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From the Editor . . .

Reflecting the diversity and depth of the field, this issue’s authors are professors of musicology, religion, and English/literature, and a graduate student in history. If there is a tie binding the essays together, it is interaction between Jews and non-Jews and its impact.

Ellen Umansky explores how the perception of Christian Science’s lure especially to Reform Jews contributed to the creation of the little-known Jewish Science movement and how Rabbi Alfred Geiger Moses’ thoughts on Jewish Science changed as he was exposed to different ideas.

From Moses’ residence in Mobile the reader travels north to Birmingham. John Baron explicates the roles of Christian musicians in a Reform congregation and how a highly regarded composer put a Friday night service to music with some intriguing twists. Jewish liturgical music becomes a lens for acculturation in a majority-Christian society.

Adam Mendelsohn offers the first comparative study of Jewish responses to black civil rights in South Africa and in the American South. Mendelsohn emphasizes forces within congregations as non-conformist rabbis press boundaries along frontier lands. In doing so, he expands our understanding of rabbinical behavior in relation to local environments.

These studies treat aspects of acculturation. Rosalind Benjet revised her Shreveport conference presentation for publication. Her study delves into ambiguous incidents that occurred in Dallas during the early 1920s concerning the Klan and Jews that reflect acculturation but also marginality. Were Jews subject to Klan brutality or did the business climate mitigate bigotry? Did Jews support the Klan or did they go along to get along?

Finally, this volume includes as a research/study tool a bibliography of articles published in the three major Jewish historical
journals that I compiled as part of a larger project. This bibliography is a work in progress. If readers are aware of articles missing from the list, I would appreciate being informed.

*FOR THE RECORD:* Instead of making the decision to publish the bibliography, I polled the editorial board without informing the members that it was my work. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor. John Baron is Rachel Heimovics’ brother. Following the journal’s practice, two peer reviewers recommended publication of the blind manuscript and Rachel played no part in the peer review process.

The Gale Foundation increased its support of the journal with a five-year grant and the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation continued its annual donations. To Rachel and me, the commitment on the part of these foundations is as important as their financial contributions. Thanks to the editorial board and especially Dianne Ashton, Mark Greenberg, Karl Preuss, Deb Weiner, and Steve Whitfield rotating off after three-year terms, and to outside peer reviewers Cathy Kahn, Mark Kligman, Mark Slobin, and Hollace Weiner.

Mark K. Bauman
Christian Science, Jewish Science,
and Alfred Geiger Moses

by

Ellen M. Umansky

In March 1911, a headline in the weekly Jewish newspaper the American Hebrew declared, “International Order of B’nai B’rith Excludes Christian Scientists.” Reporting on B’nai B’rith’s annual convention in San Francisco, the American Hebrew described in detail the attention paid to the growing number of American Jews attracted to Christian Science. These Jews diligently studied Mary Baker Eddy’s Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, first published in 1875, regularly attended Christian Science services, availed themselves of Christian Science practitioners, and eventually joined the Christian Science church. By an overwhelming majority, members of B’nai B’rith voted to exclude such Jews from their fraternal order on the grounds that it was impossible for one to be both a Jew and a Christian Scientist. Believing that Christian Science had already made serious inroads into the American Jewish community, it insisted that the American rabbinate “do more constructive work,” beginning with a recognition of the reasons why so many Jews had been “led astray” by Christian Science teachings.

Jewish Attraction to Christian Science

Like most non-Jews who joined Christian Science, Jews often found themselves initially drawn to the religion because of its promise of health, peace, and comfort. In an age of rapid urbanization, and the anxiety and tension that observers maintained went with it, many American city dwellers found
themselves suffering from such ideational or functional illnesses as neurasthenia (nervous exhaustion) and hysteria. Hysteria was especially widespread among urban middle and upper-middle class women between the ages of fifteen and forty, with symptoms that included nervousness, depression, fatigue, headaches, pain, seizures, and even paralysis. Whether hysteria was a disease that had some identifiable cause or was simply a functional illness frequently used by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women as a way of consciously or unconsciously expressing dissatisfaction with their lives, hysteria became one of the classic diseases of the era and one for which many women sought relief through practitioners of such mind-cure faiths as Christian Science. Given the fact that most American Jews were both middle class and city dwellers, it should come as no surprise that Jews were said to be especially prone or, as one contemporary observer put it, were “notorious sufferers” of nervous or functional disorders.

The argument that one simultaneously could be a Jew and a Christian Scientist was repeatedly used both by Christian Scientist missionary activists and by Jews attracted to Eddy’s teachings. In fact, however, as Rabbi Max Heller, spiritual leader of Temple Sinai in New Orleans and president of the Reform movement’s Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) from 1909 to 1911, noted, one could not justifiably claim to be a Jew and a Christian Scientist since membership in the church required that one formally abjure membership from any denomination or religious group to which he or she previously had belonged. Jews had to produce a certificate of dismissal from their former rabbis before they could join Christian Science. Yet many Jews continued to perpetuate this argument perhaps in order to justify their actions to themselves and to their families. While undoubtedly the initial attraction of hundreds if not thousands of Jews to Christian Science was physical, what Christian Science offered was spiritual sustenance, only part of which was relief from apparent physical pain. Many Jews who first went to Christian Science in order to be healed stayed in it long after the symptoms of the illness from which they had been suffering had disappeared. Their reason for
initially going to Christian Science may have been physical, but their reasons for actually joining the church were spiritual in nature.  

The Growth of Christian Science in the South

Although Christian Science began in the North, Christian Science groups were created in the South only seven years after the establishment of the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston, in 1879. According to Carolyn Cobb, in 1886 Julia Bartlett, a follower of Mary Baker Eddy, moved from Boston to Atlanta and began a class in the teachings of Christian Science. Among those to whom she offered spiritual aid was Sue Harper Mims, who soon after organized a regular Christian Science meeting in her home. Wealthy, sophisticated, and cultured, Mims and her husband, Major Livingston Mims (who, in 1901, was elected the city’s mayor) numbered among Atlanta’s leading citizens. Sue Mims later became known throughout the South, and eventually throughout the United States as a Christian Science teacher, practitioner, lecturer, and founder of Atlanta’s First Church of Christ, Scientist. In fall 1898, ground was broken for the establishment of a church that soon attracted two hundred members and claimed the interest of many more. Construction of a larger building was completed in 1914.  

According to a lengthy article in its local newspaper, the Times-Picayune, New Orleans was the first city in Louisiana to establish a Church of Christ, Scientist. Gaining its charter in 1895, the church included as members those who had begun to meet in informal groups or clusters as early as 1887, the year in which a copy of Eddy’s Science and Health apparently was first brought to New Orleans. Members of the group both studied Eddy’s work and practiced its teaching. By 1930, numerous Christian Science churches and societies had come into existence throughout Louisiana, with small but active membership lists of men and women.  Newspaper articles, diaries, and references in the Christian Science Journal indicate that churches were also established in various cities in North Carolina, South Carolina, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Alabama. Here, as elsewhere, one was able to learn
about Christian Science by attending services or lectures, talking to a local practitioner, and reading *Science and Health*.

**Rabbinc Responses**

Jewish reaction to the increasing numbers of Jews who were attracted to Christian Science ranged from indifference to hostility. For the most part, Orthodox rabbis met the defection of Jews to Christian Science with silence, perhaps reasoning that this was no worse than the “defection” of Orthodox Jews to secularism and/or Reform. While Conservative leaders maintained a similar stance, some, like Mordecai Kaplan, voiced concern over the implications of this defection. Reactions from Reform rabbis were both more sustained and more vociferous. By the end of the nineteenth century, leading Reform rabbis like Isaac Mayer Wise had begun to denounce Christian Science as charlatanry. “It is almost incredible,” he wrote, “that Jews who regard themselves as of more than average intelligence should have recourse to Christian Science,” a religion of “pure quackery” that is “rapidly assuming the proportions of an epidemic delusion.” References to Christian Science by other Reform rabbis were similarly hostile. While acknowledging that Christian Science seemed to be meeting a spiritual need that some Jews felt they could not find in Judaism, many shared Max Heller’s feelings of pity and scorn for those Jews who had taken up Christian Science “with avidity, out of love for the bluish-gray haze of unintelligible twaddle which [their] female savior has managed to spin around the simplest utterances.” Though Heller’s contempt may well have been genuine, it was in all probability motivated by the fact that Heller, like other early twentieth-century Reform rabbis, perceived Christian Science as a threat not only to the American Jewish community in general but also, and more directly, to the Reform movement itself.

There were several reasons for this latter fear. First, many believed that while Orthodoxy was primarily losing adherents to Reform, Reform was losing adherents either to agnosticism or Christian Science. Thus, Jewish attraction to Christian Science directly threatened Reform Judaism, robbing it of real or potential
members. Second, since Reform prided itself on being the Judaism of the future, many Reform rabbis, if not the CCAR as a whole, came to believe that it was the responsibility of the Reform movement to meet the challenge posed by Christian Science. Indeed, many felt that only Reform could provide a solution since it alone was capable of revitalizing American Jewry’s spiritual life. And last, many in the Reform movement recognized that Jewish defection to Christian Science gave credence to a charge leveled at Reform throughout the early decades of the twentieth century, namely, that Reform Judaism was in trouble, beset by difficulties, shortcomings, and disintegrating influences that it could not overcome. The defection to Christian Science could be and was seen as a visible sign of Reform’s spiritual stagnation.

By 1912, the CCAR passed a resolution maintaining that “Jewish adherence to Christian Science implies abjuration of Judaism.” Any Jew subscribing to Christian Science teachings, it continued, would henceforth be regarded “as a non-Jew in faith.”10 Six years later the CCAR’s Responsa Committee, chaired by Kaufmann Kohler, declared that “no rabbi ought to officiate” at funerals of Jews who had become Christian Scientists and who were to be buried in Christian cemeteries. Henceforth, a number of Reform rabbis searched for ways in which more concrete action might be taken. One idea supported by the majority of CCAR members was to revitalize Reform Judaism by reemphasizing its notion of the Jewish mission, a concept embedded in the ideology of nineteenth-century Classical Reform. This mission, as understood by Reform Judaism, was to bear witness to the reality of God and to spread God’s moral teachings to all of humanity. It was the belief of many that if this concept could be communicated to American Jews, and its importance underscored, Christian Science would seem less attractive because Jews would discover within Judaism itself the opportunity to develop their spiritual nature and realize that personal happiness, health, and peace of mind were not in and of themselves sufficient.11

Although many Reform rabbis viewed the promulgation of the Jewish mission idea as a means of successfully combating the inroads that Christian Science had made within the American
Jewish community, a handful proposed a more far reaching solution. It was their belief that the influence of Christian Science could best be checked both by promulgating the idea of a Jewish mission and by creating a new counter-vision of happiness and health set within a specifically Jewish context. The first to advocate this solution was a southern rabbi named Alfred Geiger Moses (1878–1956.) To underscore both the Jewish and scientific nature of his vision and to gain the attention of those attracted to the ideas of Mary Baker Eddy, he identified his teachings as Jewish Science.

Spiritual leader of a Reform temple in Mobile, Alabama, Alfred Moses first articulated his views in a slim volume published in 1916, titled *Jewish Science: Divine Healing in Judaism*. Its aim, he stated, was to create a spiritual renaissance within the American Jewish community by restoring to the modern Jew “the art of genuine prayer.” He believed that such a renaissance would serve the dual purposes of awakening religiously apathetic Jews to Judaism’s spiritual possibilities and help stem the growing tide of Jews who claimed adherence to the teachings of Christian Science. Before turning to his ideas, the background will be established.

*Mobile’s Congregation Sha’arai Shomayim, Alfred Moses, and the Promulgation of Jewish Science*

Jews settled in Mobile as early as 1724, although it wasn’t until 1841 that the newly established Sha’arai Shomayim U-Maskil El Dol [Congregation of the Gates of Heaven and Society of the Friends of the Needy] purchased its first burial ground. Three years later, Sha’arai Shomayim formally incorporated as a congregation. By the mid 1840s, membership had grown sufficiently to warrant hiring a rabbi and holding services in the Turner Verein Hall on St. Emanuel Street, which was formally dedicated as a synagogue in December, 1846. Several years later, the growing and prosperous congregation dedicated its new synagogue on Jackson Street, where it remained for over fifty years. During Alfred Geiger Moses’ tenure as rabbi (1901–1940), the congregation erected a larger, architecturally impressive synagogue on
Rabbi Alfred Geiger Moses.

He began serving Sha’arai Shomayim in 1901, the year he was ordained by the Hebrew Union College.

(Courtesy, Sha’arai Shomayim Archives, Mobile, Alabama.)
Government Street, where it remained through the early 1950s. Subsequently, a temple was built on the more suburban Spring Hill Avenue, where the congregation worships today.

By 1855, there were approximately 250 Jews in Mobile. According to temple records, just over one hundred belonged to Sha’arai Shomayim, while a significantly smaller number belonged to a second congregation formed as a result of inner dissension among Sha’arai Shomayim members. By 1905, Sha’arai Shomayim, still Mobile’s largest Jewish congregation, boasted a membership of six hundred. Yet, out of a general population of approximately fifty thousand, the Jewish community remained relatively small.

Alfred Geiger Moses was born on September 23, 1878, to Rabbi Adolph and Emma Isaacs Moses. Adolph Moses (1840–1902) came from a rabbinical family in Poland and received a yeshiva education before attending the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau, headed by Rabbi Zacharias Frankel, a proponent of moderate religious reform. In Germany he subsequently came under the influence of the more religiously liberal Rabbi Abraham Geiger, the major philosophical spokesperson of the Reform movement, and the man after whom he later named his son. Adolph Moses arrived in the United States in 1870 and briefly served a congregation in Montgomery, Alabama, before becoming rabbi of Sha’arai Shomayim in Mobile (1871–1881). After his sojourn in Alabama, he completed his career at Congregation Adath Israel in Louisville, Kentucky (1882–1902). Identifying with the more radical wing of American Reform Judaism, he placed great emphasis on the universal nature of Judaism and, more generally, of all true religion. In fall 1885, he was one of the fifteen rabbis who met in Pittsburgh to deliberate and adopt the platform that became the ideological foundation of Reform Judaism for the next fifty years. In fact, it was he who enthusiastically moved for the adoption of this “able and wonderfully liberal document” that would later have a deep influence on the religious thought of many Reform rabbis including his son.

Alfred Geiger Moses received his early education in Louisville. He then attended the University of Cincinnati, earning a
Bachelor of Arts in 1900, and Hebrew Union College, from which he received rabbinic ordination in 1901. That same year he moved to Mobile, serving as rabbi of Sha’arai Shomayim until 1940, and as rabbi emeritus from 1940 to 1946. In June 1915, he married Birdie Feld of Vicksburg, Mississippi. The couple had one child, Shirley. A noted teacher, orator, scholar, and writer, Alfred Geiger published several historical monographs including a history of the Jews of Mobile in addition to his two books on Jewish Science. According to temple records, he also spoke at “hundreds of service club and other meetings, and gave many Jewish Chautauqua-sponsored lectures throughout the area.”

It is conceivable, but unlikely, that Alfred Moses’ interest in the formulation of Jewish Science stemmed from the drift of Jews to Christian Science within his own community. While a Christian Science group apparently was formed in Mobile as early as 1897, becoming incorporated in July 1902, its membership remained small. Several Jews eventually joined despite Moses’ claim that not a single Jew in his community had done so. However, there is no indication either in the Mobile Register or in the congregational records of Sha’arai Shomayim that Christian Science ever posed a threat to the Mobile Jewish community. Although the reasons remain unclear, Christian Science seems to have had relatively limited appeal among the Jewish and non-Jewish population of Mobile. Jews looking for social advancement through church affiliation, for example, were more likely to join the local Methodist, Episcopal, or Baptist churches than to become affiliated with Christian Science. Moreover, most Mobile Jews probably recognized that such social conversions were unnecessary. In the early twentieth century, the Jews of Mobile enjoyed extremely cordial relations with their non-Jewish neighbors. For the most part, they were socially accepted even by the local elite and their religious differences viewed with tolerance if not respect. Leon Schwarz, president of Sha’arai Shomayim from 1932 to 1934 and at one time county sheriff and mayor of Mobile, maintained that most Jews living in Mobile during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries felt, as did his father, that they had come to live among their gentile neighbors and to be one with
them, sharing all of their troubles and differing in religious faith alone.\(^{22}\)

Some Jews apparently did join Christian Science for physical and/or spiritual reasons. Yet the vast majority of Mobile Jewry either identified as Reform, affiliating with Sha’arai Shomayim, or saw themselves as religiously indifferent. Indeed, minutes of meetings of Sha’arai Shomayim’s board of trustees during this period reveal great concern over the number of Jews who remained religiously unaffiliated, a number reaching as high as two thirds of the local Jewish population. Sermons delivered by Alfred Moses during the first two decades of the twentieth century repeatedly stressed the importance of “spiritual Judaism” freed of ceremonial laws yet existing “for the glorification of God in acts of humanity, kindness, charity and intellectual growth.”\(^{23}\) Explicitly invoking the concept of religious mission, Moses urged his congregants to bear witness to the living faith of their ancestors and to transform that faith into action, making their congregation the “pride of every Jew of Mobile,” one which might encourage both the affiliated and the unaffiliated Jew to consecrate themselves to God.

Although Alfred Moses’ desire to create a Jewish spiritual renaissance may have been stimulated in part by the religious apathy that he observed in Mobile, his formulation of Jewish Science as a direct counterattack against Christian Science should be seen within a broader context. As a Reform rabbi and a member of the CCAR, Moses was well aware of the Reform rabbinate’s increasing concern over the growing number of Jews who were joining Christian Science. Explicitly referring to the CCAR’s recent consideration of this problem, Moses maintained in the 1916 edition of *Jewish Science* that his work was intended to be a spiritual weapon by which Christian Science might be fought by the Reform rabbinate as a whole. Like Reform rabbis Morris Lichtenstein and Clifton Harby Levy, who, in the early 1920s, helped organize and assumed leadership of Jewish Science groups in New York,\(^{24}\) Alfred Geiger Moses viewed Jewish Science as both a critique of American Reform Judaism and as a solution to that which he perceived to be Reform’s own limitations.
In the 1916 edition of his work, Moses made this critique of Reform clear. Referring to the “considerable heart-searching” of members of the Reform rabbinate and others in attempting to find ways of combating the influence of Christian Science within the Jewish community, Moses asserted that the only solution was “to educate the growing generation in the true Jewish doctrine, and to teach not only the abstract, but the practical [italics in original] value of faith.” To him, Jewish Science met both of these demands and, as such, offered the spiritual means “by which Christian Science [might] be fought from the Jewish standpoint.”

The “true Jewish doctrine,” as Moses understood it, rested on the teachings of Classical Reform as embodied in the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885. Equating Judaism with ethical monotheism, Moses, like the platform’s authors, viewed Judaism as a religion based on faith in God and on the efficacy of prayer. Denying that modern Jews were members of a separate Jewish nation, he maintained that the quintessence of Judaism could be found in the Ten Commandments whose teachings, combined with those of the prophets, underscored universal truths that could be apprehended by all people.

Like many other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Reformers, Moses spoke of the “God-idea” rather than of a supernatural, transcendent deity. Indeed, the God-idea was central to his understanding of Jewish Science as a science or wisdom that was Jewish in origin and that revealed the reality of divine healing as unfolded throughout the history and literature of the Jewish people. For him the Jewish scriptures, embodying the “supreme expression of the God-idea,” contained the first and original message or principle of divine healing. This principle, reiterated in liturgy and in other Jewish writings, rested on the power of faith to cure sickness and to assist the individual in achieving perfect health. Recognizing that faith in a benevolent God was in many ways a projection of the believer, Moses equated faith with the power of autosuggestion. Although to the mind of the believer, it is God alone who is the source of all healing; in fact, healing occurs because the human mind “has the unique or peculiar function of being able to suggest to itself ideas which work
themselves out in the sub-conscious self.” Without denying the benefits of medical science, Moses staunchly maintained that all strong suggestions help in the healing process. The good physician realizes this truth, and it is a trite saying that “Confidence in the physician is half the battle of the patient.” The sick man who has faith in his doctor already helps himself. At some stage of his treatment, the invalid must receive in addition to drugs or surgical relief powerful suggestions that intensify and strengthen his hope of recovery.26

For Moses, the power of faith lay in its emotional and driving force based on the absolute conviction of the individual that his or her beliefs were true. Divine healing, in other words, did not depend on the truth of the individual’s beliefs (although they indeed might be true) but on the intensity with which they were held. For Moses, then, the ultimate value of the God-idea rested on its “moral motive-power” which, as a power of goodness, was a source of health, exerting great influence over mind and body.

Moses incorporated his understanding of the God-idea and its moral motive-power into his broader understanding of the Jewish mission. To bear witness to God, he maintained, was to rely on divine providence, to have faith in the reality of God and of God’s healing power. Thus, he concluded, Jews, as God’s chosen people constantly proclaiming their divine mission, “should be the last to discourage the use of those spiritual agencies that help the body as well as the mind and heart.”27 His implicit criticism here may well have been against those Reform rabbis who stressed the importance of the Jewish mission without emphasizing its practical implications. Indeed, in 1919 he made this criticism more explicit in his response to Kaufmann Kohler’s CCAR address on the mission of Israel. While acknowledging that he shared Kohler’s belief in the centrality of the mission idea, he criticized Kohler for omitting any pragmatic suggestions as to how this idea might best be implemented. Opening his remarks with a reference to his father, Rabbi Adolph Moses, he stated:

My father, who stood with Isaac M. Wise in the working out of his life’s dream, detached the messianic idea from the historic side and followed it as a pragmatic question. He believed the
Adolph Moses (1840–1902) preceded his son as rabbi of Sha’arai Shomayim in Mobile. (Courtesy, the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.)
philosophy of Judaism based upon its past was capable [of be-
ing] and should be unfolded to the gentile world. He died disillusionsed. But I believe the methods of the churches are wor-thy of copy and emulation. Let us not waste our efforts on dis-cussion only. Let us try to do something definite, something that will stimulate thought—something that will bring results.28

Evidently, Alfred Moses envisioned Jewish Science as a pragmatic means of implementing the Jewish mission as he and many of his contemporary Reform rabbis understood it. Empha-sizing that his intent was not to start a new religious movement but simply to demonstrate that the teachings of Jewish Science were identical to those of Reform Judaism itself, he conjectured that Reform had previously de-emphasized or ignored divine healing because it had exalted reason and logic, while minimizing emotion and sentiment. Without these, modern Jews had lost their “prayerful sense.” Thus they were ignorant of prayer’s efficacy and power. His intent was to restore the art of prayer and its in-fluence on every day life by emphasizing the importance of emotion in stimulating divine worship. In so doing, he hoped to make Judaism “a living reality and an ever-present help” by fill-ing its synagogues once again with genuine believers.

It is no coincidence that in responding to Kaufmann Kohler’s CCAR address on the Jewish mission, Alfred Moses invoked the memory and life’s work of his father. Equating Judaism with ethi-cal monotheism, Adolph Moses continually emphasized Israel’s mission of bearing witness to God’s reality and of spreading God’s moral teachings to the rest of the world. In order to under-score his conviction that Judaism was a universal faith and not a tribal or national religion, he adopted the term Yahvism in place of Judaism. It was his hope that this term, by emphasizing faith in the biblical God as the universal creator, king, lawgiver, and sav-ior, would attract non-Jews and, at the same time, lead to the departure from the religion of those Jews who were Jews in name only. Consequently, he believed Yahvism would succeed where Reform Judaism had failed. Although Reform spoke of a universal messianic age of brotherhood and peace in which all would ac-knowledge the reality of the one true God, its retention of such
“tribal” concepts as that of the chosen people, and its tacit acceptance of nonreligious men and women as Reform Jews limited Reform’s effectiveness in bringing this messianic age to fruition. In contrast, Judaism as Yahvism would represent a new “Church of Humanity,” grounded in the universal vision of the biblical prophets and based on the mutual respect, union, and universal love of those who had formerly identified themselves either as Christians or Jews.  

Although his own future vision of Judaism was less universal than his father’s, Alfred Moses, too, was committed to seeking a way in which the Jewish mission, as understood by Reform Judaism, might best be fulfilled. His hope was that Jewish Science, by bringing about a Jewish spiritual rebirth, would result in greater dedication to the Jewish mission and, more broadly, to a greater belief in the efficacy of prayer. As Rabbi Emil Leipziger later noted, being the son of Adolph Moses, “one of the Gedolim of the unfolding history of Reform Judaism,” greatly affected Alfred Moses throughout his career and served as a “constant challenge to his own abilities and ideals.”  

Alfred Moses’ concern for the spiritual vitality of Judaism and his efforts to preserve this vitality may have been one that he not only shared with his father but learned from him. Thus, Jewish Science, as originally presented in 1916 and revised in 1920, may have reflected Alfred Moses’ desire to continue the spiritual work that his father had initiated.

Alfred Moses’ focus on God as healer and Judaism as a source of happiness and health also possibly stemmed from physical and mental health problems that plagued him for much of his adulthood. As early as March 1903, less than a year and a half after assuming the pulpit of Sha’arai Shomayim, Moses (then twenty-five years of age) asked the board of trustees to be temporarily relieved of his duties and granted an extended vacation for health reasons. Acting on the recommendation of Moses’ physician that such a vacation be granted, the board approved the request. Although it is unclear how long this vacation lasted, it was not until March 1904 that the board recommended to the congregation that Moses be given a three-year contract. This suggests that Alfred Moses’ vacation may have been as long as a year in
duration. While the board records make no further mention of his health, there apparently were intervals when his mental life “became clouded by emotional confusion,” and by 1940 he resigned as rabbi of Sha’arai Shomayim. According to Sam Brown, a past president of Sha’arai Shomayim who later visited Alfred Moses in the state mental institution where he died in 1956, Moses’ mental illness progressed slowly, extending over a number of years, and eventually led to total mental incompetence. It may well have been, then, that Alfred Moses’ interest in spiritual healing was primarily personal in nature, stemming from his earlier physical problems and perhaps, although this is not documented, from the fear that he was beginning to suffer, or was prone to suffer, from mental illness.

Moses maintained that he first became interested in divine healing in 1914. A couple in Mobile whose one-year-old daughter had become very ill called him and asked him to perform a change of name ceremony for their child. Never having heard of this ceremony, Moses was told by them that it was a Jewish ritual that invoked God’s help as healer. The person performing the ritual was to pray to God as the restorer of health and then to change the name of the individual in need of divine assistance. While skeptical, Moses agreed to perform the ritual and, much to his surprise, the child improved almost immediately, even though the child’s physicians maintained that recovery was hopeless. Although Moses subsequently learned of other instances in which the same ritual was performed resulting in both success and failure, the recoveries that did occur conclusively proved to him that Jewish Science, or the wisdom of divine healing, “had its effect” and therefore, he concluded, should “recommend itself to all zealous Jews.”

Moses devoted a major part of his work to refuting the claims of Christian Science, contrasting them to those of Jewish Science and revealing the anti-Jewish bias of Mary Baker Eddy’s work. As friends and critics later pointed out, it was this latter aspect of his book that was most valuable both to those Jews who were attracted to Christian Science but uncomfortable about joining the church and to those searching for specific Jewish arguments
against Eddy’s teachings. Moses discussed at length Eddy’s explicitly Christian understanding of faith. Among that which he discussed was her belief in Jesus as the messiah, her exaltation of Christian Science’s pure and spiritual understanding of the Godhead versus Judaism’s more materialistic conception, and her celebration of Jesus’ life as proving that God is love, in contrast to Jewish theology which gives “no hint of the unchanging love of God.” Citing specific pages from Science and Health, he attempted to prove that Eddy’s anti-Jewish bias was so great that no “self-respecting Jew” could possibly accept a religion containing so many “false and unfounded statements regarding Judaism.”

