

*Spring/Summer, 1993*

---

AMERICAN  
JEWISH  
ARCHIVES

---

Volume XLV    Spring/Summer, 1993    Number 1

# American Jewish Archives

*A Journal Devoted to the Preservation and Study  
of the American Jewish Experience*

Jacob Rader Marcus, Ph.D., *Editor*  
Abraham J. Peck, Ph.M., *Managing Editor*  
Ruth L. Kreimer, *Editorial Associate*  
Tammy Topper, *Editorial Assistant*

*Published by The American Jewish Archives*  
*on the Cincinnati Campus of the*  
Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion  
Dr. Alfred Gottschalk, *President*

*American Jewish Archives is indexed in The Index to Jewish Periodicals, Current Contents, The American Historical Review, United States Political Science Documents, and The Journal of American History*

*Information for Contributors:*

*American Jewish Archives follows generally the University of Chicago Press "Manual of Style" (12th revised edition) and "Words into Type" (3rd edition), but issues its own style sheet which may be obtained by writing to:*

*The Managing Editor,  
American Jewish Archives  
3101 Clifton Avenue  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45220*

*Patron 1993:*

*The Neumann Memorial Publication Fund*

*Published by The American Jewish Archives on  
the Cincinnati campus of the Hebrew Union  
College-Jewish Institute of Religion*

*ISSN 002-905X*

*© 1993 by the American Jewish Archives*

---

## Contents

---

### 1

*Louis Marshall and the White Terror in Hungary, 1919-1920*

Nathaniel Katzburg

In the immediate weeks and months after the end of World War I, the "peace" which was supposed to take its place did not relate to the Jews of Eastern Europe. In numerous nations of the region, terrible pogroms against Jewish citizens were carried out with a ferocity perhaps unmatched in the modern history of anti-Jewish assaults. Nathaniel Katzburg focuses on the anti-Jewish attacks in Hungary following the overthrow of a soviet-type republic established in the country only a short time earlier. The pretext for the attacks against Jews was that they had been among the leading Communists of the deposed republic. In actual fact, any number of anti-Jewish hatreds played their part. Despite the obstructionism of American consular officials in Hungary, American Jewish organizations and leaders, especially Louis Marshall, sought to exert pressure on American and Hungarian diplomatic circles. The pressure worked as the attacks abated. But East European Jewry would have only a short period of peace. What would follow in the 1930s and 1940s would far exceed the suffering of that Jewry only decades before.

### 13

*Ambivalent Relations:*

*Acceptance and Anti-Semitism in Confederate Thomasville*

Mark I. Greenberg

From the very beginnings of their existence in the South, Jews who settled in the region sought to display their local loyalty and their acceptance of the code of cultural conformity necessary to exist in the

antebellum environment of religion, racism, and states rights. Yet the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 resulted in a wide-spread anti-Jewish "backlash" in the Confederate states unprecedented in the history of Jewish-Gentile co-existence in the South. Thomasville, Georgia in 1862 was the site of such an anti-Jewish event. Mark I. Greenberg analyzes the relationship of Jews and their neighbors in Thomasville before and after this activity and concludes that a number of factors were involved in the anti-Jewish pronouncements of Thomasville's leading Gentile citizens including the relationship of the Christian community to the image of the "mythical Jew" and the "Jew next door." Would the Jews of Thomasville take the anti-Jewish message to heart and depart for more tolerant climates?

31

*The Design of a Modern Synagogue: Percival Goodman's  
Beth-El in Providence, Rhode Island*

George M. Goodwin

When a synagogue decides that it needs a new building it is a time for both rejoicing and for concern. There is joy in the fact that the present building may be too small to house a growing group of congregants, especially children. There is joy in the idea that a new building will infuse the congregation with a new spirit of direction. But there is concern with the eternally difficult questions of "how much money will it cost and where will that money come from?" Yet only a few people stop to consider equally important questions: "What will it look like and who will design it?" All of these questions preoccupied the thoughts of Rabbi William G. Braude of Temple Beth-El, Providence, Rhode Island in the 1940s. The search for a new building and an architect worthy of translating the congregation's vision of itself and its Judaism is the subject of George M. Goodwin's fascinating analysis. It is clear that building a new synagogue involves much more than any set of blueprints can convey.

73

*Rethinking the American Jewish Experience  
Some East European Letters on Emigration*

Jacob Kabakoff

83

*American Jewish Personalities  
Pluralism, Chicago School Style:  
Louis Wirth, the Ghetto, the City, and "Integration"*

Zane L. Miller

93

Book Reviews

Posner, Richard A. *Cardozo: A Study in Reputation*

Reviewed by Melvin I. Urofsky

97

Efrati, Nathan. *Mi-ma'shber Le-tikvah*  
[The Jewish Community in Eretz-Israel during World War I,  
1914-1918]

Reviewed by Yossi Feintuch

101

Lissak, Rivka Shpak. *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull  
House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919*

Reviewed by Henry D. Shapiro

105

Brenner, Rachel Feldhay. *A. M. Klein,  
the Father of Canadian Jewish Literature:  
Essays in the Poetics of Humanistic Passion*

Reviewed by Daniel Walden

109

Robinson, Ira, Anctil, Pierre, and Butovsky, Mervin,  
Edited by. *An Everyday Miracle: Yiddish Culture in Montreal*

Reviewed by David Rome

112

Grossman, Cissy. *A Temple Treasury: The Judaica Collection of  
Congregation Emanu-El of the City of New York*

Reviewed by Nancy Berman

116

Hyman, Harold M. *Oleander Odyssey: The Kempners of  
Galveston, Texas, 1854-1980s*

Reviewed by Natalie Ornish

119

Brief Notices

122

Selected Acquisitions





*Louis M. Marshall*  
(1856-1929)

---

# Louis Marshall and the White Terror in Hungary, 1919–1920

*Nathaniel Katzburg*

## *Introduction*

Following the overthrow of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in August 1919, a wave of terror erupted in Hungary. It was directed primarily against Jews, allegedly as a retaliation for crimes committed by the Communists, among whose leaders Jews were prominent. The terror in Hungary gave rise to sharp reactions abroad, particularly on the part of international labor (the trade unions and the socialists were also persecuted) and Jewish organizations in the Western countries. Among the latter, the Joint Foreign Committee of British Jews, the Alliance Israélite in Paris, and the American Jewish Committee interceded with their respective governments on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Hungary. The following documents relate to the action taken by the president of the American Jewish Committee, Louis Marshall.

The terror in Hungary caused deep indignation in the United States, especially among those of Hungarian origin, both Jews and non-Jews. One of the central organizations of Hungarian-Americans, the Hungarian-American Federation, called the attention of the State Department to the situation, expressing its "horror at and condemnation of the persecution of the Jews in Hungary as reported in the newspapers"<sup>1</sup> In its reply the State Department stated that "although some mistreatment had occurred it could not be attributed to the Hungarian authorities who were doing their best to prevent such occurrences and were severely punishing offenders."<sup>2</sup> The department, as was usual in such cases, was relying on reports by its officers on the spot, in this case Ulysses S. Grant-Smith, head of the American Mission in Budapest. The Hungarian-American Federation, not having its own sources of information, was satisfied by what it was told by the State Department.<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile, however, the situation in Hungary deteriorated, and the first months of 1920 saw some of the worst acts of violence against Jews. This caused grave concern, especially among American Jews of Hungarian origin, many of whom resided in New York City. Consequently, they appealed to the acting mayor, Fiorello H. La Guardia, to intervene with the State Department. Accordingly, La Guardia cabled on February 27, 1920, to Acting Secretary of State Frank L. Polk, asking for information on "news just received New York City, that there are pogroms and general massacre of Jews in Hungary."<sup>4</sup> Replying on the following day, Polk pointed out that "Department has received no information to indicate pogroms and massacres of Jews in Hungary. Reports indicate that Hungarian Government is making every effort to keep order and to prevent possible outbreaks of popular feeling against those connected with former Bolshevik regime."<sup>5</sup> In fact, the State Department reiterated what it had said five months earlier, endeavoring to exonerate the Hungarian government and to deny the existence of enmity toward the Jews. The reference to this effect in the draft of Polk's cable (the italicized passage in the preceding quotation) was deleted in the text sent to La Guardia. The Hungarian Jews in America were hardly satisfied with this statement, and it was felt that more energetic measures should be taken. It was at this stage that Louis Marshall, as president of the American Jewish Committee, stepped in.

On May 20, 1920, Marshall had an interview with Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby and delivered a formal protest against the persecution of Jews in Hungary, thus indicating the severity with which the American Jewish Committee viewed the situation in that country (Document 1). Thereupon the State Department instructed Grant-Smith in Budapest to report on the situation and also to make clear to the Hungarian government "that American sympathy for Hungary will depend largely on fair treatment given to minorities" (Document 2). At the same time the department pointed out to Marshall, as it had on previous occasions when intervention was sought, that the Hungarian government "is endeavoring to prevent the oppression of Jews" (Document 3). As a proof thereto, Marshall was provided with a copy of a British White Paper entitled *Report on the Alleged Existence of 'White Terror' in Hungary* (Cmd. 673, London: His Majesty's Sta-

tionery Office, 1920). This is a collection of despatches by British diplomatic and military representatives in Hungary, obviously published in response to public protests and questions in Parliament. The documents in the *Report* supposedly indicated that there was no terror in Hungary, although acts of violence had taken place. It was a clear attempt to minimize the scope of the terror. From the documents there emerged a distorted picture of the real situation. For considerations of foreign policy, mainly with a view to backing up the anti-Bolshevist regime, the British were not desirous of compounding the difficulties of the Hungarian government, which, in fact, did not exercise effective control over the wild elements in the army that maintained the reign of terror.

Nevertheless, the State Department recommended the British White Paper to Marshall as a reliable document that supported its own findings. However, a sharp-eyed and experienced jurist like Marshall was not taken in by the British document. He put it to a penetrating analysis, criticizing particularly the anti-Jewish prejudices reflected in the despatches (Document 5).

While the American Jewish Committee and Marshall were concerned about Hungarian Jewry as a whole, they took a special interest in the case of Rabbi Dr. Immanuel Loew (1854–1944), the chief rabbi of Szeged, the country's second-largest town, and a scholar of international reputation. Rabbi Loew was arrested in April 1920, after an interview with a journalist in which he allegedly made unfavorable observations about the regime and about the regent of Hungary, Admiral Horthy. The case aroused wide interest. The British Foreign Office and the French government were requested to intervene. The case was brought to the attention of Marshall by William N. Loew (1847–1922) of New York, a brother of Rabbi Loew. After a detention of thirteen months the rabbi was set free, and in October 1921 the case was dropped.

The interventions of the American Jewish Committee, like those by the European Jewish bodies, were from the outset of limited effectiveness. This was mainly due to the strong anti-Bolshevist position of the Western powers and their consequent attitude of "understanding," toward Hungary. The lack of political stability in Hungary during the years 1919–1921 and the government's lack of control over the army

were also factors which limited the effect of external pressure for the cessation of violence. The intervention by the Jewish bodies did, however, have some degree of influence, for it motivated the representatives of the powers to take action, and it was made clear to the Hungarian government that it would have to impose its authority. The acts of violence lessened at the end of 1920, and the organized terror ceased at the beginning of 1921.

Documents 1–5 are reproduced from the originals in the National Archives of the United States, Washington, D.C. The reference number is in brackets at the upper left-hand corner of each document. Document 6 is from the papers of the late Leopold Loew, son of Rabbi Immanuel Loew. None of the documents have previously been published.

*1. Louis Marshall to Secretary of State*

[864.4016/9]

May 21, 1920.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

At the interview which you were good enough to accord to me yesterday, I communicated to you the information that had been received by the Joint Distribution Committee relative to the persecution to which the Jews of Hungary have been recently subjected. For many years the Jews of that country were free from the discrimination from which their brethren suffered in Rumania and Russia. During the past six months, however, conditions have changed to such an extent that today the Jews of Hungary are in a most unfortunate plight. There have been frequent outbreaks conducted by sections of what is termed the White Army,<sup>6</sup> which have resulted in the murder of many Jews, in the looting of their property, and in the perpetration of the most shocking indignities. They have been humiliated and libelled, the newspapers have sought to make them responsible as a body for the actions of Bela Kuhn [*sic*] and his associates, with the result that conditions have been intolerable and the Jews have been practically driven to despair.

I am quite sure that at this time, when the fate of Hungary is dependent upon the action of the Great Powers and the attitude of the Supreme Council,<sup>7</sup> when she is seeking to rehabilitate herself and expects to be relieved from the obligations which she is about to assume under the Treaty of peace, an indication from the Great Powers or from the Supreme Council that these anti-Semitic demonstrations must cease, will not be disregarded.

As President of the American Jewish Committee I am in receipt of numerous telegrams and letters from Jews of Hungarian birth residing in various parts of the country, in which I have been urged to bring these facts to the attention of our Government, which they justly believe will not hesitate to exert its influence in behalf of their suffering brethren. It is for that reason that I turn to you in this emergency, knowing that we shall have your entire sympathy and assured that you will leave nothing undone that can lead to an immediate cessation of this recrudescence of medieval brutality.

I am,  
very cordially yours,  
[Sgd.] Louis Marshall

The Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

*2. State Department to U.S. Commissioner,<sup>8</sup> Budapest*

Cable

[864.4016/9]

May 26, 1920.

The President of American Jewish Committee has formally protested to Department against alleged mistreatment of Jews in Hungary by sections of National Army. You will send full report on this subject to Department by mail with such comments on present situation as you wish to make and you should informally make clear that American sympathy for Hungary will depend largely on fair treatment given minorities in Hungary by Hungarian officials.

*3. Department Of State to Louis Marshall*

[864.4016/9]

May 26, 1920.

Mr Louis Marshall,  
120 Broadway,  
New York City.

Sir:

In acknowledgement of your letter of May 21, 1920,<sup>9</sup> in which you refer to statements made during a personal conversation concerning the alleged mistreatment of Jews in Hungary, I beg to inform you that a cable has been sent to the American Commissioner in Hungary requesting a detailed report on this subject.<sup>10</sup> The American Commissioner has also been instructed to make clear to the Hungarian Government that it can hope for American sympathy only as it makes every effort to assure fair treatment to the minorities in the state.

In this connection I may point out that all reports received by the Department of State would indicate that the present Government of Hungary<sup>11</sup> is endeavoring to prevent the oppression of Jews and that such cases as have been verified, with one or two unfortunate exceptions, occurred before the accession to power of the present Hungarian Government.

I am, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
For the Secretary of State:  
Bainbridge Colby<sup>12</sup>

*4. Department of State to Louis Marshall*

[864.4016/9]

May 27, 1920.

Mr. Louis Marshall,  
120 Broadway,  
New York City.

Sir:

With reference to my letter of a few days ago concerning the opinion of the Department as to the alleged mistreatment of Jews in Hungary,<sup>13</sup> I beg to enclose for your information a British report on Alleged Existence of "White Terror" in Hungary. The letters printed herein and presented to Parliament<sup>14</sup> seem to confirm reports received by this Department that the present Government is making every effort to guarantee to all classes of people fair and equitable treatment.

I am, Sir,  
Your obedient servant  
Bainbridge Colby

Enclosure:  
Copy of Report  
Above Described.

*5. Louis Marshall to Secretary of State*

[864.4016/10]

May 27, 1920.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am in receipt of your letters of the 26th and 27th instant, concerning the mistreatment of Jews in Hungary.<sup>15</sup> I thank you for the interest that you have taken in the subject and for your prompt action.

I have carefully read the British report on the "Alleged Existence of 'White Terror' in Hungary". The latest document contained in this report is dated March 8, 1920. Most of them are of previous date, one so long ago as October 7, 1919. It seems to be conceded that there

have been outbreaks resulting in murders and in the ill-treatment of the Jews, but it is claimed that the instances are not as numerous as has been asserted. Some of the expressions contained in the documents, as, for instance, in the letter from Brigadier-General Gorton<sup>16</sup> to Mr. Hohler, seem to indicate a rather non-judicial frame of mind. Thus he speaks of "complaints of ill-treatment of Jews *and other communists*".<sup>17</sup> To say the least, that is an unfortunate attempt to imply that the Jews of Hungary are communists. In the letter of Admiral Sir E. Troubridge<sup>18</sup> to Mr. Hohler there is likewise an attempt to charge the Jews with responsibility for the acts of Bela Kuhn [*sic*].<sup>19</sup> He shows, however, that there were serious outrages in certain districts and that the victims were practically all Jews.<sup>20</sup> Without apparent reason, in describing the present government of Hungary, he makes the statement "It is a Christian Government in a Christian country".<sup>21</sup> One might deduce from that remark the inference that he was reflecting a state of mind entertained by his informants evincing hostility to the Jews.<sup>22</sup> This insidious and subtle insinuation that all Jews are Bolsheviks finds an echo in certain avowedly anti-Semitic London newspapers.<sup>23</sup>

As bearing on present conditions in Hungary, the newspapers of a few days ago gave an account of a serious anti-Semitic outbreak in Budapest that had just occurred.<sup>24</sup>

As further indicating the seriousness of conditions in Hungary, I take this opportunity of calling your attention to facts which I have just learned regarding the arrest of Mr. Emanuel Loew, who is Chief Rabbi of Szegedin [*sic*], Hungary. He is the uncle of Mrs. Rosalie Loew Whitney, the wife of Travis H. Whitney, until recently a member of the Public Service Commission of New York. He is a man of international reputation as a great scholar. His father, before him, was one of the great rabbis of Hungary,<sup>25</sup> whose memory was honored in 1911, on the occasion of the centenary of his birth, by naming a street in Szegedin, whose population is predominantly Catholic, for him. Both of them were known throughout the world as ardent patriots. Both of them were champions of assimilation, and delivered their sermons in the Magyar language. The charges against Chief Rabbi Loew are that, in an interview with a Jewish newspaper reporter, an apostate Jew, he had declared that Hungary no longer existed and had

also referred to the reported atrocities of which the Hungarian Jews had been the victims.<sup>26</sup> These charges were made the subject of parliamentary interpellation, with the result that this eminent and venerable man, who has been criticized by his own people as being a chauvinistic Magyar, is in peril of his life. In the prevailing atmosphere of suspicion and prejudice against Jews there is serious doubt as to whether a fair trial will be accorded to him. His relatives here are in consequence in a state of profound anxiety. If anything can be done to impress upon the Hungarian Government the fact that, for the reasons stated, our Government is greatly interested in the fate of this man, it is quite certain that a great calamity may be averted. The enemies of the Jews everywhere would welcome the conviction of one who occupies the prominent position that Chief Rabbi Loew does in the Jewish world, 'on a charge of treason; just as they did when Dreyfus was convicted in France and when Leo Frank was convicted in Georgia.'<sup>27</sup>

I am confident that you will not fail to recognize the commanding importance of this episode and that you will do all that is possible to avert any injustice.

Very cordially yours  
[Sgd.] Louis Marshall

The Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

*6. Louis Marshall to William N. Loew*

May 28, 1920.

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of yours of the 24th instant, with enclosures.

On May 20th I had an interview with the Secretary of State in Washington,<sup>28</sup> with regard to the anti-Semitic outbreaks in Hungary, which had been brought to my attention as the President of the American Jewish Committee and in connection with the work of the Joint Distribution Committee. At the request of Mr. Colby I wrote to him fully on the subject on my return,<sup>29</sup> and have since received two

letters from him in regard thereto, in one of which he informed me that he had cabled to the American Commissioner in Hungary requesting a detailed report on the subject of the maltreatment of the Jews there, and that he had instructed the Commissioner to make clear to the Hungarian Government that it can hope for American sympathy only if it makes every effort to assure fair treatment to the minorities in the State.<sup>30</sup> In another letter he sent me a copy of a report by British officials, in which they somewhat minimize the charges that had been made as to the existence of white terror in Hungary.<sup>31</sup> This report, however, was made in February last and bears intrinsic evidence of an unfriendly disposition on the part of those who made the investigation, the Jews being spoken of as Communists and Bolsheviks.<sup>32</sup>

I have taken advantage of the opportunity afforded me by these letters to write further on the subject to the Secretary of State, and, in connection with an analysis and criticism of the report to which I have referred, have presented to him additional facts, and especially those pertaining to the case of your brother, Dr. Emanuel Loew.<sup>33</sup> I referred also to the interest that your daughter is taking in the case of her uncle, being quite sure that Mr. Colby is acquainted with her and her husband.<sup>34</sup> I have requested him to have this case investigated, and have emphasized its importance as affecting not only your brother, but Jews in general.<sup>35</sup>

Very truly yours  
[Sgd.] Louis Marshall

William N. Loew, Esq.,  
147 Fourth Avenue  
New York City

---

Nathaniel Katzburg teaches at Bar-Ilan University, Israel

### *Notes*

1. Hungarian-American Federation to Secretary of State Robert Lansing, September 30, 1919, National Archives, Washington (hereafter cited as NA) 864-4016/-.

2. Alvey A. Adey, Second Assistant Secretary, to Eugene Pivany, Secretary, Hungarian-American Federation, October 1, 1919; NA 864-4016/1.

3. Hungarian-American Federation to A. A. Adey, October 24, 1919; NA 864-4016/3.

4. NA 864-4016/4.
5. Polk to La Guardia, February 28, 1920; NA 864-4016/4.
6. The Hungarian national army, under the command of Admiral Miklós Horthy, who was elected regent of Hungary on March 1, 1920.
7. Supreme Council of the Peace Conference.
8. Ulysses S. Grant-Smith.
9. Document 1.
10. Document 2.
11. Formed on March 15, 1920, headed by Sándor Simonyi-Semadam.
12. Colby succeeded Robert Lansing as Secretary of State on March 22, 1920.
13. Document 3.
14. The White Paper referred to in the Introduction. As a rule, such papers are presented to Parliament "by Command of His Majesty" and may be debated in the House of Commons.
15. Documents 3 and 4.
16. Reginald G. Gorton, British member of the Inter-Allied Military Mission, Hungary.
17. *Report on the Alleged Existence of 'White Terror'*, p. 3. The report by Gorton, dated February 18, 1920, was prepared at the request of Thomas B. Hohler, British high commissioner in Hungary.
18. Ernest C. Troubridge, chairman of the Inter-Allied Commission for the Control of Navigation on the Danube.
19. In his report, dated February 20, 1920, Troubridge refers to Béla Kun and the "Jewish leaders" of the Communist revolution, which in his opinion was not really a labor movement; *ibid.*, p. 9.
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*, p. 10. The new regime in Hungary called itself Christian, but the meaning was political rather than religious, and it implied the exclusion of the Jews.
22. Marshall's deduction was not far from the truth. The British diplomats in Hungary, particularly the chief political representative, Hohler, displayed a strong pro-Hungarian sentiment. They largely adopted the Hungarian position with regard to the terror; in fact they tended to justify it: "That patriotic Hungarians should desire to punish those who were in any way, however slight, implicated in events entailing such disastrous consequences cannot be regarded as surprising" (Hohler to Foreign Secretary Lord Curzon, February 21, 1920; Public Record Office, London, file FO 404/1 p. 80). On the great sympathy of Hohler for the Hungarians and their cause, see Harry Hill Bandholtz, *An Undiplomatic Diary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), p. 31 n. 77. Major-General Bandholtz was the American member of the Inter-Allied Military Mission in Hungary, 1919-1920.
23. In the early months of 1920 an anti-Semitic campaign was conducted by some British newspapers, especially by the right-wing *Morning Post*, following the publication of the English translation of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.
24. The reference is probably to the riots which took place in Budapest on the night of May 8, 1920, reported by Grant-Smith on May 25, 1920; NA 864.4016/13.
25. Leopold Loew (1811-1875), from 1850 chief rabbi of Szeged. His son Immanuel succeeded him in 1878.
26. The alleged pronouncements were made on April 19, 1920, and Rabbi Loew was arrested a few days later.
27. Leo Frank of Atlanta, Georgia, was accused in 1913 of murdering a Christian girl, found guilty, and sentenced to death. The fact that he was a Jew was believed to be an important ele-

ment in the trial. The death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, but Frank was lynched in 1915. Marshall was one of the defense counsels in the appeal to the Supreme Court. He regarded the case "almost as a second Dreyfus case." See Morton Rosenstock, *Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965), p. 92.

28. Document 1.

29. Ibid.

30. Document 2.

31. Document 4.

32. Document 5.

33. Ibid.

34. Mrs. Rosalie Loew Whitney, wife of Travis H. Whitney, referred to in Document 5.

35. The State Department cabled on May 29, 1920, to Grant-Smith in Budapest, and pointed out that "Rabbi Loewe [*sic*], a man of international reputation, is well connected in America and condemnation would create most unfavorable impression and arouse deep feeling." Grant-Smith is requested to "report facts immediately." NA 864.4016/10. He reported back on June 17, 1920, saying that he had taken the matter up with the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In order to repel American and probably other foreign intervention in this case, the Hungarians resorted to a counter-action of slander against Rabbi Loew, furnishing the American diplomat with extremely malicious information: "I am informed that he [Rabbi Loew] is not considered mentally sound by a number of his acquaintances, and according to information received, there would appear to be insanity in his family" (Grant-Smith to Secretary of State, June 17, 1920; NA 864.4016/18). Needless to say, this "information" had no foundation whatsoever. After his release Rabbi Loew resumed his office as chief rabbi of Szeged. In 1927 he was elected one of the two representatives of the Hungarian Jewish community in the upper house of Parliament. Rabbi Loew was a member of the council of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

---

# Ambivalent Relations: Acceptance and Anti-Semitism in Confederate Thomasville

*Mark I. Greenberg*

A sudden and unexpected rise in anti-Semitism occurred in the South during the Confederate era. Historians commenting on the increase argue that under the strain of wartime scarcities, inflation, and fear of military defeat, Southerners used Jews as scapegoats. As war profiteering and counterfeiting grew worse, the traditional, yet irrational, stereotype of the Jew as Shylock took on special meaning.<sup>1</sup> While this interpretation has validity, the "scapegoat thesis" does not account for the dynamics of community life in the South. The scapegoating of Jews in the Southern mind was tempered, even at the height of wartime tension and anxiety, by the recognition, especially in small towns, that Jewish merchants played an essential role in economic life. Southerners may have resented their dependence on foreign, non-Christian businessmen, but could not dispense with the vital services they provided.

The experiences of five Jewish households in Thomasville, Georgia, demonstrate that by recapturing the interrelationship of Jew and Gentile in a typical small town we can better understand the seemingly ambivalent character of Southern responses to the Jewish presence.<sup>2</sup> Thomas County serves as an especially interesting case study for the dynamics of Jewish-Gentile interaction because its demographic, economic, and social characteristics during the late antebellum period parallel those of other agricultural regions in the South. In addition, Thomasville holds a prominent place in the historiography of Confederate anti-Semitism.<sup>3</sup>

Created in 1825 and located in the southwestern portion of Georgia, Thomas County grew from a population of 3,299 persons in 1830 to 10,766 in 1860. Thomasville, home to 2,500 Georgians at the beginning of the war, served as county seat. Situated on fertile soil, the county had a predominantly cotton-based economy with approxi-

mately 600 families engaged in farming. The black population of 6,244 slaves and 34 freedmen exceeded that of whites by 1,790. Of the 4,488 whites in Thomas County, only 403 planters owned slaves. J. G. Fondren held 202 bondsmen, but most slaveholders possessed fewer than ten. Fifty farmers owned only a single slave.<sup>4</sup>

Until the arrival of the Atlantic & Gulf Railway from Savannah in April 1861, Thomasville remained relatively isolated from neighboring communities. Nevertheless, a wide assortment of business and professional men catered to the needs of the area's urban and rural residents. The county's largest religious denomination was the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which ran the only school, employing six teachers. Twenty-four residents described themselves as doctors in the 1860 census, although only seven physicians sought patients by advertising in local newspapers. The town had several ministers, two dentists, a few government employees, a jeweler, a photographer, various craftsmen, a butcher, and a tavernkeeper.<sup>5</sup> The town also had a few Jewish residents who, within a short time of their arrival, had become successful merchants.

### *The August 1862 Anti-Jewish Rally*

Community stability and the apparent acceptance of the Jews were short-lived, however, for on Saturday, August 30, 1862, a group of prominent Thomasville and Thomas County citizens met at the courthouse to denounce the area's German-Jewish merchants and peddlers. William G. Ponder, a wealthy slave trader, chaired the anti-Jewish rally, and T. J. Wombwell, a journalist from Fernandina, Florida, and editor of the *Thomasville Weekly Times*, served as secretary. James L. Seward, a former representative to both Congress and the Georgia legislature, spoke briefly at the rally.

