and food by the New Orleans Jewish community.³¹

The year 1878 brought an epidemic to the southern United States. Ha-Meliz reported that Jews in New Orleans, Chicago, and elsewhere were sending financial and medical assistance.³²

The difference in the English and Eastern European Jewish press reporting can be attributed to a difference in community organization. When a stranger would arrive in an Eastern European village, hospitality would be extended to him on an individual basis. The British Jewish community, on the other hand, formed organizations to take care of its needy, such as the Anglo-Jewish Association which was founded in 1870 and the Jewish Board of Guardians which was founded in 1839.³³

The American Jewish community also supported orphanages and homes for the elderly. One reference in the periodicals specifically concerned homes for the aged. In 1887, the Chronicle reported that the Home for Aged Hebrews in New York supported 147 people and had an annual income of \$28,000. The trustees of the Home wanted to enlarge its facilities and were trying to start a major fund-raising campaign to accomplish this end.³⁴

All of the journals carried information about orphanages. The earliest reference occurred in 1860, in the London Jewish Chronicle. This article stated that the New York area congregations were organizing an Orphans Asylum. The Chronicle expressed amazement that some of the New York Rabbis were using their pulpits to solicit funds and to promote the orphanage. Specifically, the paper objected to congregants being asked to fill out pledge cards for this cause in the synagogue on the Sabbath and

festivals.³⁵

The New York Jewish community, however, was not able to establish the orphanage on its own, and the Chronicle reported that the trustees of the Orphan Asylum had to apply to the State of New York for legal custody of the children and for financial assistance.³⁶ The Jewish community also had to ask the City Council for a parcel of land. According to Ha-Meliz, the city donated a piece of property worth \$20,000,³⁷ whereas Ha-Zefirah reported that the land was worth \$30,000.³⁸

Various organizations and individuals sponsored groups to help Jewish orphans. In 1874, the Chronicle printed a story about B'nai Brith. The article noted that: "One district supports a Jewish Orphan Asylum, with 250 inmates, at Cleveland, Ohio."³⁹ A few months later, the Chronicle reported that a Mr. Morgenthau had formed the Hebrew Female Orphan's Dowry Society of America. The purpose of the Society was to make sure that each female Jewish orphan would have a dowry to take to her marriage.⁴⁰ Finally, the New York congregations banded together to build another new orphanage for the city's Jewish orphans. Within four weeks, the congregations had raised the equivalent of two million francs at their annual Purim Balls.⁴¹

The increased activity of establishing orphanages and homes for the aged led to a census taken by the Union

of American Hebrew Congregations and the American Board of Delegates in 1878 which showed that there were eleven of these institutions in America.⁴²

The Jews in the United States did not only assist needy American Jews. Much of their philanthropic activity was directed toward Jews in other lands that needed emergency aid or wanted to come to the United States to live. In each of the three decades studied, the European Jewish Press concentrated on the American Jewish community's efforts to help a different group of foreign Jews.

During the 1860's, Spain invaded Morocco and the Islamic people vented their frustrations about the war on the Jews living there.⁴³ Many of these Jews fled to Gibraltar in order to survive, and the British Jews asked the American Jewish community to help support these refugees. The Americans responded to the request and the Chronicle "printed with pleasure" a speech by the Rev. Raphall asking his congregants to contribute. He was successful and collected five hundred dollars for the Moroccan Jews.⁴⁴

Many other congregations in America contributed to the Moroccan Relief Fund set up by the British Jews. In New York, appeals for money were made at Congregation Shaaray Tefila, Temple Emanuel, the Wooster Street Synagogue, and Congregation Anshe Chesed. Other cities that participated in the drive to raise money to help the

Moroccan Jews included Richmond, Virginia; Washington, D.C.; New Orleans, Louisiana; and Cincinnati, Ohio.⁴⁵

The British acknowledged American Jewish co-operation in their efforts to help the Moroccans. The Chronicle reported that the British Board of Deputies was grateful for the \$3,000 that the American Board of Delegates had sent to them. The article explained that the money had been solicited by sending letters to all members of Jewish congregations in America.⁴⁶

One issue of the Chronicle from 1860 contained an exchange of praise between the American and British Jewish communities. The Jews of Chicago, while voting to help the Jews exiled to Gibraltar, commended Sir Moses Montefiore for his efforts in organizing philanthropic aid for these people.⁴⁷ The issue also contained a letter from Montefiore which had been sent to the Jewish Messenger, expressing appreciation to the Jews in the United States for their assistance and support.⁴⁸

The 1870's brought oppression to the Jews of Roumania. The American President, U.S. Grant, assigned Mr. B. Peixotto to act as the American consul to Roumania.⁴⁹ Mr. Peixotto would distribute financial aid to the Roumanian Jews, donated by the American Jewish community. The London Jewish Chronicle reported that: "In response to a circular issued to the B'nai Berith Lodges of America, a large amount has been contributed to the

Roumanian Fund. \$200 has been remitted to Mr. Peixotto."⁵⁰

The London Jewish community felt that financial support from America was not enough. The Chronicle reported that the Jews of England and Europe wanted to send 40,000 Roumanian Jews to the United States. The Chronicle stated that the United States government had been asked to contribute a land grant of 250,000 acres.⁵¹ The paper continued its pressure on the American Jewish community to accept the responsibility of resettling the Roumanian Jews.

In 1873, the Chronicle commented that even though American Jewry had been generous with its contributions for the Jews in Roumania, it was inadequate as there were few Roumanians being resettled in America at that time.⁵² The same issue of the Chronicle reported that it would be possible to send up to 50,000 Roumanian Jews to Nebraska, where land had been acquired for resettlement. The paper commented that with many Jews added to the population of Nebraska, the Jewish population of that state would be almost one-third of its total population.⁵³

The 1880's turned the attention of the Jewish world to Russia and Eastern Europe, and the philanthropic efforts of American Jewry were also turned in that direction. The European Jewish press took note of the efforts of American Jewry to help these Jews of Eastern Europe, although it was not always in agreement with those efforts.

The London Jewish Chronicle felt that American Jewry was obligated to help the Eastern European Jews, no matter where they decided to settle. In 1882, the Chronicle printed an editorial which decried the position of some American Jews, represented by a Mr. F.D. Mocatta, that American Jewry should only lend their support to those Jews who came to America and not to those who chose to go to Palestine. Mocatta favored America because he felt that the Eastern European Jews could become cultured there. The Chronicle expressed the opinion that Mocatta and those who agreed with him were wrong because in Palestine the emigrants could remain Jews without the temptations of assimilation. The paper also pointed out that the emigrants should have a choice of where they wanted to settle and that the Jews in the West and America had an obligation to help them reach their goal.⁵⁴ Overall, however, the European Jewish press recognized the good work done by the American Jewish community to help the Eastern European Jews reestablish their lives.

Aid given by the American Jews came in many different forms. On an individual level, the London Jewish Chronicle reported an incident concerning "the marriage of two young immigrants who had made their escape together."⁵⁵ The ceremony was held in New York and several people attended. After the wedding, "a collection was suggested in place of a collation and a little dowry

of about thirty dollars was handed over to the blushing bride."⁵⁶

Assistance was also given to establish farming colonies for the immigrants. One such colony was in Louisiana, and was sponsored by the New Orleans Relief Committee which had arranged for the land and supplies and for immigrants to be sent there.⁵⁷ The colony was eventually settled by "51 male and 34 female adults, and 36 children of both sexes under 15" on Sicily Island, Catahoula, Louisiana.⁵⁸

Even though much good work was being done it was felt that a better system for resettling the refugees in America had to be found. In 1882, the Chronicle wrote in an editorial that an organization was needed to help settle emigrants from Russia, in order to limit the number of bad experiences that these people were experiencing while trying to get to America, and once there, while trying to reestablish their lives. The need for such organizations was also recognised by American Jewry.

The Chronicle reported in 1885 that an organization had been founded to help eliminate the poor tenement conditions which Jews from Russia were forced to endure.⁵⁹

Most organizations were founded to offer aid for a wider range of problems. In 1882, Ha-Meliz reported that a קרן ק"מ a philanthropic fund had been formed in New

York and was providing millions of dollars for the new Jewish immigrants from Russia.⁶⁰

These funds were not provided by the American Jewish community alone, Western European Jews contributed to them as well. The London Jewish Chronicle listed the amount of money contributed by the Jews of France and England to the American relief organizations. The total amount was the equivalent of 250,000 francs.⁶¹

One of the American organizations was the United Hebrew Charities. This New York organization provided about 11,000 to Jews who had been in America five years or less, which meant that they had helped 3,694 families or 12,431 individuals.⁶²

Another New York organization was the Jewish Protective Immigrant Aid Society, founded by J. Judelson, of Philadelphia, in 1885. The group was formed for the purpose of preventing "the return of immigrants as paupers to Europe."⁶³ Within the first year of its existence, the Society helped 1,830 people and spent only \$1,600.

A third organization, the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society, provided relief and support to Jews coming to America from Eastern Europe, but it was also a source of conflict and controversy. Organized in 1881, the Society was the outgrowth of another group known as the Russian Emigrant Relief Committee of New York. At the time of its founding, the organization had \$15,946.

One of its major goals was to form the immigrants into agricultural communities upon their arrival in New York.⁶⁴

In the summer of 1882, it seems that the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society wanted the English philanthropies to give them control of funds earmarked to help the Russian Jews. The English Jews reacted negatively to this idea. The Chronicle, in an editorial, explained that their reluctance was based on several reasons. Primarily the British Jews felt that the American organization was spending too much money on the organization itself and not enough on the relief work. They also expressed dismay at the reluctance of the American Jews to give help to any but those who were best able to survive on their own in America. The Chronicle stated that the Americans felt they could only find jobs for those Eastern European Jews who were willing to work on the Sabbath and not observe the Jewish dietary laws. Finally, the Chronicle said of the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society that "they advocate wife desertion."⁶⁵ One week later, the Chronicle printed the following editorial:

The Jews of America have long been noted for their large and open-handed charity. If they will allow the New York Emigrant Aid Society to die the natural death which seemed impending when the last advices left America, and will everywhere establish extensive organizations of earnest workers for finding situations for the emigrants in the various localities to which the dispersion has been effected, the best results will be attained. There could not have been a greater mistake than to centralize all action in New York, and make it a focus of pauperism. Diffussion,

dispersion, decentralization are now the principles which govern economists in dealing with social difficulties, and if such principles be adopted in the present instance and the wise dispersion policy of the Mansion House Committee be worked out by our American brethren by the establishment of local labor agencies, consisting of honorary workers instead of highly-paid secretaries and managers, the ten thousand emigrants already despatched (sic) will soon be in comfort, and we may shortly hear that there is room for ten thousand more.⁶⁶

By the end of the summer, the conflict seemed to have ended. The Chronicle printed the monthly expenditures of the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society, and reported that the Society spent \$35,966 in June of 1882. This money had been spent for the housing and feeding of the Russian immigrants: for transporting them to cities other than New York: for clothing, loans and subsidies; and for the support of the agricultural communities in Colorado, and Vineland, New Jersey.⁶⁷ In August, the Society spent \$39,474.⁶⁸

European Jewry was concerned and interested in the philanthropic efforts of the American Jews. While there may have been times when they did not agree with American methods, they were generally supportive of the American Jewish communities and their philanthropic work.

IMMIGRATION

The previous chapter discussed the efforts of American Jewry to aid the emigrants from Eastern Europe. In addition to philanthropy immigration to the United States had other facets, as described by the European Jewish press. For example America was viewed as a hope for freedom.

In 1882, the London Jewish Chronicle stated that it felt emigration to America was one of the answers to the persecution of Jews in Europe. The article continued:

So rapid is the growth of wealth in America, so rapid the rise in the value of a district when settlement and agriculture seize upon it, that the workers have within sight and short distance of time not only the discharge of their obligations, but the prospect of substantive proprietorship for themselves. Their future is soon seen by them to be assured by even a moderate degree of exertion.

