MAX J. KOHLER

BY IRVING LEHMAN

Max James Kohler was born in Detroit, Michigan, on May 22nd, 1871, the son of Dr. Kaufmann and Johanna Einhorn Kohler. From his father and from his grandfather, Dr. Isaac Einhorn, he inherited the ideals and principles which guided him during his whole life. He loved Judaism and America with a passionate love. He accepted, without hesitation or reservation, the view of his father and his grandfather, that Judaism is a living religion which must change and develop to meet the needs and to embody the ideals of Jews, under changing conditions and in new lands, but which must always remain firmly based upon the same universal and immutable truths which had been revealed to the Jews of old, and must always be colored and illumined by Jewish history and traditions. He felt the bonds of kinship which united him to the Jews of other countries; and he knew that such bonds did not separate him in spirit from his fellow-Americans of other creeds and with other historic background. On the contrary, it was his philosophy that all Americans can best serve their country by preserving here the spiritual ideals which had sustained their fathers in other times and in other countries. He found, as other students have found, that the ideals upon which American government is based are the ideals of the Jewish prophets. Those ideals were part of his being as an American and as a Jew. His father and his grandfather had been teachers and spiritual leaders of American Jews. Max James Kohler applied in the field of practical affairs the ideals which they had taught.

He was graduated from the College of the City of New York in 1890. From Columbia University he received the degree of M.A. in 1891 and that of LL.B. in 1893. A year after his graduation he was appointed an Assistant by United States Attorney Wallace Macfarlane, and served
in that office until 1898. He appeared frequently in court
in behalf of the United States government, but even then
he recognised that the government should assert no rights
against a citizen or subject, which were not based on justice.
Later, in many cases, he applied his learning and experience
to the vindication of the civil rights of the individual, even
against government officials, when he believed that they
were exceeding their legitimate powers. He was especially
active in protecting the rights of aliens. He had the vision
to see in aliens, properly admitted to this country, the
citizens who must, in the future, uphold its ideals. Where
there was injustice to an alien, he saw justice withheld from
a future citizen. Indeed, the consequences of injustice to
an alien might be more disastrous than the consequences
of injustice to a citizen, for citizens can, at times, protect
themselves against injustice through the exercise of their
political rights, while aliens can appeal only to the courts
for the protection of their civil rights. For these reasons,
Mr. Kohler undertook, in a number of important cases,
voluntarily and without expectation of personal reward,
the duty of instituting proceedings which served to clarify
our law as to the rights of immigrants and aliens. Indeed,
his contribution to the development of that branch of our
law stands out as unique.

Mr. Kohler's other activities were diversified and numer-
ous; but those who have worked with him can testify that,
in each, his contribution was significant and important.
In some activities, indeed, it was almost indispensable.
His study of the laws governing the rights of aliens and
immigrants led him early into the broader field of civil
rights, guaranteed by our Constitution, and from there
into the field of international law and practice. He was,
for many years, an active member of appropriate com-
mittees, dealing with the protection of the civil rights of
Jews here and abroad, appointed by the Union of American
Hebrew Congregations and of B'nai B'rith; but his most
effective work in that field was as a member of the American
Jewish Committee and its Executive Committee and as
chairman of its committee on immigration. His counsel
was wise; his learning was deep; his industry in research
and study was boundless.
He lived only fifteen months after the establishment of the National Socialist government in Germany, but during those tragic months his mind and heart were engrossed in efforts to assist, in some way, in meeting the critical situation there created. He served as a member of the Joint Consultative Council of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the B’nai B’rith. He was consulted by government officers, by Jewish organizations and by non-sectarian committees. He gave freely of his strength until his strength was exhausted.

Doubtless, his work was most important during the last years of his life, but his earlier activities should not be forgotten. He was Honorary Secretary of the Baron de Hirsch Fund from 1905 till his death, and was actively connected with other philanthropic, religious and social organizations too numerous to mention; but any record of his life would be incomplete if special mention were not made of his work in the field of American Jewish history.

That work was perhaps more effective because Mr. Kohler regarded it as recreation rather than labor. He was, in 1905, the Honorary Secretary of the National Committee for the Celebration of the 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of Jews in the United States. He was Vice-President of the American Jewish Historical Society, President of the Judaeans, and Vice-President of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Science. He gloried in his Jewish descent as he gloried in his American citizenship. He felt pride in Jewish and American accomplishment but it was the pride of a man who realized that family, racial, and national tradition and accomplishment must serve as an incentive to the individual for similar accomplishment.

His interests and his activities extended, nevertheless, beyond the bounds of race or creed. He served willingly in any case where he could give effective service. So, for many years, he was a very active member of the Committee on Legislation of the New York County Lawyers Association and of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and in 1933 he was appointed by the Secretary of Labor a member of the Committee on Ellis Island and Immigrant Relief.

It is impossible in a brief article to do much more than
catalogue the organizations and movements with which he was actively connected. Only those who shared in some of his interests and who worked with him in particular fields can properly appraise the value of his work there. By choice, he remained in the background; always prepared, however, to furnish information to those who were more ready to speak; to give counsel to those who determined policies; to do the detailed work which is needed for success, though others might be heralded as leaders in the work. The range of his interests and the thoroughness of his scholarship can, perhaps, be demonstrated best by a list of his more important publications:

"Methods of Review in Criminal Cases in the United States" (1899).

Edited Judge Charles P. Daly's "Settlement of the Jews in North America" (1893).

"Jewish Disabilities in the Balkan States—American Contributions towards their Removal, with Particular Reference to the Congress of Berlin" (1916, in conjunction with Hon. Simon Wolf).

"Jewish Rights at International Congresses" (1917).

"Jewish Rights at the Congresses of Vienna and Aix-la-Chappelle" (1918).

"Educational Reforms in Europe, in their Relation to Jewish Emancipation" (1919).

Edited "Proceedings of the 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States" (1905).

"Un-American Character of Race Legislation" (1909).

"Rebecca Franks, an American Belle of the Last Century" (1894).

"The Immigration Question with Particular Reference to the Jews of America" (1911).

"Injustice of a Literacy Test for Immigrants" (1911).

"Registration of Aliens—A Dangerous Project" (1924).

"The Jews in America" (1923).

"An Important European Mission (1817–1818) to Investigate American Immigration Conditions" (1918).

"Judah P. Benjamin, Statesman and Jurist" (1904).
“Some Aspects of the Immigration Problem” (1914).
“Right of Asylum, with Particular Reference to the Aliens” (1917).
Numerous articles for publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, “The Jewish Encyclopedia” and the Jewish and legal press.
“Jews in America” for the “Encyclopedia Americana.”

In his many altruistic actions, Mr. Kohler was greatly encouraged and ably seconded by his wife, Winifred, the daughter of Joseph M. Lichtenauer, a banker. They were married in 1906. Mrs. Kohler was a woman of refinement and culture who was profoundly interested in her husband’s humanitarian activities. She quickly become an integral part of her husband’s family, between whose members and herself there was always a strong bond of affection. Her death, after a marriage of fourteen years, to which he always looked back as the happiest years in his life, profoundly saddened Mr. Kohler. Not long after this event, he made his home with his parents, his brother Edgar, and his sisters, Lily and Rose. In their tender devotion to one another the members of this family exemplified attachment to those Jewish traditions of parental and filial loyalty which are a most cherished part of the Jewish heritage.

The general public can never know the full value of Mr. Kohler’s work. He never sought or desired wide recognition. He did seek the satisfaction of work well done. He did value the respect and even admiration of his friends and fellow-workers. These he received and these were the only reward he desired.
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By Louis Rich

Adolph S. Ochs no longer belongs to The New York Times or The Chattanooga Times. From now on he belongs to Time. One may be permitted therefore to attempt an appraisal of the life and work of the late publisher. Yet it is difficult to treat of the departed with the objectivity necessary for a calm evaluation. The mantle of time has only begun to envelop and screen from mortal vision the individuality that was Adolph S. Ochs. Human memory, that cherished guardian of fleeting impressions and emotions, refuses to yield ground to neutral judgment. Those who knew Mr. Ochs personally are still too much under the influence of his imperceptible being to make their reminiscences serviceable for a detached record. To his kin, to his friends and intimates, to his associates, to his employees he is still too much alive to be coldly analyzed and labeled with any degree of finality.

Outwardly nothing has changed in his great newspaper. His invisible presence still pervades its spacious offices and rooms. The inner "corporate conscience" and consciousness of The New York Times continue to be active, moved along by the momentum which Mr. Ochs' journalistic personality re imparted to it in 1896. His life-long scorn for personal publicity and self-display is respected and emulated. It is as true now, as it was true when he was alive, that in a purely personal sense, Adolph S. Ochs remains largely to be guessed at.

But at least there is the reasonable certainty that no further disclosures are likely to alter materially the basis for the guess. The main facts of Mr. Ochs' life and labors are known. It is their arrangement and construction into a consistent story of human self-realization that await the biographer. To the future student of journalistic history,
which Adolph S. Ochs so magnificently helped to make, the retrospect will necessarily consist in part of the opinions that we, of the contemporary world surviving him, have been able to form. It is for such possible future use that the endeavor to estimate Mr. Ochs now must be made.

The career of Adolph S. Ochs bore the hall-marks of a perfect destiny, fulfilled in living a life dedicated to the realization of a single purpose. That purpose was the publication of the only kind of newspaper that to him was worth publishing. The course of his career ended practically where it began, at the scene of his initial effort. But between the beginning and the end lay the cumulative results of a life-work ever growing in scope and amplitude, like the rising and broadening curve of a spiral, until in its highest and widest reach it constituted an achievement recognized by all as unique in American newspaperdom.

With a profound and genuine, almost instinctive, sense of modesty and objective self-effacement, Mr. Ochs ever denied any and all claim to importance in his chosen field. Yet it was in this very lack of self-consciousness that his complete identity with the character and spirit of the time in which he lived found its expression. For no one reflected the prodigious nature of his period better than did Mr. Ochs. Without realizing it, he became, through his newspaper, the articulate voice of the forces that shaped the recent history of this country.

In him were combined in striking measure some of the best—because they proved to be the ultimately victorious—qualities of a Jacksonian Democrat, journalist and Jew, which, in the three domains covered by the qualifications, made him a most fitting mouthpiece of his generation. As a Jacksonian Democrat, he endeavored to rally public opinion behind political and social measures essential to the growth of the economic colossus that is America. As a journalist, he created a superb and huge institution—the American newspaper—built on the principles of non-missionary, non-opinionated, non-controversial journalism, best suited to the needs of an immensely developing and expanding nation, and made this journalism supreme in the world today. As a Jew, he was one of the leaders of a group of men who were instrumental in giving concrete form and
organizational existence to that adaptation of Jewish religious doctrine to economic, political and social conditions in this country which has become known as American Reform, or Progressive, Judaism.

It is, of course, upon his achievements in the realm of journalism that Mr. Ochs' chief title to imperishable fame rests. Here he stands without a peer. He has built up one of the world's greatest and most renowned dailies. It is sometimes said that news is history in the making. If this be true, then it is to Mr. Ochs and his newspaper that we owe much of our knowledge of the stupendous history of our day. Undoubtedly there are many people who earnestly disagree with the views advanced by The New York Times. But even they will admit that the source of their information, upon which they base their disagreement, has been The New York Times.

No greater recognition than is implied by this fact can come to any newspaper. It also explains what has been called the supremacy of American journalism over that of any other country. For while non-American newspapers have striven mainly to supply the readers with opinions, representative American newspapers have set their ideal on furnishing all the news available, leaving it to the intelligence and mental predisposition of the reader to draw his own inferences therefrom. In the eyes of both Europeans and Americans The New York Times has been the embodiment of this distinctive feature of American journalism, and there is little question that it owes most of its unparalleled success to this circumstance.

But the qualities making for success possessed by their owner had been sown and cultivated in a soil quite different from the stratum in which Mr. Ochs' genius came to full fruition. They had their origin in a Jewish home maintained by pioneering spirits seeking to establish themselves in what was at the time a frontier region.

Adolph S. Ochs was born March 12, 1858, in Cincinnati. He was the eldest of the six children of Julius and Bertha Levy Ochs who had emigrated from Germany, whence, up to the last two decades of the past century, most of the Jewish population of the United States was being recruited. Both parents were revolutionists by temperament and
conviction, who in their native land had actively opposed the policies of the numerous autocratic governments of Germany.

The revolution which such people as Julius Ochs and Bertha Levy were promoting was essentially the same kind of revolution that had transformed the thirteen American colonies into an independent nation. It was demanded by the commercial and industrial awakening of a country split into thirty-eight separate political states, each with its own civil laws, tariff and transit imposts, currency and customs. The Palatinate, whence Mr. Ochs' parents came, was economically the most developed part of Germany. There, the demand for political and business freedom and above all for a united Germany was more persistent than elsewhere. But the indecision and weakness of the very class that stood to gain most from the liberalization of Germany made the revolutionists themselves doubtful of their victory. The German intelligentsia, finding little to do in an economically laggard country, abandoned itself to abstract speculation and literature, or emigrated to the beacon land of opportunity—the United States of America.