Seward and the other speakers condemned the town's Jews on the alleged grounds that they had passed counterfeit bills, engaged in speculation, and held no allegiance to the Confederacy. The gathering resolved that if the Jews did not leave town within ten days they would be expelled by force. It also prohibited new Jewish settlers from entering the area. The organizers called for the creation of a Committee of Vigilance to "inquire into the mode and manner of

dealing with the local German Jews" and to investigate possible acts of extortion, counterfeiting, or unpatriotic behavior. Members of the committee included Dr. T. B. Little, Mayor Arthur P. Wright, and several city aldermen.<sup>6</sup>

Despite the harsh denunciation of the Jews and the resolutions calling for their expulsion, there is no surviving evidence that the town carried out any of its threats. On the contrary, the Jews of Thomasville continued throughout the war to purchase land and buildings, operate their stores, and participate in social events and civic duties. They fought in the Confederate army and supported the Southern cause. The meeting of August 30, 1862, served as a climax of growing fears and worries, and ostensibly had no lasting consequences for Jewish economic success or social integration. With the exception of this single anti-Semitic outburst, the townspeople lived in harmony.<sup>7</sup>

### *Jews in the Thomasville Economy*

As a center for trade in the county, Thomasville contained approximately thirty merchants who dealt in merchandise ranging from general dry goods to luxury items.<sup>8</sup> By 1866, Jews owned three of the town's largest dry goods stores: H. Wolff & Bro., established by Herman and Nathan Wolff; B. & L. Goldberg's, run by Louis and Bennett Goldberg; and J. Schiff & Bro., operated by Jonas and Philip Schiff. Two other Jews, Simeon M. Goldbach and Michael Rosenfeld, owned smaller stores in town. Each of the five Jewish households living in Thomasville during the war participated in the merchant trade.

Many Jewish merchants in the nineteenth-century South began as peddlers, and Thomasville's Jews were no exception to this pattern. Georgia law required that once a year peddlers obtain a license from the clerk of the Inferior Court in each county in which they desired to sell their wares.<sup>9</sup> On March 12, 1858, and again twelve months later, Herman and Nathan Wolff applied to the Thomas County clerk, received a license to peddle "with one wagon only," and paid the county treasurer a fee of \$75.<sup>10</sup> Louis Goldberg likewise obtained a license for the year beginning April 17, 1859.<sup>11</sup>

Peddling had long provided a number of advantages for Jewish immigrants in the United States despite the hardship of carrying a 100-pound pack around the countryside. Lacking experience in farming because European governments prohibited Jewish ownership of land, many newly arrived Jews specialized in trade, an occupation that afforded them the freedom to set their own hours and observe religious holidays.<sup>12</sup>

Rarely an end in itself, work as a traveling peddler served as a stepping stone to an eventual store. Apprenticeship gave an aspiring merchant familiarity with supply routes and economic conditions. By seeking out customers, he knew in advance the extent of the demand for his goods and established a loyal clientele.<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, working as a peddler forced new immigrants to learn the language and local customs and to become familiar with a particular territory and its inhabitants. After a period of time catering to the needs of local residents, friendships developed. A farmer, for example, might offer a Jewish peddler a chair at the dinner table and even ask the guest to say the "Jewish" prayers over the food.<sup>14</sup> This form of hospitality attests not only to the farmer's gratitude to the itinerant salesman for providing a needed service but also to an acceptance of or, at least, interest in the customs of his Jewish visitor.

Louis Goldberg and the Wolff brothers made the successful transition from peddling, and by the end of the war they had established prosperous merchant houses in Thomasville. County deed records indicate that in addition to Goldberg and the Wolffs, Michael Rosenfeld and the Schiff brothers bought property throughout the war years. In order to obtain the best price, they often purchased real estate at auction, occasionally with money loaned by a non-Jewish businessman.

Herman and Nathan Wolff acquired their first city lot and storehouse on Broad Street from Hamilton Sharpe in July 1860, with \$3,000 loaned them by Sharpe and William G. Ponder. Two years later Sharpe sold the brothers a house on an adjoining piece of property.<sup>15</sup> Michael Rosenfeld paid David Holloway \$400 for three city lots in February 1860 and purchased another tract in July 1861 from William McLendon.<sup>16</sup> Louis Goldberg bought his first piece of property on Broad Street in January 1863 for \$1,550 from the estate of Elzy

Thompson, and in August of that year he paid \$4,000 when Hansel R. Seward's brick storehouse came up at auction.<sup>17</sup>

Competition for customers required merchants to advertise aggressively the arrival of the season's new fashions. Promotions for Jewish businesses appear in the Thomasville newspapers throughout the 1860s. In 1857 and 1858 Jonas Schiff and his partner, Jacob Baum, plied the county with a cart selling blankets, men's and women's clothing, silks, shoes, firearms, and jewelry. In April 1860, they announced the opening of Baum & Schiff, a store located in neighboring Quitman.<sup>18</sup> At approximately the same time, Jonas opened J. Schiff & Bro. in Thomasville with his brother Philip.<sup>19</sup> H. Wolff & Bro. first welcomed customers in April 1860 and advertised in order to promote their "new Dry-Goods Emporium." They sold men's and women's ready-made clothing, footwear, cutlery, tobacco, and jewelry.<sup>20</sup> Stiff competition among the merchants prompted Benjamin F. Hubert to print the following announcement: "New Goods! New Goods!! Cheaper Than The Cheapest!! Great Excitement at Receiving Better Bargains Than Jews or Gentiles Offer."<sup>21</sup> The wealth of Thomasville's Jewish merchants before 1870 is difficult to assess, as they kept most of their assets in inventory rather than more visible forms of property.<sup>22</sup> Credit ratings submitted to R. G. Dun & Company in New York make it possible to surmise the strength of Jewish businesses immediately before and after the war. Local credit reporters, however, did not provide a systematic accounting of net worth. Nonetheless, their reports give some indication of the relative success of various enterprises.

The 1870 tax digest for Thomas County furnishes the earliest systematic measure of economic success. By all accounts, Thomas County residents fully supported Jewish-owned stores. As a basis of comparison for measuring affluence, two of Thomasville's largest merchants, I. Kubitshek & Brother and Remington McKinnon & Co., held merchandise valued at \$8,000 and \$24,000 respectively. County officials listed their net worth at \$13,050 and \$28,000.<sup>23</sup>

On the low end of the scale, stock valued at under \$3,500 constituted a small mercantile establishment. Michael Rosenfeld had money and solvent debts worth \$2,000, and merchandise valued at \$5,000. The R. G. Dun & Company credit reporter described him as "a fine

businessman." When Rosenfeld died the following year, the county appraised his estate at over \$12,000. This sum included a storehouse on Broad Street worth \$4,500, goods in the store valued at \$3,035, and a \$1,000 life insurance policy.<sup>24</sup> At the time of S. M. Goldbach's death in 1891, officials appraised his estate at \$2,146. He owned a home and storehouse worth \$1,300 and goods amounting to \$720.<sup>25</sup> H. Wolff & Bro. were "doing a fine business" in 1866, and four years later possessed \$12,000 in merchandise and a net worth of \$16,300.<sup>26</sup> As the wealthiest Jewish business in Thomasville, Louis and Bennett Goldberg owned merchandise at their two stores estimated at \$9,000, and an aggregate value of all property near \$24,000. In April 1866 the R. G. Dun & Company credit reporter called them "the most active business men I know of."<sup>27</sup>

### *Jews in the Thomasville War Effort*

With the outbreak of war in April 1861, Thomasville's Jewish population joined the rest of the community in its support of the Confederate cause. Of the seven eligible men, three fought in the Confederate army. Herman Wolff, Nathan Wolff, and Louis Goldberg hired substitutes, and nothing is known about S. M. Goldbach's military career.<sup>28</sup> Michael Rosenfeld's name appears on the May 1861 muster roll for the Ocklockonee Light Infantry. He served as a private attached to Floyd House & Ocmulgee Hospitals in Macon, Georgia, until his discharge in April 1864.<sup>29</sup> Philip Schiff held the rank of 4th Corporal in the Thomasville Guards. He remained with the unit for ten months but hired a substitute in May 1862. His brother, Jonas, spent over three years in the Guards but received a discharge from duty in the fall of 1864, when sixty-three Thomasville residents petitioned the governor that Jonas's work as a tanner made him an indispensable member of the community. The signatures of two men who had attended the August 1862 meeting denouncing the town's Jews appeared on the petition.<sup>30</sup>

Thomasville's Jewish citizens participated in civic affairs and supported the war effort by supplying the army with materials and money and assisting in humanitarian work. In 1863 Louis Goldberg and Philip Schiff served as Superior Court jurors. When the Inferior

Court met in February 1862, Herman Wolff was a juror; Louis Goldberg and Nathan Wolff served in February and June 1863, respectively.<sup>31</sup>

On at least one occasion a Jewish merchant from Thomasville sold goods to the Confederate military. H. Wolff & Bro. received \$140 for eight tin pans purchased by the army on January 25, 1864.<sup>32</sup> The *Southern Enterprise* records that during a May 1861 fundraising drive to support two military companies from Thomasville, both the Wolff brothers and the Schiffs contributed to the cause.<sup>33</sup>

The Wolff family became involved in two humanitarian efforts. During General Sherman's march through Georgia in late 1864, the Confederate authorities herded 400 Union captives from the nearby Andersonville prisoner camp onto an Atlantic & Gulf Railroad train bound for Thomasville. When they arrived, residents of the town came out to see the Union soldiers and found them "sick, lousy, hungry, and in filthy rags." A group of women, including Nathan Wolff's wife, Rachel, and Mrs. A. P. Wright, took pity on the captives and provided them with food, barrels of homemade soap, towels, and clean clothing.<sup>34</sup>

A number of escapes occurred while the prisoners were still in Thomasville. On one occasion a prisoner fled in the middle of the night and sought refuge in the Wolff brothers' store. The fugitive appealed to Herman and Nathan as Masonic brothers not to turn him in. The Wolffs summoned Edward Remington, a Gentile merchant and fellow Mason, for advice. After some discussion the three men provided the prisoner with civilian clothes and money on his promise that he would not take up arms against the South after he had made his way back across the Union lines.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to demonstrating the acceptance of Jews into Thomasville's social network, the episode with the Union prisoner suggests that the town's Jews had a sense that their position in the community was precarious. Charged in the August 1862 resolutions with disloyalty to the Confederate cause, Herman and Nathan Wolff no doubt felt uneasy dealing alone with the escapee. They wisely called in a prominent Gentile merchant to give legitimacy to their actions and to deflect any charge that Jews had aided Northern prisoners to escape.

*Anti-Jewish Sentiment in the Civil War South*

Jews and Gentiles in Thomasville enjoyed a harmonious, peaceful relationship throughout most of the Confederate era. Feelings, though at times ambivalent, were largely positive, and patronage of Jewish businesses increased, as did social interaction. Non-Jewish residents acknowledged the contribution that Jews made to community life. Townspeople perceived their Jewish neighbors as hardworking, energetic, decent folk who sought success in their newly adopted home.

Despite all this, the stress caused by soaring inflation, a deteriorating standard of life, and the fear of invasion by Union troops led some people to seek simple explanations for the array of difficulties befalling the region. Rather than condemn the Southern economy or the Confederate army, they sought an external influence on which to lay blame. There was, they thought, nothing wrong with the Confederate army, their leaders, or Southern society. The problem—or so the argument went—lay with Jews bent on undermining the Confederate cause. As a result, anti-Jewish sentiment, latent in good times, rose to a level of consciousness during the summer of 1862, and resulted in the outburst of August 30.

The wartime crisis and resulting tensions that gripped Thomas County coincided with events occurring throughout the South. The anti-Semitic incident in Thomasville constituted only one episode in a series of outbursts against Jews during the war.

Because of the Union blockade of Southern ports and the disruption of supply lines from the West and North, planters could not sell their cotton or import basic necessities from abroad. In addition, prices began to rise as early as the autumn of 1861. One of the first items to soar in cost was salt, crucial for preserving meat. In Athens, Georgia, salt sold for 80 cents a bushel in January 1861, and by August had risen to \$1.25. At the end of 1861, it sold for \$3.75. The following May, people were paying \$25 a bushel, and in December the price had climbed to \$30.<sup>36</sup> Prices for all other commodities, including food, also spiraled, causing great hardship for the whole population.

John B. Jones, a Confederate quartermaster stationed in Richmond, described the South's economic plight. "The Jews are at work," he noted in his diary on September 7, 1861. "Having no nationality, all wars are harvests for them. Now they are scouring the country in all directions, buying all the goods they can find in the distant cities, and even from the country stores. These they will keep, until the process of consumption shall raise a greedy demand for all descriptions of merchandise."<sup>37</sup>

Some Southern newspapers fueled the fires of prejudice with harsh statements against Jewish merchants and alarmist reports about the spread of counterfeit currency. *The Augusta Daily Chronicle & Sentinel* reprinted an article written by a Memphis correspondent. "The Israelites have come down upon this city [Memphis] like locusts. Every boat brings a load of the hooked-nose fraternity, with mysterious boxes under their arms, and honied words on their tongues."<sup>38</sup> From *Southern Punch* came the following: "Who are our capitalists at the present time? The dirty, greasy Jew peddler [*sic*], who might be seen, with a pack on his back, a year or two since, bowing and cringing even to Negro servants, now struts by with the air of a millionaire."<sup>39</sup> The *Florida Sentinel* printed a short article in July 1862 warning that over \$12,000 in fake bills had been discovered in Columbus, Georgia, and on August 26 the *Columbus Weekly Enquirer* published a front-page story on currency problems in the region.<sup>40</sup>

The sentiments expressed in the media were echoed by some Southern politicians. Congressman Henry S. Foote of Tennessee made his feelings about Jews known in the Confederate House of Representatives during a debate in January 1863. He claimed that Jews had flooded into the country and controlled nine-tenths of its business. According to Foote, they engaged in illegal trade with the Union army, and "if the present state of things were to continue, the end of the war would probably find nearly all the property of the Confederacy in the hands of Jewish Shylocks."<sup>41</sup>

Harsh words against Southern Jews occasionally erupted into threats of expulsion and physical attacks. In Santa Luca, Georgia, in the spring of 1863, a group of soldiers' wives raided Jewish stores and made off with needed provisions at pistol point. They also accused Jewish merchants of speculating on shortages and making fortunes

while their husbands fought for the Southern cause.<sup>42</sup> On October 6, 1862, John B. Jones noted the robbery of \$8,000 worth of merchandise from a Jewish store on Main Street in Richmond. He commented, "I apprehend there will be many scenes of violence this winter. . . . The supplies necessary for existence should not be withheld from a suffering people. It is dangerous."<sup>43</sup>

One of the most striking examples of how good relations between Jew and Gentile could turn hostile occurred in late 1862 in Talbotton, Georgia. A grand jury presentment to the Talbot County Superior Court referred to the "evil and unpatriotic conduct of the representatives of Jewish houses who had engaged in this nefarious business [of extortion and speculation]." When Lazarus Straus, the town's only Jewish merchant, learned of the grand jury statement, he announced his intention to move away rather than permit the community to cast aspersions on his family's reputation.

Straus had lived in Talbotton since 1852, and his planned departure created such a sensation throughout the county that every member of the grand jury and all the area ministers came calling. They tried to assure him that the statement did not reflect negatively on *his* faith and *his* business practices.

The men did not explicitly state the real reason for their visit. They needed Straus's services and feared increased shortages and a loss of credit if he left the area. Unconvinced of the jury's benign intentions, Straus resettled his family in Columbus, Georgia.<sup>44</sup>

Thomas County faced many of the same problems and reacted in much the same fashion as other regions in the South. Shortages of various provisions plagued Thomasville and environs. An article that appeared in the Thomasville newspaper on November 20, 1861, recounted how the governor of Alabama had seized 1,400 sacks of salt to prevent speculation. The article also noted that the previous Saturday Mayor A. P. Wright had presided at a meeting of Thomas County citizens at which they condemned speculation in basic goods and other articles, lauded the Alabama action, and called for a Georgia law against speculating in salt, fabrics, grains, medicines, and "all articles of necessity." Significantly, the speakers made no mention of Jews.<sup>45</sup> In August 1862, as the shortages continued, James L. Seward recommended to Governor Brown that he appoint Wright as salt

agent for Thomas and surrounding counties in order to assure the equitable distribution of salt to needy families.<sup>46</sup>

Fear of invasion gripped the county in early 1862 as the Union navy threatened Florida's Gulf coast. Thomasville resident A. H. Hansell wrote to General Henry C. Wayne in February 1862, urging him to prevent Union troops from moving east from Pensacola and cutting off railroad communications with Savannah.<sup>47</sup> As the terminus of the Atlantic & Gulf Railroad, Thomasville seemed a logical target if Northern forces wished to isolate the Georgia coast from communities inland. Despite Hansell's pleas, his request was not implemented. However, Brigadier General Howell Cobb, who took command of the District of Middle Florida, received instructions to defend southwestern Georgia.<sup>48</sup> Union forces never entered Thomas County, and the railway remained in operation until December 1864, when Sherman's forces destroyed a section of track much farther east between Savannah and Doctortown.<sup>49</sup>

Although scholars can describe the manner in which anti-Jewish sentiment was expressed, explaining the psychology behind these attitudes requires some conjecture. Suspicious of foreigners in general, small-town Southerners surely noticed that many Jews spoke English haltingly or with a German accent, shunned agricultural work, and tended to keep to themselves in business and social matters.

Negative attitudes stemmed also from the strong opposition of evangelical Christians to what they considered extortion. Drew Faust reveals how the Confederate nationalist ideology inextricably tied religious convictions to economic issues. Southerners identified themselves within a framework that made moral reform fundamental to the Confederate national purpose. Military victory could not be achieved without moral and social change, and the sin of extortion arose accordingly in religious and political discourse.<sup>50</sup> Clergymen considered avarice to be a sin, and politicians campaigned to make speculation and extortion a crime. Much of the Southern discussion of extortion lapsed into anti-Jewish sentiment founded not on the belief that Jews had killed or rejected the Messiah, but on the idea that Jewish business practices were un-Christian and therefore sinful.<sup>51</sup>

A fear and abhorrence of dependency may have also contributed to Southern resentment of Jews. The dominant local elite regarded bourgeois mercantile functions with disdain, but they also disliked relying on foreign Jewish merchants for the credit necessary to buy goods for their families and farms.<sup>52</sup> During periods of inflation or uneasiness, the reliance that Southerners tolerated during good times became totally unacceptable, and they struck out at their "oppressors."

Jewish frugality and marriage patterns likely made Jews seem peculiar or aloof to their Gentile neighbors. Frugal living habits precluded the extravagant hospitality characteristic of men of means in antebellum Southern society. Jews tended to reinvest profits rather than spend on creature comforts and entertainment. Saving to pay for the passage of additional family members from Europe took precedence over lavish displays of wealth.<sup>53</sup>

The Jews of Thomasville did not intermarry with their non-Jewish neighbors but actively sought Jewish mates. Nathan Wolff traveled to New York in search of his future bride, Rachel Hertz.<sup>54</sup> Louis Goldberg married Julia Grossman, the first cousin or sister of Michael Rosenfeld's wife, Sarah. The ceremony took place at Rosenfeld's home, and Rabbi Abraham Harris traveled from Savannah to officiate.<sup>55</sup>

One can only speculate as to why the people of Thomas County did not enforce the anti-Jewish resolutions passed at the August 1862 meeting. In all likelihood the rally's organizers intended the gathering to serve as a vehicle for venting anger and anxiety and not as a forum for establishing policy. Amidst the various crises befalling the region, a public display of solidarity against perceived transgressors sent area residents a strong warning that unpatriotic behavior would not be tolerated. The message served also as a visible expression of Thomas County's support for the Confederate cause and its active participation in checking the spread of subversive activity.

No doubt community leaders fully appreciated the ramifications that would follow on the departure of the county's Jews. Jewish-owned stores in Thomasville comprised one-sixth of the thirty-odd area merchant houses in 1860. With the heavy demands imposed by military service, many merchants found it impossible to operate their

shops throughout the war, making the retail services provided by Jews all the more important.

Fraternal bonds in the Masonic Order and economic ties between Jew and Gentile acted as an additional obstacle to wholesale expulsion. Jewish businessmen owed money, and lenders had no intention of forgiving the debts. Also, store owners received only about one-fifth of the payments for their goods in cash. Much of the exchange between merchant and client took the form of liens and promissory notes.<sup>56</sup> Even if exiled from the county, the area's Jewish merchants could still petition the courts in order to foreclose on a lien or call in a loan.

The decision of Thomasville's Jews to remain in town and weather the anti-Semitic storm indicates how they perceived the actions of their neighbors. Whereas Lazarus Straus, the sole Jewish merchant in Talbotton, chose to leave town, the Jews of Thomas County understood their importance to the area and took comfort in the strength their numbers afforded. While they undoubtedly were concerned about the tone of the meeting, the threats to expel them did not produce a panic. Perhaps they believed that the community's leaders did not intend to enforce the resolutions and that within a short time peaceful, stable relations would resume. If so, the considerable success they enjoyed throughout the remainder of the war supported their perception of the situation.

### *Conclusion*

Without question, a deplorable anti-Semitic incident occurred in Thomasville in 1862. In an atmosphere of economic crisis and wartime anxiety, a small group of citizens sought a scapegoat for the problems they faced. Their ambivalent feelings toward Jewish business and social practices placed Jews as a group on the fringes of society. But to take one example of anti-Semitic behavior and assume that the community lived in a constant state of agitation creates a distorted picture. Thomas County residents depended on the goods and credit that Jewish merchants provided. Jews recognized their importance to the region's economy and had the resolve to weather the sudden explosion of anti-Jewish sentiment. Not only did the Jews of

Thomasville remain in town throughout the Confederate era, they prospered.

---

Mark I. Greenberg is a doctoral student in Southern Jewish history at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

### Notes

1. Bertram W. Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War* (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1951; reprint ed., New York: Atheneum, 1970), p. 188; idem, "American Judaeophobia: Confederate Version," in *Jews in the South*, ed. Leonard Dinnerstein and Mary Dale Palsson (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), p. 155; E. Merton Coulter, *The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), pp. 224, 226. See also Abraham J. Peck, "That Other 'Peculiar Institution': Jews and Judaism in the Nineteenth Century South," *Modern Judaism* 7 (February 1987): 103-104; James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 442.

2. For a discussion of ambivalence in Jewish-Gentile relations, see John Higham, "Social Discrimination Against Jews in America 1830-1930," *Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society* 47 (September 1957): 2-5; Louise A. Mayo, *The Ambivalent Image: Nineteenth-Century America's Perception of the Jew* (Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, 1988), p. 18; Peck, "That Other 'Peculiar Institution'," pp. 103, 109; Michael N. Dobkowski, *The Tarnished Dream: The Basis of American Anti-Semitism* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979), p. 79.

3. References to anti-Semitism in Thomasville appear in Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War*, p. 179; idem, "American Judaeophobia: Confederate Version," p. 141; Coulter, *Confederate States of America*, p. 227; Drew Gilpin Faust, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), p. 50; Steven Hertzberg, *Strangers Within the Gate City: The Jews of Atlanta, 1845-1915* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1978), p. 25.

4. William Warren Rogers, *Antebellum Thomas County, 1825-1861* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1963), pp. 61, 68; idem, *Thomas County During the Civil War* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1964), p. 1; idem, "The Way They Were: Thomas Countians in 1860," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 60 (Summer 1976): 133, 135.

5. Rogers, "The Way They Were," pp. 136-38.

6. The *Thomasville Southern Enterprise* ceased publication in December 1861 and did not resume again until July 1865. In April 1862, the *Thomasville Weekly Times* began publication; however, no issue reporting on the August 30, 1862, meeting is extant. For a record of the meeting see the *Georgia Journal and Messenger* (Macon), September 10, 1862, and the *Savannah Daily Morning News*, September 12, 1862.

7. For another interpretation of the events of August 30, 1862, and their aftermath, see Louis Schmier, "An Act Unbecoming: Anti-Semitic Uprising in Thomas County, Georgia," *Civil War Times Illustrated* 23 (October 1984): 22-23; idem, "Notes and Documents on the 1862 Expulsion of Jews from Thomasville, Georgia," *American Jewish Archives* 32 (April 1980): 12; Richard M. McMurray, "Rebels, Extortioners and Counterfeiters: A Note on Confederate Judaeophobia," *Atlanta Historical Society Journal* 22 (Fall-Winter 1978): 45-51.

8. Rogers, "The Way They Were," p. 139.

9. The peddler had to provide evidence of good character and swear an oath not to use the license in another county or lend it to someone else. The law required the clerk to enter the oath and license in a book kept for that purpose and to provide a description of the peddler. The book in which peddlers' licenses were noted for Thomas County has been lost, but the Inferior Court Minutes for 1856–1859 contain the names of men granted licenses for those years. See R. H. Clark, comp., *The Code of the State of Georgia* (Atlanta: John H. Seals, 1861), pp. 310–311.

10. Thomas County Minutes Inferior Court 1849–1860, pp. 229, 294, Office of the Clerk of the Inferior Court, Thomas County Courthouse, Thomasville, Ga. (hereafter cited as Thomas County records).

11. *Ibid.*, p. 296. Louis Goldberg operated the business alone until sometime in late 1865, when his older brother Bennett arrived in Thomasville.

12. Stephen J. Whitfield, "Commercial Passions: The Southern Jew as Businessman," *American Jewish History* 71 (March 1982): 343–344.

13. Elliot Ashkenazi, *The Business of Jews in Louisiana 1840–1875* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1988), pp. 132–134; Louis Schmier, "For Him the 'Schwartzers' Couldn't Do Enough: A Jewish Peddler and His Black Customers Look at Each Other," *American Jewish History* 73 (September 1983): 44.

14. Schmier, "For Him the 'Schwartzers' Couldn't Do Enough," p. 44.

15. Thomas County Superior Court Deed Records, bk. I, 151, 459, Thomas County records. Thomas County Superior Court Realty Mortgages, bk. A-M, 123, Thomas County records.

16. Thomas County Superior Court Deed Records, bk. I, 60, 355, Thomas County records.

17. *Ibid.*, 510, 695–696. Following the arrival of Bennett Goldberg in 1865 the two brothers made numerous real estate purchases in 1866 and 1867.

18. Jacob Baum purchased a peddler's license in Thomas County in November 1856, and his brother Michael received a license in August 1859. Thomas County Minutes Inferior Court 1849–1860, 162, 318, Thomas County records; *Thomasville Wiregrass Reporter*, December 8, 1857 and April 28, 1858; and *Thomasville Southern Enterprise*, April 18, 1860; Credit Reports, Georgia, vol. 33, p. 9, R. G. Dun & Co. Collection, Baker Library, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration (hereafter Dun Collection). The author gratefully acknowledges permission from the Dun and Bradstreet Company and from Baker Library at Harvard University to cite from the R.G. Dunn & Company Collection.

19. *Thomasville Southern Enterprise*, September 19, 1860, October 30, 1861, and November 22, 1865.

20. *Ibid.*, April 4, 1860, December 25, 1861, and November 15, 1865.

21. *Ibid.*, July 11, 1860.

22. Ashkenazi, *Business of Jews in Louisiana*, pp. 109–110.

23. 1870 Tax Digest Thomas County, District 637, Ga. Department of Archives and History, Atlanta; Ashkenazi, *Business of Jews in Louisiana*, p. 124.

24. 1870 Thomas County Tax Digest, District 637, Georgia Department of Archives and History; Court of Ordinary Inventory and Appraisements 1868–1883, bk. I, 154–56, Thomas County records; Credit Reports, Georgia vol. 33, p. 30, Dun Collection.

25. Court of Ordinary Inventories and Appraisements 1883–1901, bk. J, 225, Thomas County records.

26. Credit Reports, Georgia, vol. 33, p. 10, Dun Collection; 1870 Tax Digest Thomas County, District 637, Georgia Department of Archives and History.

27. 1870 Tax Digest Thomas County, District 637, Georgia Department of Archives and History; Credit Reports, Georgia, vol. 33, p. 30, Dun Collection.