Ha-Zefirah expressed a similar feeling when it printed an article by Yehudah David Eisenstein which stated that America had been the great place of refuge for the Jews ever since the time of Christopher Columbus.²

Where did the Jews who emigrated to America come from? In 1874, Ha-Zefirah reported that most of the Jews in the United States came from Germany and the Slavic nations.³ The Chronicle noted that the grandfather of Senator Benjamin Franklin Jonas had come from Devonshire

in England.⁴

However, most of the references in these journals concerned emigration from Russia and Eastern Europe. The Chronicle reported that as early as 1882 there were Russian and Polish Jews who had been in America long enough to form societies to help the new immigrants from those countries who were just arriving in the United States.⁵

In 1885 The Chronicle printed: "Some idea of the enormous increase in the emigration of this class may be gathered from the fact that in 1872, 2,641 Russian Poles landed here, in 1882, 20,993."⁶

Once the Jewish immigrants arrived in the United States, they did not all stay in New York. Various organizations were responsible for the distribution of the refugees throughout the United States. The local Jewish Association of New Orleans helped to bring some of the newcomers to agricultural colonies in Louisiana.⁷ For the most part, however, it was the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society that arranged for resettlement outside of New York City. This group sent immigrants to New Vineland, New Jersey;⁸ Colorado;⁹ St. Paul, Minnesota.¹⁰ Cincinnati, Ohio; Kansas;¹¹ and Missouri.¹²

The Christian community also helped with resettlement: "Mr. H.W. Fisher, a prominent Christian citizen of New Waverly, Texas, has offered to take as many Russian families as can cultivate two hundred acres of land, to

give them homes, implements, and provisions."¹³

Once the immigrants arrived at their final destination, they immediately began to reestablish their lives. The Chronicle reported in 1885: "Two years ago a number of the Russian Polish congregations organized a separate Talmud Torah School for themselves. About three hundred little fellows from five to twelve years of age attend daily."¹⁴ By 1887, the Chronicle noted that the new immigrants had established retail businesses, as well as "trade and political associations, and two newspapers in Hebrew and in German; they have two evening schools, a reading room, a theatre, and a library where Russian books can be obtained."¹⁵

The Chronicle saw the increase in immigration to America as favorable. The paper printed an editorial in which the editor expressed pleasure in the fact that the American Jewish community was welcoming the newcomers to the United States and was helping them to resettle. The editorial continued: "America is the only country of the world where room can be found and a livelihood discovered for any number of immigrants that reach its shores."¹⁶ The paper's enthusiasm for America was tempered by the realization that some of the Eastern European Jews would rather have gone to Palestine, and the Chronicle felt that it was important that these people be supported in their desire as well as those who chose to go to the

United States.¹⁷

The London Jewish Chronicle kept close track of cooperation between American and European Jewish communities to resettle the new immigrants in America. In 1881, the Chronicle reprinted an item from the Jewish Record of Philadelphia which stated:

The European Jewish Press are devoting much space to discussing plans for the colonization of Palestine by emigrants from Russia and Roumania. Some wealthy capitalists in Russia, reports say, have promised large sums in support of the schemes and heavy contributions are expected from other quarters. Some of the papers express surprise that the Alliance Israelite Universelle should favour emigration to the United States in preference to the Holy Land. In our opinion the Alliance is right. In this country the refugees will be encouraged to follow the vocations to which they are best adapted; they will be scattered over our vast territory and not huddled together in the large cities, where they are likely to continue their foreign habits; they will become self-reliant, useful citizens, and contribute their share towards the general prosperity of their adopted country. . . . Let these unfortunate refugees, by all means, come to America. Their fellow-Israelites in this country are fully aroused to the propriety of aiding them; their sympathies are awakened and actively engaged in arranging for their reception and employment. In all the seaport cities and in the large inland towns, where there are communities of Jews, committees are in existence, or are being formed to provide for the emergency. There is ample room for all; work for all who can work; lands to cultivate; security to persons and property; everything that can tend to make men prosper and render life desirable.¹⁸

Four months later the Chronicle reported another instance of the Alliance Israelite Universelle's interest in the work of American Jewry to resettle Eastern European Jews in the United States:

The Central Committee of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, referring in their February report to the organization of the "Russian work" in America, observe: Our American coreligionists are ready to further with all their power the work of emigration to America. The experience which they have acquired in the treatment of the emigrants despatched by the Alliance gives them confidence in the future of this work. The majority of the Russian Jews whom they have seen are robust and industrious men, anxious to work and to gain an honourable living; but they do not know any trades, or they do not know enough of them to exercise them in America. If they should arrive in the United States in large numbers, and follow the calling of hawkers, or if they should be reduced to poverty, heavy responsibilities would be cast on the American Israelites. It is therefore necessary to seek the best means whereby, immediately on the arrival of the emigrants, the Board in New York may procure for them honourable occupations and a certainty of earning a living. The formation of agricultural colonies is the only means of attaining this end.¹⁹

The London Jewish community's interest in immigration was also satisfied by direct reports from America. These reports were often made in person by representatives of the American Jewish organizations responsible for resettlement. One such instance occurred in 1882. The Chronicle reported: "Mr. Moritz Ellinger, who has arrived in this country as a Delegate of the Hebrew Emigrants' Aid Society, of New York, and also furnished with credentials from other institutions."²⁰

Direct reports from America were also brought by Europeans who had gone to the United States to inspect the situation first-hand. "Mr. George S. Yates, of Liverpool, who was delegated by the Mansion House Committee to proceed to New York with the view of expressing the views

of that Committee to the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society, and to study the arrangements which are being made to dispose of the Russian refugees arrived in New York on the 8th of May."²¹ Yates sent back favorable reports of the work being done in America.²²

Problems were also reported to the European Jews. At times, the London Jewish Chronicle was very much in opposition to the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society. In 1880, the Chronicle wrote that: "We think that the Aid Society has been its own greatest enemy and has said more against itself than all its critics have written against it."²³ By 1882, the relationship between the British and the Aid Society was so poor that a British organization, the Mansion House Committee, began to send immigrants to the United States without first consulting the Society. This action caused some problems, as immigrants were arriving in cities other than New York and those Jewish communities were not able to take care of the newcomers.²⁴

In October of 1882, the image of the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society had deteriorated to the point that when reporting a riot involving Russian Jewish refugees which had taken place in New York, the Chronicle indirectly placed the blame on the Society as well as on the participants:

A riot occurred on Saturday among 600 Russian Jewish refugees quartered on Ward's Island near this city. They have been supported there for several

months by the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society, and have frequently complained of bad treatment and poor food. On Saturday one of them named Rabotta objected during dinner to the manner in which the food was served, seized a ladle from the attendants hand, and struck him over the head with it. Rabotta was ordered to leave the island, and consented to go. Before he could, the refugees gathered about him, and began to threaten the superintendent and assistant. A message was sent to the city for police assistance, and three policemen were sent. When the refugees saw only three they were emboldened to attack, and the moment Rabotta's arrest was attempted, they assailed the superintendent and police with stones and sticks. The superintendent was knocked down and severely injured. His office and house were attacked with stones, and all the windows broken in the general riot which followed. Further police aid soon arrived, and order was restored. Two policemen received severe cuts on their faces, and several of the rioters were injured by the policemen's truncheons. There seems to be no doubt that the refugees have been badly treated but they are entirely responsible for yesterday's disturbance. They are idle, worthless people, and a great burden on the hands of the American Hebrews who support them.²⁵

The Chronicle also attributed other problems to the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society. At times, the Society would send refugees back to Europe: "A party of nearly 80 Russian Jews, who had been sent back to Europe by the Hebrew Emigrants' Aid Society in New York, arrived in Antwerp the other day and were dispatched thence to Germany."²⁶

Apparently, Jews were sent back to Europe by other means as well. In October of 1882, the Chronicle stated that "of 20,000 Russians who emigrated to the United States, there have returned to Europe but 1,100 of whom 400 are children."²⁷ Since some of these people were

ordered returned to Europe by the United States government,²⁸ it would seem that less than 1,000 were probably sent back by the Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society.

European Jews emigrated to America with the impression that it was a land of freedom. This view was shared by the English Jewish community which provided those refugees with assistance and support. Despite many problems, the immigrants did manage to make a new life for themselves in America and to become a part of American Jewry, with the help and support of the Jews in America and Europe.

EDUCATION

The European Jewish press took notice of the educational accomplishments of American Jewry. The English Jews in particular felt that education was very important for Jewish life.¹

Jews in America could attend both high school and college.² In 1879, Ha-Zefirah reported that the Jewish children who attended public schools were among the better students in those schools.³ The London Jewish Chronicle reinforced this observation with an article which reported that in Cincinnati: "Upwards of twenty percent of the graduates at the Woodward and Hughes High Schools belong to the Jewish persuasion. In the former the first in general scholarship was Miss Leopold to whom was awarded the gold medal; and the second in general scholarship, Joseph Eichberg, received a silver medal."⁴

American Jews also did well in university studies. In 1879, Ha-Zefirah stated that there were over two hundred Jewish lawyers in New York alone.⁵ The Chronicle carried an article about the Rev. Edward Chapman, a Rabbi from Dallas, Texas, who received his Ph.D. from Baylor University in 1887.⁶

American Jewry sometimes built its own schools to

provide a secular education. In 1880, Gottheil founded a preparatory school in New York which also offered some college level classes.⁷ Several other institutions were established by Jews to train Jewish youth in various professions. In 1880, the Jews of New York founded a new orphanage which would train the children there to do "handy work."⁸ The next year, two New York women collected \$6,000 to establish a school which would train Jewish girls to be nurses. Another New York school gained the attention of the Educational Exhibition which was held in Chicago in 1887:

An Educational Exhibition has been held in Chicago, and the only school from New York State represented there was the Hebrew Technical Institute of New York City. Mr. H.M. Leipziger, principal of the Institute, who addressed the convention on two occasions, was elected Vice-President of the Section on Industrial Education, and was appointed Chairman of the committee to draw up a course of study on technical training for public schools.⁹

American Jews were also concerned with teaching their children and themselves about Judaism. Some of this religious education was informal. In 1860, the London Jewish Chronicle reported that: "At New York there exists a 'Hebrew Literary Union' to which the Rev. Dr. Fischel, delivered a lecture, the first of the season on 'the history of the Jews in America.'"¹⁰

However, most of the Jewish education in America was conducted in formal schools. One example was the Hebrew Free School which was founded in 1865. By 1885,

this school had taught 1,800 students. The London Jewish Chronicle gave credit to the Hebrew Free School for slowing the tendency of American Jews to convert to Christianity.¹¹

The majority of Jewish religious schools in America were associated with synagogues. The London Jewish Chronicle noted that in 1874 there was "no synagogue of any importance in the United States which has not its regularly-organized school."¹² In 1879, Ha-Zefirah concluded that every congregation in America had its own religious school.¹³

The Chronicle reported on the Religious School of Temple Emanuel in New York City. In 1873, the school had 400 students and 80 confirmands. Classes met two days a week and were taught by ten teachers.¹⁴ The Chronicle expressed a fear that because Temple Emanuel was a Reform congregation, its educational procedures might not be of good quality. This fear was dispelled in 1874, when the paper reported that Rev. Morais of Philadelphia had examined the Hebrew School at Temple Emanuel. He found that it was a good school and that the Reform orientation did not affect the quality of its education.¹⁵

The Sunday Schools of various congregations were sometimes organized into Hebrew Sunday School Associations. The Chronicle stated that one of the functions undertaken by such an organization in Philadelphia was the publication

of textbooks for is students. One textbook, called Thoughts on Bible Texts for My Children, originally had been published in England, and the Chronicle's editors thought highly of this endeavor.¹⁶ The Chronicle noted in 1874 that the Hebrew Sunday School Association of New York had five member schools with an enrollment of about five hundred students.¹⁷

The attention paid to Jewish education was not all positive. Even though the Chronicle and Ha-Zefirah reported many good examples of Jewish education in America, on two occasions the Chronicle noted Americans were still not satisfied with their own efforts. In 1872, the Chronicle reprinted an article from the Jewish Messenger which lamented the lack of Hebrew training that Jewish children received in America. The article called for better religious education to improve the quality of Jewish life in America.¹⁸ The following year, the Chronicle printed another article from the Messenger which said that synagogues in America spend too much money on their buildings and not enough on Jewish education. The report also stated that "few children are retained in the classes till they are able to pursue the higher branches of Hebrew study."¹⁹

The European Jewish press spent many pages discussing the efforts of American Jewry to establish a rabbinical College in America. In 1874, Ha-Zefirah pointed out

that a school to train Rabbis was need in America, to help fill the needs of English speaking Jews living there. Previous to that time, most of the Rabbis in America had come from Europe. Their English was often poor, and they had difficulty relating to the problems of the American Jew.²⁰

The London Jewish Chronicle expressed similar concern. In 1873, the Chronicle printed an article in which the closing of the only Rabbinical Seminary, Maimonides College, was discussed. This event prompted the paper to comment that even though Isaac M. Wise was talking about establishing a Rabbinic Seminary, it was not likely to occur. As a result all of the Rabbis in America would have to be brought there from Europe. The Chronicle deplored these conditions in its report.²¹

Less than one year later, the Chronicle carried an article about the formation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The report stated that the temporary Chairman for the Union, Mr. Sigismund, had assured the delegates that every effort would be made to establish a Rabbinical College as soon as possible.²² Ha-Zefirah carried a similar article which said that the Union would definitely establish such an institution.²³

The European Jewish press followed the progress of this college which the Union of American Hebrew Congregations wanted to establish. In 1875, the Chronicle reported

that the "preparatory department of the College will be opened in October" of that year,²⁴ and that \$40,000 had been raised to help establish the college.²⁵

A report in the Chronicle dated October 29, 1875 confirmed that the preparatory department of the Hebrew Union College had opened on schedule in Cincinnati. Isaac M. Wise, principal of the College, conducted the opening ceremonies.²⁶ Four years later, in 1879, Ha-Zefirah stated that the Hebrew Union College was entering its fifth academic year with forty-two students studying there.²⁷

In 1880, the London Jewish Chronicle indicated in a report concerning America that the preparatory department of the Hebrew Union College had been moved to New York but that the Rabbinic school had remained in Cincinnati. The article said that both institutions were "making satisfactory progress."²⁸ In an article just one month later, the Chronicle wrote that there were only thirty students attending the Hebrew Union College, but that it had a library of over three thousand volumes.²⁹