Moreover, Alfred Moses was convinced that Jews did not have to become Christian Scientists in order to discover the healing power of prayer because Christian Science offered “nothing new to the Jewish Mind. It is simply Judaism, veneered with Christology or the belief in the divinity of Jesus.” To prove this thesis he sought to reveal the biblical basis of Eddy’s belief in God as healer, citing passages from every part of the Hebrew scriptures that attest to God’s healing power. Unlike Morris Lichtenstein and Clifton Harby Levy, Alfred Moses did not focus on Psalms and Proverbs, although he cited several. Rather, by also quoting from the first five books of the Bible, I and II Kings, Samuel, and numerous books of the prophets, he attempted to underscore the pervasiveness of this theme throughout Scripture and, by quoting from the daily prayer book, throughout later Jewish literature as well.

He also described specific historical expressions of this belief in God. Focusing most fully, although selectively, on eighteenth-century Hasidism, he maintained that Hasidism as envisioned by its founder, the Baal Shem Tov, was an early expression of Jewish Science, “inspired by a sincere and genuine effort to afford a living faith, and to improve the individual in conduct and character.” Recognizing that true religion did not lie in Talmudic learning but in the love of God, Hasidism, he continued, aimed to change the believer rather than the ceremonies and dogmas of traditional Jewish life. Thus, “by suggestion, it created a new type of religious man, who placed emotion above ritual, and religious excitement above knowledge.” Moses omitted mention of
Hasidism in the second edition of his work after Rabbi Max Heller, whom he greatly respected, convinced him that his characterization of Hasidism as an historical expression of Jewish Science was unfounded. As Heller pointed out, Hasidism was not a protest against legalism, as Moses had claimed. Nor could one equate the Hasidic reliance on divine providence with simple faith healing.38

There are no extant records attesting to the financial success or failure of Moses’ work or to how many copies were printed. By 1919, however, in responding to men and women interested in purchasing the book and to rabbis congratulating him on the important task that he had undertaken, Alfred Moses maintained that all printed copies of Jewish Science had been sold. He planned to publish a second edition, yet decided to substantially revise his work before doing so, in part, in response to such critics as Heller. However, his decision to substantially change the content of his work also reflected his newfound interest in applied psychology and in the broadly-based Protestant alliance known as New Thought, thanks to readers of Jewish Science who brought both to his attention. Consequently, the greatly expanded and largely rewritten second edition, published in 1920, devoted less attention to the broader historical and religious Jewish context out of which Jewish Science emerged. It instead attempted to create an “applied psychology of Judaism,” equating that which Moses previously identified as divine healing with the power of autosuggestion.

Unlike the earlier edition, in which he argued that Jews need not abandon Judaism for Christian Science because its major teachings were Jewish in origin, he now argued that Christian Science’s fundamental beliefs were in fact antithetical to what Jews and, for that matter, most Christians believed. Revealing a better understanding of Christian Science than he had in the 1916 edition, in which he simply equated Christian Science with belief in God as healer, Moses now focused on Eddy’s denial of matter, including her denial of the body’s organs and functions. Asserting that the body was real, just as sickness was real to the sufferer, he maintained that the sufferer “may dissolve the abnormal state by suggestion and spiritual realization, but must recognize the
temporary reality of his or her malady, in order to understand and deal with it.”39 Insisting that Christian Science was a false conception, unsupported by reasoning, logic, “or any modern system of idealistic thought,” he faulted Mary Baker Eddy for not recognizing that healing and, indeed, all mental ends could be attained without denying either the body or the reality of nature. Thus, he concluded, Jews must reject Eddy’s teachings, for “all philosophies that minimize or deny the sensuous are rejected by the practical genius of Israel,” whose scriptures in no way share the “strange, mystical claim of Christian Science that ‘mind being all, matter is nothing.’”40

In voicing these beliefs, Moses revealed the growing influence on him of the so-called “new psychology.” He did not identify specific psychologists or schools of thought to whom he was indebted. Yet, as he understood it, the central feature of the new and applied Psychology is the rediscovery of the truth that man has in himself the power to create health, happiness and success, by direction of the Sub-conscious mind and by conscious relation with the Super-mind of God.41

Affirming the reality of the material world, Moses maintained that Jewish Science, unlike Christian Science, recognized the “psychological truth” that individuals possess the mental power to modify and mold the material elements of creation. Viewing the body as an extension of the mind, Moses labeled disease, a dis-ease, i.e., a “lack of ease or harmony” that can be overcome by directing the conscious, reasoning self to the sub-conscious mind, the agency that converts thought into action. Thus to him the subconscious mind directs the breathing, blood circulation, “the creation of lymph, secretions, depositions, in fact, every iota of bodily functions.” While medicine may prove beneficial, its efficacy depends on the extent to which it succeeds in assisting the subconscious mind by “removing certain obstructions that impede its free flow.” Yet, Moses continued, it is ultimately neither the conscious nor the subconscious mind but the super-conscious mind or God that is responsible for healing. It is this force, he argued, that impels the conscious self to direct the subconscious mind into developing those habits,
methods, and “moral ways” that insure creativity and accomplishment.42

Between 1917 and 1920, Moses corresponded with several Jews who regularly attended New Thought lectures and were inspired by the messages they contained. Enthusiastic about the possibility of harmonizing Jewish and New Thought teachings, they encouraged him to learn more about New Thought and possibly to consider forming a group of his own.43 During the summer of 1919, while in New York City, Moses studied both the methods and the teachings of New Thought and Christian Science. Among the New Thought leaders to whom he was particularly drawn were Harry Gaze, minister of the First Church of Life and Joy, and Eugene Del Mar, a founder and leader of New York’s League of the Higher Life. Moses attended their lectures and classes, met with them privately, and discussed with them at length his own desire to religiously revitalize the American Jewish community. Later, Moses thanked Gaze, Del Mar, and other New Thought leaders whom he had met for helping broaden his concept of Jewish Science from that which dealt with negative states of being such as sin, sickness, and poverty to that which also included the positive act “of assisting in the creation of the normal and God-given states of consciousness, as strengthen character, holiness, power, poise etc. by means of the understanding and application of certain Jewish standards.”44

By 1920, Alfred Moses began to speak of God or, as he more frequently wrote, of the God-consciousness as a divine mind existing within the soul. In content, this description of God did not substantially differ from the non-supernatural concept of divinity, Classical Reform’s God-idea that he wrote about in 1916. However, the terminology that he now used, as well as his recommended healing techniques, revealed the influence of New Thought. Like Mary Baker Eddy, New Thought preachers advocated religious psychotherapy. Yet not all believed that matter was not real. Perhaps following the lead of the late nineteenth-century healer, popular writer, and New Thought pioneer, Warren Felt Evans (1817–1889), many viewed medical science to be “an auxiliary to the mental system of cure”45 and thus did not
refuse, and, indeed at times, welcomed medical treatment. Like Eddy, however, they emphasized the power of the mind, employing techniques such as silence, affirmation, visualization, and denial to bring about divine healing.

Acknowledging their indebtedness to Ralph Waldo Emerson and other nineteenth-century Transcendentalists who spoke of the world as the product of a mind that is active everywhere, practitioners of New Thought placed special emphasis on ways in which one could become receptive and responsive to the activity of the divine mind within each person. Like Emerson, they believed in beginning with a posture of silence, because, as Emerson wrote, “real power is in silent moments.” It is then that we become most aware of our own internal power. Leaders of New Thought, again like Emerson, maintained that self-perfection, which Emerson identified as self-reliance, was similarly attainable through silence. Echoing Emerson’s sense of optimism, they insisted that self-perfection was not a privilege but an absolute duty, attainable once we recognize “through the channel of our minds” that the “Infinite Divine life force” and our own life force are one and the same. Many within New Thought, including the prolific popular writer Ralph Waldo Trine, identified this divine force as Christ. Consequently, each maintained, as Trine often did, quoting Emerson, that he or she believed in the “still, small voice, and that voice is the Christ within me.”

Sharing this belief in the importance of silence was Ernest Shurtleff Holmes (1887–1960), who began publishing books on what he called Mental Science in 1919, and later founded and led what became the Church of Religious Science. In his writings, Holmes frequently pointed to the biblical proverb “As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he,” a proverb which, according to Alfred Moses, crystallized Jewish Science. This verse, Holmes later maintained, reveals the truth that what we are and what we become depends on what we are thinking. This is so, he continued, because the infinite mind that surrounds us reacts to our thoughts and to our mental state, rather than to our words. Mind, in other words, reacts to mind, and thus, according to Holmes and others more closely identified with New Thought, it is through
contemplative silence that one is best able to stir the divine mind within us into action.49

Without explicitly acknowledging his indebtedness to New Thought, although elsewhere in the book he quoted Emerson, Moses devoted an entire chapter of his revised *Jewish Science* to that which he identified as “the Silence.” “Silence,” he wrote,

is the divine manner of manifestation. God reveals Himself to the listening ear of faith in complete stillness. In Silence, we find God and commune with the Spirit of all flesh. Be still and in the holy awe know that God exists. To know God means to cast off the coils of sensuous life and to enter the realm of spiritual thought. Casting off the bonds of mortal mind, we enter the Silence of the inner soul and dwell on the thought of the Infinite and Eternal.50

To Moses, the power of silence lay in its ability to strip away all distractions, leading people to focus their thoughts on God. He therefore advised his readers to school themselves in the practice of silence so that they could enter into “the Silence at any time or place,” finding moments within one’s everyday life to enter into the state of spiritual quietude.

Although his description of silence as both a spiritual state and a mental technique may have been borrowed from New Thought, Moses’ understanding of why such a state was important unmistakably bore the imprint of Classical Reform Judaism. When Moses discussed the importance of recognizing the God-consciousness within, his emphasis was not on the realization of one’s own internal power, as it was for members of New Thought. Rather, his emphasis was on the importance of becoming aware of God’s presence, or, echoing Reform’s concept of mission, on bearing witness to the reality of God. The identification of the divine with one’s conscience, the “still, small voice” within us, was a belief that Alfred Moses shared with many Reform rabbis of his day. Moreover, Moses’ insistence that communion with the divine led one to seek righteousness and truth, since God is not just the source but the law of morality, reflected Moses’ concept of Judaism as ethical monotheism, the heart and soul of Classical Reform.
In describing the power of silence, Moses applied the teachings of Reform Judaism as he understood them to everyday life. In so doing, he found himself indebted to the insights of applied psychology. By controlling the conscious mind through silence, the subconscious self, he maintained, is able to respond to the mental suggestions or demands of the super-conscious mind, or God. Thus, through solitude, one can invigorate one’s spiritual powers, establishing “a direct communion with Divinity” that makes possible the realization of one’s higher aims, particularly the carrying out of God’s moral law. Combining the teachings of Reform Judaism with those of New Thought, Moses included as part of this law the law of self-perfection. Through silence, he asserted, one discovers the God-consciousness within, a belief shared by Reform Jews and advocates of New Thought. This discovery, he continued, brought about by inaction, i.e., meditative silence, leads one to action; that is, to the pursuit of justice and the attainment of happiness and health. Without denying the centrality of God’s moral teachings, Moses thus sought to incorporate within Reform’s ideological understanding of ethical monotheism the more personal goals of health, joy, and inner peace that were espoused by leaders of New Thought and Christian Science.

To achieve these aims, he offered practical suggestions, all of which had already been articulated by New Thought practitioners. First, he proposed finding a quiet place where one could relax completely. He next recommended breathing deeply, letting “the body be in repose so as to render the mind receptive.” Shutting out all external stimuli and suggestions, the individual should then concentrate intensely on an appropriate biblical verse, to be selected from among those offered by Alfred Moses in chapter fourteen, or on thoughts of petition, affirmation, or denial, taken from chapter fifteen of Moses’ book or from any text in which one found a theme of particular spiritual meaning. Moses advised his readers to read this text repeatedly until their minds were filled with its central thought. Photograph that thought, he continued, and try to recall it continuously until you have mastered the art of concentration. Only having done so could one
begin to affirm his or her own beliefs and desires, thanking and praising God for their fulfillment.

Personal affirmation, Moses maintained, was an important method of Jewish Science. Like petition and denial, it might be practiced either through words or through silence. Distinguishing between the great affirmation that God is one (Judaism’s *Shema*) and the lesser affirmations that stress conditions like health, joy, strength, and courage, Moses believed that such affirmations were important in bringing “absolute conviction to the Sub-conscious mind . . . command[ing] it to exercise its imperial power.” He advised his readers to enter the silence with a particular affirmation in mind. One might focus, for example, on a particular biblical verse that expressed in a positive manner an ideal which one desired, be it courage, joy, success, justice, kindness, love, or faith. Thus, if one sought the power to better deal with life’s difficulties, one might enter the silence with the pervading idea, taken from Psalms, that one should “be strong and of good courage.” Hold this idea in your mind, Moses wrote, and say it repeatedly, letting it “flood your being and fill your soul with its dynamic message.” Once the subconscious mind has absorbed the message, retain it as a mental image that one can revitalize, or, in New Thought terminology, visualize, at any time. Think of this message constantly, when awakening, during the day, and before retiring at night. If you do so, he asserted,

by the exact law of God, written in the human spirit, you will find that you have actually incarnated “courage” into your being. You will feel a new interest in your life-tasks, a new enthusiasm for work and ambition. Fear and sensitiveness will be dissolved. You will actually demonstrate power, fearlessness, directness, determination. You will lose your self-consciousness and feel at one with [yourself and with] God.51

To Alfred Moses, the biblical text that best conveyed the reality of human-divine kinship, an idea that both members of New Thought, as Christians, and Reform Jews, as Jews, shared, was the revelation of God’s name to Moses at Sinai as “I AM THAT I AM.” Moses encouraged his readers to say this text repeatedly, dwelling on its all-embracing concept of the Almighty.
As one repeats these words, either out loud or in silence, he or she must remember, Moses wrote, that God, as immanent, is within us and that we, therefore, share in His nature. Thus say to oneself that I am the child of God and therefore “I am well. I am strong. I am happy. I am serene and joyful.” Affirm, in other words, one’s spiritual nature, the realization that ultimately we are one, or, taking the Jewish concept of atonement as at-one-ment, we are at one with God.

For Moses, as for those in New Thought, and, for that matter, in Christian Science, denial was another effective method through which one could affirm his or her true spiritual nature. By denying the reality of fear, worry, anger, and other negative emotions, one was able to free oneself of negative states of being (the disease or dis-ease to which we are prone) and to affirm instead his or her essential oneness with God. “To deny,” Moses wrote, “means first to recognize the wrong reality or condition in order to remove it from the mind,” or, in psychological terms, “to inhibit or dissolve the abnormal state that has been built up by conscious or unconscious cause. It means that we direct the Sub-conscious mind to destroy the undesirable condition.”

Like leaders of New Thought and Mary Baker Eddy, Alfred Moses paradoxically viewed denial as a positive method of healing. By denying the reality of sin, sickness, and sorrow, one is best able, he maintained, to affirm health, joy, and well-being. Once one reveals that evil thoughts are only illusions, the product of imagination or of an unnatural obsession, one is able to dissolve them, replacing them with thoughts that are wholesome and healthy. Moses claimed that to do so through the method of denial is to affirm that God as the source of good, a central focus of both New Thought and Christian Science teachings, is with the individual, because it is this affirmation, Moses insisted, that gives one the strength and courage to overcome those negative ideas that continue to plague one’s temperament or body.

In emphasizing the power of both denial and affirmation in removing that which he identified as abnormal states of being, Moses, like most of those involved in New Thought, did not mean to claim, as Mary Baker Eddy did, that physical suffering was an
illusion. Rather his point, again, like most advocates of New Thought, was that mental suffering is an illusion and that all suffering is abnormal. In discussing the nature of evil, however, Moses seemed to vacillate between New Thought’s denial of its reality and the more Jewish belief that evil exists but one should deny oneself or refrain from doing evil actions. In order to overcome what even Moses recognized as an apparent contradiction in his thinking, he maintained that although God is good, God is also the source of both good and evil. Similarly, while human beings possess good and evil impulses, their inherent goodness enables them to resist evil by denying or shutting out thoughts that lack ethical judgment. Combining New Thought’s understanding of evil as illusion with Reform Jewish emphasis on morality, Moses acknowledged the presence of evil in the world but, at the same time, insisted that such moral evils as violence, sin, and injustice could indeed be overcome through human effort. Harmonizing Jewish Science’s essential vision with that of Classical Reform, New Thought, and Christian Science, Moses thus maintained that

Jewish Science sounds the note of optimism—the principle that, by conscious realization, we can make to-day better than yesterday and each day watch for the rising sun of a grander tomorrow. Optimism is not a sentimental mood but a definite state of mind, arising only from thought and achievement.53

Finally, although he did not discuss it at length, Moses advocated seeking God through the use of petition. A method revealing greater indebtedness to Judaism than to New Thought, Moses continued to maintain that traditional prayers asking God for strength, courage, health, and so on, often were effective means of vitalizing one’s spiritual power. By turning the mind towards God, both private and public devotions could stimulate faith and thus lead one to trust in God (from the Hebrew, emunah) as the source of healing and inspiration. Although he placed greatest emphasis on silence and affirmation, Moses encouraged the use of any method that helped to keep one’s mind on God.

In describing Jewish Science, Moses often maintained that Jewish Science was simply applied Judaism; that is, the application of Jewish teachings to every day life. Although Moses
explicitly identified applied Judaism with applied psychology, his understanding of Judaism did not significantly differ from that of most contemporary Jewish Reformers. Indeed, many within the Reform movement in America and England shared Moses’ belief that only by revealing the practical application of its teachings could Judaism hope to remain a living religion. Viewing the spiritual revitalization of contemporary Jewry as part of their religious mission, many leaders of Classical Reform, including Moses, sought ways in which religiously apathetic Jews could begin to take seriously the concept of bearing witness. What Alfred Moses also attempted to do, primarily through his writings, was
to underscore the belief that bearing witness was a Jewish concept and that therefore one need not turn to other religious faiths in search of the one true God.

In sum, Alfred Moses attempted to harmonize the teachings of Reform Judaism with New Thought and applied psychology, and to some extent, Christian Science, by maintaining that: a) it was the responsibility of every Jew to bear witness to the reality of God and to spread God’s moral teachings throughout the world (Reform’s idea of religious mission), and b) included in these moral teachings were the imperatives to be happy and healthy. Citing the Israelites’ promise at Sinai to hear and do God’s commandments, Moses maintained that the aim of Jewish Science similarly was to hear God’s message of truth and to bring that truth to others. Faith, he contended, was pragmatic, and thus, brought concrete results such as greater joy, life, and harmony, which made faith possible. Put succinctly, Moses both claimed that faith brought one peace of mind and that peace of mind was a precondition of faith. One could only keep one’s mind on God if one were calm, happy, and cheerful, while keeping one’s mind on God helped create these positive mental states. “Faith,” he wrote, “leads to life more abundant, and life, rightly understood, leads to ever-increasing faith.”

For Moses, one could not understand life correctly if one did not acknowledge the importance of mental and physical health. First of all, one could not love God with all of one’s heart, soul, and might, as Deuteronomy enjoins one to do, unless one were healthy, and, in turn, health was in and of itself a visible sign of God’s immanent power. Moses asserted that suffering was rooted in a disregard for God’s laws, leaving one open to weakness and disorder. On the other hand, he claimed, health “is God’s gift to those who recognize and realize His laws of Being.” As in the 1916 edition of his book, Moses drew on numerous Jewish sources to underscore his belief in God as healer. If God is one, he maintained, he must indeed be “the Power that makes for life and well-being.” Faith healing, then, is possible because it recognizes and utilizes this power. In psychological terms, through mental suggestion (i.e., belief in God as healer) the subconscious acts on the
super-conscious to direct the conscious mind towards greater health and perfection, which Moses, in religious terms, identified as the salvation of mind and body. Thus, he insisted, Jewish Science does not deny the benefits of modern medicine, but, like Judaism, maintains that the surgeon himself does not heal. All healing is from God, who acts “through the soul of man.” Identifying God with mind, Moses concluded that mind or thought is more important in the healing process than people imagine. Medicine alone cannot make one well; it is the attitude that one has and the thoughts that he or she thinks, that have greatest affect on one’s mental and physical condition.57

The Influence of Moses’ Work

Moses’ attempt to create an applied psychology of Judaism was to some extent successful. The 1920 edition of his work, more so than the 1916 edition, is difficult to read, due largely to its lack of clear organization and endless repetition of ideas. Yet, the major thesis that Moses presented—that peace of mind leads to faith and vice versa, set within a context that was, at least by the standards of Classical Reform, explicitly Jewish—appealed to at least several hundred, and more probably thousands, of Jewish men and women.58 While the letters of praise found among Moses’ papers, written by fellow rabbis and members of the laity, are insufficient in number to determine the true extent of positive interest in his work, there are several indications that Moses’ concept of Jewish Science received serious attention.

Between 1917 and 1922, Moses received many letters from both traditional and Reform rabbis who praised his work and promised to share his ideas with others. For example, Moses Gast, chief rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews of Great Britain, maintained that he would not fail to bring Moses’ “excellent little book” to the attention of a wider circle of friends,59 while Reform rabbi Emil Leipziger, leader of the Touro Synagogue in New Orleans, wrote that he hoped to organize a group of congregants who would meet with him on a regular basis to discuss the subject of religious psychology in general. “If I succeed,” he
stated, “I shall be glad to have you come over to address them.”⁶⁰ In 1917, Martin A. Meyer, rabbi of Temple Emanuel in San Francisco, asserted that he hoped to get together a group that would discuss the 1916 edition of Moses’ book page by page, and Rabbi Louis Mann of Congregation Mishkan Israel in New Haven, Connecticut, notified Moses that the study circle of the local Council of Jewish Women was to discuss his book at its next meeting.⁶¹ Among the most enthusiastic letters that Moses received were those written by Jews who were attracted to the ideas of New Thought. Many thanked him for offering within a Jewish context that which they previously believed Judaism was unable to offer. They described his book as a “revelation,” satisfying a deep, spiritual hunger.⁶²

During the 1920s, Moses traveled and lectured extensively, sharing his religious ideas in synagogues and auditoriums throughout the United States. Occasionally he participated in conferences that focused on spiritual healing. In addition, he lectured to New Thought groups, emphasizing both the similarities and differences between the teachings of New Thought and Jewish Science. Christians who heard Moses lecture often expressed their appreciation of the work he was trying to accomplish, suggesting books that Moses might find useful in developing his ideas further.⁶³ Of the Jewish men and women who heard Alfred Moses lecture, many were already familiar with his work and came wanting to know more about the ways in which one might incorporate the teachings of Jewish Science into everyday life. Some conceived of ways in which groups might be formed to study and attempt to live by Jewish Science teachings.

Marcel Krauss, for example, after listening to Alfred Moses’ lecture at the Atheneum in New Orleans in early 1920, suggested that Moses form Jewish Science groups in Mobile and New Orleans, adding a promise to provide the necessary finances.⁶⁴ Della H. Bloomstein, a Nashville woman who wrote to Moses on several occasions and apparently was the author of numerous papers on Jewish spiritual healing, expressed the hope that when Moses next came to Nashville she might be able to talk to him about the “possibility of spreading the belief in Jewish Science.”⁶⁵
It is unclear whether Krauss, Bloomstein, or most of the others who expressed interest in forming local Jewish Science groups ever did so. Moses himself apparently decided against forming such groups himself. At least one group, however, was formed as a result of Moses’ work. This group, which formally identified itself as the First Society of Jewish New Thought, was founded in 1920 in New York City by two Jews, Lucia Nola Levy and Bertha Strauss. They had long attended New Thought lectures, read *Jewish Science*, maintained a lengthy correspondence with Moses, met with him in New York, and unsuccessfully tried to convince him to leave Mobile and form a Jewish New Thought group in New York City. When he declined their invitation, they created and led their own group, naming him “Honorary President.” It was a title that he maintained until December 1921, when Reform Rabbi Morris Lichtenstein left a pulpit in Athens, Georgia, to become the society’s permanent leader.66

Although Moses apparently retained a great interest in Jewish Science, participating in both Jewish and New Thought circles in discussions concerning Jewish Science teachings and the benefits of spiritual healing in general, it seems that he never attended any meetings of the society once Lichtenstein became its leader. Indeed, throughout the 1920s, as Jewish “defection” to Christian Science continued, Moses took few concrete steps towards bringing these Jews back to Judaism. Although Jews still read and were inspired by his earlier writings on Jewish Science, Moses himself focused on his daily responsibilities as rabbi of Sha’arai Shomayim.67 At the same time, he continued to fight, what by the 1940s had become a losing battle, against his slowly deteriorating mental health. Ironically, despite his belief that mental illness was an illusion, Moses spent the last years of his life in a mental institution. For over twenty years the teachings of Jewish Science may have helped him cope with his mental problems, but, in the end, struggling to retain his sanity, he found that optimism could not defeat the mental “illusions” from which he suffered.

Despite the interest that Moses’ work generated within the American Jewish community, his disinterest in creating a Jewish Science group, even within his own congregation, limited his
influence on both Reform Judaism and American Jewry as a whole. Yet, the term Jewish Science, which he created, succeeded in attracting the attention of Jews already interested in Christian Science. Believing that it was his duty as a Reform rabbi and a Jew to bring others to an awareness of God’s presence, and unafraid to use the techniques and aims of Christian Science, applied psychology, and New Thought in order to do so, Moses encouraged his readers, as well as those like rabbis Morris Lichtenstein and Clifton Harby Levy, who later developed Jewish Science further, to incorporate within Reform’s ideological understanding of ethical monotheism the more personal goals of health, success, and happiness.
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Synagogue Music for Birmingham, Alabama:
Arthur Foote’s Azi v’Zimrat Yoh

by

John H. Baron

In his autobiography, the celebrated New England composer Arthur Foote (1853–1937), a Unitarian and admirer of Judaism, describes how he came to write a “complete” Sabbath service for Temple Emanu-El, a Reform synagogue in Birmingham.

In the spring of 1900 I had become interested in the musical service of the Jewish Church, as described to me by Benjamin Guckenberger, a friend who had been organist at a synagogue in Birmingham, Alabama. Before beginning, it was, of course, necessary to find out the meaning of the texts and the accentuation of the words, with regard to which some rabbis of my acquaintance were so kind as to enlighten me. The picturesque service is inspiring to a composer, and I grew very keen on the undertaking. While my conscious object was to fit the music to the feeling of the words by the use of a quasi-modal system, I was unconsciously led to a wholly different sort of writing from ever before, because of the words used—an example of the fact that (as a rule) a composer will write different types of music to English, French, or Italian words. The reason is probably that accents and rhythms differ in the different languages. I always associate Gloucester [Massachusetts] with this service, for it was written there. I have heard it a few times at Jewish temples, and I have always been glad of the experience of writing it.¹

Although it is possible that Foote’s piece had its premiere at Temple Emanu-El, no evidence for that has been found. Foote’s key contact, Guckenberger, was appointed temple organist
probably in 1898. At a temple board meeting on August 25, 1899, his position was renewed for the next year to run from September 1 (before the High Holidays) to June 27, 1900 (through Shevuot), and he subsequently received renewals for each of the next two years. On March 16, 1902, Guckenberger informed the board that he was leaving Birmingham on that April fifteenth and was therefore resigning his position. Thus, if Guckenberger personally conducted the premiere of Foote’s service, it would have had to take place between fall 1900 and April 1902. During the period from 1898 to 1904 there is no mention of Foote, his service, or any special choir hired to perform it in the minutes of the temple board meetings that took place several times per month. Likewise, there is no indication of any special payments made to Guckenberger, Foote, or the choir for the service, and none of the documents of the presiding rabbi at the time, Rabbi Morris Newfield, indicate any such performance. Furthermore, the newspapers, which sometimes reported on services and special events at Temple Emanu-El, remained silent about the honor that Foote bestowed on Guckenberger, his choir, the temple, and Birmingham.

Why would a non-Jewish composer of stature living in far-away New England write a service for a small southern synagogue? How does the composition fit into the musical history of Reform Judaism in the South? What does Foote mean by “a quasi modal system” and that he must set the Hebrew differently from the way he would set English, French, or Italian? Why, with such a great honor bestowed on the Birmingham Jewish community, is there no record of a performance there?