28. Georgia Adjutant-General's Division, Enrollment of the Present Militia Co. District No. 637, Thomas County, December 1963, Georgia Department of Archives and History.
29. Georgia Adjutant-General's Division, Muster Roll of the Ocklockonee Light Infantry, May 18, 1861, Georgia Department of History and Archives; Lillian Henderson, comp., *Roster of the Confederate Soldiers of Georgia, 1861-1865*, 6 vols. (Hapeville, Ga.: Longino & Porter, 1960), 3:444.
30. Georgia Adjutant-General's Division, Enrollment of the Present Militia Co. District No. 637 Thomas County, December 1863, Georgia Department of Archives and History; Petition of Thomas County residents, August 8, 1864, in Letters to Governor Joseph E. Brown, 1860-1865, Georgia Department of Archives and History; Simon Wolf, *The American Jew as Patriot, Soldier and Citizen*, ed. Louis Edward Levy (Philadelphia: Levytype Co., 1895), pp. 129-134.
31. Thomas County Superior Court Minutes 1858, 508, 534, Thomas County records; Thomas County Minutes Inferior Court 1861-1870, 53, 72, Thomas County records.
32. Invoice from H. Wolff & Bro. for Goods Sold, January 1864, Confederate Papers Relating to Citizens or Business Firms, Micropublication 346, Roll 1135, National Archives, Washington, D.C.
33. *Thomasville Southern Enterprise*, May 15, 1861.
34. S. W. Davis, "Federal Prisoners from Andersonville Brought to Thomasville," *United Daughters of the Confederacy Historical Collection*, I (1930), n.p. in the Elizabeth F. Hopkins Collection at the Thomasville Cultural Center Library, Thomasville; Rogers, *Thomas County During the Civil War*, pp. 83-84.
35. Rogers, *Thomas County During the Civil War*, pp. 88-90.
36. Coulter, *Confederate States of America*, p. 220; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, p. 440.
37. For this and other anti-Semitic slurs, see John Beauchamp Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary at the Confederate States Capital*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1866), 1:78, 165-166, 213, 221.
38. *Augusta Daily Chronicle & Sentinel*, July 17, 1862. See also *Richmond Examiner*, December 20, 1862, quoted in Eli N. Evans, *Judah P. Benjamin: The Jewish Confederate* (New York: Free Press, 1988), p. 200.
39. *Southern Punch* (Richmond), October 17, 1863, quoted in Evans, *Judah P. Benjamin*, p. 200.
40. *Florida Sentinel*, July 29, 1862; *Columbus Weekly Enquirer*, August 26, 1862. See also *Milledgeville Southern Recorder*, August 19, 1862; and *Macon Daily Telegraph*, August 30, 1862.
41. For this and other outbursts by Foote, see "Proceedings of the First Confederate Congress—Third Session," *Southern Historical Society Papers* 47 (December 1930): 122, 144; "Proceedings from the First Confederate Congress—Third Session," *ibid.* 48 (1941): 8-9, 185.
42. Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War*, p. 179.
43. Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, 1:164.
44. After the war the family moved to New York, where in 1888 Lazarus's sons Isidor and Nathan purchased R. H. Macy & Co. Jacob Rader Marcus, ed., *Memoirs of American Jews, 1775-1865*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1955), 3:301-304; Korn, "American Judaeophobia: Confederate Version," p. 147.
45. *Thomasville Southern Enterprise*, November 20, 1861.
46. James L. Seward to Joseph E. Brown, August 6, 11, 1862, in Letters to Governor Joseph E. Brown, 1860-1865, Georgia Department of Archives and History.
47. A. H. Hansell to Henry C. Wayne, February 2, 1862, in Letters to Georgia Adjutant-General, 1861-1865, Georgia Department of Archives and History.
48. Rogers, *Thomas County During the Civil War*, p. 18; McMurray, "Rebels, Extortioners and Counterfeiters," p. 51.
49. Rogers, *Antebellum Thomas County*, p. 21, 47; *idem*, *Thomas County, 1865-1900* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1973), p. 102.

50. Faust, *Creation of Confederate Nationalism*, pp. 41–42.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50.
52. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 333; Ashkenazi, *Business of Jews in Louisiana*, p. 3.
53. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, p. 332; Ashkenazi, *Business of Jews in Louisiana*, p. 163.
54. *Thomasville Southern Enterprise*, September 13, 1866.
55. Thomas County Court of Ordinary Marriage Record, bk. I, 1875–1880, 280, Thomas County records.
56. Ashkenazi, *Business of Jews in Louisiana*, p. 38.



*Percival Goodman*  
(1904-1989)

---

# The Design of a Modern Synagogue: Percival Goodman's Beth-El in Providence, Rhode Island

*George M. Goodwin*

The third building constructed by Temple Beth-El, in Providence, Rhode Island, designed by Percival Goodman between 1947 and 1952, is noteworthy in several ways. The structure was one of the first modern synagogues in New England. When erected midway in his career, it helped Goodman launch his specialty as a synagogue designer. Over thirty years, he built more synagogues than any American and perhaps more than any architect.<sup>1</sup> The Beth-El design is also important because of its rich documentation. Numerous letters and oral history reminiscences show that a modern design was not initially sought by temple leaders and that the selection of an architect was perplexing.<sup>2</sup> Nearly forty years after its dedication, however, Beth-El remains a functional, beautiful, and much-admired building.

Rhode Island, of course, is famous for another synagogue design. Newport's Congregation Jeshuat Israel, better known as the Touro Synagogue, completed in 1763, is the oldest Jewish house of worship in North America.<sup>3</sup> It is also a masterpiece of the Georgian style. Planned by the eminent Newport architect Peter Harrison (1716–1775), Touro was based on contemporary English and earlier Palladian sources.<sup>4</sup> Harrison, the son of Quakers and an Episcopalian, may have been personally acquainted with London's Portuguese Synagogue (Bevis Marks), completed in 1701.

## *The Friendship Street Synagogue*

Temple Beth-El, officially known as Congregation Sons of Israel and David, is Rhode Island's second-oldest Jewish congregation. Organized informally in the 1840s under the leadership of Solomon Pereira, Sons of Israel was chartered by the General Assembly in 1855.<sup>5</sup> Sons of David, chartered in 1871, merged with Sons of Israel in



*The sanctuary of Temple Beth-El at the time of its dedication*

(Courtesy Alexander Georges)



*Rabbi William G. Braude*  
(1907-1988)

1874. The congregation's early members included Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Most were merchants who had gathered for worship in private residences before renting downtown halls for services and classrooms. One of the congregation's early homes was the former St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church.

In 1877, Sons of Israel and David became one of the first congregations in New England to join the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.<sup>6</sup> Jacob Voorsanger, who served Sons of Israel and David between 1877 and 1878, was the congregation's first rabbi. Not until 1890, however, did Sons of Israel and David erect its own building. Located at Friendship and Foster Streets, it was known as the Friendship Street Synagogue. Designed by the local architect Wilmarth Colwell and costing approximately \$14,000, it was built of brick, stone, and slate in a vaguely Romanesque style. It resembled many parish churches of its day, and in 1909 it was sold to the Swedish Baptist Church. The Friendship Street Synagogue seated 410 congregants on the main floor and 85 in the balcony, and included an organ and choir loft. When the new building was dedicated, there was a full day and evening of celebrations, attended by numerous dignitaries, including former governors, Supreme Court judges, city fathers, and Christian clergy. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, the great shaper of the Reform movement in America, gave the major address. Only seventy years later, the building was demolished to make way for an interstate highway.

### *The Broad Street Temple*

Less than fifteen years after its dedication, however, the Friendship Street Synagogue was inadequate for its congregational needs. Membership had grown to more than 250 families, and 130 children squeezed into the few Sunday School classrooms. The neighborhood in downtown Providence had also deteriorated. Rabbi Henry Englander, after being accosted by a prostitute, threatened to leave unless a new synagogue were built in a better neighborhood. In 1910, accepting a professorship at Hebrew Union College, he made good on his threat.

In 1911, Rabbi Englander returned to Providence to participate in the gala ceremonies marking the dedication of the congregation's sec-

ond home. He remained a close adviser to Sons of Israel and David, and was consulted many times regarding the selection of his successors. Englander was present in 1932 at the installation of his student William G. Braude (1907–1988), who served the congregation until his retirement in 1974, the longest tenure of any rabbi in Providence and one of the longest in New England.<sup>7</sup>

With the dedication of the brick, terra cotta, and concrete structure at the corner of Broad and Glenham Streets in the Elmwood neighborhood of Providence, Sons of Israel and David became known as Temple Beth-El. The new temple, designed by local architects Banning & Thornton, was built in a Classical Revival style, perhaps based on William Walker & Son's interpretation of Mount Zion Temple in St. Paul, Minnesota.<sup>8</sup> With its imposing portico of Corinthian columns and capitals supporting a pediment with cornices and moldings, the synagogue resembled a Roman temple or, at the very least, other symbols of civic authority, such as banks, libraries, and courthouses. Among Providence's churches, it was an architectural cousin to Hopkin & Field's First Church of Christ Scientist, erected on College Hill in 1913. Far larger than the Friendship Street Synagogue, Beth-El also had seating on its main floor and balcony. A choir loft and an organ flanked the white onyx ark, which was decorated in a Neoclassical style, imitating the Georgian vocabulary of Touro. Downstairs were a social hall, offices, and seven classrooms, as well as a library, which, until the establishment of Judaic studies at Brown University, was the best of its kind in Rhode Island. The new Beth-El cost \$75,000.

Located on the south side of Providence, the temple occupied a religiously mixed neighborhood. Most of its members lived nearby, many within walking distance. Farther south was Willard Avenue, easily identifiable by its numerous Orthodox congregations, Jewish shops, and three-decker tenements. For new Americans and their children, Beth-El was a potent symbol of the established Jewish community.

### *Visions of a New Building*

Providence was and remains a city of ethnic neighborhoods: Italian, Portuguese, French Canadian, Black, Jewish, and Yankee. The East

Side of Providence, only a few miles from City Hall and the central business district, was and is a prosperous neighborhood of single-family homes, including many mansions facing Blackstone Boulevard. Before the founding of Temple Emanu-El in 1924, a tiny number of Jews lived on the East Side. With the construction of the Conservative congregation's large, domed structure in 1927, on land previously owned by Brown University, the migration of Jews quickened.<sup>9</sup>

By the 1940s, it became necessary for Beth-El's leaders to think about a new and larger temple. The Elmwood neighborhood had begun to deteriorate, a pattern which accelerated. Approximately half of the congregation's members had already moved to the East Side, and many others dreamed of the possibility. Many Beth-El parents, not eager to send their children to religious or Hebrew school on Broad Street, enrolled them in satellite programs established at local public schools. Rabbi Braude, who had earned his doctorate at Brown and taught occasional courses there, moved near the campus when he was married in 1938 to a Pembroke College student.

During the Depression and the war years, though the need to build a third home for Sons of Israel and David was evident, the congregation lacked the financial resources. Though membership was stable and included a number of successful businessmen, particularly in retailing and jewelry manufacturing, the congregation was not wealthy. The tiny staff was modestly paid, and annual budgets were only miraculously balanced.

A new home for Sons of Israel and David moved beyond the realm of wishful thinking in January of 1942, with the death of John Jacob Rosenfeld. A journalist, lawyer, and Republican Party leader, Rosenfeld was the last surviving grandchild of Cantor Abraham Jacobs, who had led Sons of Israel in the 1860s. A widower and childless, he left his estate of approximately \$200,000 to Beth-El in memory of his mother, Anna, and wife, Mary Elizabeth. The gift, intended for the construction of a religious school and known as the Rosenfeld Memorial, had been cultivated over many years by Rabbi Braude.

*The Site*

When the mortgage on the Broad Street Temple was paid off at the end of 1943, a search for a new property commenced. Though downtown Providence was the location of the First Baptist Meeting House (1775), Beneficent Congregational Church (1809), St. John's Episcopal Church (1810), and Sts. Peter and Paul Catholic Church (1889), congregational leaders focused their efforts on the East Side. The suburbs south of Providence seemed remote and uninviting, and the Jewish community was still clustered within the city. The East Side offered quiet, tree-lined streets, good public schools, an easy commute to downtown, and an aura of upward mobility.<sup>10</sup>

In April of 1944, the Beth-El board approved the purchase of two adjacent sites, costing \$46,000, at the northwest corner of Butler and Orchard Avenues, near the southern terminus of Blackstone Boulevard. A cottage built in 1839 for the Moses Brown farm was still in use.<sup>11</sup> The parcels comprised 90,000 square feet, abundant space to erect a new complex. A number of churches were located in the neighborhood. Immediately to the west of the site was St. Martin's Episcopal Church, an English Gothic Revival-style edifice, erected in 1916, but considerably older in appearance. In May of 1944, the vestry of St. Martin's wrote to the temple board, unanimously extending its welcome. There have been cordial relations between the two congregations ever since.

*Questions of Style*

Although he was a master of the written and spoken word, Rabbi Braude was never a student of the visual arts and architecture. He was aware, however, that the appearance of the new Beth-El would be symbolically important. Though he favored a handsome building set unobtrusively in its neighborhood, he otherwise seemed open to considerable possibilities. Most likely, Rabbi Braude was not aware of the emerging world of avant-garde architecture—there was not yet a single important modern building in Providence and only a few in Boston<sup>12</sup>—but he did appreciate the need to think seriously and systematically about alternatives. It is not clear that the temple's lay

leaders were as prepared to think in such theoretical or imaginative terms. Either curious himself or feeling personally responsible for the Rosenfeld Memorial, Rabbi Braude, a de facto member of the building plans committee, seized the initiative.

By April of 1944, he started to read about the strange world of modern architecture. He found a short bibliography, prepared by an art professor, George Downing, in the Brown library.<sup>13</sup> One of the references on the one-page sheet was the Museum of Modern Art's *What Is Modern Architecture?*, published in 1942. Other books on the bibliography were by Walter Gropius, the founder of Germany's celebrated but banished Bauhaus and the chair of architecture at Harvard's Graduate School of Design; Eliel Saarinen, the Finnish-born modernist who directed Michigan's Cranbrook Academy of Art; and Frank Lloyd Wright, Gropius's rival as the leading modernist in America and the director of his own Taliesin Fellowship in Wisconsin and Arizona. Wright had in fact spoken on the Brown campus in the fall of 1932.<sup>14</sup>

Rabbi Braude did not make notes on the bibliography, so it is not known whether he was even aware that Wright, at seventy-seven years of age, was not only active professionally but would have been a very logical and perceptive candidate for a synagogue commission. In 1953, Wright was approached by Congregation Beth Sholom in suburban Philadelphia, and the synagogue he designed is considered one of the outstanding religious buildings of the postwar era.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Beth Sholom and Touro in Newport are the only two American synagogues represented through models in an exhibition of thirteen synagogues at Tel Aviv's Beth Hatefutsoth, the Museum of the Diaspora.<sup>16</sup>

In April of 1944, Rabbi Braude also began to seek advice from friends and colleagues who had recently constructed new buildings. Rabbi Abraham Feldman of Hartford recommended Charles Greco of Boston, who had designed Beth Israel in 1936 in a popular style based on Byzantine sources.<sup>17</sup> Greco had also designed "The Temple," Congregation Tifereth Israel in Cleveland, and the community building of Mishkan Tefila in Boston.<sup>18</sup> He responded to an inquiry from Rabbi Braude, pointing out his firm's experience with five other synagogue projects.<sup>19</sup> Braude's antennae even spread to the West Coast. Rabbi

Edgar Magnin invited him to visit the monumental and eclectic (Byzantine-Moorish-Gothic) Wilshire Boulevard Temple in Los Angeles, completed in 1929, the heyday of Art Deco. Commenting on the temple's most unusual feature, figurative murals throughout the sanctuary, Rabbi Magnin explained that the services of a great artist would also be required. "Otherwise," he wrote, "it would be better to have none."<sup>20</sup>

In December of 1944, Rabbi Braude sought advice from the distinguished art and architectural historian, Professor Richard Krautheimer of Vassar College. One of the leading emigré scholars, Krautheimer (b. 1897) was a medievalist who later joined New York University's Institute of Fine Arts, one of the stellar art history faculties in this country. Writing that there was essentially no such thing as Jewish architecture, Krautheimer explained that synagogue designs always reflected the prevailing styles of a time and place.<sup>21</sup> Beyond the liturgical and ritual needs of an individual congregation, Krautheimer recommended a design that was "modern, simple and dignified."<sup>22</sup> Implicitly criticizing the work of Gropius, the Bauhaus, and the International style, Krautheimer remarked that "modern architecture need not give a religious building the looks of a factory." A modern synagogue, the historian theorized, "can be just as dignified and inspiring as the Altneuschul at Prague was in its time."

### *The Search for an Architect*

Krautheimer seemed reluctant to recommend specific architects. He did mention Erich [Eric] Mendelsohn (1887–1953), a German modernist who had achieved critical and commercial success in Berlin in the 1920s and early 1930s, and afterwards built extensively in Palestine and England.<sup>23</sup> Mendelsohn, probably the leading avant-garde Jewish architect in the world, had emigrated to New York City in 1941. The year before he had already enjoyed an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art. Lacking other commissions, Mendelsohn was about to launch his American career as a specialist in synagogue design.

By July of 1945, Rabbi Braude was still pursuing possibilities. Less concerned with obtaining the names of suitable candidates, he was

sorting out the issues presented by the building itself. He wrote to Dr. Franz Landsberger (1883–1964), former director of Berlin's Jewish Museum and curator of Jewish art at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Rabbi Braude was considering two separate structures, a temple and a "school house," as well as several styles, such as Byzantine, New England Colonial, and "functional," which was his rubric for modern. Braude was also undecided as to the advantages of hiring a prominent architect from out-of-town or a local architect who would be readily available for consultation and supervision.

Dr. Landsberger, a consultant in synagogue architecture to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, eagerly offered his advice.<sup>24</sup> Though aware of Greco's work in Hartford and Cleveland, he clearly favored a modernist. Landsberger mentioned Mendelsohn, but he was unsure if his *landsmann* would be interested or available. Landsberger offered to contact Mendelsohn on Beth-El's behalf.

Not yet satisfied with the ideas presented to him, Rabbi Braude broadened his search, never mentioning in his correspondence the existence of a trustees' building committee. In December of 1945, he sought the advice of Professor Salo Baron of Columbia, who, in turn, recommended his distinguished colleague, Professor Meyer Schapiro (b. 1904) of the art history and archaeology department.<sup>25</sup>

A medievalist who was equally devoted to modernism, Schapiro acknowledged the difficulty of Braude's dilemma: finding an architect, preferably an American, who could seek some balance between tradition and innovation.<sup>26</sup> Schapiro recommended Percival Goodman, a New York architect whom he had known for fifteen years. Goodman later became his colleague as a professor in Columbia's School of Architecture. He seemed particularly well qualified because of the work he was undertaking for the Jewish Theological Seminary, transforming Mrs. Felix Schiff Warburg's Fifth Avenue mansion into a Jewish Museum.<sup>27</sup>

In December of 1945, Braude sought the advice of another emigré scholar, Rachel Wischnitzer (1885–1989), formerly the curator of Berlin's Jewish Museum, who later authored a comprehensive and perceptive study of American synagogue design.<sup>28</sup>

Dr. Wischnitzer explained that there were "very few architects familiar with Jewish history and art."<sup>29</sup> She suggested that a signifi-

cant design would be produced through the collaboration of a rabbi, an art historian, and an architect.<sup>30</sup> Dr. Wischnitzer recommended Fritz Nathan (1891–1960), the architect of various Jewish communal buildings in Germany, who was also living in New York.<sup>31</sup> She portrayed him as a moderate, who could interpret “older synagogue art with discrimination and taste.”

### *Erich Mendelsohn*

In the late fall of 1945 and early winter of 1946, Rabbi Braude began corresponding with Erich Mendelsohn, who had left New York City and was residing temporarily at Finney Farm, an artists' colony in Croton-on-Hudson, not far from Vassar College.<sup>32</sup> By this time, Mendelsohn was planning to relocate to San Francisco and establish a practice with John Dinwiddie. Writing in longhand on scraps of paper, Mendelsohn apologized several times to Braude for not being able to visit Providence. Evidently, Braude was more than politely interested in Mendelsohn's availability. Braude thought that Mendelsohn possessed a special insight into synagogue design. When Mendelsohn cleverly described himself as “a Jewish artist and practicing architect,”<sup>33</sup> Braude's curiosity was heightened.

By January of 1946, Mendelsohn was involved in the design of the first two of four American synagogues, all located in the Midwest.<sup>34</sup> The first commission, B'nai Amoona in St. Louis, resulted from a recommendation by a member of the congregation who had been a Mendelsohn client in Germany. The second commission, based on the strength of B'nai Amoona, was Cleveland's Park Synagogue, probably the fullest expression of his vision. The third synagogue commission was Emanu-El in Grand Rapids, and the fourth, completed after his death, was St. Paul's Mount Zion Temple.<sup>35</sup> While consulting with leaders in Cleveland, Mendelsohn offered to visit Providence to make a presentation.<sup>36</sup>

At the end of January of 1946, before Mendelsohn visited Beth-El, Rabbi Braude received a stirring letter of support from Gordon Washburn, the director of the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design. (This position had been briefly held by a Jewish emigré scholar, Alexander Dörner, against the wishes of some of the museum's

key supporters.)<sup>37</sup> Washburn wrote, "Since learning of this possibility I have been unable to think of anything else inasmuch as it would be a contribution of major importance to the architectural history of New England and indeed of the whole Atlantic Coast."<sup>38</sup> The museum director prophesied that the new synagogue "will become known to everyone in the Western world who is interested in architecture." So overflowing with praise, the letter raises the question whether Mendelsohn or Braude had encouraged Washburn to impress the temple's trustees.

Albert Simonson, an architect and dean of the Rhode Island School of Design, also sent off a letter to Rabbi Braude in praise of the possible selection of Mendelsohn. Simonson said that he had seen examples of Mendelsohn's work in Germany and considered him "one of the greatest contemporary architects."<sup>39</sup>

Mendelsohn met with Beth-El's building committee in March of 1946. Unfortunately, there are no minutes of the meeting. Judging from Mendelsohn's letter to the committee's chairman, attorney Arthur Levy, the meeting was far from perfunctory. Most likely, the committee had still been considering a neo-Colonial style, which would have complemented the Grand Revival-style homes on Orchard Avenue. If not outraged by this line of thinking, Mendelsohn was hardly sympathetic. In his letter to Levy, Mendelsohn delivered a short but sharp dissertation on the inevitability of modernism.<sup>40</sup> It was a strong letter, somewhat sarcastic in tone, offering no basis for compromise.

No doubt, Mendelsohn had fought what he referred to as "the battle of the styles" all too many times, but much earlier in his career. If a client was attracted to Mendelsohn's work, it was on the basis of Mendelsohn's zealous embrace of the present and his decisive rejection of tradition. Mendelsohn probably thought that Providence was a city mired in its architectural history and that Beth-El's building committee, which did not include an architect or modern art collector, was a timid, if not provincial, group.

There is perhaps another reason why Mendelsohn's presentation must have been jolting and upsetting. Though not a practicing Jew, the architect had some strong ideas about Judaism. Like architecture, he saw it in ideal terms: as a fresh, vital, and powerful force that was

constantly evolving. Offering a critique of neo-Colonialism but also tossing a grenade at St. Martin's, Mendelsohn stated in his letter: "A Temple for you in harmony with the residential surroundings would mean not to erect a medieval fortress from which to enforce our faith, but rather to think of an open and flexible plan, an organic integration of all its different uses where Jehovah could truly reside *in our midst*."<sup>41</sup> The word "organic" was of fundamental importance. Not only did it evoke the philosophy of Wright, one of Mendelsohn's heroes,<sup>42</sup> but it is a key to the ultimate success of the Beth-El design.

In his letter to Arthur Levy, Mendelsohn enclosed two recommendations. The first, in which he is described as "one of the outstanding figures in architecture today," was from the Detroit architect Albert Kahn (1869–1942), a world pioneer of industrial design.<sup>43</sup> The second recommendation, in which his gifts as "an artist and builder" are praised, was written by Tamar de Sola Pool, the national president of Hadassah, based on Mendelsohn's sweeping design of the medical center on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem. Given the inescapable fact that his presentation had not been well received, Mendelsohn did not seem optimistic about the Beth-El commission. Closing his letter with an offer to help the building committee find "a contemporary decision," he seemed to acknowledge probable defeat.

One day after Mendelsohn's visit, Rabbi Braude wrote to Rabbi Alan Green of Congregation Emanu-El in Houston, asking why his temple's negotiations with Mendelsohn had broken down.<sup>44</sup> Personally disappointed that the negotiations had been unsuccessful, Rabbi Green sensed that the architect was a significant artist who was entitled to his egotism.<sup>45</sup> He explained that his building committee had been inflexible and inclined to hire a local architect.<sup>46</sup> Rabbi Green mentioned a friend living in New York who had heard about Mendelsohn's plans for Houston and reported that the ideas were "breath-taking" and "strikingly original."

At the end of March of 1946, Arthur Levy's building committee wrote a report to Beth-El's board of trustees.<sup>47</sup> Four architects had been interviewed: Robert Cohn, the designer of Temple Emanu-El in New York; Charles Greco, who designed the temples in Cleveland, Hartford, and later Worcester; and Benjamin Moscovitz, a consulting architect for Macy's then at work on the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital.

The fourth, Mendelsohn, was described by Levy as "one of the most noted architects in the world," whose work in St. Louis, Cleveland, and a possible temple in Washington, D.C., was mentioned. The selection of Mendelsohn, however, would commit Beth-El to "contemporary architecture," a decision that the committee felt reluctant to make. Levy's committee asked the board to decide whether the design should be contemporary, Byzantine, Moorish, or New England Colonial.

As a further indication of the building committee's indecisiveness, Levy explained that since one-fifth of an architect's preliminary fee had to be paid if his services were terminated, the cancellation of a contract might cost \$5,000. On the assumption that the architect's fee would have been 6 percent to 10 percent of the building's cost, this makes it evident that the committee was envisioning a building that might cost \$500,000 or more.

Rabbi Braude, in a memo to Levy, decided that the committee should retain only an architect with synagogue-building experience, which would rule out any local professionals.<sup>48</sup> Further, the authorities whom he had consulted—Krautheimer, Wischnitzer, and Landsberger—not only favored a contemporary style of architecture, but strongly recommended Mendelsohn; Goodman seemed a logical second choice to him because of Schapiro's recommendation.

### *The Search Continues*

The minutes of the April meeting of the temple board do not reveal the depth of discussion, although a preference for a contemporary style was expressed. Without endorsing either Mendelsohn or Goodman, Levy's committee was advised to consider other possibilities.

Consequently, Levy invited Eliel Saarinen (1873–1950) of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, and William Worster (1895–1972), dean of the School of Architecture at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as consultants. Both declined. Saarinen's partner, J. Robert F. Swanson, replied that his firm was too busy to consider additional work and, further, a commission as far away as Providence might be burdensome.<sup>49</sup> Worster, explaining that he maintained a practice in San Francisco, was unwilling to take on a new project at such a distance.<sup>50</sup> He

did, however, recommend two other possibilities: Lawrence Anderson & Herbert Beckwith, professors at M.I.T., and The Architects Collaborative, the Cambridge firm led by Gropius of Harvard.<sup>51</sup>

To generate additional names, Levy turned to Albert Simonson, the dean of the Rhode Island School of Design, who had so favorably endorsed the selection of Mendelsohn. Not expressing disappointment over the committee's lack of enthusiasm for Mendelsohn, Simonson provided seven more possibilities.<sup>52</sup> Goodman was among the first group of four. Two other choices seem particularly interesting. The first was Richard Neutra (1892–1970), a Viennese-born architect who had come to America to study with Wright and then settled in Los Angeles. By 1929, he was considered one of the leading modernists in the world. Neutra, who was descended from a Jewish family, had submitted a plan for a synagogue in Vienna-Hietzing<sup>53</sup> and another for a synagogue while living in Chicago.<sup>54</sup> Though he built a number of churches later in his career, he never received a commission for a synagogue. A second possibility mentioned by Simonson was William Lescaze (1896–1969), a Philadelphia modernist, famous for the Savings Fund Office Tower, completed in 1932. Levy was indeed familiar with this architect, for he had apparently considered him for the design of his own home but had an "unpleasant experience."<sup>55</sup> Simonson's fourth suggestion was Walter Bogner, a Harvard professor. The last three names were Providence architects—Philip Creer, Peter Geddes, and Albert Harkness—part of the local professional establishment. Harkness designed the East Side's Friends Meeting House, built in 1953.<sup>56</sup>

### *The UAHC Symposium*

Another turn of events helped determine the outcome of the future temple. In late 1946 and early 1947, Beth-El became the beneficiary of a second bequest, even greater than John Rosenfeld's, which gave the building project enormous momentum. Alphone J. Lederer, a Providence native who ran a successful jewelry-manufacturing business based in New York City, was the grandson and great-nephew of Sons of Israel founders. In July of 1946, Lederer, who had never married and lived with his mother near Orchard Avenue, committed suicide.