Besides sharing the restiveness of German intellectuals, Mr. Ochs' parents had to bear the injustices of special restrictions imposed upon them as Jews. The conditions under which the Jews at that time were compelled to live in the Germanic countries were wretched almost beyond endurance. The breath of freedom wafted over what was then Germany by the Napoleonic wars had dissipated. The Jews were still regarded as outcasts and treated as such. They were herded together in ghettos and slums. Pales of settlement were devised for them. They were not allowed to follow mechanical trades. They were prohibited from owning or leasing land. The law forbade them to marry except by special permit from the government, and then only in cases where a vacancy occurred in the community through the death of some member of it. A young rabbi, who later became Adolph S. Ochs' father-in-law, was once called before the authorities to answer the charge that he was sanctifying unlawful marriages. The defendant vehemently told his accusers that they could
not suppress a natural law and that he would continue to help people violate the injunction against marriage.

The mental reaction of the German Jews to their environment was one of dejection and passionate longing for some way out of the gloom and despair that surrounded them. To many of them the orthodox Jewish faith in Germany seemed uncouth and uncompromising, making the estrangement between the Jew and the non-Jew complete and humiliating. Anything therefore that offered the enlightened Jew a way of discarding the old and identifying himself with the people about him in appearance, ideas, education and manners was like a ray of hope in an atmosphere of despondency. There appeared men of learning and eloquence who envisioned a new form of Judaism, free from traditionalism, purged of what they thought were its ancient crudities, outlandish customs and medieval observances. They were the advocates of Reform Judaism, which sought to adapt itself to the philosophical, political and scientific views of the times.

But many would not or could not wait for the emancipating influence of the new creed. They had to live and earn their bread and support their families; and that is why the migration of the German Jews to America began. Practically all who came here prior to 1830 were prompted by the economic motive. A few years before, and after the Revolution of 1848, Germany began to send here Jews of the intellectual type: teachers, students, army officers; pacifists, freethinkers, idealists of various persuasions. They were attracted by the political career of this country, by the prospect of the free, unhampered life it offered. Among them were Jews who sought a place to practice their new Reform religion, unmolested.

The tide of German-Jewish migration that brought to the shores of this country Julius Ochs and Bertha Levy and others like them, before the upheaval of 1848, brought also the impecunious young rabbi, Isaac M. Wise, who had so resolutely opposed the German ban on Jewish marriages. At home he had been thrilled by the agitation for the new kind of Judaism and the possibility of creating new institutions to propagate it. He had been among the first to think of America as the land where Reform would find its
greatest opportunity. Accordingly, he came here and not only proved to be right in his expectation, but was the principal force that made that expectation a reality.

It is necessary to keep in mind this intellectual and spiritual heritage and background of the German-Jewish settlers in this country to understand the influences that determined the early upbringing of Adolph S. Ochs.

Julius Ochs came to the United States in 1844, at the age of 18. He had received an excellent religious and secular education and was an able linguist, being proficient in six languages—German, French, English, Spanish, Italian and Hebrew. He took up teaching as a profession and, for many years, taught languages in various schools in the South. Nine years after his arrival, he met Miss Bertha Levy, and in 1855 the two were married in Nashville, Tennessee.

Bertha Levy Ochs came of a distinguished family. She was an accomplished woman and possessed a strong and fervent personality. Like the rest of the intellectual youth of Germany of her generation, she was an idealist and a rebel. At the age of sixteen, she joined in the work of the revolutionary committees active in 1848. One evening, during that exciting year, she made a revolutionary speech before a large audience in Heidelberg. The next day she had to leave Germany in haste to escape the political police.

Attracted by the charm and beauty of the rustic life of the new South, where she had lived before her marriage, Mrs. Julius Ochs became an ardent Southerner and later, when the Civil War broke out, passionately believed in the righteousness of the Confederate cause. Her brother was a soldier in the Confederate Army. Her husband on the other hand, was just as ardent a believer in the Union cause. In 1861 he enlisted in an Ohio regiment, serving for the entire duration of the war and attaining to the rank of Captain. Thus the peculiar fate that often befell Jewish families throughout history, namely, the fate of being torn apart by conflicting loyalties causing some members of the family to range themselves, weapons in hand, against other members of the family, manifested itself in the early days of Adolph Ochs' childhood. The rift, however, was not as tragic as might be supposed. We have the testimony of those who know, to the effect that the political division did not really
affect the harmony of the Ochs family. Nevertheless, it was a harmony maintained at the cost of no compromise. There is the alleged statement of Mr. Ochs that "mother gave father a lot of trouble in those days."

To some of these "troubles" little Adolph himself was an innocent witness. His own tiny presence was often used as a disguise, so it is claimed, for some of the daring patriotic exploits of his mother. There is a legend that at the very time her husband was stationed as a Union Army Captain in Cincinnati, Mrs. Ochs frequently wheeled across the bridge to Covington, Kentucky, a baby-carriage with the infant in it, but concealing under his pillows a quantity of Red Cross supplies intended for the Confederate troops. Apparently, outsiders knew and did not condemn this divided but intense loyalty of a Jewish family; for when Captain Julius Ochs died in Chattanooga in 1888, the Grand Army of the Republic was represented at the funeral, and when Mrs. Bertha Levy Ochs died in New York in 1910, the Daughters of the Confederacy paid a similar tribute to her memory.

Discharged from the army, Julius Ochs had to start from scratch again. His family had grown by that time, and in 1865, in the hope of improving his financial circumstances, he moved to Knoxville, Tenn. His idealistic nature and predilections of a scholar, however, prevented him from "going after" things in the manner that usually characterizes a person bent on succeeding materially at any cost. He shrank from some of the coarser aspects of the money struggle. He was preoccupied with matters of the spirit, and being familiar with Jewish law often acted as "emergency" rabbi for his co-religionists. He was interested in political and social problems and was a reformer at heart, but not a politician. His public spirit was noted and now and then rewarded by his community. At one time he served as Justice of the Peace and United States Commissioner; at another time he filled the office of Probate Judge for a short term. His interest in clean politics brought him the election as a delegate to the Liberal Republican Convention held in Cincinnati in 1872. He took a leading part in the organization of one of the first Jewish fraternal orders in this country.
A versatile man of lovable and rather whimsical character, Julius Ochs was kind, attentive to all and never self-seeking. It is from him that Adolph inherited his gentleness and profound respect for human personality. It probably did not matter much to Ochs, Senior, that it could be said of him that he was not "cut out" for material success. But material circumstances could not be ignored, and it did not take long for Adolph and his brothers to realize that the family income would have to be augmented as soon as possible by their own efforts.

Having received the rudiments of knowledge in a private day-school, Adolph embraced his first opportunity to go to work and help his parents when he was 11. He secured a job as office boy to the editor of his home town paper, The Knoxville Chronicle. Young Adolph performed his duties so efficiently that he was promoted to the rank of delivery boy, and now had to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and carry newspapers to the homes of subscribers over a route four and a half miles long, for which work he was getting $1.50 a week.

After delivering papers for about a year, Adolph went to Providence, Rhode Island, to help out as cash-boy in the grocery of his two uncles. The following year he returned to Knoxville and got himself a new job in a drug store, which he held only six months. Shortly afterward he was rehired by his first employer, The Knoxville Chronicle, to do all the odd jobs and dirty work required in a composing room. During the three years that he worked as printer's devil, learning the printing trade under the personal supervision of the foreman, Adolph Ochs attended classes in his free time in the preparatory department of what is now the University of Tennessee. He also found time to work as usher in the local "opera house," together with his younger brothers, George and Milton, with whom he formed a company for the sale of refreshments.

Ambition, however, was prompting him to seek his fortune in a larger field. He had a vague notion that California might be a good place to try. But Adolph's next change was to obtain employment as journeyman printer in the job printing department of The Louisville Courier Journal. Six months later the establishment of a
new paper, The Knoxville Tribune, lured him back home. He worked a year and a half for The Tribune, gaining experience, first as compositor, then as a reporter, and finally advancing to the position of assistant business manager.

Foreseeing a great future for Chattanooga, Tennessee, the youthful newspaper executive made plans with an associate to publish a new paper there. His own superior, however, the owner of The Knoxville Tribune, stole a march on him and started a paper of his own, The Dispatch, in Chattanooga. In 1877, Adolph Ochs, then only nineteen years old, and his associate entered the employ of this new paper as advertising solicitor and editor, respectively. Six months later, The Dispatch failed, and Adolph Ochs was appointed receiver. To provide himself with a source of income in the meantime he published a city directory, for which he did practically all the work himself. He succeeded in paying off the debts of the bankrupt paper. With $250 of borrowed money he bought a controlling half interest in The Chattanooga Times, which was about to go under, merged The Dispatch with it and, using his own private fortune of $37.50 as working capital, began, in 1878, his career as newspaper publisher.

His very first step was to announce his intention of making The Chattanooga Times the organ of business and industry, serving the interests of the city and surrounding territory. The paper was to be democratic on questions concerning the nation, and independent in local and state matters. It proposed to prosper on the strength of its own merits, without depending upon special favors from local interests or donations from private sources, which, in the practice of all small-town journalism in those days, meant subservience to outside elements.

When Adolph Ochs acquired The Chattanooga Times it was a flimsy, four-page affair, and had a circulation of 250. Its editor was serving on part-time basis at a salary of $1.00 a day. It had a staff of nine, exclusive of the publisher, and a payroll of $100 a week. The first year was a critical one. To create some additional income, Mr. Ochs established in 1879 The Tradesman, a trade publication. But the next year he was out of debt sufficiently to be able to buy the other half interest in his paper. The Chattanooga Times
steadily grew and prospered. Out of its profits, Mr. Ochs was able to build up a reserve fund with which he subsequently acquired control of *The New York Times*. The success of his new publication made it possible for him to bring his family to Chattanooga. His two brothers, whom he had been sending through college, joined the staff of the paper, and his father was made treasurer of the publishing company.

On February 28, 1883, in Cincinnati, Adolph S. Ochs married Miss Effie Miriam Wise, daughter of the Rev. Dr. Isaac M. Wise, famous as a religious leader and organizer of the distinct denominational existence of Reform Judaism in this country. He was the founder of two historically important institutions: the Hebrew Union College and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The world now recognizes him as one of the outstanding personalities developed by American Jewry during the past century. He was endowed with many gifts, among them capacity for leadership and a genius for organization. He was a man of great courage, of tumultuous passions and all-consuming ambition; a pugnacious spirit, not afraid to meet the enemy with bare hands. He was orator, novelist, theologian, journalist, controversialist and teacher all in one. Friend of Daniel Webster and Horace Greeley, personally acquainted with Presidents of the United States, he was often swayed by the most contradictory impulses and moods, and at different times was preparing himself to enter politics, become the partner of a legal luminary, adopt an academic career as professor in a university, and accept a responsible position in the Library of Congress. This man, practically single-handed, initiated movements and built institutions which survive to this day.

The union with one of the most prominent families in America had an important bearing on Mr. Ochs' interest in the strengthening of Reform Judaism. But in another sense, this interest was also an outgrowth of the idealism and traditions brought to this country by the band of German-Jewish immigrants that included, as already stated, Mr. Ochs' parents and Isaac M. Wise.

The publisher of *The Chattanooga Times* actively associated himself with the business and cultural development
of his city. His communal leadership later earned him the title of Citizen Emeritus of Chattanooga. It also brought him the advantage of becoming personally acquainted with many of the outstanding Americans and leaders of his time. Among the prominent people who visited Chattanooga and met the young publisher were governors, senators, industrial magnates, bankers, railroad presidents, clergymen, influential politicians, etc. They included President Cleveland and a newly-married Republican editor from Ohio by the name of Warren G. Harding, who wished some professional advice from Mr. Ochs.

The manner in which he made a success of The Chattanooga Times was gaining a wide and favorable reputation for Mr. Ochs. In 1891, he was invited to deliver an address before the National Editorial Association Convention in St. Paul, Minnesota, in which he was expected to tell his audience how to conduct "a small, interior, daily paper along practical, successful lines." What he actually conveyed to the Convention was much more than that, namely, one of the earliest formulations of a policy which proved prophetic of the future development of American journalism. He said among other things:

"... The day of the organ, if not past, is rapidly passing. The people as they gain culture, breadth of understanding, and independence of thought... more and more demand the paper that prints the history of each day without fear of consequences, the favoring of special theories, or the promotion of personal interests. The duty of the editor and publisher who serves an intelligent and manly constituency is to give his patrons the facts, and attempt nothing with reference thereto beyond assisting to a clearer understanding of the same... The editor and publisher of a daily newspaper should give his thoughts, time, money, and energy, first to securing and then printing in good shape all the news, and give the thoughts of the best-informed men upon the topic under discussion—fairly give all views with reference to it..."

In this profession of a journalistic creed Mr. Ochs gave voice to a growing demand arising out of the changing economic conditions of the country. The period that felt
the need of a new kind of newspaper was one of greatest internal growth. It witnessed the transformation of the United States from a purely agricultural and importing nation to an industrial and exporting one, the building of transcontinental railways, the development of mining and machine industries. It was the period during which Europe became interested in this country as a field for the investment of capital. It was an epoch of great social strides, of the growth of labor organization, the advent of woman suffrage, the consolidation of industry, the rise of corporations and trusts. Large masses found themselves drawn into the vortex of economic struggle. Individual enterprise and free for all competition were at their height. They lured and gratified more people than at any other time in the history of America.