*The Historical Position of Music in Reform Services*

Jewish music in Reform synagogues in America and especially in the South circa 1900 often bears little resemblance to the *nusach*, or traditional music of Orthodox synagogues of that time. Whereas Orthodox *nusach* was transplanted from Europe or the Middle East to American Orthodox synagogues, Reform musical practice in the United States grew largely independently from an external Jewish tradition, although some of the Reform
Arthur Foote, circa 1895.
(Boston Public Library/Rare Book
Department – Courtesy of the Trustees.)
European music of Hamburg and that inspired by Salomon Sulzer did cross the Atlantic. Except in some major centers, there were few trained cantors available to Reform congregations in the heartland of America at the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, thanks to the efforts of Isaac Mayer Wise and other Reform rabbis, more and more men were entering the rabbinate and subsequently serving new congregations in small cities, such as Birmingham. The new American rabbi was minister, preacher, teacher, fundraiser, moderator, psychological counselor, sexton, and administrator, roles most of which were totally unfamiliar to the rabbi in Europe. The rabbi often had to decide what music was to be heard during services even though he had no preparation in music and lacked cantorial training. The members of the congregations came from Polish, Russian, German, French, and, sometimes, Sephardic backgrounds. When anyone in the congregation remembered the music from the Old World, it usually conflicted with what other members remembered. There was no unanimity in the musical consciousness of the congregation, and, in many cases, there was little interest in retaining traditional Jewish practice. Gradually the various liturgies these people brought with them blended into the new English-language liturgy encouraged by the new Cincinnati-trained rabbis. Nonetheless, rabbis and congregants alike recognized that they were unprepared to decide on the appropriate music for Jewish worship.

Thus, in the late nineteenth century many Reform congregations and their rabbis depended more on the professional or semi-professional musicians in the community than on cantors to select the repertory for synagogue services. More often than not, the local musicians were Christian. The local church musician could provide singers with pleasant voices and a pianist or an organist to accompany them, and the style of music usually based on Protestant hymns and classical music was exactly what the Jewish congregants found pleasing in their services. If rabbis had become more like Protestant preachers than European rabbis, it was no great leap for the music to emulate Protestant church music rather than traditional chanting and cantorials. Taste and the determination of many Reform Jews to become accepted by the
Rabbi Morris Newfield

(Courtesy, the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.)
dominant Protestant community led them to make their religious services not much different from those of their non-Jewish neighbors.

The organ had become established in many American synagogues beginning with Charleston’s Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim in 1840, although European precedence had already been set. Twenty years later Rabbi Wise gave halachic approval for the organ at Oheb Shalom Congregation of Baltimore. If there were an organ and church-like choirs, then composers had to be found to accommodate the synagogue songs to the performances. In some cases traditional Christian hymns were adapted with new texts to make them acceptable to Jewish theology. To some extent “reform” Jewish music from Europe was adopted. The music of Samuel Naumbourg, Louis Lewandowski, and Sulzer headed the list that also included the Lutheran-like hymns of the Hamburg reformers. But some congregations began to hire musical directors who felt compelled to write their own music specifically for these services. Such was the case of Frederick Kitziger in New Orleans at Touro Synagogue during the last two decades of the nineteenth century and Sigmund Schlesinger in Mobile at Sha’arai Shomayim synagogue from 1870 to 1906. Kitziger was Christian, but he was helped through the liturgy by Rabbi Isaac Leucht, a fellow German, who no doubt coached him through the Hebrew passages, although the service was mostly in German and English. Schlesinger was Jewish, but there was no ostensible difference in style between his music and that of Kitziger. It all sounded like Protestant hymns. When the first Union Hymnal of the Reform movement was published in 1897 under the national leadership of Alois Kaiser (1840–1908), a European-trained cantor, all the hymns were Protestant-like, a practice continued in the editions of 1911 and 1914, and modified only in the 1932 edition.

Thus, for Foote to compose a service when he did was not an unusual phenomenon. Other Christians had written for the synagogue, and the musical forces for which Foote wrote were common to both Protestant and Jewish services of the era. What was unusual was Foote’s stature, which far surpasses that of
Kitziger or Schlesinger, who remain little known beyond scholars of Jewish liturgy, and the quality of Foote’s work.

*The Music Director*

Benjamin Guckenberger (originally Guchenberger), a native of Cincinnati, studied at that city’s famous College of Music. He also studied with George Henschel (1850–1934) of London and with others in Germany. Before coming to Birmingham, he married a soprano, and both he and his wife were instructors at the Cincinnati College of Music. Guckenberger was brought to Birmingham in 1895 to direct the newly-founded Birmingham Conservatory of Music.

He quickly became active in the city, organizing a large choral society and various concerts. He developed an important music festival in 1899 that had two concerts each in 1901 (April 30 and May 1) and in 1902 (April 7 and 8). For these he was extremely fortunate in bringing the famous Theodore Thomas (1835–1905) and the Chicago Symphony as cornerstones of the festival. The programs were varied and always of a high standard. On April 30, 1901, they performed popular European works: part two of Felix Mendelssohn’s *Elijah* with Mrs. Guckenberger (as she was billed, thus her first name apparently lost to history) as a soprano soloist, the *Meistersinger* Overture by Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt’s *Les Preludes*, Edouard Lalo’s *Norwegian Rhapsody*, and violin solos played by Leopold Kramer. The next evening they performed Carl Maria von Weber’s *Euryanthe* Overture, two movements from Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony, Tchaikovsky’s *Theme and Variations* Opus 55, excerpts from Wagner’s *Lohengrin*, cello solos played by Bruno Steindel, scenes from Grieg’s *Olaf*, and, what is significant for our purposes, Beach’s *The Rose of Avontown*. Amy M. Beach (1867–1944), known professionally as Mrs. H. H. A. Beach, was a member of the New England group of composers that included Arthur Foote, one of her closest friends. Thus, Guckenberger, who prepared the Beach piece for the concert, knew the important American composers of that period as well as the European masters, and, because he had personal contact
with Foote, he may also have met Beach on one of his trips to New England.

The following year Guckenberger continued his performances of the works of the European masters interspersed with New Englanders. In addition to Wagner’s *Rienzi* Overture, Cesar Franck’s *Morceau Symphonique* from *Redemption*, Camille Saint-Saëns’ *Introduction and Rondo Capriccioso*, Antonin Dvorak’s *Slavonic Rhapsody* and works by Franz Xaver Scharwenka and Max Bruch on the program of April 7, 1902, Guckenberger and Thomas scheduled Arthur Foote’s *Skeleton in Armor* for chorus and quartet. The following evening, in addition to works by Wagner, Grieg, Delibes, and Weber, Thomas and Guckenberger performed Horatio Parker’s *Hora Novissima*, with Mrs. Guckenberger as soprano soloist. Parker (1863–1919) was another New England composer and close colleague of Foote. Foote had good reason to consider Guckenberger a friend by this time, since Guckenberger clearly admired Foote’s music enough to perform it, although the composition of the service probably predated any arrangements for performance of *Skeleton*. At the end of the program on April 8, 1902, both Benjamin Guckenberger and his wife were honored by the chorus and Birmingham for all their achievements in bettering the musical life of the city during their seven years residence, and received wishes for their success in Massachusetts. Mrs. Guckenberger had already established herself as a singer in New England during the previous winter, and Mr. Guckenberger had conducted a Boston Festival Orchestra as guest, probably in 1900. The couple’s decision to leave Birmingham for New England was several years in the planning, and Mr. Guckenberger perhaps used his tie to Foote as a means to make the move. Since no trace has been found of him after he left Birmingham, however, this can only be conjecture.

*The Temple and the Rabbi*

Temple Emanu-El was founded in 1882 by five Jewish settlers of German and central European background. During the next decade the Jewish population of the city grew considerably along with the city’s economy, and the two were, of course, interrelated.
In 1886 the congregation had eighty-five families, mostly of German background. They had come to Birmingham not only to earn a living but to help build a new city. From 1886 to 1889 Temple Emanu-El constructed its first sanctuary, and the leader of the American Reform rabbinate, Isaac Mayer Wise, laid the cornerstone. Financial problems led to delays, and two rabbis came and departed before its completion. One of the five original settlers, Samuel Ullman (1840–1924?), served as president and kept the congregation alive even when a scandal involving a rabbi caused a temporary split in the congregation. From 1890 to 1894, Ullman served as the unordained rabbi of the congregation, where he remained an important official for the rest of his life. In 1891 Temple Emanu-El officially became a Reform congregation, although it had clearly identified with the Reform movement from its inception in 1882. The first Orthodox Jews from eastern Europe began to arrive in 1882 and formed an Orthodox congregation in 1889.

Frank O’Brien organized Temple Emanu-El’s first choir, “which included members from five different faiths: one Methodist, one Roman Catholic, one Baptist, two Episcopalians, and only one Hebrew.” In this ecumenical fashion the choir followed the typical situation in most Reform congregations of the time, where the choir members were drawn from the pool of professional singers in the community regardless of religion. Professor Fred L. Grambs performed as the first organist. After Guckenberger left in 1902, Grambs, a local band leader, served as choir director at the temple, with Norma Schooler, soprano, Annie B. Altman, alto, Wyatt Heflin, bass, and B. L. Michaelson, tenor. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Corinne Handley and Edna Gockel were the organists. The organ used in the early days of the synagogue seemed too old by 1898, when the president of the congregation, Burghardt Steiner, “recommended that our ladies form themselves into an organization for the purpose of saving money with a view of purchasing a new organ, for the present organ cannot last but a year or so longer, even with the continued expenditure of money for repairs.” Yet the same organ seems to have been repaired in 1900 and no new organ is again mentioned or accounted for in the financial records.
this old organ was probably that which would have been used for any performance of the Foote service. All the choirs and music directors mentioned in the congregation’s records were professional, and all the musicians were paid. A volunteer choir is mentioned only in the rabbi’s letters to the board of the synagogue and, not being paid, there is no financial record of it. This means that the synagogue possessed a professional choir whose members were capable of performing polyphonic art music (complex multi-voice music) at a much higher level than would an amateur congregational choir, and therefore was in a position to perform a musically sophisticated synagogue art work by a composer such as Foote.

Morris Newfield (1869–1940) was born in Homanna, Hungary, the son of a poor Talmudic scholar. After considerable rabbinic schooling in Europe, he came to the United States in 1891 in order to enter Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Newfield was determined to continue in the tradition of his father as a Jewish scholar, but he also hoped to better his economic position. On graduation and ordination in 1895, he was appointed rabbi of Birmingham’s Temple Emanu-El, where he achieved his two aims and remained for the rest of his life. Both Guckenberger and Newfield, coming from Cincinnati, arrived in Birmingham the same fall. The rabbi possibly already knew Guckenberger in Cincinnati, if not personally, at least by reputation, and the brief but significant association of the two in Birmingham may have been a result of that tie.

Newfield’s concern with the music of the service seems to have been mixed. In 1897 he noted that the temple board had established a volunteer choir for Saturday morning services the previous year in the hope that it would boost attendance, and that this plan had already showed signs of working. In 1898 he reported that the volunteer choir under Edna Gussen was inspiring, and the same choir under a “Mrs. Rosenhaim” was “ever effective” during the young people’s service for Yom Kippur. Apparently, the rabbi’s interests were solely with the volunteer choir since he did not mention anything about Guckenberger and the professionals in his annual reports to the temple board. Also,
apparently, attendance at Friday night services was sufficient and the music beyond question, so that he concentrated his energies on building the Saturday service and its music.

A Mrs. Newfield was singing in the volunteer choir in 1898, but what relationship, if any, she had to the rabbi is uncertain, since he was still unmarried in that year. When the rabbi did marry in 1901, he chose as his bride Leah Ullman, Samuel’s daughter. She was a voice student at the Birmingham Conservatory and worked directly with Guckenberger. On June 15, 1899, she sang Beethoven’s *Adelaide* with Guckenberger accompanying at the piano. The following March she sang a complete recital assisted by pianist Edna Gockel. The city was still so small that the few professional musicians who resided in Birmingham inevitably would be ubiquitous, and, with the synagogue providing a number of them with employment, their close circle could be found there as well as at the conservatory.

**Foote’s Musical Service**

Foote set fifteen liturgical portions of the Sabbath service (see examples in the Appendix on pages 56–58). Of these, the first thirteen follow in order the common practice of many Reform congregations in America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. That is, the Friday night services sometimes included portions that traditionally were from the Saturday morning services, because attendance was often poor on Saturdays and rabbis wanted to make sure that Reform Jews would not forget entirely the Saturday liturgy. While in the traditional liturgy the main service was on Saturday morning, in Reform temples the main service was on Friday nights. Many Reform Jews did not observe the Sabbath as a day of rest, because they kept their stores and offices open on Saturday, the key shopping day. Thus, they could attend services only on Friday evenings. In some cases rabbis shifted the Saturday morning services to Sunday morning, but in most cases they took parts of the Saturday service and performed them on Friday evenings. Chief among these transfers was the *Kedushoh*, the Torah reading, with its surrounding pieces, and the
singing of the two most beloved hymns, *En Kelohenu* and *Adon Olam*.

What is striking about the text that Foote set is that twelve of the fifteen portions are in Hebrew. Many Reform congregations at the time had reduced the Hebrew texts to only the *Shema* and used English translations or paraphrases for the rest. Mark Cowett, Rabbi Newfield’s biographer, points out that in Birmingham “90 per cent of the service was conducted in English and the rest in Hebrew.” By 1902 the struggle between English or German texts had been finally resolved by eliminating the German, and the weighing of Hebrew versus English was still heavily in favor of the latter. The Hebrew text usually appeared in the *Union Prayer Book* (first edition 1895) side by side with the English, but, as Cowett observes, the Hebrew was ignored in practice. Thus, Foote’s decision to set Hebrew rather than English is unusual for the time and for Birmingham, a typical assimilationist community with a relatively small Jewish population. The fact that Foote was writing his piece in New England, however, and that his advisers were rabbis of his acquaintance, probably from Boston, may have meant that the rabbis by whom he was influenced did not know the practice in Birmingham; there is no evidence he ever consulted with Newfield.

The transliteration of the Hebrew into Roman letters shows clearly that Foote’s Hebrew consultants were of German background; the *y* sound, for example, is written with the usual German *j* letter, and the *v* sound is written with the usual German *w*. The single English text in Foote’s setting is the passage “May the words” that always follows the Silent Reading; the *Union Prayer Book* includes no Hebrew for it in 1895 or in later editions. Thus, in this case, there would have been no choice but to use English.

Foote states how excited he was to set a language other than French, Italian, or English because he recognized the subtle musical differences each language has when sung. Of particular interest to him were the rhythmic differences between European languages and Hebrew, and he strove to set the text so that the accents and rhythmic flow of the language would determine the
musical rhythm. In nearly every case he was very successful, as in the *Shema* where the setting looks like that in a typical eastern European cantor’s script, i.e., the music is written in three-two meter but flows independently of the musical meter following the non-metrical Hebrew declamation. There is freedom from strict musical meter altogether except when it coincides with the Hebrew accents. This occurs not only in the solo passages, when it is relatively easy for Foote to notate the rhythmic peculiarities of the Hebrew, but also in choral passages where he must also be practical in keeping four different singers together. Only in the final choral passage of *Adon Olom* do the musical accents on “Adoshem” fall on the second, rather than third syllable.28 Despite this slip, Foote is much more sensitive to Hebrew recitation than some of the other non-Jewish composers of the time, such as the widely popular Kitziger in New Orleans, or even than Jewish synagogue composers like Schlesinger, who were so concerned with sounding musically literate that they allowed the bar line to control them, i.e., they forced the rhythm of the spoken Hebrew to be distorted to fit the musical meter (often regularly recurring accentual patterns of trochees, which are feet of two syllables of which the first is long and the second short).29

The difference between Foote’s setting of Hebrew and that of English is clear when we look at *May the Words* and the last two works in his service. The natural rhythmic flow of the English text of *May the Words* (see page 58) fits snugly into a regular three-four musical meter even though the text has a variable flow of accented (longer, shown by the / slash) and unaccented (shorter, shown by the . dot) syllables.

```
. . . / . . . / . . . / . . . .
May the words of my mouth, and the me-[/]ditation of my
/ . . . / . . . . / . . /
heart be acceptable in thy [/] sight, O Lord;
. . / . . / . . /
my strength and my redeemer.
```
First of all, the English text has clear patterns of accented and unaccented syllables that are not characteristic of most Hebrew poetry. Secondly, the two basic patterns in this short text, ( . . / and / . ) are easily transferred to standard western musical patterns within triple musical meter. The two textually irregular patterns (between the [//] signs) suggest to the musician a more rapid declamation by the division of quarter notes into eighth notes, a division that allows the overall triple musical meter to remain constant. Thus, unlike the Hebrew examples, both the English text and its musical setting remain “regular” simultaneously from the standpoints of each system, whereas in the Hebrew setting the “correct” rendition of Hebrew prosody requires an irregular flow of the music.

Since most rabbis kept the Friday night service short, some well-known prayers were recited only once or twice a month instead of every week. Such was the case with the V'Shomru (no. 14) and How Goodly Are Thy Tents (no. 15). In the case of no. 15, Foote states clearly that his rabbinic consultants used this text (probably as the opening psalm to the service) only on the third Friday night of the month. The unwavering musical rhythm (accents falling unrelentingly on the first beat of each measure or the first of each pair of eighth notes) recalls that of the Protestant hymn where strict adherence to an unchanging musical meter fits the English textual rhythm.

Foote’s choice of harmony is inspired. Within the confines of a simple, standard-practice harmonic system that was known to all composers in the nineteenth century, he avoids trite and trivial progressions and spices up passages just enough to make them fresh without jarring the congregants’ sense of standard musical practice. For example, in the Kedushoh (no. 5), which is in D major, he ventures into the unrelated key of B-flat major during the Hal’lujoh (see examples on the following pages). The progression from D major to B minor to B-flat major and back to D major is both simple and elegant, and it offers harmonic variety not usually found in contemporary synagogue choral music.

The musical setting for solo alto, four-voice mixed choir, and organ is normal for the time in Reform synagogues as well as in
"Jimloch Adonoi l'olom" from the Kedushah (no. 5).
From Arthur’s Foote’s Music for the Synagogue.
“Jimloch Adonoi l’olom” (continued).

From Arthur’s Foote’s Music for the Synagogue.
Protestant churches. Most choirs in Reform synagogues included women and men together, and since cantors (exclusively men at this time) were unavailable except in the largest cities (which definitely did not include Birmingham), the solo part would be given to the best singer available. This may have been Leah Newfield or, perhaps, even Mrs. Guckenberger, and Foote may have had this in mind when he composed his service. In any case, the solo part could have been taken by a tenor by transposing it down an octave (as was the case at a Sabbath morning performance of Foote’s service at Temple Sinai in New Orleans in June, 1940).

The organ part is written so that it could be played on the piano, although Foote indicates “manual” or “great” and “pedal” at some points. (“Manual” and “great” are common terms for organists indicating specific keyboards of the organ on which they are to play, while “pedal” indicates to the organist that he or she is to use the foot keyboard.)

What distinguishes Foote’s service from that composed by many of his contemporaries is the sensitivity of the music to the text and its harmonic inventiveness; i.e., his choice of chords and notes is not hackneyed and his progression from one chord to the next shows a clever and tasteful variety. Here we have one of the country’s greatest masters of music applying his genius to the Reform service, and the variety of harmony and rhythm coupled with great sensitivity to the text and ritual far exceeds those elements in the music of so many others of the time. The piece centers around D, both major and minor, as a tonality, meaning that the tone, D, is the focal point for all the chords and melodies.

From these keys he smoothly modulates during the service to A major, B minor, and B major on the one hand, and on the other to F major. This results in a musical cohesiveness to the service as a whole, even though the thirteen or fifteen portions are separated in the actual ritual by non-sung texts, or regular cantillation. As a Christian composer of religious music, Foote had centuries of precedence for this in the composition of the Ordinary of the Catholic Mass, where its separate parts (Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei), separated in time by other liturgical portions, sung or not, often would be related musically.
The flow of the voices, particularly of the solo voices, is within the traditional Jewish prayer style. It shows a distinctly western European nusach in its avoidance of the augmented second, a particular interval between two successive notes, such as C to D-sharp, that is characteristic of much eastern European Ashkenazic music and often utilized by both Jewish and non-Jewish composers who want their music to sound Jewish. There are a few instances of chromaticism (such as using sharps and flats for color effect) as in the Kedushoh, but essentially the music is diatonic (in the simplest terms, such as using only white keys on the piano) with suggestions of the pentatonic (such as using only black keys on the piano). This style is what Foote describes as “quasimodal.” In a few instances, melodic motives are carried over from one portion to another; for example, the solos in the Sh’ma and the Bor’chu recur in the first solo in the Mi Chomocho.
The mystery remains as to whether or not the service was ever performed in Birmingham. Foote mentions hearing the piece on several occasions, but he does not say where. Rabbi Newfield’s silence on all aspects of the piece strongly suggests that it was either unknown to him or at least not performed in Birmingham. He was so interested in Jewish-Christian relations that this wonderful opportunity of ecumenism would hardly have passed by unobserved by him if there had been a performance in Birmingham. It is even stranger that a piece dedicated to his own temple choir and music director, his wife’s teacher, would have elicited no interest whatsoever. Could there have been a rift between Newfield and Guckenberger? Since the service was published by Arthur Schmidt, one of the most important music publishers in America, and since it was written by such a famous composer, there would have been ample opportunity and incentive to have it performed at every Reform temple in America, including Temple Emanu-El in Birmingham. The quality of the music and the appropriateness of the setting would make it ideal for continued performances today.

Foote was Unitarian, but in Birmingham there was no Unitarian Church circa 1900. When a young woman who was Unitarian died in Birmingham in 1898, it was Rabbi Newfield, rather than any Christian clergyman, who officiated, “representing as he does, a faith closer akin to Unitarianism than any other Birmingham minister.” This spiritual proximity between Unitarianism and Reform Judaism that apparently was understood in Birmingham at the turn of the twentieth century probably was also felt by both the composer and those Jews who were involved in helping Foote in creating his service. Foote did not compose anything else that could be construed as Jewish, but his one contribution is further evidence of the ecumenicism that was prevalent at the time in liberal circles throughout America and that Foote clearly espoused. In turn, the ecumenicism of the musical portions of the Reform synagogue liturgy during the period from at least 1870 to at least 1930 is evidence of this fundamental philosophy of American Reform Jews.
Appendix

“Sh’ma Jisroel”
*(Arthur Foote: Music for the Synagogue, p. 10.)*
"Bo-ruch"

(Arthur Foote: Music for the Synagogue, p. 11.)
“Response to Silent Prayer”
(Arthur Foote: Music for the Synagogue, p. 18.)
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30 This setting occurs regularly in the services of Kitziger and Schlesinger, while in Sulzer the tenor is used more often instead of the alto solo, because Sulzer was writing for his own voice.

31 The author’s copy of Foote’s service is that used in the Temple Sinai performance in 1940. It is heavily edited in pencil, presumably by the then music director, Henry S. Jacobs.

32 The pentatonic scale is common among many ethnic groups around the world but is rare in traditional folk and classical music of the West. Thus, when nineteenth-century composers wanted to sound “ethnic,” they often used pentatonic scales. Since Mussorgsky and Debussy, however, pentatonic scales have become more common in western art music.
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Two Far South: Rabbinical Responses to Apartheid and Segregation in South Africa and the American South

by

Adam Mendelsohn

From the 1950s through the 1960s, South Africa and the American South were moving in opposite directions. While in the South segregationists were engaged in a forlorn fighting retreat against the advance of integration, apartheid legislation steadily entrenched and extended racial separation and inequality in South Africa. Constituting minorities within the white populations of both societies, the majority of Jews responded to these parallel racial crises by assuming a quiescent and largely inactive role. The explanations offered for Jewish behavior during the civil rights struggle and apartheid are nearly identical, focusing on the insecurities and fears of the two communities. Jews in both locations were aware of the parallels between the two situations and, in both cases, the local Jewish press reported extensively on the responses of the counterpart community to the racial crises.

Beyond the overlap in the timing and nature of the societal crises, the South African and southern Jewish communities also shared similar histories. Both communities were formed by the same waves of immigration, first a steady trickle from central and western Europe in the mid-nineteenth century, later and in larger numbers from eastern Europe. In both cases Jews headed south chasing opportunity or following chain migration patterns. Although by the 1960s the bulk of the Jewish communities were concentrated in a few large cities, Jewish populations were still present in small towns and rural areas as well. Jews in South Africa were prominent in the retail trade in these small towns,
matching their counterparts in the American South. Often isolated in a deeply religious population (Calvinist in South Africa, Baptist and Methodist in the South), Jews encountered philosemitism and limited antisemitism. More importantly, they were forced to engage with questions of race and power. 7

The stories of two rabbis provide a bridge between the Jewish communities in the South and South Africa, revealing parallel and intertwined experiences and suggesting the differences and similarities between the two contexts. André Ungar and David Ben-Ami, both young foreign-born rabbis, were committed to social justice causes. Their rabbinical careers in South Africa and the South followed a similar path. Ungar spent two years in South Africa between 1955 and 1957. Ben-Ami replaced Charles Mantinband, a rabbi popular for his charm but not for his outspoken opposition to segregation, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, from August 1963 until February 1965. Aside from the close parallels between their experiences, Ungar and Ben-Ami’s paths crossed. Ungar resurfaced at the protests in Birmingham, Alabama, in May 1963, and again in Hattiesburg a year later as the town became a focal point of the 1964 Freedom Summer. Ungar was present in Ben-Ami’s story, participating in an incidental role in a drama nearly identical to his own in South Africa.

Beyond highlighting broad similarities between Jewish responses to apartheid and segregation, David Ben-Ami and André Ungar’s experiences suggest a tentative model for civil rights activism among rabbis in the South and South Africa. Their stories are a springboard to explore the factors that shaped the responses of southern and South African rabbis to apartheid and segregation. This article focuses on frontier rabbis, those who served the scattered and isolated Jewish communities dotted across the South and South Africa. The nature and extent of rabbinical involvement will be traced to a set of underlying conditions specific to frontier pulpits, and it will be argued that a common set of factors limited, sometimes dictated, and often inhibited the civil rights options of frontier rabbis. 8 The examination of the varied responses in both contexts reveals broad schools of rabbinical behavior, ranging from that of the crusading outsiders, transient newcomers, and
entrenched veterans. The clustering of common rabbinical responses across this loose spectrum suggests the differential exposure and impact of frontier conditions on their worldview, ambitions, and options.