According to Ha-Meliz, the building of the Hebrew Union College was officially dedicated in Cincinnati, on April 24, 1881. The establishment of the College had cost \$25,500 plus another \$1,500 for supplies. This money had been provided for the College by the members of the Union of America Hebrew Congregation. The report said that the College consisted of five teachers and thirty-two students,

and had eight thousand volumes in its library. The paper questioned the fact that since the faculty of the Hebrew Union College was Reform, how could people know if "the word of the Lord is pure in the mouths of the graduates of this Rabbinic College and His spirit is among them."³⁰

The Chronicle also detailed the dedication of the College. Its report said that there were thirty-five students, not thirty-two as had been stated in Ha-Meliz. The article continued, describing the curriculum of the College and noticing that it did not contain secular studies.³¹

The European Jewish press seemed to think that the Hebrew Union College was a successful venture. However, one article in the London Jewish Chronicle questioned the popularity of the College within the American Jewish community. In 1881, the Chronicle reported that there was some controversy concerning the location of the Rabbinic School of the Hebrew Union College. It seemed that some Jews in America thought that it should be located in New York City, where there were more Jews and where it would be easier to raise the financial support needed for the maintenance of the College. The article also intimated that the Jews of New York were jealous of Cincinnati Jews because only the preparatory branch of the College had been established in New York. The Chronicle indicated that the reason the Rabbinic

School of the Hebrew Union College remained in Cincinnati was because, "Rev. I.M. Wise is in love with the College, the Union is in love with I.M. Wise," and since Wise was in Cincinnati, the College was there with him.³²

In 1887, New York City got its Rabbinic Seminary. The London Jewish Chronicle reported that the Jewish Theological Seminary had been established in New York that year. Many prominent Jews of New York attended the opening of the Seminary, including Dr. Gottheil, Alexander Kohut, F. de Sola Mendes, and the Rev. H.P. Mendes. At the time of its opening there were eight students following the eight year course of study in the seminary.³³

The observations of the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz and Ha-Zefirah concerning the education of American Jewry were varied but were largely positive. The European Jewish press recognized the fact that in order to live in an open society such as that of the United States, a Jew had to be schooled in both Judaic and secular studies. Reports of this educational process seem to indicate that the European papers approved of the education that American Jews received. The only reservations expressed involved the area of religious education for Jewish children, which the papers felt might have been given more attention from the American Community.

LEISURE

The European Jewish press paid attention to the various ways in which American Jewry spent its leisure time. A popular pastime for some Jews was to spend vacations away from home. So many American Jews abandoned the cities during the summer months that the London Jewish Chronicle commented: "It will be considered undoubted a strange circumstance in England that Judaism as manifested in and by public worship is almost a nonentity in New York during three months of the year." This article printed in 1874, continued: "At Long Beach, the Brighton of America, the Jewish population this year exceeded 1200 souls."¹ It was not only the laity that vacated the cities during the summer, as the Chronicle reported that Rabbis from New York would also go to the beaches to avoid the hot summer weather in the city.²

American Jews could not always leave the city, so they developed other ways to spend their sparetime. A major leisure activity was the joining of organizations. Religious and philanthropic organizations are discussed elsewhere in this work. In addition to these, other organizations existed that were both serious and social in nature. In 1875, the Chronicle printed a report which stated that: "There are Jewish Clubs which provide the

social life for New York Jews. Their main activity is gambling but there are some parties."³ These societies were limited neither to one special social group in American Jewish community, nor only to those Jews who lived in the cities. In 1887 The Alliance farm colony at Vineland, New Jersey, founded its own social club known as the Alliance Young Friends Club. The group had its own meeting hall on the grounds of the colony.⁴

There were several of these organizations concentrated in the cities of America. One such group was the Young Men's Hebrew Association (YMHA), founded in New York City in 1874. The Chronicle's account of the opening estimated that 300 people had joined. The group had the support of the local synagogues, as the article also stated that Temple Emanuel had donated approximately 1,500 volumes for the YMHA's library.⁵ In 1875, the Chronicle described the YMHA as having quiet rooms and lectures for its members, and pointed out that there were so few Jewish speakers that the YMHA's lectures were given by four non-Jews for every Jew.⁶

Even more successful than the YMHA were the Jewish fraternal organizations. Such groups included the B'nai Brith, the Independent Free Sons of Israel, the Improved Order of the Free Sons of Israel, and the Keshet Shel Barzel.⁷ Of these, the B'nai Brith was reported to be by far the most active and popular. In 1874, the London

Jewish Chronicle noted that B'nai Brith had 19,000 members.⁸

By 1881, Ha-Meliz reported that B'nai Brith had 22,810 members.⁹ This growth continued through 1885, when the

Chronicle indicated that there were 25,000 members.¹⁰

These figures are especially impressive, considering that like the other fraternal orders its membership was entirely Jewish.¹¹

The Chronicle attributed the success of the B'nai Brith to the "unparalleled liberty enjoyed by the citizens in the United States."¹² In 1874, the Chronicle added to that observation the thought that the success of B'nai Brith was a symbol of the strong Jewish feeling among the Jews of America.¹³

B'nai Brith was involved in several areas of activity in 1872, "In response to a circular issued to the B'nai Brith Lodges of America, a large amount has been contributed to the Roumanian Fund. \$200 has been remitted to Mr. Peixotto."¹⁴ This philanthropic aspect of the B'nai Brith was also expressed through direct service. In 1881, Ha-Zefirah reported that the Chicago chapter of B'nai Brith had sponsored a group that visited the sick.¹⁵

B'nai Brith participated in activities for the whole American community as well. In 1875, the Chronicle printed an article which stated that the B'nai Brith planned to donate a "statue of Religious Liberty" to the committee in charge of planning the Centennial Celebration

of the American Revolution.¹⁶

Besides Jewish clubs and fraternal groups, American Jewry also participated in social organizations of the secular community. In 1887, a Jewish doctor became the President of the Cincinnati Academy of England.¹⁷ That same year, Mr. A.S. Solomons became the Vice-President of the American Red Cross.¹⁸ Jews also belonged to Masonic lodges.¹⁹ By 1880, there were enough Jewish Masons in the city of St. Louis that a new synagogue building was "dedicated with full Masonic honours."²⁰

In addition to joining organizations, Jews in America participated in the cultural arts. As mentioned earlier in this work, a Jew had written a play about the Mortara case and it had been performed in Cincinnati.²¹ There were also Jewish actors, such as Herr Sonnethal, a Viennese Jew who came to New York in 1885 and was paid \$40,000 to perform.²²

The Jews were also interested in music. In 1860, the London Jewish Chronicle printed an article which stated that a great deal of the entertainment in New York consisted of Jewish opera.²³ In 1885, there were two Russian opera companies which provided entertainment for the new Russian Jewish immigrants.²⁴

American Jews spent a great deal of time reading. There were many Jewish newspapers available in the United States some of which have been mentioned previously. In

addition to those already discussed, there were the Jewish Independant of Chicago;²⁵ a Hebrew journal called Hameasseph;²⁶ the American Hebrew; the Jewish Advocate; the Hebrew Leader; the Jewish Record; the Jewish Progress; the San Francisco Jewish Times; the Jewish South; the Hebrew; the Hebrew Observer; Die Deborah; and Der Zeitgeist.²⁷ In 1881, Ha-Meliz published a report which noted that the Jewish Gazette in New York had become the first daily Jewish newspaper printed in English.²⁸

The Jewish community founded several literary societies to promote Jewish literacy in America. In 1860, the Chronicle reported that a Hebrew Literary Union had been established in New York City. According to the article lectures sponsored by the Union were attended by both Jews and Christians.²⁹

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations also sponsored a literary society, and the Chronicle reported that the U.A.H.C. wanted to produce an inexpensive English copy of the Bible.³⁰

The main Jewish publishing concern in America was the Jewish Publication Society. During its first two years of existence, the J.P.S. did not publish any books.³¹ Its first work was an English translation of the fourth volume of Graetz's History of the Jews, in 1874.³² Another J.P.S. project was to publish a Bible in English that every American Jew could afford to own.³³ In 1875,

the Chronicle reported that the Jewish Publication Society intended to publish the Herzberg family papers by Mendes and the works of Jellinek³⁴ and Grace Aguilar,³⁵ some of which had been bequeathed to the Society by Isaac Leeser.³⁶

American Jews enjoyed reading works by American Jewish authors. In 1873, the Chronicle reviewed a work by Isaac M. Wise entitled Judaism: Its Doctrine and Duties.³⁷ Other notable American Jewish authors included Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf and Louis Washington, a politician.³⁸

Two of the most popular Jewish authors were women. The London Jewish Chronicle noted with sadness the death of Miss Penina Moise, and commented that she was "a poetess of unusual endowments."³⁹ In 1887 the Chronicle reported the death of Emma Lazarus, stating that as an author she had "consecrated her intellectual gifts to the most elevating ends."⁴⁰ The obituary also praised Miss Lazarus for the work she had done for the Jews in Roumania and Russia and lamented the fact that she had never married.⁴¹

American Jews had many different outlets for their leisure time. They travelled, participated in social groups, and supported the cultural arts of both the Jewish and general American community.

RELIGION
REFORM VERSES ORTHODOX

Most of the reports concerning America found in the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah, dealt with the religious life of the American Jew. This special interest centered upon the practices and organization of Judaism in the United States.

The European Jewish press expressed approval in regard to most of what it reported about American Jewish practice and ritual. However, there was some concern about Reform Judaism and the affect it might have on Jewish religious survival in America.

In 1881, Ha-Meliz reported that some of the Jewish refugees from Russia had arrived in Cincinnati, Ohio and had attended Sabbath services at Congregations B'nai Jeshurun. The immigrants were horrified that the men praying there did not cover their heads while praying.¹ That same year, as mentioned in the chapter on Education above, Ha-Meliz questioned the quality of education at the Hebrew Union College, because it was a Reform institution.²

Ha-Zefirah was more tolerant of Reform Judaism than was Ha-Meliz. In 1862, Ha-Zefirah carried an article

which simply described a Reform congregation. The report said that at Congregation Emanuel in San Francisco, California, a Rabbi had been hired from Albany, New York. He instituted reforms in the religious practices of the congregation, he allowed men and women to sit together, and he had the Cantor face the congregation with his back to the Ark. The liturgy used in the worship service denied the return of Israel to the land of Israel. The Rabbi also eliminated the practice of observing the second day of the festivals and seemed to have given his approval, at least by his silence, to the eating of non-Kosher foods.³ Several years later, Ha-Zefirah noted that each Reform congregation in the United States used a different ritual and prayerbook.⁴

These descriptive writings in Ha-Zefirah were presented without any editorial comment. Generally, the paper neither approved nor disapproved of the actions of the Reform movement in America. There were times, however, that the journal did express its opinion of Reform Judaism and its changes. In 1879, Ha-Zefirah carried an article which stated that in Chicago there were two groups, Reform and Orthodox. The difference between them seemed to be that the Reform group had no respect for tradition. For example, they ate on Yom Kippur, and avoided the practice of many other customs. Although the writer of the article tried to be objective concerning these changes in tradi-

tional Jewish practices, he could not condone the observed fact that a Reform Jew would say Mazel Tov to a Jew who had married a non-Jew.⁵

Another article from the Ha-Zefirah that was definitely anti-Reform was a report of the ceremonies which followed the graduation of the first class of Rabbis from the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio. The author of this article referred to the serving of non-Kosher foods at the graduation banquet, and condemned Isaac M. Wise as being worse than Pharoah. The analogy continued, stating that at least when the Jews were slaves in Egypt, Pharoah did not make them eat frog legs, but Wise chose to serve them at his dinner. The paper reported that this meal split the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (which it regarded as being Reform in orientation) because the Eastern Reform congregations and their Rabbis were outraged. The article noted that Jews in America would eat milk together with meat, justifying the practice by saying that the meat is not from a kid and the milk is not from a goat. It went on to observe that American Jews would even eat at non-Jewish restaurants during Passover, but the eating of forbidden meat, frog legs, was too much for either the Easterners or Ha-Zefirah to accept.⁶

This attitude of disapproaval toward Reform Judaism was tempered with understanding in Ha-Zefirah. In 1879, the paper printed an editorial on Reform Judaism in the

United States which acknowledged that even though Reform Jews made many changes in ritual, they still wanted to remain Jews. This idea was supported by the fact that Reform congregations each had its own religious school, and that the movement itself supported five religious schools which were free and open to anyone.⁷

In contrast, the London Jewish Chronicle presented an overall negative opinion of Jewish religious practices in America. In 1873, the Chronicle published an editorial which said:

the general religious status in America is in all respects unsatisfactory in the Jewish Community, each congregation has its own views. . . and takes its colour from the prevailing notions of the principal rabbi who may direct it. It is a pity that our brethren do not know how absurd all this seems in European eyes. The notion that it is extremely sublime and considerate to follow Gentile customs seems to prevail in some American congregations; and the result is that they are not only laughed at by European Jews but by American Christians also.⁸