Such a period required a change from the personal, individualistic kind of journalism to a journalism reflecting the everyday interests of large numbers of people composed of individualists. It called for newspapers capable of unprejudiced mass appeal. But mass appeal was a matter of mass production. Such production was made increasingly possible by the rapid succession of mechanical improvements in newspaper publishing. The rotary press, the linotype, the stereotype, the photoengraving process, the automatic feeding of paper from a huge roll, the manufacture of newsprint out of wood-pulp—all this contributed toward making the newspaper suited to its age and opportunities.

The race for circulation was on, never to diminish. To make the racing-ground smoother news-gathering associations were formed, and mechanical means of transmitting news more speedily were introduced. The telegraph, the telephone, the typewriter were utilized. The Transatlantic Cable was laid. The place of the individual and sometimes dictatorial editor-commentator was taken by a staff of several members. The editorial "we" no longer concealed the multiple or split personality of a political missionary; it became a reality, the result of daily conferences.

Competition led to the reduction of the price of newspapers. On the other hand, it increased the cost of distribution. But the great advance in business generally resulted in an increase in the amount of newspaper advertising. The
development of department stores in the cities was an important factor in the situation. They began using entire pages for the printing of display matter. There appeared other new advertisers who were willing to spend thousands of dollars for bringing their wares or services to the attention of the public. Thus advertising became an important item in the business of newspaper publishing. In 1880, it is claimed, newspapers received a revenue of $50,000,000 from circulation, and $40,000,000 from advertising. In 1890 the income from the two sources was about equal—$72,000,000. Thereafter, advertising was outstripping circulation as a source of profits at an accelerated rate.

The desire of industry and trade for a maximum consumer market and the function of the press in creating this market found their complement in an increased effort to gain more and yet more readers. The drive now was for larger circulation to attract more advertisers to pay for still larger circulation to get still more advertisers. To attain their end many newspapers resorted to methods more or less artificial and sensational. A business manager capable of steering the newspaper in the right direction came to be looked upon as the most important asset of a paper. Mr. Ochs' shining example of managerial ability was enhanced by the fact that it did not involve the use of artificial or sensational methods.

While conducting his more or less regional paper in Chattanooga, Mr. Ochs never for a moment lost sight of the connection existing between the growth of the South and the great economic and political transformation which the country as a whole was undergoing. The apex of the national economic pyramid was in New York. Here was a metropolis that was bidding fair to become one of the greatest business nerve-centers of the world. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Mr. Ochs had been cherishing the hope to be able to become active in the newspaper field of that city as well. It was probably with this ambition lurking somewhere in his mind that, in 1890, he remarked to a friend, who had discussed with him the decline of *The New York Times*, that the New York paper offered the greatest opportunity in American journalism.
Six years later this remark was recalled to him by the receipt of a telegram from a New York friend telling him that the opportunity of his life was at hand. Mr. Ochs went to New York to investigate. He found that the opportunity referred to was a chance to manage a small paper for a group of Senators interested in free silver. Now, free silver was something to which Mr. Ochs was unalterably opposed, despite his Southern sympathies and Democratic principles. The moribund New York Mercury, the daily which he had been asked to manage, was then offered to him for sale. But Mr. Ochs could not avail himself of the offer because ownership of the paper did not carry with it the right to the service of the United Press, upon which The Mercury depended for its news.

He returned home rather disappointed. But shortly afterward he received a telegram from another friend, a reporter on The New York Times, informing him that if he were interested in The New York Times he could buy it at a reasonable price. This second telegram proved to be the call of destiny, which Mr. Ochs obeyed courageously, though not without circumspection.

The New York Times, which came into Mr. Ochs' possession as the ultimate result of the wire message sent to him by a newspaper friend, had had a great and honorable career as a leading journal of opinion conducted by an eminent editor who played an important part in the political life of the nation. From its inception and during the major part of its career, it was under the editorial direction of Henry J. Raymond and the business management of George Jones. Established by the two partners in 1851, the newspaper followed the policy of "moderation, decency, excellency in news service, avoidance of fantastic extremes in editorial opinion and general sobriety in manner." This was in healthy contrast to the temper and style prevailing among its contemporaries.

Raymond, as a journalist, had been trained by Horace Greeley, but he shared none of the extravagant social views of his great teacher. At the age of 31, when he became editor of The New York Times, he was already known as one of the ablest political writers among the Whigs. In the middle of the decade, Raymond became a "Free Soiler" and
later one of the founders of the Republican party. Under its brilliant editor The Times prospered from the start, and its prosperity was a direct reflection of the prosperity of New York. For almost thirty years it was the leading Republican newspaper in the country. Yet in its Republicanism it stood closer to the Democrats than any other prominent journal of its day. It perceived and encouraged the inevitable industrialization of the South, and could combine sympathy with the victims of the Reconstruction period with the defence of certain principles that have remained basic with The New York Times to this day.

Those basic principles were and still are: opposition to all unsound credit and money policies, which seem to serve as an ever-ready panacea advanced by agricultural groups caught in a depression; tariff reform, such as will not permit the victimization of agricultural and other domestic interests for the sole and selfish protection of home industries that need no protection; administrative reforms to reduce the cost of government; and the advocacy of the use of the merit system in civil government. As a Republican organ, The Times often found it difficult to square its principles with the practices of the political party to which it had chosen to owe allegiance. The politicians, on their part, stood ever ready to relieve the paper of its embarrassment by offering to acquire an interest in it and controlling it, but their efforts were vain.

Although not a crusading paper, The New York Times was, in its early days, instrumental in exposing some of the most notorious misdeeds of corrupt politicians. In 1857, it published an expose of the land grab in Minnesota perpetrated under the guise of granting land for railroad construction. The exposure led to an investigation by the House of Representatives, which resulted in the expulsion of four members.

Raymond died in 1869 and was succeeded for a short time, first by John Bigelow, and later by George Shepard. Then the editorial chair was assumed by Louis J. Jennings, who served for seven years. After Jennings came John Ford, who in 1883 was succeeded by Charles R. Miller.

It was during Jennings' editorship that The Times performed another memorable service for the public good.
It brought into the limelight the gigantic frauds practiced upon the citizens of New York City by Boss Tweed and his Ring.

The death of George Jones in 1891, after forty years of skilful management of The New York Times, was the beginning of the decline of the paper. Jones' heirs, like the heirs of some other great newspaper publishers, were not equal to the task so splendidly performed by their predecessor, and they were not interested in keeping up a business which they considered a losing one. They were therefore ready to sell out.

To prevent the passing of the control of The Times into the hands of strangers, Charles R. Miller, its editor, aided by a group of friends of President Cleveland, in 1893, organized a new company and bought the paper for $1,000,-000. With no working capital except that provided by current receipts, The Times continued to struggle on for three more years. Its doom seemed inevitable; but just when it was about to be sealed, Adolph S. Ochs came upon the scene.

Mr. Ochs impressed the editor of the metropolitan paper which he wanted to take over not only as a Democrat of sound, conservative views but also as a capable young executive who made him feel confident that The New York Times could be reorganized and put back on its feet. Several proposals were made and considered, but the one accepted was suggested by Mr. Ochs. Essentially it was the same plan of reorganization which he had carried out once before, when he took over The Chattanooga Times.

On August 19, 1896, in the first issue of The New York Times under his management, Mr. Ochs announced his intention of publishing a "high standard" newspaper which was to be "clean, dignified and trustworthy," so as to appeal to "thoughtful, pure-minded people." He believed that in New York City there was a large and growing public for the kind of paper which The Times had been in its heyday, and which he meant to revive. In the issue of October 25 of the same year there appeared for the first time the motto "All the News That's Fit to Print," which The Times has carried ever since. By stressing the quality of fitness in news Mr. Ochs meant to differentiate his
publication from the sensational and vulgar type of journalism which was practiced at the time by two other popular newspapers in New York.

In New York, as in Chattanooga, Mr. Ochs had an unerring sense of orientation in the surge of social forces about him. His newly enunciated principles were but an expression of the trends of the new era which the United States was entering. It was an era of colonial expansion, when the developmental energies of the country were bursting their national bounds and seeking an international outlet, when finance and industry were making this nation a world power, attracting to itself men and money from all parts of the globe. *The Times* drew readers who associated domestic issues with national and international questions, and who, in forming whatever views they held, had to rely upon complete, impartial and speedy information of worldwide scope. In seeking this kind of information people of all shades of opinion were at one. This largely accounts for the fact that *The New York Times* is read probably by more "die-hard" conservatives and burning-red radicals than any other newspaper in the country.

News became the paramount quest of *The Times*, and to the furnishing of news everything else was subordinated. Chiefly through his interest in news, Mr. Ochs was instrumental in advancing the use of new means of communication, in promoting radio, aviation, geographical discovery and other scientific undertakings. He greatly developed and expanded the financial news department. During his very first year with *The Times*, he established the Book Review Section as a supplement to the Saturday edition. It was later made a part of the Sunday issue and achieved national popularity.

He also instituted the policy of treating advertising as news, the most important requisite of which is truth. He laid down the rule that all advertising matter submitted to *The Times* must pass the test of truthfulness and honesty. If it fails to come up to the standard set, the advertising copy is rejected. The rule is carefully enforced, and has led to the exclusion of millions of dollars worth of advertising.
The new publisher expressed his political independence often by switching his editorial support from one party to the other. A Democrat of the Jacksonian tradition, which meant essentially that his political credo was made up of a mixture of what was best in conservative Democracy and conservative Republicanism, Mr. Ochs could, with a clear conscience, follow his convictions by supporting when necessary one or the other of the two major parties, on specific issues. He soon demonstrated, too, that this independence extended to the field of advertising as much as to the news and editorial opinion.

Shortly after he assumed control, the Board of Aldermen in New York City offered *The New York Times* a chance to publish the complete vote cast in the municipal election of 1896. The compensation for this was to be about $34,000. Mr. Ochs rejected the offer as a waste of public money. A few months later the city government, which was then under Tammany domination, tendered all its advertising required by law to *The Times*. The contract would have amounted to about $150,000 a year. It was explained to Mr. Ochs that the offer was made simply because the Democratic city officials felt that it was a good idea to help in the development of a conservative Democratic paper in New York. The offer was refused, to avoid any suspicion that *The Times* had been bought by Tammany. During the Presidential campaign of 1900 the Republican National Committee proposed to Mr. Ochs the purchase of one million copies of an issue of the paper which contained an editorial lucidly indorsing the stand of the Republican party. The million copies were denied. That same year the Republican State Committee of New Jersey wished to buy 20,000 copies of *The Times* every day during the last three months of the campaign. This, too was refused.

In more recent times, a western manufacturer asked that *The New York Times* be sent to 50 clergymen in his city at his expense for a year. *The Times* declined to send its issues to people who did not express a desire to become subscribers. A Southern banker, who liked the financial news and editorials of the newspaper, ordered it sent regularly to 450 bankers in his State at his expense. His wholesale subscription was rejected. The banker then tried to
gain his end by enlisting the aid of a newsdealer. The sudden large increase in the newsdealer's order led to an investigation, and the banker was again thwarted.

Mr. Ochs scrupulously avoided printing or doing anything that might be interpreted as a surrender of principles for the sake of profit. This was to him the only way in which he could effectively prove his independence. No suspicion of influence, therefore, could attach to his conduct as a publisher. As for the alleged inevitable influence of the advertisers, it was his belief—no doubt born of the great success of The Times—that the popularity of a newspaper as an advertising medium made it independent of any influence that individual advertisers might wish to exert.

On July 1, 1900, having fulfilled the terms of the reorganization contract, Mr. Ochs became the controlling stock-owner of The New York Times, which position he never relinquished. His new business methods, coupled with the matchless manner in which The Times organized and used its news-gathering facilities, brought results far beyond the fondest dream of its owner.

Upon the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his management, which occurred on August 18, 1921, Mr. Ochs announced that the gross income of his paper for the quarter century had been about one hundred million dollars, of which only three and three-quarter million, or an average of $125,000 a year, had been distributed in dividends. The balance had been used in financing the expanding activities of The Times. This was an amazing illustration and proof of a business philosophy to which Mr. Ochs had clung since his youth. He was not interested in savings, in letting money beget money for its own sake. Surpluses, according to his idea, could be best used by plowing them back into the business, so that the enterprise might grow, increase in value to its workers, and widen its services to the community.

Mr. Ochs regarded the unparalleled growth of The Times, which reached a weekday circulation of over 467,000 and a Sunday circulation of more than 780,000, as "a vindication of the newspaper reader," for it proved what he had been saying right along, that a clean, unbiased newspaper could attract a large number of readers. The Times' record, which has not been equaled, in getting together and printing
the news of the day has robbed even its harshest critics of a valid reason to accuse it of journalistic partiality. Even those who are prone to point to the so-called class character of Mr. Ochs' personal political and economic views, as they found their reflection on the editorial page, are disarmed by the knowledge that their most dependable authority upon which they lean for support of their condemnation of The Times has been The Times itself. To some who have expressed their dissatisfaction with The New York Times for its official attitude toward Soviet Russia, for example, the most reconciling answer is provided by the distinguished work of Walter Duranty, The Times correspondent in Moscow, who in 1932 received the Pulitzer Prize for his illuminating dispatches.