The Frontier Rabbi

Pulpits in the South and South Africa, particularly outside the larger cities, offered few attractions to rabbis. Positions in small southern towns were regarded as a “rabbinical graveyard.” 9 These were often poorly paid, isolated backwater postings that lacked prestige and opportunities for advancement, but that came with a taxing job description including the roles of religious leader, Hebrew school teacher, prison chaplain, and itinerant rabbi, in the case of the circuit rider. South African Reform pulpits were little more attractive for similar reasons. The salaries offered by South African synagogues paled next to those of their American counterparts. 10 South Africa was distant from home, family, and jobs, and its political situation off-putting. 11 However, the frontier congregation had its own attractions and compensations,
often providing stability, local prominence, freedom from hierarchy, and latitude for innovation and independence.\textsuperscript{12}

Despite the difficulties of recruitment and retention experienced by many frontier communities, frontier congregations offered rabbis enhanced status, although not necessarily increased leverage. Paradoxically, the scarcity and isolation of the rabbis magnified the role and power of the temple board. Sparsely represented, frontier rabbis were scattered over large distances, making interaction and practical cooperation difficult. Moreover, the kind of rabbis that these congregations attracted often ensured that the temple board dominated the minister. Frontier rabbis were often those who had been unable to find success elsewhere, whether because of personality factors or lack of training. With few ambitions and even fewer prospects, many such individuals were content to settle into long-term service. Moses Cyrus Weiler, the chief minister of the South African Progressive movement, thought that recruits to South African temples were “little more than mediocre,” an evaluation shared by commentators on rabbis in the South.\textsuperscript{13} Rabbi Balfour Brickner of the Union of American Hebrew Congregation (UAHC) despaired at the number of southern pulpits occupied by men with “mediocre skills or [who had] drifted from congregation to congregation throughout a tortured career.”\textsuperscript{14}

This imbalance of power between pulpit and pew tended to stress more parochial issues and was less significant prior to the civil rights struggle. Most frontier congregations were satisfied so long as their rabbi performed his duties, calculating that his scarcity value outweighed his idiosyncrasies. The civil rights struggle altered this equation, producing acute sensitivity to the rabbi’s political stance and simultaneously reducing his already limited leverage. Some congregations concluded that it was better to go without a rabbi than to be stuck with one who was embarrassing and who generated anxiety and insecurity. The rabbi could be pressured by resignations as well as by withdrawal of financial support from the congregation. The prospect alone was often enough to inhibit a rabbi.\textsuperscript{15} This pliability in turn increased the dependence and vulnerability of frontier rabbis, a group that was
already immobilized by the absence of alternative work prospects, long service, low salaries, and consequent reliance on a hard-earned pension typically payable by the congregation for future support. The position of the frontier rabbi was further weakened by his isolation, as physical distance placed him beyond the reach and protections of rabbinical associations and support organizations. Conversely, congregations were shielded by the principle of non-intervention. For example, the UAHC was restricted by a constitution that guaranteed congregational autonomy and prohibited interference in the affairs and management of individual congregations. Moreover, national Jewish organizations were often wary of inflaming their sensitive southern members. David Ben-Ami reproached these national Jewish organizations for abandoning southern rabbis, leaving them to “stand utterly alone” while convening “conferences where like-minded liberals pat each other on the back.” During the civil rights struggle these factors
militated towards rabbinical passivity, as the imbalance of power
enforced a dependent relationship between congregation and
rabbi, and raised the cost of nonconformity.\textsuperscript{18}

In a few cases, this web of constraining features was counter-
acted either wholly or partially by a set of liberating factors,
specifically, financial independence, celebrity, youthfulness, mo-
bility, and alternative job prospects. While these mitigating factors
on their own did not propel rabbis to activism, they served as cru-
cial preconditions that freed some rabbis, who were already
inclined toward activism, to speak out. Not all rabbis who became
involved in civil rights activities benefited from these buffers.
Some, like Perry Nussbaum, the rabbi of Temple Beth Israel in
Jackson, Mississippi, who engaged in activism despite the absence
of these protections, suffered the consequences of the exposure of
the frontier condition. Nussbaum’s example suggests the costs for
those who chose to act despite the absence of liberating factors, in
circumstances representative of the frontier norm.

\textit{The Cost of Courage: Perry Nussbaum and
the Consequences of Frontier Activism}

In his career trajectory and temperament, Perry Nussbaum
epitomized the frontier model, illustrating the constraining effect
of frontier dynamics on rabbinical activism.\textsuperscript{19} As a peripatetic
mid-career rabbi with seemingly few prospects, burdened by a
cantankerous personality and a series of pulpit failures, Nuss-
baum lacked mobility.\textsuperscript{20} His relationship with his congregation
was never easy. Thin-skinned and easily offended, Nussbaum’s
abrasive style and fondness for feuding alienated many potential
supporters. His congregational skills did not help matters. By his
own admission, he was a poor sermonizer.\textsuperscript{21} He lacked finesse,
often adopting a blunt, confrontational approach in private affairs,
from the pulpit, and lectern.

Inclined towards outspokenness, itself rare among rabbis in
the South and South Africa, but constrained by his vulnerability,
Nussbaum was initially reluctant to become involved in civil
rights activities and steered clear of significant commitment.\textsuperscript{22} His
initial reluctance partly stemmed from his belief that the bulk of
Rabbi Perry Nussbaum, April 1967.
(Courtesy, the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.)
his congregation was “indistinguishable in ideology” from other whites, “as racist as any non-Jew.” These racial attitudes were “not the by-product of antisemitism, but an honest conviction.” The local *Jackson State Times* concurred, approvingly noting in 1958, “Today many a Jewish leader is part of the Southern resistance. Jackson’s Citizens Council, outstanding in south and Nation, points to them with pride.” His limited early forays confirmed his judgment, producing a backlash from his congregation, intended, to Nussbaum’s mind, to “cut me down to size.” Ideological incompatibility was at the core of this conflict, but the rabbi’s opponents harbored a diverse range of grievances. His political stance became the rallying point for his opponents. He expected that any further controversy would result in being given “walking papers by a drumhead court martial of my Board of Trustees.”

This circumspection evolved into activism prompted by events within Mississippi. The imprisonment of the first wave of freedom riders in 1961 pushed Nussbaum into the engagement that he had previously sought to avoid. The rabbi took on the responsibility for the jailed activists but felt obliged to conceal this work from his congregation, fearing recriminations. Prior to this point Nussbaum’s tenure was indistinguishable from that of other frontier rabbis sympathetic to the goals of the civil rights movement but immobilized by the fear of sanctions from both inside and outside his congregation. Rabbi Moses Landau of Cleveland, Mississippi, typified this mindset, balking at Nussbaum’s requests for help in assisting freedom riders incarcerated in Parchman Penitentiary: “I am paid by my Congregation, and as long as I eat their bread I shall not do anything that might harm any member of my congregation without their consent.”

Nussbaum emerged as a vocal proponent of tolerance and racial change in Jackson, allying himself with sympathetic liberal clergymen. This local public prominence produced an uneasy coexistence with his congregation. Nussbaum’s wife, Arene, a native of Texas, shared the misgivings of the congregation about her husband’s activities. She, like many others, had a “sincere conviction that Blacks were not ready for
integration,” a belief rooted in “well founded private doubts (never in public, but only to her husband) about the path of racial integration.”

As long as Mississippi remained the focus of national attention, Nussbaum was provided with some temporary measure of protection from his temple board. Such visibility, however, did not spare him from radical segregationists who bombed Temple Beth Israel and Nussbaum’s home in two separate incidents in 1967. The bombings undermined his already shaky relationship with the local Jewish community, inviting an “inevitable backlash from those racist and assimilated Baalhabteem [sic] here whose harassment and nitpicking [became] fierce.” Crucially, the incidents restored an imbalance of power in his relationship with the congregation. In the wake of the bombings, the temple board tightened its hold over the rabbi. It demanded a loyalty pledge from the president and vice-presidents “that they would resign rather than involve the congregation in any future racial crises.” The temple board was hostile, vindictively acting to “keep [the rabbi] under restraint.”

Nussbaum was unhappily forced to wait out his contract, unpopular, frustrated, and fearful of the violence of white supremacists. His latter years in Jackson were spent haggling over his meager salary and pension with an unsympathetic and domineering temple board, clutching on to the “tenuous degree of support” and vainly searching for a pulpit elsewhere. He had few allies and fewer prospects. The Placement Commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) offered as an alternative “the worst of pulpits,” those rejected even by newly-ordained rabbis. He did not want, nor could he afford “to sink . . . away in a small, isolated town, at a salary less than I get here.” He felt abandoned and betrayed, resentful at the lack of recognition despite his persistence “in maintaining his concept of Judaism in a time and place which [had] contributed to being a persona non grata not only to several of his congregants, but to most of the congregations in the State, most of the Christian power structure as well; who persisted in keeping his congregation in the Union, [and who kept] B’nai B’rith lodges from flight from the national
Rabbi Perry Nussbaum surveys the damage to the secretary’s office after the bombing of Beth Israel, Jackson, Mississippi, September 18, 1967. Nussbaum’s home was bombed two months later. (Courtesy, the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.)
Only in 1973, after nineteen years at Temple Beth Israel, did an embittered Nussbaum leave Jackson.

By contrast, André Ungar, David Ben-Ami, and Charles Mantinband benefited from a variety of factors that provided a degree of latitude in their relationships with their congregations that differentiated their situations from that of Nussbaum. Yet the frontier pulpits that they served also contrasted with those of rabbis like Julian Feibelman in New Orleans and Jacob Rothschild in Atlanta. Feibelman and Rothschild benefited from the advantages of their locations: relatively temperate political environments, with relatively large Jewish populations, and opportunities for forming coalitions with like-minded liberals. These advantages were unavailable to frontier rabbis. Charles Mantinband’s position was bolstered, among other factors, by his celebrity, itself a by-product of his activism, as well as by his relative financial security. Transient rabbis, new to the South and South Africa, felt free of the responsibilities that narrowed the options available to their anchored colleagues. Exemplars of the former, André Ungar and David Ben-Ami were in some ways freedom rabbis, midway between frontier rabbis and the Jewish freedom riders who flocked to the South in the 1960s. They intentionally chose pulpits on the frontline, seeking to apply the lessons of the prophetic tradition to the civil rights scene while simultaneously fulfilling personal ambition. Mantinband, Nussbaum, and others in the South were driven by similar motivations, but disagreed with the newcomers over the appropriate forms that activism should take.

The frontier experience also shaped preferred methods of activism. Whereas Mantinband and Nussbaum, like many other southern liberals, trusted mediation over marching, Ungar joined Rabbinical Assembly delegations to protest in Birmingham in 1963 and Hattiesburg in 1964. The roots of Ungar’s activism can be traced to his time in South Africa.

*André Ungar in South Africa*

Born in Hungary but trained in London, André Ungar took up the pulpit of Temple Israel in Port Elizabeth in January 1955 at the age of twenty-five. The newly established Reform
congregation, one of only four in southern Africa, had a membership of over three hundred. The Jewish community, comprised of storekeepers, businessmen, and professionals, was solidly middle class. Most of Port Elizabeth’s one thousand Jewish families were nominally Orthodox, observant of tradition but acculturated. As elsewhere in South Africa, the Progressive movement was a newcomer, regarded with suspicion by the dominant Orthodox leadership.

Ungar arrived at a key moment in South African history. The National Party (NP), first elected in 1948 and thereafter in every election until 1994, was consolidating its hold on South African politics. The government was gradually introducing new racial policies, supplementing the preexisting, largely unlegislated social, economic, and cultural segregation with expansive and rigid race laws. Legislation central to the apartheid system was first applied and enforced during the early 1950s. In 1956 the sleepy coastal city of Port Elizabeth was introducing the measures stipulated by the Group Areas Act, entailing a transfer of non-white residents out of areas allocated to whites. Apartheid issues had little immediate and practical impact on South African Jews in the 1950s, entailing minimal inconvenience to a group that was regarded as white.

Yet the Jewish community had a diffident relationship with the government. Many were troubled by memories of the 1930s and early 1940s when Afrikaner nationalist politicians used antisemitic rhetoric freely. The NP had introduced the “Jewish Question” into political debate in the 1930s, railing against the undesirability of Jewish immigration and negative Jewish influence on South African society. Antisemitism was seized upon by a ragtag assortment of fascistic Afrikaner organizations, many of which were allied or associated with the NP. Although by the late 1940s NP leader Daniel Malan had dissociated the NP from antisemitism, promising white solidarity, the rapprochement between the ruling party and the South African Jewish community was slow and unsteady. Fears persisted throughout the 1950s, particularly as the NP itself seemed divided over the correct course to pursue in its relationship with the Jewish community.
While Malan spoke in conciliatory terms, he was surrounded by a coterie of senior leaders who had openly expressed Nazi sympathies a decade before. These leaders occasionally lapsed into old antisemitic habits, reawakening dormant insecurities. Membership of the Transvaal branch of the NP remained closed to Jews until 1952. The South African Jewish Board of Deputies, the community’s official representative body, was equally uncertain of the NP’s long-term intentions. This produced an acute sensitivity to public perceptions of the community. That the NP periodically scolded South African Jewry for its apparent over-representation in opposition ranks, particularly in the trade union movement, the Communist Party, and in opposition benches in parliament did nothing to ease these concerns. The Board of Deputies frowned on actions that confirmed these negative perceptions, preferring to encourage conciliation with the government. This was buttressed by a policy of strict political neutrality.

Members of the broader Jewish community certainly shared the board’s lingering sense of unease, disapproving of actions that could potentially antagonize the government. However, it would be a mistake to suggest that insecurity and caution concealed a widely-shared preference for racial equality. In their voting patterns and political associations, most Jews mirrored the behavior of their white, middle-class, English-speaking peers. While mainstream Jewish political opinion ranged across a spectrum from conservative support of the status quo to liberal humanitarianism, this majority found the idea of surrendering the privileges of race in pursuit of a more equitable society to be distinctly unappealing, never mind unthinkable. The highly visible Jewish minority that supported this departure had a fraught relationship with the community, poisoned as much by political polarity as by a mutually-shared disdain. The disproportionate part played by this radical clique in the ranks of the Communist Party, trade union movement, and African National Congress was the cause of much dismay and embarrassment.

At the opposite end of the political spectrum, the doctrinaire approach of the NP won little enthusiastic support. An obscure
minority was persistent and consistently unsuccessful in its attempts to persuade other Jews to join the NP. Most Jews were attracted neither by the NP’s fixation on the color question, nor by its appeal to the interests of working-class Afrikaans voters. Sizeable Jewish support for the NP only emerged in the 1970s in response to changes in the party, the waning of memories of its erstwhile antisemitism (although the party won most of its support from older Jewish voters), a shift in the political landscape, and South Africa’s burgeoning relationship with Israel. Thus in the 1950s, the overwhelming majority of Jews supported the centrist United Party, their traditional party of preference. Although the race policies of the United Party were less rigid and exacting than those of the governing NP, it supported continued racial segregation and was pushed rightwards by the latter’s extremism. The inclusive catch-all nature of the party meant that its Jewish supporters held a broad spectrum of views ranging from liberal to conservative on race matters. While a small parliamentary alternative advocated the removal of the system of racial privileges, only a minority of the white electorate, Jews included, gave it support.

André Ungar, who was sympathetic to the position of this liberal minority, came to Temple Israel committed to making social justice the focus of his ministry. For someone brought up in a Modern Orthodox household and exposed at close quarters to virulent racism, the Progressive movement offered a socially relevant alternative to traditional Judaism. Ungar combined his doctoral studies in modern philosophy in London with rabbinical training, first at the Orthodox Jew’s College and later under Leo Baeck and Harold Reinhart. Baeck, a symbol of loyalty to his calling and spiritual resistance to oppression, was a distinguished role model for an activist rabbi. Baeck’s brand of Progressive Judaism sought to harmonize social engagement with Jewish teachings, looking to the prophets and early rabbinical reformers as appropriate sources for inspiration. As with David Ben-Ami a decade later, Progressive Judaism’s social agenda resonated with Ungar’s personal encounter with antisemitism. Ungar, who escaped the Holocaust by living on false papers in Budapest, was
“haunted” by his wartime experience.46 Progressive Judaism incorporated the lessons of the Holocaust into the framework of prophetic Judaism. The Holocaust had altered thinking about the role of bystanders. For Ungar, and other progressive rabbis trained in the prophetic tradition after the war, to be a passive spectator to injustice was equivalent to acquiescence in evil. In his eyes, the rabbi’s responsibilities extended beyond his congregation to the pursuit of justice for all.

Newly ordained and in search of a position, Ungar was offered the pulpit of Temple Israel. Although not a prestigious post, it was well remunerated and a first step on the rabbinical ladder. The job was probably earmarked for Ungar by Baeck,
president of the World Union for Progressive Judaism. Ungar served as liaison officer of the youth section of the organization’s governing body. The posting in Port Elizabeth was in line with the WUPJ’s goals of spreading Progressive Judaism abroad since South Africa was seen as a receptive new frontier for expansion. Moreover, for Ungar, South Africa presented the challenge and opportunity of practical fulfillment of the ideals of prophetic Judaism. Despite the misgivings of his family, by then living in Israel, and the apprehensions of his wife, Ungar accepted the job fully aware of, and perhaps relishing, the “dangers” of such a pulpit.

Ungar revealed these inspirations and intentions at his induction. Moses Cyrus Weiler, the chief minister of the Progressive movement in South Africa, probably sensing the spirit of the new arrival, warned Ungar of the necessity of restraint in dealing with sensitive political issues. Sol Marcus, the president of the temple, concurred and stressed the “importance of caution and experience for newcomers in finding their place in a new country.” Ungar’s reply, that his “ultimate loyalty is to no one else than God and Israel as an organic whole. . . . The Rabbi is indeed the Rabbi of one particular congregation, but above all he is a Rabbi of the Jewish people,” should have forewarned his congregation of the strength of his convictions, the independence of his thinking, and his resistance to advice and criticism. Above all, André Ungar regarded it as his “task to bring to the [congregation’s] notice in no uncertain terms the concrete implications of our ethical heritage for here and now.”

The rabbi’s early attempts to discuss the race issue in private were warily rebuffed: “That . . . is a lifetime’s study. You must be born there to understand it. Foreigners can know nothing about it. Besides, it is an unsavory topic, a communist thing to worry about.” Making little headway in personal discussions, Ungar decided to bring his views before his congregation in a sermon titled “Apartheid Three Thousand Years Ago” that he delivered on Passover eve, 1955. Ungar’s pointed comparison of the treatment of Jews in biblical Egypt with contemporary attitudes towards blacks aroused “pained consternation” from his
congregants, who pleaded that he in the future “preach us religion, not politics [italics in original].”\textsuperscript{51}

Initially forgiving of what they regarded as an isolated political sermon, the temple board and membership were dismayed by his return to the race issue in a sermon preached a few weeks later. Responding to an article in a local newspaper detailing the denial of a passport for a black student to study in America, Ungar ridiculed the government from his pulpit as “arrogantly puffed up little men [who acted] in heartless stupidity,” perpetrating “a greater tragedy than the biblical episode of Moses being denied entry into the Promised Land.” Ungar concluded his sermon by provocatively offering prayers on behalf of his congregation “for all who suffer in their innocence.”\textsuperscript{52} Many temple members were furious. Some were outraged at the presumptuousness of a newcomer’s meddling in a local political issue, while others were upset by the implied criticism of Ungar’s message and his disregard for their warnings, and most were disturbed by his reckless fixation on an unpopular racial theme. This widely felt consternation was exacerbated by the publicity that the sermon generated in the local and national press, raising the fear that its sentiments would be understood to be representative of member, and wider community, opinion. Particularly worrisome was the attention that the Afrikaans press gave to the story.\textsuperscript{53}

Rabbi Ungar became an “acute source of embarrassment” to the Jewish community, which was discussed in agitated correspondence between concerned regional representatives and the national head office of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies.\textsuperscript{54} Statements of this kind were anathema at a time when the board sought stability in its relationship with the ruling party. The government would be unlikely to differentiate between the views of a rabbi and those of the broader community, potentially confirming its association of Jews with the liberal parliamentary and radical extra-parliamentary opposition. Ungar claimed to speak in the name of Jewish tradition and urged the Jewish community to take a collective stand against apartheid. Hostile statements from a rabbi, seen as a community leader, risked undermining various countervailing efforts to portray South African Jews as loyal white
citizens. The South African Union of Progressive Judaism was also concerned by the incident. J. Heilbron, the president of the union, thought it necessary to issue a stern warning:

I do deplore the words you are reported to have used to describe the members of our Government, men with outstanding careers behind them, and men who have been appointed to act as this country’s leaders and spokesmen.

You must realize, Dr. Ungar, that all men do not think alike, and by making use of such unfortunate expressions in your Sermon, you are doing no good to anybody or to anything, least of all to the cause which you obviously have so much to heart...you are new to our country, cannot possibly in the short time you have been here fully understand all the political problems with which we have to deal in South Africa. I would beg of you, therefore, to avoid making political speeches that can do infinite harm not only to yourself as a spiritual leader, but also to the general Jewish community....

Very friendly relations indeed exist between the South African Government and the Jewish Community in this country. We want to keep it that way for as long as possible. Whilst you are fully entitled to disagree with Government policy, there can be no excuse for personal abuse.55

For Heilbron and the Board of Deputies, the demands of the prophetic past were no match for the demands of the pragmatic present. The priorities of the Jewish community, rooted in concerns about safety, acceptance in white society, and the preservation of what was regarded by some as a tenuous status quo, conflicted with the convictions of an outsider rabbi. Ungar was seemingly insensitive to these local priorities; later, in a similar vein, he called for all Jews to leave South Africa, or, failing that, to support black opposition to the government in the expectation of an eventual dividend. Although the controversy gradually abated and tempers cooled, the rabbi and his congregation thereafter coexisted in an uneasy truce.56

Instead of serving to subdue the rabbi, the congregation’s shrill complaints and demands backfired, spurring an increasingly
headstrong Ungar to extend and deepen his involvement in local racial matters. Ungar’s commitment to social justice assumed a public form. He was elected to the regional executive committee of the South African Institute for Race Relations, an outspoken liberal organization probably regarded as politically radical by some in his congregation. Ungar also became involved in fighting the local implementation of the Group Areas Act by joining the interracial Group Areas Action Committee. His public statements in this latter role brought further press attention and controversy. Speaking at a public meeting in November 1956, Ungar compared his own experience of Nazi ghettoization in Hungary to the relocation of communities from their homes into segregated suburbs. Openly chastising the local Jewish community for its passivity, Ungar warned that Jews were shortsighted and foolish if they ignored the NP’s core “basic identity of both anti-Jewish and anti-black racialism.” Ungar next condemned the Group Areas Act as a “despicable evil,” admonishing his audience, and all South African Jews, that “Hitler was not defeated [as] his spirit was marching triumphantly” across South Africa.57

Statements of this kind reinforced the board’s view that the rabbi was reckless and irresponsible, drawing attention to the Jewish community at a time when it was better for it to be inconspicuous. Ungar was seen to be playing a dangerous game, tempting fate by riling politicians averse to reminders of their shady past connections. Yet beyond reprimands, cautions, and pleas, the community was almost powerless to rein in their rabbi. Ungar was unmoved by the appeals of his critics. The imagined concerns of an “accepted, respected and pigmentocratically privileged” community paled next to the reality of daily black suffering.58 To be swayed by the pressure for silence would be the equivalent of complicity. The prophetic tradition demanded that he stand up for an unpopular but just cause. It also provided a salve for the stinging rebukes and encouragement to remain steadfast when facing an obdurate congregation. For were not the biblical prophets, wrote Ungar in the Temple Israel Bulletin, because of
the partisan, and apparently revolutionary nature of their teachings, the focal points of heated controversy, more often than not, exposed to extreme unpopularity. . . . They had something definite to say, and they said it even though some people raised their eyebrows in shocked horror at their outspokenness. . . . So much for any outward resemblance there may be between the zealous prophets of old and some of the fearlessly enthusiastic champions of Progressive Judaism in the contemporary world.59

The temple board exerted little leverage over their rabbi. Its weakness was probably compounded by the inexperience of its members. Ungar was the congregation’s first rabbi; the temple had been founded only in 1951. The board members were faced with an unprecedented situation made more difficult by the ineffectiveness of the standard constraints on a frontier rabbi’s behavior. Long service could create a web of understanding and dependency between a rabbi and his congregation. Over time a rabbi was likely to win the respect of his congregation and even of the broader community. Time together was also likely to heighten the rabbi’s sense of responsibility to his congregation, creating an awareness and sensitivity to local concerns and priorities. Conversely, the congregation was likely to be more tolerant of the idiosyncrasies of an established rabbi. Unlike such ministers in frontier pulpits, Ungar’s brief tenure ensured that these links of mutual dependency were frail. It also meant that the usual considerations of job and pension security played a lesser role in his thinking, particularly because he was employed on a short-term contract. Moreover, unlike most other rabbis on the frontier, Ungar’s qualifications, coupled with his youth, ensured a high degree of mobility. Even firing the rabbi was problematic, risking embarrassment and stigma, potentially making recruitment of future rabbis difficult. Barring dismissal before the natural conclusion of Ungar’s contract, the congregation was left with few ways to control his behavior.

Ungar’s increasing involvement in opposition to apartheid coincided with and contributed to a deteriorating relationship with his congregation. Although the rabbi toned down the political content of his sermons, he began needling his congregants
with pointed political commentary in the *Temple Israel Bulletin*. Sometimes his approach was blunt. For example, he lashed out at Port Elizabeth Jewry’s “bundu backwoodsmanship of intolerance and prejudice.” Temple Israel members began to believe that Ungar was neglecting his pastoral duties by devoting more time to his social justice interests than to his rabbinical responsibilities. A member of Temple Israel recalled that Ungar was “more in the [black] townships surrounding Port Elizabeth, than at shul. When you needed him—he wasn’t there.” His self-described “hot-headed” temperament and provocative personality may have also estranged the rabbi from his congregation. Congregants were easily upset by the criticism of outsiders, particularly one as young as Ungar, and intolerant of those they regarded as self-righteous meddlers in South Africa’s problems. While the majority of his community were willing to forgive what Ungar later termed his “pulpit naughtiness,” most were likely to have privately disapproved of his breaching of racial taboos. According to his own account, temple members found his interracial friendships, invitations to black friends to drop in at his home, and his visits to the black townships unacceptable. That these friends included political activists such as Dennis Brutus and Govan Mbeki, both later imprisoned on Robben Island, only made matters worse. In response, the community stepped up pressure on their rabbi through a “barrage of telephone calls, personal visits, emergency meetings” and “threats, reproofs, [and] anonymous letters.” Ungar, impervious to his congregation’s demands, realized that he and they had reached a stalemate, and probably sensed the approaching end to his tenure. Perhaps he also was taunting congregants with his provocative and public interracial contacts.

The combination of an outspoken stance on racial matters and private friendships across the race line produced an open confrontation with the temple sisterhood committee. Ungar was censured by the committee, which disapprovingly noted with “grave concern” that the rabbi had vacationed with two black companions, and sought assurances that “such a thing would not reoccur.” The congregation was “on the whole upset, afraid, at
Letter from J. Heilbron to Rabbi Ungar August 12, 1955.
(By permission of the Rochlin Archives, South African Jewish Board of Deputies.)
times outraged, generally icily unsympathetic” towards their own spiritual leader.67

In October 1956, barely a year and a half after assuming his first rabbinical position, André Ungar informed his temple board of his acceptance of an offer for the more modestly-paying position of rabbi at the Settlement Synagogue in London’s East End. Ungar opted to leave, although he agreed to delay his departure until January 1957 so that Temple Israel could find a replacement, because he was “beginning to feel that we had reached an impasse,” recognizing that with “all the amiability in the world, Congregation and Rabbi cannot remain wed unless there is a basic acceptance of common principles.” At Temple Israel “that substantial agreement which is the foundation of serving a congregation was lacking.”68 Although his combustible interactions with the temple board and strained relationship with his congregation largely dictated his decision, other factors were likely involved as well. There were few prospects for a Reform rabbi in South Africa, a relative backwater of the Progressive movement. Port Elizabeth was a small and unsophisticated city with an “arid cultural scene,” an uninspiring first posting for a highly-educated and cosmopolitan minister.69 Ungar had a restless personality and moved from his next two pulpits in quick succession.

