

PART ONE

Special Articles

A CENTURY OF JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

By Oscar and Mary F. Handlin

THE EVENTS of the Second World War left the United States the center of world Judaism. The answers to the most critical questions as to the future of the Jews everywhere will be determined by the attitudes and the position of the five million Jews who are citizens of the American Republic. This responsibility is alone a weighty burden. But it is not the only one borne by the Jews of the New World.

For while American Jews remain concerned with the fate of their distressed co-religionists elsewhere, they expect at the same time to continue to live where they are and to participate in the future, as they have in the past, in the development of the American way of life. They have the additional responsibility of playing a role, of taking an important place, among the many ethnic groups which together have shaped the culture of the United States.

Yet this group on which so much depends is relatively recent in origin. Its history on this side of the Atlantic reaches back scarcely a century. It is true that from time to time an occasional covert Jew appeared on the Spanish colonial scene in Mexico and to the South; and in the English possessions there were a few professing congregations. But the five million now here are not the offspring of the fifteen thousand or so who lived in the United States in the first decades of the nineteenth century. They are, rather, the descendants of the hundreds of thousands who have immigrated since then. How these newcomers, gathered from all the ends of Europe, of North Africa and of the Near East, settled in

the New World, and how they adjusted to its conditions determined the character of American Judaism. A proper comprehension of the nature of that process of settlement and adjustment is essential to the understanding of the character of the whole group, and of the society of which it is a part.

Unfortunately, the time has not yet come to write a complete history of the Jews, or of Jewish immigration to the United States. It has been characteristic of all immigrant peoples that they have turned their attention to chronicling their own past at a relatively late date, and the Jews have not been exceptional in that respect. Consequently, some of the most elementary data necessary for unraveling very important problems still are not accessible. Yet it may be useful in anticipation to gather, in as usable a form as is now possible, whatever materials are available and, without hope of being all-inclusive, to mark out what seem to be the dominant trends in a very complicated process.

THE SOURCES OF JEWISH IMMIGRATION

With few exceptions, the Jews who left their old homes to make new ones for themselves in the United States came from Europe. But even at departure they were by no means homogeneous as a group. Long centuries of development had cut apart the various remnants of Israel that survived in all parts of the continent, had perpetuated differences in customs and in position, and had left their mark in diversities that would be carried across the ocean to influence the growth of the community in America.

Divisions within European Jewry

Such divisions are not at all simple of definition. In a sense, every hamlet had its local peculiarities, every region its singularity. Often in the New World these immediate local differences were as important in the practical life of the immigrants as the more striking lines of division. But tra-

ditionally the Jews of Europe themselves accepted a number of major demarcations.

The old separation of Sephardic and Ashkenazic communities was still recognized and in some places was buttressed by the law. Small numbers of Sephardic Jews survived in Western Europe—in France, in Holland, in England, in Germany—as well as in southeastern Europe. Tracing their ancestry to Spanish and Portuguese exiles, these people in the West were few in numbers, high in social and economic status, and seemed in the nineteenth century not to have entered the stream of migration to the New World significantly.

More important was the situation that existed within the world of Ashkenazic Jewry, divided in the closing years of the eighteenth century into two main areas of settlement. A small minority lived in the West—in France and the Low Countries, in England and in southern Germany. A great majority, perhaps 80 per cent, lived in lands that were at one time or another parts of the Kingdom of Poland—Poland proper, Lithuania, White Russia and the Ukraine—and in the neighboring fringes of Hungary and Rumania.

The differences in the eighteenth century between the Jews of the West and those of the East were not geographic alone. The whole context of life in the two areas was dissimilar to a degree that markedly affected the social and cultural structure of each group.

At root was a fundamental divergence in economic experience. In the West long generations of enforced residence in a ghetto had defined the status of the Jews. There they were confined to a limited number of occupations, to usury and its accompanying forms of retailing—pawnbrokerage and the sale of second-hand goods. Generally, restrictions by the guilds kept these people out of the handicraft industries, and the hostility of the established merchants shut them off from the more remunerative forms of trade.

In the East, on the other hand, the position of the Jews was more favorable, although the golden age of Polish Jewry had barely survived the fury of Chmielnicki's Cossacks. There was no compulsory ghetto there. Unlike the West,

society in those regions was still dominated by a manorial economy. Emphasis on agriculture and the low level of exchange perpetuated a population that was overwhelmingly rural, a mass of peasants and a sprinkling of noble landlords. Without a substantial competing indigenous middle class, the Jews were free to enter a wide range of occupations, and managed to get along in the various branches of industry and commerce.

The divergence in economic position was complemented by a significant divergence in religious experience. The narrow life of the western Ghetto, walled off from the rest of society, set the conditions for a rigid religious formalism dominated by corporate communities, highly organized and controlled by the state. The Jews of the East were no less orthodox, but their orthodoxy was not divorced from the whole life of the world in which they lived. Favorable, relatively free conditions nurtured a rich communal life, at least until 1648. If conditions were less free and less favorable thereafter, there was a measure of compensation in the spirit of *Hasidism* (Jewish Pietism). The environment, physical and human, was often harsh and disorderly, oppression was no stranger, nor bitterness; but in this realm of small villages, of nobles and of peasants, Jewishness was not merely a yoke thrust on from without—it was a meaningful way of communal life. Even the *Mitnagdim*, the protestants who objected to the excess of mysticism in *Hasidism*, were touched by its influence in the very process of protesting.

Nineteenth Century Revolutions

Both in the East and in the West, the nineteenth century was a time of changes, changes which steadily imposed a common lot upon all Jews. In the West, a new era seemed already to have dawned in the glow of the enlightenment. The first signs came in fields that were broadly cultural and intellectual. The fresh currents of eighteenth century ideas of natural human goodness and natural human rights tended

to minimize religious differences and to stress instead common ethical principles. In a reciprocal influence that was to last more than a century, Christian thinkers stressed the rights of Jews to equality, while Jews of all ranks found the whole world of non-Jewish thought and activity increasingly attractive and increasingly accessible.

The cultural walls between Jew and gentile had hardly been breached when the ghetto itself was razed. Out of the French Revolution came a series of radical impulses that everywhere in western Europe transformed the place of the Jews in society. To begin with, the whole conception of natural rights made it hard to justify the invidious discriminations under which Jews labored. Furthermore, a new view of nationality emerged from the Revolution and in that theory there was no place for the separate, autonomous communities in which the Jew had once lived. Citizenship was tied to nationality and whatever differences were considered to exist between Jews and other citizens were deemed to be religious only. Jews ceased to occupy a special position as members of a national community within the territory of France and Germany; they became Frenchmen and Germans of Jewish religion. At the same time, Church and State were progressively being separated, and a new tolerance gave these citizens all the rights of their neighbors. The transformation did not come all at once. But the trend was unmistakable and steadily worked itself out in France and England, in Germany and in the Austrian empire.

Emancipation in this political sense was accompanied by relaxation of many economic restrictions. A wide range of new opportunities opened up to the Jews. The Revolution in France and the aftermath of revolution in the rest of western Europe destroyed the power of the old guilds and enabled the Jews to penetrate many forms of enterprise hitherto closed to them. Meanwhile, unparalleled economic growth in trade and in industry created a state of flux in which there was the opportunity for improvement of the material condition of the Jews.

These changes were not confined to the political limits

of the western European states; their influence permeated eastward through the whole of the continent. The times were certainly propitious. For by now the Jews of the East were entering upon a long period of instability and uncertainty. Their position was decidedly weakened by the decline of the old economic order and by the rise of trade which brought along with it a competing Christian middle class.

The security of the Jews in the East was further threatened by the partition of the Kingdom of Poland in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The largest portion of eastern Jewry then fell under the sway of the Czar; and the Romanoff autocrat was not disposed to make the concessions that had once been granted by the laxer regimes of Poland, Lithuania and the Ukraine.

While this partition of Poland subjected so many to Russia, it also brought a portion of eastern Jewry under the sovereignty of German rulers who at that very time were ameliorating the condition of their subjects. In Prussian Posen, in Austrian Galicia, large bodies of eastern Jews became conscious of the advantages of what was happening in the West. Through them the western influences were transmitted eastward, even across the border into Russia.

The attractiveness of the new conditions in the West, coinciding with the deterioration of the situation in the East, created a magnetic pull that drew large numbers of eastern Jews through Germany to France and England, through Bohemia and Hungary to the heart of Austria. Emigration was, of course, easiest from the Polish provinces of Prussia and Austria, but it was by no means confined to these regions, for until almost the end of the nineteenth century, political boundaries were not serious barriers to the enterprising.

Furthermore, the same changes generated an intellectual force that spread eastward to affect even those Jews who remained in their old homes. The new economic and cultural conditions were weakening the old communal institutions and were provoking thought as to what should be the situation

of the Jews in the modern world. Now it seemed as if at last the Jews would no longer be destined to remain isolated, would come to grips with all the social and intellectual problems of modern life. The ideas of the enlightenment, of the *haskalah*, spread eastward and penetrated into all the districts of Jewry. The revival of Hebrew, the growth of Jewish nationalism, the participation of Jews in radical movements and in Zionism and their interest in the culture of the outside world—all these were in some measure responses to the challenge of the enlightenment. In the West, the ghetto walls had crumbled and it was not long before the integrity of the Jewish community was similarly disrupted in the furthest reaches of Poland, White Russia and the Ukraine.

These events did not occur in a vacuum. The Jews were no longer isolated and did not escape now, if they ever had, the effects of very general economic pressures that were coming to play upon the whole society in which they lived. Beginning in England late in the eighteenth century, and then spreading through France and Germany to central and eastern Europe, a profound revolution reorganized the industrial life of the continent. Everywhere, great capitalist factories, manned by a wage-earning proletariat and run by power, replaced the old independent workshop of the artisan who toiled by hand. Everywhere, large farms operated by hired labor and machines took the place of the small peasant holdings. And everywhere, a vast network of railroads and steamship lines, a complicated commercial and credit system, knit together the structure of a new world economy.

The shock of these cataclysmic transformations jolted millions of people out of their accustomed positions. First to be displaced were the artisans whose skills lost their value as more efficient mechanical competitors turned out enormous quantities of cheap goods. They were followed, usually after a decade or so, by peasants ejected from ancestral acres to make way for more effective techniques of production. All these uprooted persons had to find new

homes, some in the rising cities, others across the seas in foreign lands.

The Jews, too, were affected by the change. Their old economic position, precarious at best, and in any case changing, quickly became altogether untenable. For under the conditions of the transformed system of production the Jews could not maintain their accustomed role. In the West, many farmers, artisans and petty retailers in the small towns—the Jews among them—were compelled to change their way of making a living. In the East, as the peasants were displaced, the Jews, who lived by dealing with them, became superfluous. By 1900, in Galicia where the situation was extreme, for every ten peasants there was one Jewish trader trying to scratch out a living; the average value of the stocks of these merchants came to some twenty dollars. Clearly, most of them would have to seek a livelihood in some other fashion.

But this general economic change was far from the only difficulty. Not only was there less opportunity where they were, but at the very same time, the number of Jews grew phenomenally, at a rate even higher than the incredible increase in the total population. The two million Jews estimated to be living in Europe in 1800 more than tripled in the course of the century that followed, and continued to grow in the three decades after 1900, despite losses by emigration and disasters, war and pogroms, conversion and intermarriage.

With more hands and less need of them in the old towns and villages, some movement was inevitable if whole communities were not to sink further into abject poverty. But before large masses of people were willing to migrate, the bonds that tied them to the places where they were born had to be loosened. In a psychological sense, that was achieved by the influence of the enlightenment that freed many Jews from the forces of local communal authority. Emancipation, or even the consciousness that emancipation was possible, generated a desire for improvement that sometimes amounted to a virulent fever and infected whole districts. In a phys-

ical sense it was achieved by the growth of trade and the spread of railroads and shipping lines that made movement easier.

Jewish Migrations

Since the impact of both the enlightenment and of the growth of trade, as well as of the underlying economic changes, was felt first in the West and then in the East, the movement of people followed the same order.

The transfer of Jewish population was, however, no simple matter. Actually, three distinct currents were involved. First was a migration from small towns to the large cities where the new commercial and industrial opportunities were to be found. In these years, large Jewish agglomerations were built up in London and Paris, Berlin and Vienna, Budapest and Bucharest, Lodz and Warsaw, Odessa and Kharkov. The seven largest German cities in 1816 held 7 per cent of the Jews in the country, 50 per cent a hundred years later. At the same time there was a shift of population from East to West, from the less to the more developed industrial regions. The century saw a substantial rise in the number of foreign Jews in England, France and Germany.

But in the midst of all this shuffling about there were some Jews who desired a break that was even more complete, people who had had enough of the Old World and were eager to find a New. Perhaps a taste of emancipation and enlightenment had shown them there was not emancipation or enlightenment enough in Europe. Certainly, opportunities were more readily to be found across the Atlantic. Increasingly, those who sought a change found it by leaving the continent altogether. The movement away grew steadily more pronounced until, in the nine years before the first World War, one and a quarter million Jews, one-seventh of all those in Europe, left that continent.

Great numbers took the same road as other displaced Europeans and came to America. For those who made the total break, there were, from time to time, alternatives—

South America, South Africa and Palestine—which attracted Zionists and, earlier, the participants in the (proto-Zionist-Russian) *Bilu* movement. But through the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries the United States consistently attracted the largest number. For most Jews on the move, the land of opportunity was across the Atlantic. In that respect, they were like all other peoples in the stream of emigration away from Europe.

These were the elemental forces that carried the flow of Jewish immigrants to America. Occasionally, specific local conditions accelerated or retarded the movement. Political and civic discrimination, such as the limitation upon the number of marriages in Bavaria, stimulated the exodus from southwestern Germany in the 1840's. Pogroms, products of peasant unrest and government encouragement, in 1881, 1899 and 1905, hurried Jews away from Rumania and Russia. Cholera and famine, as in 1869, had the same effect. And in the Czar's domains persecution, compulsory military service and the confinement of Jews to the Pale of Settlement produced a similar outcome; the Jew in Russia could not move to Moscow as easily as the Jew in Prussia to Berlin, and therefore was more likely to leave the country altogether.

But such incidental factors did not significantly alter the general contours of the movement. Persecution alone drove no one away; the bitter policy of the Hapsburgs in Galicia in the first half of the nineteenth century created no exiles. On the other hand, when the volume of emigration increased after 1870, it was as high in Austria, where there were no pogroms and where government policy was by then relatively liberal, as in Russia where the reverse was true. The curve of Jewish immigration to the United States runs remarkably parallel to that of general immigration to America, and that indicates that the decisive forces were the general ones common to the whole movement. The same economic revolutions that had destroyed the economic position of millions of other European artisans and peasants forced the Jews, too, to move.

Streams of Immigration

While the movement had an overall continuity, it may meaningfully be divided into two periods which differed in terms of rate and emphasis. Before 1870, emigration was western, not in the sense that the emigrants were all natives of western states, but in the sense that they were dominated by western, and particularly by German, influences. Whatever the nationality of these Jews, they either lived under German monarchs, or unavoidably spent a greater or lesser period in some German state in the process of transit, or had been swayed by German conceptions of emancipation in the course of breaking with the Old World. In this period the total number of Jewish immigrants was low, somewhere between two and four hundred thousand in all. (The statistics of immigration in these years are hopelessly inaccurate; any more specific figure is no more than a guess.)

After 1870

After 1870, emigration was overwhelmingly eastern. Germans continued to come, of course, but as the nineteenth century drew to a close, economic changes released much larger numbers from central and Russian Europe. Furthermore, the development of railway and steamship lines, which sold through tickets good from the point of origin to the final destination, eliminated the occasion for a German experience for transients; travelers less frequently found themselves stranded by exhausted funds. Finally, the disruptive influences of emancipation were so completely diffused that now it was not the exceptional man alone who was influenced by Germany, but all were affected by it. Now it was not only the unusual intellectuals, the *maskilim*, who thought of a new departure in Jewish life; even the most orthodox were aware that conditions could not continue as they were.

These latter years were different in orientation in another sense. The Jews had been a minority among the emigrants

from Germany, far outnumbered by non-Jewish artisans and traders. But in Eastern Europe the Jews were almost alone in those pursuits and were first to move; in Galicia, for instance, where Jews were only 12 per cent of the population, they supplied 60 per cent of the immigrants between 1881 and 1890. Peasants from that part of the continent later came in large numbers, but not until after 1890. The fact that these Jews arrived first would significantly influence the course of their Americanization.

The numbers involved in the second period of Jewish immigration were also much larger. In a single year, 1906, more than 150,000 arrived in the United States, more than had come in any decade before the Civil War. Between 1870 and 1914, the entries mounted up to more than two million, of whom more than 60 per cent originated in Russia, and more than 20 per cent in Austria-Hungary.

Outside the main stream of Jewish immigration from Europe were a number of supplementary currents that added almost fifty thousand "Oriental" Jews. Natives of Greece and Turkey, Syria and Morocco, their languages Greek, Arabic and Ladino, they joined co-religionists in the New World with whom they had had little contact for half a millennium.

The World War caused an interruption; less than a hundred thousand reached America during the conflict. But Jewish immigration seemed about to flow again when a quarter-million crossed the Atlantic in the four years after 1920. Then suddenly the whole movement was choked off by a reversal of the traditional American attitude toward immigration in general.

A growing fear of foreigners, stimulated by the nationalistic passions of the war years, led between 1920 and 1924 to the enactment of legislation which curtailed the number of entrants drastically. What was more, the limitation was imposed in terms of a quota system based on nativity that excluded almost all Southern and Eastern-European newcomers, among whom were the great bulk of prospective Jewish immigrants.

In 1927, a new law further reduced the number for whom the gates remained open, and in 1930, an executive order effectively stopped up the remaining chinks in the wall around the promised land. Although there were occasional relaxations in individual cases, the barriers in general were insurmountable. A whole epoch in American history had come to a close.

The new policy had far-reaching effects upon the economic and social structure of the country. It also had the unfortunate incidental effect of shutting off the United States as a refuge for those who might otherwise have fled, after 1933, from the persecutions of the Nazis in Germany and the reactionary governments of Poland, Hungary and Rumania. In practice, while hundreds of thousands who waited were ruined and before long killed, only thousands were admitted. In the twelve years between Hitler's rise to power and fall, only 170,000 found sanctuary in America.

By then the American Jewish population was formed. The total had grown from twenty thousand in 1848, to several hundred thousand (perhaps two, perhaps as much as six) in 1870, to approximately five million in 1948—immigrants and the children of immigrants, brought by war, persecution, and most of all—what was true of all immigrants—by the fundamental economic dislocation of modern times.

THE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

A few, very few, Jews were among the representatives of European banking houses that extended their operations to America in the period that included the Civil War. But most Jews, like most other immigrants, were not so fortunate; they rarely came with substantial stores of capital, and seldom had direct personal or business connections in America. How well off they were at the start may be gauged by the fact that in the 1850's between 10 and 20 per cent of those in New York were assisted by the Jewish charities. For all these people the first concern had to be that of finding

a way to earn a livelihood. All had quickly to cope with the problem of how to adapt the skills and training of the Old World to the need of making a living under the strange conditions of the New.

Commerce

Among the migrants of the first half-century were many who had been accustomed to carrying on trade at home either as petty retailers in the West or as intermediaries between the life of the peasants and the life of the towns in the East. Many of these people found opportunities for similar kinds of business in the United States.

The simplest kind of commerce was that transacted from out of the peddler's pack. The conduct of such an enterprise required little capital, only the ability to work hard for a slight margin of return. The peddler found his market, in the first instance, among other immigrants, who were accustomed to dealing in this manner with itinerant traders in Europe, and who were reluctant to enter into complicated relationships with the more formal one-price native shops and stores. But the peddler could also extend his clientele, take in other residents of the city. Shouldering his *pak tores*, his bag of woes, he wandered into strange districts, edging into trolley cars, braving the taunts and stones of boys and their elders, avoiding the signs, "No Beggars or Peddlers Allowed," making goods available.