During the World War, The New York Times rose to its greatest opportunity and became the world's greatest newspaper institution. It rendered a distinct service to historians, present-day and future, by printing the full text of official documents, such as peace treaties, government declarations, statements of national leaders, and other important records.

In 1913, Mr. Ochs established The Annalist, a weekly financial review. The following year, the rotogravure process of printing pictures in the Sunday issue was introduced and, as an outgrowth of that, the Midweek Pictorial, an illustrated weekly review, was started. The New York Times Index, published since 1913, is of inestimable value to historians, students and writers in search of material. The World War prompted the establishment of Current History, a monthly magazine devoted to the discussion of problems and issues arising out of the war. In 1918, the Times Wide World Photo Service came into existence.

There were times when Mr. Ochs was considering buying other newspapers. In 1899, he contemplated taking over The New York Telegram. Three years later, he bought The Philadelphia Times and Public Ledger, consolidated them and, after operating the amalgamated property for eleven years, sold it to Cyrus H. K. Curtis. In 1918, arrangements for the purchase of The New York Herald and The New York Telegram were abruptly terminated by the death of their owner. Mr. Ochs thereafter evinced no
interest in acquiring other newspaper properties, considering the management of *The Times* “a big enough job for any man.”

One of the many remarkable intuitions of Mr. Ochs was responsible for the construction of the Times Building in what is now known as Times Square. It showed the keen vision he had of the coming growth of the middle uptown section of New York City and the drift of business and population northward. When the Times edifice was completed in 1905 it was the second tallest structure in New York. It was a splendid demonstration of a novel architectural idea, American in origin, namely, that a skyscraper can be beautiful as well as useful. Its construction put a heavy strain on the financial resources of *The Times*. But it proved to be a good investment, despite the fact that the paper had outgrown its new home before it settled in it. Seven years later, *The Times* had to move to new quarters, The Times Annex, specially built for it in 43rd Street. The new structure had to be enlarged twice to meet further requirements. It is now one of the most imposing and best-equipped modern newspaper buildings in the world.

The huge demand for newsprint for *The New York Times* and related publications impelled Mr. Ochs to become a paper-maker as well. In 1926, *The Times* obtained a large interest in a paper company that owns 5,000 square miles of woods in Northern Ontario, Canada, and operates one of the largest paper-making plants in the world at Kapuskasing, Ontario, which supplies *The Times* with all its paper.

Mr. Ochs was a prominent organizer and director of cooperative associations for the gathering of news. He was a dominant influence in the Southern Associated Press in the nineties, and in the Associated Press of today. He was so engrossed in the business of newspaper publishing that he had comparatively few interests that were not in some way connected with that field. His hobby, if such it may be called, was helping in the development and preservation of public parks. An undertaking very close to his heart was the collection of funds during the Christmas season for “The Hundred Neediest Cases.” The first appeal for this fund was made in 1912, when $3,630 was collected. In 1930 the total raised was close to $350,000. Since then,
owing to the depression, the annual totals of gifts have somewhat decreased.

Mr. Ochs' interest in the work of American academic societies made it possible for some of them to undertake projects which might not have been started otherwise. His donation of $500,000 to the American Council of Learned Societies, composed of 150 outstanding organizations devoted to the advancement of historical learning, enabled that body to begin the publication of the American Dictionary of Biography, which, when completed, will cover the lives of about 20,000 prominent Americans. In 1928, The Times took over the publication of the American Year Book, an annual record of American accomplishments. About fifty national learned societies are cooperating in this project. The publication has won national and international recognition.

Honors came to Mr. Ochs from far and wide, but he accepted only a few, among them the election as Officer and, later, Commander of the French Legion of Honor. In 1922, Yale conferred upon him the degree of Master of Arts. Subsequently he received honorary doctorates from Columbia University, the University of Chattanooga, New York University, Dartmouth College and Lincoln University. The National Institute of Social Science awarded him a gold medal in 1927. Two years later, the New York Chamber of Commerce cited him among the seven citizens who rendered distinguished service to the city. In 1931, he was elected member of the American Philosophical Society. Formal recognition came also to his great newspaper as an institution. In 1918, The New York Times received the first gold medal ever awarded by the Pulitzer School of Journalism of Columbia University. In 1930, the University of Missouri School of Journalism awarded The Times a medal for “distinguished work in journalism.”

Adolph S. Ochs exerted the influence that he did by virtue of his personality and his ideas. Seldom did one meet a man in whom true modesty was so indissolubly combined with an unshakable faith in certain precepts to be followed. He sincerely repudiated any suggestion that he personally was responsible for the success of his paper. He honestly believed that the success was due entirely to the application
of right fundamental principles of journalism. And this genuine belief made his unpretentiousness a striking and charming attribute of his nature. But there is no doubt that Mr. Ochs’ utter subjection of the personal factor to the rational utilization of objective opportunity did not in the least remove the fact that he was the guiding force of his paper’s progress. The very faith that he had in the prudence of his course of action brought out in splendid fashion the active qualities inherent in his make-up, the qualities of born leadership, indefatigable energy, supreme confidence, and readiness to square actions with thoughts.

Although his formal schooling was limited, the knowledge which Mr. Ochs picked up from reading and from meeting prominent people was broad and, at times, surprising to men of specialized training. At the luncheons frequently given to distinguished persons in the Times Annex, Mr. Ochs would ask questions that showed a remarkable familiarity with the particular subjects in which the persons spoken to were interested as experts or students.

Those who had occasion to observe him at close range, at his office desk or at the editorial conference table, speak of him as the perfect newspaperman. He devoured The Times, reading carefully and critically everything that appeared in the news or on the editorial page. He took pleasure in seeking out obscure and insignificant items and developing them into timely first-page stories. Himself of an independent mind, he encouraged independence in others, and often purposely advanced an extreme view in order to bring out all the points that could be made on both sides of the question. He never lost his temper or raised his voice in argument. His perspicacity and unerring judgment of people were extraordinary.

Mr. Ochs’ Jewishness expressed itself in his religion, which he accepted as a sacred heritage. Religion in its universal sense was to him a spiritual yearning for perfection that distinguished man from beast and was indispensable to civilization. Of his own inherited brand of religion, Judaism, he wrote:

“Judaism is a conception of religion that spells responsibility—responsibility to society, to neighbor, to family and to one’s self—distinguishes man from the brute,
civilizes his life, makes him human and justifies his existence. Everything that my religion teaches me, if adhered to and practiced, would make me a better man and a better citizen.”

In a still more specific sense, Mr. Ochs was a devout believer in the tenets of American Reform Judaism. He shared the view of the expounders of that creed that Judaism meant allegiance to a common inheritance in its essentials, that Reform meant the principle of progress which follows the needs of time and environment, and that American Judaism meant the kind of Judaism that was under obligation to help in the advancement of the moral and spiritual life of the American commonwealth in the spirit in which this republic was founded.

As soon as he had the power to help and promote its progress, Mr. Ochs enlisted in the cause which his great father-in-law, Isaac M. Wise, was advancing, and contributed materially toward making it an active force in the life of the Jews in this country. He was one of the leading workers in the campaigns that put the Hebrew Union College, the rabbinical academy founded by Isaac M. Wise, upon a firm financial basis. In 1926, Mr. Ochs directed a drive for the raising of an endowment fund of $5,000,000 for the College. He adopted the practical method of calling upon 100 wealthy Jews to pledge $50,000 each, the sum to be paid out of the estate of the donor upon his death, either outright or in equal instalments, for which interest was charged.

In speaking of the need for Jewish religious teachers as well as for perpetuating Judaism through religious training for children, Mr. Ochs said:

“Should not the Jew cherish the rich heritage he has in his religion, that he has preserved and given to humanity and civilization, the Bible, the Ten Commandments, the Prophets, the Proverbs, the Psalms, and on which rests the moral code of the world, the basis of its jurisprudence and its ethical standards? . . . It is time that we instilled into our children the feeling that to be a Jew is not an impediment. The Jew who stands up for his Judaism, proud of his faith, invariably has the respect and admiration of his fellow-citizens of every creed.”
In memory of his father, who was a pious adherent of the liberal Judaistic faith, and of his mother, Mr. Ochs built a beautiful Temple in Chattanooga. He also caused the construction of the splendid Isaac M. Wise Memorial Hall in Temple Emanu-El in New York City. He was for many years a member of the Board of Governors of this congregation.

His strong conviction that the Jews owe allegiance only to the country whose citizens they are made him an opponent of Zionism. But his opposition rested on philosophical and political grounds and had nothing to do with active hostility to the movement. In a statement published in the *American Israelite*, Cincinnati, Mr. Ochs made his position clear:

"... I belong to that very large school of Jewish thought in America that think that the greatest heritage of the Jew is his religion and that it should be preserved; and that as a distinctive race the Jews need no place in modern civilization; that, left to the processes of environment and time, they would soon lose their racial characteristics and become an integral part of the people of their country and share the weal and woe of the land."

He traveled in Palestine and admired some of the achievements of the Zionists. But he believed that those achievements rested upon a false and uncertain foundation. To him they represented dangerous ventures, because of the hostility of the Arab population and all Islam to the aspirations of the Zionists, namely, dominance and political control of Palestine. Zionism, Mr. Ochs thought, could exist only by the protection of the British troops.

Mr. Ochs' careful avoidance of anything that might give the impression of having been inspired by his own preferences, opinions, or position amounted almost to a fault. It often exposed him to censure. He was criticized, for example, for not showing enough interest, i.e., journalistic interest, in matters affecting the Jews, outside of religion, for not having *The New York Times* publish more about specifically Jewish problems. The truth was that Mr. Ochs' interest in these problems was probably as great as that professed by others, but that as a publisher of a general
newspaper he did not care to give his readers the slightest reason for thinking that the publication of this or that "Jewish" item might have been dictated by the fact that he himself was a Jew.

Mr. Ochs was simple in appearance and tastes. Next to modesty, inoffensiveness, an instinctive reluctance to harass or embarrass anyone, was his most obvious characteristic. He was considerateness and kindness incarnate. His personal life was a nexus of gracious relationships with the people near him. He was deeply attached to Mrs. Ochs who, although keeping herself in the background, was his most intimate friend and adviser. In all crucial moments of his life, it was his wont, whenever he happened to be away from home, to sit down and write a long letter to his wife, telling her every detail of the matter at hand and every angle of the consideration which he was giving to it. She was his true and ever-present consultant.

His sense of family loyalty and kinship was almost religious. He showed his regard for friends by showering them with attention, even in smallest things, and he himself was pleased with any attention that came to him from anybody. At his home in White Plains, where he presided over a circle of relatives and friends without the slightest show of authority or self-importance, Mr. Ochs was called affectionately "Uncle Dolph."

Despite the fact that Mr. Ochs never really aspired to a writer's laurels, he unquestionably had the gift of expressing his thoughts lucidly and effectively. In the latter period of his life, he also developed considerable ability as a speaker. He was a collector of books, and owned a magnificent library which he liked to show to visitors.

He was ever interested in gaining the good will of the people who worked for him, no matter how humble their job. On his sixtieth birthday he established group insurance for all of his employees, later increasing the amount of insurance. In 1921, he instituted a liberal system of sick benefits and a retirement pension fund. He helped literally hundreds of people who were personally unknown to him. The help, however, was not given in a haphazard manner. He usually instructed some of his associates to
investigate the person who had applied for aid, and if the facts were as represented, the aid was given.

Mr. Ochs was greatly affected by the misfortunes that befell the Jews in Germany. This undoubtedly aggravated the ailments from which he suffered the last few years of his life.

On April 8, 1935, Adolph S. Ochs died in Chattanooga. He passed away as he lived—at work, giving advice to associates on a matter close to his heart and for which he had the affinity of genius, namely, newspaper publishing.

This sketch may be fittingly closed with the following tribute to the memory of the great journalist and Jew, paid by Dr. John H. Finley, his friend and co-worker of many years:

When Alexander, who was called the Great,
Wept at the Indus, it is said, because
There were no other worlds to be annexed
To those which he had conquered on the way,
He did not dream that down in Palestine—
An obscure corner of his vast domain—
There were two humble folk, a Man and Wife,
The far progenitors of Adolph Ochs,
Who, centuries to come, would hold all lands
Within his daily cognizance, nor tire,—
For each succeeding morning he would see
A world made new by news of its own self
In columns of The Times.—Long may you live
Who've conquered where an Alexander failed!
EDWIN WOLF
By SIMON MILLER

In 1837, at the age of 17, Elias Wolf came from Bavaria to Philadelphia. His education, particularly in Hebrew, was considerably beyond that of the average German immigrant of that time. This fact, along with his piety and love for the ancient Faith, made for a strong religious atmosphere in the home which he eventually established.