Although his congregation may have been pleased to see him depart, the government, probably unaware of his announced resignation, was even more determined that he leave South Africa. In December 1956, a month before his scheduled departure and days after arrests nationwide of 156 anti-apartheid activists who were charged with treason, the government revoked Ungar’s temporary residence permit.70 The national press trumpeted him as “virtually deported.”71 While Ungar regarded this unexpected order as a “compliment” to his “modest efforts,” becoming the first rabbi to be “expelled” from South Africa, his congregation and the Board of Deputies saw things differently. Ungar’s earlier resignation proved to be a relief for his congregation, absolving them of their obligation to defend their rabbi. Most were not “unpleased when he had to leave.”72
The pattern of the reactions from Port Elizabeth Jewry to Ungar’s departure presaged the nature of later South African Jewish responses to apartheid. The national Jewish press dealt with the Ungar affair in what was to become characteristic of its later coverage of Jewish dissidence in racial matters, opting for either circumspection or avoidance. The South African Jewish Chronicle shunned the controversy entirely, limiting its comments to a cryptic editorial about the “Dilemma of the Jewish Rabbi.” The editorial avoided naming Ungar, vaguely proclaiming that rabbis must “preserve the relevance of Judaism,” but steer clear of “identifying the lay community with every rabbinical assessment.” The South African Jewish Times defended Ungar’s right to freedom of the pulpit, although it castigated him for the “little discretion in the way he used it” and his “intemperate statements.” The Board of Deputies’ response was derived from its policy of assuming neutrality in political matters it regarded as not directly affecting the Jewish community. Ungar, the board argued, “went on to the political platform and must therefore bear the consequences as an individual.” He had spoken “entirely as an individual—neither for his congregation nor for South African Jewry as a whole.” Jews, the board proclaimed repeatedly, held a spectrum of political opinions, “in common with other sections of the South African people.” Not content with this declaration of dissociation, one member of the Board of Deputies later made his case against Ungar in Jewish Affairs, the organization’s official publication:

. . . it is [not] true that Judaism imposes upon its adherents opposition to Apartheid as such. Judaism enjoins consideration and justice for all people, assistance to the sick, the poor and the underprivileged, facilities for all people to live their lives in peace. This writer, at least, fails to see any reason why these desiderata cannot be achieved within the framework of the social separation that has been traditional in South Africa since even before the Union [of South Africa] began.

The article suggests the range of acceptable attitudes on racial matters within mainstream Jewish opinion, a spectrum that stretched from liberal humanitarianism exemplified by Helen Suzman in parliament to endorsement of the racial status quo. It
can also be interpreted as an attempt to limit the potential political consequences of Ungar’s call for a collective Jewish stand against apartheid. Its timing is significant in that it was published during the treason trial at which Jewish radicals were disproportionately represented among the white defendants. While the Board of Deputies and Jewish press studiously avoided making this connection known, all but avoiding a major national event, criticism of Ungar’s lesser antics offered the means to obliquely disassociate the community from actions hostile to the government that might also enflame passions against the Jewish minority.

Ungar himself interpreted the termination of his residence permit as an act intended to intimidate the South African Jewish establishment and thus to bully the insecure community into “if not active conformity, then at least into a fearsome silence.” Ungar, returning to and expanding on this fear-centered explanation for Jewish behavior in his later writing, employed themes and tropes instantly recognizable to anyone familiar with historical writing about southern Jewry and segregation. South African Jews were “frustrated, terrified and unhappy,” a suspect minority caught in the middle of an enveloping struggle between blacks and whites. In its current state, the Jewish community concealed its “fearfully hushed up nightmare” of potential antisemitism and racial exclusion, hiding a “nervous apprehension” that was revealed only in a “tone of nervousness.” Jews were “uncomfortably near the [racial] fence to feel really secure.”

While the racial divide was currently positioned so as to accommodate Jews as whites, it could easily be moved, ejecting Jews from their privileged perch. Ungar was suggesting that Jews would never gain full acceptance as whites in a society structured by race: their racial in-betweenness would only be eliminated in the egalitarian society promised by the opponents of apartheid. Jews, Ungar warned, were already victims of social antisemitism and coerced conformity. Echoing the calls of Jewish defense agencies active in the South, Ungar cautioned that passivity and acquiescence would win only a temporary respite: “How long before the intrinsic disruptiveness of racialism begins to weed out the less desirable from within the light-skinned fold?” His
admonition that the Jews would be “most vulnerable” when white supremacists “follow out the essential logic of their position,” replicated countless warnings made to southern Jews by Anti-Defamation League and American Jewish Committee officials. Ungar and the defense agencies were articulating what John Higham has termed the theory of the unitary character of prejudice. This paradigm, dominant in the 1950s and 1960s, was rooted in a psychological explanation for racism. According to this theory, racists, no matter their preferred target, shared a “generic need to hate.” By implication, bigots would shift their negative attentions to new groups once a particular hatred was sated or a target disappeared.

Yet, unlike commentators on southern Jewry, Ungar was ultimately unsympathetic and accusing. Whereas observers from the defense organizations and historians such as Clive Webb, Leonard Dinnerstein, and Mark Bauman have pointed to the “innate sympathy” of southern Jews to the civil rights struggle, Ungar’s judgment about the political and racial sympathies of the South African Jewish community was damning. For all their fears and vulnerabilities, South African Jews were “wholly and beyond redemption part of White South Africa, sharing its privileges, interests and prejudices.”

Not all Jews in Port Elizabeth agreed with Ungar’s claim that the government was attempting to intimidate the community. Many were pleased to see Ungar depart. The latter prompted an outpouring of bitterness and barely concealed gloating in the press. While the vitriol vented in the pages of the local newspapers may not have been representative of Port Elizabeth Jewry, the sheer volume of correspondence hostile to Ungar suggests that he had won few supporters in the wider community. Although letters defending Ungar did appear in the press, much of this support came from non-Jews. The Jewish Review, the otherwise politically unengaged official monthly of Port Elizabeth’s Orthodox Jewish majority, was scathing in its criticism of Ungar:

The entire Jewish community resents Dr Ungar’s act of making a publicity stunt out of it, encouraging the press to make a whole ‘Tzimes’ about it. A rabbi serving a community usually
consisting of members holding different points of view, should concentrate on the job to which he is appointed or which he is called upon to do rather than indulge in political controversy of any kind. Was there for him not enough work to do, within the framework of his congregation to prevent him wasting time on arguments with the government? Are there not more competent people in our community older and more experienced than Dr Ungar to instruct the community in matters of ‘Universal Justice’? Was it for Dr Ungar, a recent arrival in this country, who has never had a chance of studying thoroughly and properly the complex racial problems in South Africa, and their implications, to take this task on himself? It is from this point of view that we venture to say, that Dr Ungar’s departure from our country will be received by some of us with a sigh of relief.87

Another Port Elizabeth Jew wrote to a local newspaper to record his indignation at the abuse of the freedom of the press by the non-desirable visitor to South Africa, Rabbi Ungar. If he is planning to get cheap publicity and pave the way for his future career in one of the London suburban congregations, let him not drag into this controversy the whole Jewish community. Let him also not run away from South Africa with the idea that he is Emile Zola or a Rev. Mr. Scott, because he lacks the responsibility and dignity of a responsible leader of a community. The friendly and good-neighborly relations between the South African Jew and his non-Jewish fellow citizens will not be affected by Rabbi Ungar’s, or any other foreigner’s radical and subversive ideas. We are citizens of this country and we owe our allegiance to the Government and people of this country. As Jewish members of this community we demand from our leaders, those who are graced or disgraced, the sense of dignity and responsibility which befits a Rabbi. On the occasion of Rabbi Ungar’s departure, the Jewish community of Port Elizabeth should pronounce the traditional Hebrew blessing of “Baruch Sheptorau”, i.e. “Thank God we are getting rid of this Rabbi.”88

Ungar was lambasted as self-seeking and publicity hungry, a young upstart and “foreign busybody” with a “Messiah complex.”89 The criticisms directed at Ungar mirrored similar condemnation of “outside agitators” who became involved with the civil rights struggle in the South. Northern rabbis
who came south in the 1960s were berated in nearly identical terms.\textsuperscript{90}  

As André Ungar departed Port Elizabeth in January 1957, sent off to the strains of Aveinu Shalom Aleichem sung at the airport by students of the Temple Hebrew School (which suggests that politics rather than his personality was primary in alienating him from his congregation), few would have predicted that he would play a coincidental but crucial role in a parallel drama, encountering and affecting the experience of a rabbi in a similar position at Temple B’nai Israel in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Ungar’s experience in South Africa had affected his weltanschauung and priorities. Social justice, already important to the rabbi, had become a central concern.

After a brief stint in unsatisfactory positions in London and Toronto, he was appointed associate rabbi to Dr. Joachim Prinz at Temple B’nai Abraham in Newark.\textsuperscript{91} From there he took the pulpit of Temple Emanuel in Westwood, New Jersey, a position he still holds. Ungar continued to mull over his South African experiences, writing and lecturing extensively about South Africa.\textsuperscript{92} Having cut his civil rights teeth in South Africa, Ungar transferred his concern about social justice to his new environment. Gradually, interest and involvement in the southern civil rights struggle complemented his continued opposition to apartheid.\textsuperscript{93}

\textit{The Micah of Mississippi}

While Ungar was battling his congregation in South Africa, Rabbi Charles Mantinband was fighting a similar (and similarly unsuccessful) lonely war of attrition in Hattiesburg.\textsuperscript{94} Although Hattiesburg was perhaps “less rigid in the resistance” to integration than other towns in the state of comparable size, Mississippi was hostile to dissenting views on the racial status quo, and values of the town’s citizens were moderate only in relation to those of the state’s citizens as a whole. Nevertheless, the gentile townspeople may have been more tolerant toward Charles Mantinband than were his own congregants. Mantinband, having taken up the pulpit of Temple B’nai Israel in 1951, explained this tolerance as a consequence of his established position and familiarity in
the small town by the time the focus of the civil rights struggle shifted to Mississippi in the early 1960s. Locals did not see him as an outside agitator, but perhaps instead as a misguided liberal race mixer, albeit he was their misguided liberal:

. . . when you live in a town long enough, you get to know everybody, and you’re given the opportunity to befriend everybody. And, if after ten years or more you have gotten this fellow a job, and this fellow you visited when he was in the hospital, and this person you were able to get a scholarship for his
child, and this person you did a favor—you served on a committee with him... they’ll say, “Well now, this fellow is out of step, and he’s ahead of his times and he’s crazy — we don’t like what he says — but don’t touch him, he’s my friend, and I like him!” Whatever the case may be, I stayed a long time.95

Mantinband ministered to Hattiesburg’s fifty Jewish families, 180 people in a population of thirty-five thousand.96 A native southerner, Mantinband came to Hattiesburg towards the end of his rabbinical career, already having served communities elsewhere in the South. His personal charm, geniality, and familiarity with the region would serve as a crucial buffer when his civil rights activism awakened insecurities and raised tempers.97 He was held in affectionate regard, an honored and respected figure in Hattiesburg, who was active in the broader community.98 This esteem was magnified by the southern regard for clergymen. However, Mantinband’s outspoken opposition to segregation generated mixed responses from his congregants. Some resented his sermons supporting racial change, a small, like-minded minority was encouraged by his willingness to deal with a taboo subject, but the majority “brooded in silent unease or in friendly-sinister warnings to ‘take it easy.’”99

Although most would have tolerated some “pulpit naughtiness,” many were upset when Mantinband took to activism beyond the pulpit. This resentment and unease boiled over when Mantinband’s activities were publicized in the local press. One such incident in 1956, his public denunciation of Mississippi’s staunchly segregationist senior senator James Eastland, that the Hattiesburg American headlined as “Local Rabbi Says Race Relations Stink,” produced outraged responses from his congregation. At an emergency meeting, the rabbi promised to avoid future publicity.100 Responding to calls for his resignation, Mantinband’s allies within the temple chose not to defend his racial stance, but instead pointed to his virtues as a man and the difficulties that would be created by his dismissal.101 Mantinband’s transgression of local racial mores, as with Ungar, was another cause of friction. Members of the temple objected to Mantinband’s interracial friendships, made all the more unacceptable by the visits of
African Americans to his home opposite Temple B’nai Israel. That his friends included Clyde Kennard, Vernon Dahmer, and Medgar Evers, all prominent civil rights activists in Mississippi, made these visits even more unpalatable. Citing a state law that threatened to remove tax-exempt status from facilities that were used on non-segregated bases, a delegation urged the rabbi to stop these visits. An indignant Mantinband refused, retorting that the house may be temple property, but it was also his “home.”

Although massive resistance measures adopted by the Mississippi legislature suppressed the already limited support for dissent and reduced the scope of opposition activism, Mantinband remained committed to the civil rights cause, his involvement eliciting disapproving responses from some members of his community. The concerted challenge to the stasis in race relations in Mississippi in the early 1960s, including freedom rides and Freedom Summer projects organized by civil rights organizations hoping to undermine segregation in the most racially recalcitrant state, injected new fire into Mantinband’s relationship with his congregation. Tensions between rabbi and congregation escalated alongside the level of activism in Mississippi. Although the rabbi’s political position, made more so by his forthrightness and prominence, was unpopular, Mantinband was still admired and valued by his congregation. A series of incidents, climaxing in 1962, persuaded Mantinband to leave Hattiesburg. In May 1962 the rabbi was again reprimanded by his congregation at an emergency meeting after he was publicly linked with the Mississippi State Council, an inter-religious body that advanced acceptance of desegregation. The responses at a congregational meeting illustrate the range of concerns within the Jewish community. The temple’s president objected to the identification of the congregation with a liberal cause, expressing a widely shared fear of antisemitic reprisals. These fears were particularly acute at a time when freedom riders, among them a disproportionate number of northern Jews, poured south. The arrival of freedom riders galvanized radical segregationists and prompted a surge in distribution of segregationist literature, some laced with antisemitism. Another congregant complained that the rabbi’s civil rights stance created
divisions within the congregation, an untenable situation in a small and vulnerable community. A final complainant articulated what other members were likely to have felt, but were reluctant to express in public, also suggesting the incompatibility of Mantinband’s liberal attitudes with those of some of his congregants: “Why must the rabbi mix with the niggers? Let us sell to them and keep them in their place.”

Mantinband refused to compromise or back down, agreeing only to avoid publicity “for the time being” and to steer clear of biracial meetings. The congregation was unsatisfied by this promise, having heard similar reassurances in the past. Gathering again later, the temple board agreed to additional steps to restrain their rabbi. Mantinband was stung by the acrimony expressed at these meetings with his congregation and unhappy with the strictures imposed on his activism. Further news was disheartening. The small Jewish community of Brookhaven cancelled Mantinband’s weekly visits. Word trickled back to him that a congregational delegation had met with the president of the local college, a friend and ally in local civil rights matters, urging him to rein in his friend. The cancellation of a public lecture at a black college in compliance with his congregation’s demands solicited a disappointed rebuke from the college president: “It is indeed a sad day to know that the Children of the Seed of Abraham, themselves persecuted down the ages, have yielded to the persecution of their black brothers.”

These actions suggest both the congregation’s desperation and its weakness. While Charles Mantinband displayed some of the characteristics of the frontier rabbi’s condition, particularly his long service to a single community, a number of factors served to reduce his dependence on Temple B’nai Israel. In many ways Mantinband was atypical of the frontier rabbi. While his political views engendered hostility in Hattiesburg, Mantinband’s charm, celebrity, and success guaranteed him prospects elsewhere, reducing the importance of job security. The dismissal of a rabbi during the civil rights era produced embarrassing press attention and potentially hindered the recruitment of a replacement. Mantinband’s prominence all but ruled out this option. This unusually
high level of job security was augmented by the timing of his service in Hattiesburg. Mantinband held the pulpit of Temple B’nai Israel towards the end of his career and beyond into retirement age. This reduced his financial vulnerability by ensuring him access to a pension. Maury Gurwitch, a member of the temple board, recalled that Mantinband “was old and set in his ways and money meant little to him so you could not pressure, sway or change him.” These critical, liberating factors reduced the temple board’s leverage over their rabbi, simultaneously serving as facilitating factors that produced confidence and scope for activism and outspokenness.

Yet, although the board’s direct leverage was limited, Mantinband was attuned to local concerns. His long residence in Hattiesburg produced sensitivity to the community and a stake in the maintenance of a positive relationship with his congregation. The deterioration in this relationship was, therefore, particularly troubling. In an intimate congregation, those who were upset were often friends and long-term acquaintances. Mantinband, unlike Ungar, was therefore more responsive to their pleas, and they were tied together through bonds of obligation.

At this point Mantinband reached a state of impasse with his congregation similar to that which had persuaded Ungar to leave Port Elizabeth. While he was still highly regarded within the congregation, the rabbi was frustrated by the restrictions placed on him, unhappy in representing a reluctant congregation, unwilling to curtail his civil rights efforts, and certain to have known that renewed activism in the heated climate would bring about an acrimonious departure. Mantinband was caught in a dilemma; a return to smooth relations with his congregation dictated a reduction of his controversial public activities, but withdrawal from the fight for civil rights would compromise his principles. Ill feeling continued to fester throughout 1962, probably exacerbated by Mantinband’s contact with freedom riders and the tension generated by challenges to Mississippi’s racial caste system.

In March 1963 Temple B’nai Israel’s problem with its rabbi ceased when Mantinband resigned and left Hattiesburg. Mantinband’s decision to leave, clearly the product of much soul
Rabbi Charles Mantinband, after a Confirmation service at Temple B’nai Israel, Hattiesburg.
(The Papers of Rabbi Charles Mantinband, McCain Library and Archives, University of Southern Mississippi Hattiesburg, Mississippi.)
searching, was motivated by a combination of factors. The departure was made possible by the attractive offer of the pulpit of a new congregation in Longview, Texas. Mantinband explained that he “moved because of special circumstances of a personal nature: [in Longview] we were near our grandchildren and we were near our family . . . there was a brand new congregation that challenged me.”

Matinband was attracted by the “less turbulent pastures” of Texas that offered an escape from the “day to day tensions” he and his wife had experienced for years. By his own admission, Hattiesburg had become “increasingly difficult to work in” and likely to become more difficult as Mississippi became the focal point of the civil rights struggle. However, Mantinband may have simultaneously been pushed out of Temple B’nai Israel. Colleague and civil rights ally Nussbaum wrote of Mantinband’s “removal.” Leo Bergman, rabbi of Touro Synagogue in New Orleans, maintained that Mantinband’s claim that he left for family reasons was a “polite pretense,” and argued that he “was leaving by a mutual gentleman’s agreement between Congregation and Rabbi.” Rabbi Allan Schwartzman of Greenville, a close friend, thought that Mantinband was “ridden out on a rail.”

Charles Mantinband was given a warm send off by the non-Jewish community including a public farewell banquet. Few of Hattiesburg’s Jews attended; apparently it had been “difficult to interest the Jewish group” in the occasion. The membership of Temple B’nai Israel was ambivalent about the loss of their rabbi. While the temple board attempted to persuade Mantinband to stay, the congregation had cause to feel relief at the rabbi’s planned departure. A final demonstration of the burden of having an outspoken and prominent rabbi had come in the frank and revealing extracts from Mantinband’s personal journal printed in American Judaism. This critical and intimate portrait of his congregation, detailing its obstructionism and exposing its prejudices, suggests why some within a congregation sensitive to its image and wary of conspicuousness would have been comforted by
the prospect of a more reticent replacement rabbi.120 This was not to be.

Ben-Ami’s Background

Less than two years after Mantinband’s departure, his replacement, Rabbi David Z. Ben-Ami, left Temple B’nai Israel in much the same circumstances as André Ungar had exited Temple Israel in Port Elizabeth.121 During his brief tenure in Hattiesburg, Ben-Ami’s path crossed with his historical doppelganger; Ungar playing an incidental role in the first act of Ben-Ami’s personal drama.

Temple B’nai Israel began looking for a rabbi after Mantinband traveled to Longview and soon settled on David Ben-Ami. It is uncertain as to who referred or nominated Ben-Ami as a candidate (indeed he seems to have been the only candidate), although he did enjoy the enthusiastic backing of temple president Alvin Sackler.122 Sackler nonetheless later turned on his charge, becoming the major proponent of the speedy termination of the rabbi’s services. Ben-Ami was not a member of the CCAR and therefore not recommended by the organization’s placement commission. The temple board may have been attracted by Ben-Ami’s background, promising a low-key alternative to his high profile predecessor.

Ben-Ami, born in Germany in 1924, was on the surface an unusual candidate for a southern pulpit. He had trained in social work at New York University and practiced as a social worker in New York, a career that the temple board believed to be far removed from political activism.123 He received his rabbinical training in the late 1950s from the Academy for Higher Jewish Learning, a small, newly-established independent seminary.124 His motives for this mid-career turn to the pulpit are unclear, as are the reasons for his choice of Hattiesburg. Temple B’nai Israel paid a modest salary, a sum smaller than that which elicited complaints from Perry Nussbaum.125 Ben-Ami later claimed that he was driven by prophetic motives, intentionally opting to serve on the “frontlines” of the civil rights struggle.126 However, he came to Hattiesburg with his wife and three young children,
not a propitious platform for activism in Mississippi’s turbulent political climate. He was surely also aware of Charles Mantinband’s experience at Temple B’nai Israel, certainly a discouragement to all but the most foolhardy of activists. He may have been seeking celebrity if his later activities in the town are indicative. Alternatively, his motives may have been more practical. His wife used his brief tenure to complete a master’s degree in education at the local campus of the University of Southern Mississippi, undertaken with an eye to future employment as a teacher in New York.\(^\text{127}\) Ben-Ami wanted to join the CCAR. Without membership his prospects for employment and advancement were limited. Not having trained at one of the “recognized theological schools” that would have gained him automatic membership in the CCAR, he was required to serve a five-year probationary period at UAHC-affiliated congregations in order to qualify.\(^\text{128}\) Four years in the rabbinical backwaters of Irondequoit and Brewster in New York left only one year in Hattiesburg to fulfill this requirement, thereafter leaving him “free to return to ‘civilization.’” He looked forward to finally finding a “suitable (decent) position.”\(^\text{129}\)

Ben-Ami’s background placed him between Mantinband and Ungar on the frontier spectrum. Whereas Ungar’s mobility allowed him to place the demands of the prophets before the responsibilities of the pulpit, Ben-Ami exhibited both the weaknesses of a frontier rabbi and the strengths of an outsider. While he did not share Mantinband’s deeply-felt sense of responsibility towards his congregation, he was constrained by a set of factors typical of the frontier condition. For example, his wife’s studies tied him to Hattiesburg and established local links and pressure for the maintenance of a relatively stable relationship with his congregation. While his age and family responsibilities may have been counterbalanced by the possibility of a return to his secular profession, he had few alternative prospects within the rabbinate. Lacking membership in the CCAR, he was excluded from the support and protection offered by organizational ties. His mobility as a rabbi was further reduced by the coincidence of his tenure with a period of crisis in the Reform rabbinate. The rapid growth
of the Reform movement in the 1950s had slowed by the mid-
1960s, producing an oversupply of rabbis. The already small pool
of attractive pulpits shrunk, leaving few desirable options for rab-
bis who were not served by the CCAR Placement Commission.
Another consequence was a change in power relationships within
congregations as their boards and the laity became more assertive
and made inroads into the rabbi’s sphere. Moreover, unlike Port
Elizabeth’s Temple Israel, Hattiesburg’s congregation was experi-
enced in dealing with a difficult rabbi. Crucially, Ben-Ami seems
to have regarded his move to Hattiesburg as temporary. He never
formed the lasting attachments that restrained many frontier rab-
bis. However, Ben-Ami was more pliable than Ungar and Mantinband. He ultimately reduced his involvement in public
civil rights activities in response to congregational pressure.
Ungar and Other Outsiders

David Ben-Ami’s problems began within months of his arrival when Hattiesburg became a center of the Freedom Summer project in Mississippi. Freedom Summer began in Hattiesburg on January 21, 1964, with a demonstration outside the Forrest County Courthouse organized to coincide with the South’s inaugural Freedom Day. Two hundred of Hattiesburg’s African American residents, joined by fifty pastors from the National Council of Churches, stood in the rain all day outside the courthouse waiting to register as voters. Among the poster-toting protestors was André Ungar, who participated in the first week of protests together with a small delegation from the Rabbinical Assembly. The day’s demonstration was uneventful, the first of a series of protests that continued through spring. The protests and the presence of the northern rabbis had an unsettling effect on the Hattiesburg Jewish community, which disapproved of their “marching around for the news cameras.” The rabbis were a noticeable presence among the mainly black protestors; “white men with beards and black suits,” they were “obviously Jewish.” To add to the community’s worries, the courthouse was in the heart of Hattiesburg’s business district, and the demonstrations disrupted commerce including at Jewish-owned businesses.

The Jewish community’s disquiet was intensified when Ungar and fellow rabbi Jerome Lipnick announced that they planned to attend the Friday night service at Temple B’nai Israel. The rabbis were forewarned that the service could be cancelled if they chose to come. This threat was not carried out; instead many members of the congregation seem to have demonstrated their displeasure by not attending. Reluctantly invited into the temple, Ungar, Lipnick, and several Protestant ministers who accompanied them joined a turnout of fifteen members for the service. Much to the rabbis’ disappointment, Ben-Ami did not deliver a sermon, relinquishing, what to their minds was a perfect opportunity to apply the lessons of the weekly Torah portion to the events in Hattiesburg. Appropriately the Torah portion described the exodus from Egypt, material that Ungar himself had used to much effect and disaffection in his first controversial
sermon in Port Elizabeth nearly a decade before. The rabbis’ presence and the start of the Freedom Summer project in Hattiesburg set in motion a train of events marked by escalating tensions between the rabbi and his congregation that led to the unseating of David Ben-Ami within a year.

Ungar was familiar with the cold welcome of his southern co-religionists. In May 1963, he and eighteen other Conservative rabbis left the annual Rabbinical Assembly convention in the Catskills to travel to Birmingham in a show of solidarity with the civil rights protests in the city. The expedition had been spontaneously suggested as a means to demonstrate commitment to social justice, an issue that took on immediate relevance when the daily newspapers showed scenes of police brutality in Birmingham. While Ungar relished the short visit, rhapsodizing that the delegation had come within “hissing distance of the grand sweep of history itself, of the immortal battle between good and evil”, Birmingham’s Jewish community was much less enthusiastic. Indignant at the rabbis’ failure to warn them of their plans and concerned that the delegation’s presence could spark equally spontaneous reprisals, the local Jewish leadership tried to persuade the delegation to leave immediately. Failing that, they sought reassurances that the rabbis would consult with the community before taking any action. Ungar, unsympathetic to and suspicious of the community’s timidity, scornfully dismissed their fears in much the same way that he spurned the pleadings of Port Elizabeth’s Jews:

Our coming had already caused much harm; let us not bring it to the boil by being seen in the streets as demonstrators. We were solemnly warned about the peril to our own lives. The number of dynamite sticks recently found under the Temple was solemnly adduced. How the forthcoming convention of the States’ Rights Party and the as yet quiescent Klanners wreak vengeance for our misdeeds on the heads of the local Jewish population was starkly portrayed. Also, we were assured of the liberal sentiments and the behind-the-scenes commitment of Birmingham Jewry, as well as their efforts on behalf of civil rights. Hints were flashed our way about the public recognition that Robert Kennedy might flash our way if only we withdrew
now and forever. . . . The Birmingham Jew was squarely on the side of reaction.145

Although the trip coincided with a lull in the protests as city officials negotiated with the protesters, the delegation was denounced by Birmingham’s Jewish leaders as “irresponsible,” “intoxicated,” “ill-timed and ill-conceived.”146 After discussing the visit with Rabbi Milton Grafman of Temple Emanu-El in Birmingham, Charles Mantinband apparently agreed with this assessment, adding a final reproachful “ill-advised” to the alliterative list of epithets.147 Despite the frosty reception from Birmingham Jewry, Ungar and his colleagues were inspired by their perceived success and excited that a mere “handful of individuals may indeed leave their worthy mark.” “Who,” Ungar concluded, “is more called upon than Jews, God’s chosen, and among them rabbis, the chosen people’s chosen ones, to fulfill that holy task?”148 This sense of obligation and excitement motivated Ungar’s return south a few months later, this time to Hattiesburg.