The Chronicle also felt that the lack of consistent policies concerning mixed marriage, marriages prohibited by Jewish law, and conversion was responsible for the negative view of American Jewish religious practices held by European Jewry.⁹

The negative opinion of American Jewish religious life, as presented in the London Jewish Chronicle, was also due in large part to the pluralistic nature of American Judaism. In an 1880 editorial, the Chronicle pointed out that there were extremes within Judaism in America which

were "the offspring of sincere spiritual fervour," especially on the part of the Reform Jews, who wanted to make Judaism more like the other religions of the world.¹⁰

The concern about the pluralistic nature of American Judaism was particularly emphasized in the London Jewish Chronicle by many reports concerning Reform as well as Orthodox Judaism. In 1860, for example, the Chronicle stated that the Reform congregations in America used different liturgies and prayerbooks. Some used Wise's Minhag America, while others used the Reform prayerbook from Hamburg, Germany.¹¹

The Chronicle reported about many of the ritual practices of Reform Judaism in America. In the 1860's, the Chronicle wrote about several conversions to Judaism that were conducted by Reform rabbis. One report concerned a woman who was converted by Dr. Adler at Temple Emmanuel in New York City. The woman had been a Presbyterian, and even though she had already married a Jewish man, the article maintained that she had converted for honest reasons of personal conviction. The ceremony consisted of the woman standing in front of the congregation in the Temple Emmanuel sanctuary, taking vows of belief in Judaism, and then reciting, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is One," in both Hebrew and English. Rabbi Adler then read the Priestly Blessing, found in the Book of Numbers 6:22-26, to conclude the ceremony.¹²

Two months later, the Chronicle noted that another Protestant woman had converted to Judaism at Temple Brith Kodesh in Rochester, New York. The London Jewish Chronicle seemed to regard this conversion as a positive sign of Judaism in America, even though there was no mention of the woman participating in a ceremony of ritual immersion, a traditional requirement for conversion to Judaism.¹³

Another type of Reform ceremony was discussed in 1873. That year, the Chronicle noted that Temple Emmanuel in New York was going to confirm eighty students that had completed the necessary requirements.¹⁴

The Chronicle also noted attempts by reformers in America to change the traditional liturgy. One such attempt was reported in 1882. The Chronicle said: "German 'reformers' and their American followers have done their utmost to expunge the Return from their prayerbooks and their hearts."¹⁵ The Return referred to the return of the Jewish people to the land that today is known as the State of Israel.

Many of the reports in the London Jewish Chronicle concerning Reform Judaism were negative. Most of these echo the feeling expressed by the Chronicle in 1873, when the paper recounted the history of Reform Judaism and often used terms like "freak" within the article.¹⁶

One of the first reports of this kind was presented in 1860. The Chronicle printed, "as a curiosity,"¹⁷ an

article from the Occident which criticed Dr. Adler of Temple Emmanuel in New York, who had used the event of Dr. Leo Merzbacker's¹⁸ death to exhort his congregation to give money to the temple. The Chronicle said that some of the people at the Yom Kippur service were shamed into violating their convictions, and publicly desecrating the holiness of the festival. They were asked to fill out pledge cards for the benefit of the congregation. These were later read from the pulpit.¹⁹

In June of 1860, the Chronicle remarked with pleasure that Rabbi E. Cohn had become the Rabbi of the Reform congregation in San Francisco. The Chronicle pointed out that this meant that "there are no less than three Jewish ministers in a community which, ten years ago, numbered little more than a minyan!"²⁰ In October of that same year, the Chronicle reprinted an article from the Occident which expressed disappointment over the fact that Rabbi Cohn had successfully initiated new reforms into the San Francisco congregation.²¹

By the 1870's, the London Jewish Chronicle was editorializing and voicing its disapproval of Reform Judaism in America. The paper printed an editorial in 1873 in which reforms were referred to as "Gentile Customs." The opinion was put forth that the adoption and introduction of such reforms into the synagogue would detract from Judaism's uniqueness, and that Judaism in America would

soon decline because of a desire to be like the Gentiles.²² One correspondent writing to the editor's column said that Temple Emmanuel in New York was built like a Protestant Church and that the congregation had abandoned many of the Jewish traditions as "superstition and absurdity."²³

In 1881, the Chronicle printed the following editorial:

Giving a concert in a synagogue on Friday night is somewhat "advanced Judaism," and it has inspired a New York correspondent of ours (whose letter we published last week) with many reflections. It is in Chicago that a congregation have thus practically carried an amendment of the Decalogue; the Treasury of the Michigan Avenue Temple is reported to have realized a goodly sum by the transaction. Our correspondent comments with just severity on the innovation, and is also very indignant on the subject of a certain Dr. Hahn. The Rev. Dr. Hahn, he observes, of Cleveland, "although a Jewish minister, confessed as to the question 'What is Judaism?' that he could not tell exactly." That any American minister had not an answer pat to roll off the reel when he was asked to define Judaism is indeed astonishing but the smartness of Michigan Avenue may be pleaded in mitigation. Another American preacher denounces Succoth. "This feast" he observes, "has lost its sanctity. It comes in the midst of the business season. It comes right after the New Year and the Day of Atonement. We are no agricultural people just now to celebrate this beautiful harvest feast." The avowed postponement of religion to commercial affairs is a little startling; Succoth comes "in the midst of business" just as Friday night is apt to do at this time of the year. But after all, even the wildest vagaries of our American brethren express a truth, that modifications of observances may fittingly be made if the spirit of institutions be preserved. Some American Reform congregations have been hurried into extravagances by the very sincerity of their spiritual guides, who, finding their flocks will not live up to their creed, have levelled down their creed to their flocks. We are bound to believe that all will come right in the end; in the meantime with Sunday Services, Friday-night concerts, and fine

distinctions between the Law and the Law of Moses, American Israelites may be excused for feeling a little mixed. Perhaps after all the picture is somewhat overcharged with colour, the alterations are not so numerous but that every fresh one is striking, and the apostles of change succeed in making themselves heard because they speak in a different key from that of the great majority.²⁴

This editorail postulates that Reform Judaism is just a small minority of the Jews in America. One wonders if the editor of the Chronicle truly believed this to be so, considering the large amount of attention that the Chronicle paid to Reform Judaism in America.

One of the main concerns of the London Jewish Chronicle during the 1880's was the Sunday Sabbath movement. This Reform innovation was a movement to observe the Sabbath on Sunday instead of Saturday. In 1880, the Chronicle pointed out that the idea to celebrate the Sabbath on Sunday was meant to make it more convenient for people to observe the Sabbath laws. The article continued, remarking that in I.M. Wise's congregation, less than ten of the one hundred and sixty-five members did not observe the regular Sabbath. Based on these numbers, Wise was opposed to the observance of the Sabbath on Sunday.²⁵

In order to correct the apparent confusion about the Sabbath in American Jewish practice, the Chronicle called for a Jewish Synod to be held to decide this question.²⁶ By 1881, the Chronicle considered the

American situation to be so poor that it commented that unless a synod, led by a European Jewish scholar, was called soon, the Sunday Sabbath movement would become dominant.²⁷ In 1881, the Chronicle commented that Kaufman Kohler had been trying to institute a Sunday Sabbath since 1873. It was in 1881 that the Chronicle reported that the Sixty-third Street Synagogue, in New York had become the first to adopt that practice. The article commented that this success for Kohler would mean that eventually the American Jewish community would allow the "abolition of circumcision and permission for intermarriage."²⁸

The reaction to this news of the Sunday Sabbath movement appeared the next week. In a scathing editorial, the Chronicle said:

The letter from our New York correspondent published in our last week's impression gives particulars of a serious retrogressive movement in connection with Sabbath observance in the United States which cannot fail to have a disastrous effect, if it spreads, on the future of Judaism in America. We are accustomed to regard extreme eclecticism in the States as a matter of course. The "Ethic-culture" party led by Dr. Felix Adler, indicates to what lengths Jews by race are prepared to go in throwing off the restriction of the Mosaic Law. The Sunday services advocated by Dr. Kohler are even a greater danger for their effect will be insidious in undermining the foundations of Judaism, and familiarizing the members of the congregation to study their personal convenience before authority. The Seventh Day Sabbath is symbolic of the Creation, it is enshrined in the Decalogue, and is endeared by the most sacred associations. Dr. Kohler's congregation may be grateful to their pastor for his lack of courage and consistency, but the effect is certain upon the rising generation. A Commandment obeyed by substituting "first" for "seventh"

is disobeyed; and if this sort of interpretation is applied to Scripture, "Jew" may be converted into "Atheist."²⁹

In 1885 , the London Jewish Chronicle printed an editorial concerning an important defeat of the Sunday Sabbath movement:

We are glad to learn that the attempt to establish Sunday Services in the Temple Emanu-El of New York has sustained a decisive defeat. The event is all the more significant because the proposed innovation had the approval of the Minister of the Congregation, the Rev. Dr. Gottheil. Indeed, it is owing to a letter addressed by the reverend gentleman to his congregants last summer, in which he expressed himself, though in guarded language, in favour of Sunday Services, that an inquiry was instituted into the question. That in these circumstances the proposal has been negatived by a large majority is a conclusive proof that the congregation is less heterodox than it has been painted. Despite its reform tendencies and the example of other advanced congregations in the United States--that of Chicago for example--it has clearly kept in view the dangers which would attend the establishment of a Sunday Service. It is true that the proposed innovation did not include the abolition of the Sabbath Service. But a Sunday Service once established, the desuetude of the Sabbath Service would only be a question of time. As we pointed out, also, some time ago, the establishment of Sunday Services would be interpreted as an indication that in the eyes of the Synagogue the Seventh Day had properly lost in these times some of its binding force; and thus the security of one of the most vital institutions of Judaism would be seriously imperilled.³⁰

Many of the polemics against Reform Judaism which appeared in the London Jewish Chronicle were directed against Isaac M. Wise, one of the major organizers of the Reform movement. Wise was also the publisher of the American Israelite, one of the American newspapers which the Chronicle often used as source material for its reports

concerning American Jewry.

Wise had written a book entitled Judaism: Its Doctrines and Duties. In 1873, the Chronicle reviewed the book and expressed its dislike for the work. The paper's main criticism was that the book was inconsistent with rejection of Jewish law as binding. The review stated that: "It is rather curious that Dr. Wise, though 'ignoring the three Talmuds,' seems to adopt Talmudical teaching in more than one instance."³¹ The Chronicle seemed to find this contradiction in Wise's philosophy to be amusing.

The Chronicle also described Wise as being pompous. In 1873, the journal reported that Wise had founded the Union of American Hebrew Congregations "in opposition to the 'Board of Delegates of American Israelites,'"³² and indicated that Wise had formed his Union because the Board of Delegates had spurned him. The Chronicle wrote: "Rabbi Wise attended a meeting of the latter society (the Board of Delegates) a few years ago, but as the delegates refused to worship him, he determined to establish a society of his own which would worship him, and now he had done it."³³

In 1873 the Chronicle indirectly accused Wise of threatening to leave his congregation in Cincinnati and go to New York in order to force his congregation to accept additional reforms. Although the Chronicle did not say that this was the only reason that Wise's congregation

had instituted the new reforms, it was presented as a possibility:

The Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of Cincinnati, now that they are about to lose their ultra-reform minister, Dr. Wise, it was resolved by a large majority that the second New Year's Day be abolished, and that worshippers will in future be permitted to pray with uncovered heads. Whether this progressive movement was caused through exasperation at the probable loss of their Rabbi, or was intended as a sop to his extreme reform tendencies in order further to induce him to stay we cannot say.³⁴

Wise's attempts at reforming Jewish religious practice were often criticized because of the reasons which he gave for instituting them. In 1880, the Chronicle stated that Wise had called for the abolishment of the festival of Succoth, an agricultural festival, because it fell in the middle of the business season. Wise felt that business concerns should take precedence over religious law since Jews were, for the most part, no longer farmers. He claimed the right to make this decision based upon the concept of progressive revelation,³⁵ which was the basis of Reform Judaism. The Chronicle continued admitting that perhaps some reform of Judaism was needed but, in this case, Wise had gone too far. The paper commented that Wise's reforms meant: "Liberty to do what we like; Fraternity with Christianity to any amount, equality of hatters, bankers, clothiers and shoemakers with rabbis, sages, aye even with Moses himself."³⁶

On two occasions the London Jewish Chronicle noted

that Rabbis were not always responsible for the reforms that took place in America. In 1874, Kaufman Kohler was forced by his congregation in Chicago to institute several reforms.³⁷ Sixteen years later, in 1885, the Chronicle printed an article which again showed that the lay leadership was often influential in instituting reforms. The article read:

We have on a previous (sic) occasion expressed the conviction that for the vagaries of American "Reform" the Rabbis are not always responsible. That is to say the motive power is to be looked for very often in the restlessness and the love of notoriety of the lay element in the congregation, against whose tendencies the minister contends in vain. Our New York correspondent furnishes an illustration of the truth. The Temple "Sinai" of Chicago is one of the most advanced synagogues in the United States. It has long been the cherished home of Sunday Services; and the Sabbath being practically defunct in the congregation, the Rabbi, Dr. Hirsch, has ceased to preach on Saturdays. But the disestablishment of the Sabbath at Chicago has only paved the way for further "reforms"; and it now becomes clear that the "reforming" spirit of the Temple is not the Rabbi but the Parnass. The latter has recently issued a manifesto advocating the abolition of the Abrahamic Covenant, the total expulsion of Hebrew from the Synagogue, and the transfer of the Festivals to the Sunday of the week in which they fall. Dr. Hirsch appears to have accepted the whole of the programme, with the exception of the proposal respecting the Festivals. He felt he must draw the line somewhere. Hebrew he could expunge from the Prayer Book without a pang; the Abrahamic rite was of small moment; but to hold the Festivals on days which did not belong to them was an idea to be battled with, even at the risk of incurring the ire of a Parnass. In the end the Rabbi prevailed; but Hebrew is doomed in the "Sinai" Temple, and in the days to come it will be a congregation of the uncircumcised. And all because a Parnass suddenly feels himself competent to improve Judaism!³⁸

The Chronicle was not alone in its dislike of

Reform Judaism. It carried articles which stated that there were often disagreements between the American Orthodox and Reform communities. In 1860, the Chronicle reported that the Orthodox Jewish community of New Orleans wanted to put up a statue honoring Judah Touro. The Reform segment of the community objected to the idea, creating friction between the two groups, so the orthodox community wrote to Samson Raphael Hirsch asking him to decide if the placement of such a statue would be idolatry.³⁹

When a congregation did not want to reform, the Rabbi had to come to terms with the problem. In 1960, the Chronicle reported: "When Dr. Frieklein on the eve of the New Year preached in the Philadelphia temple he uncovered his head. The congregation disliked it, and he preferred to preach no more rather than comply with the old custom."⁴⁰

The Chronicle reported a conflict between New York Rabbis on the issue of the Sunday Sabbath and other specific reforms. In 1885, Kohut took the conservative side and Kohler, the Reform side. The article stated:

Dr. Kohut's resolute conservative attitude arouses considerable talk just now. The attendance on Sabbaths continues phenomenally large at his Temple, and his sermons are listened to with marked attention. The views he advocates are not novel; they have been the arguments of the Conservative leaders and press, but they are reinforced by an earnestness, an oratorical power, and an acknowledged erudition, which make his congregation think. I am informed that he desires to restore the second day holidays--at least the second day of the New Year. Naturally, a large body of his members do not favour his conservative attitude, and it is going to be an interesting

trial of strength between Rabbi and congregation-- which, en passant, belongs to the "moderate reform." Dr. Kohut insists upon a Mosaic-Rabbinical platform.

Dr. Kohler, well known for his advocacy of Sunday services, whose failure he frankly admitted, has taken up the gauntlet thrown down by Dr. Kohut, and is preaching a series of discourses against the conservative reaction. Dr. Kohler has been very active in the present confirmation ceremony, and advocates its postponement to a later age. His rejoinder to Dr. Kohut will certainly add to the piquancy of the situation. Of late he has been decidedly conservative in his views. So we are likely to have a vigorous discussion again, and Dr. Kohut's platform will be assailed and defended.⁴¹

The London Jewish Chronicle did print some positive reports about Reform Judaism. One of the most positive comments concerning American Reform Judaism to be found in the pages of the London Jewish Chronicle concerned a congregation in Hartford, Connecticut. This congregation, which had been founded in 1843 with an Orthodox membership, began to institute reforms in the late 1850's and continued this trend into the 1860's.⁴² In 1873, the Chronicle commented:

The Hartford congregation seems to be a model one, if we may judge by the following paragraph in the Israelite of Cincinnati;--"In Hartford, Ct. the congregation desires to engage a minister. . . ." The post of minister to a congregation which is "peaceable and intelligent," and which has a "fine temple, organ, choir, family pews," and other things on a like scale, is undoubtedly "a desirable situation for an active man," especially when we remember that this model community offers a salary of \$500 per annum.⁴³

In many parts of Europe, an organ, a choir, and family pews were thought to be major reforms. It is interesting to note that the Chronicle considered them to be incentives

for a Rabbi desiring to serve that congregation.

The Chronicle reported with pleasure many instances of traditional Jewish practices observed in America. As noted earlier the Chronicle noted a movement in Cincinnati, Ohio, by the Jewish merchants to initiate a signed resolution to keep their stores closed on the Sabbath and to encourage other Jewish merchants to do the same. The paper reported that the merchants were doing this to emphasize the Sabbath as a fundamental part of Judaism,⁴⁴ and noted that news of this movement was spreading, with approval, across the United States. The Occident, in Philadelphia, was quoted as being in favor of such a movement.⁴⁵

In 1880, the Chronicle printed a letter from America which stated that even though the Chronicle was in favor of the work of the Sabbath Association in New York to encourage the observance of the Sabbath, it had failed to print the names of those involved in the movement. All of them were prominent members of the Jewish community and their participation in the movement was public knowledge. The correspondent, F. de Sola Mendes, minister of Shaaray Tefilla, thanked the Chronicle for its attention.⁴⁶

In 1860, the Chronicle wrote that a Jewish congregation was being formed in Aurora of the Jefferson Territory. The paper noted that the congregation wanted to be known as an Orthodox congregation and had acquired land for a building and a cemetery. The members sent a

request to the American Israelite, asking for a model constitution so that the congregation could be properly and legally established.⁴⁷

Just as the Chronicle would note the formation of Orthodox congregations in America, it would also make its readers aware of Orthodox congregations that were disbanding or that they thought were becoming Reform. One such congregation was the Dispersed of Israel, in New York. After the paper printed a report that the congregation was adopting Reform, Mr. Joseph M. Chumaceiro wrote a letter to the editor of the Chronicle defending his congregation against these charges. He claimed that changes made in the worship services of the congregation were insignificant and did not change the "fundamental principles of our faith, nor impair the Sephardic Minhag of the congregation."⁴⁸

The London Jewish Chronicle noted that there were different levels of Orthodox Jewish practice in America. In 1882, the Chronicle reported that a group of new immigrants from Eastern Europe felt that they were more religious than the Orthodox community already established in Cincinnati. The article stated: "As none of the synagogues in New York was orthodox enough to suit their ideas, they have engaged a hall in which they meet for religious services. They have also hired separate shambles, where cattle are slaughtered by a Shochet who accompanied the band of emigrants."⁴⁹

At times the Chronicle would defend American Orthodox Judaism against charges from Europe that there were no legitimate Jewish scholars or Rabbis in America. In 1882, The Chronicle responded to the attack of a Rabbi S.B. Bamberger:

A correspondent, whose letter on "Jewish Law and Modern Life" we publish in another column takes objection to our quoting American Jewish opinion upon the subject and refers to the authority of Rabbi S.B. Bamberger, who refused to accept a deed of divorce from America in 1853 because he was convinced there was not at the time in America a Rabbi who could edit a ḥalakah: This is a typical instance of the most unfortunate view taken by the ultra-orthodox of the struggle for Reform. We need scarcely observe there was not the least foundation for the charges of Rabbi Bamberger. To mention a name familiar to our readers, the Rev. Isaac Lesser, the well-known translator of the Bible, was quite capable of such a task and Lesser was by no means without compeers in America in 1853. The circumstances that in the United States there is now displayed a desire to join orthodox circles in adapting Jewish Law to modern life is the best evidence we can have of the gain that would accrue to orthodoxy by such adaptation under authority.⁵⁰

The European Jewish press took note of the various aspects of religious practice among America's Jews. It reported on religious controversies, and the general interest that American Jews took in their religion. Even though there were many positive aspects of the religious life of the American Jew, the general attitude of the European Jewish press can be summed up in the following description of an American Jew which was printed by the London Jewish Chronicle in 1881:

He was married by a Jewish minister, he attends shool occasionally to hear a service in an unintelligible language, he lives as a Christian, and he is to be buried in a Jewish burial ground--that. . . is the Judaism of many American Jews today.⁵¹

RELIGION
ORGANIZATION

In reaction to the conflict which arose between the Orthodox and Reform groups in America, the European Jewish press offered suggestions and solutions to the problem.

Ha-Zefirah proposed that the American Jewish community needed a Chief Rabbi to help standardize Jewish ritual practice.¹ In 1879, this paper elaborated upon its proposal, and suggested that the Chief Rabbi should be a recognized European Orthodox Jewish scholar, fluent in English so that the native American Jews would accept him.²

The London Jewish Chronicle felt that one way to standardize Jewish ritual practice in America was to hold synods and rabbinical conferences. The first reference in the Chronicle to a rabbinical conference appeared in 1875. That year, the conservative Rabbis of New York wanted to meet in reaction to a decision by the civil courts which upheld the right of a synagogue to institute reforms in its ritual.³

In 1885, the Chronicle reported that another attempt was being made to organize the Jewish clergy in America. The promoters of the organization wanted to

"unite the ministers, hold quarterly sessions in various cities, have papers read and debated on topics of an educational nature, and strive to lead to more co-operation, and practical work in the synagogue."⁴ There was no further indication in the Chronicle that such a national organization ever existed as proposed in the article.

There were, however, local rabbinical conferences. In 1885, the Chronicle reported that such conferences had taken place in Philadelphia and New Orleans. The article did not state what was discussed or resolved in these conferences.⁵

As reflected in the European Jewish press, most American Jewish religious life was centered in the synagogue. In 1873, the London Jewish Chronicle quoted an article from the Jewish Messenger which said that American Jews limited their Judaism to the synagogue which they attended only on the Sabbath and festivals. The article expressed the opinion that this was not a good practice and that American Jews should incorporate their Judaism into their everyday lives.⁶

Each synagogue in America was an independent body. In 1862, Ha-Zefirah wrote that, in New York, "every synagogue is a congregation unto itself, it has a rabbi, and a special preacher."⁷ However, it was noted that not every congregation could survive on its own, and at times it was necessary for two congregations to merge. In 1874,

Ha-Zefirah reported one instance of such a merger in New York.⁸

American Jews established synagogues wherever they settled. As early as 1860, a group of Jews in San Antonio, Texas had bought a building to use as a synagogue.⁹ In 1872, a new synagogue was dedicated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.¹⁰ The Jews of Peoria, Illinois bought an Episcopal church and converted into a synagogue.¹¹ In 1880, the oldest congregation in St. Louis, Missouri laid the cornerstone for a new synagogue,¹² and it was not until 1887 that the first synagogue in Maine was erected.¹³ 1887 was an active period for the Jews of Chicago, as they dedicated two new synagogues that year.¹⁴

The synagogues of San Francisco, California captured the attention of Ha-Zefirah in the year 1862, when the journal printed a history of the Jews of that city. The report stated that in 1850, "a society was formed to do good and righteousness and they bought a special site to use as a graveyard, and on festivals and sacred days they assembled and gathered together to rejoice and to pray."¹⁵ This group called themselves Eureka and had three hundred members.¹⁶

The article continued: "In the year 1852, forty families here (San Francisco) organized the Ashkenazic congregation 'Emanu El'."¹⁷ This congregation was interesting to the writer of the article because it was initially

an Orthodox synagogue which later became Reform with the arrival of a new rabbi. The congregation allowed men and women to sit together, eliminated the observance of the second day of festivals, and had the cantor and rabbi face the congregation with their backs to the Ark.¹⁸

Emigration from Russia and Eastern Europe brought more Jews to San Francisco. By 1862, there were enough Polish Jews in San Francisco to form a synagogue of their own, which they named "'Shearith Israel.'"¹⁹

Many of the synagogues in the United States were located in New York City. In 1860, the London Jewish Chronicle noted that there were nineteen synagogues in New York.²⁰ In 1862, Ha-Zefirah reported that New York had twenty synagogues,²¹ and by 1878 there were fifty-two congregations in that city according to Ha-Meliz.²²

Building a synagogue was an expensive proposition. In 1873, the Chronicle wrote that the Jews in New York were spending between \$200,000 and \$400,000 to build their synagogues.²³ As the immigrants from Russia came to America, Jews had to spend more of their money on supporting these newcomers and less on building their synagogues. The new immigrants did not have money to spend on buildings comparable to the native American synagogues. In 1887, the Chronicle reported that an Orthodox synagogue for the Russian and Polish Jews of New York, had cost only \$90,000 to construct.²⁴

Some of the New York congregations and their synagogues were very old. In 1860, the Portugese Congregation, Shearith Israel, moved into its fifth building,²⁵ and in 1880, this congregation celebrated its one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary.²⁶

The synagogue in America was more than just a place to worship and learn about Judaism. Many congregations provided burial services and cemetery plots for their members,²⁷ and they would offer assistance to a member in need when necessary.²⁸

The management of the synagogue was handled mainly by the rabbi and the male lay leadership. In 1881, the London Jewish Chronicle noted that: "Several of the American journals urge that ladies should be permitted to participate more actively in the management of synagogues."²⁹

The Chronicle, while able to report that at times the synagogues in America were overflowing with Jews,³⁰ recognized that there was more to a synagogue than filling seats at worship services. In 1885, the Chronicle commented: "Unhappily the synagogue has become a mere house for the recital of Sabbath prayers. Its duty is supposed to end there. If the synagogue is to survive the storms of the twentieth century, it must accomplish more!"³¹

One method that the synagogues of America used to better themselves and their work was the formation of national organizations. The European Jewish press carried

information about two of these organizations, the American Board of Delegates and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

The American Board of Delegates, also known as the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, was first mentioned in the London Jewish Chronicle in the year 1860. At that time, the Chronicle printed a section of the Board's constitution which had been received from America.