After a few years in Philadelphia, he settled in Wilmington, North Carolina, where there were few, if any, other Jews. He readily adapted himself to his new environment and must have earned the appreciation and good will of the community, because we find that in 1848 he was elected Master of his Masonic Lodge.

In 1850, he moved to Uhrichsville, Ohio, but occasionally returned to Philadelphia. On one of his visits to Philadelphia, he met Amelia Mayer, whom he married in 1851. Mrs. Wolf's religious fervor was equal to that of her husband and theirs was a genuinely religious Jewish household. Mrs. Wolf was a woman of rare judgment and discerning mind. She was a truly benevolent Matriarch whose sense of justice was highly developed but was always tempered with a tenderness of heart.

Into such a home, on March 11, 1855, Edwin Wolf was born, and the impress of that childhood environment was stamped indelibly upon his character, mind and spirit. When Edwin Wolf was one year old the family moved to Philadelphia, which from that time on was its home.

As a child, Edwin Wolf was studious, reserved, and of an exceedingly inquiring mind. In his childhood and youth, he manifested these traits and, in his adult life, added to these an exceptionally judicial trend—no decision to be arrived at without study and weighing of all the facts of the matter at issue.
He received a public school education in the course of which he acquired a reading habit which ruled him throughout his life. In all probability, unconsciously this reading was "rather to forge his mind than to furnish it." His reading ran the entire literary gamut, both in German and English, from the classics to modern mystery stories, from Emerson to Ouida, the latter of whom he characterizes in his diary as "mush, bosh, trash."

After completing school he went into his father's manufacturing business and, when in 1877, Mr. Wolf senior retired, Edwin, then twenty-two years old, succeeded him. The following year, the young man's health failed and he went to Europe in search of the best medical attention. During his three months' stay he jotted down in a diary his experiences and reactions. "Biographies should dwell more on motives than events, more on what issues from within than happenings without." If, in attempting to analyze our own motives, we often go amiss, how much more difficult to determine the motivation of another! But when a man speaks to himself through a personal diary, not intended for the eyes of another, he lays his soul bare and one can then arrive at the true man.

In the diary, he does not speak of the hotels at which he stayed, nor of the meals of which he partook. Instead, he speaks of the books he has been reading, of the postilion who drove him, of the peasants to whom he spoke, of the cultivation of the land and, more often, of woods and fields he traversed on his many walking trips (often 15 miles). His descriptions of these woods, hills and watercourses are poetic in the extreme. His talks with the common man in the field lead him into dissertations both sociological and economic. In fact, he discloses himself as a lover of both nature and his fellowmen. In these he shows the same judicial mind and motives that he manifested throughout his career.

Music and the fine arts appealed to him, and much of his time was spent in the art galleries and opera houses, particularly in Paris. They shared most of his time, along with walks about the highways and byways, the latter to see the common folk, in whom he was more interested than the beau monde. At this time, he wrote a letter to two of
his younger brothers in which he counseled that they interest themselves in music for its cultural effect as well as for the pleasure it would afford. He closes his letter with “I didn’t get the chance to study music but I’m determined to educate myself in it.”

From this diary, one may glean the very essence of the man who was to make for himself a place of honor and usefulness in the Jewish and civic life of Philadelphia, as well as in the activities effecting the Jews as a whole.

In 1882, having retired from his former business, he joined his four younger brothers in their various enterprises. His trained mind was invaluable to this venture and success followed. It was about this time that his civic consciousness crystallized upon education, in its broadest sense, as the one thing that was of greatest interest to him, and his future years were concentrated on this problem.

On October 31, 1882, he married Mary Fleisher, a woman of rare culture and literary appreciation. Her outlook on life coincided in a remarkable degree with that of her husband. The writer lived within a few doors of their home and his visits there afforded him many a rare treat. Ushered into the second floor “sitting room” (now dubbed living room), one would find Edwin Wolf, as was his wont, hunched up in a comfortable armchair with a book, and his wife similarly employed. Around all the walls, shelves filled with books, on the table, books; everywhere books. Departing, the visitor felt that he had been in an ideal cultured home surroundings, and had been elevated by the discussion of books, of topics of general and of civic, concern.

Mrs. Wolf’s health failing, the couple’s life became more hermit-like and, therefore, more dependent on their common interests. Two children were born, Morris and Blanche (Mrs. Isidore Kohn), who are today taking up the threads broken by their father’s death.

In 1901, Edwin Wolf was elected to the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia. This body has exclusive financial and administrative conduct of the entire public education of the city. “A book lover, and not unmindful of the claims of higher education, his chief concerns, nevertheless, were the strengthening of the elementary schools
and the enlargement of vocational training." Edwin Wolf anticipated what is now well recognized, that is, education should fit the individual not alone for life, but also for living. He was ever insistent that the Board should plan for the future, that buildings should be improved in sanitation and safety. His wide knowledge of literature and finance were of great help in the Board's deliberations. In 1908, he installed the system of accounting which is still used. He was elected President in 1917, voluntarily retiring from the Board in 1920, in spite of the importunities of his colleagues.

March, 1902, Mr. Wolf was elected as a trustee of the Jewish Publication Society of America and, in October of 1902, he was elected as its President, succeeding Mr. Morris Newburger, the first incumbent. Although the Society, 25 years earlier, had planned the publication of a Jewish translation of the Bible, it was under Mr. Wolf's regime that the plan was adopted by which this monumental work eventually came into being. Under his direction and guidance, the scope of the Society was enlarged, its publications were increased in number and its membership was augmented. To the work of the Society he dedicated the same judgment and zeal that he did to every movement in which he was interested. But in addition, he was urged by the Jewish ideals which were a part of his whole warp and woof, the result of the environment into which he was born. The souls of Elias and Amelia Wolf spoke and acted through their son.

His interest in education was recognized in his selection as one of the original Board of Governors of Dropsie College. His experience and ripe judgment were of great service in safeguarding the investment of the funds of the College. At the same time, he fully appreciated the academic work of this institution, unique in its aims and purpose, and his interest in it remained undiminished until the end of his life.

Mr. Wolf was, for quite a number of years, a member of the Board of the Philadelphia Free Library, whose main building is at 19th Street and The Parkway, with branches in various parts of the city. His knowledge of books, his
administrative and executive ability were of inestimable value in the functioning of that vast enterprise.

He served for a long period as a Governor of the Penitentiary for Eastern Pennsylvania. He spent much time visiting the institution, and was keenly interested in the prisoners, spending many hours chatting with them. He tried to analyze the individual and the causes back of the infraction of the law for which each was incarcerated. From the facts thus gleaned, he drew the general conclusion that to lack of education, practical not academic, most broken careers could be traced. Acting upon this conviction, he bent every fibre in his being to provide means for teaching the prisoners some useful occupation. His thought was to give hope to the discharged prisoner and a means to earn a livelihood so that, thus rehabilitated, he could take a useful place in the world. Formerly, the discharged prisoner was given but five dollars and a complete clothing outfit, only to return to his former haunts in life.

Edwin Wolf recognized the necessity of an agency to represent the interest of the whole Jewish people, to guard its civil rights, to coordinate the work when some calamity occurred to Jews, and provide for other contingencies. For this purpose he was a staunch upholder of, and contributor to, the American Jewish Committee.

In the course of this biographical sketch the influence of Edwin Wolf's home atmosphere has several times been mentioned. A striking proof of its influence is shown by the fact that he was one of five brothers, all of whom were at the same time presiding officers of Jewish communal organizations.

To avoid any misunderstanding, it is here necessary to explain Edwin Wolf's thought upon the acceptance of a position on the controlling body of any institution. When offered such a position, he propounded to himself the questions: Can I do the work? Am I interested in the objects of the organization? Have I time to discharge the obligations in full? After answering the former two, there arose in his mind a fourth question: Of which of my present obligations can I divest myself to meet this new demand?

In other words, he was not dazzled by honors, nor by the too prevalent mode of giving the use of one's name,
and not assuming the obligation implied therein. Titles and medals meant naught to him; only labor, well directed, appealed to him.

Edwin Wolf contracted no friendships except after weighing carefully the worth of the individual. Once admitted into the inner circle, Mr. Wolf gave himself wholeheartedly to that friendship, delighting to give more than he received. When he passed away on December 16, 1934, his had been a long and useful life, full of work for the good of humanity, and particularly for his People. It would be a reflection on his fine discrimination to say that "he left a host of friends." Rather it should be said, he left many staunch friends and a host who honored and respected him.

"Upright, just and loving" is a fitting epitaph for Edwin Wolf.
MAIMONIDES

By SOLOMON ZEITLIN

The world-wide celebration of the Octocentenary of the birth of Moses Maimonides affords us the opportunity of reevaluating the life and works of one of the greatest minds produced by Judaism since the close of the Talmud. No one else has had such profound influence upon Jewish life. Again, no Hebrew scholar has aroused such controversy which actually divided the Jewish people into two hostile camps. New information, made available by the researches of modern scholarship, supplies us with material better to envisage him in the wider context of his times.

Great talmudist, thinker, jurist, and leader, he assumes the proportion of a statesman who sought, through a tempestuous era of persecution and intellectual and social change, to direct constructively the destiny of the Jewish people. The broad similarity between our own times and the troubled Jewish world of the later twelfth century, deepens our practical interest in the part he played as guide to a perplexed generation. It may be that this approximate identity of experience between the present and the past is the unconscious motivation that has spontaneously and eagerly turned the mind of the Jewish people to Maimonides that we might be helped to learn from his leadership the secret of Jewish survival.

I.

Moses ben Maimun, later known as Maimonides and Rambam (the letters r, m, b, m, being the initials of Rabbi Moses ben Maimun) was born in the city of Cordova, in the southern part of Spain on the eve of Passover, the fourteenth day of Nisan, 4895, (March 30, 1135 C. E.). He was a descendant of an illustrious family which for many generations had occupied a very important place in the Spanish Jewish community.
His father was a scholar who had the title of dayyan (judge), and was a pupil of the well-known Rabbi Joseph ibn Migas, the successor of the famous scholar, Isaac Alfasi. The young Moses received his early education in the usual manner of those days. Undoubtedly his father was the chief instructor of this promising boy.

In 1148, when he was yet a lad of thirteen, the city of Cordova was captured by the Almohades (the Puritans), a fanatical sect of Islam. The Almohades did not tolerate any other religion beside their own. They destroyed synagogues and churches, and Jews and Christians alike had to choose between Islam or exile. Those who did not emigrate but continued to live as Jews were unmercifully persecuted.

Many Jews fled with their belongings from southern Spain, some going to the northern part which was Christian, others to the Provence, France. Some of them accepted the religion of Mohammed openly, but secretly continued to live as Jews and observe the Jewish precepts. Still others, however, did not declare themselves as Moslems but disguised themselves in the dress of the natives so as not to be conspicuous as Jews. Among these latter were Maimun and his family. It was not difficult for them to use this disguise as Arabs, for the turbans they wore were similar to the Mohammedan head-gear, and they spoke Arabic perfectly. Continually exposed to the danger of detection, they could, however, not stay in one city any length of time and, therefore, they traveled from place to place.

The education of the lad, Moses, nevertheless, was not neglected by his father. In this period, though no Jewish schools, Yeshivot (places of learning), or synagogues existed, Moses continued his Jewish studies and occupied himself in research work. He pursued his secular studies, particularly philosophy, with great success. He studied with the pupils of the famous philosopher, Abu Bekr ibn Alzaig, and was also friendly with the son of ibn Aflah of Seville. Already at this time he compiled commentaries on a few tractates of the Talmud, and wrote an essay on the Jewish calendar and a short treatise on logical terms, Millot Higgayon. Such youthful authorship showed that Moses ben Maimun, still in his early twenties, was a mature
scholar, not only in talmudic law but also in mathematics and Aristotelian philosophy as well. He also displayed an effective and remarkably lucid style.

In 1158, when he was twenty-three years of age, he began to write his well-known commentary on the Mishna in the Arabic language, but in Hebrew characters. He gave it the title "Siraj" which in Hebrew is "Maör" (Luminary). In the following year, Maimun and his family left Spain for Morocco.

This migration of Maimun and his family to Morocco has led many scholars to believe that they had officially accepted the Mohammedan religion and considered themselves Moslems. They were classified as Anusim, proselytes (force majeure). This theory has been strengthened by the fact that, after Maimonides had settled in Egypt and occupied a high position there, an Arab, Abul Arab ibn Moisha, informed the authorities that Maimonides had been a Moslem while in Morocco. Others, however, deny that Maimonides accepted the religion of Islam, or ever lived as a Moslem. They point out that at no time could he have been a Moslem, for never did his opponents, even in the heat of the controversies against him, accuse him of being an apostate.

However, both of these theories are untenable. The elder Maimun never officially accepted Islam; he and his family simply disguised themselves as Arabs and thus deceived the authorities and avoided persecution. They tried to remain at home where they could observe the Law. They mingled very little with the people in order not to attract too much attention. It was a common occurrence for Jews to disguise themselves in times of persecution. In Germany, for instance, during the period of the Crusaders, to save themselves from persecution, many Jews adopted disguises by wearing the garments of the Christians. Some went so far as to wear a cross as a means of protection.