The ill feeling that Ungar encountered in Birmingham and Hattiesburg reflected a resentment of outside intervention in what was perceived by many southerners as a problem that was theirs alone to solve. This reaction was part of a broad response manifested in a widely shared suspicion of “outside agitators” and “Yankee foreigners.”149 Everyone, from extremists blaming “communist Jews” for secretly pulling the strings of the hated NAACP, to moderate, educated southerners, criticized northern interference.150 David Danzig, the American Jewish Committee’s program director, encountered this feeling among Jewish leaders in the region when he received the unspoken admonition that “if Northern Jews ‘would go away and leave us alone’ — keep hands off the desegregation situation — everything would be alright.”151 Mantinband similarly advised his northern colleagues that “we who live in the South know how to proceed.”152 This resentment was a rare area of commonality between the minority of rabbis who openly supported integration and the minority of vocal Jewish segregationists. Progressive rabbis could agree with the sentiment expressed in the pamphlet A Jewish View on Segregation, written by a Mississippi Jew (avowedly a
“Jewish Southerner”, “not a Southern Jew”) and published by the Mississippi Citizens’ Council:

Is it too much to ask that they leave us to the solution of our own problems? Any jackass can be a Monday morning quarterback, an armchair general. Any idiot can successfully rear the other fellow’s children or make a go of his marriage or solve his financial difficulties. But it is the smart man who knows that each person has not only the right but the obligation to settle his own problems to the best of his ability.153

Even outspoken supporters of civil rights were annoyed by the criticisms and moral demands made by their northern counterparts.154 The pronouncements of northerners often ignored the need for practicality and slow, steady progress.155 Mantinband “didn’t have too much respect for the North or their attitudes towards the Negro,” urging “them not to feel superior” and pointing out that “it is easy to be liberal one thousand miles away from the scene of the battle.”156 Echoing Mantinband’s words, Rabbi William Silverman of Nashville cautioned, “It is little help to beat one’s breast in New York and preach at us in Boston.”157

This resentment extended to the perceived insensitivity of northern Jewish organizations to their southern constituency, often compounding the problems of already embattled rabbis. For example, the UAHC’s invitation to Martin Luther King, Jr., to address its biennial banquet in Chicago in 1963 was criticized by seven Mississippi rabbis, Ben-Ami included, as a “completely unnecessary provocation,” that generated unwanted publicity and visibility for southern Jews.158 Rabbi Moses Landau reported that Jews in the Deep South were “full of sound and fury” about the selection of banquet speaker: “Boards meet and pass resolutions. . . . Even the moderates join in. . . . People speak of secession from the UAHC. . . . It is 1860 here again.”159 Nussbaum thought that the invitation indicated that the UAHC “has no regard for the security of the Jewish communities” in Mississippi. Moreover, it undermined his own efforts as “a one man vocal defender of the Union,” as well as the work of other “Rabbis of congregations fighting the battle for our national bodies day by day, and year
by year.” Nussbaum ominously warned that most Mississippi Jews had been “restrained until now from aggressive displays toward the Union,” suggestively highlighting his congregation’s “steady history of financial support.” With the Social Justice Commission of the UAHC “on the march”, seemingly placing political motives before their concerns of their southern colleagues, Nussbaum found himself “committed to a position wholly unrealistic and untenable — a brinkmanship unworthy of a Jewish doctrine of responsibility toward Jews also!”

Many southern rabbis also resented the brief visits of northern rabbis who came south to join protests. Northern rabbis gained praise in their own region for these actions, but were often regarded as interfering meddlers in the South. The visitors were not tied down by local responsibilities and were unaffected by the factors that constrained frontier rabbis. The security of fleeting prophetic tourism, the remoteness of congregational obligations, and the perceived Manichean moral nature of the South’s problems freed the rabbi to say and do what many would not in the North. Rabbi Arnold Turetsky of the Jacksonville (FL) Jewish Center complained that the visits of crusading rabbis were counterproductive, creating “a great deal of resistance and resentment even among those [in the Jewish community] who consider themselves moderates.” Turetsky regarded the rabbis’ visits as impolite, questioning “the propriety and the courtesy of someone coming down to my community” and deprecating “hit-and-run, sporadic, staccato” morality. Mantinband complained that he had “long become accustomed to visits by investigators from the North who, after a few days, become experts upon conditions in Dixie. I should not presume to venture any opinion about the sorry situation in New York City.” Nussbaum dismissed such rabbis as “carpetbaggers.” The actions of northern rabbis in the South were often embarrassing for both the southern rabbi and his community and potentially disrupted relations with the non-Jewish community and sometimes undermined low-key desegregation initiatives. Unrestrained by local responsibilities and often not in contact with their southern counterparts, the
temporary visitors often left their colleagues with bruised egos and angry congregations. Some southern rabbis, Nussbaum included, suggested restrictions on these unsolicited visits by northern colleagues. Anshe Chesed Congregation in Vicksburg, Mississippi, formally requested from the CCAR that “no rabbi should come to Vicksburg.”

Resentment at outside interference became particularly pronounced during the freedom rides and the Freedom Summer projects, soured with additional indignation at the perceived hypocrisy of northern Jewish activists who failed to protest inequalities closer to home. The Jewish northerners who made up a sizeable proportion of the white freedom riders often met with private hostility from their southern co-religionists. Mantinband regarded the freedom rides as “grandstand stunts for publicity.” He bitterly complained that the “greatest experts on Mississippi are persons who have never been there or those demonstrators who are there for 48 hours and get arrested and their names in the papers.” Jacob Rothschild similarly argued that the Freedom Riders, unlike participants in the sit-ins, were “often . . . outsiders who have come in without consulting people really involved in the situation.” Mantinband preferred a strategy that avoided confrontation, fearing that civil rights protests, particularly by outsiders, would trigger a segregationist backlash, radicalizing and polarizing the political climate, and undermining the slow and steady efforts of moderates. He had “never seen active demonstrations where a messier condition wasn’t left after the demonstrators go. I deplore such actions because it may do as much bad as good.” Rothschild thought that “direct non-violent action often creates violence” speculating that “perhaps some of the Riders may have hoped for violence.” Negotiation was more productive than “self-defeating,” badly-timed protests. Mass protest made for inflexibility, obviating the possibility of compromise: “one [side] becomes more extreme, forcing the other to do likewise.” The Atlanta rabbi argued that persuasion was preferable to coercion. Solutions should be sought by bringing local moderates together, not imposed by outsiders: “whites [began] to understand and to be willing to speak, to know who the other
people were and, therefore, able to do something in the community.” To his mind “there is a value . . . in working with the so-called power structure because it can change and do something.”

The Freedom Summer projects signaled a change in strategy by bringing the civil rights struggle into the Deep South and challenging segregationists on their home turf. They also challenged the approach of many southern liberals, civil rights rabbis included. The new focus on confrontational tactics, press attention, and national pressure conflicted with the compromise and gradualist approach preferred by many southern liberals. The familiar modus operandi, drawing on a network of contacts and sympathizers, and necessitating a familiarity with the local political scene, was being replaced by mass action. Already distrustful of forced change and sharing misgivings about outside interference, many southern liberals were resistant to the new tactics that diminished their importance, leaving them on the sidelines as spectators to the change and rendering their long established role as interracial intermediaries largely redundant. That those involved in civil rights protests, most of whom were outsiders and scornful of the southerners’ liberal credentials, were suspicious of their commitment and motives only made matters worse. The unease of southern liberals, the civil rights rabbis among them, was magnified many times over in the broader white community.

Battling Ben-Ami

While David Ben-Ami was unfortunate in that his tenure coincided with a period of volatility in Hattiesburg, his own actions in the spring and summer of 1964 did much to anger the membership of Temple B’nai Israel. Many of his congregants thought Ben-Ami far too friendly towards the northern activists and clergymen involved in the Freedom Summer project. According to one of the ministers who participated in the protests, Rabbi Ben-Ami “was the only local citizen in Hattiesburg to show any amount of friendliness” to the delegation of northern clergymen. He invited them to his house and talked with them at the courthouse. While the congregation would have disapproved of visits by the
clergymen to the rabbi’s home because of their sensitivity about associating the temple with the protestors, they must have been enraged when Ben-Ami housed rabbis participating in the registration project.\textsuperscript{178} The rabbi also visited the nine clergymen arrested during the second week of the protests. Informed of his visit by the sheriff, the temple board read Ben-Ami the “riot act . . . Thou shalt not visit agitators — clerical or otherwise — who have come to disturb the equanimity of our community.”\textsuperscript{179} Alvin Sackler, Temple B’nai Israel’s president, complained that despite meeting with Ben-Ami, “we did not make a dent on the Rabbi as to his dealing with Presbyterian ministers in regards to integration.” While they could not persuade the rabbi to cease his contacts with the ministers, Ben-Ami was sympathetic to their warnings about the potential consequences for Jewish businessmen if Jews were seen to be involved in the protests.\textsuperscript{180} However, the rabbi did not heed this demand. Instead he befriended Robert Beech, a northern clergyman representing the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches in Hattiesburg.\textsuperscript{181} Ben-Ami also raised funds for the Committee of Concern to rebuild black churches destroyed by white supremacists, a project actively promoted by Perry Nussbaum.\textsuperscript{182}

The relationship between Ben-Ami and his congregation rapidly disintegrated after the first public protests in January 1964. Members of the Jewish community pressured Ben-Ami to cease his association with the civil rights activists by writing letters and telephoning the rabbi to express their displeasure.\textsuperscript{183} His initial failure to comply brought a harsher response. Sackler threatened to resign from the congregation if the rabbi was not fired: “he had lost confidence in Rabbi Ben-Ami. Cannot do anything with the Rabbi.”\textsuperscript{184} Other members of the congregation displayed their discontent in a blunter fashion by boycotting services and withdrawing financial support.\textsuperscript{185} These events eventually persuaded Ben-Ami to reduce his controversial public presence. Unlike Ungar, Ben-Ami buckled under congregational pressure. Sufficiently dependent on his position to back away from continued activism, he chose job security over prophetic self-sacrifice.
Frowning on their rabbi’s activities and probably dreading a replay of their experience with Mantinband, the congregation was provided with no respite as Hattiesburg became the largest Freedom Summer site in Mississippi. Alongside the voter registration drive, in July 1964 the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) opened freedom schools in Hattiesburg and adjoining Palmer’s Crossing. Many of the northern college students recruited to teach at the freedom schools were Jewish. Hattiesburg’s Jews were already sensitive to their image in the white community, fearful of stirring antisemitism, and critical of the civil rights struggle. The presence of Jewish activists magnified the local Jews’ preexisting hostility to the Freedom Summer project. In some of their eyes it looked too much like a “Jewish protest.” Their opposition could not have been helped by the content of some of the lessons taught at the freedom schools. Doug Baer, who had just returned from a year of study in Israel, made the similarities between the Jewish historical experience of persecution and the black struggle in America the theme of his classes, pointing to Israel’s mettle as a model for the civil rights movement. As if to prove their fears well founded, Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, a highly visible and prominent volunteer who served the Fairmont Temple in Cleveland (OH), and a small interracial group of co-workers were assaulted in broad daylight while walking. Although the Jewish community was unsympathetic to Lelyveld, the attack unsettled Hattiesburg’s Jews. It was an unpleasant reminder of the threat implicit in the antisemitic literature that had been distributed along with segregationist material in Hattiesburg during the summer.

Many considered Ben-Ami a less likable figure than his predecessor. His relationship with his congregation was marred as much by “personality factors” as by an incompatibility of convictions and priorities. His colleagues in the Mississippi Reform rabbinate thought that he was not a competent congregational rabbi because he lacked “the qualities that would have kept him in his congregation, civil rights issue or not.” While Temple B’nai Israel may have been willing to hire anybody “who professed to be a rabbi,” the community suspected that Ben-Ami fell
short of even this low bar. One congregant recalled that his “ability and education as a rabbi (if he was one) was obviously minimal.” He failed to perform his rabbinical duties, perhaps distracted by his part-time teaching at the University of Southern Mississippi. Sackler composed a lengthy list of “grievances against [the] Rabbi”: services did not start on time, he was under-prepared, did not teach at the Sunday School, “talks bad about the congregation out of town,” “disregards wishes of board of directors,” and failed to “set [an] example for [the] community in personal life.” Shortcomings that might have otherwise been overlooked were fodder for a fault-finding board. Ben-Ami also seems to have lacked Mantinband’s finesse and charm, virtues that were essential in soothing and placating a raging congregation. Like Ungar, he appears to have been quick to disapprove of his congregation’s timidity. Suggesting poor judgment, he most likely distributed reprints of a sermon by a rabbi jailed at Albany, Georgia, to some members of congregation:

Let those who embrace a faith without a passion for justice at its core, without a willingness to act — sacrifice, if need be without ‘Love thy neighbor as thyself,’ and all that implies of human responsibility — let them do what they will, but let them not call that faith by the name of Judaism. For their temples are only comfortable shams, their God is opportunism, and in the place of the Torah they might well build their idols to success, conformity, respectability and ambition — for truly this is already the religion of their heart.

Ben-Ami was unhappy in Hattiesburg, and he expressed his disappointment about the congregation and community to Nussbaum shortly after his arrival. However, he received little sympathy from his rabbinical counterpart in Jackson. Nussbaum chided Ben-Ami that he “must have been fully aware of what developed in this congregation and in the city towards the end of Mantinband’s ministry” before he accepted the Hattiesburg pulpit. Nussbaum refused to believe that the congregation had “turned against” Ben-Ami over his civil rights activities, as their “attitudes and concerns were already fixed by the time he arrived.” Ben-Ami complained that he was isolated in the small
town, receiving no support from national Jewish bodies beyond “pious statements.” The tense local scene troubled the rabbi: “I had to tremble when I walked in the street or when someone knocked at my door. It reminded me of Germany where I was born.”

The rabbi’s despondency was rooted in frustration and disappointment. He began looking for alternative postings barely months after taking up his position in Hattiesburg, probably realizing that his already stormy tenure was likely to be short-lived. “Decent” pulpits were still out of his grasp. Not yet a member of the CCAR, he was offered positions in Bluefield, West Virginia, and Muskegon, Michigan. After years of sacrifice in the expectation of eventual reward, all he could look forward to were further frontier pulpits.

In October 1964, the temple’s trustees unanimously agreed to terminate the rabbi’s three-year contract, giving Ben-Ami the “prerogative of leaving at anytime.” He was offered the inducement of three months salary if he opted to depart early. Ben-Ami reached a mutual agreement with the temple board that he would leave the following February, amicably and quietly satisfying both parties.

This was not to be. He left Temple B’nai Israel in the blaze of publicity that the congregation had long sought to avoid. The controversy and resulting press attention arose out of the “Christmas in Mississippi” project, a scheme hatched by black entertainers Dick Gregory and Sammy Davis, Jr., to provide twenty thousand turkeys to the poor of Mississippi for Christmas. The Salvation Army was enlisted to distribute the turkeys, but many of its local officers refused to participate. It was left to volunteers to fulfil this function. When David Ben-Ami’s name was included in a list published in the New Orleans States-Item of those distributing turkeys in Hattiesburg, alongside the names of the controversial Reverend Robert Beech and a black Baptist minister, members of the Jewish community were enraged. The temple held an emergency meeting the next day. The publicity was considered to be a final provocation and even Ben-Ami admitted that the “notoriety . . . added fuel to the fire.” Rumors swirled that segregationists
were planning a retaliatory boycott of Jewish owned stores. To further worsen matters, the timing of this final act created the impression that the incident had precipitated Ben-Ami’s departure. The national Jewish press trumpeted Ben-Ami’s “ousting” as a scandal, claiming that the rabbi had “lost his position with the congregation because of his advocacy of civil rights.” Temple B’nai Israel was swamped by angry letters from across the country decrying its betrayal of Jewish values.

Relations between the rabbi and his congregation reached a nadir. Some of the congregants were so distrustful and upset that Ben-Ami “had to have the Salvation Army’s National Commander . . . in New York wire the board to assure them that I was not a subversive character.” The incident also soured the rabbi’s relationship with his Mississippi colleagues. Nussbaum, who had shortly before reminded Hattiesburg’s rabbi that “the rabbis and congregations in Mississippi would still have a lot of problems once he was gone,” an implicit warning against provocative actions as his departure grew near, resented the complications created by the controversy. Ben-Ami could not resist making a final splash. Like Ungar, who made his last public speech fiercely condemning the Group Areas after having announced his resignation to his congregation, David Ben-Ami had used this opening to take a controversial public position. To Nussbaum’s mind, he had acted in a manner unrestrained by congregational responsibilities and due regard for the interests of his fellow Jews in Mississippi.

Ben-Ami’s departure in February 1965 was not regretted by his congregation. Exhausted and distressed by their experience with two troublesome rabbis, Temple B’nai Israel elected not to seek a replacement. Congregants would conduct their own services in the future. The congregation did not want to “get ‘stuck’ again after our disappointment with Ben-Ami.” Before leaving Hattiesburg, Ben-Ami took a last swipe at his congregation, at the same time justifying his own actions: “The Jews’ position as Jews is morally untenable, but the rabbi in the South cannot always act in the rabbinic tradition. Either we had to do what was right, or we compromised with evil.”
The tone and sentiments expressed could easily have been André Ungar’s.

_Micah, Mantinband, Amos, and Ben-Ami_

These sentiments reflect a trend within progressive Judaism in the 1950s and 1960s. In America, the UAHC under Maurice Eisendrath pushed the rapidly expanding Reform movement towards greater engagement with social justice issues, providing institutional backing for civil rights activities by rabbis and congregations. Ben-Ami credited Eisendrath’s “call to action” as an inspiration for his own activism. André Ungar drew similar inspiration from Leo Baeck who urged his students to exemplify the ideals of prophetic Judaism: “the message is not the preaching of a Rabbi, but the man himself. . . . Only if he himself is a message, can he bring a message.” Both Ungar and Ben-Ami were influenced by this renewed effort to synthesize Judaism and human service, a movement that resonated with their own personal encounters with Nazism. These same forces galvanized the social justice movement within progressive Judaism. The expansion of the Reform and Conservative movements and the accompanying institutional support for the social message of prophetic Judaism provided a platform and a niche for the turbulent priest-prophet. The postwar period offered opportunity and encouragement for idealistic rabbis to exemplify prophetic Judaism, whether by assuming pulpits in Mississippi and South Africa or, more commonly, by participating in the freedom rides and Freedom Summer projects. Ben-Ami, working as a social worker in New York, claimed to have seized the opportunity to live out what he saw as the ethical implications of his religious heritage. He “volunteered to serve on the front lines of the civil rights struggle,” wanting to be on the “firing line instead of dealing only with dialog on racial strife.” Ungar “felt keenly the duty to articulate the traditional Jewish laws on social justice,” arriving in South Africa with “leaping hopes and blazing ideals,” driven by a vision of a “community thriving in its fulfillment of prophetic Judaism.”

Both rabbis derived inspiration from the prophetic model, understanding social justice to be central to Jewish values and to
be intimately bound up with Jewish identity.\textsuperscript{222} Ben-Ami presented his activities in the South as that of “a ‘witness’ laboring in the prophetic tradition, and therefore not able to assume a ‘hands-off’ and neutral position in the struggle for civil rights.”\textsuperscript{223} Ungar, who saw himself as the heir to rabbinical reformers and prophets, articulated this commitment to “living Judaism” in a \textit{cri de coeur} in the \textit{Temple Israel Bulletin}. As “Justice is the highway to piety,” the rabbi’s responsibilities extend to

\begin{quote}
Human Dignity, the equality of all peoples and races, the oneness of mankind and the worth of all its members. Prophetic courage was—and is—needed to assert them amidst circumstances which let the negation of these values pass as permissible and even respectable. . . . The pulpits and written pronouncements of progressive Jewish congregations always represent focal points of the struggle for human rights, social equity, universal moral standards.
\end{quote}

While Ungar and Ben-Ami defined Judaism in prophetic terms, entailing inescapable universal responsibilities, their congregations preferred their religion to be a socially acceptable counterpart to that of their conservative, church-going neighbors. The temple stood at the center of an orbit of religious, social, education, fundraising, and sisterhood activities, but was resistant to the pull of controversial social justice activities. The perception of vulnerability, coupled with disinterest and disinclination, persuaded South African and southern Jews to steer clear of political involvement. Ungar scorned the “hollow automatism of lip and limb movement” of a Judaism that placed appearance before substance, warning that without commitment to prophetic ideals South African Jewish “spiritual coherence will be reduced to the level of a common liking for gefilte fish.”\textsuperscript{224} Instead, it was necessary to “infuse meaning into outward observance; and spread Jewish relevance from its arbitrary ritual confinement to all levels of life.”\textsuperscript{225} Ben-Ami shared this concern, counseling that a morally unengaged Judaism was unsatisfactory.\textsuperscript{226}

This clash of perceptions extended to the appropriate role of the rabbi. Above all, Temple B’nai Israel in Hattiesburg wanted its rabbi to be presentable, as much an ambassador to the gentiles as
a representative of God’s preferably undemanding message.\textsuperscript{227} Although Charles Mantinband fulfilled this role, participating in an assortment of civic organizations, he was headstrong and resistant to pressure from his congregation. Ungar, and to a lesser extent Ben-Ami, were no more malleable or willing to “consecrate the status quo.”\textsuperscript{228} In their eyes the rabbi’s paramount obligation to fulfillment of prophetic teachings beyond his community dwarfed his congregational duties.

The divergence between the needs of congregation and rabbi points to the widening gulf between progressive Judaism, pushed by the social justice orientation into activism, and South African and southern Jewry, pulled by the countervailing tug of conservative conformity. Ben-Ami and Ungar’s brief tenures also suggest the dynamics of the frontier power relationships. Both were isolated, André Ungar on a double frontier. If Port Elizabeth was an outlying settlement of Jewry in South Africa, Temple Israel was a beleaguered outpost of Reform Judaism in its midst. Although Port Elizabeth had a large Jewish community, the tensions between Reform and Orthodoxy ensured that the lone Progressive rabbi was unable to draw on the support of his Orthodox colleagues.\textsuperscript{229} Nor did he have the support of the fledgling Progressive movement, which was hostile to his political stance. David Ben-Ami could not rely on the support of the CCAR, one potential ally, because he was not a member. Elements in the rabbis’ backgrounds made their positions even more precarious and problematic. Their outsider status, by virtue of their foreign origins, simultaneously sensitized them to injustice and created barriers between them and their congregations. It also activated the endemic suspicion of outsiders, impeded their acceptance into the community, and reduced their commitment and sense of attachment to their congregations. Although their temple boards attempted to dominate them, their relative youth, qualifications, and brief tenures provided the option of mobility that many of their counterparts lacked. Nonetheless, the sway that the congregation held over these two unusual rabbis is demonstrated by the liberating effect that the lifting of congregational responsibilities had on them. Ungar and Ben-Ami became vocal
and troublesome for their congregations after they agreed to depart.

The place that the two rabbis currently occupy in southern and South African Jewish consciousness also hints at the fickle nature of memory. Although David Ben-Ami’s name still elicits disapproving murmurs from Hattiesburg’s older Jewish residents, recently André Ungar has been retrospectively embraced by the South African Jewish community as a Jewish “struggle hero.” Although a suspicious South African Jewish Board of Deputies continued to follow Ungar’s actions and writings until the late 1980s, in post-apartheid South Africa, a “struggle” rabbi is now an asset and no longer an embarrassment.
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The Ku Klux Klan and the Jewish Community of Dallas, 1921–1923

by

Rosalind Benjet

Many long-term Dallas residents assert that the Jewish community in the heart of the Bible Belt neither experienced antisemitism nor incidents that reflected hatred of Jews by groups such as the Ku Klux Klan. This statement is only partially true. Although Jewish Dallasites never experienced much in the way of overt antisemitic activities such as Jews endured in other cities and towns, including some in Texas, a few events did take place that color an otherwise benign picture.

Both the leaders of the Jewish community and those of Dallas were involved in business. Jews had resided in the city almost from its inception and had made numerous business and civic contributions. As was the case in many other southern cities and towns, economic prosperity outweighed possible prejudice in this relationship because both groups were needed to make the city prosper. By attacking Jewish businesses, which were among the largest in Dallas at the time, a group like the Klan would be attacking the general business climate of the city, something that few advocated.

Two significant incidents mar the otherwise calm waters that Jewish Dallas experienced in the early 1920s. First, in March 1922, a Jew named Philip Rothblum was taken by a group of men to the Trinity River Bottoms, a relatively unpopulated area west of the city, where he was flogged and threatened with further harm if he did not leave the city at once. One year later, former impeached governor James E. Ferguson wrote an article titled “The Cloven
Foot of the Dallas Jew,” published in his newspaper, the Ferguson Forum, in which he accused prominent Jewish businessmen of supporting Klan politicians, thus allying themselves with the Klan. An examination of these events contributes to an understanding of what may have happened and why the Jewish community responded the way it did. Before addressing these two incidents, however, it is important to look at the Jewish and Klan presence in Dallas, as well as Klan influence.

Early Jewish Settlement

Although John Neely Bryan, the first settler, came to the area that would become Dallas in 1841, the city did not grow immediately. In 1845, Texas became the twenty-eighth state in the Union, no longer the Republic of Texas, which it had been since 1836. Settlers came mostly from other southern states, and in 1855 a French-speaking agricultural community called La Reunion was founded by two hundred French and Belgians. Although the La Reunion community failed, some of the participants remained in the new town. The population grew to 775 by 1859, shortly after the arrival of Alexander Simon, cited by Gerry Cristol as “the first known Jew to settle in Dallas.”1 Born in Poland, Alexander Simon had already lived in Houston, and by 1858 he ran unsuccessfully for the office of alderman in Dallas, where he was the proprietor of a store located on the town square. By 1863 Simon had left Dallas and moved to Brenham, Texas.2

During and just after the Civil War, other Jews settled in Dallas, many of them apparently shopkeepers like Simon, who remained only temporarily. In 1871, when it became clear that the railroad would come to Dallas, more Jews started to arrive. Among them were Jonas Rosenfield, a tobacco dealer, M. Ullman and E. M. Tillman, merchants selling groceries, wine, liquor, and tobacco, and E. M. Kahn, who operated a men’s clothing business, which grew into one of the city’s larger establishments.3

In 1872, the railroad arrived, and the city’s growth was assured. Sanger Brothers Dry Goods, which had already operated in other Texas towns, opened a store in Dallas in that year, and in the following year, Alex Sanger moved the original store to a site
“with 10,000 square feet of sales floor on Elm and Lamar streets—it was the largest retail store in Texas!”

Numerous other Jewish merchants settled in the city, many also dealing in dry goods, as well as home furnishings, groceries, fruit, and liquor. Additional Jewish businesses included bakeries and saloons. On July 1, 1872, the Dallas Hebrew Benevolent Association was established to serve the needs of the fledgling Jewish community. Three years later a decision was made to organize a permanent congregation, Temple Emanu-El, with a rabbi, a building, and a religious school for children. On March 1, 1884, Orthodox Jews, who had either attended services at Temple Emanu-El or worshipped in private homes, organized a new congregation, Shaareth Israel. A second
Orthodox congregation, Tiferet Israel, was founded in 1890. Other Jewish organizations followed, including B’nai B’rith, the Young Men’s Hebrew Association, and National Council of Jewish Women.

By 1920 the Jewish community of Dallas had reached a population of 8,000 out of a total city population of 135,000. Many of the leading retail businesses were owned by Jews, and, although social activities between Jews and gentiles remained separate, these businessmen had a significant role in the life of the city, serving as members of philanthropic and civic boards, such as that of the Texas State Fair. Like other prosperous businessmen, many were also members of the Masonic order where they came into contact with members of another significant Dallas group, the Ku Klux Klan.

Dallas was now a thriving commercial city, a regional banking and retail center in a cotton-producing area. Thus, at the same time that Klan membership was estimated at thirteen thousand, including many prominent citizens, a large percentage of the leading merchants of the city were Jewish. Jewish leaders spoke out against the Klan but never originated any actions to fight it. Spokesmen for the Klan wrote anti-Jewish slurs in their weekly newspaper but never planned any organized campaign against Jews. Indeed, the most virulent antisemitic document of the time came not from the Klan but from former governor James Ferguson.