The constitution said that: "Every congregation of Israelites in the United States shall have the power to send two persons as delegates to the Board."³² The constitution also provided for the Board to meet annually. The first meeting was to be held in New York City, and succeeding meetings would be held in different parts of the United States.³³

The Chronicle reported that fifty congregations in America were meeting to elect delegates to the 1860 convention. The Board of Delegates was concerned that few of the congregations in the western United States was planning on sending representatives to New York for the meeting.³⁴ The reason for this was probably that there was no railroad transportation from the west to New York.

Once it was established, the Board of Delegates concentrated its efforts on aiding Jews in other parts of the world who were in distress. For example, when the Jews in Morocco were forced to flee their homes and go to

Gibraltar, the American Board of Delegates contributed financial support through the British Board of Deputies, the co-ordinating body for aid being sent to Gibraltar.³⁵

In 1872, the Board of American Delegates reported that it had protested the treatment of the Jews in Roumania. The Board also helped some of the Roumanian Jews to settle in the United States, and sent financial aid to Jewish agricultural settlements in Palestine and Persia.

The Delegates also worked with the American Jewish community. They sponsored Maimonides College which had been established to train American-born rabbis, as well as a Jewish Publication Society to help educate the general American Jewish community.³⁷

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) was founded in 1873, with the purpose of combining the Orthodox and Reform movements in America Jewry under one organization. In 1874, the Chronicle noted that the UAHC's "main object is to give children an 'American Judaism.'"³⁸ The Chronicle saw this as an attempt to change Judaism, and commented: "Let the Jews of America be Americanized-- but their Judaism can be nothing save Jewish."³⁹

That same year, the Chronicle printed an article about the UAHC which indicated that fifty-five congregations had joined and that the ethnic origin of most of these was German.⁴⁰ By 1875, the London Jewish Chronicle realized that the UAHC had become an important movement in American

Judaism. The Chronicle printed a descriptive article about the UAHC which read:

A movement has been going on for some time in the United States which bids fair to become of considerable importance, but which has as yet not attracted sufficient attention in our country. This movement is the formation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. This organization is quite distinct from, although apparently not in opposition to, the Union represented by the American Board of Delegates; the former it would seem, chiefly aiming at keeping up the Jewish spirit in the united communities, promoting religious feeling among them, supporting religious schools, supplying suitable school-books, and endeavouring to establish a Jewish college on a large scale. The central seat is in Cincinnati, and the ideas pursued seem chiefly to have found favour in the eyes of the Western and Southern congregations. A copy of the reports presented by the Executive Boards of the Committee on Sabbath Schools, and of the Hebrew Union College to the Council of the Organization for the current year now lies before us. The following appear to us the most interesting items. Having sketched the existing commercial depression and the threatened national decline, the report comes to the conclusion that this mischief arises from "the inobservance of the Ten Commandments in their broadest and fullest spirit," and thence infers the urgent necessity of impressing more forcibly than before upon the minds of the rising generation the precepts of the Bible, more especially the observance of the Sabbath, the widespread neglect of which in the Jewish community the report pathetically deplores, tracing its sad effects upon Jewish character and family life. The report then urgently recommends the Council to take into consideration by what manner and means every Israelite should be induced to observe the Sabbath as God has commanded it, what measures are best to adopt to induce every Israelite to join a congregation; to request the united congregation to bring into practice the exchange of pulpits. The report then describes the scope of the projected Union College to establish which on a solid and permanent basis one hundred and sixty thousand dollars are required which it does not despair to see raised. The report also reproduces a letter from Sir Moses Monteiore, accompanying the present of a Bible in five folio volumes containing thirty-two commentaries of our most ancient and most celebrated authors, for the Union College.⁴¹

Like the American Board of Delegates the Union of American Hebrew Congregations helped the Jews of Europe and Palestine with financial assistance, supported agricultural settlements in America and Palestine, and sponsored a school to train American-born rabbis.⁴² In addition to this work, the UAHC also tried to help congregations establish and support educational programs within their synagogues.⁴³ The Union assisted in solving unemployment problems among the Jews, especially among the immigrants from Eastern Europe, and tried to establish a program which would have provided the services of "circuit preachers" to some of the more isolated member congregations that could not procure the services of a full-time rabbi.⁴⁴

These two organizations, the American Board of Delegates and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, did not always work independently of each other. In 1874, the Chronicle reported that the two groups were thinking of merging, and noted that the main obstacle preventing the merger was the regional jealousy that existed between congregations east and west of the Allegheny mountains.⁴⁵

In 1878, the two organizations worked together to conduct a census of the American Jewish community. The census noted the total number of Jews, congregations, schools, health care institutions, and fraternal organizations that comprised the American Jewish community.⁴⁶

Even though the American rabbis and synagogues were independant agents, they recognized the need to work together on a local, and a national scale to better the religious and social lives of Jews all over the world.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has dealt with the image of American Jewry as reflected in the writings of the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-meliz, and Ha-Zefirah. Although this primary subject has been extensively covered, nothing has been mentioned as to when the first Jews came to America. In 1860, a report was printed in the Chronicle which stated that a curious stone tablet had been found in an Indian burial mound. The writer presented the tablet as proof that the American Indians were descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel.¹ Speculation about this idea continued for many years, and culminated in the following article of 1882 which attempted to show that such theories were simply conjecture:

Perhaps no historical question has taxed the ingenuity of scholars more severely than the fate of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel. The subject, though shrouded in impenetrable, and as one might reasonably suppose forbidding, mystery, has been a sort of literary will o' the wisp for the learned curious, at all times. It has exerted a fascination for certain minds which no amount of failure seems to discourage. The Anglo-Saxons of Great Britain and the Greater Britain beyond the seas, the Celts of Ireland, the Afghans of Cabul, the Taio Rin-Raio of China, the Kareens of Burmah, and lastly the Red Indians of America have all in turn been identified with the lost Israelites. In Captain Palmer's work on the "Migration from Sbitar" is mentioned the theory of Lord Kingsbrough, the author of a magnificent work on the antiquities of Mexico, similar to

that suggested by Adair in his treatise on the North American Indian, which seeks to establish an identity between the Ten Tribes of Israel and some of the American nations. . . .

The American tribes also have a feast of first-fruits which they celebrate with songs and dances, repeating with great fervour the words, Hallelu, Hallelu, Aleluiah, Aleluiah, Haleluiah, Alelu-yah. They cook their fruits at this festival on a kind of altar and shout the praises of Yo He Wah. Not only are these words almost identical with the Hebrew name of the Supreme--Jehovah--but the use of these words resembles somewhat the Jewish use of the Ineffable Name on the Day of Atonement, for they are only pronounced on religious festivals. More remarkable still is the coincidence that they have no image of the Supreme Being from Hudson's Bay to the Mississippi. There is a striking similarity, too, between certain American and Jewish traditions. There is an American tradition of the sun standing still for one entire day in the year "seven rabbits," in the Aztec chronology corresponds almost exactly to the date assigned by Archbishop Ussher to the same event in Scripture. . . .

But these are pure conjectures, and of so unsatisfactory a nature, that the very mention of them arouses the suspicions of genuine students. There is, however, a considerable class of persons who delight in such antiquarian trifling which they mistake for true science. While scientific proof is not always forthcoming, of learned theorizing there is no end. In examining such gossamer theories, the most cautious prudence is the better part of valour.²

Whether or not theories such as these were believed in Europe is not significant. Beyond the factual or conjectural nature of the articles it is important to recognize that each paper studied in this work had its own unique view of American Jewry.

Of the three, Ha-Meliz presented the least amount of material about the American Jewish community. Reports from this paper generally seemed to stress the efforts of American Jews to help fellow Jews in other lands as well

as in America. Ha-Meliz offered little information concerning freedom of religion in America, possibly due to the influence of governmental authorities in Russia who may not have wanted the suppressed population to hear that there were better places than "Mother Russia."

Ha-meliz did print reports about the mass movement of Jewish people from Eastern Europe to America. This information was mainly concerned with the number of emigrants going to America, the assistance that American Jews provided for the newcomers, and the immigrants' reactions to Jewish life in America, especially Reform Judaism.

Ha-Zefirah included a wider range of material about American Jewry. This paper presented a picture of the good life in America, reporting that American Jews held many different occupations and had a great deal of religious freedom. Articles from Ha-Zefirah stressed the roles of philanthropy, education, and religion in American Jewish life. Jews in America were shown to have helped both individuals and groups of Jews all over the world. Great care was taken, according to Ha-Zefirah, to make sure that every Jewish child in America had both a religious and a secular education.

Of the three papers studied in this work, Ha-Zefirah was the most tolerant of Reform Judaism. While this paper never expressed its approval of Reform, it rarely criticized the movement and chose to simply report

whatever changes the reformers had made in the rituals and traditions of Judaism.

The American Jewish concerns of the London Jewish Chronicle are most easily divided into decades. During the 1860's, the Chronicle mainly reported the philanthropic efforts of the Jews in America. For example, the paper provided many examples and reports concerning the financial aid which the American Jewish community had sent to the Jews stranded on Gibraltar.

The 1870's turned the attention of the Chronicle toward religion in America. Articles which questioned the reforms being made in the American synagogues appeared in almost every issue. The Chronicle was definitely anti-Reform Judaism, but on occasion the paper did admit that the motives of the reformers were proper. However, great care was taken to print reports that traditional Judaism was still strong and flourishing in America.

During the 1880's the Chronicle continued to show interest in religious practices, but its main concern involved the efforts of the American Jewish community to help refugees coming from Eastern Europe. The Chronicle would point out that America was the best place to try and resettle these emigrants, and there were constant reports on the condition of the new Americans. Some of these reports were critical of American methods, but the Chronicle was always careful to report the good life that

the immigrants were finding in their new home.

While the London Jewish Chronicle, Ha-Meliz, and Ha-Zefirah each had its own point of view, all three presented an overall positive impression of American Jewry and life in the United States.

It is important to note how other Jews saw American Jewry. Their accounts of American Jewish history can help the American Jewish historian gain a broader understanding of the events and people being studied.

ENDNOTES

Introduction

¹These transliterations are taken from the Encyclopedia Judaica (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972). I chose this method as it is the transliteration used by the United States Library of Congress as the standard catalogue entries for these periodicals.

²This is a common rendering of a quote by Sir Walter Scott: "The sun never sets on the immense empire of Charles V." which is found in The Life of Napoleon. Bartlett's Familiar Quotations, p. 495 (London: 1919).

³Albert M. Hyamson, A History of the Jews in England, (London: Chatton and Windus, 1908), p. 350.

⁴ibid., p. 350.

⁵ibid., p. 350.

⁶ibid., p. 351.

⁷ibid., p. 351.

⁸Encyclopedia Judaica, 1972 ed., s.v. "Jewish Chronicle," by Cecil Roth and Josef Fraenkel.

⁹Jewish Encyclopedia, 1910 ed., s.v. "Jewish Chronicle, The," by Joseph Jacobs.

¹⁰Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, 1948 ed., s.v. "Jewish Chronicle," by Nathan Ricardo.

¹¹LJC, 16 March 1860, p. 5.

¹²LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 3 and p. 6; LJC, 19 October 1860, p. 8.

¹³LJC, 6 January 1860, p. 6.

¹⁴These letters appeared in the London Jewish Chronicle approximately every three months during the 1870's.

- ¹⁵"HASKALAH, a term derived from the Hebrew root sechel (intelligence) and applied to the movement to 'enlighten' the Jews which began in Germany about the middle of the 18th cent., whence it spread to Eastern Europe." U.J.E., 1948 ed., s.v. "Haskalah," by Jacob Raisin.
- ¹⁶E.J., 1972 ed., s.v. "Ha-Meliz," by Getzel Kressel.
- ¹⁷E.J., s.v. "Ha-Zefirah," by Getzel Kressel.
- ¹⁸Ha-Zefirah, 18 November 1874, p. 147.

Population

- ¹LJC, 9 November 1860, p. 8.
- ²LJC, 2 March 1860, p. 3.
- ³LJC, 5 October 1860, p. 7.
- ⁴LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 5. A minyan is a Jewish religious quorum which consists of ten adult Jewish males.
- ⁵LJC, 13 August 1875, p. 39.
- ⁶LJC, 1 November 1872, p. 425.
- ⁷LJC, 21 February 1873, p. 675.
- ⁸ibid., p. 675.
- ⁹LJC, 16 May 1873, p. 116.
- ¹⁰LJC, 1 January 1885, p. 15.
- ¹¹LJC, 21 May 1880, p. 9.
- ¹²LJC, 14 January 1881, p. 13.
- ¹³Ha-Meliz, 24 January 1861, p. 275.
- ¹⁴Ha Meliz, 17 Adar I 5641, p. 107.
- ¹⁵Ha-Meliz, 23 Adar I 5641, p. 126.
- ¹⁶Ha-Meliz, 17 Adar I 5641, p. 107.
- ¹⁷Ha-Meliz, 23 Adar I 5641, p. 126.