The charge of Abul Arab ibn Moisha that Maimonides had been a Moslem was apparently based on his recollections of Maimonides in Mohammedan dress and probably seeing him entering a Mosque. Even the most bigoted rabbis could never accuse Maimonides of being an apostate. Since he never actually accepted Mohammedanism, but only
disguised himself to resemble the Moslems, his conduct could not be considered a transgression of Jewish law.

It is very probable that the family of Maimun left Spain for Fez for the purpose of aiding Moses, who was then engaged in writing his commentary on the Mishna. He did not have the necessary books in Cordova, nor did any distinguished rabbis live there. Knowing that Rabbi Judah ibn Shoshan, the eminent scholar, was in Fez, and that some Jewish activity was going on there underground, Maimun, and his two sons, Moses and David, left for Morocco. Although the Almohades had destroyed the synagogues and the churches, they interfered little with secular activities. Schools of learning were still in existence in Morocco and were conducted by many scholars proficient in mathematics and medicine. Thus, Maimonides' thirst for knowledge, both talmudic and secular, prompted the family to undertake this adventurous trip.

Upon their arrival in Morocco, they found the Jewish community in a deplorable state. Judaism was suppressed, and anyone who dared to observe the Jewish religion was put to death. The persecution of the Jews had already lasted more than a decade, causing many of them to become skeptical and to wonder whether Judaism was the true religion, and whether Islam had not superseded it. They even thought it possible that Mohammed was the true prophet who had come to replace Moses.

At that time, a group of émigrés had succeeded in escaping from Morocco. Since they were thus no longer exposed to any danger in practising Judaism, they denounced their co-religionists of Morocco by charging that they were not good Jews, because, for the sake of saving their lives, they had officially accepted Islam. The prayers of these Anusim would find no acceptance before God, these critics held, and it was futile for them to continue following the Jewish precepts secretly. Furthermore, declared the émigrés anyone who accepted a human being as a prophet, even under compulsion, was to be considered a heathen though he fulfill the entire Torah. An epistle expressing this opinion was written by a rabbi who had escaped from Morocco to a foreign country. Upon his arrival in Fez, in 1160, realizing the dangers of the situation, Maimonides composed in
Arabic a letter called *Maamar Kiddush Ha-Shem* (A Treatise on the Sanctification of God), better known as *Iggeret ha-Schemad* (Letter on Apostasy). In this letter, Maimonides bitterly opposed the opinion of such fanatics in reference to the *Anusim*. He held that such an opinion was not only unjust to the *Anusim*, but was a gross mis-representation of Judaism. He proved from Talmudic passages that it was not considered a sin for anyone to disguise himself in times of religious persecution in order to save his life. As precedent, he pointed to Rabbis Meir and Eliezar who, in the time of persecution by the Romans, had saved their lives by pretending that they were not Jews. Maimonides argued passionately: Would these fanatics consider Rabbi Meir a non-Jew? Would it not be unjust to designate as heathens, Jews forced to accept Islam, so long as they continued secretly to observe the Jewish law? Rabbi Meir acted like them and yet did not lose his rabbinic authority.

This letter was written by Maimonides when he was not yet thirty years of age. It shows that he felt not only the anguish of the entire Jewish community because of the attack of some fanatics, but voiced also the suffering of his own family. Thus he encouraged the Jews of Morocco to continue their Judaism secretly and thereby saved the entire community.

In this strained atmosphere, Maimun's family lived in Fez. Moses ben Maimun continued his work on the Mishna, with the encouragement of Judah ibn Shoshan, the Rabbi of Fez, and also pursued his study of medicine under the guidance of Arabic physicians. Although he observed Jewish law in its entirety, he disguised himself as a native. It is even probable that during the month of Ramadan (ninth month of the Mohammedan year), he joined in the Tarawith prayers. Since he did not consider the Moslems as idolatrous, nor their place of worship a house of idolatry, he could enter a Mosque even during Ramadan, without violating his conscience as a loyal Jew.

About the year 1165, Rabbi Judah ibn Shoshan was seized by the Moslems and executed. Maimonides was fearful that he might share the same fate as his friend and teacher. Very likely he had already been caught in the
net of the Almohades, but had been saved from death only by the intervention of his Moslem friend, Abul Arab ibn Moisha.

Deciding to flee from the country, he set sail on a Saturday night, the fourth of the month of Iyar, in the year 1165, for Palestine, which was then a Christian country called the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Maimonides' own account of his stormy voyage to the Holy Land gives us interesting glimpses into his personality:

"On the evening of the first day of the week, the fourth of the month Iyar, I went to sea, and on Sabbath the tenth of Iyar, of the year 25, we had a dreadful storm; the sea was in a fury and we were in danger of perishing. Then I vowed to keep these two days as complete fast days for myself and my household, and all those connected with me, and to command my children to do the same throughout all their generations; they should also give charity according to their ability. For myself, I further vowed to remain apart from human intercourse on every 10th of Iyar, to speak to nobody and only to pray and to study, as on that day I saw no one on the sea except the Holy One, praised be His name, so will I see no one and stay with no one on that day in the years to come. On the evening of the first day of the week, the 3rd of Sivan, I landed safely and came to Acco, and by arriving in the land of Israel I escaped persecution. This day I vowed to keep as a day of rejoicing, festivity, and the distribution of charity, for myself and my house throughout all generations."

For the first time, he lived in a country under Christian domination. His contact with the Christians evidently did not impress him very favorably. One can readily understand the reason, for the hands of the Crusaders, who had killed many Jews during the year 1147, were still reeking with the blood of their victims. He regarded the images of Jesus and Mary, and the statues of the saints, before whom the Christians knelt and prayed, as idols. He, therefore, considered the Christians to be different from the Moslems and put them in the category of idol-worshippers who did not believe in the unity of God. In the short time that he
was in Acco, he apparently did not associate with the
knights and the ministers of the church to learn more
about Christianity. Upon leaving the country, there
remained with him the impression that Christians were
heathens. Even though they believed in the Bible and
accepted the five books of Moses as well as the prophets
as Holy, inspired by the Divine Spirit, he considered them
idolators and so classified them in his Halakic work.

He finally decided to leave for Egypt. Before leaving,
he undertook a trip to Jerusalem sometime in the autumn
of 1165. He also visited Hebron and then turned back to
Acco whence he sailed to Alexandria, Egypt.

It is very singular that Maimonides does not mention
his father at all in the account of his journey from Morocco
to Egypt. He writes as if he himself were the head of the
family. Is there a likelihood that Maimun, the father of
Moses, remained in Palestine or even Morocco? (It is
worthy of note that Maimonides never mentioned either
his mother or wife in all his writings.)

Egypt had a considerable Jewish population at the time
of Maimonides' arrival there. Alexandria, Damietta,
Bilbeys and Fostat (Old Cairo) had large Jewish com-
munities. The Egyptian Jews enjoyed religious freedom.
The Jewish community possessed autonomy in its internal
affairs and was under the leadership of the Nagid (Prince)
who represented all the Jews before the government. He
had the power to supervise Jewish religious life and to
appoint judges. He delegated some of his duties to his
subordinate judges, but he had supreme power over the
Egyptian Jews.

Egypt also had a considerable number of Karaites, a
Jewish heretical sect. Not having a Prince of their own,
they too came under the supervision of the Nagid. They,
however, exerted great influence from time to time upon
the orthodox Jews who, on many occasions, adopted
Karaite customs. The reason for this influence was probably
a social one, since the Karaites constituted the wealthy
class. However, another cause is more likely. The Karaites
were also the privileged class in Egypt and were favored
by the Fatimids who, being Shiites, the heretic sect of the
Moslems, accepted only the written word of Koran and
rejected tradition, just as the Karaites did with respect to the Bible and the oral tradition.

When Maimonides arrived in Egypt, he did not look for a rabbinical position since he greatly disapproved of scholars who lived by their scholarship and made their learning a source of livelihood. He believed that a scholar should live like the ordinary man, by the toil of his hands, and that the public should never have respect for a scholar or his scholarship, if he derived his livelihood from his learning. He saw no objection, however, to a learned man investing his money with a partner and sharing the profits. Scholarship, however, must never be made a business. Furthermore, being independent by nature, he would not accept a position which would make him a possible pliant tool in the hands of leaders. He was able to continue his scholarly research, because his brother David, who was engaged in the jewelry trade, supported the family.

II.

In the year 1168, at the age of thirty-three, Maimonides brought to completion his commentary on the Mishna, *Siraj,* (the Luminary), which he had begun in 1158 while he was living in Cordova. He had to labor at this commentary under great hardships during his exile and while traveling in different countries and crossing the sea. He, therefore, begged his readers for leniency in case they found any errors. (See the end of Maimonides' Commentary).

The purpose of the Commentary, as he himself said, was to interpret the word as well as the meaning of the Mishna, because, to understand this code one must know the entire Talmud by heart—a task which is practically impossible, particularly when a Halaka is interpreted in different places in the Talmud. Therefore, he found it necessary to interpret the Mishna according to the Talmud. He made an effort also to give the decision of the Law. He next presented an introduction to the student who desired to study the Talmud. Finally, he gave to the reader who was familiar with the Talmud, a ready guide to, and a digest of, it.

In this commentary on the Mishna, he presented the Halaka in such a manner as to make it easy for a student
to understand the difficult passages in the Talmud. He wrote introductions to every section of the Mishna, particularly to the last, the sixth, Tohorot, in which he described the different laws of purity and impurity, usually considered the most complicated laws in the Talmud.

In his commentary on the Mishna, Maimonides gave not only the decision of the Halaka as interpreted in the Talmud, but also found occasion for expounding his philosophy of Judaism. In the tractate Sanhedrin, in the commentary on the tenth chapter where the Mishna reads, "All Israelites have a share in the Olam Haba" (the future world), he ventures a solution to the questions, "What is the Olam Haba?" and "Who is an Israelite?"

After expounding his philosophy on the Future World and presenting his views on the Messiah, the Messianic Age, and Resurrection, he gives his definition of the Israelite who would have a share in the Olam Haba. He formulated thirteen articles of faith which every Jew had to accept. These were:

1. Belief in the existence of a Creator who is the cause of all creation.
2. Belief in the unity of God.
3. Belief in His incorporeality, for of God no substance could be predicated.
4. Belief that He has no beginning and He is eternal.
5. Belief that He is our Master and that we must worship Him alone.
7. Belief that there was no prophet like Moses and that there never would be another like him.
8. Belief that the Law which was given to Moses on Mount Sinai came in its entirety from God.
10. Belief that God knows the acts and ways of man.
11. Belief that God would reward the righteous and punish the wicked.
13. Belief in the resurrection of the dead.
Maimonides was the first to formulate thirteen principles of Judaism. In his time, when the Jews lived all over the known globe, and no central authority existed, it was almost presumptuous for a young man to declare that a Jew who does not believe in one of these thirteen principles would not share in the World to Come. Especially bold was his assertion that a Jew who believes that God is corporeal is to be considered a heretic. It is well known that, in his day, many rabbis of great learning held the opinions that God could be conceived as corporeal. Maimonides' theory, which he later incorporated in his *Mishne Torah*, aroused the ire of many of the great rabbis. His thirteen principles of Judaism were generally accepted, but not without opposition, and later they were included in the synagogue ritual. The well known hymn, *Yigdal*, which is chanted in many synagogues, is a metrical reading of his thirteen principles.

In his introduction to the tractate Abot, which deals with the ethics of the sages, he found occasion to include a special treatise on psychology and ethics, known as the Eight Chapters. In these Eight Chapters, he introduced Hellenistic ideas into Judaism, He based his ethics on the sayings of the sages and on the Aristotelian principles in the Nicomachean Ethics.

The commentary on the Mishna was written by Maimonides in the Arabic language but in Hebrew letters. Some of the introductions were translated into Hebrew during his life-time, but the entire commentary was not translated into Hebrew until the thirteenth century.

Some biographers of Maimonides believe that this commentary is absolutely indispensable for understanding the Mishna. One cannot agree with this opinion. The Mishna may be understood without the commentary of Maimonides, for we have one written by one of the greatest of commentators, Rashi, who compiled his work a century earlier than Maimonides, and another excellent one by Obadiah of Bertinoro. Maimonides' commentary is valuable chiefly because it renders the decisions of the Law. Without the aid of Maimonides' commentary, the reader could not know these by consulting the Mishna alone. He would be compelled to consult the Talmud, not an easy matter since
it is very complicated. Only a great talmudist, well equipped in rabbinical law, is able to formulate the decision of the Halaka from the Talmud. Moreover, Maimonides’ commentary on the Mishna simplifies the Talmud and makes it more comprehensible.

While Maimonides was busy writing his commentary and at the same time was engaged in the study of medicine, Egypt underwent both a scholastic and a political revolution. The country was ruled by the Fatimid Caliph who was a Shiite, a heretic. In the year 1171, by the order of Saladin, prayers were offered in the chief Mosque for the health of the Caliph of Bagdad who was a Sunnite, of the orthodox wing. A few days after this scholastic revolution took place, el Adid, the last Caliph of the Fatimid dynasty died, and Saladin became the Viceroy of Egypt.