When Lederer's mother, Julia, died six months later, his estate passed to the temple. Its ultimate value was more than \$500,000. Lederer, like Rosenfeld, though not active in the congregation, had been befriended by Rabbi Braude.

Thus, in the spring of 1947, it appeared that without yet embarking on a capital fundraising campaign, Beth-El had among its assets more than \$750,000. This amount was based on both the Rosenfeld and Lederer bequests and an estimated \$50,000 from the sale of the Broad Street Temple.

Though perhaps exceptional in financial well-being, Beth-El was not unique in its need for architectural guidance. Responding to inquiries from dozens of congregations, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations sponsored a two-day symposium in New York City in June of 1947. "An American Synagogue for Today and Tomorrow" was a forum at which numerous architects, artists, and UAHC officials shared their ideas and optimism for the new buildings of the coming decades. None could have predicted that hundreds of synagogues and other Jewish communal buildings would indeed be constructed during the next twenty years.

Beth-El was represented in New York by A. Henry Klein, a member of the building committee and temple vice-president, as well as by Pearl Braude, the rabbi's young wife. A 1940 Phi Beta Kappa graduate, she was a devotee of the arts, particularly dance, music, and design.<sup>57</sup> Perhaps more than the members of the committee, she grasped that Beth-El stood on the threshold of a wonderful opportunity: to build in functional terms but also provide sensory stimulation and pleasure. At the symposium, she was particularly impressed by the presentation made by Percival Goodman and joined him and the distinguished sculptor Jacques Lipchitz (1801–1973) for lunch. Goodman and Lipchitz conversed in French, though Lipchitz, who had lived in New York during the war years, also spoke English. Most likely, Mrs. Braude thought, all three could have communicated, at least haltingly, in Yiddish.

Pearl Braude had known another member of Goodman's family. When the Braudes were married in the summer of 1938, they honeymooned near Rabbi Braude's brother, at a resort east of Chicago. The

freelance writer Paul Goodman, Percival's younger brother, would visit frequently, particularly at mealtimes.

*Beth-El Makes Its Choice*

In late May of 1947, Levy had already written to Goodman, inquiring as to his interest in the Beth-El commission.<sup>58</sup> The chairman of the building committee described the temple as "an old reformed Congregation" contemplating "a substantial enterprise," which would include a sanctuary, a school building, and a "community house." Levy further explained that his committee was inclined to follow a contemporary design "but nevertheless, with appropriate New England conservatism."

Goodman finally met with the building committee on July 21, 1947.<sup>59</sup> Most likely, he presented photographs of his work and spoke more generally about his philosophy of building. Up until this time, however, Goodman had not yet completed a synagogue, though he had three commissions in various stages. As a result of his moving presentation at the New York symposium, he had been approached by three congregations: Baltimore Hebrew, B'nai Israel in Millburn, New Jersey, and Beth Israel in Lima, Ohio.<sup>60</sup> Struggling in a general commercial practice, Goodman suddenly found new opportunities presented to him.

No doubt Goodman made a positive impression in Providence. Immediately after his visit, Levy began to check his references. Stephen Kayser, curator of New York's new Jewish Museum, supplied a glowing letter.<sup>61</sup> Under difficult circumstances, he explained, Goodman had skillfully remodeled the Warburg mansion. Kayser was impressed with Goodman's thoughts about synagogue design and also with his character and sense of responsibility. Having studied Mendelsohn's design for Park Synagogue, the curator thought that Goodman could do as well or better. Kayser, a German emigré, also believed that an American architect should be given an opportunity to express his own "interesting" and "fertile" ideas. "I am convinced," he wrote, "Goodman will do a splendid job." The next day Kayser sent Levy a list of thirteen references for Goodman, including former clients, such as Dr. Louis Finkelstein of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

Goodman was now emerging as the front-runner in Beth-El's search. None of Dean Simonson's several candidates received further consideration, and Mendelsohn was not asked to give more detailed ideas nor provide drawings. Chairman Levy wrote to his committee in August of 1947 with one more suggestion, however. While on vacation near Burlington, Vermont, he had noticed a striking new church, built of brick and wood, and with little exterior decoration other than a simple cross placed over the main entrance.<sup>62</sup> He sent postcards of this unidentified church to his committee members, noting that its simplicity followed many of Goodman's ideas. Levy was probably not aware that St. Mark's Catholic Church, designed by Freeman, French, Freeman, had attracted national attention and was the subject of a five-page photo essay in the July 1944 issue of *Architectural Forum*.<sup>63</sup> In 1952, the Burlington architects built a new home for Ohavi Zedek Synagogue, a pioneering Vermont congregation.

In October of 1947, after three years of exploration, Beth-El's building committee unanimously recommended the employment of Percival Goodman to the full temple board.<sup>64</sup> Chairman Levy wrote that "contemporary is the style taught in substantially all schools of architecture in the United States today" and that at the symposium in New York sponsored by the Union, no other style had been considered or discussed. "Whether we are right or not," he concluded, "all the world seems to agree with us."

Levy then outlined Goodman's qualifications, identifying his age, forty-three, his teaching position at Columbia, and his recent experience, including the design of the Jewish Community Center in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. Clearly another factor weighed heavily in Goodman's favor. Levy explained that the Beth-El commission is "the job which Mr. Goodman wants to do more than any other in his career and we believe he will give us not only all the services of a skilled and competent architect but all the enthusiasm which we could hope to get from any one."

Levy then reported on Goodman's fee, 6 percent of the total cost of the building, then calculated at \$1 million, a schedule of payments, and a timeline for the preparation of working drawings and specifications. Levy estimated that construction could begin in about a year. Concluding his report, he commented that the success of the design

would depend both on the architect's skill and the amount of thought contributed by his client.

At its November meeting, the temple board approved the committee's recommendation. Goodman gladly accepted the offer, replying in his letter, "I honestly think that we are going to make some history on this building."

### *Percival Goodman*

Though Goodman seemed not only a logical but a highly attractive choice as Beth-El's architect, the board did not know how the architect himself had been led to the commission. Until the Jewish Museum experience, Goodman had been a largely disappointed and frustrated designer who had few ties with the organized Jewish community and little personal interest in spirituality. Even more than the temple leaders who had retained him, he was searching for a new and deeper form of expression.

Born in New York City in 1904, Goodman had a difficult and troubled childhood.<sup>66</sup> His father, Barnet Shatz, was an auctioneer of estate goods, such as antique furniture and furs. His mother, Augusta Goodman, was descended from a Dutch Jewish family that had settled in New York in about 1808. When Percival was seven years old, his parents divorced. Barnet ran off with an actress to South America and was never heard from again. Percival, his older sister, Alice, and his younger brothers, Paul and Arnold, lived precariously, moving to a different apartment at least once a year.

At thirteen years of age, refusing to take money from his mother, Percival left home. Though an avid reader, he had already dropped out of school. Goodman began working (for \$6 a week) as an office boy in the architectural office of his uncle, Benjamin Levitan. At first a floor sweeper and then a copier of blueprints, he soon learned the fundamentals of drafting.

A precocious and ambitious architectural student, he was hired as a draftsman by Grunenberg & Reichstag, a firm which built tenements in the Bronx. By deleting such details as fire escapes, Goodman made mundane structures look pretty on paper. He continued his studies at New York's Beaux-Arts Institute of Design, which was

modeled after the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, where many of his instructors had studied. Thus, Goodman, trained in the Beaux Arts style, was unaware of the emerging avant-garde either in America or Europe. Goodman embraced academic art and architecture when another employer, John Peterkin, encouraged him to study at the Fontainebleau Ecole des Beaux-Arts, where he spent three summers, beginning in 1920. At eighteen years of age, Goodman was married to an American, and he soon became a father. Goodman was widowed at age twenty, and his infant son, George, was reared by his wife's family.

Goodman planned to live in France as long as possible. In New York, he twice competed for the Paris Prize, a scholarship awarded by the Beaux-Arts Institute. In 1924, he was eliminated in the early rounds of the competition. The next year, determined to win, he advanced to the final round of required drawings over a three-month period. He defeated three finalists, including Louis Kahn (1901–1974), who at the height of his career and following his death has been hailed as one of the modern period's greatest architects. One of Goodman's four presentation drawings, a virtuoso display of draftsmanship on the subject of "A Summer Capitol for the United States," was purchased by the Metropolitan Museum of Art and shown in 1988 in an exhibition of recent acquisitions.

A Francophile, Goodman remained in Paris three years. Though he did not consider himself an expatriate, he hoped to remain indefinitely. He met many famous writers and artists, such as Cocteau, Hemingway, and Man Ray, but thought little of it. More importantly, while abroad he was exposed to the International style of architecture. Though largely oblivious to Gropius's Bauhaus and its impact, Goodman was deeply impressed by the work of Le Corbusier (1887–1965), particularly his drawings entered in the competition for a Palace of the League of Nations in Geneva. Goodman saw much of the simplicity of modernism as a reflection and an outgrowth of classical tradition.

He returned to New York in 1928 and established a partnership with Jay Whitman, an American friend from Paris. Specializing in interior design for retail businesses, their firm was an immediate commercial success, employing a staff of thirty in its offices on West

57th Street. By 1932, when Goodman saw the exhibition on the International style organized by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson for the Museum of Modern Art, Goodman knew that he had become a modernist. He claimed, however, that he was never purely interested in style, but in style as a means of expressing a larger idea.

Goodman survived the early years of the Depression largely due to his clients' optimism. If success was measured by impressive drawings, he was emerging as a leading modernist. Although Goodman won national recognition in key competitions of the late 1930s—an art center for Wheaton College in Norton, Massachusetts, and a National Gallery for the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.<sup>67</sup>—he still felt grateful for an occasional laundry or garage. Gradually, he became bitter, losing interest in commercial work because of its ceaseless demands to build as cheaply and quickly as possible. During World War II, when hired to design camouflage for factories and trains, he felt, rightly so, that his abilities—and government funds—were being wasted. Goodman, moreover, espoused pacifism.

Teaching architecture was a creative outlet. Goodman began at New York University, then moved to Columbia, where he taught three afternoons a week from 1945 until 1973.

Another creative avenue was writing. Largely through coincidence, Goodman and his brother, Paul, a leader of the New Left and counterculture of the 1950s and 1960s, discovered that they shared similar ideas about cities and their chaos. Percival had developed some of his ideas about planning for the Otis Elevator pavilion, an unbuilt project for the New York World's Fair of 1939.<sup>68</sup> Paul had graduated with highest honors from City College of New York and pursued doctoral studies at the University of Chicago. He was a philosopher and lecturer as well as a lay psychotherapist. When Paul proposed a book on cities of the future, Percival eagerly accepted. With a text by Paul and illustrations by Percival, *Communitas* was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1947. A bold manifesto on public and private ownership of property and means of production, the book became a classic of utopian thinking. Though widely read and taught, its ideas have been consistently ignored by builders.<sup>69</sup>

Paul had been a Bar Mitzvah, but Percival had received no religious education. He had worked in Jewish firms and had mostly Jewish clients, but was in few other ways associated with Jews. The persistent anti-Semitism he encountered in France was his closest identification with Judaism.

Percival Goodman's desire to grow Jewishly occurred as a result of the Holocaust and Israeli statehood. When he was hired by the Jewish Theological Seminary to build the Jewish Museum, he reached a personal turning point. Goodman felt embarrassed by his ignorance but challenged to express architectural ideas conducive to Judaism. Ironically, when the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was organizing its symposium on synagogue design in 1947, Goodman was invited to attend as a Jewish architect. He accepted the invitation with the provision that he could lecture.<sup>70</sup> Convinced that Judaism celebrated the written word at the expense of visual imagery, his lecture on "The Holiness of Beauty" was pivotal: it transformed his career and, through his work, the postwar American synagogue became enriched and ennobled.

### *Goodman's Plan*

In November of 1947, as soon as he had been selected as Beth-El's architect, Goodman sent a detailed questionnaire to the temple's building committee.<sup>71</sup> Divided into three parts—"The House of Worship," "The House of Assembly," and "The House of Study"—it suggested that the structure should be divided accordingly. There were more than forty questions whose answers would help the architect shape and color his ideas.

Only Rabbi Braude's questionnaire survives, with his preferences showing the nucleus of the building that was eventually constructed. For example, Rabbi Braude requested seating in the sanctuary for 500 congregants, High Holy Day seating for 1,500. He visualized an ark for six to eight Torah scrolls; the *bimah* would accommodate eight chairs. There would be two lecterns: one for preaching, the other for reading. Space would be required for an organ as well as a grand piano and stringed instruments. Rabbi Braude preferred a social hall equipped with a stage, but no permanent seating. He requested meet-

ing rooms for various groups, such as Boy and Girl Scouts, but he did not care for bowling alleys, as Goodman had suggested. The area most difficult for Rabbi Braude to envision was, surprisingly, the religious school. He could not predict the number of classrooms needed nor their configuration. Braude noted that the need for nursery and kindergarten classrooms would require further discussion.

There were two important areas missing from Goodman's exploratory questionnaire. The first was a library. The second was a chapel.

In November of 1949, Goodman presented his concept of the temple's design to the congregation's board of trustees. A cardboard model had been fabricated to demonstrate his ideas.<sup>72</sup> The design represented a simple and harmonious structure, imaginative but not radical. Goodman's plan emphasized the integration of the structure's three major functions: prayer, study, and sociability. Approximately 300 feet in length and 100 feet at its greatest width, the synagogue's spaces flowed easily and unobtrusively. Occupying a parklike setting, with lawn, trees, shrubs, and flowers, the temple was intended to have a distinct identity yet relate to its residential surroundings. If not readily identifiable as a synagogue, it was surely not a church of any denomination.

The third home built by Congregation Sons of Israel and David was inviting, unpretentious, and self-confident. Goodman's vision of a modern synagogue was fresh, strong, and dynamic.

After the concept was approved by the board, it was presented to the full congregation at its annual meeting the following month. Described by Chairman Levy of the building committee as "the finest Temple in the United States," it received broad and vigorous support.<sup>73</sup>

### *Financing the New Building*

Despite this enthusiasm, however, financing remained an obstacle. In June of 1949, the architect had estimated that construction costs would run \$830,000 (or \$1.10 per cubic foot), but this figure included neither his fee of 6 percent nor the costs of engineering, furnishing, landscaping, or art. These additional expenditures would run \$250,000.<sup>74</sup>

It became apparent to temple leaders that though the Rosenfeld and Lederer bequests would serve as financial cornerstones of the building program, a capital campaign of \$400,000 or more would be required. Yet the timing of such a campaign was less than ideal. Jewish needs overseas were extraordinary, and Rhode Island had not yet developed a strong network of Jewish social service agencies.

Fundraising for Beth-El was considered by many temple leaders to be burdensome. The presidency of the congregation was thus regarded as much a task as a privilege. With the explicit agenda of completing a capital campaign, Walter Sundlun, a former president, was persuaded to return to office. To this day, Sundlun remains the only Beth-El president to have served two nonconsecutive terms. His son, Governor Bruce Sundlun, is the only second-generation president in the congregation's history.

Despite Walter Sundlun's determination, fundraising was difficult at best. As of May of 1951, pledges totaled \$179,000. There were fifty-eight pledges of \$1,000 or more. Six of these pledges were for \$5,000 or more, and three were for at least \$10,000. The three largest gifts were \$20,000 from the temple sisterhood, \$17,500 from one family, and \$10,000 from the temple's brotherhood. Percival Goodman pledged \$1,000.

Two and one-half years later, in November of 1953, the building campaign had grown to 361 pledges of \$242,000. There had been little growth at the upper end of the scale; the pledge by the sisterhood remained the largest.

### *Construction Underway*

In September of 1951, four years after an architect had been hired, the congregation finally voted unanimously to enter into contracts for the erection of the new building.<sup>75</sup> The cost was not to exceed \$1,200,000, with additional expenses budgeted at \$250,000.<sup>76</sup>

There was one further impediment to construction, however. During the Korean War, the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Production Authority controlled the availability of metal, particularly steel, copper, and aluminum. Consequently, Goodman's design was altered to rely less on steel and more on reinforced concrete. The fed-

eral government's authorization to obtain these precious materials was not granted until March of 1952, with construction to begin in July of that year.<sup>77</sup>

On June 30, 1952, a groundbreaking ceremony was held on Orchard Avenue. More than 250 temple members attended. Temple officers posed for photos wearing hardhats. Even Rabbi Braude sat on a bulldozer to record the festivity of the moment.

September 20, 1953 was another momentous occasion, when the cornerstone of the new temple was laid. Once again, there was a parade of speakers, ceremonial handshakes, mugging for photographs, and expressions of progress and nostalgia. The president of the confirmation class spoke, as did two temple elders, both of whom had been present at the dedication of the Broad Street Temple in 1911.

### *Dedication Ceremonies*

In the spring of 1954, during its ninety-ninth year, Congregation Sons of Israel and David departed its second home and entered its third. The last Shabbat services at Broad and Glenham Streets were held on April 16 and 17. Virtually the entire membership attended the bitter-sweet ceremonies. On Sunday, April 18, the first day of Pesach, the congregation's Torahs were removed from their stately ark and driven by limousine to Orchard Avenue, where they were marched into the new sanctuary, led by officers, board members, and a color guard of veterans.

The new Beth-El celebrated no fewer than six ceremonies of dedication. The first, for the congregation itself, was on Friday, April 23, 1954, the seventh day of Pesach. There was a ceremonial kindling of the Eternal Light, and an address was delivered by Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. A children's service of dedication was held Shabbat morning. On Sunday, April 25, the Rosenfeld and Lederer Memorials were consecrated, as symbolic keys were presented by Norman Fain, chairman of the building committee, to President Sundlun and Rabbi Braude.

During the following three weeks, there were four more dedications, each intended for a special group within the Jewish or larger community. There was a galaxy of speakers, including the governor

of Rhode Island, the mayor of Providence, educators, rabbis, ministers, and priests. The oldest confirmands of the congregation were honored. President Eisenhower, unable to attend, sent a congratulatory message.<sup>78</sup>

Percival Goodman, looking young and fit, spoke at the dedications. His design was soon published in leading architectural journals, including *Architectural Record* and *Progressive Architecture*.<sup>79</sup> In the spring of 1955, when *Life* magazine published a five-part series on "The Great Religions of the World" (later made into a book), the section on Judaism featured a short text and five photos of the new Beth-El. In its hundredth year, Sons of Israel and David represented the forefront of growth and the promise of renewal within liberal Judaism. Indeed, in 1954 and 1955, the congregation played a key role in Rhode Island's celebration of the American Jewish Tercentenary, which focused on the settlement of Newport.

### *The Building Described*

As viewed from Orchard Avenue, Beth-El is a low-lying, gently proportioned building, characterized by rounded shapes and contours. The temple's most prominent form is its vaulted sanctuary. Adding contrast nearby is the small dome of the chapel. At the western end of the building, opposite St. Martin's Church, is the two-story wing of the religious school.

As a modern building, Beth-El lacks the solemnity, and perhaps the authority, of traditional religious architecture. It is physically and emotionally accessible, however. The temple is orderly but not stuffy, friendly but not chatty. It conveys a quiet dignity, eloquent in its understatement.

The exterior walls, built of Ohio brick and trimmed with Indiana limestone, are plain and modest. Passing through the birch doors of the main entrance, one reaches the foyer, a threshold of multicolored slate flagging. Large enough to shelter a small congregation of its own, the foyer leads to the meeting hall on the left and the sanctuary on the right. In daylight, greenery is again evident through the large picture windows at the rear of the foyer.

Visitors and longtime congregants alike are often surprised by the spaciousness of the main worship hall, remarkable for any period or style in Rhode Island. Approximately 100 feet long and 80 feet wide, the sanctuary seats nearly a thousand. The arched wooden roof, of lamella design, rises 32 feet, but appears even loftier. The trusses of the copper-sheathed roof form an intricate diamond pattern, the primary decoration of the interior. Abundant natural lighting is provided by two arched clerestory windows, 13 feet high, on the north and south walls of the sanctuary. At the east end is the raised platform of the *bimah*, which nestles the ark.

Goodman's ingenuity is further demonstrated by his solution to the challenge of High Holy Day seating. The common device of a collapsing wall between sanctuary and social hall or foyer is avoided. Rather, he created additional space for seating by flanking the northern and southern sides of the sanctuary with eight classrooms, whose walls, when folded, allow for 600 temporary seats.

Beth-El's meeting hall, to the west of the foyer, is another spare, open space, 70 feet long and 60 feet wide. It can seat 350 for dining and 600 for educational and entertainment events. Even more restrained in its decoration than the sanctuary, the meeting hall has a ceiling supported by wooden beams and, running the length of the north wall, a bank of windows and glass doors that open to a patio and garden. A large, full-service kitchen is nearby.

Beth-El's chapel, also radiating from the foyer, is used for weddings and, without interruption since 1955, for a daily minyan. Compared to the quiet grandeur of the sanctuary, the chapel, seating about 100 congregants, conveys a feeling of intimacy. If any part of the temple suggests more traditional synagogue architecture, it is the chapel, with its small copper dome. The dome, resting on a band of glass, also provides soft illumination. The chapel is adorned with a simple cedar ark, a rosewood reading table, and a north wall decorated with a diamond-patterned grill. The Eternal Light, brought from Broad Street, hangs on the east wall beneath the inscription *Shaddai*, meaning "The Almighty." Like the sanctuary, the chapel has its own secluded choir and organ loft.

The other parts of Temple Beth-El, though less remarkable visually, are functional and uncluttered. The rabbi's study, the administrative

offices, and a large library are found on the ground floor. The religious school contains two classrooms on the ground floor, seven on the second floor, and one in the basement, where there are additional offices, lounges, storage spaces, and a second kitchen.

Goodman's architecture embraces many art forms. Though the sanctuary resembles a theatre, it reflects the warmth of a home. The acoustics are outstanding. A child's song or a shofar's blast resonates throughout the room. Though not visible from the pews, the temple's professional choir and organist—and an occasional harpist, cellist, or flutist—can be heard clearly. Over twenty years, many of the world's finest musicians have performed in public concerts sponsored by the sisterhood.

In sound and silence, Beth-El's sanctuary is a serene place. Though protected from the commotion of the workaday world, it celebrates nature. The sky, clouds, and trees are visible through the large arched windows. Flashes of lighting and explosions of thunder offer momentary but exciting distractions. Brilliant light and falling darkness animate the room.

### *Artistic Adornments*

As both a traditionalist and a modernist, Goodman saw architecture as giving unity to the other visual arts. Decoration is integral to his design.<sup>80</sup> From his earliest contact with the building committee, Goodman advocated an art budget of 5 percent of total costs.<sup>81</sup> He dreamt of employing some of the most luminous Jewish artists to embellish and vivify the synagogue. Goodman hoped Lipchitz would carve bold, symbolic sculptures for the southern and eastern facades. Two rectangular slabs of stone, visible today, would have supported such images. The facades look bare without these sculptures.

Judging from sketches found in fundraising materials, Goodman had even more specific plans for magnificent, tapestrylike designs by Marc Chagall (1887–1985). In the sanctuary, large drapes beneath the arched windows, concealing folding classroom walls, would have portrayed biblical heroes and stories. Goodman calculated that the cost of such designs would be \$100,000, and he made tentative plans for their manufacture by an order of French nuns.<sup>82</sup>

But art of this quality was simply beyond the comprehension and reach of his clients. Goodman nevertheless sought brilliant, not subdued colors. He chose a rich gold for the sanctuary carpet and a deep purple for the upholstery. The curtains covering the ark, designed by the prominent textile artist Dorothy Liebes (1899–1972), were an inky blue. The drapes beneath the arched windows, in lieu of Chagall's figures, were solid bands of color. At the rear of the sanctuary, Goodman placed two mural-like panels of stunning red marble—with veins of green, brown, and white—to support memorial plaques that are rotated throughout the year.

The sanctuary's clerestory windows were not left unadorned. They were sandblasted with biblical verses selected by Rabbi Braude. The Hebrew calligraphy and Jewish motifs were designed by another prominent Jewish artist, Ismar David.

While preserving the spaciousness of the sanctuary, Goodman foresaw a need for symbolic sculptures. Hoping to obtain fine examples by contemporary American artists, as he did so successfully for the synagogue in Millburn, New Jersey,<sup>83</sup> he turned to the New York art dealer Sam Kootz. Three leading sculptors received commissions. The most daring pieces are the columns flanking the ark by Ibram Lassaw (b. 1913). Their design was based on passages in Exodus selected by Rabbi Braude.<sup>84</sup> When illuminated from below, the spidery bronze forms, entitled "Pillar of Fire" and "Pillar of Cloud," seem to convey a sense of infinite time and space. Lassaw's pieces were considered among his best and were selected by the Museum of Modern Art for exhibition at the Venice Biennale of 1954.<sup>85</sup>

The Eternal Light, welded from sheet steel and copper by David Hare (b. 1917), seems to vacillate between representation and abstraction. It has a rough, unfinished quality, at odds with the sanctuary's more refined ambience. Hare's seven-branched menorah, displayed like a bas-relief on the left side of the *bimah*, is a dazzling piece of sculpture. It not only functions as a candelabrum, but evokes an ancient Mediterranean past through its resemblance to a nautical vessel.

Also commissioned through the Kootz Gallery was a large bronze *hanukkiyah*, mounted on a stone pedestal, by Herbert Ferber (1906–1991). Displayed adjacent to the temple's main entrance, the piece is

the focal point of Hanukkah celebrations, when, despite cold weather, children and parents gather outside to light the candles and sing the traditional blessings and holiday songs.

Adding further color and glow to the new Beth-El were mosaic panels crafted by Walter Feldman (b. 1925), an art professor at Brown University. Portraying biblical stories through complex imagery, there are three mosaic medallions embedded in the temple foyer, four more in the front patio.

In a further break with convention, Goodman refrained from decorating the temple's exterior with such obvious Jewish symbols as a Star of David or the Ten Commandments. These symbols appear more subtly in Ismar David's windows and can be seen from Orchard Avenue when the sanctuary is illuminated. An inscription carved on a beam over the main entrance reads simply: "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations" (Psalm 90).

Even today, one of the remarkable features of Beth-El's decoration is the unobtrusiveness of plaques. Most Jewish communal buildings are encrusted with them. There are only two carved inscriptions on the Orchard Avenue exterior, recording the Rosenfeld and Lederer Memorials. While there are many names throughout the temple's interior, all are tiny in scale, some barely noticeable. The idea was to preserve the beauty of the architecture and also, in keeping with Rabbi Braude's outlook, to enforce modesty upon donors. Further, there are no painted portraits or bronze busts. A small photograph of Rabbi Braude was only recently hung in the temple library, which had been named in his honor in 1967.

### *Forty Years After*

Solidly built and well maintained, the temple complex has undergone minor changes since 1954. The Braude library, growing to more than 25,000 volumes, required a remodeling of its reading room and an expansion of its basement stacks. Goodman's design did not include an office for an assistant rabbi. When the first was hired following the move to Orchard Avenue, new quarters were built. Beth-El's physical plant also necessitated the employment of a professional administrator. Similarly, a full-time director of the religious school was required,

and for eleven years the temple employed a full-time cantor. A much enlarged administrative office, neutral in style, was built in the mid-1980s.

During Leslie Gutterman's tenure as senior rabbi over the past twenty years, membership has grown significantly, reaching 1,100 families. Following the matriculation of the Baby Boom generation, the religious school's enrollment experienced a drop, but the number of children has begun to increase. Classroom space is again at a premium, and older students attend evening sessions. There is ample room but insufficient interest for a nursery or a Jewish day school under Reform auspices.

During the High Holy Days and for special lectures and concerts, the sanctuary is filled to capacity. During winter months, however, the chapel is frequently used for Shabbat services. Those congregants who regularly attend services and others who participate in the minyan form a congregation within Sons of Israel and David. To further heighten the sense of intimacy within the chapel, the seating arrangement was changed, so that three groups of congregants face one another rather than focus on a reader.