- ¹⁸Ha-Meliz, 7 Kislev 5642, p. 913.
¹⁹Ha-Zefirah, 5 Tammuz 5622, p. 171.
²⁰Ha-Zefirah, 14 Elul 5639, p. 258.
²¹Ha-Zefirah, 14 Kislev 5642, p. 363.

Occupations

- ¹LJC, 8 December 1875, p. 577.
²LJC, 5 March 1875, p. 781.
³LJC, 8 September 1882, p. 4.
⁴LJC, 25 December 1874, p. 628.
⁵LJC, 14 December 1860, p. 2.
⁶LJC, 8 November 1872, p. 432.
⁷LJC, 2 October 1885, p. 10.
⁸LJC, 22 April 1887, p. 17.
⁹LJC, 18 October 1885, p. 12.
¹⁰LJC, 19 September 1873, p. 409.
¹¹LJC, 29 October 1880, p. 605.
¹²Ha-Meliz, 31 January 1861, p. 294.
¹³ibid., p. 294.
¹⁴Ha-Zefirah, 15 Iyar 5622, p. 114.
¹⁵LJC, 10 January 1873, p. 571.
¹⁶Ha-Zefirah, 29 Iyar 5622, p. 130.
¹⁷LJC, 26 August 1887, p. 12.
¹⁸Ha-Zefirah, 29 Iyar 5622, p. 130.
¹⁹LJC, 6 January 1860, p. 7.

- ²⁰LJC, 13 July 1860, p. 8.
- ²¹LJC, 22 April 1887, p. 17.
- ²²LJC, 2 March 1860, p. 8.
- ²³Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ²⁴LJC, 29 October 1880, p. 10.
- ²⁵LJC, 27 November 1885, p. 10.
- ²⁶LJC, 30 December 1880, p. 12.
- ²⁷LJC, 8 October 1880, p. 11.
- ²⁸LJC, 24 September 1880, p. 11.
- ²⁹LJC, 11 October 1885, p. 10.
- ³⁰LJC, 13 January 1882, p. 12.
- ³¹LJC, 2 October 1885, p. 10.
- ³²LJC, 22 October 1880, p. 5.
- ³³LJC, 6 January 1882, p. 6.
- ³⁴LJC, 3 February 1882, p. 4.
- ³⁵LJC, 28 July 1882, p. 4.
- ³⁶LJC, 11 August 1882, p. 3.
- ³⁷ibid., p. 3.
- ³⁸LJC, 28 January 1887, p. 14.
- ³⁹LJC, 17 March 1882, p. 14.

The Relationship Between Jews and Non-Jews

- ¹Ha-Meliz, 28 Av 5641, p. 690.
- ²Rufus Lears, The Jew in America: A History (New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1972), p. 172.
- ³ibid., pp. 172-173.

⁴Ha-Meliz, 6 Elul 5638, p. 167.

⁵This is my transliteration from the Yiddush spelling of the name.

⁶Ha-Zefirah, 22 Tammuz 5641, p. 214.

⁷LJC, 8 September 1882, p. 12.

⁸"MORTARA CASE. In 1858 Edgar Mortara, the six year old child of a Jewish family of Bologna, Italy, was abducted by Papal Guards and placed in a monastery. The child had previously been secretly baptized through the efforts of Anna Morisi, a servant in the employ of the Mortara family. When her confessor reported the matter to the Papal authorities, who at that time held temporal sway over the Papal States, the child was forcibly removed from the custody of his parents to be reared in the Catholic faith." U.J.E., s.v. "Mortara Case."

⁹LJC, 2 March 1860, p. 2.

¹⁰LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 2.

¹¹LJC, 25 July 1873, p. 284.

¹²LJC, 6 January 1860, p. 6.

¹³ibid., p. 6.

¹⁴LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 8.

¹⁵LJC, 11 March 1887, p. 7.

¹⁶LJC, 1 October 1880, p. 4.

¹⁷LJC, 2 September 1881, p. 10.

¹⁸LJC, 6 October 1882, p. 5.

¹⁹LJC, 20 January 1860, p. 2.

²⁰LJC, 3 February 1860, p. 7.

²¹LJC, 24 December 1880, p. 12

²²LJC, 5 October 1860, p. 7.

²³LJC, 28 January 1887, p. 14.

²⁴LJC, 22 July 1887, p. 6.

¹⁵"Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von. . . (1759-1805), German poet, dramatist, and aesthetic philosopher." Colliers Encyclopedia, 1965 ed., s.v. "Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich Von,"

²⁶LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 6.

²⁷LJC, 21 December 1860, p. 8.

²⁸LJC, 16 July 1880, p. 12.

²⁹LJC, 18 October 1872, p. 390.

³⁰LJC, 21 March 1873, p. 746.

³¹LJC, 29 September 1882, p. 3.

³²LJC, 14 February 1881, p. 11.

³³LJC, 27 May 1887, p. 13.

³⁴LJC, 7 October 1887, p. 13.

³⁵LJC, 11 July 1873, p. 245.

³⁶Shavuot-the Jewish festival which commemorates God's giving of the Law to Moses on Mount Sinai.

³⁷LJC, 11 July 1873, p. 245.

³⁸LJC, 26 May 1882, p. 687.

³⁹LJC, 29 September 1882, p. 3.

⁴⁰LJC, 19 August 1887, p. 7.

⁴¹ibid., p. 5.

Freedom of Religion

¹Hyamson, p. 350.

²Ha-Meliz, 4 July 1861, p. 717.

³Ha-Zefirah, 5 August 1874, p. 37.

⁴Ha-Zefirah, 25 Kislev 5642, p. 381.

- ⁵LJC, 5 October 1860, p. 2.
- ⁶LJC, 9 March 1886, p. 2.
- ⁷LJC, 11 May 1860, p. 60.
- ⁸LJC, 7 September 1860, p. 5.
- ⁹LJC, 21 May 1873, p. 746.
- ¹⁰LJC, 24 February 1860, p. 3.
- ¹¹LJC, 2 March 1860, p. 2.
- ¹²LJC, 23 March 1860, p. 7.
- ¹³ibid. p. 7.
- ¹⁴"SALOMON, HAYM, a financier of the American Revolution," U.J.E. s.v. "Salomon, Haym" by Z. Tygel.
- ¹⁵LJC, 8 September 1882, p. 4.
- ¹⁶The American ambassador to Switzerland protested to the Swiss government concerning the prohibitions placed against American Jews in Switzerland. J.E., 1910 ed., s.v. "Switzerland," by Meyer Kayserling.
- ¹⁷LJC, 27 April 1860, p. 2, and LJC, 3 August 1860, p. 2.
- ¹⁸LJC, 21 May 1873, p. 746.
- ¹⁹LJC, 2 September 1881, p. 10.
- ²⁰LJC, 16 April 1875, p. 55.
- ²¹LJC, 26 November 1875, p. 565, and LJC, 26 March 1880, p. 15.
- ²²LJC, 26 March 1880, p. 15.
- ²³LJC, 17 September 1875, p. 397.
- ²⁴LJC, 19 August 1887, p. 5.
- ²⁵LJC, 11 February 1860, p. 11.
- ²⁶LJC, 3 February 1860, p. 3.
- ²⁷LJC, 20 January 1860, p. 7.

- ²⁸LJC, 20 April 1860, p. 5.
- ²⁹LJC, 30 April 1880, p. 12.
- ³⁰LJC, 14 May 1880, p. 5.
- ³¹LJC, 30 September 1881, p. 4.
- ³²LJC, 27 November 1885, p. 10.
- ³³LJC, 2 August, 1872, p. 246.
- ³⁴LJC, 1 July 1887, p. 5.
- ³⁵LJC, 16 April 1880, p. 55.
- ³⁶ibid., p. 55.
- ³⁷LJC, 16 June 1882, p. 9.
- ³⁸General Order No. 11.--Issued at the request of General U.S. Grant in 1862, it expelled all the Jews from the area he commanded. U.J.E., s.v. "Grant, Ulysses Simpson," by Charles Reznikoff.
- ³⁹LJC, 25 October 1872, p. 403.
- ⁴⁰LJC, ibid., p. 405.
- ⁴¹LJC, 6 September 1872, p. 317.
- ⁴²LJC, 25 October 1872, p. 406.

Philanthropy

- ¹LJC, 15 March 1875, p. 781.
- ²LJC, 16 April 1875, p. 55.
- ³LJC, 13 February 1880, pp. 3-4.
- ⁴LJC, 9 January 1874, p. 683.
- ⁵LJC, 5 March 1875, p. 781.
- ⁶LJC, 22 April 1881, p. 9.
- ⁷LJC, ibid., p. 9.

- ⁸ LJC, 10 April 1885, p. 6.
- ⁹ LJC, 1 May 1874, p. 76.
- ¹⁰ LJC, 27 November 1885, p. 10.
- ¹¹ LJC, 30 August 1875, p. 298.
- ¹² LJC, 8 May 1885, p. 13.
- ¹³ LJC, 3 June 1887, p. 11.
- ¹⁴ LJC, 11 February 1887, p. 11.
- ¹⁵ LJC, 12 August 1887, p. 12.
- ¹⁶ LJC, 6 October 1882, p. 5.
- ¹⁷ LJC, 27 April 1860, p. 8.
- ¹⁸ Ha-Zefirah, 28 Tevet 5646, p. 408.
- ¹⁹ LJC, 5 March 1875, p. 781.
- ²⁰ Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ²¹ LJC, 7 June 1872, p. 141.
- ²² LJC, 21 February 1873, p. 675.
- ²³ LJC, 31 October 1873, p. 509.
- ²⁴ LJC, 5 June 1874, p. 155.
- ²⁵ Ha-Meliz, 3 Sivan 5641, p. 402.
- ²⁶ LJC, 29 April 1887, p. 12.
- ²⁷ LJC, 21 January 1887, p. 14.
- ²⁸ LJC, 5 July 1872, p. 199.
- ²⁹ LJC, 29 October 1875, p. 500.
- ³⁰ Ha-Zefirah, 13 Adar II 5641, p. 75.
- ³¹ Ha-Zefirah, 18 Adar 5622, p. 50.
- ³² Ha Meliz, 20 Elul 5638, p. 211.

- ³³Hyamson, p. 350.
- ³⁴LJC, 27 May 1887, p. 13.
- ³⁵LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 6.
- ³⁶LJC, 4 May 1860, p. 5.
- ³⁷Ha-Meliz, 4 July 1861, p. 717.
- ³⁸Ha-Zefirah, 4 Adar II 5622, p. 34.
- ³⁹LJC, 20 February 1874, p. 783.
- ⁴⁰LJC, 5 June 1874, p. 156.
- ⁴¹Ha-Meliz, 18 Iyar 5641, p. 358.
- ⁴²LJC, 14 January 1881, p. 13.
- ⁴³In 1860, the Spanish armies attacked the Moors of Morocco. This conflict caused many Jews to flee to Gibraltar for safety. William L. Langer ed., An Encyclopedia of World History, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972), p. 696.
- ⁴⁴LJC, 13 January 1860, p. 5.
- ⁴⁵LJC, 20 January 1860, p. 2.
- ⁴⁶LJC, 17 February 1860, p. 6.
- ⁴⁷LJC, 16 March 1860, p. 2.
- ⁴⁸ibid., p. 2.
- ⁴⁹LJC 2 August 1872, p. 246.
- ⁵⁰ibid., p. 246.
- ⁵¹LJC, 15 November 1872, p. 456.
- ⁵²LJC, 16 May 1873, p. 109.
- ⁵³ibid., p. 116.
- ⁵⁴LJC, 19 May 1882, pp. 8-9.
- ⁵⁵LJC, 20 January 1882, p. 16.

- ⁵⁶ ibid., p. 16
- ⁵⁷ LJC, 4 November 1880, p. 13.
- ⁵⁸ LJC, 3 February 1882, p. 4.
- ⁵⁹ LJC, 9 January 1885, p. 15.
- ⁶⁰ Ha-Meliz, 7 Kislev 5642, p. 913.
- ⁶¹ LJC, 20 October 1882, p. 10.
- ⁶² LJC, 7 January 1887, p. 16.
- ⁶³ LJC, 2 October 1885, p. 10.
- ⁶⁴ LJC, 16 December 1881, p. 12.
- ⁶⁵ LJC, 30 June 1882, pp. 8-9.
- ⁶⁶ LJC, 7 July 1882, p. 4.
- ⁶⁷ LJC, 4 August 1882, p. 12.
- ⁶⁸ LJC, 29 September 1882, p. 10.