Even more important, he could carry his trade to the people who lived on farms, people who had some money to spend, but little opportunity for traveling to a distant city in the poor state of communications. Landing in the various seaports along the Atlantic coast, the Jewish peddler soon got his start and made his way into the interior where he became a familiar figure, matching his wares and his wits with Yankee, Irish and German competitors.

We will never know how many scraped by at these businesses without ever advancing in wealth, and grew old without security; and how many more were failures, forced

back upon charity, men who joined the ranks of the *schmorrers*, the beggars, the tramps, the hoboos, who wandered from town to town, living off the gifts of the local synagogues anxious to be rid of them. Generally, we hear only of the more fortunate.

The successful found peddling a temporary expedient and soon accumulated surplus enough to transform the pack into a settled retail establishment. There was certainly room for such undertakings under the conditions of the American economy. The westward movement yearly brought into being scores of new towns that were eager to be served in this manner, places where newcomers were welcome. In his journeyings the wandering peddler often hit upon just such a likely place, decided to stay and sent for his family. It was not long before the length and breadth of the land was dotted with these enterprises, general stores and groceries, drygood's stores, shoe, clothing, hardware and every other kind of store.

They also found similar opportunities in the expanding cities. Here, too, there was growth and a demand for new services. As the heart of the city became more densely populated and as the city itself spread outward, engulfing suburb after suburb, the whole pattern of retail trading changed, and immigrant shopkeepers played an important role in that change. Some commodities—dry goods, for instance—had always been distributed through retail establishments; there was now more demand for dealers in such products. But many other articles had not been exchanged in this manner. Food and fuel were thus brought by farmers directly to markets where consumers could come and buy. Most articles of clothing and furniture were made to order. For such commodities only the poor, who were willing to wear and use second-hand goods and who could not afford either the money or the storage space to buy in quantity, went to a shop where the cast-off, the misfit and the second-hand were stored. Since the poor were mostly immigrants who preferred to trade with other immigrants and since, in any case, natives shunned such peripheral

trades, the shops were kept by immigrants, the Jews among them.

Expansion of the cities, however, made many other people dependent upon the same shops. Sooner or later, local farmers could no longer bring their produce to market, for many foodstuffs came from far-off places; houses were smaller and had less storage space; and ready-made replaced custom-made articles. The business of the shopkeeper increased enormously and, in this case, the immigrant was there first and thrived correspondingly.

The forty years or so after 1840 marked the high point of this development, a development which created attractive new opportunities for the arriving Jews. After 1880, the virgin opportunities were gone and ever greater sums of capital were necessary to make a start. Nevertheless, the same process often brought success to those who began with humble resources. The way from pushcart in the Ghetto market to chromium and plate glass on Main Street remained open so long as the economy was expanding. Not a few, both then and later, built their businesses into substantial enterprises, adding department after department to the original store. Others remained at a more modest level. Still others came to the dead-ends of bankruptcy and failure. Still, this was perhaps the most satisfactory means of economic adjustment; it involved hard work and insecurity, but it enabled the Jewish immigrant gradually to adjust his old habits to his new situation in life. In the store he had the boss's sense of independence; he had the dignity of a man who could take time off to observe the Sabbath; and he had the comfort of preserving the family structure, for in these enterprises the whole family worked together.

Retail trade had many ramifications. Some who started in such businesses occasionally extended their activities to other phases of distribution. There were many new opportunities in wholesaling, jobbing and brokerage. Dealers in second-hand goods were likely to become auctioneers and to undertake to handle waste products, and many invested on the side in real estate. The same process could even be the means for

entering manufacturing, notably in the clothing, cigar and furniture industries, where fabrication first developed as an adjunct of distribution. But these were only the points of largest concentration. In the rapid expansion of new industry after 1870 there was room for enterprising and hard-working Jews in many other spheres as well.

Clothing Industries

Every manufacturer found his new factories unceasingly dependent upon the immigrant labor that manned his new machines, and that by its very availability made possible the phenomenal growth of industry. The last two decades of the nineteenth century saw for the first time the emergence of an extensive Jewish proletariat in the United States to take its place beside the Irish, German, English and native laborers. Earlier there had been a number of artisans who had transplanted their skills from the Old World to the New. But the wage-earning unskilled worker was a stranger to American Jewry until well after the Civil War.

This development was a product of the increased rate of immigration. The enormous numbers, rising steadily after 1870, could be absorbed in no other way. Moreover, the nature of the arrival encouraged the tendency to take employment in factories. In these years, a noticeable concentration in shipping routes and shipping lines brought an ever-larger proportion of Jewish newcomers to the single port of New York who were less able to break away from the place in which they landed. At the turn of the century, they brought with them an average of only eight dollars a head and faced the stark necessity of finding work to keep themselves alive.

Like the Irish and other earlier immigrants in a similar position, the Jews turned to a rapidly expanding industry, the garment trades. (The value of products in the ready-made women's clothing industry rose 133 per cent in the decade 1890-1900.) They did so not by virtue of any inherent proclivity for the needle or because of previous training, but because here was a constant demand for cheap labor. Most

of these were "Columbus tailors" wedded to the "Katrinka" (sewing machine) after they reached the land of Columbus.

Some Jews were already active in the clothing industries as manufacturers and were able to take on large numbers of immigrants as workers. In New York, in Philadelphia, in Boston and, to a lesser degree, in Chicago, thousands of Jews found at the end of their long journey, the shears, the iron and the treadle of the sewing machine. Bound thereafter to those tools, they toiled to clothe a nation. By 1890, well over 13,000 were so employed on the East Side of New York alone, and for two decades more, their numbers grew steadily, as one *landsmann* taught another, as relatives introduced their "greeners" to the same occupations.

Low wages were characteristic of the industry; for that matter, they were characteristic of all branches of manufacturing that employed unskilled labor. Still, the harsh fact was that before 1910 a man's work in the garment trades was not likely to bring him more than twelve dollars a week—when he worked. And then there were the long periods when he did not work, the slack seasons and the weeks of unemployment. It was an inescapable condition of the new life that the earnings of a single breadwinner could not be depended upon to keep a household going; the women had to work, and the children, too.

This circumstance made it somewhat easier for the immigrant to accept the ignominies of the sweating system and homework. Since in any case all the family's hands had to serve, it was better that the family should work together as a unit with their own kind under circumstances that made it possible to observe the Sabbath. In the crowded tenement quarters, dimly lighted whether by sun or lamp, the yards of cloth mounted up in heaps, waiting for tired fingers to fashion them into the New World's clothing.

By the abstract measurements of health and sanitation this was worse than the factory. But the laborers had no choice. Increasingly, factory owners relied upon outside contractors and kept in the workshop only the very skilled tasks, beyond the skill of most immigrants, like cutting. The manufacturer

could thus divorce himself from responsibility for the conditions under which garments were made in the tenements. He could also squeeze the competing contractors who, in turn, squeezed the too-eager workers a little more. The employees knew well enough that the boss steadily manipulated piecework rates to lower the returns. They liked the filth in which they lived and slaved no better than the inspectors. They felt the hunger, the shame of it all more keenly than any social investigator. But they were trapped.

Or almost trapped. Toiling as they did in the tenement, at home or near the home, they clung to the illusion of independence. Their working day was long, it was true. But perhaps if they worked a little harder, they could finally break through the darkness into the golden land of dreams. And indeed, for some there was a shred of reality behind the illusion. Often enough to keep hope alive, the more fortunate were able to throw off their wage-earning status and become "business men." Not the pressers, indeed; these, by common reputation, were uniformly a dull lot; but the ambitious cloak-maker could aspire to edge in as a contractor in the highly morselized organization of the industry.

Although some labored days without end at the same trade, others succeeded in becoming employers or in leaving the industry altogether. After 1900, a larger proportion of the unskilled tasks fell to the lot of still-newer immigrants, Poles and Bohemians in Chicago, Italians in New York, Armenians in Boston. The trend became even more pronounced after World War I. By 1948, in many branches of the garment industries into which so many Jewish tears and hopes were sewn, Jewish workers were distinctly in the minority.

That so many immigrants were lumped in this single field of manufacturing must not obscure the fact that many others found work elsewhere, sometimes because of the special skills they had brought with them—more often, through the accident of acquaintanceship that revealed an opening or gave access to a shop or trade. Some rolled cigars, at home or in shops. Some labored in the building industry, for wages if they had to, or preferably for hire, as independent painters, glaziers,

and carpenters. Still others found their living in the printing trades, in the fabrication of jewelry, in the amusement business, and in a wide variety of jobs as clerks and salespeople—almost everywhere, indeed, except in heavy manufacturing, in mining and in agriculture.

Agriculture

There were, in fact, determined but largely unsuccessful efforts to induce Jews to take up farming as a vocation. Long before the Civil War, Jewish projects for settlement on the land had been started and failed. Major Noah had dreamed of Ararat, and Moses Cohen's Shalom had actually come into being for a brief period. In 1843, Julius Stern had contrived a great scheme, and eight years later, B'nai B'rith had sponsored the Hebrew Agricultural Society to aid would-be husbandmen. So that, when Jacob Schiff and Michael Heilprin suggested in the 1880's that agriculture was the solution to the immigrants' problems, they were only following long precedent, in accord with the American conception of a good life and in accord with the Jews' own aspirations.

Not a few idealistic young people, particularly in Russian cities like Kiev and Odessa, dissatisfied with the kind of life their folk had led in the Old World, came to the United States with the firm intention of becoming more productive, of getting closer to the soil. Thus, in 1882, several groups of the organization, Am Olam, came to America and founded agricultural settlements at Sicily Island, Louisiana, Cremieux, South Dakota and New Odessa, Oregon. In a major effort the Hebrew Immigrants' Aid Society also settled several hundred families in the towns of Alliance, Carmel and Rosenhayn, New Jersey, and in Catopaxi, Colorado, that year. The Baron de Hirsch Fund founded the nearby colony of Woodbine, New Jersey, in 1891, and the same agency stood ready to make loans and to give advice to any would-be farmers. Meanwhile, the Jewish Colonization Association actively planned settlements that would enable organized groups of immigrants to make agricultural careers for them—

selves. The Yiddish press regularly added its encouragement. Lest traditional prejudices stand in the way, the *Morning Journal* in 1914 pointed out that the American farmers "are similar to the small noblemen of our old home rather than to the degraded and oppressed peasants."

The sum total of all these efforts was remarkably slim; by 1912, there were less than 4,000 Jewish families on the land. Whatever allowances must be made for poorly chosen sites and for the unforeseen calamities of nature, the fact remains that Jewish immigrants were not tempted by the reality involved in being "small noblemen." The intellectuals were quickly discouraged, and the others failed to make a living. Despite the fact that subsidized industries were brought in to furnish supplementary income, the colonies in New Jersey fell off dishearteningly; the 300 families there in 1882 were only 200 ten years later, and only 76 in 1896. Where the effort took root and flourished, it was in specialized forms of commercial agriculture—dairying, with which some immigrants had had experience in the Old Country, poultry-raising, and summer-boarder farming. All these activities were carried on in the vicinity of the big cities; consequently, New Jersey, New York State and New England held all but a few of the Jewish husbandmen.

The failure of these efforts was significant. There was no aversion to the land; Jews on the contrary tended to over-idealize it. But positive cultural and economic factors stood in the way. Apart from the very general discouragements of isolation and loneliness and, outside the colonies, the difficulties of Orthodox observance, Jewish immigrants found this form of life unsatisfactory. For them the crucial test was that their children were discontented and eager to be off to be trained, either for the technical and scientific aspects of farming or for the general opportunities of the city. Nor was that trend surprising in a period when even the children of native American farmers were deserting the family homesteads for the attractions of the towns, when the percentage of economically active Americans in agriculture fell from 50 per cent in 1870 to 20 per cent in 1940.

Heavy Industry

In part at least, the seeming absence of opportunity accounts for the unwillingness of Jewish immigrants to enter heavy industry. Not that long days and nights at labor in the service of the sewing machine was any easier, or the drudgery of candy or grocery store. But the few guided to the steel mill, railroad or mine saw no purpose in hand-to-mouth living, no prospect of improving their own status or that of their children, of becoming a real American boss. "A Russian student," recorded a social worker, "beat his way to Cincinnati from the mines, on a freight train. Eating nothing for two days but coffee grains which he found in the box car, he was almost famished. One year later he was part owner in the hot tamale trust."

Professions

The enormous expansion of professional occupations after 1890 also seized the imagination of many Jews. To the extent that doctors and dentists, teachers and lawyers were more often trained in schools rather than by apprenticeship, and more often appointed by examination than by favor, these professions became free—that is, open to ability rather than to personal or family contacts. Here indeed was a purpose worth slaving for. To some immigrants the goal seemed close enough to be reached personally; by 1905, there were almost 500 Russian Jewish doctors in New York City alone. Many more transferred their hopes to the next generation, and toiled in the exciting faith that they would be opening doors for their children.

PROBLEMS OF METROPOLITAN LIVING

For all Jewish newcomers, as for almost all other immigrants to the United States, settlement involved one very fundamental change. Behind them they left the little towns and

tiny villages, places where even a ghetto was not cut off from the open countryside. Before them were the narrow passages of the great cities, stoned in from the sight of nature, and crammed to bursting with people and objects. Only the few who had had an earlier experience in one of the European urban centers were prepared for this life. Most had only passing glimpses of the seaports, as they moved through London or Liverpool, Hamburg or Bremen.

Yet an ever larger proportion of the Jewish immigrants was destined to spend its days in the great American metropolitan regions. After 1890, about two-thirds of the Jews in the country consistently resided in the four largest cities, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston. In that period, New York alone embraced about one-half of the total.

New York

This concentration was in part due to the fact that to an ever larger degree the transatlantic shipping lines tended to converge upon the port on the Hudson. Given the circumstance of their coming, roughly three-fourths of the Jews who landed at Castle Garden or Ellis Island perforce stayed in New York, stayed where they could immediately and most profitably dispose of their labor, get higher wages and live at lower costs.

From this massive accumulation New York developed its uniqueness in American Jewish life. Here was scope enough for the emergence of the whole range of communal institutions and activities; in this vast body were enough resources to support synagogues and charities, newspapers and schools, theaters and societies. That fact alone made this city the focal point of group life in the whole nation. From this profusion of organizations and publications there radiated an influence that to some degree affected the Jews in the farthest corners of the land. In addition, who in America did not have some contact, or the memory of a contact, with the Knickerbocker metropolis? Everyone passed through at one time or another, had at least a cousin living there.

Concentration

In respect to the fullness of social and institutional life, the other cities followed New York on a decreasing scale, according to the size of their Jewish population. The Philadelphia community boasted a long history, had once been the largest in the United States and grew rapidly with continued immigration. Metropolitan Boston and Chicago had a more recent Jewish development; large-scale settlement did not come until after 1840, but then multiplied quickly. By 1940, these cities each numbered 200,000 Jews or more.

In all these places, there was a high proportion of wage earners among the immigrants; and the adjustment to urban living involved particularly grave problems for them. The cities, half-formed, and in any case suffering from growing pains, simply could not absorb so many newcomers, especially impecunious ones. How could the resources of housing expand fast enough to shelter the 9,000,000 additional souls that were added to New York and Chicago alone in the seventy years after 1870? With the demand so great, the Jews, like other immigrants, for many years were compelled to get by with unhappy makeshifts.

In each of the great cities there was an area of primary settlement: the lower East Side in New York, the West Side in Chicago, the North End in Boston, downtown in Philadelphia. Here each successive wave of newcomers had found accommodations of a sort. Here low rental quarters were available to Jews, as the Irishmen and Germans who had formerly lived here improved their position and moved away.

Density of population was the most striking characteristic of these regions. In the East Side of New York, in 1916, were fully 700,000 Jews, to say nothing of Italians, Irishmen and members of other nationalities. Naturally, land was at a premium. In New York and Boston, the high value of every square foot led to the erection of tenement houses, towering six- or eight-story structures which utilized every inch so cunningly that twenty-four to forty families, one hundred to three hundred people, could reside in a plot twenty by one

hundred. In Philadelphia and Chicago, cities not so completely hemmed in by water, there was more room to spread out in, and the tall tenement was not as common. Instead, there was a tendency to convert old frame houses and warehouses, to put one building in the yard of another, and to run alleys blind in the process of using up unused space.

Health

Whatever the variations among them, all such quarters were characterized by a common poverty, and by miserable sanitary conditions. Conveniences that were not known in the Old Country were not "missed." But here, the consequences of not having them were disastrous. In the narrow, crowded rooms, dirt crept up on the family, despite the unavailing efforts of the housewife, oppressed with so many other unfamiliar tasks. In the winter, a bitter cold swept into the unheated flats and brought sufferings that were only matched by the effects of the stinking heat of summer.

It was a hard life, yet most survived it. The death rate for Jews in these districts was not higher than that for comparable age-groups elsewhere. Tuberculosis was less frequent than among other immigrants, although as the slums took their toll, the Jewish rate began to rise steadily until the 1920's. Physically, the most pronounced effect seemed to be an inclination toward nervous diseases, perhaps a consequence of the unending struggle against insecurity. Yet there was no leaning toward drunkenness; at most, a kind of characteristic addiction to good food, to tobacco and to gambling. They were poor people, with some even poorer than the rest, so there were some paupers among them. They lived hemmed in by violence and produced a few gangsters, but not so many as to disturb the whole body; criminality rates on the whole were low.

Family Life

What seems to have furnished a saving balance was the fact that family life was sound enough to preserve an element

of stability and cultural health. There were shocks in plenty to rock the family: the lack of space; the obligation of women and children to work; the presence of boarders who helped make up the rent but also consumed valuable space; and the husbands here and there, discouraged and discontented, despairing of ever being able to cope with those bitter obligations, who went out on some errand and never returned. Though for a time the desertion problem was a serious one, the percentage was small, and not alone because of lack of courage. These people generally came in family units and clung together; if the wife was a *tsore* (affliction), children were always a blessing. With that bastion for security, the ghetto was tolerable, even had its compensations.

Here a man was not so much alone among strangers; he was safe among his own kind. This place was close to work, a factor which saved precious carfare. And here were all the familiar institutions that eased the adjustment to new conditions—the synagogue and ritual bath, the Jewish theater and the kosher butcher. Certainly, for the women it was easier to shop on Hester or on Maxwell Streets than to risk contacts with foreign ways and foreign goods.

For the immigrant, then, the area of primary settlement was often tolerable. But he soon learned that it was not himself alone he had to think of. The effect of such a life was harsh on his children, particularly on those born in America. Scornful of the discipline of the school, with parental authority weakened by the stigma of foreignness, driven into the streets because there was no room in the home, boys and girls grew up wild. They went off to work at a young age as newsboys or in shops, where no one knew what influences played upon them. The rate of juvenile delinquency may have been low in comparison with some other immigrant peoples, but it was high enough; and even parents who did not read the cold statistics knew their children were pagans, in danger of being lost. Besides, this environment seemed to them to be no place in which to marry off a daughter.

Movement

As the American generation grew up, the immigrant parents thought of moving. If they did not think of it, the children called it to their attention. They did not flee the ghetto. Far from it; they rather sought a place to which they could take the ghetto with them. First they went to a contiguous area, say across the bridge to Williamsburg or over to Harlem, or to the other side of Boston and Chicago, the West End and South Side. Then, if they possessed the resources, they became interested in something better; they looked for space and fresh air, and the sight of a bit of green. Only now they had to move farther out, avoiding the intermediate settlements of other ethnic groups. Now trolley lines and subways carried them out to Brownsville and the Bronx, Dorchester and Chelsea and with them went the *shul* (synagogue) and candy store. Here one could live in a two-family house or a triple-decker, join a land association and perhaps become a landlord, even have the luxury of a yard—for a while, that is. For a whole army followed the first comers; the suburb too filled up, and there were further extensions, in Borough Park and Flatbush, Brookline and Lawndale. By 1926, the number of Jews in the East Side of New York had fallen from the 700,000 of 1916 to 500,000.