To commemorate Beth-El's 135th anniversary, the temple's rich archival collections were organized and stored in a newly created basement study area. The adjacent lounge, which had been designed as a gallery, was finally built as an exhibition area. Similarly, a hallway on the ground floor was redesigned to serve as an art gallery.

The temple's sanctuary, the heart of Goodman's design, has retained its integrity. There have been many cosmetic changes, however. As fabrics became worn and required replacement, there has been a continually changing color scheme of carpets, upholstery, and drapery. Goodman's vibrant colors have been sacrificed to muted tones, whose effect is a prettier and sweeter look. In the mid-1980s, new Torah mantles, ark, and lectern drapes were designed by Ina Golub, a New Jersey fiber artist. Aside from a lighter palette, these textiles also introduced busier rhythms, inconsistent with Goodman's stronger design.

While there has been no public criticism of the sculptures by Lasaw, Hare, and Ferber, an additional sculpture was commissioned for the sanctuary. Because Goodman's design never included images of

the Ten Commandments, Martin Craig was commissioned in 1960 to fill the so-called gap.<sup>86</sup> His wiry copper tablets resemble Lassaw's columns, but there was no appropriate place to put them. Consequently, they were wedged into the diamond pattern of the ceiling, where they look precariously balanced. Some congregants objected to Goodman's design of the chapel ark. The simple wooden cabinets in the shape of tablets but without Hebrew letters resembled coffins to some. Consequently, Hebrew letters were later affixed.

In another attempt to embellish Goodman's design, the large windows at the rear of the foyer were decorated with leaded designs. The glass artist, Edward McIlvane, chose obvious Jewish symbols and presented them in a rigid, heavy manner.

After nearly forty years on Orchard Avenue, Temple Beth-El—both the congregation and its building—are a landmark on Providence's East Side. Only a few score families remember the old temple at Broad and Glenham. Most congregants who are aware of the older building assume that it, like the Friendship Street Synagogue, has long since been torn down. Fortunately, they are mistaken, because the old temple not only stands but is still in use. Purchased by a consortium of Orthodox synagogues in the spring of 1954, the Broad Street Temple became Congregation Shaare Zedek and has been carefully maintained. Today as few Jews live in south Providence as in some Eastern European communities, however.

Looking back, Beth-El's move to the East Side of Providence was not only inevitable but overdue. The East Side needed a Reform congregation, but given the scale and expense of the new Beth-El, it could never have supported two. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the further dispersal of Providence's Jewish community was not foreseen. Two Reform congregations were established in southern suburbs and towns, Temple Sinai in Cranston and Temple Habonim in Barrington, one on each side of Narragansett Bay.

Now, nearly a half-century since Rabbi Braude began his search for an architectural style, it is evident that he had embarked on a journey not merely to clothe the exterior of a new building but to help define and shape an institution. His path toward modernism now seems totally logical and necessary. To have built in a manner evocative of some earlier time and place would have been a serious mistake. On

the one hand, Temple Beth-El would have been somehow relegated to a safe, predictable existence, more comfortable with a nostalgic past than an unfolding future. On the other hand, the congregation would have lost an opportunity to achieve an excellence provided by thought, imagination, and freedom. In retrospect, Beth-El's quest for an architectural identity was an exciting adventure, more successful and fulfilling than anybody would have dared predict.

### *Architectural Second Thoughts*

It can be asked, rhetorically, whether Percival Goodman was the best choice of an architect espousing a modern design. No doubt a professional relationship with Erich Mendelsohn would have been taxing, given his remote distance from Rhode Island, his stormy temperament, and the timidity of the client. That Mendelsohn would have created an unusual, if not extraordinary, design is also not debatable. He was a gifted architect, thoughtful about Jewish needs, and a relentless seeker of truths. Most likely, a Mendelsohn design would have been more daring, perhaps radical, compared to Goodman's. This would have been exhilarating for architects, historians, and critics, but probably few others. Even after four decades of experiencing modern architecture, it is doubtful that Sons of Israel and David, if starting anew, would seek a bolder, more aggressive, more provocative design. Goodman continued to seek new challenges, however.<sup>87</sup>

Another question worthy of speculation is the extent to which architects other than either Goodman or Mendelsohn should have been considered. Most of the modernists recommended to Braude, such as Gropius, Neutra, and Saarinen, would have been stimulating choices as well. Neither Neutra nor Saarinen ever built a synagogue, and the Gropius synagogues in Newton, Massachusetts, and Baltimore<sup>88</sup> are probably closer in spirit to Goodman's Beth-El than to any of Mendelsohn's counterparts. At least in theory, there were still other possibilities, but the proponents of the International style did not, generally, create outstanding houses of worship. The great exception is Le Corbusier's Notre-Dame-du-Haut in Ronchamp, France, but this was not completed until 1955, and it breathtakingly contradicts most of the premises of his earlier work. In America, Marcel Breuer

(1902–1981), a student of Gropius at the Bauhaus and later his colleague, responded triumphantly to the task of designing Catholic churches,<sup>89</sup> but this ability was demonstrated after Beth-El was completed. Breuer did design a synagogue in Short Hills, New Jersey, built in 1961.

Today it is evident that Beth-El's search for an architectural vision occurred at an extraordinary moment. A distinguished era of American ecclesiastical building was just underway. If the search had begun only a few years later, in 1955, for example, many more possibilities would have been evident. Harrison & Abramovitz's Three Chapels at Brandeis University, in Waltham, Massachusetts, would have given confidence and inspiration to Beth-El's building committee. Similarly, Philip Johnson's Kneses Tifereth Israel in Port Chester, New York, completed in 1954, would have suggested a bold possibility.<sup>90</sup> Though he had built a synagogue in Philadelphia, Louis Kahn, in the mid-1950s, was not yet considered a leading architect, and he had not quite entered the phase of his own career that brought him three promising synagogue commissions.<sup>91</sup> If Beth-El's leaders had waited for an important example of contemporary religious architecture to be built in Rhode Island, they would have sat on the sidelines until 1961, when Pietro Belluschi (b. 1899) built a handsome octagonal chapel for Portsmouth Abbey and School on the same island as Newport's Touro.<sup>92</sup>

Perhaps Beth-El's oversight in the late 1940s was not giving serious consideration to America's most challenging, accomplished, and temperamental architect, Frank Lloyd Wright. Though shunned in New England, Wright was alive, well, and available. Further, he hardly ever turned down a commission. Fortunately, his opportunity to design a synagogue came in suburban Philadelphia when he was nearly ninety years of age. Beth Sholom in Elkins Park was indeed an extraordinary result. As unconventional, powerful, and revolutionary as Wright's only art museum, the Guggenheim, the synagogue too was completed in 1959, shortly after Wright's death.

While it is fascinating to hypothesize about what the new Beth-El might have been, such speculation is basically unfair in view of Percival Goodman's accomplishments. Providence's Beth-El is a work of

exceptional and enduring quality, within his enormous output of synagogues and beyond.

With Beth-El to his credit, Goodman's practice gained strong momentum. During the next twenty-five years, he designed scores of synagogues, of which fifty-four were built in twenty states. The majority are found in the Northeast and Midwest, with others scattered in such places as Tennessee, Florida, Oklahoma, and California. During the peak decades of his practice, Goodman took on an average of four synagogue designs each year. Evidently, many congregations were pleased with his work and his manner. Twelve congregations returned to him for additions to his original designs.

It is not possible to determine from Goodman's papers the number of times that he was invited to consult with a congregation but not awarded a commission. In Rhode Island, for example, he was approached by Woonsocket's B'nai Israel, which later selected Samuel Glaser, a Boston architect.<sup>93</sup> There can be no doubt, however, that Goodman, like Mendelsohn with Beth-El, positively influenced the Woonsocket design. By 1962, B'nai Israel's leaders required little coaxing in the direction of modernism. Probably reinforced by Goodman's thoughts, B'nai Israel's leaders sought the finest decoration. The Israeli artist Avigdor Arikha (b. 1929), a disciple of Chagall, designed magnificent stained-glass windows, which were fabricated in France. Equally impressive were textiles designed by Anni Albers (b. 1899) and metalwork crafted by Ludwig Wolpert (1900–1981).<sup>94</sup>

Though Goodman built his later career around synagogue design, he was involved in other commissions, such as public schools, a community college, and urban planning. In Providence, he was consulted in the design of new offices for the Apex Company, whose president, Norman Fain, had been chairman of the temple's building committee. Also through Fain's influence, Goodman was involved in the design of a suburban campus for Providence's Jewish Home, but the facility, unfortunately, was never built.<sup>95</sup> Due to Norman Fain's encouragement, Goodman was hired by his older brother, Irving, later a temple president, and his wife, Macie, to build a home near Blackstone Boulevard.<sup>96</sup> A splendid example of contemporary architecture, it resembles many of the Southern California homes by Neutra but is even more understated in its simplicity. For Rabbi Braude's younger

brother, Michael, a publisher and writer, and his sister-in-law, Lillian, Goodman designed a large home in East Hampton, New York, not far from his own vacation home.<sup>97</sup> The Braude home, spacious and unassuming, is a fine backdrop for the display of an important collection of contemporary art, including a piece by Lassaw, who also lives nearby.

Throughout the years, Goodman remained particularly proud of his design of Temple Beth-El.<sup>98</sup> Though he was aware of some imperfections, he considered the commission one of the best of his career in terms of site, budget, and freedom of expression. Beth-El was also meaningful to him because of the cohesiveness of its design. Nevertheless, though he grew closer in his respect for Judaism, Goodman remained both an architectural and a religious maverick. To the end of his life, he was privately outspoken, eager to criticize all with whom he disagreed and any note of hypocrisy or artifice. Though Goodman did not worship God, he saw divinity in men and women, most notably his wife, Naomi. He was not a prayerful man, but he provided resonance for others' prayers.

Most likely, Congregation Sons of Israel and David will occupy its place on Orchard Avenue far longer than any of its previous locations. Presently, a move anywhere else seems implausible. But if further growth necessitated a new wing or an unforeseen bequest offered a guest house for visitors, in what style would it be built? Surely the postmodern era, with its many leading Jewish architects, would present numerous possibilities. One design might use as a springboard the neo-Colonial styles of the neighboring residences. Another design might take for its lead the neo-medievalism of St. Martin's Church. A third possibility would be a departure on the Victorian buildings of nearby Lincoln School. Percival Goodman's Beth-El would be a difficult building to reinterpret, because it represents a clear, honest, and humble search for truth in its time.

---

George M. Goodwin, Ph.D. of Providence, Rhode Island, is the consultant in art and architecture of the American Jewish Archives.

## Notes

1. For introductory references on American synagogue design, see Alexandra Shecket Korros and Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Synagogue History: A Bibliography and State-of-the-Field Survey* (New York: Markus Wiener, 1988). For a list of extant synagogue buildings, see Mark W. Gordon, "Rediscovering Jewish Infrastructure: The Legacy of U.S. 19th Century Synagogues," *American Jewish History* 75, no. 3 (March 1986). The most distinguished nineteenth-century American architect of synagogues was Dankmar Adler (1844–1900), the son of a rabbi, who built four synagogues in Chicago, of which two survive, both as Baptist churches. See Charles E. Gregersen and Joan W. Saltzstein, *Dankmar Adler: His Theatres and Auditoriums* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1990).

2. The Beth-El Archives (hereafter cited as Temple Archives), contain extensive correspondence files of Rabbi William Braude and other files of Arthur Levy and Norman Fain. Among a large collection of oral histories recorded by the author between 1988 and 1990 were interviews with Lillian Braude, Pearl Braude, Norman Fain, Percival Goodman, Ibram Lassaw, and Macie Fain Silver. The Beth-El commission is probably one of Goodman's best-documented synagogue designs.

3. The first synagogue in the Americas was built in Recife, Dutch Brazil, in 1640. The oldest surviving synagogue building is in Surinam, and was dedicated in 1685. The oldest synagogue in its original form is Mikve Israel, in Curaçao, consecrated in 1732. See Gunter Bohm, "The First Sephardic Synagogues in South America and in the Caribbean Area," *Studia Rosenthaliana* (University Library of Amsterdam), 22, no. 1 (Spring 1988).

4. For information about Touro and Peter Harrison, see Antoinette F. Downing and Vincent J. Scully, Jr., *The Architectural Heritage of Newport, Rhode Island: 1640–1915*, 2nd ed. rev. (New York: American Legacy Press, 1982). For fine color reproductions of Touro and other Rhode Island houses of worship, see Peter T. Mallary, *New England Churches & Meetinghouses* (Seacaucus, N.J.: Chartwell Books, 1985).

5. For a comprehensive history of the temple, based largely on minutes of board meetings, see Seebert J. Goldowsky, *A Century and a Quarter of Spiritual Leadership: The Story of the Congregation of the Sons of Israel and David (Temple Beth-El)*, Providence, Rhode Island (Providence: Beth-El, 1989).

6. Other early members of the UAHC in New England were Hartford's Beth Israel (1878) and Boston's Ohabei Shalom (1880).

7. For autobiographical essays by Rabbi Braude, see "Recollections of a Septuagenarian," *Rhode Island Jewish Historical Notes* 8, no. 3 (November 1981) and 8, no. 4 (November 1982).

8. Beth-El's architectural dialogue with Mount Zion was resumed in the 1940s with Mount Zion's architect, Erich Mendelsohn.

9. David Hovitz, ed., *Temple Emanu-El: The First Fifty Years, 5684–5734* (Providence: Temple Emanu-El, 1974).

10. For an analysis of Providence's ecclesiastical architecture, see William McKenzie Woodward and Edward F. Sanderson, *Providence: A Citywide Survey of Historic Resources* (Providence: Historical Preservation Commission, 1986), pp. 116–124.

11. The William J. Harris House still stands in a dilapidated condition at the rear of the temple parking lot.

12. The most important modern residence in New England was the home Gropius built for himself in Lincoln, Massachusetts, in 1937. The second key modern home was built by Rhode Islanders, the John Nicholas Brown family of Providence, on Fishers Island, New York, offshore New London, Connecticut, in 1938. The Brown house, called "Windshield," was designed by Richard Neutra, beginning in 1935. It was destroyed by fire in 1975. In 1939, Henry-Russell Hitch-

cock, a leading historian of modernism, considered the Brown house "the largest and most elaborate modern house in America, by one of the world's leading modern architects." *Rhode Island Architecture* (Providence: Rhode Island Museum Press, 1939).

13. Temple Archives, April 17, 1944.

14. Wright spoke on November 11, 1932 at the first Institute of Art cosponsored by Brown University and the Rhode Island School of Design and supported by a grant from the Carnegie Endowment. A headline in the *Providence Journal* is probably illustrative of the way he was received: "Noted Architect Says Bathrooms Offer Only Message of American Civilization Today" (p. 1). The architect declared, "Modern architecture should invade Providence because we can't go on ad nauseam repeating the old." Thomas Hart Benton, the prominent muralist, was another speaker at the Institute. Wright asked Benton, "Why doesn't painting come home to its mother, architecture, take its spanking and go to work?" Evidently, there was laughter in the audience, but Wright was not joking.

15. The writer and critic Brendan Gill believes that Beth Sholom is one of Wright's greatest buildings, and that his numerous religious designs form a major contribution to American architecture. Typically, only Wright's Unity Temple, the Unitarian church in Oak Park, Illinois, completed in 1904, is singled out for praise. See *Many Masks: A Life of Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York: Putnam, 1987), p. 471.

16. Geoffrey Wigoder, *The Story of the Synagogue: A Diaspora Museum Book* (Tel Aviv: Beth Hatefutsoth, 1986).

17. Temple Archives, April 25, 1944.

18. Goodman designed Mishkan Tefila's new building in Newton, Massachusetts, which was dedicated in 1958.

19. Temple Archives, September 29, 1945.

20. *Ibid.*, May 16, 1944.

21. Richard Krautheimer, *Mittelalterliche Synagogen* (Berlin, 1927).

22. Temple Archives, December 12, 1945.

23. For Mendelsohn, see Bruno Zevi, *Erich Mendelsohn* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1985); idem, *Erich Mendelsohn: Opera Completa* (Milan: Etas/Kompass, 1970); Sigrid Achenbach, *Erich Mendelsohn: 1887-1953: Ideen, Bauten, Projekte* (Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1987); *Erich Mendelsohn: Complete Works of the Architect: Sketches, Designs, Buildings*, English trans. of 1930 German ed. (Princeton Architectural Press, 1992).

24. Temple Archives, July 27, 1945.

25. *Ibid.*, December 3, 1945.

26. *Ibid.*, December 14, 1945.

27. Presently, the Jewish Museum's addition of 1953 is being rebuilt by Kevin Roche, the Pritzker Prize winner, in a French Gothic Chateausque style to mirror the original mansion built in 1908.

28. Wischnitzer's book, *Synagogue Architecture in the United States: History and Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1955), is still the best overview of its subject.

29. Temple Archives, December 16, 1945.

30. The collaboration Wischnitzer sought was probably achieved through Wright, Rabbi Mortimer Cohen, and Prof. Boris Blai of Temple University, who recommended Wright, in the design of Beth Sholom. See Cohen, *Beth Sholom Synagogue* (Beth Sholom, 1959).

31. Nathan built or remodeled synagogues in Frankfurt am Main, Friedberg in Hessen, Konstanz, Mannheim, and Klaus. For an encyclopedic and lucid history, see Carol Herselle Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe: Architecture, History, Meaning* (New York: Architectural History Foundation

and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1985). Nathan built at least three American synagogues, including Brooklyn Torah Israel Sephardic Society, Sheepshead Bay, 1953; White Plains Jewish Community Center, 1957; and Temple Mishkan Israel, Hamden, Connecticut, 1960.

32. For information about Finney Farm, I would like to thank Jane Northshield, the village historian of Croton-on-Hudson.

33. Temple Archives, December 9, 1945.

34. In his Rizzoli book, Zevi described all four synagogues as "community centers," which meant that they had religious schools and social halls as well as sanctuaries. They were not recreational centers. Zevi dated the Mendelsohn synagogues as St. Louis, 1946–1950; Cleveland, 1946–1952; Grand Rapids, 1948–1952; and St. Paul, 1950–1954. Drawings of the St. Louis synagogue were published in *Architectural Forum* in May of 1947, which surely led to the other commissions. It seems noteworthy, however, that Mendelsohn was largely ignored on the West and East Coasts.

35. Mendelsohn was contacted by Rabbi Harry Margolis of Mount Zion as early as 1946. A contract, however, was not signed until 1950. Mendelsohn's design was completed by a St. Paul firm, Bergstedt & Hirsch. See my brochure on Mendelsohn, published by Mount Zion in 1987, on the occasion of a centennial exhibition and symposium.

36. Temple Archives, January 22, 1946.

37. For Dorner, see Carla Mathes Woodward and Franklin W. Robinson, eds., *A Handbook of the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design* (Providence, 1985); Samuel Cauman, *The Living Museum* (New York: New York University Press, 1958). Gropius, among others, recommended Dorner for the directorship in Providence. See Winfried Nerdinger, *Walter Gropius: Architecture, Drawings, Prints, Photographs, Complete Project Catalogue* (Berlin: Harvard University and Bauhaus Archive, 1985), p. 245.

38. Temple Archives, January 29, 1946.

39. *Ibid.*, January 30, 1946.

40. *Ibid.*, March 19, 1946.

41. *Ibid.*, March 19, 1946.

42. Mendelsohn first met Wright at Taliesin, in Wisconsin, in 1924. They met again, at Taliesin West, in Arizona, in 1941 and 1946. See Zevi, *Erich Mendelsohn* (Rizzoli), pp. 199–201. Also: Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, ed., *Frank Lloyd Wright: Letters to Architects* (Fresno: California State University Press, 1984).

43. Kahn had built three synagogues: two for his own Congregation Beth El (1903 and 1922), and one for Congregation Shaarey Zedek (1932), all in Detroit.

44. Temple Archives, March 8, 1946.

45. *Ibid.*, March 11, 1946.

46. Mendelsohn was also considered for a synagogue design in Dallas, drawings for which were published in *Architectural Forum* of April 1953. Wischnitzer wrote that only his death prevented Mendelsohn from carrying out his design. *Synagogue Architecture*, p. 148.

47. Temple Archives, March 25, 1946.

48. *Ibid.*, March 13, 1946.

49. *Ibid.*, May 23, 1947.

50. *Ibid.*, May 12, 1947.

51. Like Neutra, Gropius was a pioneer in modern public school design. An early example by The Architects Collaborative was Peter Thacher Junior High School, in Attleboro, Massachusetts, completed in 1950. Attleboro is only a few miles northeast of Providence.

52. Temple Archives, June 4, 1947.

53. For information about Neutra's entry in the competition for the Vienna-Hietzing synagogue of 1924, see Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe*, pp. 195–199.

54. For Neutra's unbuilt design for the North Shore Temple, also 1924, see Thomas S. Hines, *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p.

50. I would like to thank Dan Sharon of the Asher Library, Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago, for identifying the "North Shore Temple" as today's Agudas Achim North Shore Congregation on Kenmore Street, Chicago. Neutra, early in his career, was also a devotee of Wright. See Pfeiffer, *Frank Lloyd Wright*.

55. Temple Archives, June 9, 1947.

56. See Woodward and Sanderson, *Handbook of the Museum of Art*, p. 216, and William H. Jordy and Christopher P. Monkhouse, *Buildings on Paper: Rhode Island Architectural Drawings, 1825–1945* (Providence: Brown University and other institutions, 1982), p. 216. Harkness's son, John C. Harkness, became a partner in the Gropius firm, The Architects Collaborative.

57. Oral history interviews with Pearl Braude, recorded by the author on November 15, December 11, and December 22, 1989, in Providence.

58. Temple Archives, May 27, 1947.

59. *Ibid.*, July 12, 1947.

60. The exact chronology of Goodman's earliest synagogues is difficult to establish. Wischnitzer thought that Beth El in New London, Connecticut, completed in 1950, was first; B'nai Israel in Millburn was completed in 1951; and Beth El in Springfield, Massachusetts, was completed in 1952. Goodman's Providence synagogue stands today as the earliest and perhaps best example. The New London synagogue, diminutive in scale, received a large and provocative addition by Paul Rudolph in 1964. The Springfield synagogue, destroyed by fire, was rebuilt by Goodman in 1968.

61. Temple Archives, August 5, 1947.

62. *Ibid.*, August 11, 1947.

63. I would like to thank William Goss, the archivist of the diocese of Burlington, for the identification of the church and its architects.

64. Temple Archives, November 3, 1947.

65. *Ibid.*, November 6, 1947.

66. Oral history interview with Percival Goodman, recorded by the author on May 12, 1989, in New York City, shortly before the architect's death. Copies of the tapes are available at American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati; Avery Architecture Library, Columbia University, New York; Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal; and Architecture Archives, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. For additional information about the Goodman family, I am indebted to Professor Taylor Stoehr of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, who is a specialist on Paul Goodman.

67. See James D. Kornwolf, ed., *Modernism in America, 1937–1941, A Catalog and Exhibition of Four Architectural Competitions* (Williamsburg, Va.: Joseph and Margaret Muscarelle Museum of Art, College of William and Mary, 1985). I would like to thank Zephorene L. Stickney, archivist of Wheaton College, for sharing this source with me.

68. Wischnitzer wrote that Mendelsohn's design for a Dallas synagogue "vividly recalls" Alvar Aalto's Finnish Pavilion at the New York World's Fair of 1939. *Synagogue Architecture*, p. 148. Goodman's vaulted roof in Providence bears a generic similarity to the naturalism and warmth of Aalto's work.

69. In his obituary of Percival Goodman, Paul Goldberger emphasized the architect's stature as an urban planner and theorist. *New York Times*, October 12, 1989.

70. Evidence suggests that Goodman's desire to speak was not only a matter of happenstance. Along with Franz Landsberger of Hebrew Union College, Mendelsohn, and the architect E. J. Kahn, Goodman had been invited to respond to an article by Rachel Wischnitzer, "The Problem of Synagogue Architecture," which appeared in the March 1947 issue of *Commentary*. Goodman's response, "Creating a Modern Synagogue Style," appeared in the June issue. Percival and Paul Goodman later wrote "The Modern Artist as Synagogue Builder," *Commentary*, January 1949.

71. Temple Archives, November 17, 1947.

72. A reproduction of Goodman's model is found in Wischnitzer, *Synagogue Architecture*, p. 151.

73. Temple Archives, December 4, 1949.

74. *Ibid.*, December 4, 1949.

75. *Ibid.*, September 9, 1951.

76. The final cost of the new temple, including construction, architect's fees, engineering, furnishings, landscaping, and art, was \$1,490,812.72. A mortgage of \$500,000 was required.

77. Temple Archives, March 22, 1952.

78. *Ibid.*, April 1, 1954.

79. See *Architectural Record*, December 1955, and *Progressive Architecture*, October 1956. Three of Goodman's synagogues—Baltimore, Springfield, and Providence—were featured in "Five Contemporary Synagogue Pulpits," *CCAR Journal*, October 1956.

80. Avram Kampf wrote that Goodman was chiefly responsible for the revival of synagogue art that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s. Further, according to Kampf, this achievement is as significant as Goodman's designs of individual synagogues. See *Jewish Ceremonial Art and Religious Observance* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1969), p. 37.

81. Temple Archives, November 3, 1947.

82. Norman Fain, chairman of the building committee, believes that his greatest mistake in completing the temple within its budget was the omission of the Chagall drapes. Oral history interview with Norman Fain, recorded by the author on May 31, 1989, in Pawtucket, Rhode Island.

83. The Millburn synagogue was embellished with a Torah curtain by Adolph Gottlieb (1903–1974), a lobby mural by Robert Motherwell (1915–1991), and relief sculpture by Herbert Ferber (1906–1991). Gottlieb's magnificent Torah curtain is on extended loan to the Jewish Museum. See Norman L. Kleblatt and Vivian B. Mann, *Treasures of the Jewish Museum* (New York: Universe Books, 1986), pp. 190–191. Among other artists for whom Goodman obtained commissions were Helen Frankenthaler (b. 1928) and Seymour Lipton (1903–1989). See Avram Kampf, *Contemporary Synagogue Art: Developments in the United States, 1945–1965* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966).

84. Oral history interviews with Pearl Braude.

85. Lassaw's first solo exhibition in New York was with the Kootz Gallery in 1951. Lassaw also made sculptures for the Goodman synagogues in Cleveland and St. Paul. Perhaps his finest ensemble of sculptures—an Eternal Light, a menorah, and an enormous exterior relief—were for Goodman's synagogue in Springfield, Massachusetts. See *Ibram Lassaw: Space Explorations: A Retrospective Survey, 1929–1988* (East Hampton, N.Y.: Guild Hall Museum, 1988). Also: Oral history interview with Lassaw, recorded by the author on September 25, 1988, in East Hampton.

86. Craig previously received a commission from Goodman's Mishkan Tefila in Newton, Massachusetts.

87. There is continual variation in Goodman's synagogue designs. Perhaps the most striking is Congregation Shaarey Zedek in Southfield, Michigan, completed in 1962. G. E. Kidder Smith,

the distinguished architectural historian and photographer, described Goodman's Temple Beth-El in Springfield as "one of the great contemporary synagogues in the United States." Springfield's Beth-El was built in 1953 and then rebuilt by Goodman after a fire in 1968. *The Beacon Guide to New England Houses of Worship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989), p. 96.

88. Newton's Temple Reyim was completed in 1958, Baltimore's Temple Oheb Shalom in 1960. See Walter Gropius et al., eds., *The Architects Collaborative: 1945-1965* (New York: Architectural Book Publishing Co., 1966).

89. Breuer, like Neutra, had Jewish ancestry but did not practice Judaism. See Christopher Wilk, *Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1981), p. 15. St. John's University Church in Collegeville, Minnesota, famous for its "bell banner," was completed in 1961, as was St. Francis de Sales Church in Muskegon, Michigan. Annunciation Priory in Bismarck, North Dakota, was completed two years later.

90. Johnson's synagogue has three sculptures by Lassaw: an Eternal Light, a menorah, and a relief-like screen displayed behind the ark.