The Ku Klux Klan in Dallas

In 1915, the post-Civil War Klan was revived in Atlanta by William J. Simmons. It attracted many people in the Midwest and the Southwest. According to Darwin Payne, a Dallas historian, the Klan’s “appeals to morality, native Americanism, patriotism, and fundamental Christianity proved to be an appealing message to local residents who were not well-educated and whose ties to small towns and rural areas remained close.” Bertram G. Christie organized Klan No. 66 in Dallas in late 1920, and, several years later, when membership grew to thirteen thousand, it was “said to be the largest local Klan in the nation.”
Klan members came from all walks of life. In Dallas, as elsewhere, Klan membership was common for those in business and politics as well as other occupations. Payne cites the Executive Committee of the Klan in spring of 1922 as such an example. Among the ten members of the committee were: “Police Commissioner Turley, three attorneys, a physician, and the assistant general manager of the Dallas Street Railway Co.” The steering committee of one hundred people included “twelve attorneys, eight physicians, four Dallas Power & Light Co. Officials, the superintendent of the local Ford Motor Co., a Daily Times Herald reporter, the Democratic Party county chairman, the county tax collector, a district judge-elect, a run-off candidate for district attorney (who soon won), and a smattering of bankers, druggists,
grocers, and others.” Another member was Robert L. Thornton, president of Dallas County State Bank, later prominent in Dallas politics and civic life. Especially well represented was the Dallas Police Department, whose Klan members included “Police Commissioner Louis Turley, Police Chief Elmo Straight, the assistant chief, three captains, ten sergeants, and ninety-one other officers, or about two-thirds of the force.”

Dallas became the center for Ku Klux Klan activities in north Texas. Its Imperial Wizard, Hiram W. Evans, was based in Dallas. Evans was most likely one of those responsible for the whipping and branding of a black man, Alex Johnson, in April 1921. African Americans were often the targets of hate and discrimination, and Dallas was no different from other cities in this respect. In March 1919, the African American community did have some success in appealing the showing of the film *The Birth of a Nation*, a film that glorified the Old South, slavery, and the original Klan. The local branch of the NAACP won the support of the board of censors, who canceled the show. During this time there was also a Colored Voters Association which opposed candidates for city office that they felt were objectionable to African Americans. (There were twelve thousand African Americans eligible to vote.) African Americans lived and worked in the Deep Ellum section of the city, just east of downtown Dallas, an area where a number of eastern European Jews settled and ran small businesses. There is no record of any association between Jewish and African American groups. Segregationist policies resulted in what Robert Prince, an African American doctor, who wrote a history of the African American community in Dallas, calls “the complete isolation of Dallas’ African-Americans,” a “culture within a culture” where “the black man was governed by, and worked in, a white society with folkways and mores dating back a millennium. The Negro was forced to develop a sub-culture that addressed his human needs.” Thus, African Americans lived their lives within the larger community but largely apart from it in all but the workplace.

On May 21, 1921, about eight hundred Klansmen marched on Main Street in downtown Dallas, carrying placards that read “All
Native Born,” “All Pure White,” and “Our Little Girls Must Be Protected.” The Dallas Klan claimed to be concerned with such matters as “cohabitation of blacks and whites of either sex,” and “the gambler, the trickster, the moral degenerate; and the man who lives by his wife and is without visible means of support.” Klan members in Dallas usually harbored no specific prejudice against Jews. In fact, Hortense Sanger, whose husband’s family ran the Sanger Brothers Department store, recounts the story of her uncle, Edward Titche, a good-looking and prosperous Dallas merchant, who was asked to join the Klan. When he informed them that he was Jewish and, therefore, was not interested in joining the Klan, they were disappointed because they thought he would have made a good Kleagle. She also recalls that her father went to meetings of the Masonic order and came home shaking his head sadly at learning that many prominent members were Klansmen.

Official Klan doctrine was, of course, antisemitic. Lois E. Torrence, who studied the Klan in Dallas, attributes this policy to both racial and religious factors: “The Jew was considered an absolutely unblendable element and by every patriotic test, he is alien and unassimilable. Not in a thousand years of continuous residence would he form basic attachments comparable to those the older type of immigrant would form within a year.” This was not an unusual view, as nativist and eugenic theories were widespread at the time. Other comments by Ouida Ferguson Nalle, the daughter of former governor Ferguson, attest to the generally antisemitic attitude of the Klan toward Jews: “The hooded night riders so terrorized the Jews in some parts of the State that for a time during the campaign [apparently her mother’s campaign for governor] they gathered together and sat up all night fearing a pogrom.” Nalle adds that the Klan had organized boycotts, not only of businesses owned by Jews, but of all so-called foreigners. But what Nalle described did not happen in Dallas.

There is a dichotomy in what the Klan said and what it did in Dallas. In fact, the relationship between the Klan and the Jewish community seems almost non-confrontational. Jewish leaders denounced the Klan, but no organized action ensued;
spokesmen for the Klan wrote some anti-Jewish slurs, but again no concerted efforts occurred. According to Charles C. Alexander, antisemitism as an organized Klan policy was not as significant an issue in Texas as it was in other states. Texas Klan members did not “openly advocate boycotting Jewish merchants” and no crosses were burned before synagogues. Although the Klan may at times have complained about Jewish business practices, such resentment made little difference to “the social standing or economic well-being of prominent Jewish families.”

The Klan newspaper, the *Texas 100% American*, published in Dallas, was itself ambivalent in its attitude toward Jews. On September 29, 1922, an article titled “Catholics and Jews, and our Public Schools,” explained that the Klan did not approve of Catholics teaching in public schools or serving on school boards, but it did not object to Jewish involvement. A Jew elected to the school board was there “because he has distinguished himself as a true friend of the cause of education.” Furthermore, “the majority of Jews, when you have found them in office, have mounted there from true worth, and not because of political ambitions.” But on February 23, 1923, in the same newspaper, Hiram Evans wrote that Jews have been “tendered hospitality” in America and that he believed that Jews were “Klannish.” Although the latter statement could mean that Jews could be good Klansmen and that they had Klan-type characteristics, it would have been out of character for Evans to have welcomed Jews as Klan members even if they posed no threat. It is more likely that he meant that Jews stayed together and apart from gentiles. Furthermore, Evans claimed to know what he believed western civilization had been slow to realize: “The amalgamation of two dissimilar races produces the inferior qualities of both.” These ideas were common to Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, and other racial theorists of the era.

Evans’s antisemitic remarks, under the headline “Attitude of the Klan Toward the Jews,” stand out as the most negative comments of the Dallas Klan against Jews. Catholics, rather than Jews, appear to have been more victimized by the Klan, and on June 1, 1923, the Klan declared that if Jews were not allied with Catholics, they would not be attacked by the Klan; but if the Jews joined
with the Catholics, they, too, would be attacked. Most of this article, however, disclaimed antisemitism on the part of the Klan: “We have not been Jew baiters, and we have not permitted ourselves to be known as Jew persecutors.” Subsequent articles that mentioned Jews emphasized the dangers of Jewish business practices, but none indicated that this was the case in Dallas. As Jonathan Sarna has demonstrated, the distinction was being made between the international Jew and the Jew next door.

Since Klansmen were expected to conduct business with other Klansmen whenever possible, some Dallas businesses feared Klan boycotts. Glenn Pricer, of the Dallas Dispatch, recalled, “The Klan was quite a threatening organization—people were afraid to belong to it and afraid not to. One of the main reasons for its growth was fear of boycott on the part of little businesses.”

There is no solid evidence that any sort of boycott of Dallas department stores, or any stores for that matter, was ever conducted. In fact, an editorial from the Jewish Monitor, a newspaper published weekly in Fort Worth that included news of the Dallas Jewish community, refers to rumors of a Ku Klux Klan and Knights of the Egyptian Mysteries boycott of Jewish businesses. The editor, Dr. G. George Fox, a Fort Worth rabbi, stated that, when the rumors persisted, he investigated personally and, after speaking with men, “whom we know to be very intimately connected with both organizations,” concluded that the rumors were taken too seriously, and, if repeated, they could get worse. He added, “Our own feeling in the matter is that the alleged prejudice against the Jews in these organizations is exaggerated and that we can only make matters worse by consistently dwelling upon the unfortunate intrusion into the calmness of American life, of racial and religious prejudices.” Although Fox may have preferred to smooth over an unpleasant situation, there is no evidence that Jewish businessmen in Dallas suffered any business losses because of boycott activities of the Klan or any other group.

The Klan did, however, boycott the Dallas Morning News. According to Darwin Payne, the Klan alleged “falsely that the newspaper was controlled by Catholics.” During spring 1922, George B. Dealey, president and general manager of the
newspaper, received scores of letters from readers and newspaper distributors demanding to know the religious affiliation of the board and employees of the newspaper. Although some letters came from Dallas, many originated in small towns within the state and from neighboring states. Dealey sent a form letter response, listing the religious affiliations of board members and key employees. There were no Jews, but two Catholics did hold key positions, the circulation manager, M. W. Florer, and Alonzo Wasson, the writer whose editorial initiated the paper’s anti-Klan policy.31 One letter, dated May 6, 1922, asked if any of the paper’s stock was owned by Jews. Dealey responded, “It may be that some of the stock of this corporation is owned by Hebrews, but so far as we recall now there are only one or two Hebrews who own stock, and who live in Dallas. We only know one for sure, and he owns one share.”32 Whether Dealey’s account is accurate or not is unknown, but the fact that he responded at all indicates that he had to be on the defensive because of his anti-Klan policies. Dealey was concerned about a drop in circulation from 72,340 as of April 1, 1919, to 66,902 as of October 1, 1921, due to Klan opposition to the paper’s stance.33 At the end of 1922, circulation was still down by three thousand, and the company was forced to use a cash reserve of $200,000 to pay the usual 8 percent dividend to the major stockholders. Dealey continued to oppose the Klan, but, at the same time, he had to satisfy the concerns of Jeannette Belo Peabody, the daughter of the company’s founder, about the profitability of the paper. No doubt such a boycott of the Dallas Morning News would have alarmed Jewish businessmen, but there is no record of their sentiments. Dealey, however, remained steadfast in his opposition to the Klan.

Jewish Response to the Klan

David Lefkowitz of Temple Emanu-El, the leading rabbi in Dallas at the time and often a spokesman for the Jewish community, seems to have been ambivalent about how to respond to the threat of the Klan. On June 16, 1921, Lefkowitz, who had a friendly relationship with Dealey, responded to Dealey’s
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editorials opposing the Klan: “Let me take this opportunity to thank you for your very courageous stand in both of your newspapers [the same company, A. H. Belo, owned both the *Dallas Morning News* and the *Dallas Journal*, an afternoon newspaper] on the sinister Ku Klux Klan. . . it has meant much in molding public opinion rightly in Dallas.”³⁴ On January 26, 1922, Lefkowitz wrote to John W. Stayton of *Holland’s Magazine*, stating that he was pleased that there were people outside his own religion “who are awake to the danger of the Ku Klux Klan, who realize that it is rank poison and threatens the very foundation of democracy.”³⁵ The following month, the rabbi’s strategy seems to have changed. In response to A. J. Kaufman, of Buffalo, Texas, who wanted to publish a vehemently anti-Klan article in the *Dallas Morning News*, Lefkowitz wrote, “My objection to fighting the Ku Klux Klan through the papers is that it gives this organization the publicity it wants and upon which it thrives. I believe that it can be more easily combatted by silence. . . . We here in Dallas are taking the latter tack of silence however you must use your own judgment.”³⁶ Like many Jews of the time, Lefkowitz may have believed that calling attention to problems like this only made them worse.

By December 26, 1923, Lefkowitz’s policy of silence was firmly entrenched. He wrote to J. J. Taubenhaus regarding some antisemitic remarks made by a speaker to the women’s section of the Klan: “I would hardly dignify an effusion like that by answering it. . . . The country is just mad and will have to see the end of its little spree and the Jews will suffer.”³⁷ Lefkowitz’s initial reactions against the Klan more likely reflect his true feelings, but during the 1920s Jews were not yet secure as Americans, and low-profile strategies were far more common than confrontational tactics. At the same time groups like the Klan were calling the Jews “unblendable,” many Jews were trying hard to “blend,” even if that meant ignoring racial slurs.

Regardless of what the Klan said, what they did or did not do in Dallas is more significant, and only a few incidents of antisemitic actions have been recorded. Marilyn Wood Hill tells of Jewish men receiving threatening phone calls from the Klan warning them not to date Christian women. She also recounts the story
of Helman Rosenthal, who had come to Dallas in 1918 to become the first professional head of the water department. When the Klan gained control of the city government under Mayor Sawnie R. Aldredge, Rosenthal was fired because the Klan wanted “one of their own kind” in his position.

More typical of the Dallas experience is the story of Milton Levy, who became a licensed plumber, “no mean feat, considering the prejudice against Jews felt by the established plumbers of the city.” By the early 1920s Levy was able to build up a successful plumbing business, and his name is mentioned regularly in minutes of the city council as the plumbing contractor for various city projects. Levy acknowledged that his success did not come easily: “Some of them didn’t know what a Jewish person looked like. They thought he must have horns. They know what a cowboy looked like, but if you told them you were Jewish, they would look you up and down to see if you were human or not. They [other plumbers] didn’t want me in business.” He explained further: “Everybody . . . knows that the name Levy means ‘Jewish’ but whenever there is a contract to be let, if our price is right we get the work.” Although Levy’s experience is mixed, again the business of Dallas is business, and his story reinforces that assertion. In fact, many Jewish businesses thrived during this time, and few experienced any direct Klan actions.

The Rothblum Incident

On March 6, 1922, Phillip Rothblum, 49, a picture framer, became the first reported Jewish victim of a Klan-like attack. According to the Dallas Morning News, several unmasked men came to his home, asked to see Rothblum, and forced him into an automobile, where he was blindfolded and taken to an unknown location. These men hit him in the face, knocked out two teeth, and whipped him with a heavy black snake whip. He was then threatened with further harm if he did not leave the city at once. Rothblum stated, “I’m afraid not to comply.” After the flogging he closed his business and left Dallas. Mayor Aldredge deplored the incident and promised that the police would investigate.
Meanwhile, the Dallas City Council adopted a resolution authorizing a reward of $250 for information “leading to the arrest and conviction of any one of the participants involved in the whipping of Phillip Rothblum.” An addendum described Dallas as “a peaceful law abiding community and this disgraceful affair was an outrage upon its good name.” Immediately following this announcement in the minutes was a response by the Ku Klux Klan, answering the council’s appeal (which had also been printed in the *Dallas Morning News*). The Klan approved the actions of the city council and authorized it to offer an additional five hundred dollar reward from Dallas Klan No. 66. Just as Dallas had sought a remedy to this violence, the Klan, too, stated that it supported “law and order. . . ONLY THROUGH THE REGULAR CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES, regardless of the unjust criticism of some of the press and those uninformed.” The Klan would back the city’s efforts at law enforcement and “any time that an act of felony is committed under any kind of hood or disguise you may call on the Ku Klux Klan for double the reward.”

With two-thirds of the police force as Klansmen, the police department was put into a difficult position. They could have remained silent about the incident, as police did elsewhere in lynchings, floggings, and other acts of violence, or directed responsibility to some group other than the Klan. It would have been difficult for police officials to condone anything like the flogging incidents, yet they could absolve the Klan by pointing out that the perpetrators were unmasked, whereas Klan punishments and threats were usually carried out by hooded men.

The Rothblum incident continued to be front-page material for the *Dallas Morning News*. On March 9, 1922, the newspaper published a second letter from the Klan backing law enforcement as well as a statement from Mrs. Rothblum that she could identify one of the attackers because she had seen him “about the courthouse a short time before the flogging.” On the same day, the *Texas 100% American* also recounted what had happened to Rothblum, adding that he had left the city and that a special investigation was being conducted.
Three days later, the *Dallas Morning News* reported that there was new evidence in the case and that Mr. and Mrs. Rothblum had returned from Little Rock after being given police protection. The Rothblums were scheduled to go before the grand jury on March 13, 1922. An editorial that same day alleged that the police were “tolerant of mob crimes of a species virtually unknown before the advent of the Ku Klux Klan,” and added, “If the men who invaded Rothblum’s home had stolen his slippers, they would probably now be in jail.”

When subpoenas were issued for the grand jury investigation, among those called was policeman J. J. Crawford. Crawford, identified by Darwin Payne as “a secret Klansman,” and his partner, Officer Leroy Wood, did have some connection with Rothblum. In February 1922, they had tried to arrest a black man as he left Rothblum’s house and business. (Rothblum’s business was located in his home.) When Crawford fired at the suspect, his shot missed the target and struck and killed Wood. On March 16, a headline read “No Indictments in Rothblum Flogging” and the grand jury did not even mention the case in its report.

By March 22, 1922, another flogging had occurred involving F. H. Etheridge, a gentile lumber dealer. Exactly why Etheridge was attacked is unknown. Again, rewards were offered by the city and the Klan. Chief detective W. R. Moffett told the *Dallas Morning News* that the grand jury knew who had whipped Rothblum, and the sheriff and Special Investigator Grady Kennedy promised to apprehend those responsible for the floggings. On March 23, District Attorney Maury Hughes stated that he believed both of the whippings had been committed by the same people and that he would prosecute those responsible. Hughes, who had been a Klansman himself, resigned from the Klan because he “was so disgusted by this incident” [the Rothblum flogging]. The following day, patrolman J. J. Crawford was arrested and charged with false imprisonment and aggravated assault, and police sergeant Louis Spencer and policeman Paul Adair were suspended from duty. A March 29 editorial in the *Dallas Morning News* suggested that Dallas police authorities should sever their ties with the Ku Klux Klan. With so many
members of the police force belonging to the Klan, this, of course, was unlikely.

On March 31, 1922, the trial in the Rothblum case began with his testimony: "They took off my vest, took my pants down and with a large whip, big at one end and tapering off to the other end, they lashed me about 25 times." Rothblum testified that when the blindfold slipped off, he saw Crawford, who was about three feet away. The defense strategy was to attack Rothblum personally, producing witnesses who said that Rothblum’s reputation for “truth and veracity was very bad.” In addition, the defense tried to establish Rothblum’s house as having a “bad reputation” but the judge refused to allow this line of questioning. Rothblum was then accused of keeping women in “crib houses,” which he denied. The defense claim centered on a reference to the death of Crawford’s partner, who was shot accidentally during the attempt to capture a black man in Rothblum’s neighborhood. They alleged that Rothblum’s wife was somehow involved with Crawford’s partner, and said that Rothblum therefore “had it in for Jim.”

Other testimony revealed that Rothblum had visited the police station two days before the whipping and was told by Policeman Pat O’Shea that “policemen said they were going to Ku Klux Klan him.” Rothblum heard one of them say, “To the same place.” [The Trinity River Bottoms was allegedly the site of a number of other incidents of violence.] Rothblum’s version of the story is that he knew Crawford because Crawford had bought a picture from him for three dollars but had not paid for it. He went to the police station to ask Crawford for the money. Further attempts were made to sully Rothblum’s reputation, including asking him if his wife was a prostitute (which he denied) and asking if his hair was dyed (it was).

Also on March 31, the Texas 100% American directed attention to the motives for the whippings, alleging that the authorities knew why these people were whipped. The article declared that blame for the incidents was unfair to the Klan, and then the writer abandoned the subject of the whippings for a diatribe about young girls being “led astray by night-riders in expensive, inviting automobiles.” By portraying Rothblum as the keeper of a
house of prostitution, the Klan, like the defense attorney, attempted to justify the flogging.

After deliberating for only thirty-five minutes, the jury found Crawford innocent on the first ballot, and he was reinstated by the police department. The judge said that the allegations regarding Rothblum’s “immorality” had no bearing on the case, although “Colorfully expletive and adjectives of odium were applied to Rothblum by the defense attorneys.” Thus the judge purported that the jury ignored the accusations about Rothblum in reaching its verdict, a highly unlikely conclusion.

Approving the decision of the court, the Klan emphasized the “bad reputation” of Rothblum. The Klan newspaper identified Rothblum as a Jew “disowned by the better element of his own race, and despised by every lover of pure womanhood in the city of Dallas and the State of Texas. . . . And, to think of our tax payers having to ‘foot the bill’ for riding this Jew all over the country in order that he might seek seclusion, then bringing him back among decent people to TESTIFY against a white American is beyond us! God help America.”

How can one make sense of these conflicting stories? Why did the Dallas Jewish community remain silent? Given official Klan doctrine, it is easy to determine that it would support a “white American” over a Jew in any controversy. As Matthew Frye Jacobson points out, “race resides not in nature but in politics and culture,” and during a time when questions of eugenics and race were taken seriously, Jews were often regarded as a race other than white. It is impossible to determine the exact facts of the case, and there is no proof concerning Rothblum’s involvement in any of the activities that the defense alleged. It is interesting that the Klan would state that Rothblum was “disowned by the better elements of his own race.” Klansmen were acquainted with the prosperous Jews of the city and would surely have noticed if Rothblum had supporters in this group. In fact, the Klan was correct; no prominent Jew supported Rothblum. The Jewish Monitor, the only Jewish newspaper in Dallas and Fort Worth, never mentioned the Rothblum case and Rothblum’s name does not
appear in Rabbi David Lefkowitz’s papers. Unfortunately no records from the Orthodox congregation survive, and Jewish federation minutes fail to mention any of these events. The connection with prostitution raises additional questions. If Rothblum was really involved with prostitution, why not prosecute him for that crime?

What is known is that Rothblum and his wife Eula had lived in Dallas for several years. He is listed in the 1921 city directory as a picture framer with his residence and business at 405 North Akard. There is no listing for Rothblum in the 1922 edition because he left the city after the trial. He was not a member of Temple Emanu-El, the only congregation with membership lists from that time, and his name does not appear in the records of any Jewish agency. There is no evidence that he was acquainted with any of the leading Jewish merchants of the city. Rothblum may have offended Crawford by insisting on payment for the picture and further exacerbated the situation by showing up at the police station, thus embarrassing Crawford in front of his peers. Crawford also may have held Rothblum responsible for the accidental shooting of Officer Wood. Crawford and his Klan cronies did not have any qualms about attacking a Jew, and, given the Klan membership in the police department and influence on juries, they probably believed they could carry out the flogging with impunity.

Furthermore, Rothblum is identified only as an “Austrian” Jew, a naturalized citizen. At that time Austrian most likely meant he was from Austria-Hungary, the origin of many eastern European Jews who immigrated to the U. S. Rothblum seems to have had no relatives in Dallas and was not of the German Jewish lineage of many of the original merchants. Numerous oral histories reveal that there was little love lost between the descendants of German Jews and eastern European Jews in Dallas at the time. The two groups rarely socialized and many of the successful German Jews looked on the newer eastern European immigrants as an embarrassment. In fact, Jerrie Marcus Smith records an incident in which Carrie Neiman, co-founder of Neiman-Marcus, refused to allow her niece to bring her boyfriend to dinner at her
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home because the boyfriend was a Russian Jew. It seems, then, that Rothblum, an outsider, not affiliated with any of the Jewish movers and shakers of the city, could count on no support from them. Maintaining a low profile had served them well, and they were not going to jeopardize their comfort or their status in the community for the likes of him.

The Rothblum case did accomplish one thing. It made the citizens of Dallas more concerned about the Klan. On the day after the Rothblum verdict, a committee of twenty-five citizens led by former judge C. M. Smithdeal issued an anti-Klan statement signed by over four hundred citizens. Plans were made to organize a mass meeting on April 4, 1922. Among the signatures of those calling for the public meeting are those of several Jews, including Rabbi Lefkowitz, Alex Sanger, Charles Sanger, Arthur Kramer, Herbert Marcus, Leon Harris, D. Goldberg, C. A. Levi, and Leo Levi. Some politicians, including Mayor Aldredge and senatorial candidate Cullen F. Thomas, used this opportunity to inform the constituency that they were not Klan members; possibly sensing that public opinion was turning away from the Klan and using this occasion to establish themselves as unsullied by Klan associations.

More than five thousand people attended the anti-Klan meeting, which adopted a resolution to fight the Klan. Among those on the rostrum were Alex Sanger and Edward Titche, Jewish businessmen who owned two of the largest department stores in Dallas, but were not among the original twenty-five petitioners. As a result of this meeting, a Dallas County Citizens’ League was formed. Its mission was to campaign against the Klan, asking the Klan to disband, a position supported by George B. Dealey. Lefkowitz wrote to Dealey, informing him that his editorial “specifically was in just the right spirit and I only regret that the Klan did not meet the suggestion.” Lefkowitz added that he considered the News a “fine example of a newspaper for taking this stand.” Despite the formation of the Citizens’ League and the views of Dealey, Lefkowitz, and others, no real action was taken; the Rothblum case was forgotten, and the Klan continued to thrive.
By 1923 the Klan members and sympathizers retained power in the city, although Dealey and others had tried to oust them. Then, on March 15, 1923, an explosive article, “The Cloven Foot of the Dallas Jew,” by James E. Ferguson, the former governor of Texas who had been impeached, appeared in Ferguson’s weekly newspaper, the Ferguson Forum. Ferguson began his inflammatory accusations with a disclaimer and then moved into accusation: “I have just a few friends in Texas among the Jews that I still believe in and I much dislike to have to say anything that reflects on their race. But recent disclosures show that there is now hatched in Dallas an unholy alliance between the Big Jews and the Big Ku Klux, whereby the Ku Klux are to get the big offices and the Big Jews are to get the big business. In other words the Jews of Dallas now think the Ku Klux are on a paying basis and they have took over the business end of it.”

As proof for his allegations, Ferguson mentioned that a “prominent Dallas Jew” supported the election of Earle Mayfield, the Klan candidate for governor, and “36 prominent Jews in Precinct No. 22 voted the straight Klan ticket.” He added that “one of the most prominent Jew dry goods merchants on Main Street in Dallas told me that he and Z. E. Marvin, the big Ku Klux leader, were good close personal friends.” In addition, Ferguson claimed that Evans of the Ku Klux Klan stated in his newspaper that he and the Klan “have no fight to make on the Jews.” Ferguson then stated, “As between the Dallas Jews and the Dallas Ku Klux, I want to say that the Ku Klux is the better of the two. . . . Me and my friends are getting damn tired of these Jews running to us and asking us to defend their liberties and then running to the Ku Klux to sell them dry goods.”

Ferguson’s diatribe contains references to the floggings that had happened the previous year, but does not mention Rothblum by name. He indicates that more than one Jew was involved in the floggings, but there is no evidence to support this claim. Ferguson affirms his own anti-Klan stance: “Last summer and spring when the Ku Klux Klan were trying the Jews down in Trinity Bottom, it took half my time to read the Jew mail from Dallas to know where
I stood on the Ku Klux. . . . The helpless wails of your Jew Brethren down in Trinity bottom, as the lash and the whip of the masked persecutors was laid upon their helpless bodies, the struggling voices, and the sound of breaking bones, and the dying gurgle of defenseless victims at Mer Rouge ought to be a lasting memory to every Jew in this country that he owes something to this government besides the desire to get money and grow rich.” Exactly what letters, if any, Ferguson received from Jews is not known, and since no record exists that Jews other than Rothblum were flogged, it can only be assumed that Ferguson exaggerated the situation.

Ferguson’s reasons for this attack are, like so many episodes of Dallas history, tied to business relationships. When the former governor of Texas moved his newspaper from Temple to Dallas, he expected local businesses to advertise in it. When the larger businesses, many owned by Jews, did not do so, Ferguson turned a business situation into a political and ethical issue. Ferguson did not realize or care that none of the larger businesses advertised in the Jewish Monitor either. As businessmen, they most likely believed that their advertising dollars could best be spent in mainstream newspapers which reached the largest possible audience.

The Klan itself claimed to be outraged by Ferguson’s article, which was reprinted on the first page of the Texas 100% American. The Klan paper depicted Ferguson as a “has-been politician” who became angry when “the folks of this city did not make a god of Jimmie, and kiss his dirty toes.” The writer believed that Ferguson’s views are only anti-Klan because of money, “but when the money stops flowing, then Jim’s ready to turn in some other direction.” As for Jews, “we will say the Klan has never fought the Jew.” A related article discussed a supposed change of heart among Jews regarding the Klan and indicated that Jews are no longer influenced by Catholic anti-Klan policies.