If the leaders of the Jewish community in 1900 could have looked ahead a quarter of a century, they would have judged that development good. For in the early days, as population accumulated in New York and Philadelphia, there was a vivid fear that the consequences might be socially, physically and economically disastrous. Already in 1850, New York philanthropists were planning to shift a "surplus" of population to Illinois. In the 1880's, the United Hebrew Charities spent a good deal of energy encouraging removals, and after 1890 a national committee for ameliorating the conditions of the Russian refugees labored to distribute the newcomers throughout the country.

By 1900, with the trend toward concentration unabated, there was positive terror at the degrading conditions in the

Ghetto. The report of the United Hebrew Charities of New York City that year cried out for relief, and, partly in response, B'nai B'rith embarked upon a program of distributing the new arrivals through the interior. In 1901, the effort was formalized with the establishment of the Industrial Removal Office, with branches in Philadelphia and Boston, aided by the Baron de Hirsch Fund. Five years later came still another project; with the influential backing of Jacob Schiff there was an attempt to divert immigrant shipping to the port of Galveston, closer to the geographical center of the United States. All these valiant exertions distributed a few; but the four or five thousand subtracted each year made no noticeable difference in the metropolitan accumulations.

These organized drives failed to achieve more removals than they did (between 1901 and 1912 the Industrial Removal Office sent 59,729 people to 1,474 towns out of New York) because they focused on moving the wage-earner who was better off near the source of employment in the largest cities. A contemporary pointed out, "The progress made by this movement is controlled almost exclusively by economic conditions. Thus, cyclical fluctuations of labor demand are reflected in the number of removals."

Smaller Communities

But quite another process did spread some 35 per cent of America's Jews outside of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston. From the very earliest years of immigration, Jewish settlement involved a kind of mobility that was at once spatial and social. The laboring man found no incentive to leave New York, but one who was about to become a business man did. A peddler saw a place in his travels, a worker with savings heard from a friend, a grocer not doing so well found out from a salesman—somehow they learned that an opportunity existed, and were off to test it.

From these people and their descendants came the bulk of the Jewish population in the rest of America, and this accounted for the very low proportion of proletarians outside of

the largest cities, and the very high proportion of independent proprietors and people in other middle-class occupations. Probably a majority lived in cities with 10,000 Jews or more, places like Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Baltimore, St. Louis and Minneapolis. There were not enough Jews there to support the full range of communal activities that flourished in New York. But there were enough to maintain synagogues and philanthropies.

Because of the structure of their population, the history of these communities was somewhat different from that of the larger ones. As in New York and Chicago, there was a focal point of primary immigrant settlement, a place where the newcomers found their first homes and where they built their first institutions. Although not so crowded as the East Side, not so close to the slums, these districts had many of the same social characteristics. But the movement outward was different. Since the economic status of such people improved more quickly, they sought better homes earlier. However, the relative sparseness of their numbers made it difficult to maintain more than one Jewish area, and those who moved were likely to plant themselves in the midst of other ethnic groups. The consequence was a sharper break, and often the only ties that survived were those which grew out of the desire, or compulsion, to continue to support religious and charitable organizations.

In the smaller towns, where Jewish population was ten thousand and less, the division was even sharper. For in these localities only the synagogue and a few ancillary institutions drew the community together. Generally, immigrants did not settle as a coherent residential group, or if they did, quickly flew apart as they improved their living quarters. Here strict orthodox observance was still more difficult and those who were not religious lost all contact with the community.

The extreme situation existed in the thousands of smaller places where there were handfuls of Jews or individual families, where it was difficult to assemble a bare *minyan* (quorum), and where the struggle to maintain a synagogue exhausted

all communal energies. For many families so isolated, Jewishness faded into a thin memory of antecedents, revived from time to time by short visits to the big cities.

MODES OF COMMUNITY ACTION

The nature of these adjustments throws light on the role of institutional activity in Jewish life. The way in which people settled in America determined the extent to which they could reorder their modes of co-operation, of working together in the new society. Emigration had destroyed the inner meaning of the whole pattern of the traditional Jewish community. On this unfamiliar ground, old forms, no longer considered appropriate, were perforce readapted, perhaps discarded and replaced. This foreign land, which was doubly foreign because for most it was also an urban land, challenged the newcomer to create a new mode of living.

Even less than other men could the immigrant live alone. Surrounded by strangers and oppressed by the constant peril of being left helpless, he had no well-established roots to nourish him in adversity. He turned as a matter of course to his fellows, seeking with them to contrive organizations that would strengthen his hand against an alien world.

Such organizations played a two-fold role. They set up an area of activity in which the immigrant could meet and relax in the company of people like himself, away from the critical gaze of outsiders. In this area he could win the esteem of people whose esteem he valued, become a person of importance, a president, an officer. Here could be found solidarity of values and human sympathy. The same organizations also performed specific functions useful in the lives of their members. So, when a group came together, they formed a *hevrah*, a company, a guild, for common action toward common ends.

Synagogue

Of course, those who came to the Atlantic seaboard cities found in existence by 1840 well-established synagogues which they were expected to join. But these had a character of their

own, not always acceptable to the new arrivals. Such places of worship were controlled by native American Jews whose customs diverged significantly from those of Jews in the Old Country. American congregations were accustomed, from colonial times, to follow the lead of their English co-religionists; they used the Sephardic ritual, received advice on moot questions from London and wrote there for recommendations when they sought a minister. Furthermore, the Americans had a consistent reputation for impiety among immigrants, at whatever date the latter arrived; in the United States, it was supposed, people did not observe the Sabbath in its full strictness; they gave up European dress too quickly; they shaved; they were careless as to the dietary laws of *kashrut*, and they were ignorant of the Torah, had not even rabbis to guide them. No wonder the newly arrived Jew was suspicious of them.

The first synagogues attempted to maintain a monopolistic position. That in Charleston, for instance, ruled that no unauthorized *minyan* could gather within a radius of five miles. But there were no means of enforcing such arbitrary legislation. Unlike some European communities, these did not have the support of the state. The synagogue was entirely under lay control and there was neither rabbinate nor any other body to exercise discipline. Any group that liked could assemble in a *hevrah* and worship God in its own way.

Consequently, new synagogues appeared quickly, as soon as the growth of population made it possible to support them. Sometimes, as in 1825 when B'nai Jeshurun appeared in New York, the motives had to do with religious considerations; the organizers then wished to follow the "rites, custom, and usage of the German and Polish Jews," and to free themselves from contact with those who violated the Sabbath. Sometimes, the motives were more personal, involving a conflict over elections, an offense to someone's dignity, or a dispute over the hiring of a cantor. But one way or another, the number of congregations grew, "forming factions, clans, small corporations." By the outbreak of

the Civil War, there were already in New York, in addition to the old American group, German, Polish, Dutch, English, Bohemian and Russian congregations.

These nationalistic designations did not necessarily refer to the nativity of the members; thus, a correspondent of the *Israelite* pointed out in 1856, that "the so-called Polish Congregation consists of Polanders, Hollanders, English, Germans and other nations." The title applied rather to the style of the service and the pronunciation of the sacred language, which in Europe often differed markedly from place to place. Later, with increased differentiation, the *shul* would be popularly named after specific towns—the Jassier (after Jassy), the Berdichever, the Odesser, the Krakauer and so on. After 1870, as the number of Jews grew with a new rapidity, such variations served as the occasion for the establishment of still more synagogues; in New York, the 14 in existence in 1854 had become almost 150 in 1890, more than 300 ten years later; there were more than 1,200 in 1942. Every fresh contingent clung to the *nusah* (style of services) of its own locality. This condition was a source of strength in one sense. It enabled the immigrant to savor at landing the full flavor of his old religion. Indeed, in the smaller communities where there were no resources to make possible the same degree of differentiation as in New York, the religious element was often sadly missed.

But there were also disadvantages. While this insistence upon every jot and tittle of the old ways was touching evidence of the importance of religion in immigrant hearts, it created a chaotic organizational situation; and the chaos was further confounded by the shifts of population from neighborhood to neighborhood which left some edifices empty not long after they were built. The result was looseness of structure, and an absence of discipline that often led to intellectual and social confusion among the mass of Jews.

This situation antedated the influx by the Eastern Jews, but was aggravated by it. It was hard to define the relationship of each autonomous, free and independent synagogue to the whole community. It was also hard to locate a sov-

foreign religious authority within any congregation. In the Old Country that role had been played by the rabbi, who was not primarily a preacher, but rather the ecclesiastical head of the community and the judge on matters of ritual and law; his function was to study and interpret the law. Normally, worship in the synagogue could proceed without his assistance and many American congregations likewise got by without the expense of maintaining a rabbi. As late as 1927, no more than half of those in New York supported one.

Much more likely to be chosen was a *hazan* or cantor, a layman who led the prayer, and perhaps was *shohet* (ritual slaughterer), *mohel* (circumciser) and teacher besides. Many of these officials added a "Reverend" to their names in imitation of the Christian sects, called themselves ministers, and assumed what in America were clerical duties, such as the performance of marriages. This was to be a fertile source of disputes; as late as 1929, the Massachusetts civil courts were called upon to adjudicate a quarrel between the rabbis and the cantors.

When the rabbi did appear on the scene, his authority and his role were not clearly defined, either in relationship to the synagogue of which he was a functionary or to the Jewish community as a whole. The synagogue could hire and fire him at will, while the community was dominated by "secular organizations" and by individuals who were not necessarily members of any synagogue.

With many rival authorities in competition, the ordinary Jew was not likely to trouble himself with punctilious obedience to any. Only in New York and Philadelphia for a few years were there attempts to set up formal community organizations; and the failure of these *kehillot* discouraged the formation of others. Generally, a few congregations or a committee of rabbis might unite for a specific purpose, such as supervision of ritual slaughter and examination of *mohelim*, as happened in New York in 1888, under Rabbi Jacob Joseph of Wilno. Some congregations, though not all, joined one or another of the national congregational federations. But any more rigid entanglements were avoided.

Fraternal and Benevolent Associations

Because of this looseness of community structure, many functions originally tied to the synagogue fell into the hands of autonomous, disconnected new bodies. The earliest congregations had tried to make the *shul* what it had been in the Old World, the center of the whole life of their society. But once the synagogues multiplied in this disorganized fashion, no one of them, or group of them, could make a claim to universality. In addition, the impact of urban life tended to divide the allegiance of the individual immigrant. Not all the people who met to worship together in a given place were likely to be interested in the same activities or have the same point of view outside the place of worship. As the synagogue ceased to be comprehensive and general, as it became local and particular, many functions not purely religious fell into the hands of other local and particular institutions.

Three matters, above all, early aroused general concern. Among all immigrants there was a dread of dying alone, of isolation in the final moments of life on earth. The few who came together quickly made provision that they would give each other proper burial in the foreign soil on which they met. And for Jews, for whom this last human attention had a religious significance connected with the hope for resurrection and for a future life, the cemetery ranked high in the list of communal needs. In the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth the cemetery was an adjunct of the synagogue. But after the influx of immigrants in the 1840's, many who could not or would not affiliate permanently with a place of worship still wished to be secure in this primary sense.

Almost as deep a source of concern was the possibility that illness, accident or some other unforeseen disaster might deprive a man of his livelihood and his family of its support. Few of these immigrants had found enough security in the United States to erect their own safeguards against such contingencies. Mostly, they hoped for some organization that

would do what in the Old Country the village had done spontaneously, and what in early America the synagogue had done informally.

Finally, there was a deep urge for company, simply for the occasion to join with one's friends, to lose the sense of strangeness and to maintain a measure of continuity with the life of the past.

To fill one or a combination of several of these needs, there sprang up a galaxy of organizations, large and small. Since they represented responses to the specific needs of specific people, these fell into no logical general pattern. Sometimes their purposes were confused. They overlapped each other in jurisdiction and membership. And, very likely, they were not efficiently managed. But they grew in numbers and in membership and held the loyalty of the immigrant; no one ever resigned from an organization unless it was to form a rival one.

Some had very narrow functions. There were *bikur holim* societies, to visit the sick. There were *gemilat hasadim* societies, which collected funds from which to make small loans to tide over those temporarily in distress.

Others assigned themselves a somewhat wider sphere. The mutual benefit association was a voluntary group which accumulated monthly dues and paid out stated benefits at death or illness, like an insurance company. Unlike the insurance company, however, these associations also assured consolation in illness, and mourners at funerals. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Jewish immigrants seemed often to have joined the organizations of this kind set up by Germans; and in many places they continued to do so. But where Jews were numerous the religious elements were important enough to lead early to the establishment of specifically Jewish groups; by 1847, there were two in New York, and the number grew without pause thereafter.

Most comprehensive of all was the lodge, increasingly popular with all Americans, which added to the burial, insurance, benefit and fraternal functions the embellishments

of ceremony, ritual and honorific titles. Some Jews were, and continued to be, prominent in the older American Masonic orders, while others joined the newer ones in which immigrants took a leading role, such orders as the Knights of Pythias and the Odd Fellows. Often in these general organizations there were local lodges in which Jews were a majority or made up the whole membership.

Other Jews, however, formed orders distinctively their own, such groups as B'nai B'rith and B'rith Abraham which quickly sprouted branches throughout the nation. At the outset, men were drawn to these orders through the hope of uniting Jews separated by religious and national differences. But each soon acquired a particular character, for their essential attraction was the comradeship of the like-minded. Thus B'nai B'rith, despite the intention of its founder, Henry Jonas, became predominantly "German"; in Chicago by the end of the century Polish and Russian Jews complained they were not admitted.

Consequently, the lodges proliferated in number as new arrivals set up competing bodies, such as Free Sons of Israel, the Sons of Benjamin and many other groups often having only a few offshoots, sometimes confined to a single locality. In addition, there were literally hundreds of coteries narrower in membership, *landsmannschaften*, and regional and family societies. This is to say nothing of the feminine counterparts, the ladies' auxiliaries that arose as housewives began to acquire the leisure to match the activity of their husbands.

In describing these formal organizations there is danger of forgetting that there was often more vitality in aggregations that had no constitutions, by-laws or officers, groups that were held together only by the fact that they played an important part in the lives of their members. From time to time, a club is immortalized by a reference in a written source, but surely many more that never attained that dignity were worthy of it for the comfort and solace they furnished to lonely immigrants. What their specific functions were is indeterminate: no doubt the Purim Association in New York

in the 1860's had something to do with the celebration of that holiday; but what the Roumanisch-Amerikanischer Bruderbund did in the 1880's is not really known, perhaps is not even as important as the mere fact that the association existed.

Nor must the conscientious chronicler overlook the 300 coffee and cake establishments on the lower East Side in 1905. Surely it was the talk and comradeship rather than the food alone that drew men there. In this perspective, it was a momentous occasion when the first Rumanian-Jewish restaurant opened its doors on Hester Street in 1884. Within two decades it had 150 competitors in New York alone, brothers under the skin to the more modish uptown clubs, Harmonie, Phoenix and Standard, to which the elite withdrew. And when it comes to the completely occasional institutions—e. g., the halls (Manors, Mansions) in which weddings were celebrated—then the hesitant pen of the historian runs completely dry.

Philanthropy

Spontaneous and planned, these were the organizations by which immigrants protected themselves against the danger of being left alone in a foreign world. But once settled, the immigrants were moved also by the impulse to aid those who could not help themselves. No man among them was so well settled that he could not remember when he had himself been a stranger in the land, not far from want. Charity, traditionally a religious virtue among Jews, became a categorical obligation.

Charity, too, had once been within the domain of the synagogue, but it now fell into the hands of societies particularly charged with that function. Many congregations customarily maintained funds from which the officers extended assistance to the resident and transient needy. Even in later periods the Jew in quest of alms could generally count on not being turned away empty-handed from the synagogue.

But the growth of the population made it clear that such informal acts of individual generosity were not only inefficient but ineffective. Too often the most deserving were overlooked, while the few mendicants circulated from congregation to congregation. Furthermore, the Jewish poor were often immigrants unknown to the community and members of no organization. In the 1840's and '50's, Hebrew Benevolent Societies began to appear in the various cities, their function to assure an equitable distribution of the community's philanthropy. The scope of their activities and the size of their budget mounted with the size of the immigration. Thus the United Hebrew Charities of New York more than doubled its expenditures between 1880 and 1895.

The trend was from the general to the particular. As the problems of philanthropy became more complex, the early organizations, which took as their province the whole field of welfare work, either narrowed their scope or gave way to more specialized agencies. This development was particularly urgent in the case of newly arrived immigrants. As their numbers rose and it became ever more difficult for them to be settled, the need to extend organized assistance grew more pressing. Immigration was a universal experience; this was a plight everyone who had himself suffered could understand. Furthermore, the fate of the latest immigrants, it was thought, would reflect upon the general reputation of the Jewish community as a whole.

The first faltering steps toward easing the way of the wanderers were actually taken in Europe by the Alliance Israelite Universelle after the cholera epidemic and famine in Russia in 1868 and 1869. But effective measures were taken only when the pogroms of 1881 dramatized the situation. Then, twenty thousand refugees fled to the Austrian border, where they gathered in the town of Brody. Almost at once Jewish societies in England, France and Germany mobilized their resources to help, and a co-ordinating Russian Refugee Aid Committee with branches in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and other large cities set itself the task of receiving the newcomers in America.

It was true that the attitude of American Jews to their Russian brethren changed once they got here; the refugees then ceased to be respected objects of sympathy and became pathetic objects of charity. Some Americanized Jews never gave up the hope that the tide might be dammed up, or, at least, diverted. Yet the obligation to aid those here was not shirked. The existing Hebrew Charity organizations in many places contributed money, and the Baron de Hirsch Fund proved generous through various intermediaries in helping immigrants to their destinations and in tiding them over until a first job was found. But it then became clear that a more permanent effort was called for.

In 1884, Jacob Judelson was instrumental in establishing the Association for the Protection of Jewish Immigrants in Philadelphia. Almost at the same time, a Hebrew Sheltering House was set up in New York, and during the course of the next few years a series of other organizations joined in the work. A turning point came in 1901 when the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) appeared in its present form and soon thereafter absorbed the sheltering house. HIAS steadily integrated and centralized the administration of aid to the newly arrived. Other groups continued to handle particular aspects of the task; the National Council of Jewish Women, for instance, assumed responsibility for female immigrants. But the core of the Jewish effort was the widespread organization of HIAS.

The flow of refugees after 1933, although small in volume, led to a carefully planned program of assistance. The restrictive immigration policy put all newcomers on trial. Those who now urged the nation to open its gates to the persecuted were on the defensive and felt it necessary to make sure that the few who did get through were well taken care of. In 1934 the National Coordinating Committee set up a clearing house for all interested agencies, and ultimately the United Service for New Americans (formerly the National Refugee Service), its successor, provided unified direction.

Few concerned with the fate of the millions who endured the process of transplantation were heedless enough to imagine

that the most important problems were those involved in getting the immigrants across the Atlantic. Indeed, it soon appeared that the first few years after entry were freest of trouble. The most trying difficulties seemed to come after two or three years of residence, when immigrants were worn out with harsh and unaccustomed labor, when relatives felt they had already helped out enough and when old social restraints had worn thin from constant friction with the unfamiliar ways of urban living.

Although the first tentative steps toward ameliorating these conditions were taken at the middle of the nineteenth century, it was really later, with the rise in population and the concentration of Jews in metropolitan areas and in working class occupations, that the need grew more pressing. First came hospitals to prevent the observant from being compelled to eat forbidden food, or face the danger of dissection after death. Cincinnati, New York and Chicago, in 1850, '52 and '68, led in this area. Despite the enormous cost of maintaining such institutions, they grew in number and in the quality of their services; Mt. Sinai in New York, Michael Reese in Chicago, Mt. Zion in San Francisco, Beth Israel in Boston, Cedars of Lebanon in Los Angeles, were among the better known hospitals. Their work was supplemented by that of numerous sanitariums and clinics.