91. Louis Kahn (1901-1974) built Philadelphia's Ahavath Israel Synagogue, now Grace Temple, in 1937. His reputation beyond Philadelphia did not grow significantly until 1947, when he was appointed a visiting professor at Yale. The extension of the Yale Art Gallery, completed in 1953, is considered his first major commission. In 1954, he completed the Jewish Community Center of New Haven, which was followed by the Jewish Community Center of Ewing Township (near Trenton), New Jersey. Also that year, when Wright had already been commissioned by Beth Shalom in Elkins Park, Pennsylvania, Kahn was approached by Adath Jeshurun Synagogue to design a building nearby. This project remained unbuilt, as was Kahn's design for Mikve Israel Synagogue, developed between 1961 and 1972, for Independence Mall. Kahn's design for Jerusalem's Hurva Synagogue, developed between 1967 and 1974, was also never realized. The only Jewish house of worship built by Kahn in later years was Temple Beth El in Chappaqua, New York, completed in 1972 and based on the destroyed wooden synagogues of Poland. See David B. Brownlee and David G. DeLong, *Louis I. Kahn: In the Realm of Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, and Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1991). Kahn's deeply moving First Unitarian Church in Rochester, New York, completed in 1962 (and an addition in 1969), is located across South Winton Road from Goodman's Temple Beth-El, completed in 1961.

92. Belluschi built two synagogues: Temple Israel in Swampscott, Massachusetts, in 1955; and B'rith Kodesh in Rochester, New York, in 1964. B'rith Kodesh, notable for its campuslike building and grounds, is one of the finest synagogues of the postwar era.

93. See minutes of B'nai Israel board of trustees, February 1959. Glaser was the brother of Vera List and brother-in-law of Albert List, of Greenwich, Connecticut. The Lists were instrumental in bringing Philip Johnson to the commission of Kneses Tifereth Israel in Port Chester, New York. Glaser had met Johnson in the Lists' home. The Lists, important collectors of contemporary art, were major patrons of the Jewish Museum. They also gave the List Art Building to Brown University, which was designed by Johnson and, without his permission, completed by Glaser.

94. For reproductions of B'nai Israel's art, see Kampf, *Contemporary Synagogue Art*, pp. 60 and 161.

95. Norman Fain to the author, July 21, 1992.

96. Oral history interview with Macie Fain Silver, recorded by the author on July 14, 1989, in Newport, Rhode Island.

97. Oral history interview with Lillian Braude, recorded by the author on September 25, 1988, in East Hampton.

98. Oral history interview with Percival Goodman.



---

Rethinking the American Jewish Experience

## Some East European Letters on Emigration

*Jacob Kabakoff*

Letters played a vital role in influencing East European Jews to emigrate to America. Countless immigrants from Eastern Europe wrote home to describe the economic and material benefits of life in the New World. Many expressed misgivings about the lack of religious observance and the low spiritual state of immigrant existence. Yet, for the most part, the constant stream of letters served to encourage emigration and to fan hopes for a better future.

The use of model letters for didactic purposes is part of an old literary tradition. A history of collections of model Hebrew letters has been published by Judith Halevi-Zwick under the title *Toledot Sifrut ha-Igronim* ("The Hebrew *Briefsteller*") (Tel Aviv: Papyrus, 1990). Her volume traces the development of this literary form from the sixteenth through the twentieth century and highlights the role which it played as a means of transmitting ideas.

At first *Briefstellers* were published exclusively in Hebrew. Later they became bilingual, consisting of Hebrew-Yiddish and Hebrew-German collections. Intended as guides for both young and old, some were compiled by well-known authors, such as Abraham Mapu, Menahem Mendel Dolitzky, and David Frishman. Other collections represented the efforts of pedagogues who utilized the letter form to foster correct Hebrew style.

The letter collections dealt with various aspects of Jewish life and touched on both personal and national problems. They reflected the conditions of their times and the attitudes of their compilers. They sought also to impart practical knowledge and to offer guidance regarding proper conduct.

Among the issues touched upon by some of the model Hebrew letter collections was that of emigration to America. We shall examine

here three such letters and present them in English translation in order to illustrate some of the prevailing attitudes at the time of their composition.

Dov Aryeh Friedman ( 1845–1925) published his collection, entitled *Mikhtavim li-Venei ha-Neurim* ("Letters to Young People"), in Berditchev in 1889. In letter no. 96 (in part I), translated below, a son informs a friend that his father has emigrated to America, and he confides that he is deeply concerned over his fate in the New World. In letter no. 97 his respondent seeks to comfort him and expresses the hope that he will soon be reunited with his father. In still another letter (no. 89, in part II) he offers further encouragement and indicates that many immigrants in America have risen from poverty to riches. In a humorous aside he adds that if Columbus had come from a rich family, who knows whether he would have been led to discover America?

That emigration was very much on the mind of Dov Aryeh Friedman is evident from the fact that in 1892, at the age of forty-seven, he set out for America. Born in Suwalki, Poland, he had been a Hebrew teacher in Warsaw and was the author of Hebrew textbooks. In America he continued to teach Hebrew in various cities.

The thoughts of Friedman's readers must have been similarly occupied with plans for emigration, for the subject is touched upon in several letters. In one letter (no. 34, in part I) a son writes to his father about a nephew who, following a two-year stay in America, where he became wealthy, had returned for a visit to his hometown. The family could not get from him whether he intended to remain or to return to America. At times he was full of praise for the new land, but at others he was critical of the people and their ways. Still a further indication of the sorrow that was experienced by the break-up of families due to emigration is seen in another letter (no. 42, in part I) in which the writer informs his brother in America about the death of their father and suggests that he return in order to run the family business which is their only support.

All in all, Friedman's letters concerning emigration to America reflect an ambivalent attitude. On the one hand, there is emphasis on the sorrow of parting and its tragic results. On the other, there is a note of hope for the better life that beckons in the new land.

That emigration to America was often viewed negatively is evident from letters included in two collections, Israel Pissar's *Mikhtavim le-Venei Yisrael* ("Letters to the Children of Israel"), published in Warsaw in 1900, and Tuviah Pesach Schapiro's *Yad va-Et* ("Hand and Pen"), published in Vilna in 1891. Both authors took a strong stand against emigration to America.

In letter no. 72 of Pissar's collection, translated below, the writer expresses satisfaction over the fact that his friend has changed his mind about going to America. He indicates that on the basis of press reports the difficulties of travel are considerable and concludes with the hope that his friend will succeed in finding employment at home.

Schapiro (1845–1927), who had earned a reputation as a pedagogue in Suwalki, and who was a contributor to the Hebrew press, emigrated to America in 1882. He remained here for about one and a half years but was unsatisfied with conditions. Upon his return to Europe, he published a critical article in *Ha-Melitz* in which he sided with the supporters of Palestine in the ideological debate that was then current. He did not deny that America offered material benefits to immigrants, but maintained that it brought harm to the Jewish soul and the Jewish national spirit. He decried the squabbles among both the Orthodox and Reform groupings in America and pointed to the danger of anti-Semitism.

Schapiro's support of Palestine settlement led him to incorporate his views in a lengthy letter (no. 193), which he included in his collection. In the letter, translated below and dated Tishri 1883, he presents a survey of Jewish settlement and agricultural efforts in America, which he maintains ended in failure. He offers particularly an account of the abortive attempt of Mordecai Manuel Noah to found the Jewish agricultural colony of Ararat. For information about Ararat he used an article by Yehudah Jetteles which appeared in 1826 in the Hebrew yearbook *Bikkurei ha-Ittim*, published in Vienna.

Although Schapiro's letter is critical of the Ararat project, it has praise for the sincerity of the founders which stands in contrast to the damaging actions of the current religious leaders in both the Orthodox and Reform camps. The reader of the letter is led to conclude that Palestine is more suitable for Jewish agricultural effort and that

there is little hope that America could become a center of Jewish settlement.

Schapiro's letter serves as a additional document attesting to the conflict engendered by the Palestine-America debate following the outbreak of the 1881 pogroms in Russia.

We present below the translations of the letters by Friedman, Pisar, and Schapiro.

1. From Dov Aryeh Friedman, *Mikhtavim li-Venei ha-Neurim* ("Letters to Young People"), part I, letter 96 (Berditchev, 1889).

My dear friend! This day was a sad one for me, for my dear father has left us and has set out for America in order to seek there sustenance for the members of his family. My soul grieves when I remember that such a man will be forced to live in a strange place without friend or acquaintance and will have to work and toil by the sweat of his brow, while many who are ignorant and empty-headed live here on the fat of the land. But can we complain about the doings of the Almighty? He has ordained it, and who can tell Him what to do?

Your faithful friend,

2. From Israel Pisar, *Mikhtavim li-Venei Yisrael* ("Letters to the Children of Israel"), letter 72 (Warsaw, 1900).

My friend! You have gladdened me with your fine letter in which you informed me that you have changed your mind about going to America, which, as the reports have it, has enough hungry people without you, and where hundreds go about dejectedly without finding an opportunity to earn anything. I am very surprised, my dear friend, how such a strange idea could have entered your mind. You are, after all, a reader of the *Ha-Melitz*, and you undoubtedly read in its issues about the sorrows that beset the travelers on their journey, for it is very difficult nowadays to cross the border, and many of those who crossed it were punished. They were caught red-handed and were returned under military guard to their cities of residence. Only after three months of trouble and misery were they permitted to return home in one piece. You, my dear one, who—as you have indi-

cated—lack any travel document from the district authorities, would most probably have been caught and subjected to the same suffering as that of the travelers who preceded you. You can readily appreciate how great was my happiness when I heard through your letter that you have rejected your unfeasible plan and that you have some hope of finding a position at an adequate salary in our country. May your hope be fulfilled in accordance with the prayer of your friend who wishes you success . . .

3. From Tuviah Pesach Schapiro, *Yad va-Et* ("Hand and Pen"), letter 193 (Vilna, 1891).

Tishri 1883

My dear friend! We have until now had many discussions concerning the question of the settlement of Eretz Yisrael, which now preoccupies the minds of most of our fellow-Jews as well as of our writers who are concerned with the fate of their people and religion. But you still persist in giving preference to the unloved son over the loved one, to America over Palestine, to the foreign soil over our ancestral soil and the cradle of our history. —As long as your arguments stemmed from considerations of sustenance and economy, knife and fork, white collar and polished footwear, as long as you held that America was a desirable land for commerce and industry and great economic opportunity, I went along with you to some degree. However, when your fantasy misleads you to imagine that the land of Columbus is more suitable than our ancestral land for agriculture as well, this is the height of folly!

You argue that by increasing Jewish settlements on special sites there in the land of freedom the hope for Jewish nationalism would be broadened and ensured. However, you have only to go back and look into the history of our fellow-Jews there, or to go forward and observe the present status of Judaism in this country. If you but use healthy common sense, you will surely be disillusioned.

The hope for Jewish redemption through agricultural work in America is not a new idea which was fathered by the Board of Delegates of American Israelites in 1879. Its roots can be traced to a much earlier time when it was elaborated by Mordecai Manuel Noah, the American consul and sheriff, in 1825. He appeared as a savior and

leader of his people and chose Grand Island on the banks of the Niagara River in New York as the site of a Jewish agricultural colony which he called "Ararat." —This Ararat was officially proclaimed in a public ceremony in the month of Tishri 5585, during the fiftieth year of American independence, in a house of worship in which were gathered Mordecai Manuel Noah and his followers. When the spirit rested upon him and he envisioned the salvation and revival of Israel, he proclaimed loudly: "Hear, O Israel, today you have become a people."

For the purpose of settling the remnants of Israel on American soil as an independent people under the aegis of the American government—a hope which our fellow-Jews in Eretz Yisrael cannot entertain—and of restoring their ancestral practice of tilling and tending the soil, many important individuals rallied to the help of the consul with funds and advice. These included leaders and the wealthy, men of power and bankers, who all united and helped launch that important project of building a Jewish nation in America. However, the leading rabbis of Paris and London, who had heard of the plan, publicly made their views known in the press indicating that they were unhappy with the idea and that they refused to support it. For besides being an impractical plan built on air, it was also opposed to the Torah and destiny of Israel (*Bikkurei ha-Ittim*, 1826, p. 47). It goes without saying that both the building and the destruction of Ararat occurred at the same time. The advice that the leaders had given to the people was of no avail. It did not become a reality and was not followed by deeds. The plan for the projected settlement remained incomplete, and the acquirer of this area was unable to carry out his program.

On the basis of all this you can discern the difference between the early organizers and the later destroyers. The main aim of the group that wished to build Ararat was to establish colonies for the scattered of Israel and to gather the Jews from the various American states into a national union based on our religious faith. It was not merely to set up individual colonies in order to strengthen the material status of the dry bones that had been scattered by an ill wind without any national and religious bonds. The area which they had chosen for settlement was a fertile and fruitful one, free of any sickness and pollu-

tion. It did not involve the cultivation of the soil of strangers in Texas and Louisiana, and the eating of pork so as to have the physical strength for the work, as reported in *Ha-Maggid*, 1882, no. 21, on the basis of the account in the *Jewish Chronicle*. The religious leadership had not changed its policy in those days and had not fallen into the hands of reverends and doctors who desecrated the tradition and despoiled the Torah. When the early organizers—Mordecai Manuel Noah and his followers—assembled to lay the foundation for the institutions that would incorporate his idea, they prayed reverently, sang songs of praise in Hebrew from the Book of Maccabees, the Prophets, and the Psalms (see *Bikkurei ha-Ittim*, loc. cit.). They still knew nothing of the innovations of Dr. Einhorn, who uprooted the Hebrew language from the synagogues in Baltimore, Chicago, and New York, who ruled that even the contents of the weekly Torah portion should be read mostly in German (*Sinai*, vol. 1, no. 4) in order to cause his people to forget God's word. They did yet know or hear of the Torah secrets of his son-in-law Dr. Kohler in New York, who openly preaches to his congregation to exchange the Sabbath day for Sunday. The irresponsibility of various unworthy Orthodox hypocrites from among the reverends who now lead many American synagogues was also unknown to them. —Even though we cannot agree with their ideas about the rebirth of the Jewish people, there is little doubt that if they had succeeded in carrying out their plan, at least the Jewish spirit would not have been so diminished by those who seek to dismember it. Still they too failed, and their entire labor and striving was in vain. For this is not the place and the land that is suited to become a center of Jewish nationalism. How can we look forward today to the salvation of Jewish nationalism in America by the mixed multitude who seek only gain and pursue chaos?

Forsake your opinion! Not only does the American environment not help foster spiritual matters, but even with regard to material things there is no hope there for Jewish colonizers. Only farmers who live in settled areas and work cultivated fields are able to receive a full measure of return for their efforts. This is not true, however, of the newcomers who settle in arid or swampy areas. Will they be able to find the courage to cope with their problems? And then there is more than a slight fear of an anti-Semitic outbreak because of the

many differing groups who will continue to hate us! —Consider these facts and choose the proper way and approach to this lofty and vital matter, so that your dear friend may rejoice in you . . .

---

Jacob Kabakoff is professor emeritus of Hebrew and Jewish Studies, Lehman College and editor of *The Jewish Book Annual*.





*Louis Wirth*  
(1897-1952)

(Courtesy University of Chicago Library)

## Pluralism, Chicago School Style: Louis Wirth, the Ghetto, the City, and "Integration"

*Zane L. Miller*

Dick Wade recently suggested that the roots of both the "old" and the "new" urban history may be found in the Chicago school of sociology during the second quarter of the twentieth century. He also gave a very nondeterministic account of how it happened, a story of unlikely people gathered by an unlikely person in an unlikely place, people who did things unexpected of them that led to historical writing about cities with a social focus. His argument seemed intriguing, but the nondeterminism of it struck me with special force. So I wondered if I might find something about the origins of nondeterminism in social and historical thought and practice in the Chicago school, and if that might illuminate the origins of the old and new urban history, and perhaps suggest some common ground on which they might be said to stand.

I centered this search on the work of Louis Wirth, the member of the Chicago school most concerned with urbanism as a way of life, and I found what I sought, or at least I think I did. But I also discovered two Louis Wirths, even though he died in 1952 at the age of fifty-five, and even though he remained throughout his career a Chicago person and a relentless civic activist with an unflagging commitment to the solution of social problems, the promotion of metropolitan planning, and the creation of a democratic government for an emerging world community, one of the most recent products, in his view, of global urbanization.

The first Wirth thought that socially determined cultural-group pluralism in urbanizing societies encouraged "integration," or "assimilation," by which he meant the sharing of cultural traits among social groups, including ethnic and economic categories. In

this view social evolution could be nudged in the appropriately democratic and nonviolent direction if "experts" like Wirth could persuade policy makers to segregate cultural groups in separate but equal subcommunities. Here they could be educated in tolerance and mutual understanding and the necessity of trait sharing as preparation for the next step in the gradual engineering of a truly cosmopolitan and residually integrated society.

The second Wirth, however, abandoned expertise-ism and socially determined cultural-group pluralism in favor of individual pluralism and the democratization of intellectual life, the notion that individuals should define their own cultures through maximum feasible participation in social and civic affairs to assure the continuation of trait sharing on a democratic basis. The second Wirth also jettisoned the gradualistic, separate but equal strategy to advocate civil rights legislation and court decisions for the promotion of the immediate residential mixing of diverse people, including races.

Wirth started on the road to these two sets of convictions in a cattle-raising and -trading family in a German agricultural village. There he received a Jewish and a secular primary education, and during his high school years he lived with an uncle in Omaha, Nebraska. Then Wirth decided to study medicine at the University of Chicago, where he had a lively time in the 1910s. He hung out at Hull House. He read *The Souls of Black Folk*. He protested America's entrance into World War I and flirted with socialism. He dropped medicine and took courses in sociology. And there, too, he met Mary Bolton, of Paducah, Kentucky, sent by her parents to Chicago for a safe Baptist education, and who, with her friend Wirth, engaged in radical protests on and off campus.

Wirth graduated in 1919, and stayed in the Windy City as director of the division of delinquent boys for the Jewish Charities of Chicago. In 1922 he returned to Germany to introduce his family to Mary Bolton, whom he married in 1923, and with whom he raised two daughters. He taught them, as one remembered it, "agnosticism with quite audible atheistic overtones," a "generalized minority ethnic identification," and always "to stand up and be counted whenever there were questions that we were Jews."

Wirth also, in the 1920s, decided on a career in sociology in America, returned to the University of Chicago as a graduate student, became an American citizen at the age of twenty-seven, and wrote his dissertation, which he published in 1928 as a book called simply *The Ghetto*. This volume laid out a history of the Jewish ghetto in Europe and the United States that attacked the idea of race-based cultural determinism, touted socially determined cultural-group pluralism, and treated the ghetto as a microcosm of the city. It began with the ancient diaspora, which turned Jews into nomads who carried with them their cultural baggage, including their experience as urbanites, and who, as they traveled, interacted so extensively with a broad range of peoples and shared traits that they became known for their cosmopolitanism. Gradually they settled in cities, where they formed voluntary ghettos. Here Jews from a variety of places developed a broad range of interacting groups and personality types and shared traits among themselves and with outsiders, processes that continued even after the advent of compulsory ghettos, complete with walls and badges. These processes also funneled ideas from the outside world—rationalism, capitalism, nationalism—into that pluralistic Jewish civilization for which the ghetto served as center. The same factors of intergroup contact eventually produced political emancipation, participation by Jews in civic affairs, and, by the twentieth century in Frankfurt, the dispersal of the ghetto, and the emergence of a sophisticated, cosmopolitan, and modern Jewish community, one carrying a “duplex culture . . . richer and more iridescent than its predecessors.”

In the second part of the book Wirth presented a history of Jews in the United States which virtually recapitulated that in Europe. But in Chicago, as elsewhere, the ghetto persisted, both as a place and a symbol. It provided a richly human, diverse, and neighborly way-station for some, a symbol of poverty and humiliation for others, and a source of divisiveness that undermined the coherence of the pan-Jewish community. It also served as a symbol of Jewish haughtiness and clannishness that endangered all Jews by arousing among outsiders suspicions about the civic and national loyalty of the Jews as uniform race, or as a uniform social group, or as a uniform international community, ideas Wirth described as fantasies projected on Jews by out-

siders and as ideas that repressed in Jews and outsiders the willingness and ability to share traits.

Wirth's analysis, then, depicted the Jewish problem as a problem for outsiders, who could relieve it by abandoning fantasies and following integrationist policies to encourage the sharing of traits. Yet it also provided a benign account of the ghetto. Here socially determined cultural groups built a pluralistic community, and through their interaction with one another and diverse outsiders acquired new traits and the resilience to devise flexible strategies for survival, including a strategy of pluralistic integration, the success of which depended on the willingness of dominant groups to facilitate the trait-sharing process. This process had been completed in Frankfurt, an outcome Wirth anticipated in Chicago for Jews and other ethnic/racial groups if experts like himself prevailed in their espousal of the temporary segregation of minority groups on a separate but equal basis combined with programs of regulated intergroup contact to facilitate the natural tendency toward trait-sharing and the cosmopolitanization of the urbanizing population.

By the mid-1930s, however, Wirth had visited Nazi Germany, where he confronted the appalling consequences of what he called "the myth of race," and had started to bring thirteen of his relatives from Germany to Chicago. He had also read and translated Karl Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia*, and concluded with Mannheim that trait-sharing "integration" would not happen "naturally."

By the mid-1930s, that is, both Wirth and Mannheim had concluded that socially determined cultural-group pluralism had yielded clashes of rigidified ideologies and utopias that prevented the sharing of traits among groups and tempted the clashing parties, in their mutual misunderstanding, to annihilate one another. Mannheim thought that intellectuals, because of their tenuous connection with social groups, might broach alternative visions of the future that would erode the appeal of contemporary ideologies and utopias, and foster group interaction and a continuing process of trait-sharing. But Wirth, by this time, regarded most intellectuals as merely another social group, too isolated from society and civic affairs to envision anything except rigidified ideologies and utopias. So the second Wirth decided to undermine socially determined cultural-group plu-

ralism as a way out of the potentially murderous situation of uncompromising conflict.

The second Wirth posited a new social dynamic, an individual pluralism of choice in which all persons defined their own cultures, a social dynamic that rested on the democratization of intellectual life. The second Wirth contended that sociologists should abandon grand theory and spend more time as civic activists and in training students for service in community organizations. The second Wirth argued for legislation and court decisions to foster widespread occupational and residential mobility to break up the rigid identification of individuals with particular social groups and to facilitate the process of self-identification. He also advocated the maximum feasible participation of citizens in policy making for social and civic organizations and in planning and plan implementation, tasks that would engage everybody in the "intellectual" game of developing democratic visions of community and urban society as alternatives to deadlocked ideologies and utopias, whose proponents, he insisted, should not suffer suppression. And the second Wirth also advocated world government based on the pluralistic principles embedded in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as he interpreted those documents. For without a consensus on individual pluralism and occupational and residential mobility, argued the second Wirth, conflicting groups would lack a measure of the public welfare around which to forge compromises. And without compromises the process of sharing traits would cease and the various self-constructed groups would stand at loggerheads, with no recourse except to the courts, or endless and perhaps violent conflict, a process encouraging to antidemocratic movements and the scapegoating of minorities, a process that had yielded such political monstrosities as the Nazi and Stalinist totalitarian dictatorships, a specter in his view that haunted all mid-twentieth-century societies.

The second Wirth's quest for a politics of consensus and compromise without repressing "heretical" ideas and their advocates produced some of his most memorable work. This includes his famous essay on urbanism as a way of life, widely regarded still as an anti-urban jeremiad but in fact an apotheosis of the city as the dynamic factor in history which led to the interaction of people that produced

the progress spelled out in *The Ghetto*, and which led ultimately to the discovery of the possibility of individual pluralism and the necessity of the democratization of intellectual life. This work also includes his denunciation of what he called some "tender-hearted, if not tender-minded romanticists" who "seek to escape the city" and "find refuge in pastoral pursuits or 'rurban' settlements," proposals condemned by the second Wirth for their assumption that "human satisfactions could be increased by dismantling our great cities."

The second Wirth also gave short shrift to those inclined to impose democracy on others by psychological manipulation. He argued in 1949 that modern civilizations and planners faced three alternatives, "change the attitude and character of our people . . . , change the situation under which we are working . . . , or . . . alter the rules of the game." Wirth preferred to change conditions and alter the rules, and ridiculed propositions to tinker psychologically with people in a thinly veiled reference to contemporary talk about the "authoritarian personality" and ways of engineering democratic personalities. "To paraphrase Vice-President Marshall's famous saying," declaimed the second Wirth, some people think that what this country needs "is a good five-cent psychiatrist; but psychiatrists . . . are not available in the quantity and quality and at the prices the masses of people can afford. We must work superficially and in large groups, altering the conditions of life and improving the rules of the game."

The second Wirth also asserted that a politics of consensus and compromise could incorporate, sustain, and flourish on a lively conflict of ideas. As he put it after Harry Truman's dramatic comeback victory in 1948, "liberal forces have already yielded . . . on the ground that higher strategy demands compromise. I, too, favor compromise, when one can foresee that the consequences of the battle will be more costly than the actual victory. But to compromise before the battle, during the battle, and after the battle is to squander one's moral heritage and in the end to gain nothing but remorse. The measures that are now before the American people for wider coverage of health, education, recreation and other forms of insurance against the vicissitudes of life that the individual cannot control are now the uncompromisable agenda of our society. And on this agenda goes the item of civil rights."

In the final analysis, then, the second Wirth sought to put whimsy into social thought, to detach ideas from social and psychological determinism in the interest of nurturing democratic visions of new urban futures. For him the key rested in human nature, its capacity for empathy and the trait-sharing integration that produced cosmopolitans capable by definition of thinking and acting in new ways. And the second Wirth's advocacy of the democratization of intellectual life and of immediate legal steps toward occupational and residential integration marked not only a rejection of short-sided pragmatism and a retreat from expertise-ism, determinism, and gradualism, but also a shift from a focus on groups to individuals as the basic units of society. But this new approach stressed in addition the importance of a consensus on a pluralism of ever-expanding visions of "better" and different communities, not only as a way out of the deadlock of socially determined ideologies and utopias but also as a means of preventing individuals engaged in the self-absorbing task of constructing their own cultures from pursuing merely self-fulfillment without regard for the public welfare.

From this angle the second Wirth may be seen as symptomatic of a major tendency in American civilization and historical writing since 1940. This analysis proposes nondeterministic, trait-sharing, individual pluralism as the vision of the so-called consensus school and questions the suspicion that its adherents longed for homogeneity or sought to homogenize the American past. It also suggests the nondeterministic character of both the "old" and the "new" urban history, and of the other "old" and "new" specializations as well. Both, that is, look for ways in which various persons have sought liberation from social or other "forces" to create for themselves a vision of who they wanted to become, and the social and physical environments in which that becoming might take place.

Finally, this analysis of the two Wirths suggests that most historical writing since the 1920s has consisted of a commentary on the delights and dilemmas of pluralism, an implicit and sometimes explicit exploration of the cultures of the past intended as an exploration of what the cultures of the present might be and might become. This we may safely celebrate, if we remember the persistence since 1952 of ghettos, racial, social, and intellectual, as facts, symbols, and states of

mind, here and around the world. That remembering should remind us of our responsibility as historians to understand the persisting ghettos and to lay out the dangers and opportunities their persistence offers for the various communities in which we live. And such studies, in the spirit of Louis Wirth, might benefit from our social and civic activism as well as from research and thinking as aspects of the pursuit of history as a way of life.

---

Zane L. Miller, Professor of History and Co-Director of the Center for Neighborhood and Community Studies at the University of Cincinnati, delivered this talk as his presidential address to the Urban History Association at its annual dinner, December 29, 1991, in Chicago during the convention of the American Historical Association. A longer version, including documentation, is available in the Spring, 1992 issue of the *Journal of Urban History*. Much of the most significant work of Louis Wirth is conveniently available in two books: Elizabeth Wirth Marvick and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *Community Life and Social Policy: Selected Papers by Louis Wirth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *Louis Wirth: On Cities and Social Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). For a complete list of Wirth's work and a helpful biographical essay about him see Roger A. Salerno, *Louis Wirth: A Bio-Bibliography* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987). Wirth's study of the Jewish ghetto, on which this essay draws heavily, first appeared as *The Ghetto* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928). Now recognized as a "classic" in urban and ethnic studies, it has been reprinted many times in various editions.





---

## Book Reviews

---

Posner, Richard A. *Cardozo: A Study in Reputation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990. 156 pp.

In my contracts class in law school, at the end of a discussion of an old New York decision, my teacher said, "Remember, at least in commercial law, Cardozo is always right!"