This time Jews responded to the allegations in Ferguson’s article. Fort Worth Rabbi Harry A. Merfeld, editor of the Jewish Monitor, dismissed Ferguson as irrational, stating that Ferguson’s article was nothing more than a “long diatribe of vilification and
abuse, with implacable hatred riding the storm of passion.”

Merfeld rejected any truth in what Ferguson had written. In his opinion, Ferguson was “deteriorating” and his remarks were attributed to “hatred borne of resentment caused by ambition thwarted.” [After being removed from state office, Ferguson failed in runs for the U. S. Senate and U. S. presidency.] Merfeld concluded that the Jewish merchants’ refusal to advertise came out of a desire to maintain “a dignified and gentlemanly demeanor” and “a reluctance to sponsor any kind of yellow journalism,” a response designed to offend no one, and not likely to be the reason that actually drove them to reject advertising in Ferguson’s paper.

On March 29, 1923, Ferguson again referred to “The Ku Klux Jews of Dallas.” He reiterated his accusations and asked why Jews would want to be associated with the Klan when the Klan had “whipped and terrorized” Jews. He added, “I want to thank the 100 Per Center though for their corroborating proof of my charges as a few good people thought I had wrongfully accused the Dallas Jews. . . . It certainly is funny what you hatch out when you put Jew dry goods and Ku Klux politics in the incubator.” Merfeld did not respond to these accusations, although on April 12 Ferguson mentioned Merfeld’s editorial, calling him a “mouthpiece” and referring to the newspaper as “the big Jew publication in Dallas and Fort Worth.” Ferguson claimed that in the past he had supported the rights of Jews, “But if Mr. Sanger, Mr. Marcus, Mr. Hurd, Mr. Kahn, Mr. Kamen, Mr. Dreyfuss, and Mr. Linz will disown the editorial of March 23, I will withdraw my charge.”

Ferguson continued with another antisemitic diatribe: “Why dad burn you Isralite [sic] hides, I had two uncles that shed their life-blood at Goliad’s sacred shrine, battling for religious freedom and the liberty of mankind thirty years before any damn Jew ever thought of bringing his back pack of dry goods to the Lone Star State.” Although Ferguson erroneously claimed that Jews were not resident in Texas during the battle of Goliad and during its war for independence, his message was clear. He resented these immigrants whose “race” and religion were different from the mainstream. He considered Jews as outsiders in America: “Me and my kind were here first and we are going to stay. If you
Alex Sanger, date unknown.
Sanger was elected city alderman in 1873, was a founder of the Texas State Fair and Exposition, later its president, and was the first Jew to serve as regent of the University of Texas.
(Courtesy, the Dallas Jewish Historical Society.)
behave yourself you can stay, too.” Again the *Jewish Monitor* did not respond. In July 1923, Ferguson moved his newspaper operations back to Temple. The move to Dallas had not been a financial success, and he blamed other newspapers for not recognizing the “truth” in his allegations. As a parting blow, he warned that Dallas was in trouble because of the Klan, and “Anything that stirs up a religious row in a town will always kill that town.”

**Klan Influence in Dallas in 1923**

The 1923 election of Klan mayoral candidate Louis Blaylock reflected continued Klan influence in the city. Blaylock, the former Dallas finance commissioner, was first endorsed by the Dallas Citizens Association, a business-dominated group. Later, he received the support of the Dallas Democrats, a group sympathetic to the Klan. Blaylock declined to reject the latter’s support, and the Citizens Association rescinded its endorsement. Blaylock also “refused to disown Klan support or Klan objectives.” After the election, Lefkowitz wrote an editorial in the *Jewish Monitor* deploring the election of a Klan candidate, but he commented that he believed that the results of the election were not due to the voters’ espousal of Klan beliefs. Instead, Lefkowitz argued, “So many complicating terms were involved in the recent elections, such was the desire for harmony in municipal matters, so important a part did the personality and record of service of the nominee for mayor rather than his identification with the Klan group play in the final result, that it can not be called a clearcut decision of the voters of Dallas for the Klan.” Once again Lefkowitz avoided confrontation. Whether he really believed what he said or that he concluded that it was better to smooth over potentially difficult situations remains unknown. Lefkowitz took a pragmatic course in a politically explosive situation rather than further arouse hatred by denouncing public officials.

Klan influence in Dallas culminated with plans for a Ku Klux Klan Day to be held at the Texas State Fair on Wednesday, October 24, 1923. When James Ferguson learned of the event, he discouraged attendance, considering it “just another scheme of the big Jew Klux, to get a big crowd of people from the
country to buy their Jew dry goods at two prices.” Ferguson advised his readers to avoid buying anything in Dallas unless the seller could prove that the item was not made or sold “by a Dallas Ku Klux or a Dallas Jew Ku Klux sympathizer. They are in together.”

Predictions of attendance for the event went as high as 300,000, but even with actual attendance of 151,192, Klan Day received national attention. Entertainment included rodeo performers in Klan regalia and patriotic orators, such as Exalted Cyclops J. D. Van Winkle, who commented, “I might say that tonight there will not be any river-bottom parties or floggings in this town. The day is yours, the city is yours, and I am glad to state that you are in a Klan town.” Imperial Wizard Evans’s speech singled out three groups, blacks, Jews, and Catholics that he considered “unblendable.” He called southern and eastern Europeans “mentally inferior” and asked Congress to stop all immigration, a position Congress essentially followed. In the evening, a crowd of twenty-five thousand watched fireworks, a parade of bands, and a mass initiation of 5,631 new Klan members.

Among those on the platform for Klan Day were Mayor Louis Blaylock, Judge Felix D. Robertson (both Klan sympathizers, if not members), and Alex Sanger. Indeed, it seems strange for a Jew to appear at such an event, but Sanger had been a member of the Board of the Texas State Fair since 1887 and, like many other prominent Jews of his time, he seems to have preferred to overlook unpleasant connections. He and his family were not affected by the Klan; nor were his fellow congregants at Temple Emanu-El. His business was enormously successful, and he had served on the city council and held prestigious appointments, like the state fair board. He was most likely not inclined to make an issue about the Klan while he was acting in his capacity of board member of the state fair.

In the months that followed Klan Day, interest in the Klan seemed to wane. With the Klan as the primary issue in the 1924 gubernatorial race, Miriam (Ma) Ferguson, James Ferguson’s wife, won the governor’s seat, beating Klan candidate Judge
Felix Robertson. Nationally, “Growing documentation of Klan abuses . . . suddenly began to reverse its popularity.”80 Klan membership declined quickly, and by 1926 the membership in Dallas Klan No. 66, which once numbered thirteen thousand, sank to twelve hundred.81

But the problem of James Ferguson’s allegation remains. Certain coincidences did occur and, therefore, cannot be ignored. Influential Klan members, themselves businessmen and politicians, regularly encountered Jewish businessmen at meetings of the Masonic order, so it is known that they had a business and a social relationship of sorts. The Klan in Dallas had enormous political influence for a short time, and city cooperation was essential for a healthy business environment. Jewish merchants no doubt had numerous dealings with Klan members in city government with no negative occurrences. The Klan itself never attacked the Jewish elite as Ferguson did. Any truth in Ferguson’s allegations is impossible to determine. Whether the formal alliance that Ferguson described really existed is unknown. Neither the businessmen Ferguson accused, nor Klansmen spoke publicly of such an alliance. The two groups were acquainted and both were interested in the commercial growth of the city. It is possible that Ferguson’s accusations might have been accurate. We also know that Jews in the early 1920s did not have the acceptance that would come later and were often reluctant to denounce injustices and prejudice. When Ferguson made his insidious comments, no one in the Dallas Jewish community responded, possibly because they feared that making an issue of Ferguson’s diatribes would bring unwanted attention to them and to their community. The choice between the Klan and Ferguson posed an uncomfortable dilemma. The Jewish elite, indicating the precarious nature of their position, chose to follow the least harmful course. Although their silence did not solve the problem, it did go away. Furthermore, by remaining silent, the Jewish businessmen of Dallas were not likely to destroy the business relationships that they had worked so hard to build. Like many other occurrences in Dallas history, business relationships were most important in forging the destiny of the city.
NOTES

2 Ibid., 3–6.
4 Ibid., 19.
5 Ibid., 30–32.
6 Cristol, Light in the Prairie, 24.
7 Biderman, They Came to Stay, 135.
10 Darwin Payne, Big D: Triumphs and Troubles of an American Supercity in the 20th Century (Dallas, 2000), 86.
11 Ibid., 86.
12 Ibid., 87. Payne writes that the names in the Klan committee membership lists are from a document printed in 1922, which was given to the Dallas Historical Society by George B. Dealey in 1942. The police force list came from a typewritten list found a year after it was written.
13 Ibid., 88. Evans moved to Atlanta in late 1922, when he became the chief Klansman of the nation. One of his Dallas friends, Philip E. Fox, managing editor of the Times Herald, also moved to Atlanta in 1923 to become public relations director for the Klan, an interesting turn of events considering the fact that Dallas Morning News president Dealey was one who actively fought the Klan.
14 Robert Prince, A History of Dallas: From a Different Perspective (Dallas, 1993), 72.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid., 73–74.
18 Ibid., 67.
21 Ouida Ferguson Nalle, The Fergusons of Texas (San Antonio, 1946), 163.
24 [Dallas] Texas 100% American, September 29, 1922.
25 Ibid., February 23, 1923.
26 Ibid., June 1, 1923.
28 Payne, Big D, 88.
31 Ibid., 23.
32 G. B. Dealey Papers, Dallas Historical Society.
33 Torrence, “The Ku Klux Klan in Dallas,” 57.
34 Lefkowitz to Dealey, June 16, 1921, Lefkowitz correspondence, Temple Emanu-El Archives, Dallas, Texas.
35 Lefkowitz to John W. Stayton, January 26, 1922. Lefkowitz Correspondence.
36 Lefkowitz to A. J. Kaufman, February 6, 1922, Lefkowitz Correspondence.
37 Lefkowitz to J. J. Taubenhaus, December 26, 1923, Lefkowitz Correspondence.
38 There is no evidence that Mayor Aldredge was a Klan member, although many of those in his administration were.
41 Ibid., 42.
42 Ibid., 138.
43 Dallas Morning News, March 8, 1922.
44 Dallas City Council Minutes, March 8, 1922.
45 Dallas Morning News, March 9, 1922.
46 Ibid., March 13, 1922.
47 Payne, Big D, 93.
48 Dallas Morning News, March 16, 1922.
49 Ibid., March 22, 1922.
50 Ibid., March 24, 1922.
51 Ibid., March 31, 1922.
52 Ibid.
53 [Dallas] Texas 100% American, March 31, 1922.
54 Dallas Morning News, April 1, 1922.
55 [Dallas] Texas 100% American, April 7, 1922.
57 Jerrie Marcus Smith, “Carrie Neiman: Nerves of Steel, Heart of Butter,” Legacies 13 (Fall 2001): 46. Smith was Carrie Neiman’s grandniece.
58 Payne, Big D, 95.
59 Alex and Charles Sanger were proprietors of the Sanger Brothers Department Stores. Leon Harris and Arthur Kramer were from A. Harris Dry Goods. Charles A. Levi’s business was in investments, secured loans, and insurance. Leo Levi was the secretary-treasurer of Builders Investment Co. David Goldberg was the proprietor of a men’s furnishings store in 1921 and 1922 and a pawn shop in 1923.
60 Dallas Morning News, April 2, 1922.
61 Ibid., April 5, 1922.
62 Lefkowitz to G. B. Dealey, April 11, 1922, Lefkowitz Correspondence.
64 Ibid.
68 Ibid., April 12, 1923. Not all the men Ferguson points to are known. Mr. Sanger is most likely Alex Sanger of Sanger Brothers; Mr. Marcus, Herbert Marcus of Neiman-Marcus; Mr. Kahn, E. M. Kahn of E. M. Kahn men’s furnishings; Mr. Linz, either Simon, Albert, or Benjamin of Linz Jewelers; Mr. Dreyfuss, Gerard Dreyfuss of Dreyfuss & Son men’s furnishings. The identity of Hurd and Kamen remains unknown. There is no entry in the city directory for either man, nor are they listed as members of Temple Emanu-El.
70 Payne, Big D, 104.
71 [Fort Worth] Jewish Monitor, April 6, 1923.
73 Nancy Wiley, The Great State Fair of Texas (Dallas, 1985), 91.
74 Jackson, Ku Klux Klan in the City, 78.
76 Wiley, Great State Fair of Texas, 91.
77 Jackson, Ku Klux Klan in the City, 77.
78 Wiley, Great State Fair of Texas, 91.
79 The WPA Dallas Guide and History (Denton, TX 1922), 320.
80 Payne, Big D, 109.
81 Ibid.
Articles Relating to Southern Jewish History
Published in American Jewish History, American Jewish Archives Journal, Their Predecessors, and Southern Jewish History

Compiled By

Mark K. Bauman

AJA = American Jewish Archives
AJA = American Jewish Archives Journal
AJH = American Jewish History
AJHQ = American Jewish Historical Quarterly
PAJHS = Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society
SJH = Southern Jewish History


* In some cases, persons, places, and topics are identified in parentheses where subject matter is not clear from the title.


“American Jewry in 1753 and 1853,” AJA 5 (June 1953): 115–120.


Engelman, Uriah Zevi, “Jewish Education in Charleston, South Carolina, During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” *PAJHS* 42 (September 1952): 43–70.


Charleston, served as Alabama lawyer opposed further importation of slaves but favored states’ rights and believed the South should solve its own problem).

——-, “Calendar of American Jewish Cases,” PAJHS 12 (1904): 87–99 (includes cases from the South).


296–306 (includes pictures of Baltimore’s Lloyd Street Synagogue and Beth Elohim of Charleston, South Carolina).

—., “Rediscovering Jewish Infrastructure: Update on United States Nineteenth Century Synagogues,” AJH 84 (March 1996): 11–28 (includes several southern synagogues).


—., “The Society in Turmoil,” AJH 81 (Winter 1993–1994): 226–244. (These articles refer to authors and articles treating southern Jewish history during the early years of the PAJHS.)


———, “The Russian Nights School of Baltimore,” *PAJHS* 31 (1928): 225–228 (Henrietta Szold and other women c. 1889).


“Judah Touro Saves a Church,” *AJA* 7 (January 1955): 64 (reprint of *Niles Weekly Register*, December 12, 1823).


Kempner, Marion Lee “Sandy,” “Letters from Sandy,” *AJA* 31 (April 1979): 7–34 (letters home to Texas from Vietnam, where he was killed in action).

———, “The Jews and the American Anti-Slavery Movement, II” *PAJHS* 9 (1901): 45–62 (includes Solomon Heydenfelt who published a letter to the governor of Alabama in 1849 proposing an amendment of the state constitution to prohibit slavery [50–51]).  
———, “Phases in the History of Religious Liberty in America, with Special Reference to the Jews, II” *PAJHS* 13 (1905): 53–73 (a Georgia case, 1783–1784; 1812 protest against South Carolina Governor Henry Middleton in re Thanksgiving services for Christian churches).  
———, “Jews and Negro Slavery in the Old South, 1789–1865,” 
*PAJHS* 50 (September 1961): 151–201.
———, “Jewish Chaplains During the Civil War,” *AJA* 1 (June 
———, “Jewish Welfare Activities for the Military During the 
Spanish-American War,” *PAJHS* 41 (June 1952): 357–380 (in-
cludes information on Rabbis Edward B. M. Browne of 
Columbus and Atlanta, Georgia, and David Marx of Atlanta).
———, “Judah P. Benjamin as a Jew,” *PAJHS* 38 (March 1948): 
153–171.
———, “Judah Touro, Retrospect After a Century,” *AJA* 6 (Janu-
———, “A Note on the Jewish Ancestry of Louis Moreau 
Gottschalk, American Pianist and Composer,” *AJA* 15 (No-
———, “Was There a Confederate Jewish Chaplain?” *AJHQ* 53 
Korn, Harold, “Receipt Books of Judah and Moses M. Hayes, 
Commencing January 12, 1763 and Ending July 18, 1776,” 
Krause, P. Allen, “Rabbis and Negro Rights in the South,” *AJA* 21 
Langston, Scott M., “James K. Gutheim as Southern Reform Rabbi, 
———, “Interaction and Identity: Jews and Christians in Nineteen-
Lachoff, Irwin, “Rabbi Bernard Illowy: Counter Reformer,” *SJH* 5 
(excerpt from book).
Lebeau, James, “Profile of a Southern Jewish Community: Way-
Leeser, Isaac, “The Jews in the United States—1848,” *AJA* 7 (Janu-
BAUMAN/ARTICLES RELATING TO SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY  177

“Miscellaneous Items Relating to Jews in Wars of United States and Correspondence with Washington,” PAJHS 27 (1920): 494–495 (translation of certificate of military service relating to Benjamin Nones and the siege of Charleston, South Carolina, 1797).


Philipson, David, “The Cincinnati Community in 1825,” *PAJHS* 10 (1902): 97–99 (letter written “To the Elders of the Jewish Congregation of Charleston” requesting assistance for building fund. Funds were sent from Charleston, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and Barbados; synagogue finally dedicated 1836).


Powell, Lawrence W., “When Hate Came to Town: New Orleans Jews and George Lincoln Rockwell,” AJH 85 (December 1997): 393–419.


Rothschild, Janice O. See, Blumberg, Janice O. Rothschild.


———, *A Quiet Revolution: Jewish Women’s Clubs and the Widening Women’s Sphere, 1870–1920,* *AJA* 41 (Spring/Summer 1989): 7–26 (includes the South).

“Trailblazers of the Trans-Mississippi West,” *AJA* 8 (October 1956): 59–130 (Texas).


Vaxer, Menasseh, “‘Hebrew Volunteers’ in Maryland,” *PAJHS* 37 (1947): 448–449 (1846 volunteer company created by and composed of Jewish immigrants).


The author acknowledges the gracious assistance of Solomon Breibart for proofreading for errors and through his *Articles on the Southern Jewish Experience in the Journals of the American Jewish Historical Society and American Jewish Archives*, (Bibliography #1, Southern Jewish Historical Society, 1986), and of Eric L. Goldstein and Marni Davis through their “Southern Jewish History: A Research Guide to Archival Sources in the Atlanta Area and Bibliography of Published Works,” (Atlanta: Emory University, 2001). This work would not have been done without the support and encouragement of Gary P. Zola, Fred Krome, Kevin Proffitt, and the hospitable and helpful staff of the American Jewish Archives where I was graciously provided a Director’s Fellowship. Corrections and additions from readers will be greatly appreciated.
**Glossary**

**Ashkenazic** ~ having to do with the Jews and Judaism associated with central and eastern Europe

**emunah** ~ faith; belief

**gedolim** ~ great men; sages

**gefilte fish** ~ poached, minced fish ball (usually whitefish, pike, or carp) with filler of bread crumbs or matzo meal

**Halacha (halaka)** ~ Jewish law

**Halakic** ~ pertaining to Jewish law

**kehilla** ~ Jewish religious community; organizations joined together representing a Jewish community

**macher** ~ a mover and shaker; important man

**Marranos (Maranos)** ~ Spanish and Portuguese Jews who practiced their religion secretly to avoid the Inquisition; derogatory in original meaning; crypto-Jews

**Shema, Sh’mam** ~ Jewish confession of faith in the oneness of God, frequently recited during religious services

Shevuot, variants include **Shevuoth, Shavuoth, Sh’buoth, Shavuot, Sh’vuos** ~ Festival of Weeks, or Pentecost, occurring fifty days after the second day of Passover; anniversary of receiving Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai.
smicha ~ rabbinic ordination

tsimmes, also, tzimes, tzimmes ~ literally, baked dish of carrots, prunes, apricots, root vegetables; but also something mixed up, involved, or blown out of proportion, as in “Don’t make a big tsimmes out of it.”

Torah ~ Five Books of Moses; first five books of the Bible

yeshiva (plural: yeshivot) ~ rabbinical seminary

Yom Kippur ~ Day of Atonement; holiest day of Jewish year
**Note on Authors**

**John H. Baron**, who received his Ph.D. in musicology from Brandeis University, holds the Schawe Chair in Music at Tulane University. He has published books and articles on baroque, chamber, Jewish, and New Orleans music, and co-authored with Emanuel Rubin an eight hundred page study, *Music in Jewish History and Culture* (forthcoming). He learned much about the development of Reform liturgy from his father, Joseph L. Baron, a prominent Reform rabbi, who served during the 1930s on the CCAR liturgy committee that planned the 1940 *Union Prayer Book*. His father informed him about the rationale for the structure of the liturgy c. 1900, particularly why portions of the Saturday liturgy were used on Friday nights.

**Rosalind Benjet** holds a B.A. from Arcadia University, an M.A. from Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and a Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Dallas. Her research interests center on ethnic literature, especially works written by Jewish immigrants in English during the pre-World War II era. She taught college for almost twenty years and is currently president of the Dallas Jewish Historical Society.

**Adam Mendelsohn** is a doctoral candidate at Brandeis University. His article draws on research he conducted in the United States and South Africa for a Masters thesis at the University of Cape Town. The degree was awarded with distinction in 2003. He has written about South African and Southern Jewry in *Jewish Affairs* and the *South African Historical Journal*.

**Ellen M. Umansky** is the Carl and Dorothy Bennett Professor of Judaic Studies at Fairfield University. She received her B.A. degree in philosophy from Wellesley College, her M.A. in religion from Yale, and her doctorate in religion from Columbia. Co-Editor of *Four Centuries of Jewish Women’s Spirituality: A Sourcebook* (Beacon Press, 1992), she is completing *From Christian Science to Jewish Science: Spiritual Healing and American Jews* (Oxford University Press).
Southern Jewish History

Contents of Back Issues

(For information on ordering current and back issues, see the page facing the Table of Contents in the front of the journal.)

**VOLUME 1 (1998)**

Why Study Southern Jewish History, Gary P. Zola
“Ride ‘em Jewboy”: Kinky Friedman and the Texas Jewish Mystique, Bryan Stone
Synagogue and Jewish Church: A Congregational History of North Carolina, Leonard Rogoff
Amelia Greenwald and Regina Kaplan: Jewish Nursing Pioneers, Susan Mayer
Harry Reyner: Individualism and Community in Newport News, Virginia, Gertrude L. Samet
Ruth and Rosalie: Two Tales of Jewish New Orleans, Bobbie Malone

**VOLUME 2 (1999)**

The Jews of Keystone: Life in a Multicultural Boomtown, Deborah R. Weiner
Lives of Quiet Affirmation: The Jewish Women of Early Anniston, Alabama, Sherry Blanton
Jewish Merchants and Black Customers in the Age of Jim Crow, Clive Webb
Mercy on Rude Streams: Jewish Emigrants from Alsace-Lorraine to the Lower Mississippi Region and the Concept of Fidelity, Anny Bloch
Kosher Country: Success and Survival on Nashville’s Music Row, Stacy Harris
“From the Recipe File of Luba Cohen”: A Study of Southern Jewish Foodways and Cultural Identity, Marcie Cohen Ferris


A Shtetl Grew in Bessemer: Temple Beth-El and Jewish Life in Small-Town Alabama, Terry Barr
Lynchburg’s Swabian Jewish Entrepreneurs in War and Peace, Richard A. Hawkins
Interaction and Identity: Jews and Christians in Nineteenth Century New Orleans, Scott Langston
Southern Jewish Historical Society Conferences

The Society sponsors an annual conference in a different community each year where papers and programs are presented on the Jewish experience in the South.

28th annual conference
"A People’s Memory Is History"
Memphis, Tennessee
October 30–November 2, 2003

29th annual conference
Charleston, South Carolina
October 28–October 31, 2004
JOIN the Southern Jewish Historical Society

PO Box 5024, Atlanta, GA 30302

Visit the SJHS Website
For information on the conferences as participants or attendees and for information about other Southern Jewish Historical Society activities, membership, grants, and publications visit http://www.jewishsouth.org/
A Fascinating Look at a Dramatic Chapter in History

NAZIS IN NEWARK
Warren Grover

“Very few people today realize that the U.S. mainland was the scene of battles against the Nazis...an outstanding work...the writing is incisive, the ideas are both original and insightful and the thesis masterfully developed and executed.”

—William B. Helmreich,
Winner of the National Jewish Book Award

“...this fast-paced, thorough study of anti-Nazism in Newark, tells the compelling story of how the city's Jews battled their Nazi enemies in the streets and in the marketplace. With meticulous research, Grover adds an important new chapter to our understanding of Jewish reaction. He chronicles how tough, blue collar Jews physically intimidated home-grown Nazis in such groups as the German-American Bund, while a mild-mannered Jewish physician organized an economic boycott against German goods being sold in some of Newark's finest stores. Grover amply demonstrates that Newark's Jews were neither oblivious nor passive toward the enemy in their midst.” —Alan M. Kraut, American University

0-7658-0193-0 (cloth) 2003 292 pp. $49.95
0-7658-0516-2 (paper) 2003 292 pp. $24.95

The Enduring Community:
The Jews of Newark and MetroWest
William B. Helmreich

“In writing such a complete and warm account of Jewish Newark, Helmreich richly nourishes that nostalgia and raises interesting questions as to how to maintain and encourage solidarity in the face of assimilation and suburban life.” —American Jewish History
1-56000-392-8 (cloth) 1998 327 pp. $24.95

Available at bookstores worldwide or direct from the publisher.
Toll free (US only)
1-888-999-6778
or fax 732-748-9801.
www.transactionpub.com
Recent Articles of Importance:

Southern Jewish Women and Their Social Service Organizations

Mark Bauman

“No Italian Spoken for the Duration of the War”: Language, Italian-American Identity and Cultural Pluralism in the World War II Years

Nancy C. Carnevale

An Encyclopedia of Ethnic Neighbors and Their Music

Victor Greene

Ronald H. Bayor, Editor

Georgia Institute of Technology

Atlanta, Georgia

Subscription includes membership in the Immigration and Ethnic History Society and semiannual Immigration and Ethnic History Newsletter.

JAEH is the leading journal on American ethnic history. It addresses various aspects of American immigration and ethnic history, including background of emigration, ethnic and racial groups, Native Americans, immigration policies, and the processes of acculturation.

Journal of American Ethnic History

The Official Journal of the Immigration and Ethnic History Society

Published Quarterly

Subscription Rates:

Individuals: $40/yr; $75/2yrs; $105/3yrs.
Institutions: $100/yr; $194/2yrs; $268/3yrs.
Outside North America add $30/yr.

(Rates subject to change annually)

Available on the internet FREE with print subscription.

Visit us on the web at www.transactionpub.com

Call 1-888-999-6778 or Fax 732-748-9801
The Hydrangea People chronicles the life of Sammy Lansky who is raised in rural Cordele, Georgia by Holocaust survivor parents but seeks the bright lights of the big city and moves to Atlanta to practice urology. He realizes his dream of getting rich but, in so doing, discovers his whole life has been an illusion: he is not who he thinks he is nor are his parents. In the end, he must do the right thing to become one of the hydrangea people.

“This is a stunning and heart-lifting debut of a new Southern writer. Charles Gershon’s novel is more than the story of a man at war with himself; it is a glorious affirmation of Jewish values brought to the rural South, and how those values triumphed in today’s world. Bravo!”

Robert Coram, author of Boyd: The Fighter Pilot Who Changed the Art of War

The Hydrangea People is available at your local bookstore, Amazon.com, or www.charlesgershon.com
“While we read history we make history.”

Read Wisely

EMILY BINGHAM
MORDECAI
An Early American Family

“The fascinating story of a remarkable Jewish family in the overwhelmingly Protestant antebellum South. . . A moving story of strife between orthodox parents and liberated children, of conflicts between duty and love, and of the family’s irreconcilable struggle for both distinctiveness and assimilation. This is truly an American saga.”

—David Herbert Donald

ALAN M. KRAUT
Goldberger’s War
The Life and Work of a Public Health Crusader

A chronicle of one of the U.S. Public Health Service’s most renowned heroes—an immigrant Jew who became an early recruit to the federal government’s health service and put an end to an American plague with a cure that required nothing less than challenging the economy, culture, and politics of the entire South.