The aged and the very young were also among the helpless. After 1865 there were homes in Philadelphia and New York for elderly Jews unable any longer to support themselves, too aged to adjust to American ways and a drain upon the limited resources of relatives. Before the end of the century, similar institutions were operating in twelve different cities. Within the same period, orphanages were erected in fourteen places, led by those of Philadelphia (1855), New York (1859) and of B'nai B'rith in Cleveland (1868). It was hoped that such homes would prevent fatherless children from being "educated in such places where the greatest care is taken to imbue the youthful mind with sectarian and mystical doctrines." Later, still other groups appeared which set themselves the task of ministering to the wayward and re-

deeming the errant, societies to aid prisoners, to deal with juvenile delinquency, with desertion and with family welfare.

The development of these spontaneous organizations was by no means logical or coherent. There was often waste, duplication of effort and inefficiency. Each successive wave of immigrants felt the urge to look after its own as soon as it had accumulated the necessary resources—sometimes even sooner. The multiplication of agencies was due in part to the dissatisfaction of the newer arrivals with the Orthodoxy of the old, in part to the suspicion that Americans, even Jewish Americans, did not really understand the needs of those who had come from Europe. Eventually, the first asylums and hospitals provided for the observance of the dietary laws and the Sabbath regulations; but the late-comers continued to suspect that they were not being given a proper voice in the management of the institutions. They complained that their doctors were not readily admitted to hospital staffs, that they were never allotted important offices and that their contributions were not adequately appreciated. Since these were not simply agencies for service, but also the means of social activity, each new group was irresistibly drawn into founding fresh societies. At the same time, thousands of immigrants continued to bestow their charity in the traditional individual form. In every home were little *pushkes*, collection boxes, through which the pennies flowed to hundreds of causes.

The consequence was that philanthropy could not take on the disciplined hierarchical structure among Jews that it did among the Catholics. Until the end of the nineteenth century, each agency was on its own; its success depended upon the popularity of its balls and benefits, upon the contacts of its managers and the degree to which it dramatized its appeals.

Yet while no movement that attempted to curtail the sovereign individuality of any institution was successful, the weakness of the system became so evident when it was faced with the task of fund raising, that a radical solution became

necessary. The solution was to "methodize" Jewish philanthropy through the formation of federations which took over the raising of funds but left the conduct of the affairs of each institution in its own hands. Sometimes two steps were involved, first the separate federation of "German" and "Russian" charities, then the union of them all. The development appeared first in the cities of moderate size. By 1900, cities like Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati and Detroit had accepted this tolerable compromise between centralization and anarchy. They were shortly imitated by Philadelphia and Baltimore, but the largest community of all held off for several years longer. The philanthropies of Brooklyn did not federate until 1910. Those in the rest of New York wrangled over their sovereignty for another seven years, even forfeiting a million-dollar bequest because they could reach agreement no sooner. The amalgamation of the two systems to cover the entire metropolis was delayed two decades longer.

Efforts to cross the lines of purely local combination met with practically no success. A National Conference of Jewish Charities established in 1899 considered such general problems as the handling of transients, family desertion and tuberculosis in the "dependent classes." But the only substantial achievement in this field was the provision of nationwide support for the Jewish Hospital for Consumptives in Denver. This failure was not surprising. For, all these societies were deeply rooted in the local situation and in the local need for communal activities. It was the local community that was the source of their strength; any other authority would have been superimposed upon them.

Politics

These associational activities were distinctive in that they affected primarily the community within which they originated. But to restrict our view to such ways of action would be to distort the description of how the community actually operated. For there were vitally important matters, in which activities that originated in the Jewish community influenced

and were significantly influenced by the whole society in which the Jews lived.

It was not accidental that Jewish immigrants took less interest in politics than did other immigrants or native Americans. In part that attitude was a heritage from European experience in which the Jew had been divorced from the state; what he had seen of the operations of government in Europe did not lead him to believe that much good could come of it in America, either. This prejudice was reinforced by the experience of crossing from the Old World to the New; the state appeared, above all, as the creator of artificial, inhuman barriers and boundaries.

The initial distrust was strengthened by the experience in America. The American conceptions of political democracy and representative government were not familiar to the common people of any part of Europe. These ideas evoked admiration and respect once the immigrant became acquainted with them; but they hardly seemed relevant to his daily experience. In practice the state seemed embodied in the policeman who took a bribe to turn his eyes away from the store open on Sunday, the politician who handed out a peddler's license for a consideration and the local boss at the ballot box, buying votes with a bottle of whiskey. Better to keep away from trouble, obey the laws as far as possible and have nothing to do with the whole business.

From a practical point of view, there was not much in politics to attract the Jew. The whiskey that was offered for his vote was not particularly tempting. Nor was he lured by the patronage; street laborers' jobs did not interest him, and the higher offices were monopolized by ethnic groups earlier on the scene. Significantly, there were enough other outlets open to Jewish talent to prevent the Jews from viewing politics as the only means of rising in society, as some other immigrant folk did.

Consequently Jews tended to avoid the formal machinery of government. As far as possible they resorted to their own charities; they preferred informal arbitration to litigation,

and the *Bet Din* (court) of the rabbi to the court of law. In Philadelphia there was for a long time a permanent board of conciliation to settle disputes among Jews. Sometimes sad results ensued from the conflict between the civil and religious laws in the field of matrimonial relations; but to the immigrant that only proved how arbitrary were the rules of the native lawmakers.

A few Jews in New York and elsewhere held public office and there were some Tammany clubs that were primarily Jewish in membership. But the most powerful Jewish political figures of the period, Abe Ruef in San Francisco and "Czar" Louis Bernstein in Cleveland, arose in cities without very large Jewish populations, and with the support of other ethnic groups; there were Jewish governors in Idaho and Oregon before there were similar dignitaries in New York and Illinois.

The Jewish press did try to stimulate interest in these matters. It urged the duty of prompt naturalization and of regular voting. But the press agreed on practically nothing else in politics. In New York, the *Tageblatt* and *Morning Journal* were Republican, the *Warheit* and the *Day* Democratic, and the *Forward*, after its own fashion, Socialist. The result was a divided Jewish vote and the absence of a Jewish machine, although occasionally a popular figure like Meyer London, for other, nonpolitical reasons, built up a following of his own. Most communal leaders, like Louis Marshall, approved of a state of affairs in which Jews voted as individuals rather than as members of the ethnic group. If the Jews of Philadelphia and Boston voted more often Republican than Democratic, those of New York and Chicago voted Democratic more often than Republican. The New Deal temporarily attracted most of the Jews and drew some of them actively into politics, partly through trade union influence, and partly because all immigrants belonged to the least secure elements in American society and were drawn to a program that promised security. Apart from that, there was remarkably little political coherence in the group.

Jewish Labor Movement

The situation in politics was in marked contrast to that in the labor movement, a sphere in which Jewish working people played a consistently prominent part throughout the period of mass immigration. Yet if the ultimate measure of success was large, the start was uncertain and slow. True, the process of economic adjustment in the metropolitan centers had concentrated Jews in a limited number of occupations where ethnic and economic interests could combine to create a powerful *esprit de corps*. But more was involved than that, for similar concentration of other nationalities in other immigrant industries did not produce the same result.

Indeed this was a period to discourage unionization. The two decades after 1870 were transitional for the economic system as a whole and therefore confused for labor. At a period when workers were continually changing jobs, and the jobs themselves were changing from day to day, it was hard to maintain any degree of organizational stability. Besides, these were "green" immigrants, raw from the villages, not sure of their relationship to these unfamiliar institutions. Watching the ritual of the Knights of Labor, a Jewish immigrant being initiated confessed, "Many of us, on seeing the sword, were not sure whether we were all going to be slaughtered or drafted into the army." They were not likely to be drawn in large numbers to such outlandish-looking bodies, unless it was through some known, trustworthy medium.

One account has it that large numbers of Jews first made contact with union activity in 1882, when they unwittingly signed on as scabs during the longshoremen's strike in New York. Abe Cahan, editor of the *Forward*, is authority for the statement that the misled Jews quit as soon as they became aware of what was happening and, horrified, thereafter were consistently labor-conscious.

We may be sure there were additional reasons for the development of labor consciousness among the Jewish immigrants. For one thing, they had what generally was the advantage of leadership by a tiny but very aggressive minority

of intellectuals and intellectually-minded workers trained in the most advanced trade unions of Europe, men who brought to New York and Chicago experience earned in the Russian *bunds* and in the English labor movement. Escaped from European oppression to the freedom of tenement and sweat shop, these radicals, anarchists and socialists of many hues regarded the trade union as an instrument in the battle against capitalism, a means for mobilizing the laboring masses in the inevitable struggle for power.

The task they set themselves was that of enrolling the immigrants in the unions and disabusing them of the notion that they might escape from the ranks of the workers through peddling or petty trade. An intermediate, educational body came into existence with that goal. In New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee and elsewhere, there were earlier organizations known as the United German Trades. These groups ran across the traditional craft lines of American unionism and performed a wide variety of propagandistic functions through which German unionists tried to familiarize their immigrants with the American labor movement. Analogous bodies were created to educate the Jewish immigrants.

The first was the Yiddischer Arbeiter Verein, which arose in 1885 in conjunction with various projects for a radical Yiddish newspaper. This society consisted of capmakers, shop-clerks, clothing workers, barbers and peddlers, and had several thousand members in its affiliated sections by 1886. But it spent its strength that year working for the election of Henry George in the New York mayoralty campaign, and collapsed shortly afterward.

More significant consequences resulted from the organization in 1888 of the United Hebrew Trades under the leadership of Jacob Magidoff, Morris Hillquit, Abe Cahan and Philip Weinstein. At first the group acted largely as a mutual assistance society. But it also propagandized for unionism, was interested in socialism and worked for the eight hour day, the regulation of child labor and the abolition of the sweat shop. Through the United Hebrew Trades and through similar associations in Chicago, Philadelphia and

Baltimore, Jewish immigrants were led into the primitive unions that were then springing up among the tailors and cloakmakers, the shirtmakers and cap operators, the printers and barbers. Even Samuel Gompers, an immigrant Jew himself, who disapproved of such an organization based on religious affiliation, perceived that "to organize Hebrew trade unions was the first step in getting those immigrants into the American labor movement."

By 1890, there were already a considerable number of Jews in the craft unions that had taken shape during the preceding ten years. They formed a considerable bloc along with the Englishmen, Germans and Bohemians in the Cigar-makers International Union. Some of the garment crafts, particularly the cloakmakers, were sufficiently organized to conduct a series of successful strikes between 1888 and '91.

But in the four years after 1892, the United Hebrew Trades suffered a crisis that vitally affected its subsequent role in the American labor movement. The intellectual anarchists and socialists, interested in unions not merely as the instruments of immediate economic gains but also as means for enlisting mass support for political ends, fell under the spell of Daniel De Leon and the Socialist Labor Party. De Leon attempted to use the United Hebrew Trades as a means for capturing the Knights of Labor. When that tactic failed, he drew the Hebrew Trades into his Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. Meanwhile, the organization was torn by struggles between the Socialist Laborites and a rival group of Social Democrats under the leadership of Cahan and Hillquit who wished to affiliate with the new American Federation of Labor.

These factional disputes confused the membership. Because they subordinated economic to political ends, they aroused the distrust of the immigrants; in addition, some of the intellectuals were atheists and aggressively anti-religious and alienated the Orthodox immigrants. When a group of radicals openly flaunted their heterodox notions at Yom Kippur Balls in 1890 and '91, they antagonized the rabbinate and alienated great sectors of potential membership.

The same obstacles that stood in the way of the United

Hebrew Trades had blocked the rise of any overall garment union during these years. A succession of local organizations fought bitter strikes throughout the 1890's, but with no substantial results. Not until 1900 did the factional fires burn themselves out. Then the needle workers joined the dominant trend in the labor movement; under Joseph Barondess they moved into the orbit of the American Federation of Labor.

The economic unionism of the decades that followed lacked the flaming idealism, the genuine humanitarianism, the intellectual sparkle of the earlier period; but it was successful. The International Ladies Garment Workers Union grew steadily in strength until the great strike of 1910, from which the famous protocol with the Cloak, Suit and Shirt Manufacturers Protective Association emerged. Whatever the difficulties in the actual operation of the machinery of conciliation and arbitration, the agreement embodied a significant conception of collective bargaining. The International had difficulty for years thereafter, but on the whole it prospered, as did similar organizations in the men's clothing, the hat and the fur trades.

The stability of the basic unions put new life into the United Hebrew Trades. By 1910, eighty-nine unions were affiliated, with a total of 100,000 members, and the boom years of World War I raised that total to fully a quarter-million. Among the incidental products of the movement was a cultural offshoot—radical Jewish nationalism, anti-Zionist, non-religious and emphasizing Yiddish.

There were significant reasons for the success of the Jewish labor movement, success that was measurable not only in terms of degree of organization but also of better living and working conditions. The nature of the industries involved contributed to this success. The Jewish working force was concentrated in light manufacturing, much easier to organize than the heavier industry. Their employers were not coal and steel barons, but the proprietors of small cigar making shops and contractors in the garment trades. The larger clothing factories employed several hundred hands, but the problem of uniting them into a union was not

comparable to that of organizing an iron mill or slaughter-house.

The fact that both owners and employees were Jews also often contributed to the relative ease of organization. There was, indeed, no love lost between the "German" boss and the "Russian" proletarian; common religion at first actually heightened friction. But they could at least talk with one another. Capitalists like Joseph Schaffner and Abraham E. Rothstein were not so far removed from those who toiled for them that they could not sympathize with the aspirations of the laborers. Leaders in Jewish affairs, like Louis Marshall, Louis Brandeis, Sabato Morais and David Philipson were ready to intercede in the interests of the good name of the whole community. Such rapport furnished a point of departure for continuing compromise.

But over and above these favorable specifically Jewish conditioning elements was the fact that the unions had adjusted to the American environment; the idealistic principles from across the Atlantic had yielded to business unionism; politics remained peripheral during this whole process of unionization, except for the 1890's, when it was disastrous. During the rest of the period the leaders may have been socialists in their private beliefs, but their ideas did not interfere with the business-like conduct of union affairs under capitalism. In the 1920's bitter struggles prevented the Communists from gaining more than a toe hold in the unions; in the few unions where the Communists did bore their way into the leadership, the mass of members and the operations of the organization were scarcely affected.

Like other associational activities of the Jewish community, the unions were a means through which the immigrants adjusted to the conditions of the new society. Like synagogues and lodges, they eased the adaptation to life in America. Through these myriads of organizations the newcomer learned how to get along in the United States without being exposed to the shock of a completely alien universe.

These organizations had still another effect upon the immigrant group. The immigrant Jews struggled to set up

this structure of communal institutions instead of relying upon those that were already available, because they were aware of meaningful differences between themselves and other Americans. Yet the very existence of those institutions served to heighten and to perpetuate their consciousness of group identity even after adjustment and acculturation had bridged the initial gap between the immigrants and the rest of America.

THE VEHICLES OF CULTURE

The relationship between associational activity and the group's consciousness of its own character emerged even more clearly in those areas that were not immediately related to the process of settlement. Shortly after their arrival the immigrants drew together into other societies, whose primary function was to serve as vehicles of culture. Every such organization assumed that the members of the group had something distinctive to say to one another, that they shared a common heritage of ideas that were worth expressing and worth transmitting to their children.

There were always, for instance, a considerable number of Hebrew literary, dramatic, library and musical societies, some concerned with the Hebrew language specifically, others with Jewish history and literature as a whole. But these by no means fully absorbed the attention of the Jews, who were also likely to join the non-sectarian associations in the community. In these matters there was no essential competition: a German-Jewish immigrant could in good conscience be a member of the Zion Literary Society, of the local turn-verein or glee club and of the lyceum.

True, the Jews from Eastern Europe had not so wide a range to choose from. They too were ready to participate in the activities of non-sectarian American culture. Nor did they disassociate themselves entirely from the other immigrants of the country of their birth. Thus, Rumanian Jews formed the backbone of the Carmen Sylva Association in New York, a society named after the queen of their former

homeland and dedicated to the study of its literature. Similarly, Jewish intellectuals played a prominent role in Russian radical circles in the first two decades of the twentieth century. But it was more difficult for such people to be culturally loyal to the country of their birth when the Eastern-European governments were pursuing an openly anti-Semitic policy.

Furthermore, the Russian Jews were left more to their own cultural resources than had been the immigrants from Germany, who had found flourishing cultural institutions already in existence upon their arrival. When non-Jewish Russians, Poles, Hungarians and Rumanians did begin to reach the United States in large numbers, they were peasants, slow to develop the same interests as the Jews already here. In consequence, the cultural forms that were evolved by Jewish immigrants at the end of the nineteenth century were often more specifically Jewish than those fashioned by their predecessors fifty years earlier.

The vehicles of culture most difficult to fashion were those that were highly institutionalized—schools, newspapers and theaters. These were expensive to maintain, required a permanent organization and were definite, visible signs of the separateness of the group in the total culture. They arose and persisted only in response to a clear-cut need.

Education

Undoubtedly, schools were the most important channels for transmitting ethnic ideas and ethnic culture. Yet the dominant conditions of American education were already set before large groups of immigrants appeared on the scene; the newcomers were never in a position to reverse decisions in the making of which they had not shared. By the 1840's it had been determined that the education of youth in the United States was to be public, that is, governed by the state. Such training, it was clear, would also be almost entirely free and universal. It followed as a matter of course that there was to be no religious instruction in the public

schools and that no public funds would go to religious schools. Although in practice sectarian control was not fully eliminated for several decades, the principle was firmly established and ultimately adhered to. As a result, any group that wanted fulltime schools of its own had to use its own resources and to compete with the public schools. Like the Catholics and Lutherans, Jews attempted to do so, but failed signally.

In the 1840's and '50's, a succession of day schools in Cincinnati, Chicago, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia were added to a number of survivals from an earlier period. In New York two schools were in operation in 1847, and ten years later these offered instruction to more than 800 students. It is not likely that they were all regular or full-time scholars, although some at least followed an extensive curriculum that included study of the German language.

Yet such parochial institutions could not stand their ground against the competition from the public schools. Like all the similar schools that sprang up later, they labored under serious handicaps. Many immigrants could not afford to pay their fees. The best teachers could make better careers elsewhere. Most important of all, these schools were not as likely to lead to the social and economic advancement which depended on contacts outside of the Jewish group. In this respect attendance at a sectarian school was a liability rather than an asset.

Consequently, the attempts to present a full curriculum were frustrated in the two decades after 1860, years when immigration was in any case low. The elimination of Saturday classes from public institutions and of the reading of dogmatic passages from the Bible hastened the trend. It was characteristic that the Hebrew Free School Association of New York (1864) and the Jewish Educational Society of Chicago, both founded to resist the proselytizing of Christian missions, early confined their efforts to the children of the poor and made no attempt to parallel the course of studies in the public schools.

The experience of the first immigrants was repeated by those who came later. The Orthodox Eastern Europeans, in whose lives the *heder* (school) and *yeshivah* (academy) had

played so prominent a part, tried to carry those institutions to the new land. But it was difficult to keep young people to the study of Torah for its own sake in America. In addition, compulsory education laws, established in New York in 1904 and elsewhere later, imposed conditions and specified a secular curriculum that the traditional *heder* which devoted all its time to the sacred language could not meet.

All but a few of the immigrants and their children, therefore, relied on the public schools for elementary and secondary education. In no other way could they afford a training which was expensive in any case. Not many families could spare even a minimal levy upon their budgets for this purpose, or, most crucial, spare the loss of income that resulted when youngsters became unproductive. Many students attended night schools or worked after hours to make up the difference in income.

The problem of financing a college education for the children was still more difficult. Yet by the first World War, 15,000 Jews were students, and twenty years later more than 100,000, one-tenth of the national total. Some found their way to a higher education through free institutions such as the city colleges in New York; others drove themselves hard in the quest for scholarships; still others worked at part-time jobs. Nevertheless, probably the greatest number of university students attended through the sacrifices of their immigrant parents, who hoped thus to help their children rise to professional status. That is why talk of a Jewish university, mentioned as early as 1854 and bruited about again in 1902 and '22, came to nothing.