This revolution in the year 1171 induced Maimonides to leave Alexandria for Fostat where he was to remain the rest of his life. There were several reasons for his migration to Fostat. After finishing his commentary on the Mishna, he had intensively studied medicine and other sciences. Fostat was a more suitable place for him since Saladin established schools there for higher learning.

His migration may also be explained by economic reasons. The family of Maimonides found it hazardous to conduct their jewelry business with Moslem countries that could be reached only by the Mediterranean Sea, which was no longer safe for Egyptian vessels because the combined fleet of the King of Jerusalem and of his allies could always harass them, particularly since the fleet was besieging Damietta, a short distance from Alexandria. Situated on the Nile and not far from the Red Sea, Cairo was more advantageous for the business interests of Maimonides’ family. It is also likely that, being the capital, the place where the women of the Caliph's harem resided, Cairo offered a better market for jewelry than Alexandria. Fostat had also been rebuilt since Saladin had become vizier, and its former inhabitants had returned thither.

When Maimonides arrived in Fostat, Zuta was the Nagid. Having obtained his position from Saladin by bribery, and being responsible for the downfall of the most respected Nagid Samuel, Zuta was hated and opposed by many Jews.
Maimonides shared this animosity and joined the opposition to Zuta.

The commentary on the Mishna which Maimonides completed in the year 1168 did not make him renowned as a scholar even among the Jews in the Arabic-speaking countries, and he was not yet known to the public at large. But later, through services he performed for the Yemen Jews, he became one of the most respected men among the Jews of Islamic countries.

Yemen had come into the possession of the Shi'ite Mahdi who was as fanatical in his religious convictions as the Almohades in Morocco. He could not tolerate any other religion but his own. He persecuted the Jews, giving them one of two alternatives: to accept Islam, or to leave the country. Many Jews became Moslems. A renegade tried to persuade the rest to accept Mohammed as the true Messiah, saying that there were many allusions to him in the Bible.

In this state of affairs, another danger was added. A young man who proclaimed himself to be the forerunner of the Messiah, told the Jews to be in readiness for his appearance which was to take place shortly, when all their misfortunes would end. In such a state of affairs, the few leaders of the Jews who remained loyal to Judaism were in despair and, not being able to refute the renegade, sought help elsewhere. Jacob al Fayumi, one of the leaders of the community, carried their mission to Maimonides. A letter of counsel which became known as the “Iggeret Teman” (Letter to the South) and also as “Petach Tikvah” (Gate of Hope) was addressed by Maimonides to the Yemen Jews.

In his epistle to the Yemenites, Maimonides told them that he and the entire Jewish community in Egypt were very much grieved that they were persecuted. Jewish suffering, he wrote, was universal, in the East as well as the West. “I do not doubt,” he said, “that this period is the one to which our sages referred in which the sufferings precede the advent of the Messiah.” The sages had foreseen these sufferings and had prayed to God not to let them live through this interval. The Jews had been persecuted ever since the Torah had been given to them. Jewish persecutions
could be divided into three categories. First, those of Nebuchadnezzar and Titus who wanted to root out the Jewish religion by destroying the Jewish people. Second, those of the Hellenes and the Persians who sought to abolish the Jewish religion by dispute and argumentation. Third, the sufferings which were more severe than the others and which were inflicted by those who wished to destroy the Jewish nation by creating a new religion similar to the Jewish religion.

He advised his fellow-Jews of Yemen not to become discouraged by persecution which could not last forever. God had already promised Jacob that his children, the Jews, would remain, while the nations who persecuted them would disappear. Then, Maimonides took up the arguments of the renegade, who maintained that the Bible had referred to Mohammed, and refuted them. As to the time when the Messiah would appear, Maimonides said that one could not know this with certainty for the time had not been revealed to any person. He declared, however, that the time of the Messiah would arrive when the Christians and the Moslems would be at the height of their power with their kingdoms spread all over the world, and he was convinced that the Jews would never have a kingdom of their own. "I have a great and wonderful tradition," Maimonides said, "which I received from my father, which he received from his father, and this tradition goes back to the beginning of the exile from Jerusalem." The tradition was to the effect that prophecy would again reveal itself in Israel in the year 4976, (1216 C. E.), and there was no doubt that this event would be the forerunner of the coming of the Messiah.

Maimonides explained that the cause of the appearance of so many deceivers lay in the fact that the Messianic period was approaching. In sending his epistle to the Jews of Yemen, he begged them to read it in every community to fortify their hearts and to encourage the people. He further suggested to them that they do not disclose his letter to the Moslems as they might inflict severe punishment upon him. He realized the dangers of writing such a letter but, when so important a request was made of him, he set at naught his personal safety.
Thus, in this letter, he tried to persuade the Yemenite Jews to remain faithful to Judaism since persecutions would never destroy the Jews; and he showed them that, on the contrary, the oppressors are destroyed, and cited illustrations from history.

The Jews of Yemen followed the advice of Maimonides, uncomplainingly bore their suffering, and remained loyal to the Jewish religion. The persecutions did not last long, for in the year 1174, Turan Shah, the brother of Saladin, conquered Yemen and delivered the Jews from the fanatics. They now enjoyed the same religious freedom as the Jews in Egypt. Economic as well as spiritual conditions changed for the better. Maimonides was now idolized in Yemen; he became the most popular person there. In the daily sanctification prayers (Kaddish) a special prayer was inserted for the welfare of Moses ben Maimun. We may assume that this epistle also gave him great prestige in Egypt, the country of his adoption.

The epistle to Yemen presented Maimonides' views on the most important principles of Judaism. He believed that the age when the Jews suffered so painfully throughout the world, in Europe from the Crusaders, in Andalusia from the Almohades, in Morocco, and now in Yemen, was the time of the "Agony of the Messiah." He furthermore held that the conquest of the world by the Cross and the Crescent, heralded the approach of the Messianic Age. One sees from this letter, also, that Maimonides maintained that, before the advent of the Messiah, a prophet who would be a scholar would arise in Palestine.

During the year 1174, a great tragedy befell the household of Maimonides. This was the death of his beloved brother David, whose success in the jewelry business had enabled Maimonides to engage peacefully in the study of Jewish law and in the sciences. The ship on which David was traveling on the Indian Ocean sank, and David went down with it. All his jewelry and assets, and the money which people had entrusted to him were lost. Maimonides was left penniless.

In later years, he described his grief in a letter to Rabbi Japhet of Acco, giving us an insight into his state of mind.
“In Egypt, I underwent great and severe misfortunes, partly owing to illness and loss of property and partly owing to informers who were scheming to kill me, but the greatest misfortune which finally befell me caused me more grief that anything I heretofore suffered, that is the death of the just one who was drowned in the Indian Ocean, and with him was lost considerable money belonging to me, himself and others. He left me his widow and a little daughter. For nearly a year after I received the sad news, I lay ill on my bed, afflicted with fever and despair. Eight years have since passed and I still mourn, and there is no consolation. What can console me? He grew up on my knees; he was my brother; he was my disciple. He was engaged in business and earned an income that I might stay at home and continue my studies. He was learned in the Talmud, the Bible and grammar. Seeing him was my chief joy. Now he has gone to life eternal and has left me in a turmoil in a strange land. Whenever I see his handwriting or one of his books, my pain and my grief are awakened anew. In short, ‘I will go down into the grave unto my son, mourning.’ Were not the study of the Torah my delight and did not the study of the sciences divert me from my grief, I would have succumbed in my misery.”

After the death of his brother, he was left with a large family and without any income. He could easily have obtained a position as dayyan or some other rabbinical position, but he would not violate his principle of not using his scholarship in the Torah as a means of livelihood. Even in his despair, he would make no compromise. He always practised what he preached. He turned to medicine as a means of support. He was as yet an unknown man in this field, and, consequently, his practice was not extensive nor his fees substantial. He, therefore, turned to lecturing on philosophical subjects. In this way, Maimonides faced the problem of meeting the economic responsibilities of his family.

Maimonides’ authority over the Jews in Egypt manifested itself more strongly when the Nagidut was temporarily
abolished and an Exilarchate was established. The opposition to the Nagid Zuta, of which Maimonides was a member if not the spiritual leader, won a victory over the most hated Nagid. This victory, however, was not due to the strength of the oppositions itself, but rather to the political circumstances then existing in Egypt. In 1176, after defeating his rivals in Syria, Saladin returned to Egypt as King of both countries. His triumph was utilized by the opposition against the hated Nagid, Zuta, to remove him from his position.

Being the capital of Syria, Damascus was the seat of the Exilarch who claimed descent from the family of David. When Saladin proclaimed himself the King of Egypt as well as of Syria, he transferred his capital from Damascus to Cairo. The opposition to Zuta persuaded the Saladin government to transfer the Exilarchate from Damascus to Cairo, since it would be more appropriate for the Jews to have the Exilarch in Cairo, which was now the capital of the Kingdom. Judah, the son of Josiah, the grandson of Solomon of Damascus, was brought to Fostat (Cairo) and was proclaimed the Exilarch of the entire Kingdom. Thus, the opposition not only removed Zuta from his office but also abolished the Nagidut and established an Exilarchate.

The belief expressed by some scholars that Maimonides was a Nagid is groundless. Not only was he not a Nagid, but he actually helped to abolish that office and establish an Exilarch. Since Maimonides was responsible for bringing Judah to Egypt, he became influential with the Exilarch, who not only countersigned some of Maimonides' decrees, but also issued a patriarchal ordinance making all Maimonides' decisions in the Law final, and forbidding anyone from questioning them.

Maimonides was the greatest scholar of that day in Egypt. He possessed, undoubtedly, more knowledge of the Jewish Law than any of the other rabbis there. He was very popular because of his writings, his Commentary on the Mishna, and his letter to the Yemen Jews. Now with the authorization of the Exilarch, he became spiritual leader of Israel throughout the entire Kingdom of Saladin.
In 1180, Maimonides completed his *magnum opus*, the “Mishne Torah” (The Second Torah) or as it is also known, the “Yad Ha-Hazakah” (Strong Hand). Written in Mishnaic Hebrew, it comprised all the Biblical laws and other laws and customs in existence up to his own time. This work, divided into fourteen books, was completed after ten years of enormous labor. Each book dealt with several topics of Jewish law.

In a short introduction, Maimonides states that all the commandments as well as their interpretations were given to Moses on Mount Sinai. The Torah was the written law, while Mitzvah was the interpretation and was called the Oral Law. Then he relates the history of the tradition and lists all the sages from Moses to Rabbi Judah, the Nasi, the compiler of the Mishna, mentioning by name the more important ones from Rabbi Judah, the Nasi, up to Rav Ashi, the compiler of the Gemara. He enumerates forty generations from Moses to Rav Ashi.

“In our days,” said Maimonides, “when scholars are few and scholarship rare, I, Moses, the son of Maimun the Spaniard, am compiling a book on the entire Jewish Law without discussions or debates, wherein all the laws are clearly explained.” He claimed, in short, that his book included all the laws from the Bible down to the compilation of the Talmud as they were interpreted by the Gaonim. He even contended that it was not necessary to consult any other work except his for a knowledge of the Jewish Law. “Therefore,” he said, “I call this book Mishne Torah (The Second Torah).”

In the first book, Sefer ha-Mada, Maimonides codifies the laws relating to the thirteen principles of Judaism, which he had already formulated in his commentary on the Mishna. He considers a Jew who does not believe in any of the thirteen principles to be a heretic. He names five different categories of men whom he calls *minim* (heretics). First, there are those who maintain there is no God; second, those who do not believe in the unity of God; third, those who maintain that God is corporeal; fourth, those who say that God did not create the world *ex nihilo*;
and fifth, those who worship stars and planets. Because he placed among the heretics those who believed that the Creator was corporeal, he aroused the ire of the rabbis of that period. The conception that God was corporeal had been popular among the Jews for many centuries. Maimonides thus excluded a large portion of the Jewish people and also many prominent rabbis from the Olam Haba (The World to Come). Rabbi Abraham ben David of Posquières, France, in his Hassagot (Criticism) on the Mishne Torah, very rigorously objected to Maimonides' doctrine and expressed himself thus: "Greater and better people than he believe in this idea." Maimonides dealt also at length with the problems of Free-will and Providence. He gave the order of the daily prayers and those of the Sabbath and various holidays, at the end of the second book.

In the remaining books, he sets forth the rest of the laws. He divides them into two definite classes, the laws in the Bible, and the laws which were handed down by Soferim (scribes). He regards as biblical not only the laws which are enumerated in the Torah, but also those derived from them by the soferim by analogy. He also considers as biblical all the laws which the rabbis had by tradition assigned to Moses. He regards all the laws which were introduced by the sages through midoth, i.e. logical arguments, as rabbinical and not biblical.

Maimonides completed the Mishne Torah when he was forty-five years of age. He did not write this book in regular sequence, but wrote various sections at different times—a procedure which is discernible throughout this great work.

What was Maimonides' purpose in writing the Mishne Torah? Did he intend, as his contemporaries charged, to supplant the Talmud? There seemed at first to be grounds for this charge in the fact that he did not mention the name of any of the Tannaim or Amoraim. Further, he had stated in his introduction that anyone familiar with the Pentateuch would, after reading his Mishne Torah, have a knowledge of all the Oral Laws without having recourse to any other book. The charge of his contemporaries is maintained by some modern scholars.