I do not think Richard Posner would subscribe to this blanket endorsement of Benjamin Nathan Cardozo's jurisprudence, and as Posner shows, a few of Cardozo's commercial law cases do not hold up to the test of time. But in this elegantly written volume, which originated as the Cooley Lectures at the University of Michigan, Judge Posner takes us on a fascinating exploration of why Cardozo's reputation, a half-century after he left the New York Court of Appeals, remains high among practitioners, law professors, and judges.

Cardozo, the scion of an old New York Sephardic family, first came to prominence as a trial lawyer and as a "lawyer's lawyer," a man whom other lawyers consulted on difficult legal questions. In 1913 Democratic leaders needed to put a Jew on the ticket, and he was elected to the New York Supreme Court, which despite its title is actually the lowest court in the state system. After only a month on that job, he was transferred to help out with the work load on the Court of Appeals, the state's highest court, and despite his relative youth, immediately impressed both his colleagues and the lawyers practicing before the court.

In 1917 the Republicans and the Democrats endorsed him for a seat on the Court of Appeals, and ten years later he was elected chief judge of the court, again with bipartisan support. During the 1920s Cardozo became the best-known state judge in the country, and his opinions, especially in contract and tort law, were widely cited by other state courts and even by federal courts. One time Justice Louis D. Brandeis wrote a note to Felix Frankfurter in which he exclaimed

with wonder that the Supreme Court had just overturned *per curiam* a New York decision, one written by Cardozo! Even Brandeis was amazed at the temerity of the nation's high court in doing so.

In 1932, when Oliver Wendell Holmes retired from the Supreme Court, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives alike, demanded that Herbert Hoover appoint Cardozo to take Holmes's seat. Hoover at first resisted, since there were already two New Yorkers on the bench (Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and Harlan Fiske Stone) as well as a Jew (Brandeis). But he finally gave in to the demand, and as Posner points out, this was one of those rare instances when the best man for the job actually got it. Cardozo served with distinction, but not with any long-term effect on the Supreme Court. He suffered a heart attack in December 1937, a stroke the following month, and died in the summer of 1938.

This is not a full-scale biography of Cardozo, although we certainly need one. Nor is it an extensive investigation into Cardozo's philosophy or judicial record, although Posner deals with those subjects. Rather, Posner is attempting to understand the nature of Cardozo's reputation, to see why it is so high and why it has endured, and finally, whether it is deserved. Although there are a few sections where Posner must of necessity deal with technical legal questions, this is a study that will be intelligible to laymen as well as lawyers. Posner, like Cardozo, writes well.

In fact writing, according to Posner, is one of the keys to understanding Cardozo's reputation. He was able to take key principles and state them pithily. "The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered" and "Danger invites rescue" are only two of the better-known Cardozo aphorisms.

This is not to confuse style with substance, but rather to recognize that how well one says something can be as important as what is said. John Adams claimed, and correctly, that the Declaration of Independence had not a single new idea in it, but that Thomas Jefferson's masterful writing turned old notions into a clarion call for human freedom. The style magnified the substance.

Cardozo had substance. Without that substance, it is doubtful that style would have mattered much. What made Cardozo such an influential judge is that he intuitively understood the underlying rationale

of the commercial law system, namely that it is designed to help people do their business. Posner, before he went onto the bench, was one of the leaders in the so-called "law and economics" school that attempted to interpret law, especially contracts and torts, in economic terms, and for this school Cardozo is a key figure.

To put it as simply as possible, the law works best when it is economically efficient; thus any result that is inefficient (i.e., imposes greater costs than necessary) is also legally wrong. In contracts, for example, the law tries to anticipate what the parties would have bargained out themselves if they had considered the question, and "off-the-rack" contract rules thus reduce transaction costs and make the transaction more efficient.

In tort law, moral questions arise, but economic analysis still works. We want potential tortfeasors to take precautions so as to avoid injury to innocent parties; at the same time we recognize that they cannot fully protect themselves against all accidents, since the costs of that type of protection would be prohibitive. What the law, and economic analysis, require is that individuals and companies take "reasonable" precautions, and the line on this is one of economic as well as legal efficiency.

Posner examines some of Cardozo's famous commercial law cases, and explains the legal reasoning, why the decision has been influential, and why it has contributed to Cardozo's reputation as perhaps the greatest common law judge of modern times. His handling of the famous case of *Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad* (1928) is a model not only of legal analysis, but of the extralegal elements of a case. Here, and elsewhere throughout the book, one can sense the professional admiration that Posner, himself a judge on the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, has for a fellow judge.

Reputation, however, not jurisprudence, is Posner's concern, and here is the heart of the book. I do not agree with all of Judge Posner's arguments; his use of citation indexes, for example, does not convince me of how important certain judges are either in short-term or long-term impact. But what is fascinating about this book is the opportunity it provides to watch Posner grapple with questions that are not often asked, and for which we do not even have accepted methodologies.

What is reputation? I think Posner is absolutely right that reputation is bestowed upon a person by others, and therefore it may rise or fall as historical considerations change. A good example is the roller-coaster path of Oliver Wendell Holmes's reputation in this century.

If reputation is so subjective, then the best we can do is to analyze it at a certain time, to capture, as it were, a snapshot of a moving target, and to see why, at a particular moment, a person's reputation is high or low. Cardozo, considering that his major judicial contribution came on a state court as opposed to the Supreme Court, has had an enduring impact on the common law, and at least part of the answer is that he not only identified the right questions to ask, but he also came up with the right answers.

Posner notes, however, that right answers by themselves do not ensure reputation; moreover, sometimes the wrong answer can secure a good reputation. Many scholars have believed for a long time that John Marshall's reasoning in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) does not stand up to even minimal scrutiny, yet it established the basis for judicial review in this country and consolidated Marshall's reputation as the great Chief Justice.

What one has to look at, therefore, in addition to the substance is the style, of which Cardozo was a master, the judicial strategy by which one judge gets a majority of his colleagues to agree with a particular holding, and the general jurisprudential framework in which a particular judge operates.

Posner investigates all these things, and I cannot emphasize too much how his own experience as a judge illuminates his comments. This is a book to stretch one's mind, but aside from the substance of intellectual argument, Posner like Cardozo has the gift of style, so that we can enjoy grappling with the questions he poses.

— Melvin I. Urofsky

---

Melvin I. Urofsky is Harrison Professor of History at the College of William and Mary. He is the author of numerous works on American Jewish history including works on American Zionism, Louis D. Brandeis and, most recently, Felix Frankfurter.

Efrati, Nathan. *Mi-ma'shber Le-tikvah* [The Jewish Community in Eretz-Israel during World War I, 1914–1918]. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1991. 361 pp.

The devastating impact of World War I upon Palestine's Jews moved American Jewry and the United States government to embark on an unprecedented aid operation. It was Henry Morgenthau, U.S. ambassador to Turkey, who became the dominant figure in this undertaking. Nathan Efrati's book expounds on Morgenthau's unique role in facilitating, steering, and sustaining America's first major action on behalf of the Yishuv. The author stresses the fact that Ambassador Morgenthau went far beyond his diplomatic responsibilities to ensure and maintain that aid. As Efrati puts it, Morgenthau saw himself as the "guardian" and "representative" of the Yishuv's interests. Although ideologically opposed to the idea of a Jewish state, Morgenthau was an ardent supporter of the Yishuv. His enthusiasm dated from before the war, when he had visited Palestine and had been overwhelmed to witness, as he wrote home, "the birth of our people."<sup>1</sup>

As for Washington's material and diplomatic support of the Yishuv, the author characterizes it as humanitarian in nature, without any political significance. Efrati may be technically correct. Still, it is hard to ignore President Wilson's genuinely warm predisposition toward Zionism—an interest which predated his presidency. Restoring "the Holy Land to its people"<sup>2</sup> was a concept which existed, at the least, in the back of Wilson's mind.

Washington's help was demonstrated mainly by the use of American naval vessels to transport food and other necessities collected by American Jewry for the Yishuv. In addition, American Jewish philanthropists, moved by the plight of citrus and vine growers in the Yishuv, financed the shipping (and other related expenses) of such crops to U.S. markets where they could be sold for profit. Concurrently, U.S. diplomats ensured the safe passage of American vessels to and from Palestine's shores.

The author describes in detail the diplomatic cooperation between the United States and Germany, which sought to protect the Yishuv, and its Zionist leaders in particular, from being jeopardized by hostile

Turkish officials. Efrati distinguishes rightly between America's altruism and German political expediency; Berlin hoped to gain the political support of American Jewry. Efrati notes also that Germany sought to secure Palestine as a Jewish homeland in order to induce German Jews to emigrate, thus providing "a solution to the Jewish question in Germany" (p. 174).

If the Zionists had a villain, it was Jemal Pasha, the Turkish dictator of Palestine and Syria. His harsh measures against them in particular and the Yishuv in general climaxed in March 1917 with the deportation of all the Jewish inhabitants of Jaffa and Tel Aviv. While detailing Jemal's other adverse actions against the Yishuv, the author stresses that he was not an anti-Semite, though he was vehemently opposed to Zionism. Accordingly, Efrati does not regard the enforced evacuation of the Jewish populace from Jaffa and Tel Aviv as an anti-Semitic measure, but rather as a wartime exigency dictated by military considerations.

Efrati further maintains that a virulently anti-Semitic ruler would have used the uncovering of the secret Nili espionage ring to inflict severe punishment on the Yishuv in line with the Ottoman policy of collective punishment—a policy commonly used against Armenians and Arabs. Although there is nothing dramatically new in depicting Jemal Pasha's attitude to the Jews as somewhat ambivalent, Efrati's analysis of his actions drives home the message that Palestine's Jews suffered less under Jemal than did other Ottoman minorities.

The realism exhibited by the Zionist leadership in maintaining loyalty to Turkey during the war made it possible, in fact, for Jemal Pasha to refrain from more ruthless measures than those he had already taken against the Yishuv and its leaders. Thus, the Nili affair, which could have furnished him with a pretext to engage in mass executions, was unequivocally denounced by the Zionist leaders. Such pragmatism ensured "the existence of the Jewish Yishuv" (p. 11).

The Zionists also displayed impressive acumen in their approach to the economic predicament of the Yishuv. In managing the money and food arriving from America, the Zionist leaders developed, for the first time in the history of the Jewish community in Palestine, a new mode of distribution which superseded the system of direct fund distribution to those in need. Under the new system, which

gained the approval of their American benefactors, the funds were channeled as loans to the productive sector, and direct support was restricted to families whose chief bread-earner had been drafted into the Turkish military. Nonetheless, the leaders of the New Yishuv viewed themselves as responsible for the entire Jewish community and sought to keep a national perspective. Indeed, American funds subsequently went also to the nonproductive but needy population, most of which was concentrated in Jerusalem.

The extension of aid to the refugees from Jaffa and Tel Aviv brought to a zenith the New Yishuv's self-help policy. Although Efrati duly credits the settlements in Galilee and Samaria for their wholehearted efforts to help absorb the impoverished evacuees, he does not fail to mention the ugly face of this otherwise noble chapter in the history of the Yishuv. The reader learns that in several colonies many refugees were given the "cold shoulder," facing discrimination and even physical violence.

Serious stylistic and organizational flaws mar the usefulness of this well-researched monograph for the general reader. Its dissertational style has been left untouched; neither does the book seem to have a coherent and central thesis. It is apparent that the author presumes the reader to be familiar with numerous terms or phrases which he does not care to explain. Terms such as Kaimakam (deputy governor), A.P.C. Bank (Anglo-Palestine Company Bank), and "the same wagon" (?) are to mention but a few. Similarly, the book abounds with so many vague phrases as well as names and minute details that the uninitiated reader is unable to see the forest for the trees.

Despite such shortcomings the author provides important data which shed further light on the Yishuv's successful struggle for survival vis-à-vis the havoc of the war. As such, the book constitutes a solid scholarly contribution to an intriguing period in the history of Zionism and Eretz Yisrael.

— Yossi Feintuch

---

Yossi Feintuch is a fifth-year rabbinic student at the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati. He holds a Ph.D. in American history from Emory University, Atlanta.

*Notes*

1. Henry Morgenthau III, *Mostly Morgenthau* (New York, 1991), p. 135.
2. Stephen Wise, *Challenging Years* (New York, 1949), pp. 186–187.

Lissak, Rivka Shpak. *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890–1919*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. xi, 252 pp.

This book examines the ideas of the reformers and social theorists associated with Hull House in Chicago toward the immigrant cultures from which individuals were to be “uplifted” by settlement house work and settlement house workers. Dr. Lissak’s careful study demonstrates that the Hull House group hoped for the eventual assimilation of immigrants into American society through their adaptation to, or adoption of, “American” culture, and their abandonment of the cultural “baggage” they brought with them from the Old World. The Hull House group were thus *not* “pluralists,” for they denied the legitimacy of ethnic/cultural diversity as a characteristic of American civilization and rejected all definitions of American culture as the product of an intermingling of Old World cultures.

Who would have thought otherwise? Well, it seems that our recent search for the roots of “cultural pluralism”—a position first advocated by the philosopher Horace M. Kallen in 1915 but much discussed in the 1970s and 1980s with regard to America’s educational agenda—has led some historians to notice that the Hull House group “recognized” the existence of discrete patterns of immigrant culture among their Chicago neighbors. Did not such recognition constitute a kind of proto-pluralist legitimation of the national or ethnic cultures of the immigrants and pave the way for the acceptance of cultural diversity as a characteristic of American life? Although Dr. Lissak hedges her judgment in the book’s final sentence, the weight of her evidence has already answered no to this question, and her careful research and formalist analysis of everything the Hull House group said and did with regard to immigrant cultures ought to set the matter to rest once and for all.

The richness of Lissak’s book consists not so much in this conclusion, however, as in the manner in which it is arrived at. Perhaps because of the origin of the study as a doctoral dissertation completed outside the United States (at the Hebrew University), Lissak is able to take an “outsider’s” approach untainted by the assumptions

which we who are "native speakers" of American culture (or at least of "American Studies" and of recent American historiography) *know* to have been the inevitable result of the Americanization campaigns of the early twentieth century. She is thus able to see forests where some of us have only seen trees. She notices the central role of the Hull House experience for a group—the "Hull House group" or "circle" or (once) "caucus"—which included not only Jane Addams and Ellen Starr, but also Grace and Edith Abbott, Felix Adler, Emily Balch, Sophonisba Breckinridge, John Dewey, Julian Mack, George Herbert Mead, Herbert A. Miller, William I. Thomas, and Ella Young. She notices that their reports and analyses of the "immigrant problem" comprise a coherent body of thought, available to formalist analysis. And she notices that the Hull House experience, as described and analyzed in the writings of the Hull House group, had the effect of redirecting the American dialogue on American civilization in the Progressive Era from a concern with social and economic problems to a concern with "culture."

First, she helps us see that the confrontation of the Hull House group with the realities of doing benevolent work among an immigrant population precipitated a long debate over the "usefulness" to the immigrants themselves of the cultural baggage which they brought with them from the Old World, and that this discourse occurred in the context of an even longer debate about the "real" (which really meant the "proper") character of American civilization as being unified and homogeneous, cosmopolitan, or pluralist. But because she does not take for granted the outcome of these debates, she is able to examine their structure and content as if all outcomes were possible, and to help us see how the "inner logic" of Hull House attitudes toward immigrant cultures did not lead to pluralism but rather to a view of these cultures as "primitive," or at least as dysfunctional in the American context.

Second, she helps us see that the practical conduct of benevolent work in Chicago at the turn of the century required a shift in the client unit from the individual to the group, and more particularly to the group defined on the basis of ethnicity rather than social class; that this required the ascription of need to persons who did not think they were needy, and who, therefore, frequently resisted the efforts of

the benevolent workers to help them; and that this in turn yielded a new definition of "need" based on participation in one or another Old World culture rather than on socioeconomic situation, and often irrespective of socioeconomic situation. It also shifted the terms of the American debate on American culture from a discussion of the impact of modernism and modernization, including urbanization and industrialization, to a discussion of the "immigrant problem." But because she does not take for granted the values expressed in those debates, neither the immigrant problem as problematic nor the desirability of modernization, she is able to help us see how the Hull House group's benevolent intention—to "assist" the immigrants—led them into a confrontation with the problem of culture, and how this confrontation spread beyond the practicalities of "doing" benevolent work to shape the American discourse about American civilization.

Third, she helps us see that the unwillingness of most immigrants to accept the benevolent workers' definition of their *cultural* neediness created obstacles to the conduct of "uplift by example," which was the original intention of the "settlement" in lower-class neighborhoods by philanthropic members of the middle and upper classes; and that this situation helped precipitate the redirection of the settlement house toward a new kind of work, as a "community center" serving immigrant *groups* rather than individuals, and as an "honest broker" representing the interests of immigrant communities to the established power structures of city, county, state, and federal government. But because she does not take for granted either the inevitability of these shifts in the character of settlement work or the apparent and much-celebrated discontinuities between "scientific" social work and the patronizing "benevolence" of the friendly visitor, she is able to examine the activities of the Hull House group as history rather than as myth, to see what happened rather than what they hoped would happen.

In an extraordinary series of chapters on the actual relationships of Hull House with the immigrant "subcommunities," based on published and manuscript sources supplemented by interviews with former Hull House members, Dr. Lissak demonstrates that, Jane Addams's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, Hull House

was notably unsuccessful in attracting East European immigrants to the "ethnic" clubs which the benevolent workers sought to organize, and had only limited and temporary success in its self-proclaimed function as a community center where immigrant organizations might meet. As soon as possible, Lissak finds, the immigrants themselves acquired community centers of their own as intentional alternatives to Hull House, most notably the Chicago Hebrew Institute (1902), funded largely by German Jews for the benefit of the East European Jews in the Hull House neighborhood, and the Guardian Angel Mission (1898) and Madonna Center Settlement (1911), funded largely by German Catholics for the benefit of Italian Catholics in the Hull House neighborhood. As to the "honest brokerage" of Hull House, moreover, Lissak notes that this was an attempt to provide a leadership role for Hull House and its residents by displacing the indigenous leadership of the immigrant communities, and that this power play led the Hull House group to assert the essentially corrupt and self-serving nature of immigrant leaders and immigrant institutions, including political clubs, newspapers, banks, employment bureaus, churches and synagogues—for which assertions Lissak's own diligent research finds little evidence.

No book is without faults, including the faults of methodology, and few without weaknesses. The weakest section of this one consists of Lissak's attempt to address the difficult matter of the relationship between pluralism as philosophic posture and pluralism as cultural strategy. It is a matter extraneous to the argument of her book, but even here, as throughout this admirable study, she is asking the right questions.

— Henry D. Shapiro

---

Henry Shapiro is Emeritus Professor of History at the University of Cincinnati. He is the author of *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness* (1978) and editor (with Jonathan Sarna) of *Ethnic Diversity and Civic Identity: Patterns of Conflict and Cohesion in Cincinnati*.

Brenner, Rachel Feldhay. *A. M. Klein, the Father of Canadian Jewish Literature: Essays in the Poetics of Humanistic Passion*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990. 104 pp.

A. M. Klein, whose versatile talent and intellectual energy had a seminal impact on the development of Canadian Jewish letters, is virtually and unjustly unknown to readers of American Jewish literature and poetry. His last years as a silent recluse complicate both his poetic legacy and the complexity of his work. "The tragic termination of his poetic vision infused his work with the notion of unresolved conflict," Rachel Feldhay Brunner argues, in her *A. M. Klein, the Father of Canadian Jewish Literature*, "a notion which has indelibly imbued the act of reading with a sense of portentous mystery."

In the beginning, Klein's themes of alienation and dejection evolved into a text of poetic naught. Influenced by demanding personal circumstances, Klein's long-held Zionist sympathies were tested by the realization of the State of Israel and its standing as the epitome of national cultural entity. His growing sense of bitterness and frustration stemmed from Israel's indifference to what he believed to be its diasporic cultural heritage. Toward Israel's political rebirth he showed a more extreme reaction. At the same time, in contrast to the political themes, he had to contend with the poet's visionary sensibilities.

Klein's first volume of poetry, *Hath Not a Jew* (1940), reveals his emotional closeness to Jewish tradition in an array of folk stories, biblical motifs, and religious symbols. *Poems* (1944) deals almost exclusively with Jewish subject matters. The impact of the eighteenth-century English satirists is prominent in *The Hitleriad* (1944), a vituperative attack on Nazism. It was the only poetic attempt in Canada to deal with the evolving Nazi horror. *The Rocking Chair and Other Poems* (1948) has been described as Klein's best poetry, although perhaps it was so well received because it focused on social reality in Quebec. The concluding "Portrait of the Poet as a Landscape" offers a striking vision of poetry as an alienated aspect of modern society. His only novel, *The Second Scroll* (1951), was Klein's final artistic and ideological statement. Based on a visit to Israel in

1949, it celebrates the humanistic ideal of universal justice. With the birth of the State of Israel, the sense of the immanent Messianic promise of moral regeneration is seen through a structural parallel between the five chapters of the novel and the Five Books of Moses.

Soon after *The Second Scroll* was published, Klein became mentally ill, reclusive, and literally silent. He died in 1972. He was sixty-three years old.

According to Dr. Brenner, Klein accomplished the social function of both transmitting and renewing heritage. Relating closely to the centuries-old tradition of Hebrew letters, he recognized his nineteenth-century predecessors' contributions to Jewish culture. Bialik he linked to David and Solomon and Yehuda Halevi; Sholom Aleichem was the quintessential representative of European Jewish tradition. He complimented Karl Shapiro, the American Jewish poet, for including his heritage in his poetry. "Now," Klein wrote in 1948, "the continuation of our culture stands before the Jewish writer as *the* challenge. The hiatus of the Diaspora has been closed . . . we write in the aftermath of a great death, European Jewry's, and in 'presence of a great resurrection.' "

In the large sense, Brenner writes, Klein demonstrated that the continuation of the Jewish cultural tradition in North America, a relatively new Diaspora land, was possible thanks to the centuries-long tradition of referentiality in Jewish writing. He translated Halevi's "Ode to Zion" and incorporated it into his own ballad, "Yehuda Halevi, His Pilgrimage," in these words:

The princess in her tower grows not old  
For she heard his charmed minstrelsy,  
She is forever young.

"Princess Zion," the complex metaphor of both freedom and bondage, informs Klein's poetic vision: it "epitomizes the historical origins of the Jewish people in the Promised Land as well as the continuing history of the nation in the Diaspora" (p. 23).

In the poem "Autobiographical," a nostalgic recollection of his childhood in Montreal, Klein was sensitive to his non-Jewish compatriots' feelings at the same time as he searched for the heritage left behind in the Diaspora and for the magical city of Jerusalem, the

emblem of the ideal past. The paved streets of Montreal invoked childhood fantasies of "pleasant Bible-land," and witness the continuing poetic quest:

... in memory I seek  
 The strength and vividness of nonage days,  
 Not tranquil recollection of events.  
 It is a fabled city that I seek.  
 It stands in space's vapors and Time's haze.  
 .....  
 Thence do I hear, as heard by a Jewboy,  
 The Hebrew violins,  
 Delighting in the sobbed Oriental note.

Perhaps, as Brenner argues persuasively, the poet's moral stance was bound to be repudiated by his amoral environment. Rejected because of his humanism, as he puts it in *The Rocking Chair*, revived in *The Second Scroll*, yet almost ignored in reality, he had to wait for posthumous praise to credit him for his achievements. Irving Layton praised this poetry of a medieval troubadour, "his poetic magic of an alchemist [who] changed fool's gold . . . into precious metal, solid and true." Leonard Cohen saw Klein as his teacher and spiritual father. Miriam Waddington described Klein's tragedy in a single poetic question: "how many recognize / his broken brain, his fear, / are nothing but our own?" As Layton put it, in his "Personal Memoir," Klein knew guilt, despair, self-division, radical evil, and human perversity, "as well as he knew the back of his hand . . . he was aware of the lengthening shadows and that they were growing broader and darker with each passing month."

And yet, as Brenner has demonstrated, in this exceptionally insightful and persuasive analysis, Klein emerged as a Jewish poet, immersed in the Jewish heritage, yet capable of relating and responding to humanity at large. As a descendant of the prophets of Israel, Klein did not relate to self-aggrandizement. Unable to accept Orthodoxy he waged a lifelong struggle with faith while affirming his ancestral heritage and the prophetic inheritance. It is in rebirth-in-speech after the apocalyptic nothingness of silence that we will know him. His last silence thus is not the elimination of the poetic voice but the yet "unvoiced" anticipation of moral revival. It is this vision that

Brenner articulates so well: in sum, "the voice that arises from Klein's text articulates a vision which vacillates between the silent despair of 'nothingness' and the hopeful song of 'rebirth.' "

— Daniel Walden

---

Daniel Walden teaches in the Department of English, Penn State University. He is the editor of *Studies in American Jewish Literature*.

Robinson, Ira, Anctil, Pierre, and Butovsky, Mervin, Edited by. *An Everyday Miracle: Yiddish Culture in Montreal*. Montreal: Vehicule Press, 1990. 169 pp.

A miracle is that which is not an everyday event. Jewish history on the North American continent features a dozen local communities with remarkable annals not paralleled beyond their municipal boundaries. The historic challenge is to secure from their local essences the significance for American history of what is other than the common national doings of their Jewish citizenries.

Montreal, in each of its stages, has truly been a unique *kahal* on the continent. Its distinctive history through the beginning of the 1900s, starting with its first Hart two and a third centuries ago, spanned the Ashkenazi founders of its Sephardi congregation, its welcoming and nurturing of the peerless minister Abraham de Sola, the remarkable Lithuanian minyan at mid-century that pioneered the slow mass migration of the 1880s, and the adoption of the Montreal community by Baron de Hirsch from the wide, tragic, but nascent universe of Jewish flight, with the consequent imposition of a large capital administration upon the Jewish structure, etc., for another venturous century.

Just before the dawning of the present century, as Yiddish was beginning to flee its motherland in prescience of the Holocaust and in intense search of a new world beyond exile, Montreal became a home for Yiddish, a Vilno in Canada, with innovative social structures, schools, libraries, philosophers, journalists, scholars, administrators—and a daily press unparalleled in the Americas outside New York. Mobilized by publisher H. Wolofsky, the city put forth personalities like B. G. Sack, B. J. Goldstein, J. L. Yampolsky, M. Shmuelson, and K. Bercovici, and soon drew Reuben Brainin, Y. Kaufman, A. A. Roback, Leon Chazanovitch, L. Zuker, M. Dickstein, A. B. Bennett, and dozens of others before the First World War. They were but the beginning of “the third linguistic Canadian culture.”

The newest documentation on the Montreal miracle centers on Yiddish culture in the city, the theme of a trilingual colloquium three years ago. Papers on Israel Medres, Jacob Zipper, H. M. Caiserman,

Rabbi J. Rosenberg, J. I. Segal, Ida Massey, and a remarkable unsigned introduction are included in the collection, which counts among its "miraculous" elements the contribution of French-Canadian anthropologist Pierre Anctil, translator of Segal's Yiddish poetry into French.

These are annals studded with a veritable multitude of names out of a century of Jewish migration who flowered, not because of privileged genealogy or training, but solely because chance brought them into a social geography which permitted the members of this first non-French and non-British minority to live their own lives in multilingual peace. In schooling, in religion, in language, in politics, in home customs, in economics, there was no exterior pressure, not even from the benevolent assimilatory influence of the unitary society, in the absence of a single homogenizing ideal state. In this equality the penniless H. Wolofsky could envisage a Yiddish paper the peer of the *Gazette* and *La Presse*, and Israel Rabinowitch and Winnipeg's M. Selchen wrote in the tone of the *New York Times* and could be read as respectfully by their publics. J. I. Segal could indite poems about Montreal's church streets and Jewish sidewalks as much at ease as were the French poets of the city. A. M. Klein of McGill University invoked the imperial vocabulary of Oxbridge for his Messianic Zionist *The Second Scroll*, and well-to-do Jewish citizens claimed seats on Protestant school boards before the Privy Council as naturally as Aaron Hart took his rightful place as seigneur in the local church as soon as he acquired his seigneurie.

The outstanding feature of the present collection is the opening essay by David G. Roskies, professor of Yiddish at the Jewish Theological Seminary, himself a native of Montreal. The document is as much autobiographical as an examination of Shloimeh Wiseman's educational circle.