For these reasons, Jewish educational activities became supplementary. They took the public school system as a base and built about that to meet the special needs of the immigrants. English classes for adults and to prepare children for school were common. For many years the most pressing need seemed to be preparation for some mechanical trade. To the philanthropists concerned with the settlement of the Jews, it seemed that far too many lacked usable skills and were dependent upon such uncertain means of support as peddling.

Later they felt that too many were unrealistically aspiring toward the professions. The emphasis upon mechanical training was also supported by the Yiddish press, which still had vivid memories of the effort to "productivize" the Jews of the Old World.

Technical training was continuously stressed in the educational preparation of immigrants, both men and women. The Hebrew Free School Association of New York set up an industrial school for girls in 1879 and a Hebrew Technical Institute in 1884—both later a part of the Educational Alliance—and the Baron de Hirsch Fund operated a trade school that prepared students for industrial pursuits. The United Hebrew Charities in New York established a factory where immigrants could learn the garment trade, a project bitterly opposed by workers already in the industry. The Hebrew Education Society of Philadelphia taught cigar making and cloth cutting to men, and millinery and dressmaking to women. Similar organizations flourished also in Boston, Chicago, St. Louis and elsewhere. Since so great a store was then set by agriculture, particular pains were taken to develop the farm schools in Doylestown, Pennsylvania and Woodbine, New Jersey.

These efforts had some immediate importance in that they assisted the newcomers to earn a livelihood. But they lacked vitality. Adults were too impatient for immediate income to complete a course, despite the fact that they received a small weekly subsistence allowance in some schools. They grasped the first job that came along, whatever their skill, and remained "botched mechanics" the rest of their lives. The Jewish institutions quickly learned to concentrate on youth. But ultimately the public schools took over the function of vocational training; and as soon as the same facilities were available elsewhere, those that were distinctively Jewish became superfluous.

The religious aspects of education could not, however, be shifted to other hands. The very separation of Church and State compelled every denomination to make its own provisions for training youth. Accepting the fact that the major propor-

tion of their children's time would be spent in general studies in the public schools, the Jewish immigrants were compelled to devise a means of adding the traditional lore to their children's education. Although they had a long experience with education, this problem was new.

The first recourse was to an adaptation of European methods. By 1860, there were already many families that hired tutors to instruct their children in the elements of Hebrew and in the basic religious precepts. Later, the *melamed* became a familiar figure among the Russian immigrants. The more enterprising assembled enough students to conduct classes which met after school hours and which they called a *heder*. Usually independent of the synagogue, meeting in the teacher's own apartment or in a vacant store or basement, these were uniformly unsuccessful. There was little about them to attract an American youngster while other children were free to use the same time at play. Instruction was in Yiddish; teaching methods were backward; and the *heder* relied for incentive upon the disciplinary value of the *rebbe's* "strap." The *rebbe* himself, alas, more often taught for lack of another livelihood than because he had the call.

Although the *heders* sprouted by the hundreds in the Jewish quarters of the large cities, they affected relatively few children, and those often only for the brief period of preparation for bar mitzvah. It was a shock, but hardly a surprise, when Jews learned from a survey conducted by Samson Benderly that only 28 per cent of the Jewish children in New York between the ages of six and sixteen received even the scantiest Jewish education in 1908.

Yet, if the *heder* did not please the children, its American substitutes did not satisfy the parents. The Sunday and congregational schools that had already developed seemed no solution at all to the immigrant. Attached to synagogues whose orthodoxy appeared dubious, if they were not completely Reformed, these institutions were judged utterly inadequate by the transplanted European. He sought to fashion independently the structures he deemed essential to link his sons to the old tradition.

The solution, insofar as a solution ever emerged, was the development of a daily part-time school, conducted after public school hours, one that used English as the language of instruction, employed modern pedagogical methods, was co-educational, yet was adequate in content—that is, stressed the Hebraic studies and was Orthodox. In the Machzike Talmud Torah Pesach Rosenblatt had experimented with such a course after 1883, as had Harris Hörwich in Chicago somewhat later. Both under the influence of these examples and independently, such schools spread through all the large cities, particularly after the turn of the century. In terms of the number of students enrolled, they were then still far behind the *heder*. But the trend of the times was with them; they continued to grow while the older *heder* entered upon a decline. In 1935 the Talmud Torahs of New York boasted 110,000 students, the *heders* only twelve thousand. By then there were Hebrew high schools supplementing the public high school, which carried Jewish education to the secondary level in the larger cities. Teachers for these schools were being prepared at Gratz College and several other teacher-training institutes.

The development of higher Jewish education was even slower in making its appearance, for it called for full-time study. Yet the immigrants could not conceive that the American Jewish theological seminaries could take the place of the European yeshivah where scholars supported by the community devoted themselves exclusively to study for its own sake. Imbued with that ideal, a group of Jews had organized the Yeshiva Etz Chaim in 1886, but that institution never managed to expand its instruction above a very elementary level. Not until eleven years later was the Isaac Elchanan Yeshiva created.

Yet the Yeshiva did not evolve in the form that had been anticipated. In America students were not content to live on the purely spiritual nourishment of the Torah; they insisted upon a course of study that would lead to a definite goal, the rabbinate. They also wanted the privilege of pursuing more general studies in addition to the talmudic ones.

In 1908, serious differences between directors and students came into the open. A break was averted; but the Yeshiva became an institute for training Orthodox rabbis and Hebrew teachers. Despite the Orthodox distrust of secular subjects, the students were allowed to take such courses elsewhere until an associated high school and college offered supplementary instruction within the Yeshiva.

Amid the confusion of so many separate undertakings, there was bound to be waste of effort and inadequate coverage of needs. Dr. Benderly's survey of 1908 had induced the New York Community to set up the Bureau of Jewish Education in 1910. Together with similar associations in other cities, ultimately merged into the Jewish Education Association, the Bureau labored to set standards, to co-ordinate activities and to secure financial assistance. But the task outgrew all attempts to cope with it. By 1935 the percentage of children between the ages of six and sixteen who received any Jewish education had dropped to 25 per cent in New York, and seven years later it was still falling. Outside New York the proportion may have been lower.

In any event, such measurements are undoubtedly arbitrary. If only one in five attended in any given year, a much larger proportion probably received some period of training in the ten years between the ages of six and sixteen. Such a reckoning could show that almost 70 per cent of the boys and almost 40 per cent of the girls had had some Jewish education. But however one reckoned, there was little ground for complacency. The difficulty of discovering an adequate educational medium was due to the fact that it had been necessary to work out a new form that would suit the conditions of the American environment.

Journalism

The cultural expression of the immigrant Jew was a reflection of his settlement in America and not a mere repetition of the European pattern, a fact that emerged with the advent of new channels of expression. The Jews who emigrated to the

United States did not habitually read newspapers at home; lack of interest and high cost made the appearance of a journal in the small towns of Russia, or even of Germany, something of a rarity. The same Jews became regular and eager readers in the New World. The immigrant who bought a newspaper did so because it filled an American need; he was acting like an American.

For many years there simply were not enough Jews to support real newspapers even in the largest American cities. The immigrants had to find their news either in the English- or the German-language press. Indeed, quite a few Jews were prominent in the management of such journals—Joseph Pulitzer of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and Joseph Cohn of the New Orleans *Deutsche Courier*, to name only two. (Later some, like I. A. Hourwich, would also take a hand in Russian-American journalism.)

There were, in addition, a number of weeklies and monthlies that combined the functions of newspaper and magazine. These periodicals made no attempt to cover general news but concentrated instead on the particular events that concerned their group of readers, as well as giving space to discursive essays and other “features.” Some were primarily religious in interest; others were linked to fraternal societies like B’nai B’rith. A few appeared in German: *Zeichen der Zeit* (Chicago), *Israel’s Herald* (New York), and *Deborah* (Cincinnati), for instance. But the more important periodicals used English as their medium, although they occasionally made the concession of introducing a German column. Among these were *The Asmonean*, *The Jewish Messenger*, *The American Hebrew*, *The Hebrew Leader* (all of New York), and *The American Israelite* (Cincinnati).

The Eastern-European immigration at first did not affect the form of the periodicals. The journals founded by intellectuals were very much like their earlier counterparts, and differed only in language. *Hatzofeh Be-eret: Ha-hadashah* (1870–76) appeared in Hebrew, which was the language of the Russian enlightenment. On the other hand, the radical papers, like the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, organ of the Socialist Labor

Party (1890), came out in Yiddish, the language of the Jewish laboring masses. Of course the Levantine Jews had their own Ladino journals, *La America* and *La Aguila*.

The decisive departure came with the growth of immigrant population that made a daily press offering complete newspaper coverage possible. In New York, a series of short-lived trials beginning with *Die Post* (1870) led finally to the establishment by K. Z. Sarasohn of the *Tageblatt* (Jewish Daily News) in 1885, a paper which represented a rather Orthodox point of view. The simultaneous rise in immigration and spread of the reading habit made room for diversity. In the next quarter-century a dozen or so journals made their appearance, not all to survive. Intellectuals connected with the labor movement set up *Das Abendblatt* (Evening News) in 1894. Three years later it became *The Daily Forward*, the organ of the Socialist party, ultimately the paper with the largest circulation. Another organ of Orthodoxy emerged in 1901 when Jacob Sapperstein founded the *Jewish Morning Journal*. Intermediate political positions were taken by *Die Wahrheit* (1905) and the *Day* (1914), while the new Communist party sponsored the *Freiheit* in the 1920's.

Such variety was more difficult to achieve outside of New York, although Chicago at one time (1908-20) possessed three dailies, including the *Yiddische Arbeiter Welt*. But such cities as Cleveland, Philadelphia and Milwaukee found it difficult to support even one daily for any length of time. The business of publishing a newspaper grew increasingly expensive in those years and no paper could survive without a substantial circulation. Yet the lack of diversity was generally a source of weakness, for it induced many readers to turn to the New York papers, in one of which they were sure to find their own opinions expressed. An Orthodox Chicagoan was more likely to prefer old news from the *New York Morning Journal* to fresh news from a local socialist paper.

In the cities outside of New York, it was the weeklies that usually succeeded. For a time many appeared in Yiddish, like Alexander Harkavy's *Der Yiddische Progress* (Baltimore), *Das Licht* and *Die Yiddische Presse* (Philadelphia). Later, they

were more apt to be in English, e.g., *The Reform Advocate* and *The Sentinel* (Chicago), *The Jewish Advocate* (Boston), *The Jewish Chronicle* (Detroit), and many others. Sometimes, a compromise allowed for both languages, as in the *California Jewish Voice* (Los Angeles) and the *Jewish Record* (St. Louis).

This development is revealing, for it underlines the attractions that really induced the immigrants to part with their precious pennies for this new luxury. Not news for its own sake, but the point of view of the newspaper was important. The press was valued because it offered the newcomers a guide to the New World, helped them understand strange issues and interpreted puzzling questions in a trustworthy manner. In that sense, the press was an Americanizing agency, above all. The make-up of the Yiddish newspaper reflected the consciousness of that function. The emphasis was on "features" rather than on news, which had to be sensationalized and popularized to be attractive. There were extensive weekly supplements, and space was lavishly devoted to stories, poetry, exhortative articles, advice to the lovelorn, the misunderstood parent and the homesick, even in the daily editions.

These newspapers depended for their support upon the continuing stream of immigration. Once that was shut off, they entered upon a decline. The peak came in the mid-1920's when the Yiddish press reached a daily circulation of some 600,000. By 1940, the total had fallen off by about 50 per cent. English pages, first introduced to teach the immigrant to read the language, became bait to attract younger readers. But the trend was in the other direction. Once the immigrant press had performed its Americanizing task, it began to decline.

An indirect effect of the prosperity of the Yiddish newspapers was the encouragement they offered to Yiddish literature. In the years just before and just after the first World War, many talented writers had drifted to the United States. Stimulated by the newspapers and supported in part by contributions to their columns, Sholom Asch, Sholom Aleichem, Abraham Reisin, Peretz Hirschbein, Abraham Cahan, Jonah

Rosenfeld and I. J. Singer made New York a thriving center of Yiddish literary activity. Whatever the sale of their published books, these men maintained a live, warm contact with the sentiments of the immigrant Jews through the immigrant press.

Theater

The relationship between the intellectual's creative activity and the life of the people emerged still more clearly in the case of the theater. In the latter half of the nineteenth century this institution was truly popular, in the sense that it was responsive to the moods, the emotions and the ideas of its audience, to which it supplied an intimate, meaningful experience.

In those years, the stage was a mass medium, cheap enough so that everyone could afford to attend. Making no demands of literacy or sophistication, its vivid, dramatic presentation provided an easy, quick and complete release to thousands of tired people who sought there an explanation for the ache in their minds, or, at least, the means of forgetting it.

Some Jews in America had always been attracted to the stage. The actor's vocation was more open than most; talent was likely to find its level without the impediments due to lowly birth or lack of connections. Charles Dickson, Henry Dobbin and other English Jews had appeared in the very earliest American dramas, and their German co-religionists had early found an important part in the theater that grew up in the United States among the German immigrants.

As in the case of the press, the increase in population laid the ground work for a distinctive Jewish form. By the end of the nineteenth century, a well-developed Yiddish theater was active in New York and in the other larger cities.

A start was made in the early 1880's in New York. In 1881 there were already some Rumanian Jewish actors at the Oriental Theater on the Bowery. A year later, N. M. Schaikewitz and Abraham Goldfaden brought over a troupe from Russia. In 1886, another company of Rumanians estab-

lished themselves at the Rumania Opera House, and were thriving in a few years' time. At the end of the century, there were three Yiddish theaters on the Bowery alone that devoted themselves entirely to the Yiddish drama: the Jewish People's, Thalia and Windsor. With other houses that gave occasional performances, they were estimated to draw at least 25,000 patrons a week.

A comparable development took place outside of New York. In Philadelphia there were the Arch Street, the Standard and the National Theaters; in Chicago, Glickman's and the Yiddische Dramatische Gesellschaft. No slackening of growth was noticeable until after the first World War. By then the New York Yiddish Art Theater had appeared and there were resident companies in cities as scattered as Chicago, Detroit, Newark, Philadelphia, Cleveland and Toronto.

In the earliest years, and to some extent throughout the history of the Yiddish theater, Jewish plays were only slightly intellectual. The great attraction was the actor and the whole troupe revolved about the leading star. Jacob P. Adler and Bertha Kalisch, Z. Feinman, David Kessler and Boris Tomashefsky each had his following and his distinctive role. The plays were often written for the occasion by dramatists well aware of what the audience wanted to see and hear. Naturally such dramas involved little more than the manipulation of stock plots and situations. If "Professor" Moses Halevi Horowitz managed to turn out almost a play a day over long periods, that was accomplishment enough; he was not likely to be criticized for his lack of originality. Even after the reforms of Jacob Gordin, after serious writers like Leon Kobrin, Solomon Libin and I. J. Singer assumed the play-writing task, they could not escape the obligation of dealing with themes on which their audiences insisted.

Not that there was necessarily any uniformity in subject matter. There could be plays about the Old World or the New, historical or contemporary. There were adaptations from Shakespeare and from the American theater—*The Three Musketeers*, *The Black Flag*, *Two Orphans*, *Hero*, *the Indian Chief*.

What was important was that the story should have a meaning for those who watched it unfold.

The meanings sought were those that immigrants found in the real everyday life about them. The ever-present power of the temptation of material earthly things that saps faith and morals, as in Gordin's *God, Man, and the Devil*. The thanklessness of children who, unmindful of their parents' sacrifices in their behalf, turn against them. (*King Lear* was a "natural" for this.) Above all, the sadness of life, the ease with which hopes are frustrated, the imminence of death that awaits all men. No device was more effective than a *kaddish* scene (a memorial service for the dead), especially when juxtaposed with a happy occasion. The high point of the *Jewish Hamlet* was described in a program note as the "sad wedding of Vigder (Hamlet) and his dead bride Esther (Ophelia) according to the Jewish religion."

Perhaps it was its inability to supply meanings in terms of contemporary Jewish life that accounted for the fact that comedy did not flourish and quickly degenerated into broad farce. What was worse, the Yiddish comic theater had to compete with vaudeville, then in its heyday. The result was the Yiddish musical comedy as initiated by Joseph Lateiner. The true formula for success in this field was ultimately discovered by Sigmund Mogilescu, who borrowed ruthlessly from the chants of the Russian cantors, the arias of Italian operas and the popular song hits of the day, to contrive melanges that were magnetic at the box office. (In the same way, a certain two-step, though popular dance music, seemed more respectable to an audience assured that it was composed by "H. A. Russotto, author of the original Kol Nidre and other Hebrew melodies.")

The dilution of the Yiddish content of the Yiddish theater, successful at first, was ultimately self-defeating. For what it did was to stimulate tastes that could better be satisfied in the more lavish English-language theater. As plot and story receded before song and dance, even language became unimportant. But the hardest blow came from outside, from the competition of the movies. Although many Jews participated

in the new industry, there was nothing specifically Jewish about their product. Yet that great passive mass medium, completely neutral in its effects, drew the immigrants away from their own theater. The movies, which revealed the golden land, the America of the dream rather than of actuality, had the superior attractiveness of the dream over the reality.

The end of immigration hastened the decline of the theater. The young people were strangers to Yiddish, and not at all interested. Many cities gave up their theaters and were content to rely upon the occasional performances of touring companies. In New York, Maurice Schwartz's Yiddish Art Theater held on, but was valuable more as a museum piece than as a vital force.

Schools, newspapers, theaters flourished only insofar as they filled some significant need in the life of the Jew in America; the inner momentum it inherited from its service in the Old World never carried an institution very far. There was no difference from this point of view between the Jews who arrived before and those who arrived after 1870. Greater numbers and the delay in non-Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe modified the means of expression, just as the same factors created variations among specific cities in given periods. But in the last analysis, cultural institutions took form in response to the immigrant's judgment that they served a function in his life in the United States. That in turn was related to the conception which successive waves of immigrants held of themselves and of their place in American society.

THE JEWS IN AMERICAN LIFE

The experience of living in America was unique in the life of the Jews of the nineteenth century. The complex of attitudes toward the Jew was so different in the United States from what the immigrants encountered everywhere else in the world that they were forced to revise their own conceptions of themselves and of the nature of their culture.

American Tradition

For one thing, the medieval background was absent from America. This difference in historical experience produced certain general effects upon American society. It relieved this country of the stratified class structure and the rigid social system that hampered movement from one level to another in Europe. Here newcomers, and Jews among them, were free to assume whatever rank in society they could. More specifically, the absence of a medieval tradition meant that Jews were not weighed down by survivals of the medieval religious conceptions. On the contrary, the absence of an established church and the prevalence of latitudinarianism—the idea that, whatever its doctrines, any religion was good if it inculcated good morals—meant that the Jew stood on a social footing entirely equal with that of all other citizens.

It was true that the Jews were immigrants and not infrequently met the rebuffs and slurs all strangers encountered. But it was the American conception that men should be regarded in law as individuals and not as members of a group; every man could rise and fall on his own merits. This free atmosphere discouraged discrimination. Even Europeans like the Germans who were still moved by the old prejudices at home seemed to shed those relics of the Old World in the course of becoming Americans. The contrast with the other side of the Atlantic was striking. In Western Europe emancipation was recent and incomplete; in the East it did not exist at all. Part of the process of immigration consisted in adjustment from the old discriminatory conditions to the new liberal ones.

Nationality Groups

In the thirty or forty years after 1840, Jewish immigrants were regarded by other Americans as members of a nationality group, largely identifiable like other nationality groups by language. In that sense, they were uniformly considered Germans, one with other Germans who happened to be

Lutherans or Catholics. This categorization, which lumped Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and Hollanders together with the natives of the German states, was not surprising. Neither natives nor immigrants had ears sensitive enough to discriminate among all the shades of German dialect; surviving examples reveal that the German spoken by Bavarian Jews in these years was not much closer to the language of Goethe than the spoken Yiddish of Jews from Posen.