Immigration

- ¹ LJC, 13 January 1882, p. 12.
- ² Ha-Zefirah, 25 Kislev 5642, p. 381.
- ³ Ha-Zefirah, 5 August, 1874, p. 8.
- ⁴ LJC, 14 May 1880, p. 5.
- ⁵ LJC, 8 September 1882, p. 6.
- ⁶ LJC, 9 January 1885, p. 15.
- ⁷ LJC, 6 January, 1882, p. 6.
- ⁸ LJC, 28 July 1882, p. 4.
- ⁹ LJC, 4 August 1882, p. 12.
- ¹⁰ LJC, 11 August 1882, p. 3.

- ¹¹LJC, 18 August 1882, p. 7.
- ¹²LJC, 28 January 1887, p. 14.
- ¹³LJC, 28 July 1882, p. 4.
- ¹⁴LJC, 9 January 1885, p. 15.
- ¹⁵LJC, 10 September 1887, p. 12.
- ¹⁶LJC, 30 June 1882, pp. 8-9.
- ¹⁷LJC, 19 May 1882, pp. 8-9.
- ¹⁸LJC, 11 November 1881, p. 9.
- ¹⁹LJC, 17 March 1882, p. 14.
- ²⁰LJC, 27 January 1882, p. 11.
- ²¹LJC, 2 June 1882, p. 4.
- ²²ibid., p. 4.
- ²³LJC, 14 July 1880, p. 4.
- ²⁴LJC, 4 August 1882, p. 5.
- ²⁵LJC, 20 October 1882, p. 10.
- ²⁶LJC, 21 July 1882, p. 7.
- ²⁷LJC, 20 October 1882, p. 10.
- ²⁸LJC, 11 October 1885, p. 10.

Education

- ¹LJC, 6 September 1872, p. 312.
- ²Ha-Zefirah, 5 August 1874, p. 387.
- ³Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ⁴LJC, 6 August 1875, p. 308.
- ⁵Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.

- ⁶LJC, 22 July 1887, p. 6.
- ⁷LJC, 26 March 1880, p. 14.
- ⁸Ha-Zefirah, 18 Heshvan 5640, p. 324.
- ⁹LJC, 12 August 1887, p. 12.
- ¹⁰LJC, 21 December 1860, p. 8.
- ¹¹LJC, 9 January 1885, p. 15.
- ¹²LJC, 9 January 1874, p. 683.
- ¹³Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ¹⁴LJC, 18 July 1873, p. 267.
- ¹⁵LJC, 5 June 1874, p. 155.
- ¹⁶LJC, 14 December 1860, p. 5.
- ¹⁷LJC, 9 January 1874, p. 683.
- ¹⁸LJC, 6 September 1872, p. 312.
- ¹⁹LJC, 21 February 1873, p. 675.
- ²⁰Ha-Zefirah, 5 August 1874, p. 8.
- ²¹LJC, 16 May 1873, p. 109.
- ²²LJC, 11 September 1874, p. 378.
- ²³Ha-Zefirah, 18 November 1874, p. 147.
- ²⁴LJC, 16 August 1875, p. 322.
- ²⁵ibid., p. 322.
- ²⁶LJC, 29 October 1875, p. 500.
- ²⁷Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ²⁸LJC, 16 July 1880, p. 12.
- ²⁹LJC, 6 August 1880, p. 7.
- ³⁰Ha-Meliz, 3 Sivan 5641, p. 402.

- ³¹LJC, 20 May 1881, p. 9.
³²LJC, 2 September 1881, p. 12.
³³LJC, 21 January 1887, p. 14.

Leisure

- ¹LJC, 18 September 1874, p. 399.
²LJC, 15 August 1873, p. 335.
³LJC, 5 March 1875, p. 781.
⁴LJC, 30 December 1887, p. 12.
⁵LJC, 5 June 1874, p. 155.
⁶LJC, 5 March 1875, p. 781.
⁷LJC, 14 January 1881, p. 13.
⁸LJC, 20 February 1874, p. 783.
⁹Ha-Meliz, 23 Adar I 5641, p. 126.
¹⁰LJC, 20 February 1885, p. 8.
¹¹LJC, 19 August 1887, p. 5.
¹²LJC, 5 October 1860, p. 2.
¹³LJC, 25 October 1874, p. 406.
¹⁴LJC, 2 August 1872, p. 246.
¹⁵Ha-Zefirah, 13 Adar II 5641, p. 75.
¹⁶LJC, 20 September 1875, p. 335.
¹⁷LJC, 22 April 1887, p. 17.
¹⁸LJC, 8 September 1887, p. 13.
¹⁹LJC, 6 January 1860, p. 6.
²⁰LJC, 17 September 1880, p. 11.

- ²¹LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 2.
- ²²LJC, 20 March 1885, p. 11.
- ²³LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 2.
- ²⁴LJC, 20 February 1885, p. 8.
- ²⁵LJC, 3 September 1874, p. 887.
- ²⁶LJC, 10 June 1881, p. 7.
- ²⁷LJC, 26 August 1881, p. 12.
- ²⁸Ha-Meliz, 12 Elul 5641, p. 707.
- ²⁹LJC, 21 December 1860, p. 8.
- ³⁰LJC, 3 April 1874, p. 886.
- ³¹LJC, 16 May 1873, p. 109.
- ³²LJC, 20 February 1874, p. 783.
- ³³LJC, 3 April 1874, p. 886.
- ³⁴"Jellinek, Adolf, rabbi and scholar, b. Drslawich, Moravia, 1820 or 1825; d. Vienna, 1893. . . He was widely famous as a preacher." U.J.E.; s.v. "Jellinek, Adolf."
- ³⁵"Aguilar, Grace (1816-1847), English author of Portuguese Marrano extraction, who wrote a number of novels on Jewish themes and some religious works addressed primarily to Jewish women." E.J.; s.v. "Aguilar, Grace," by Cecil Roth.
- ³⁶LJC, 28 May 1875, p. 144.
- ³⁷LJC, 18 April 1873, p. 45.
- ³⁸LJC, 30 December 1887, p. 11.
- ³⁹LJC, 22 October 1880, p. 5.
- ⁴⁰LJC, 25 January 1887, p. 7.
- ⁴¹ibid., p. 7.

Religion: Reform Verses Orthodox

- ¹Ha-Meliz, 7 Kislev 5642, p. 913.
- ²Ha-Meliz, 3 Sivan 5641, p. 402.
- ³Ha-Zefirah, 29 Iyar 5622, p. 131.
- ⁴Ha-Zefirah, 18 Heshvan 5640, p. 324.
- ⁵Ha-Zefirah, 25 Sivan 5639, p. 173.
- ⁶Ha-Zefirah, 2 Adar II 5645, p. 48.
- ⁷Ha-Zefirah, 2 Av 5639, p. 213.
- ⁸LJC, 31 October 1873, p. 513.
- ⁹ibid., p. 509.
- ¹⁰LJC, 21 May 1880, p. 9.
- ¹¹LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 3.
- ¹²LJC, 3 February 1860, p. 8, and LJC, 9 March 1860, p. 6.
- ¹³LJC, 20 April 1860, p. 5.
- ¹⁴LJC, 18 July 1873, p. 267.
- ¹⁵LJC, 12 May 1882, p. 9.
- ¹⁶LJC, 19 September 1873, p. 410.
- ¹⁷LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 6.
- ¹⁸"Merzbacher, Leo (1810-1856), U.S. Reform Rabbi born in Fuerth, Bavaria." E.J., s.v. "Merzbacher, Leo," by Sefton D. Temkin.
- ¹⁹LJC, 27 January 1860, p. 6.
- ²⁰LJC, 1 June 1860, p. 5.
- ²¹LJC, 19 October 1860, p. 8.
- ²²LJC, 31 October 1873, p. 514.
- ²³LJC, 6 February 1874, p. 747.

- ²⁴LJC, 5 November 1880, pp. 3-4.
- ²⁵LJC, 13 February 1880, pp. 3-4.
- ²⁶LJC, 10 September 1880, p. 12.
- ²⁷LJC, 15 July 1881, p. 12.
- ²⁸ibid., p. 12.
- ²⁹LJC, 22 July 1881, pp. 5-6.
- ³⁰LJC, 16 January 1885, p. 5.
- ³¹LJC, 18 April 1873, p. 45.
- ³²LJC, 15 August 1873, p. 335.
- ³³ibid., p. 335.
- ³⁴LJC, 12 September 1873, p. 400.
- ³⁵Progressive revelation--a doctrine of Reform Judaism that "the revelation of the divine will is progressive and evolutionary.", U.J.E., s.v. "Revelation," by Abraham Shusterman.
- ³⁶LJC, 29 October 1880, p. 12.
- ³⁷LJC, 20 February 1874, p. 783.
- ³⁸LJC, 29 May 1885, p. 5.
- ³⁹LJC, 20 July 1860, p. 3.
- ⁴⁰LJC, 14 December 1860, p. 5.
- ⁴¹LJC, 3 July 1885, p. 15.
- ⁴²Abraham J. Feldman, ed., Remember the Days of Old, (Hartford: Congregation Beth Israel, 1943), p. 26.
- ⁴³LJC, 12 September 1873, p. 393.
- ⁴⁴LJC, 6 January 1860, p. 7.
- ⁴⁵LJC, 13 July 1860, p. 8.
- ⁴⁶LJC, 23 April 1880, p. 5.

- ⁴⁷LJC, 9 March 1860, p. 3.
- ⁴⁸LJC, 21 May 1875, p. 121.
- ⁴⁹LJC, 13 January 1882, p. 7.
- ⁵⁰LJC, 25 August 1882, p. 3.
- ⁵¹LJC, 22 April 1881, p. 9.

Religion: Organization

- ¹Ha-Zefirah, 14 Elul 5639, p. 258.
- ²Ha-Zefirah, 18 Heshvan 5640, p. 324.
- ³LJC, 17 September 1875, p. 397.
- ⁴LJC, 20 February 1885, p. 8.
- ⁵LJC, 22 May 1885, p. 12.
- ⁶LJC, 21 March 1873, p. 746.
- ⁷Ha-Zefirah, 4 Adar 5642, p. 34.
- ⁸Ha-Zefirah, 5 August 1874, p. 37.
- ⁹LJC, 9 March 1860, p. 6.
- ¹⁰LJC, 19 October 1872, p. 390.
- ¹¹LJC, 14 February 1881, p. 11.
- ¹²LJC, 17 September 1880, p. 11.
- ¹³LJC, 11 March 1887, p. 13.
- ¹⁴LJC, 2 September 1887, p. 11, and LJC, 7 October 1887, p. 13.
- ¹⁵Ha-Zefirah, 29 Iyar 5662, p. 130.
- ¹⁶ibid., p. 130.
- ¹⁷ibid., p. 131.
- ¹⁸ibid., p. 131.

- ¹⁹ ibid., p. 131.
- ²⁰ LJC, 9 November 1860, p. 8.
- ²¹ Ha-Zefirah, 5 Tammuz 5622, p. 171.
- ²² Ha-Meliz, 23 Adar I 5641, p. 126.
- ²³ LJC, 31 October 1873, p. 509.
- ²⁴ LJC, 14 October 1887, p. 12.
- ²⁵ LJC, 28 September 1860, p. 6.
- ²⁶ LJC, 23 April 1880, p. 11.
- ²⁷ LJC, 9 January 1874, p. 683.
- ²⁸ ibid., p. 683.
- ²⁹ LJC, 16 September 1881, p. 12.
- ³⁰ LJC, 1 November 1872, p. 425, and LJC, 18 July 1873, p. 267.
- ³¹ LJC, 10 April 1885, p. 6.
- ³² LJC, 3 February 1860, p. 3.
- ³³ ibid., p. 3.
- ³⁴ LJC, 27 April 1860, p. 2.
- ³⁵ LJC, 17 February 1860, p. 6.
- ³⁶ LJC, 7 June 1872, p. 141.
- ³⁷ ibid., p. 141.
- ³⁸ LJC, 8 May 1874, p. 93.
- ³⁹ ibid., p. 93.
- ⁴⁰ LJC, 11 September 1874, p. 378.
- ⁴¹ LJC, 16 August 1875, p. 322.
- ⁴² LJC, 16 July 1880, p. 12.
- ⁴³ ibid., p. 12.

⁴⁴LJC, 2 September 1881, p. 12.

⁴⁵LJC, 5 June 1874, pp. 155-156.

⁴⁶LJC, 14 January 1881, p. 13.

Conclusion

¹LJC, 10 August 1860, p. 2.

²LJC, 1 December 1882, p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

London Jewish Chronicle. London, 1860-1889.

Ha-Meliz. Odessa, 1860-1871; St. Petersburg, 1871-1889.

Ha-Zefirah. Warsaw, 1862; Berlin, 1874; Warsaw, 1875-1889.

Secondary Sources:

Encyclopedia Judaica, Jerusalem, Keter Publishing House, 1972.

Abraham J. Feldman, ed. Remember the Days of Old, Hartford, Congregation Beth Israel, 1943.

Albert M. Hyamson. A History of the Jews in England, London, Chatton and Windus, 1908.

Jewish Encyclopedia. New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1910.

William Langer, ed. An Encyclopedia of World History, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Rufus Lears. The Jew in America: A History, New York, Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1972.

Universal Jewish Encyclopedia. New York, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1948.