Roskies admits that he discovered the broad significance of his theme even as he prepared for his appearance at the colloquium; that

Montreal Yiddish culture was a utopian venture. Nothing like it existed anywhere else on earth, and therefore had to be invented from scratch. . . . It was an ideological construct, the work of a tiny group of secular Zionist intellectuals. . . . A new Jew was about to be born. . . . The Montreal Yiddish intelligentsia fought for a restorative and integrative program that would create a sense of

wholeness both within Jewish life and within the fragmented world at large. Through extraordinary self-sacrifice this cadre of young ideologues established a network of institutions to embody their bold utopian vision.

These institutions are the substance of the dramatic history of the education of Montreal Jewish children from 1920 to the present, now that the Quebec government, alone among the provinces, largely maintains the entire Jewish school system.

The story also includes an anti-miracle, for the Yiddish basis of the virile 1885-1935 half-century suddenly gave way to demography as parents surrendered their effectiveness to their children and saw Yiddish disappear into the abyss within a decade to become a sector of what is now the generally familiar western Anglo-American Jewish world scene. This newer universe is better known for its obsession with novelty than for its dedication to its own roots.

How ironic and unbelievable that this linguistic suicide should have taken place, without external pressure, in a nation and a province which are so conscious of language as are Canada and Quebec, even as the Francophone neighbors of Montreal Jewry were conducting a centuries-long war for their tongue, culture, and nationality to the point of destroying one of the great and prosperous nations of the world.

Given this situation, Professors Robinson, Anctil, and Butovsky will not be hurt if their anthology on Yiddish culture in Montreal has a shorter life on the nonfiction bestseller list than the subject deserves. But readers of Jewish history have other guides in selecting their reading, and will give serious care to Professor Roskies and his fellow contributors.

— David Rome

---

David Rome has served as Director of the Jewish Public Library of Montreal and editor of the Canadian Jewish Congress *Bulletin*. He is the author or editor of numerous works dealing with Canadian anti-semitism and Quebec Jews.

Grossman, Cissy. *A Temple Treasury: The Judaica Collection of Congregation Emanu-El of the City of New York*. New York: Hudson Hill Press in association with Congregation Emanu-El, 1989. x, 198 pp.

*A Temple Treasury* by Cissy Grossman is an extraordinary book which brings alive a significant American collection of Judaica. Her presentation is superlative because it successfully and thoroughly grounds the collection in the essential contexts which provide the reader with an enriched and necessary understanding of this unusual array of objects from Europe, North Africa, and America. The prism through which these multiple contexts are revealed is the evolution of Temple Emanu-El (the first Reform congregation in New York and the third liberal congregation in America), the important rabbinic and lay personalities involved with the development of the synagogue, and the interrelationship between the synagogue's history and the Americanization of the Jews. The collection itself, in its intrinsic significance, is well worth the precise scholarship and attention of this publication, but it is made all the more intriguing and valuable studied in its historical context as a reflection specifically of the growth of the synagogue and more generally that of New York and American Jewry.

The uniqueness of the Emanu-El Judaica collection is in how "unlike" it is to a typical museum's Judaica collection. Most of the larger Jewish museums purposefully acquire objects from sources as varied as possible in both time and place to represent the relative diversity of Jewish civilization and custom. The value of the Emanu-El collection's origin, on the other hand, is in its focused relationship to the synagogue. As Ms. Grossman so pointedly states in the preface, "This American collection is unique for the tangible evidence it offers of the life of the congregation and the way in which it illuminates and locates this particular congregation in time and place. Many of the objects were commissioned especially to fulfill community obligations of worship, of recognition, of enrichment of a heritage."

For what this book is essentially about is a collection of a number of quite superb and rare Jewish religious and historical objects amassed by an important American synagogue for use in the religious practice of the synagogue itself, as well as, eventually, objects

obtained for a synagogue museum. There are other examples of this in Jewish life, such as that of the extraordinary Danzig synagogue collection which consisted of objects from that temple's own *Kunst Kammer* (established in 1904 as the Grel dzinski Donation) as well as objects created or purchased for the synagogue's use.

*A Temple Treasury* is comprehensive and historically satisfying by offering a number of essays which enrich the reader's comprehension of the collection. Senior Rabbi Ronald B. Sobel, in a beautifully written and carefully researched piece entitled "The Congregation: A Historical Perspective," presents an overview of the many phases of Temple Emanu-El's evolution, focusing on its early history as a "microcosm of the success of the Western European immigrant in general, and of the German Jewish immigrant in particular." The essay further deals with the changing demography of the congregation as well as the relationship of the synagogue to the growth of Reform Judaism in America, its contribution to scholarship, music, and liturgy, etc.

Reva Godlove Kirschberg's essay, entitled "The Collection: Early Patrons," is an introduction to the objects themselves in the context of their extraordinary origins and truly compelling relationships to Temple Emanu-El and to some of its illustrious early members. For instance, she discusses a silver pitcher given by the eleven-year-old temple in 1856 to Dr. David Einhorn upon which is engraved a depiction of Temple Emanu-El at its then East Twelfth Street location. Another aspect of the collection's origin described in her essay is the important gift of fifty pieces of Judaica from Judge Irving Lehman of the New York State Court of Appeals. Again, what is demonstrated here is the uniqueness of the collection in that so many of the objects, because of their origins in the context of temple history and membership, have a significant provenance and history. So often in Jewish collections, a majority of the objects lack any really definitive pedigree or history because of the wanderings and adversities of Jewish history.

Cissy Grossman's essay "Temple Emanu-El: The Building" thoughtfully analyzes an architectural monument that stands as the largest synagogue in the world. She treats its symbolism, its stylistic elements, and its reflection of the social, aesthetic psychological, and political forces playing on the congregation at the time of its creation.

The heart of the book, however, is in Ms. Grossman's catalogue and interpretation of the collection. She has organized the collection into three main sections with an introductory essay for each: "Objects Used in the Sacred Service," "Commemorative Objects," and "Objects from the Home." She presents brief but significant overviews of the issues relevant to an understanding of the ceremonial art in each section, such as symbolism, maker, function, and iconography. The entries for each of the 200 objects in the book are excellent examples of thorough research and good scholarship from a technical and interpretive art-historical viewpoint as well as from a scholarly Jewish perspective. Her attributions of date, place, material, maker, ownership, etc., are impeccable. She consulted with innumerable art and Judaica scholars, librarians, and others (including Dr. Philip Miller, Librarian, Klau Library, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, who retranslated all the Hebrew inscriptions and provided their textual sources). The scholarly data comport with the highest standards of Judaica scholarship and publication. As the collection itself consists of such important objects in both Judaica art and American Jewish history, none of which has heretofore been systematically studied or published, Ms. Grossman's study represents a major contribution to both Jewish art history and American Jewish history.

Among the treasures of this "Temple Treasury" are the Schiff set of Torah ornaments. These beautiful finials and shield imported from a famous Frankfurt silversmith in 1890 by Jacob H. and Therese Schiff for presentation to Emanu-El in that very year in commemoration of the confirmation of their daughter, Frieda, reflect the aesthetic quality and significant historicity of so much of the rest of the collection. The Bloomingdale Torah crowns, made in New York in 1891, were presented to the temple by Lyman G. Bloomingdale, a prominent New Yorker and art collector, who in 1872 had opened a dry goods store which developed into the present-day Bloomingdale's. Judge Irving Lehman's Bible in Bezalel binding of 1922, with an inscription inside the clasp reading "Presented to Irving Lehman by the boys of Camp Lehman 1923," is of course captivating in its reflection of the significance of this great American Jewish personality. Further enriching the object's historical qualities, in his own catalogue of the objects which he donated to Temple Emanu-El written in 1928, Lehman noted:

"Bible bound at Bezalel School. Presented by boys at Camp Lehman Y.M.H.A. and used when I was sworn in by Judge Cardozo as Judge of Court of Appeals." Ms. Grossman's research, compilation, synthesis, and interpretation of the disparate elements which comprise an appropriate art and historical analysis of such a collection are precise, exhaustive, and excellent. In one case, in investigating an historically important 1888 Tiffany silver vase presented "to Mr. Lewis May, President of the Congregation Temple Emanu-el New York. In grateful recognition of his Twenty Five Years," Ms. Grossman sought data from the Tiffany archives to enhance her description and interpretation.

The book is elegantly illustrated with forty-two exquisite color photographs and also includes a glossary, a bibliography, a general index, and an index of geographical origins of the works in the catalogue. This book must not be thought of as a representative guide to Jewish ceremonial art, because it is shaped by the specificity and evolution of Temple Emanu-El's own history and its related collections. Indeed, that is the book's strength. It is a significant and satisfying in-depth focus on a collection unique in America and important for its symbolization of Jewish history and Jewish art.

—Nancy Berman

---

Nancy Berman is the director of the Skirball Museum at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

Hyman, Harold M. *Oleander Odyssey: The Kempners of Galveston, Texas, 1854–1980s*. Galveston: Texas A & M University Press, 1990.

*Oleander Odyssey* by Harold M. Hyman reads in part like a television mini-series of the 1990s—a Jew in his old age mourns because none of his grandchildren have been bar mitzvahed or confirmed in the temple; a Jewish woman political activist, disgusted at city crime and corruption, tells the madam of a house of prostitution not to pay off the cops and to report to *her* any extortions by police officers. She goes to the police and warns them against “taking it out in trade . . . five dollars worth and I hear about it . . .” Speaking of this incident, Ruth Levy Kempner told me, “I did not go down to the brothels but met with Big Tit Marie in the office of a slimy character who arranged the meeting when I was running for office for public health nursing service.”

As this anecdote indicates, *Oleander Odyssey* portrays the decay that comes to a city when gambling is permitted to invade it. Ruth later became the first woman to serve on the Galveston city council. Her brother Marion Levy, Jr., served as sociology professor at Princeton University. Her son, Harris Leon Kempner, Jr. (“Shrub”), is a nationally known leader of civic affairs, including Jewish causes.

*Oleander Odyssey* is the story of a family made of what the author calls “not merely minor Hebraic Carnegies.” It tells the story of a dynasty of five generations of pioneer Jewish Texans who had impact on Texas and American history.

These “titled Texans” began with the patriarch, H. Kempner, arriving in America as a teenager in the 1850s to avoid forced service in the Russian army. He emigrated from Poland through New York, where he worked as a bricklayer’s helper before going to a small town in Texas. Jews enjoyed leadership positions in the pioneer days of the Texas frontier, Galveston having a Jewish mayor as early as 1853. H. Kempner’s son, Isaac Herbert Kempner, became mayor of the oleander city in 1917, and in 1932 Ruth’s uncle, Adrian Levy, was elected mayor of Galveston.

Through hard work and perseverance, the Kempner family’s business portfolio grew to include wholesale groceries, banking, cotton, real estate, insurance, rice plantations, hotels, and sugar refining. The

diversification also included clothing manufacturing, furniture manufacturing, timber, and cattle grazing. Two of these, banking and insurance, are only lightly touched on, and this omission seems strange not only to native Galvestonians who identified the name Kempner with one of the island city's most prestigious banks, but also to members of the Kempner family who commissioned this business history.

The author, professor of history at Houston's elite Rice University and author of other histories, is well qualified to write such a work. His research team included some of his graduate students. The section on the cotton business is thorough. Cotton was king for decades in Texas, and millions of bales of cotton are still exported from Galveston island to ports all over the world.

What escaped the author are family stories, such as the fact that Leonora Kempner Thompson's son, Edward R. Thompson, Jr. ("Tim"), went from being an Episcopalian to a Jew and at this writing remains a Jew. He wrote a "History of H. Kempner," a valuable reference to this book. Thompson served as president of the island city's Temple B'nai Israel. This is the congregation served by Rabbi Dr. Henry Cohen, one of the world's greatest humanitarians, and author Hyman includes not only the rabbi's friendship with the Kempner family but also his influence on the family in inspiring them to charity.

Without naming it as such, the author includes the American Council for Judaism, writing in an overly pedantic style, "By 1918 Galveston's Jews were trifurcated into the major doctrinal and liturgical camps. . . . Sharp disagreements concerning Zionism as allegedly opposed to secular acculturation in America helped to exacerbate those divisions." I felt happy to read that Hyman did include the fact that during that era of conflict, as a Kempner letter revealed, funds went to Youth Aliyah in Israel in 1943. Actually, when I attended Sunday School at Dr. Cohen's congregation in the late 1930s, every year the students would take up a collection for a gift for his birthday, and he always turned the funds over to Youth Aliyah.

The bibliography is not one of the book's strong points, being crammed with listings of books of minimal relevance to the subject work, omitting others that are relevant, and not updating other titles; for instance, Tom Kolsky's "Jews Against Zionism: The American

Council for Judaism" is listed as a Ph.D. dissertation, when it is now a hardback book.

The author and/or his researchers also are guilty of going off on tangents that have little to do with the Kempner family specifically. For example, there are twenty-three references to blacks (but only six to Nazism).

This book is of national appeal, as the family's ancestors include roots in Cincinnati (from matriarch Eliza Seinsheimer Kempner to attorney Harris Kempner Weston) and other cities.

When asked whether she felt the book portrayed a dynasty, Ruth (Mrs. Harris Kempner, Jr.) stated, "I suppose it is. We're in our fifth generation. We haven't fallen apart. We may in the next generation, but it won't matter because the cornerstone is all laid. It won't be the same with too many young people going various ways."

The family furnished Professor Hyman with a family tree/genealogy, but it was not published in the book. Some of the Stephen Birmingham books include genealogies, which are helpful to the readers.

Designed by Jim Billingsley, *Oleander Odyssey* would make a beautiful gift for anyone interested in Judaica or Texana or American business history and the free enterprise system.

— Natalie Ornish

---

Natalie Ornish was born on the island of Galveston. She is a film producer and lecturer and is the author of *Pioneer Jewish Texans* (1990).

---

## Brief Notices

---

Angel, Marc. D. *Voices in Exile: A Study in Sephardic Intellectual History*. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing House, 1991. 237 pp.

Rabbi Marc Angel is one of the most important Sephardic and American Jewish religious leaders of our time. He has, for a number of years, fought in both an intellectual and a personal sense to bring about a greater understanding of the Sephardic contribution to the intellectual and religious life of the Jewish people, especially after 1492. *Voices in Exile* serves these purposes well. Rabbi Angel discusses the Sephardic contribution in the American context as well, with a section of his important volume devoted to American secular Sephardic literature and to Sephardic religious thinkers such as Rabbi Henry Pereira Mendes.

DiAntonio, Robert, and Nora Glickman, Edited by. *Tradition and Innovation: Reflections on Latin American Jewish Writings*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993. 225 pp.

The half-million Jews living in Latin America are almost completely unknown to their North American co-religionists. Yet those same North American Jews may be among the most avid devotees of the new boom in Latin American fiction as represented by Jorge Luis Borges, Mario Vargas Llosa, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, and more recently Isobelle Allende. But who among the many Jewish fans of the Latin American *oeuvre* have read or even heard of Moacyr Scliar, Isaac Goldemberg, Gerardo Mario Goloboff, or Clarice Lispector? These Latin American Jewish writers are only the best known of a much larger group who write about the Latin American Jewish experience.

The seventeen essays in this book introduce us to a little-known and even less understood group of Jews and the Latin societies in which they have lived for over a century. They also introduce us to the literature and the writers who seek to explore what it means to be a Jew in Latin America, both as a man and as a woman.

Kabakoff, Jacob, Edited by. *Jewish Book Annual* (Volume 44). New York: JWB Jewish Book Council, 1993-94. 322 pp.

The latest volume of this distinguished publication is, as always, a literary delight. How the author manages to maintain such standards of excellence on a year-to-year basis is a secret that all other American Jewish journals wish were in the public domain. The latest number contains important articles by Sara R. Horowitz on "Contemporary Jewish-American Women's Writing on Judaism," by Michael Greenstein on "Canadian Jewish Literature," by Shalom Goldman on "An Unknown American Hebrew-Yiddish Polemic," as well as bibliographic essays on American Jewish literature by Suzanne M. Stauffer, Linda P. Lerman, Marcia W. Posner, and Clifford B. Miller.

Krohn, Claus-Dieter. *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*. Translated by Rita and Robert Kimber. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993. 255 pp.

In 1933 Adolf Hitler began a number of "wars" against his most obvious enemies. The Jews of Germany were, of course, first on the list, but not far behind were those creators of knowledge commonly called intellectuals. A number of them were also Jewish and thus appeared twice on Hitler's list. Few in this country or elsewhere were eager to help the German intellectuals in their efforts to escape an almost certain sentence of death. But Alvin Johnson, the director of the New School for Social Research, realized at once that Germany's intellectual loss would be America's gain. He organized a rescue effort to bring nearly 200 of the best German academic minds to the United States—political scientists, economists, sociologists, philosophers, and psychologists. They became the faculty of the New School, organized initially into the University in Exile and later known as the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science. Krohn's book, which appeared in Germany in 1987, is the first in-depth intellectual history of this remarkable and influential group of German emigré academics.

Markowitz, Ruth Jacknow. *My Daughter, the Teacher: Jewish Teachers in the New York City Schools*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1993. 224 pp.

Until the pitched battles over school "decentralization" in New York City schools at the end of the 1960s drove many Jewish teachers from the classroom, they had been a highly visible part of the city's educational system for nearly a half-century. Ruth Jacknow Markowitz conducted interviews with several dozen Jewish women who had been teachers in the New York City schools from the Depression years to the early 1960s. She found how important the idea of becoming a teacher had been to these women and to their families. To be a teacher represented to New York's immigrant Jewish generation in the early part of this century the embodiment of all good things American. Among the first generation of these Jews, the desire for their children to become teachers was overshadowed by the need for the children to help provide an income for the family, usually after the completion of the eighth grade. But at the end of World War I, a certain economic stability within immigrant families allowed vast numbers of young Jewish women to take advantage of New York's system of free education through the college level, urged on by their mothers but rarely by their fathers. Markowitz follows the careers of a number of these women through their educations, marriages, classroom activities as well as the anti-Semitic, anti-union, and anti-Communist/Socialist attitudes shared by the city's Board of Education and their own colleagues in the schools.

Moody, Suzanna, and Joel Wurl, Compiled and edited by. *The Immigration History Research Center: A Guide to the Collections*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1991. xxiii, 446 pp.

The Immigration History Research Center at the University of Minnesota has for over a quarter of a century been one of the great research institutions dealing with the history of American immigration. Directed by Professor Rudolf J. Vecoli, the IHRC is a veritable "Garden of Eden" for the social historian interested in looking at the American immigrant experience from the bottom up. No less than twenty-two different ethnic groups are each highlighted by a chapter, and then there is the "General Collection" to savor as well. There is a small but concise chapter on the Center's American Jewish holdings.

Olitzky, Kerry M., Lance J. Sussman, and Malcolm H. Stern, Edited by. *Reform Judaism in America: A Biographical Dictionary and Sourcebook*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1993. xxxi, 343 pp.

This volume is the second in a series conceived by Marc Lee Raphael, who has written extensively on American Judaism. It is an "all you ever wanted to know about Reform Judaism in America" and more. The editors are to be congratulated on providing well-written biographical sketches of the Reform leadership past and present, both lay and religious, and for providing a marvelous group of published sources on the evolution and history of the movement.

Rosen, Norma. *Accidents of Influence: Writing as a Woman and a Jew in America*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. 210 pp.

A highly successful writer, Norma Rosen is also a highly agitated woman, Jew, and post-Holocaust American writer. The essays in this volume reflect two decades of struggle and frustration with her state of being as she has shaped it: "I've always known that my husband's story [both his parents were killed in the Holocaust] is his, in the eye of that annihilating storm, while mine is at the edges, in the guilt and confusion of American safety, in the tension of connection and separation, in the longing for a culture I never experienced and in the repudiation of it by everything I was raised to be." An American Jewish woman with a Holocaust mentality who writes with depth and tremendous personal insight, Norma Rosen should be read simply to discover the *angst* that will not leave American Jewish life.

Shapiro, Henry D., and Jonathan D. Sarna, Edited by. *Ethnic Diversity and City Identity: Patterns of Conflict and Cohesion in Cincinnati Since 1820*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992. xviii, 269 pp.

Although Cincinnati, Ohio, has received a perhaps undeserved reputation as a city where ethnic diversity did not exist, the authors of this excellent volume think otherwise, and in a series of outstanding essays prove their arguments. Especially interesting is Jonathan Sarna's study of Cincinnati Jewry entitled " 'A Sort of Paradise for the Hebrews': The Lofty Vision of Cincinnati Jews."

Singer, David, Edited by. *American Jewish Yearbook* (Volume 93). New York and Philadelphia: American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society, 1993. xi, 623 pp.

The 1993 edition of the *American Jewish Yearbook* contains several important articles on American Jewish life, including "Intergroup Relations" by Jerome A. Chanes, "The United States, Israel, and the Middle East" by Kenneth Jacobson, "American Jewish Communal Affairs" by Lawrence Grossman, and "Jewish Population in the United States, 1992" by Barry A. Kosmin and Jeffrey Scheckner.

## 1992 Selected Acquisitions

### Congregational and Community Records and Histories

- Chicago, Ill. Photographs and printed materials on Chicago area Landsmanschaften written and compiled by Sidney Sorkin, 1991; *Typescript and Photographs*  
(Received from Sidney Sorkin, Buffalo Grove, Ill.)
- Denver, Colo. Temple Emanuel. Dues book, 1902–1914; *Manuscript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Temple Emanuel, Denver)
- Indianapolis, Ind. A discourse on the Jewish community of Indianapolis by David H. Bernstein, May 1992; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from David H. Bernstein, Boynton Beach, Fla.)
- Los Angeles, Cal. Congregation Beth Chayim Chadashim. Constitution, July 28, 1991; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Stanley F. Chyet, Los Angeles)
- St. Louis, Mo. Temple Shaare Emeth. Constitution and bylaws, 1869 and 1912, minute books, 1889–1896, 1916, and 1936–1948; *Manuscript and Typescript; Microfilm*  
(Received from Jeffrey Stiffman, St. Louis)
- Syracuse, N.Y. Temple Society of Concord. Records of the congregation consisting of minute books, 1901–1989; Sisterhood minutes, 1939–1954, and scrapbooks, 1900–1991; *Manuscript and Typescript; Microfilm*  
(Received from Sheldon Ezring, Syracuse)

### Records and Papers of Societies and Institutions

- American Society for Colonizing and Evangelizing the Jews. Constitution and bylaws, 1820; *Typescript; Restricted; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Rose Klein, Worcester, Mass.)
- Cincinnati, Ohio. B'nai B'rith Women, Chapter No. 140. Minutes, 1957–1961, and photographs of chapter members, n.d.; *Typescript and Photographs* Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs. Memorial meeting for Clara Lemlich Shavelson, trade union activist, sponsored by the Emma Lazarus Federation, Oct. 24, 1982; *Tape Recording*  
(Received from the Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs, New York, N.Y.)

### Letters and Papers

- Eichenstein, Menachem H. Correspondence, newspaper clippings, and papers of Eichenstein, chief rabbi of the St. Louis Orthodox Jewish community, 1938–1981; *Manuscript and Typescript; English and Hebrew; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Walter Ehrlich, St. Louis.)
- Goldberg, Joshua L. Correspondence, newspaper clippings, and military papers of Goldberg, a rabbi and chaplain during World War II, 1960–1985; *Manuscript and Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Allen H. Podet, Norfolk, Va.)

Mortara, Edgardo. Letter from Mortara to Isaac Feibel discussing Mortara's relations with his parents, his views on Judaism, and his Christian faith, 39 years after his abduction by the Catholic church, Dec. 31, 1897; *Manuscript*  
(Received from Louise Reichert, Cincinnati)

Rothblatt, Dan. Materials concerning the Jewish chaplaincy and the experiences of a Jewish chaplain in Japan, 1961–1962; *Typescript*  
(Received from Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles)

#### Autobiographies, Biographies, Diaries and Memoirs

Ambrose, David. Memoir of his life as a merchant in New York City, 1877–1961, with a brief biography of Ambrose written by Scott A. Seligman, 1992; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Scott A. Seligman, Chicago)

Baeck, Leo. Document describing his release from the Nazi concentration camp Terezin in 1945 and his subsequent immigration to the United States, n.d.; *Manuscript*  
(Received from Max A. Shapiro, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Biegel, Hugo and Frida. Autobiographies of the Biegels, describing their early lives in Germany and Czechoslovakia, their experiences during the Nazi regime, and their immigration to the United States, 1992; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Melvin Weinman, San Diego, Cal.)

Bloch, Jean. Excerpts from "The Story of My Life," detailing the activities of her husband, Herbert R. Bloch, as a member of the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion Board of Governors and his work in building the Jerusalem campus of the College-Institute, n.d.; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Jean Bloch, Cincinnati)

Britton, Nancy. "Hirsch and Adler: Jewish Immigrants to Arkansas," an article written by Britton with accompanying background materials and photographs, 1992; *Typescript and Photographs*  
(Received from Nancy Britton, Batesville, Ark.)

Kaplan, Abrom. Diaries, volumes 1–50, 1908–1934; *Manuscript; Microfilm*  
(Received from Brian H. Kaplan, New Orleans, La.)

Levitt, Norma U. American Jewish Archives autobiographical questionnaire, 1992, "My Story: Streams of My Life—Writing, International Affairs, Religious Concerns," October 1992, and a vita, n.d.; *Typescript; Xerox copy*.  
(Received from Norma U. Levitt, New York)

Lewisohn, Adolph. "The Citizenship of Adolph Lewisohn: An Autobiography," n.d.; *Typescript; Restricted; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Ronald B. Sobel, New York)

#### Genealogies

Bleichroeder Family. "History of the Bleichroeder and Liepmann families, including a chapter on the Hamburgers, 1770–1972," compiled and written by Charlotte Hamburger, 1972, and translated from the German by Adelaide Flatau, 1992; *Typescript; Xerox copy*  
(Received from Adelaide Flatau, Port Jefferson, N.Y.)

Cohn Family. "Ravanna Revisited, 1992," a family history and genealogy of the Cohn family in southwestern Kansas in the 1880s and 1890s written by John E. Brown, 1992; *Typescript; Xerox copy*

(Received from John E. Brown, Chesterfield, Mo.)

Goldwater, Barry M. Letter to Rabbi Kurt F. Stone detailing Goldwater's Jewish heritage, Nov. 26, 1991; *Typescript; Xerox copy*

(Received from Kurt F. Stone, Plantation, Fla.)

Johnson, Ella G. Letter to Dr. Jacob R. Marcus concerning family history, including her great-grandfather, David I. Johnson, one of the founding members of the Cincinnati Jewish community, Jan. 4, 1992; *Manuscript*

(Received from Ella G. Johnson, Cincinnati)

Marx Family. Family genealogy, 1820–1992, compiled by Marjorie Jacobs, 1992; *Manuscript and Typescript; Xerox copy*

(Received from Audrey S. Kenis, Los Angeles)

#### Oral History

Adatto, Albert. Talk delivered at Peninsula Temple Shalom on "Growing Up Sephardic in America," Nov. 12, 1989; *Video Tape*

(Received from Isaac Jerusalem, Cincinnati)

Cohen, Oscar. Oral history memoir of his life and activities with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, n.d.; *Typescript; Xerox copy*

(Received from Leon Klenicki, New York)

Farenci, William. Oral history interview conducted by the University of Miami Holocaust Documentation Center, 1992; *Video Tape*

(Received from William Farenci, Tamarac, Fla.)

Haber, Samuel L. Oral history interviews concerning Haber's career with the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee from 1947 to 1976, taped as part of the AJJDC Oral History Project, Dec. 15, 1980–Feb. 25, 1981; *Tape Recording*

(Received from Perry Haber, New York)

Holocaust [1939–1945]. Oral history interviews with twelve Holocaust survivors who later converted to Christianity, June 1992; *Tape Recording*

(Received from Lynn Pierce (Cincinnati))

#### Miscellaneous

Jeffries, Leonard. Video tape and discussion guide of an Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith production, "Multicultural Education: Will Extremists Destroy the Dream? Professor Leonard Jeffries: A Case Study," 1992; *Video Tape and Typescript*

(Received from Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York)

Jervis, Ida G. "History Through the Camera's Eye," video documentary of the photojournalism of Mrs. Jervis, 1991; *Video Tape*

(Received from Marian Katzman, Cincinnati)

Priesand, Sally J. Tape recording of an address at Temple Jeremiah discussing her reasons for entering the rabbinate, her experiences at Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, and her personal beliefs in Judaism, January 1974; *Tape Recording*

(Received from Fred N. Reiner and Sherry Levy Reiner, Washington, D.C.)