The "Germans" (or, in Hebrew, *Ashkenazim*) did not immediately fuse with the native Jews; they resembled in this respect German Catholics and the native Catholics. In fact, the native-born American Jews, although actually descended from immigrants of many different nationalities, tried to disassociate themselves socially from the newcomers by stressing their own Sephardic (Spanish) background. Institutionally, that separation persisted for several decades.

Nor did the "Germans" fail to recognize divisions among themselves. The organization of synagogues showed how strong was the sense of locality. Little love was lost between the *Bayerische* and the *Hinter-Berliner*, who were free in criticizing one another's manners, dress, language and piety. Yet they were held together by a common social experience, by a common institutional life and by fewness of numbers.

For, the percentage of Jews who broke their affiliations with the Jewish community was rather large during this period. Occasionally, the Christian denominational journals carried accounts of Jewish conversions. But more often the change was not that formal, not that noticed. Where settlements were sparse and scattered, isolated individuals and families simply lost contact and fell away. Often, the need to have a decent funeral at which a clergyman would officiate, the need to find a partner in marriage, was too great to be denied by loyalties worn thin in the process of migration. As the second generation grew to maturity, there was a strong likelihood that it would discard everything associated with the immigrant heritage of its fathers, including religion, in its eagerness to be Americanized.

To the well-established native American Jews, this was no

danger. Judaism was not "foreign" to their children, as it was to the children of Germans and Poles. Some old Sephardic congregations, like Shearith Israel in New York and Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia, therefore felt no compulsion to alter their ways. But the immigrants feared a split between the generations and attempted to hold their children to the synagogue by Americanizing it. If the synagogue did not adjust to the spirit of the age, said the *American Israelite* in 1854, "we will have no Jews in this country in less than half a century."

Religion and Assimilation

That the fear of conversion was the underlying popular motivation behind support of the Reform movement is clear from the fact that the first demands made were for changes not in theology but in the externals of worship. There were calls for more decorum in the synagogue, for the omission of superfluous prayers that rendered services long and disorderly. There was a desire that the "Germanic and Slavonic dialects" yield to English and that the unseemly auctioning of honors cease. Some wished also for an end to the curtained women's gallery as well, and the addition of an organ or mixed choir and an English sermon, as in the services of other denominations. Later came complaints that the dietary laws were onerous, attendance at the synagogue on Saturday too difficult. Some congregations, like Emanu-El in New York and Har Sinai in Baltimore, introduced the new order at one stroke; others, like Rodeph Shalom and Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia, did so gradually. Sometimes there were disputes and secessions; sometimes the entire process of reform was uneventful.

The desire to be like unto other denominations also led the synagogues, Reformed or not, to call rabbis to their service once they could afford to support them. Since there were no American facilities for training a rabbinate, these clergymen had to be imported, generally from Germany, partly because a majority of the immigrants were themselves Germans, partly

because Germany was then the center to which advanced Jewish thinkers and scholars journeyed from all parts of Europe, partly because German culture and learning then commanded the respect of all Americans.

The rabbis who arrived were decidedly a mixed lot, whether they were Germans, like Bernard Felsenthal, or non-Germans, like Marcus Jastrow. Max Lilienthal, educated in Munich, a bastion of Jewish conservatism, was still Orthodox when he arrived. Isaac M. Wise leaned to the new ideas, although he had not yet broken with the old. On the other hand, Samuel Hirsch and David Einhorn already subscribed to Reform tenets. But whatever their opinions, the critical factor was the extent to which the American Jews desired the new departure. The rabbi followed the congregation or left it, as Wise discovered in Albany and Lilienthal in New York.

For it was the function of the rabbis to formalize in theological terms the conception of Judaism toward which their congregations were groping. Wise and his contemporaries did so against a background of those rationalistic and ethical ideas that were also influencing the American Catholic and Protestant churches in that period. In the three decades after 1855 the new creed emerged. The Talmud was no longer deemed a strict guide to practice, and Mosaic legislation was accepted only as a code of ethics. The reformers gave up the nationhood of the Jews and rejected such nationalistic holidays as Purim. It was logical that they viewed the dispersion not as a temporary divine punishment, preliminary to an eventual return to the Land of Israel, but as a permanent, providential condition. The mission of the Jews was to "lead the nations to the true knowledge and worship of God," and they were allied to Christianity and Islam in the struggle for common social ideals.

This position was so close to that of the Liberal Christianity of the day that Rabbi Ferdinand Sarnet, in an examination by an army board of chaplains, could be mistaken for a Lutheran! Yet the position of the reformers by no means involved a rejection of Judaism; it was more properly an effort to stem the tide of conversion—a fact the *Jewish Chronicle*,

organ of the Christian missionaries, recognized when it directed its most explosive salvoes, not at the Orthodox, but at the "modernized Reform infidels." Though the pews and pulpit, the whole interior of the synagogue, increasingly took on the appearance of the church, the desire to preserve a visible connection with the Jewish past persisted in Moorish and Byzantine exteriors. This was Judaism Americanized to accord with the times.

The diverse elements in the Reform movement did not achieve a complete formulation of the Reform idea until the Pittsburgh Conference of 1885. It was ironic that by then the new wave of immigration had already introduced a troublesome mass of Jews who regarded the whole Reform development as blasphemous, and had reinforced the remaining Orthodox Americans.

American Jews had of course been aware of the tragic plight of the Eastern Europeans and, swayed by the same humanitarian impulses as other Americans, had hoped that the United States might become a place of refuge for them. Thus in 1869, Rabbi Bernard Felsenthal, prominent in the Reform movement, urged the persecuted Jews to flock to the United States in an article in the Russian Hebrew journal, *Ha-Magid*.

But the flock that actually descended upon the native American Jews in the 1870's and particularly in the '80's turned out to be not quite what had been expected. The romantic victims of religious persecution proved on closer inspection to be poor and ignorant, conspicuous in long gabardines and beards, their women disfigured by the Oriental *shaytel* (wig), slum-dwellers, sweatshop workers. In the first revulsion, it was hard to tell which was worse, the long-haired anarchist or the hasidic rabbi with side locks. A fear swept over American Jewry lest it be Russified; by 1891 complaints were heard in the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and of B'nai B'rith that all the gains of the preceding half-century might be wiped out by the newcomers. And before these were even partially absorbed, the Syrians, the Turks, the Moroccans were on their way.

This shock no doubt was in part the shock of recognition. It was himself, or his father, stripped of the accessories of respectability, the outraged "German" Jew saw shuffling down the gangplank. This was what he had escaped from, been Americanized away from.

Psychologically, the shock was less surprising than the recovery from it. Like it or not, the American Jews continued to assist the immigrants and continued to fight restrictions upon immigration. The new arrivals were, after all, *Glaubensbrüder* (co-religionists); and common religion demanded that the way be smoothed for them, that they be "improved" and Americanized. Such thoroughly "German" groups as the Board of Delegates, B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee continued to insist upon the right of Eastern Europeans to come to America, and successive philanthropic ventures labored to raise their status. In 1909, the last-named organization made an effort to exempt the Syrian and other Near-Eastern Jews from the discriminatory laws against Asiatics.

But the gulf between the earlier and later Jews was not easily bridged; the initial bitter misunderstandings lasted a long time. Not that the new Jews were any more coherent a group than those who came in the 1840's. There was no love lost between the Eastern Europeans and Syrians or the later refugees from German Nazism. Nothing could match the contempt of the Lithuanian for the Galician, the Ukrainian for the Rumanian. Yet the similarities in their social experience cut the new immigrants off from their predecessors. The economic conflicts between laboring "Russians" and employing "Germans" added to the alienation, and the independent rich institutional and cultural life of the Eastern Europeans reduced the contacts between the two groups. Here and there a prosperous newcomer deserted the ghetto to become a *Daitchuk* (Heinie); but the lines of separation were not modified until after years of adjustment.

For all the later immigrants, the process of adjustment was made more difficult by the fact that more was demanded of them than had been demanded of earlier immigrants. As the

century drew to a close, many Americans began to question the value of immigration altogether, while others became impatient with the slowness of acculturation. The unconfident discarded the traditional conception of the United States as a melting pot into which many cultures would pour and from which an entirely new product would emerge, insisting that the essential forms of American culture were already fixed, and that it was the task of the immigrant simply to fit into those forms. They demanded not only "an appreciation of the institutions of this country" but also "absolute forgetfulness of all obligations or connections with other countries because of descent or birth."

That was a demand the Jews and other immigrants of the same period simply could not meet. Concretely, the choice placed before them was that between the comfort and security of the religious, cultural and institutional life of their own community and the strange "emptiness" of an abstract Americanism. Their immediate reaction was a stubborn orthodoxy.

This does not mean that the Eastern European Jews failed to be "Americanized." Like all other immigrants they adjusted through institutions of their own which provided bridges between the old experience and the new—through being members of lodges, reading Yiddish newspapers and seeing Yiddish plays. Their stubbornness was no more than a hard shell, a protection against the bruises of hostile contacts.

But the consequences of being confronted with that choice—essentially a false choice—were felt most acutely by the immigrant youth and the second generation. Boys and girls who went to public school could not escape the other world around them and were continually being told that the way to being accepted into that world lay in the rejection of the heritage of the past. To a sensitive person like Mary Antin, it seemed as though Americanization involved no more than the surrender of her Judaism.

For the parents, the danger of the loss of their treasured children increased during this period, due to the operations of a host of new Americanizing agencies. The older missions sought to convert the immigrants to Christianity. Now a

number of secular agencies was added which seemed to the Orthodox to have the same function.

The humanitarian urge to improve the lot of the immigrants took the form of settlement-house work among some American social workers during these years. Earnest young people came to live among the foreigners, in the West End House in Boston, the Henry Street Settlement in New York, Hull House and the Maxwell Street Settlement in Chicago, to show them by direct contact how to live as true Americans. With the best intentions in the world, these institutions could not help but imply that the old ways were not truly American and should be discarded.

There were similar direct efforts by native Jews. The Reform rabbis felt strongly, as Isaac M. Wise put it in 1897, that they represented "the sentiment of American Judaism minus the idiosyncrasies of . . . late immigrants." They conceived their task to be that of removing those idiosyncrasies and saw the immigrant youth as a particularly fertile field for work. Promising young Poles and Russians like Joseph Krauskopf and Hyman Enelow were given scholarships at Hebrew Union College and trained for the rabbinate; there were occasional efforts to open downtown Reform synagogues; for a time, circuits were set up to take itinerant preachers through districts which backed Reform institutions.

The Temple, however, was not equipped for making proselytes; its very American characteristics militated against it. The major accomplishments were through another medium, the Jewish form of settlement-house work. In 1889, a group of Jewish cultural societies organized the Educational Alliance in New York City to Americanize and teach the amenities to the immigrant Jews. The purpose of the new institution was to eliminate the "oriental" elements in the life and culture of the Eastern Europeans. There was a "People's Synagogue," one which stressed "good citizenship" rather than traditional Judaism. A wide variety of courses was offered in English, domestic science and civics, as well as for a while in various manual trades. In addition, the Educational Alliance sponsored occasional lectures in Yiddish, English and German; it ran a summer

camp and art school, and carried on an extensive program of physical education. Similar organizations arose in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston; some Young Men's Hebrew Associations embarked upon the same kind of projects. On a lesser scale, the Ethical Culture Society held "downtown meetings" and sponsored a People's Institute for that end.

Whatever the parents' opinions of these activities, they were attractive to the children, for they immensely broadened the horizons of the young people of the ghettos. Yet not all the boys and girls, the young men and women who played at basketball or modeled clay or listened to the lectures, accepted the ideology of the sponsoring institutions. Actually many of them continued to feel the need for ethnic solidarity, were drawn back to the narrower cultural group, and by the outbreak of the World War were receptive to the ideas of cultural pluralism and of the federation of nationalities being advocated by Horace Kallen.

Such youths were, of course, diverted from Orthodoxy, and it was that which worried the American Orthodox. It was the hope of so reshaping traditional Judaism that it would appeal to the children of the immigrants that seems to have been at the root of the emergence of the Conservative movement, centering around the Jewish Theological Seminary. The founders of that movement hoped to effect a moderate reform in the externals of worship, but one that would not affect the central core of traditional theology.

There were, in addition, other Orthodox efforts to hold the American youth to Judaism—congregational schools, the Jewish Endeavor Societies of New York and Philadelphia and, later, Young Israel. But it was clear even before the World War that activities that were solely religious were not adequate to the purpose. It was necessary to compete with rival non-Jewish agencies on their own ground.

In 1908, Mordecai M. Kaplan, the rabbi of Kehillath Jeshurun, a congregation of well-to-do Russian Jews who were concerned about maintaining the allegiance of their own children, founded the Central Jewish Institute, an experiment in the "modern reconstruction of the synagogue as a social centre." The Institute joined facilities for a wide

variety of social and athletic activities to the place of worship in the hope that the two poles of interest would strengthen each other. In the words of one of its leaders: "While strictly Orthodox, it completely surpasses any Reform Temple in modernity of conception." That boast was suggestive; it revealed that the center was attempting to accomplish under other circumstances what the Reform movement had attempted to achieve earlier—the adjustment of Judaism to the contemporary American environment.

This was not an isolated effort. In Chicago, Dr. M. B. Yudelson of the South Side Hebrew Congregation was moving in a similar direction; the years just before and just after the World War saw a notable extension of the Jewish center development. A rationale for these practical activities was the philosophy set forth by Dr. Kaplan, of Judaism as a civilization. The Reconstructionist saw a quality of dynamic unity inherent in the group, a unity that expressed itself in common identification, common language, literature, music and folkways. From this point of view, it was reasonable to preserve traditional customs and ceremonies without inquiring into their theological meaning. By stimulating nostalgic memories, Reconstructionists hoped to find a way of holding the group together; yet by not insisting on punctilious religious conformity, they tried to allow the Jews to act as other Americans in their contacts outside the group.

None of these innovations stilled the misgivings of the immigrants. They expected nothing from the "uptown" agencies and Reform ideas. It was only with reluctance that the Educational Alliance had recognized the existence of Yiddish as a language; the report of the Hebrew Free School Association in 1894 could refer to the *heder* as a matter of course as "un-American, unrefined, uncultivated, un-everything but Hebraic." Nor were the newcomers happy about the Conservative dilution of their religion; Rabbi David Philipson noted with some satisfaction "that the Orthodox are more embittered against the Conservatives than against the Reformers." But the immigrant felt a sense of loss even in his own Orthodox Jewish center. "The close propinquity of shower bath and religious school seemed sac-

rileigious to some of the older members of the congregation," a director of one of the centers gravely pointed out.

For basically, all these conceptions of Americanization came from outside and had nothing to do with the real life of the immigrant. He could listen until his head reeled to the arguments that proved that Judaism was a religion like any other or, alternatively, to those that proved he had two cultures, Jewish and American. All the facts of the living world about him argued to the contrary. His life and culture, like his personality, were one, shaped by experience in the Old World and in the New. To be American meant not to be a greenhorn, to read a newspaper, go to a picnic, see a play, join a lodge—do all the things he actually was doing. Whatever others thought, the immigrant never had doubts of his own Americanization. After all, when he thought of assimilation for the Turkish Jews on Eldridge Street, he thought of the necessity of teaching them Yiddish.

The immigrant's attitude was sadly ambivalent toward his children. No doubt he wanted to hold them, and shrank from the thought of any weakening of family ties. But he also wanted them to continue further along the way to that vision of Americanization—to find better jobs, live in better quarters in a better neighborhood; and "better" inevitably meant at least slightly different. So much that their children did was foolishness and a waste of time to those raised in the Pale; but perhaps it was necessary, as the *Warheit* said in 1913, that their offspring be athletes and frequent clubs so that they might "become more polished and refined."

The children, however, could not fail to be concerned with varying conceptions of Americanization. None of the theoretical modifications of Judaism satisfied the basic urge of American Jewish youth for an explanation of its position in American culture. Neither the insistence that Judaism could be like other American churches in practice, nor the assurance that this practice could be compartmentalized into the categories of a dual culture, prevented the second generation's identification of Judaism with the Orthodox habits of their immigrant parents. The entire process of their up-

bringing had emphasized the contrast between "American" and "foreign"; Judaism was still associated with the foreign, consequently not with the American. It was significant that the most sensitive writers of the 1920's either avoided Jewish subjects or, if they did not, regarded the Jewish heritage as an obstacle to Americanization.

New Era

The 1930's differed however. Three unforeseen but related developments sharply separated the two decades. After 1924, the stream of immigration from Europe was abruptly terminated; in 1933, the accession of Hitler to power gave a new turn to the history of the Jews in the whole world; and after 1917, Zionism steadily occupied an ever larger place in Jewish consciousness all over the world.

Paradoxically, the immediate effect of the end of immigration was not to solve but to exacerbate the problem of Americanization. Cut off from the ever replenishing source of culture in Europe, the Jews of the United States were thrown back upon their own resources and faced the definition of their position with a new urgency. Furthermore, an uninterrupted trend steadily transferred control of communal affairs and communal institutions from the hands of immigrants to those of the second generation, a group which always took more seriously the introspective questions as to their situation in society.

This development took place in a context of events that now seemed to threaten the personal security of American Jews for the first time. The past had been happier. In the nineteenth century those who thought of the defense of Jewish rights considered it to be a problem existing primarily in the backward countries of the Old World. Jews had organized to induce the American government to assure them equal rights in Switzerland in 1857; they had protested in the Mortara Case and half a century later in the Dreyfus Case; in 1893 they had resisted the extradition of political prisoners to Russia; and the long series of pogroms and discrim-

inatory measures in Russia, Rumania, Morocco and Austria had elicited their political, moral and financial support on behalf of the victims. But there was then no thought that similar events might come to the United States.

Even the forty years after 1890 occasioned no alarm. True, there was then a disturbing growth in racialism; but those ill feelings were directed against Negroes and Chinese. There was more menace in the fact that the agitation for the limitation of immigration included the Jews among the "new immigrants" against whom the venomous shafts of prejudice were hurled. It was not pleasant to be labeled inferior in serious sociological treatises and in the reports of government commissions. Those who were incautious in the choice of a summer resort were already likely to find evidence of discrimination, and there was a notable tightening in restrictions in their admission to white-collar employment in the years after 1910. By the time of the first World War the situation was alarming enough to bring into being two defense organizations—the American Jewish Committee [1906] and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith [1913].

The war made matters worse. In 1915 came the Leo Frank incident, in which a Jew in Georgia was convicted on a trumped-up murder charge and later lynched. Nationalistic xenophobia, stimulated by the war and by the unhappy peace that followed, did not overlook the Jews in the quest for a scapegoat. In 1919 a Senate committee heard charges that East Side Jews had caused the Bolshevik revolution. Henry Ford repeated the slanders of the *Protocols of Zion*. Some patriotic societies of New York demanded a law outlawing the speaking of foreign languages on the public streets. The Klan rode. Covenants denied Jews access to certain residential districts; quotas limited admissions to colleges and professions.

But before 1930 none of these movements was directed against Jews alone; other groups—the Negroes and Catholics—were the more prominent targets. The spasmodic episodes of group hatred were brought on by immediate circumstances, generally by the sharp dislocations that accompanied American expansion. Certainly there seemed no reason to

expect that these incidents, unpleasant though they were, would leave serious scars. Throughout that period the problems of Europe's Jews were far more pressing than America's, and the work of the Joint Distribution Committee (1914) far more important than that of the Anti-Defamation League.

The Nazis changed the picture. Their victims were members of the most advanced sector of modern Jewry. The brutalities the German fascists unleashed were not the primitive products of the religious rage of Russian *pogromchiks*, but calculated, scientific techniques for using racial hatreds manufactured by propaganda for political ends. Many Jews faced the ineluctable question: If it could happen there, why not in the United States?

The poison brewed in Munich was highly volatile and spread quickly to the United States. The German-American Bund, aided by funds and leaders sent from Berlin, defended the German government by attacking the American Jews. Native fascists, would-be American *fuehrers*, took up the same line; their appeals to prejudice fell upon the fertile soil of minds rendered receptive by the confusion of a decade of depression. No one could be sure then how deep a hold the hatred would take.

The crisis passed over with the coming of war in which Hitler became the enemy of America. But the effect of the crisis had been to set a great, troubling question mark after all the assumptions that Jews could somehow adjust permanently and finally to life in the United States. That unwilling, often unadmitted, doubt was not without effect upon the attitude of American Jews toward Zionism.

The thought that the Jews of the world might, by taking political action immediately, come back to Palestine and establish a national home there had at first not been well received in America. It ran counter to the whole Reform movement, which rejected the idea of restoration of a Jewish state. The Pittsburgh Conference had envisaged no return to Palestine and had insisted that the Jews did not constitute a nation. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations proclaimed, "America is our Zion," and the Central

Conference of American Rabbis in 1896 and '97 and again in 1912 and '17 had specifically condemned the Zionist program. The Yiddishist labor movement was also generally hostile. To the Orthodox, moreover, the dispersion had a religious significance and was not to be terminated by human political measures. In a very broad sense, the immigrants had made their choice of a promised land when they came to America, and Palestine did not loom very large in their consciousness.

There was a romantic attachment to the biblical scene that turned the minds of such people as Mordecai M. Noah, Emma Lazarus and Henrietta Szold to Palestine. But, significantly, the latter were not immigrants, being rather natives, and imbued with American ideas. The newcomers were too concerned with their own problems of settlement to give much thought to another homeland. Consequently, although traditional connections with Palestine were maintained through messengers and relief funds, the Federation of American Zionists had only 8,000 members in the United States in 1900.

The first World War and its aftermath marked the first turning point. Americans were then elevated to the leadership of world Jewry and played a prominent part in the peace conferences. The Balfour Declaration and the mandate made some sort of Jewish homeland in Palestine a reality. At the same time, unsettled conditions in Europe and the closing of the American gates left large groups of European Jews with whom the recent American immigrants had close familial ties anxious to move but with no place to go. The number of Americans who showed their adherence to the Zionist program by purchasing a shekel mounted from 20,000 in 1914 to 170,000 in 1920. Even the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis, though still opposed to a Jewish state, came out in favor of immigration to Palestine in 1918 on the ground that "Jewish people are, and of right ought to be, at home in all lands." The growth of American Zionist sentiment marked by revival of interest in the Hebrew language and by co-operation with Palestinian social and economic development was steady in the 1920's.

Here too, Hitlerism forced the decisive division, induced the Jewish labor movement to espouse Zionism, pushed the Reform wing of Judaism into a position of official neutrality and unofficial support, and strengthened Orthodox approval. By 1945, American Jews stood almost solidly behind the Zionists. Nazism made enormous numbers of Jews homeless and callous restrictions in every other part of the world left Palestine the sole haven. The shock of discovering how small a proportion of Europe's Jews actually survived the decade of fanaticism and war made the task of rescuing the remnant all the more urgent.

But the enormous increase of interest in Zionism was also a result of conditions in the United States. As in the case of other immigrant groups, political nationalism offered a temporary release from the fears and frustrations incidental to adjustment. For here was a way of escaping from the harshness of contact with strangers, a way of finding security in affiliation with the ethnic group, yet a way that was acceptable in terms of the standards of the larger society. The Jews behaved as the Irish and Germans had done earlier; feeling rejected by the "100 per cent Americans," they turned to a similar nationalism of their own. Zionism was the outlet, particularly for the second generation Jews, perplexed as all second generations were by the question of their place in American culture, confused by their own specifically Jewish problems of social and economic adjustment, and anxious over the meaning of anti-Semitism. Americans were extremists in the world Zionist movement, in a small measure because they carried into it the whole burden of their worries and fears as American Jews.

THE IMMIGRANT IN AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY

In 1927, looking back upon a half-century of devoted service, Rabbi David Philipson was disillusioned. "We seem to have gone backwards," he wrote. "Conditions are not nearly so bright today as . . . forty-five years ago." By "bright" he really meant settled and simple. For, the familiar

divisions and controversies, the old problems were already losing their relevance. The orthodox *shul* was taking on some of the appearances of a temple, and a "neo-Reform" trend was giving the Reform movement some of the accents of orthodoxy.

Two decades later, Philipson's disillusionment is understandable. The events of those twenty years have indicated that when he wrote he was standing at the end of a whole epoch in the history of the Jews in the United States. The era of immigration was over; the mass movement to the United States was no longer to play a part in American Jewish life. The results of the reversal of this fundamental condition were bound to be far-reaching and at first confusing.

In such a transitional period it is misleading to assume that the problems of the future will be the same as those of the past. Yet whatever its problems, the future of American Jewry will not be divorced from their past. Though the end of immigration may mean a radical reshaping of the structure of Jewish life in the United States, the great century of immigration has had effects that will not quickly be dissipated.

In the past the impact of immigration was felt in constant expansion—numerical, economic, institutional and cultural. American Jews were always in a state of instability; again and again they appeared in places where they had never been before, did things they had never done before, moved into new neighborhoods, got new jobs; every new step demanded adjustments by and to those around them. Constant expansion also made room for enormous diversity within the community; there was no need for internal discipline, for conformity with old institutions, when it was always possible to form new ones.

The effect of immigration was also to keep American Jewish culture dependent on Old World sources. The stimuli that affected the thought and institutions of American Jews were carried across the Atlantic by the newcomers. Native Jews were constantly challenged by the contrast; the second generation always strained to reconcile the two forces. In a sense the whole institutional life of the community

was a balance between European ways and European ideas and the American environment. With the need for that balance gone, the institutions which survive and the Jews whom they serve will have to find another source of equilibrium.

One thing will be certain. The development will not be determined by the Jews alone. For in the future, as in the past, they will also be an integral part of a much larger community. The nature of Jewish culture will depend upon the nature of the whole culture. Immigration, which gave American Jewry its character of the past, and the closing of immigration, which is likely to give it its character in the future, are alike aspects of great world changes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a representative selection of books on the history of the Jewish immigrant in America. It makes no attempt to be complete, does not catalogue the newspapers, contemporary periodicals and reports of societies that would naturally interest the scholar investigating the field. It is rather directed primarily at the general reader who may find a list of the readily accessible works useful for further reading.

General

American Jewish Historical Society Publications. New York, 1892—to date.

American Jewish Year Book. Philadelphia, 1899—to date.

BERNHEIMER, CHARLES S. *Russian Jew in the United States.* Philadelphia, 1905.

Commentary. New York, 1945—to date. *Contemporary Jewish Record*, 1938–1945.

EDIDIN, BEN M. *Jewish Community Life in America.* New York, 1947.

HAPGOOD, HUTCHINS. *Spirit of the Ghetto. Studies of the Jewish Quarter in New York.* New York, 1902.

JAMES, E. J., et al. *The Immigrant Jew in America.* New York, 1906. (Based on Bernheimer, above.)

JANOWSKY, OSCAR I., ed. *The American Jew.* New York, 1942.

JOSEPH, SAMUEL, *Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910.* New York, 1914.

LEHRER, LEIBUSH, and MARK, YUDL, eds. *Yorbukh fun Amoptayl* [*Annual of the American Branch of the Yiddish Scientific Institute*], vol. II, New York, 1939.

LEVINGER, LEE J. *History of the Jews in the United States.* Cincinnati, 1935.

Menorah Journal, 1915—to date.

SHATZKY, JACOB, and MUKDONI, ALEXANDER, eds. *Yorbukh fun Amoptayl*. [Annual of the American Branch of the Yiddish Scientific Institute], vol I, New York, 1938.

WIERNIK, PETER. *History of the Jews in America*. New York, 1912. *Yivo Bleter*, 1931—to date.

Biographies

ADLER, CYRUS. *I Have Considered the Days*. Philadelphia, 1941.

ANTIN, MARY. *From Plotzk to Boston*. Boston, 1899.

———. *The Promised Land*. Boston, 1917.

BLAUSTEIN, MIRIAM U. *Memoirs of David Blaustein, Educator and Communal Worker*. New York, 1913.

BOGEN, BORIS D. *Born a Jew*. New York, 1938.

CAHAN, ABRAHAM. *Bleter fun mein Leben* [Leaves from My Life]. New York, 1926. 3 vols.

COHEN, JULIUS HENRY. *They Builded Better Than They Knew*. New York, 1946.

COWEN, PHILIP. *Memories of an American Jew*. New York, 1932.

HORWICH, BERNARD. *My First Eighty Years*. Chicago, 1939.

KATZOVITCH, ISRAEL I. *Zekhtzik Yor Leben. Erinerungen, eygene un algemeyn-Yidishe (1859–1919)* [Sixty Years of Life. Reminiscences, Personal and Communal (1859–1919)]. New York, 1919.

LOWENTHAL, MARVIN. *Henrietta Szold*. New York, 1942.

PHILIPSON, DAVID. *My Life as an American Jew*. New York, 1937.

POLLAK, GUSTAV. *Michael Heilprin and His Sons*. New York, 1912.

SCHIFF, JACOB HENRY. *Jacob H. Schiff*. Edited by Cyrus Adler. New York, 1928. 2 vols.

STRAUS OSCAR, S. *Under Four Administrations from Cleveland to Taft*. Boston, 1922.

WISE, ISAAC M. *Reminiscences*. Cincinnati, 1901.

Local Studies

ADDAMS, JANE. *Twenty Years at Hull House*. New York, 1910.

BREGSTONE, PHILIP P. *Chicago and Its Jews*. Chicago, 1933.

ELZAS, BARNETT. *The Jews of South Carolina*. Philadelphia, 1905.

EZEKIEL, HERBERT E., and LICHTENSTEIN, GASTON. *History of the Jews of Richmond*. Richmond, 1917.

GOLDSTEIN, ISRAEL. *A Century of Judaism in New York: B'nei Yeshurun 1825–1925*. New York, 1930.

GRINSTEIN, HYMAN B. *Rise of the Jewish Community of New York, 1654–1860*. Philadelphia, 1945.

Hull House Maps and Papers. New York, 1895.

Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York. New York, 1928.

KLEIN, PHILIP, et al. *Social Study of Pittsburgh: Community Problems and Social Services of Alleghany County*. New York, 1938.

- MEITES, HYMAN L. *History of the Jews of Chicago*. Chicago, 1924.
- MILIER, MICHAEL. *Fifty Years of Achievements, 1890-1940: Hebrew Home for the Aged and Infirm at Lawndale*. Baltimore, 1940.
- MORAIS, HENRY SAMUEL. *The Jews of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, 1894.
- SHULMAN, HARRY MANUEL. *Slums of New York*. New York, 1938.
- WIRTH, LOUIS. *The Ghetto*. Chicago, 1927.
- WOOD, ROBERT A., ed. *City Wilderness*. Boston, 1898.

Labor and Laboring Conditions

- CARSEL, WILFRED. *History of the Chicago Ladies' Garment Workers' Union*. Chicago, 1940.
- COMMONS, JOHN R. et al. *History of Labour in the United States*. New York, 1935-36. 4 vols.
- DEFORREST, ROBERT W. and VEILLER, LAWRENCE. *Tenement House Problem*. New York, 1903. 2 vols.
- GOMPERS, SAMUEL. *Seventy Years of Life and Labor, an Autobiography*. New York, 1925. 2 vols.
- HARRIS, HERBERT. *American Labor*. New Haven, 1938.
- HOURLICH, I. A. *Immigration and Labor*. New York, 1912.
- STOLBERG, BENJAMIN. *Tailor's Progress: the Story of a Famous Union and the Men Who Made It*. New York, 1944.
- TCHERIKOWER, E. ed. *Geshikhte fun der yidisher arbeterbavegung in di Fareynikte Shtatn [History of the Jewish Labor Movement in the United States]*. New York, 1943-45. 2 vols.

Special Subjects

- ADLER, CYRUS, ed. *Jewish Theological Seminary of America*. New York, 1939.
- BERKSON, ISAAC B. *Theories of Americanization*. New York, 1920.
- BOGEN, BORIS D. *Jewish Philanthropy*. New York, 1917.
- CHAIKEN, I. *Yidishe Bleter in Amerika [Yiddish Press in America]*. New York, 1946.
- DAVIDSON, GABRIEL. *Our Jewish Farmers and the Story of the Jewish Agricultural Society*. New York, 1943.
- DRACHSLER, JULIUS. *Democracy and Assimilation*. New York, 1920.
- . *Intermarriage in New York City*. New York, 1921.
- JOSEPH, SAMUEL. *History of the Baron de Hirsch Fund*. Philadelphia, 1935.
- LEVINGER, LEE J. *Causes of Anti-Semitism in the United States*. Philadelphia, 1925.
- PHILIPSON, DAVID. *Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York, 1931.
- SCHULMAN, ELIAS. *Geshikhte fun der yidisher Literatur in Amerika, 1870-1900. [History of Yiddish Literature in the United States, 1870-1900]*. New York, 1943.

AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK,

1899-1948

By *Harry Schneiderman*

IN THE PREFACE to the first volume of the *British Jewish Year Book*, which appeared in 1896, the talented and versatile Joseph Jacobs, its editor, remarked that no excuse was needed for the publication of a year book. Similarly, no excuse is needed for the publication, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the *American Jewish Year Book*, of an article commemorating the event. That the *American Jewish Year Book* is an important institution in Jewish life is recognized by all who are familiar with its contents. This *Year Book* has a special significance because it was begun in the early formative period of the Jewish community of the United States as we know it today. Consequently, the series is a running contemporary record of the growth of the community as reflected in the development of its institutions and in the outcropping of problems, both those special to the Jewish people and those general world problems that have affected Jews.

ORIGIN AND SPONSORSHIP

It is true that our community traces its earliest beginnings to 1654, when twenty-three refugees from Brazil arrived at New Amsterdam, and that the immigrants who followed, especially those from Germany in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, laid the foundations of the community. But it was largely the immigrants who fled from pauperism, perse-

cution and pogroms in Eastern Europe, who built the superstructure, the community as it is today.

It was in 1899 during the early years of these building operations that Volume 1 of the *American Jewish Year Book*, edited by Cyrus Adler, was published. The Jews in the United States then numbered about one million, compared to the approximately four and a half millions of today. Of these one million, over half had entered the country since 1880, when the intensification of anti-Jewish persecution in Russia, marked by the infamous May Laws, set in.

That the community was virtually still in its childhood at that time will be clear from the fact that only twenty national organizations were listed in that volume, compared with nearly three hundred today. Of the twenty, only five were more than thirteen years old; three, including the Federation of American Zionists, had just come into existence. Thanks to that early beginning, we have in the *American Jewish Year Book* invaluable source material for the history of the Jewish community of the United States as we know it today.

It was not easy, however, for Cyrus Adler to persuade the then young and small Jewish Publication Society of America to embark upon the new project. Such an annual was bound to be dry and to appeal to a very small number of the members of the Society to whom the *Year Book* would be sent as one of three books each year. Furthermore, a volume of diverse materials, including lists and statistical tables, was bound to be more costly than an ordinary book. Nevertheless, Dr. Adler was successful in persuading the Board of Trustees of the Society to launch the project, especially when he himself volunteered to serve as editor without compensation. There is little doubt that the initiation of a similar project in London in 1896 was helpful in bringing about this result.

As time went on, the publication became more and more widely known and the editors became more and more ambitious in their efforts to gather information for inclusion in the volumes. As a result, the cost of compilation and printing mounted and consumed an increasingly large part of the

Society's funds. In 1907, the Board of Trustees of the Publication Society reluctantly came to the conclusion that the organization could no longer afford to compile as well as print the *Year Book*, and it was agreed that the tenth volume, then in the course of preparation, would be the last of the series. During the year preceding this decision, a new organization, the American Jewish Committee, had come into existence. It was created to safeguard the civil, political and religious equality of Jews in countries in which this equality existed, and to work for the achievement of such equality in countries of persecution. Prominent among the organizers and leaders of the American Jewish Committee was Cyrus Adler, the originator of the *Year Book*. He realized that in order to do its work effectively, the Committee would have to keep a close watch on events and trends in Jewish life all over the world and that it would have to keep its membership, and the Jewish public generally, informed in order to secure their support for the work of the Committee. In his view, the Committee could have no better medium for these purposes than the *American Jewish Year Book*, and, at his suggestion, the Committee entered into arrangements with the Jewish Publication Society under which the former would undertake the work and the cost of preparation of the manuscript and the latter would stand the cost of manufacture of the *Year Book*. This co-operative arrangement between the Publication Society and the American Jewish Committee has continued from 1908 to the present.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Although we do not find it stated in these terms, the purpose of Dr. Adler and the Jewish Publication Society in compiling and publishing the *Year Book* was to have it serve both as a force for the promotion of the homogeneity of the Jewish community of the United States and as a source of authoritative information on Jews and Jewish life for the enlightenment of the general community. Although Jews were then not nearly

as much the subject of discussion as they are today, Cyrus Adler saw also the vital need of authentic records of events affecting Jews and of authoritative statistics of their number, their distribution and their contributions to the civilization and culture of the countries in which they live.

When the American Jewish Committee took over the compilation and editing of the *Year Book*, the second purpose, namely, the presentation of authoritative material for interested persons and groups outside of the Jewish community, was made more specific. The Committee began to use the *Year Book* as a medium for the dissemination of information on problems confronting Jews and on subjects on which it was believed enlightenment was required. Thus, to the various directories, chronologies and lists, which had been the major contents of the preceding nine volumes, the Committee added special articles on various subjects on which it was desired to focus public attention. The Committee also reprinted in the *Year Book* its annual reports, which frequently dealt with subjects which were of current interest and were referred to in the body of the *Year Book*.

Although the scope of the *Year Book* was intended originally to be restricted to the American scene, this frontier was crossed even in the early years of the publication. In the very first volume, Cyrus Adler noted the important events affecting Jews not only in our own country, but in other countries as well; and in succeeding volumes he included articles on the communal life and institutions of Jews in overseas lands. This policy, which has been followed ever since, has had two extremely useful advantages. First, it has given to posterity priceless historical information; and second—and this is of even more vital importance—this policy has helped to keep alive and to nurture in the hearts of American Jews that sense of kinship and common destiny which has inspired our community worthily to fill the role of big brother to our overseas brethren, and give them courage to survive the afflictions which have so sorely beset them, especially during the past three and a half decades.

CONTENTS

In a general way the departments of the *Year Book* may be classified under two heads: (1) reference material, and (2) historical source material, although in the features intended to serve contemporary reference purposes are to be found facts helpful to the student of history. Under the headings of reference material are included calendars, directories of national and local organizations, lists of various kinds, including bibliographies, and statistics. Under the heading of historical source material we may class the special articles of various kinds, biographical sketches, the Review of the Year and documents.

Directories

Only twenty national organizations are listed in the first volume, as compared with about 270 in the present volume (50). Even this small number indicated a large variety of interests and activities. A detailed study and analysis of the successive directories of national organizations would reveal the increase in the size and in the diversification of the activities of the Jewish community.

Directories of local organizations and supplements to them constitute important historical data on the development of local communities. Attempts to compile complete directories of local organizations were made from time to time, usually in connection with the decennial censuses of religious bodies conducted by the United States Bureau of the Census. These were published in several issues of the *Year Book*. The number of such organizations, however, became so great that this practice was discontinued after the special census of 1916-17. Because of their special importance as local organizations, lists of federations and welfare funds, in which in many cities local social welfare groups are combined, were published in the *Year Book* annually, with only a few interruptions, from 1917 on. More recently, these directories have included, in addition to federations and welfare funds, local community

councils and local philanthropic organizations, whether affiliated or unaffiliated with the respective federations or welfare funds. These directories have been prepared for many years by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the co-ordinating body in this field.

With the exception of volume 1, which contained a very valuable list of Jewish periodicals which had appeared in the United States up to 1900, every volume has included a directory of Jewish periodicals current during the year preceding publication. These directories constitute important source material for the student of this type of Jewish activity and of this part of the field of American journalism. The list in 1900 shows that a total of forty-two Jewish periodicals was then being published in the United States; more than four times that number, or a total of 175 periodicals, are listed in volume 50. A comparison of the two lists reveals that there was a noticeable increase in the publication of periodicals issued in English, whereas those appearing in Yiddish showed a decline, and there was a striking, though not unexpected, increase in the number of Hebrew periodicals.

Both in 1900 and in 1948, a very large proportion of the Jewish periodicals were weeklies. There was only one short-lived daily in English, the *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, which appeared from 1924 to 1935 and had a very small circulation. Two Yiddish dailies were listed in 1900. Since 1885, when the *Yiddishes Tageblatt*, or Jewish Daily News, was established in New York City, about a dozen dailies in this language have appeared, of which four are now in existence. The story of Yiddish daily journalism in the United States, including various efforts which resulted in failures or mergers with more vigorous projects, is a fascinating one, and helpful material for that story is contained in the list of Jewish periodicals in the various volumes of the *Year Book*.

Bibliographies

A list of books of Jewish interest published in the United States during the year has been an annual feature of the *Year*

Book since 1941 under the title "American Jewish Bibliography." Special annotated bibliographies on various subjects have appeared from time to time. Notable among these were "The Hundred Best Available Books in English on Jewish Subjects," by Joseph Jacobs, in 1904, and "Nazi-Germany and the Jews: an Annotated Bibliography," by Joshua Bloch, in 1936. The bibliography by Dr. Jacobs was considered so valuable that it was reprinted in revised form twenty-one years later, in 1925. These bibliographies have historical significance as well as educational, in that they are an index to the subjects which interested Jews at various times and to the productivity of books on these subjects.

Biographical Lists

In the British *Jewish Year Book*, which Dr. Adler undoubtedly studied closely while planning the *American Jewish Year Book*, appeared various lists of Jewish personalities—clergy, members of the peerage, of Parliament, of the armed forces and other notables. The only American counterpart of these groups which could be listed in the *Year Book* were rabbis and the Jewish members of the Congress of the United States. Instead of presenting a list of rabbis in one volume, Dr. Adler presented in three instalments a series of brief biographical sketches of rabbis and cantors then officiating in the United States. The last of these instalments required so little space that there was room in the same volume for a series of biographical sketches of Jewish communal workers.

There were, up to that time, no Jews in presidential cabinets or in the United States Supreme Court, and very few in the diplomatic service of the nation. For many years the list of Jews in the Congress of the United States was the only regular feature corresponding to the various lists of notables in the British *Jewish Year Book*. Beginning in 1931, there were included lists of Jews who had served, or were then serving, as state governors or as diplomatic representatives of the United States. In the same and in the following volume appeared a list of Jews who had occupied,

or were then occupying, judgeships in Federal and in state courts. In 1939, the lists of governors, diplomats and members of Congress were combined in one schedule, which has appeared annually under the title "Jews in American Public Service." Added to the categories enumerated were Jews who had served, or were serving, as members of the President's Cabinet, United States Supreme Court, District and Circuit courts, as well as those who were appointed by Presidents as members of Federal agencies. This list was intended to serve as a sort of roll of honor of Jews who had given distinguished service to the nation.

Efforts to compile a similar roll of honor on a much broader scale were made in 1904 and 1922. In the former volume Dr. Adler presented a series of brief "Biographical Sketches of Jews Prominent in the Professions, etc., in the United States." These collections of biographical sketches constitute the first *Who's Who* in the American Jewish community, and are of great value because they include persons who were active or prominent during the preceding half-century and more. A similar attempt on a less ambitious scale, insofar as biographical data were concerned, was the compilation by I. G. Dobseavage, then secretary of the Jewish Publication Society, of "Jews of Prominence in the United States," presented in 1922. This included the names of over seventeen hundred men and women, then living, who were prominent in the arts, the professions and public service. It included such rabbis and Jewish communal workers as had attained wide recognition by the general community.

Statistics

No year book worthy of the name would be complete without statistics. These would be especially missed in a Jewish year book, so great is the interest of both the Jewish and the general public in the number of Jews and in various other facts about them. From the very first volume, statistics have been a perennial department of the *Year Book*. Besides the special sections on population and migration statistics

which have appeared annually, there has been published in the *Year Book* other important statistical material, including estimates of Jewish population in the various countries, and in those countries where data on Jews are contained in the census reports, the official statistics on the Jewish population. An example of the latter type of study is the detailed analysis of the Canadian censuses of 1941 which appeared in 1946. This article also summarizes earlier Canadian censuses since 1850.

In respect of the United States, estimates have been made decennially—1906, 1916, 1926 and 1936, in connection with the Census of Religious Bodies conducted by the United States Bureau of the Census, in which the information regarding Jewish congregations was gathered by a special agent appointed by the Bureau. The Special Agents have been Henrietta Szold (1906), Samson D. Oppenheim (1916) and Harry S. Linfield (1926 and 1936). Since 1916 this work has been financed by the American Jewish Committee and the results published in volumes of the *American Jewish Year Book*. Revised estimates compiled by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds appear in the present volume.

Twice during the past half-century, statistics of Jewish population of countries in the Old World underwent great changes as a result of the two world wars. After the first of these conflicts the map of Eastern Europe was drastically altered, with the result that large groups of persons were transferred from the sovereignty of one state to that of another which was enlarged or newly created. At that time, fairly accurate figures of populations of territory thus transferred were available, and it was possible to prepare new tables for the *Year Book*. Similar transfers of territory and population occurred after World War II, but these were of little moment compared with the effect upon the Jewish population of the European continent of the wholesale atrocious killings of Jews accompanying the Nazi extermination policy. As soon as was possible, the editors of the *Year Book* explored every source of reliable information with a view to the compilation of authentic figures of Jewish population in the

countries affected by the Nazi holocaust. Such an analysis appears in the present volume.

The large movement of Jewish population of European countries to the New World, which began during the 1880's, was another subject which it was believed required careful recording, both for contemporary interest and future study. Statistics of Jewish immigration to the United States have been published in all issues of the *Year Book* since the first. Until 1943, these were abstracts made from the official reports of the Immigration Service. These abstracts gave not only the number of immigrants who were classified by the authorities as "Hebrew," but also information regarding their sex, age and country of origin; the number of Jews refused admission or deported was also noted in these abstracts. After forty-six years, this practice had to be discontinued when, in 1943, Earl G. Harrison, then Commissioner of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, ordered the elimination of the term "Hebrew" from the classification of immigrants by race or people from the manifests used by transportation companies, and from the statistical forms used by the United States Government. Since the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, the figure for Jews immigrating to the United States has had to be based on estimates supplied by community agencies whose functions include the reception of immigrants at various places of arrival.

Statistics of Jewish immigration to Canada, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Cuba in the New World and to Palestine and the Union of South Africa in the Old, began to be published in 1913.

Besides population and immigration statistics which were the content of the statistical section in each volume of the *Year Book*, numerical data on other subjects were given from time to time. For example, in 1920 the Bureau of Jewish Social Research contributed an article analyzing the professional tendencies of Jewish students in 106 colleges, universities and professional schools chosen because of their location near centers of considerable Jewish population.

The purpose of this study was to determine the professions or occupations favored by Jewish students. In the present volume are included a number of tables on the enrollment of Jews in American colleges and universities compiled by the B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau in 1946-47.

The number of Jews serving in the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II was another subject of statistical study, the results of which appeared in the *Year Book*. Detailed tables of the World War I study were published in 1920. For World War II the *Year Book* published only preliminary figures in 1948; this study was finally completed and published by the National Jewish Welfare Board in two volumes.

Biographical Sketches

Full-length (as distinct from brief) biographical sketches have been a feature of the past thirty-one volumes. The deaths of Solomon Schechter in 1915 and of Joseph Jacobs in 1916—both of them distinguished members of the Jewish community—were regarded as events that had to be noted in the *Year Book* more strikingly than by the mere listing of their names in the annual necrology. Beginning with 1916, the policy gradually became crystallized that the *Year Book* should include biographical sketches of deceased American Jews who had during their lifetime given distinguished service to the Jewish community. There were seventy-eight such articles in all.

The subjects of all but four of these sketches (Israel Abrahams, Ahad Ha-Am, Samuel William Jacobs and Israel Zangwill) were American Jews, persons who had lived or worked in the United States since the middle of the nineteenth century. They were with few exceptions the most active and influential scholars, philanthropists, communal leaders, as well as persons who had attained distinction in the arts, professions and public service. Taken together, they constitute a key to the history of Jewish life in America during the past century.

Biographical articles have been presented to commemorate notable anniversaries of sages and scholars of the past. The first of these articles appeared in 1935, in commemoration of the 800th anniversary of the birth of the great interpreter and codifier of Jewish law, Moses Ben Maimon, known throughout the world as Maimonides.

Other sages and scholars commemorated in these articles were Rashi, Jehuda Halevi, Saadia Gaon, Heinrich Graetz and Nachman Krochmal. Articles were also published on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of two distinguished American scholars and communal leaders—Kaufmann Kohler and Mayer Sulzberger. These articles dealt primarily with the fields to which these men made special contributions—Jewish scholarship and Jewish book collections.

Institutional Anniversaries

Nothing is more natural than that in a year book noting and recording important events in Jewish life, anniversaries of important institutions as well as of notable individuals should be commemorated. Ten such institutions are the subject of articles. Appropriately, the first in the series was an article in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Jewish Publication Society of America, which appeared in 1913.

Communal Development

The information contained in the articles on institutional anniversaries, supplemented by the data presented in a number of other contributions to various issues of the *Year Book*, gives us a fairly complete picture of the development of Jewish communal institutions in the United States during the past fifty years. The supplementary articles include a group of seven which are contemporary accounts of the beginnings of important organizations or movements. One of the most interesting of these is an article dealing with the establishment,

in 1909, of the Jewish community (Kehillah) of New York City—a dramatic, though perhaps premature attempt to coordinate the work of all the various types of, and local organizations in, the largest center of Jewish population in the United States.

Other articles describing the beginnings of important communal efforts are an early history of the federation movement in this country; an article on Jewish war relief work describing the genesis of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, a description of the manner in which the National Jewish Welfare Board was established during World War I, and the story of the establishment of the New York Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropies—an event of special importance because of the size of the community and its long resistance to the acceptance of the federation idea.

The *Year Book* also contains valuable information on the course of development of institutions and their activities. One of these articles is a description of adjustments which federations had made to social and other changes from the beginnings of the movement until the early 1930's. There are also two articles on the progress of Jewish education in the United States.

Two comprehensive descriptions of the extent to which the Jewish community of the United States is organized and the structure of its institutional life are also included in the *Year Book*. The first of these was "Communal Organization of the Jews in the United States, 1927"; the second, an account of "Jewish Community Organization in the United States," appeared ten years later.

Domestic Problems

In the first two decades of the *Year Book*, anti-Jewish prejudice and its manifestations were not the important concern of the Jewish community which they have since become. The three external subjects which then absorbed much of the

attention of community leaders were immigration, the dishonoring of the American passport by the Russian government (the passport question), and the maintenance of the separation of Church and State.

During the first ten years of the *Year Book*, agitation for the restriction of foreign immigration was on the increase and many bills providing for such restriction were introduced at every session of Congress. Jewish community leaders were opposed to restriction, not only because it would reduce the possibility of refuge from persecution and poverty for the Jews of Eastern Europe, but also because of the conviction that immigration was a boon to America. In 1910, the threat of the passage of the restrictionist immigration bill in Congress was temporarily deferred by the passage of a law setting up an immigration commission to investigate the entire subject. In an article entitled "In Defense of the Immigrant," a description is given of important hearings before Congressional committees on immigration at which representatives of leading Jewish organizations expressed opposition to the proposed restrictionist legislation. Abstracts of the testimony of these witnesses and material cited by them are given in this article. The progress of the restrictionist movement up to and after the passage of the existing quota law was eagerly followed by the community and is recorded in detail in the chronology in the *Year Book* and also in the annual reports of the American Jewish Committee in each volume. Later, when persecution under the Nazis started a new flow of Jewish immigrants to the United States, and American Jews were eager to rescue as many of the victims as possible, the nature of the exodus, the places of refuge, including the United States, and existing laws and regulations governing immigration to these places were the subjects of an article "Migration of Jews in Recent Years." It is hardly necessary to mention that the newer emigration from the European continent which began in 1933, including its international aspects and the much discussed displaced persons problem, were dealt with in detail in the Review of the Year in every volume of the *Year Book* from the time the new exodus began.

The interest in, and concern with, immigration to the United States was overshadowed during the first decade of the century by preoccupation with the violation by the Czarist government of the passport rights of American citizens of the Jewish faith. As a result, a series of articles on the passport question appeared in four separate volumes.

Along with other religious groups, American Jews have long been concerned with preserving the separation of Church and State, which is expressed in the first amendment to the United States Constitution, forbidding the establishment of a state religion. Two articles discussing phases of this problem were a compilation and discussion of laws establishing Sunday as a legal day of rest without any provision for those citizens who observe another day of the week as their Sabbath and, more recently, an article giving a comprehensive history of the development of the separation doctrine, with particular reference to the field of education.

For a number of years following World War I, there was widespread interest in the subject of the Americanization of immigrants. An article, "Jewish Americanization Agencies," enumerated and described the various agencies which had been created by the Jewish community to promote the process of adjustment to, understanding of, and respect for, American customs, institutions and ideals.

One of the Americanization forces on which considerable stress was laid was the Yiddish press, a powerful force in educating its readers about America and inspiring them to become intelligent and public-spirited citizens. The subject of the Yiddish press was then of special importance, because of the discussion which had been going on in the United States since the outbreak of World War I concerning the value of the foreign-language press; some extremists even urged the abolition of this branch of the American press. That opponents of foreign-language periodicals were sadly in need of enlightenment regarding their nature was amply demonstrated by Mordecai Soltes, in a dissertation regarded as so important a contribution to an understanding of a vital phase of Jewish life in America that over 200 pages of one volume

were devoted to its presentation, under the title "Yiddish Press—An Americanizing Agency." The present volume features a special article on Jewish immigration into the United States during the past hundred years, stressing the process of acculturation.

Other subjects on which the American Jewish Committee believed the general public required enlightenment were *Shehitah*, the Jewish method of slaughtering animals for food, the spurious Protocols of Zion and the *Kol Nidre* Prayer, all the subject of agitation during the 1920's. Anti-Jewish agitation since 1933 has been described in detail in the Reviews of the Year and in the Annual Reports of the American Jewish Committee.

Overseas Problems

Moved by the conviction that the fate of Jews in any part of the world is the concern of all Israel, the sponsors of the *Year Book* regarded it as a source of information not only on domestic problems but also on events affecting overseas Jewish communities.

For that reason, early volumes of the *Year Book*, which appeared during a critical period in the history of the Jews of Rumania, published articles and documents on that subject, outstanding being the text of a note written by John Hay, then Secretary of State, calling attention to Rumania's violation of its pledge to emancipate the Jewish population given at the Berlin Conference of 1878. In 1906 the outrages initiated by the infamous Kishineff massacre of 1903 were listed in a table entitled "From Kishineff to Bialystok," accompanied by irrefutable evidence that they were government-inspired. A full account of the Beilis case was also published. It described the attempt of the Czarist Government to fasten upon the Jewish people the odious charge of the practice of ritual murder.

In connection with overseas problems, the *Year Book* has included important official documents, such as the famous minority treaties entered into by the Allied powers after World

War I, the text of the Bernheim Petition before the League of Nations, pointing up the absence of minority provisions in the treaty with Germany, the minutes of the discussion of that Petition in the League of Nations and the official summary of the Report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1936 to investigate Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine, which recommended partition.

Another subject touched on in various articles in the *Year Book* was the effect of military events upon world Jewry. These articles were especially valuable because they were written on the basis of contemporary data. Typical of such articles were the "Balkan Wars and the Jews." Following World War I, three articles dealt with the participation of the Jews of the British Empire, France and Palestine in the armed forces of those countries. Following World War II, an article was published dealing with the participation of Jews in the British forces; another article dealt with the Jews of France during the Nazi occupation.

Although much of the space in the various volumes devoted to Jewish communities outside of the United States was given over to those of Europe and Palestine, yet the Jewish communities of the Western Hemisphere were not neglected. In 1925 there was presented a comprehensive history of the Jews of Canada. Jewish communities in Latin-American countries were the subject of two articles, each dealing with an entirely different period. The first of these articles, written in 1917, gave a picture of the situation before the influx of post-World War I refugees. The second, appearing in 1945, showed how the size and activities of these communities had radically changed during the intervening twenty-eight years, because of the immigration of refugees from the Hitler tyranny.

Miscellaneous

There remain six special articles deserving of notice in this discussion. One of these is a highly competent description of the architecture of the synagogue, which appeared in 1926, at a time when there was a great deal of interest in the subject of synagogue architecture.

Another article in this group, "The Synagogue and Jewish Communal Activities," contains valuable suggestions for the participation of the membership of synagogues in Jewish communal activities of a national character. A third article gives the history of the new Jewish translation of the Bible issued by the Jewish Publication Society in January, 1917, after a decade of work by a group of leading Jewish biblical scholars in the United States. The article also gives examples of some of the more striking departures from previous English translations. Two articles deal with the participation of Jews in agriculture in the United States—"Agricultural Activities of the Jews in America" and "The Jew in Agriculture in the United States."

Finally, attention deserves to be called to "Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Jewish Crisis," describing, in outline only, the vital part played by President Roosevelt as the champion of human rights and justice during the most critical period in Jewish history, with which providentially his administration coincided.

Review of the Year

What has now become the most important section of the *Year Book*, the Review of the Year, is the result of a slow growth. In the first ten volumes the equivalent feature consisted of an article on the year and a list of "leading events." In subsequent volumes only chronologies were published, but beginning in 1923 a survey of the year was prepared annually. Its compilation was for a number of years the work of a single individual, but later became too lengthy to be so treated and was delegated to various members of the staff of the American Jewish Committee. From 1940 on, it has been the practice to have specialists at home and abroad prepare the summaries of Jewish life throughout the world. It is interesting to note that the Review of the Year in 1948 covered almost 500 pages, compared with nineteen pages which the equivalent material covered in the first volume.

This drastic change in the importance assigned to the

various features did not come about suddenly; it was the result of slow and gradual development brought about very largely by three factors; namely, first, the growing availability of information about Jewish life all over the world; second, an increase in the number and importance of events affecting Jews, especially in overseas countries; and, third, an increase in the interest of American Jews in the life and fortunes of their brethren in other parts of the world.

The Review of the Year is supplemented each year by lists of anniversaries, necrologies, bequests and appointments, as well as (in recent years) by a bibliography of American books of Jewish interest in English.

In connection with the production of books on subjects of Jewish interest, it should be noted that important information is contained in the annual reports of the Jewish Publication Society, which have appeared in the *Year Book* since the second volume. This information is highly significant, because the Society has been the only communal agency entrusted with the production of Jewish books, and because the organization has been outstanding in this field in respect of both the quantity and the quality of its publications.

EDITORS

Volumes 1 through 12 were edited by seven persons. Dr. Adler, who founded the *Year Book*, edited volumes 1 to 5 and, in collaboration with Henrietta Szold, volumes 6 and 7. Volumes 8 and 9 were edited by Miss Szold. Beginning with volume 10, the preparation of the *Year Book* was undertaken by the American Jewish Committee. Herbert Friedenwald, the first secretary of that organization, edited volumes 10 to 14 inclusive; volume 15 was edited by Harry G. Friedman, with the nominal collaboration of Dr. Friedenwald. Volume 16 was edited by Herman Bernstein, Dr. Friedenwald's successor as secretary of the American Jewish Committee. In 1914, the Committee established a statistical bureau to which the duty of preparing the *Year Book* was entrusted.

Dr. Joseph Jacobs, the first director of this bureau, edited volume 17. Following his death, in January, 1916, and pending the appointment of a successor, Dr. Adler took over the supervision of the preparation of volume 18. Samson D. Oppenheim, successor to Dr. Jacobs as director of the statistical bureau, edited volumes 19 and 20. The present writer assisted in the preparation of volumes 11 to 20 (1909-1918) inclusive, became editor with volume 21, and has continued in that capacity through volume 50, editing the last two volumes in collaboration with Morris Fine.