This charge, however, cannot be sustained, because Maimonides mentions the Talmud in many passages of
his book. By doing so, he invites the scholars, who read his book, to consult the Talmud for reference or comparison. Furthermore, in the first book of the Mishne Torah, he lays particular stress upon continually studying the Talmud. From all this we see that he did not wish to dispense with it.

However, his explanation as to why he did not mention the names of the Tannaim and Amoraim in the Mishne Torah was far from satisfactory. Did he seek to compile his Mishne Torah with Rabbi Judah's code, the Mishna, as a model, as most of the scholars maintain? This theory is untenable. Maimonides cannot be called a codifier, for a codifier does not add new laws for which he has no authority, nor does he decide the law against the sources. In many cases Maimonides decided the law contrary to the decisions in the Talmud and in the works of the Gaonim. We realize, then, that the statement in his introduction that, if one studies his book as well as the Torah, one would not need to study any other book meant that he believed that his work bore a resemblance to the Torah rather than to the Mishna.

What then, was the purpose of Maimonides in compiling the Mishna Torah? The answer to this question, undoubtedly, is connected with his conception of the Messianic Age. It is clear from the "Iggeret ha-Shemad," and particularly, his "Iggeret Teman," that he expected that the Messiah would shortly arrive. In the latter work, he had held that the persecutions of the Jews under Christian rule in France and Germany, and the persecutions in the countries under Moslem control, undoubtedly were the predicted Jewish agony before the advent of the Messiah. He also believed that the Messianic Age would be nigh just when the power of the Christians and the Moslems was at its height and their kingdoms were spreading throughout the world.

That was precisely the situation when Maimonides was working on his Mishne Torah. The critical moment had arrived, and he had no doubt that the Messiah would soon come. He said that the prophets had foretold that this very age, in which he and his contemporaries were living, was that of the Messianic era. Maimonides, it will be
recalled, gave as the date of the returning of prophecy to Israel, the year 4976 A.M., i. e., 1216 C. E. which he believed would be followed very shortly by the coming of the Messiah.

Maimonides, then, expected the return of the Jews to Palestine, shortly. This view does not conflict with his rationalism. He was not a mystic. He did not represent the Messiah as a supernatural person. He expressed his views on this subject a number of times in his writings. He held that Messiah would be a mortal, a king, a descendant of the house of David, a man wiser than Solomon, and a prophet next in greatness to Moses. The returning of the Jews to Palestine would not be a supernatural event, as many believed, but would be the aftermath of a victory by the King over those in possession of the Holy Land, making it possible for the Jews to return.

Since Maimonides expected the Messiah to arrive soon, he prepared a Jewish Constitution for the occasion. He wrote this Constitution on the model of the Torah and not on that of the Mishna. Since a constitution does not give the names of authorities, he did not mention the names of individual scholars, but referred to the Tannaim, or Amoraim, or Gaonim, only collectively. Since a constitution sets forth not only the laws but also the principles of government, as the Bible, for example, does, his Mishne Torah presented the principles and administration of Jewish government under the elements of the law. In the first book, he gave the principles of Judaism, and in the other books he codified all the laws. As the Unity of God is expressed in the first of the ten commandments, so is the Unity of God set forth at the beginning of the Mishne Torah.

That Maimonides wished to have his book second to the Torah of Moses is evident from the title, Mishne Torah (The Second Torah). He divided his book into fourteen parts because fourteen is the numeral value of the word Yad, part of the phrase “Yad Ha-Hazaka” occurring in the last verse of the Pentateuch which reads, “To the strong hand, the great vision (prophecy) which Moses showed before the eyes of the entire Jewish People.”

1 This translation is in accordance with the traditional Jewish interpretation of this passage. See also Targum Onkelos.
At the time when Maimonides was compiling the Mishne Torah, he wrote also a book called "Sefer Ha-Mitzvot," the Book of Precepts. The reason for writing it was that he sought to correct the errors of those who included non-biblical precepts among the six hundred and thirteen biblical precepts, which he had enumerated in his Mishne Torah. He called this new book an introductory work to the *Mishne Torah* itself. He wrote this book in the Arabic language but, in later days, regretted that he had not written it in Hebrew. It was translated into Hebrew in the first part of the thirteenth century. There have been three translations, one by Abraham ibn Hasdai, another by Moses ibn Tibbon, and a third by Solomon ibn Ayyub of Béziers, France. (The Arabic text was edited by M. Bloch, "Le Livre des Precepts par Moïse ben Maimon").

The Mishne Torah was welcomed by most of the Jews of Egypt. However, some obscure rabbis, either out of envy, or jealousy, or for other personal reasons, began finding fault with the work. One of the main opponents of Maimonides was Samuel ben Ali, the head of the Yeshiva in Bagdad. His opposition to Maimonides was not based alone on the merits of the Mishne Torah or his disagreement with decisions therein, but on profounder differences on the conceptions of Judaism which each entertained. Maimonides maintained that the leadership of the Jews should be vested in the Exilarch, the political leader (in this, Maimonides proved himself a pioneer of Jewish Nationalism), on the other hand, Samuel ben Ali believed that leadership should be vested in a man of spiritual authority, such as Gaon, and sought to abolish the office of the Exilarch. It was due only to Maimonides' influence that this office was not abolished. Samuel ben Ali's animosity toward Maimonides can be readily understood since he was responsible for thwarting ben Ali's life's ambition to abolish the Exilarchate, and to proclaim himself the sole leader of the Babylonian Jews.

When Maimonides' work reached France, at that time the center of Jewish scholarship, the rabbis received it with some acclamation, although not with entire approval of his method. They saw that the book was a product of one of the greatest Jewish scholars, that it was not the work
of an ordinary rabbi. However, one French scholar, Abraham ben David of Pasquieres, known also as RaBad was very much opposed to the book and wrote *Hassagot* (criticism) which was not always fair to the author, whom he assailed for his theological views, frequently indulging in severely acrimonious language including the use of such expressions as “This is not true,” “This reason has no sense.”

The Mishne Torah was received generally with great praise. The rabbis consulted it on doubtful questions of the law. But it never acquired the status of a code like the Mishna. Many modern scholars believe that it was very fortunate that Maimonides’ Mishne Torah was not accepted as the last word in the Jewish law, as, otherwise, Judaism might have become a static religion incapable of further development. This theory and the fear underlying it, however, are unfounded.

Jewish law was always elastic. During the Second Commonwealth the sages continually added new laws, so as to bring Jewish law into harmony with life. They did this by new interpretations of the verses of the Bible, modifications of ancient Halaka, and by the use of legal fictions. Although the Mishna was a code, it did not become the final word in Judaism. The Amoraim developed Jewish law further by interpretation of the Mishna. Even if the Mishne Torah had been accepted as a code, the evolution of Jewish law would not have ceased with it. The Mishne Torah, however, did become the standard book on Jewish law. Many commentaries have been written on it, one called “Kesef Mishna” by Rabbi Joseph Caro, himself the author of a famous code, the Shulchan Aruch. Vidal de Tolosa, who flourished in the early part of the fourteenth century, also wrote a commentary named, “Maggid Mishna.”

IV.

About the year 1190, Maimonides finished his second great work, “Dalalat al-Hairin,” or, in Hebrew, “Moreh Nebukim” (Guide to the Perplexed). Like his commentary on the Mishna, it was written in the Arabic language but with Hebrew characters. It was intended as a guide not
only for his disciple Joseph ibn Aknin, but for perplexed thinkers whose studies brought them into conflict with religion, and for students of philosophy bewildered by the ambiguous and figurative expressions employed in the Scriptures.

In the Introduction, which was in the form of a letter to Aknin, Maimonides stated that upon receiving Aknin’s early letters from Alexandria, he had formed a high opinion of him. His estimate of him rose still higher when he observed the acumen Aknin showed when he studied under him. Now that Aknin had left Egypt, his absence had prompted Maimonides to compose this work and send each chapter to Aknin as soon as it was completed.

The Moreh Nebukim is divided into three parts, besides the Introduction. In the first part, Maimonides deals with the interpretations of biblical anthropomorphism. He says here that some of the anthropomorphic words used are homonymous, that is, have several meanings. Other words are imperfectly homonymous, being employed in some instances only figuratively. He deals with the various divine attributes which should not be applied directly or indirectly to God.

In the second part, he sets forth his proofs for the existence of one Creator, the Primal Cause, who is incorporeal, and without resemblance or relation to anything in the world of the senses. He also treats of the ‘intelligences’ of the spheres, which he identified with the angels mentioned in the Bible. He discusses the theory of Creatio ex-Nihilo which he accepted, and the Maaseh Bereshit (the Account of the Creation). He also deals at length with the problem of prophecy.

He holds that Prophecy is a divine gift, the requisites for which are perfection of all one’s faculties as well as possession of a sound body. The mind has to be cultivated, the imagination developed, and the moral sense refined. To be a prophet, one has to possess courage and intuition and to have control over sensual thoughts; no wicked or ignorant person can become one. One has also to obtain special training and education. The philosophers held that prophecy itself is an actual faculty of man that could be achieved, but Maimonides maintains that only God confers the gift.
The mere possession of abilities does not make one eligible, unless God bestows upon him the gift of prophecy.

In part three, Maimonides enters, with great caution, upon an explanation of the Maaseh Merkabah, the story of the Divine Chariot, which Ezekiel described in his vision. Although Maimonides knew he was forbidden by Law to teach these mysteries, he overcomes this difficulty. He asserts that oral instruction on this subject is permitted when the pupil possesses unusual qualifications, although even then, only the titles of the chapters could be transmitted. Such restrictions upon this study explains why the secret of this mystery had been forgotten by the Jews. On one hand, he realizes the external obstacles of writing about the mysteries of the Divine Chariot (metaphysics), yet, on the other hand, if he had refused to write about them, his knowledge of the subject would have died with him, thus depriving those who were perplexed, of his aid. Thus, in either case, he would have been guilty of intellectual wrong-doing; therefore, he decided to set down his views without divesting the subject altogether of its mysterious character. His explanations would then be fully intelligible to the philosopher, but designedly not to the ordinary reader for whom they would be mere paraphrases of the Biblical text.

In the same book, he also sets forth his opinions on Providence. According to him, every rational individual is under Divine Providence, but in the case of animals only the species is, not the creature itself. Divine Providence manifests itself to man in varying degrees, depending upon the man himself. The greater the perfection he attains, the greater the benefits extended to him. Providence is beneficial to those who are perfect in their conception of God, and who always direct their minds towards Him. But God permits those who are perfect in their knowledge of Him to enjoy His presence only when they meditate upon Him. When their thought are engaged in other matters, Divine Providence departs from them. The temporary withdrawal of Providence in this instance is not in the same category as its complete absence in those who do not reflect on God at all.
He also gives reasons for the promulgation of the Precepts, every one of which, whether positive or negative, has its usefulness. He divides them into two classes, those dealing with relations between man and God, and those bearing upon relations between man and man. God issued all of them for the purpose of improving man's mental and physical condition. Those between man and God are intended to impart the true knowledge of man. Those between man and man are to remove injustice and to establish a righteous social order. (He divided the Precepts into fourteen classes, as he had already done in his book, Sefer ha-Mitzvot).

In his book, Moreh Nebukim, as well as in his Commentary on the Mishna, Maimonides endeavors to prove his views on philosophy and psychology by citing verses in the Bible into which he reads his ideas. In doing so, he followed the method of the sages who tried to read into the Bible their Halakic point of view. This attempt to derive various ideas of theology and ethics from the Bible is apparent throughout the Midrashim. The same method was applied by Philo and followed by many of the Church Fathers. Saadia Gaon, also quoted verses from the Bible to corroborate his theories. Maimonides' method of extracting his philosophical and ethical conceptions from biblical texts was more comprehensive and elaborate than that of earlier thinkers.

Maimonides has been accused of trying to harmonize Hellenism and Judaism and to bring Aristotelian ideas into the Bible. He has also been charged with trying to force interpretations so as to make biblical theology harmonize with Aristotelian metaphysics. These charges are really groundless. He was a Jew first of all. It is true that he had great admiration for Hellenist culture, particularly for the philosophy of Aristotle, but he did not slavishly accept it. He rejected Aristotle's idea of the eternity of the universe, not because certain passages in the Scriptures asserted the idea of Creation, but because he was not convinced that the idea of the eternity of the universe as taught by Aristotle had been proven.

Spinoza declared that Maimonides' method of reconciling the Scriptures with reason had no real basis, and that to
explain the words of the Scriptures according to preconceived opinions, twisting them about and completely changing the literal sense, as Maimonides tried to do, was harmful, useless and absurd. This severe criticism is not justified. These two thinkers differed radically in their views on the inspiration of the Scriptures. Spinoza believed that Moses did not write the Pentateuch but that Ezra, at a later period, was the author; therefore, Spinoza thought the Torah is a book which might have errors and limitations. Maimonides, on the other hand, believed that God gave the Torah, in its entirety, to Moses and hence that it is infallible. If science and reason contradict the words of the Torah, such words are to be explained allegorically, but are not to be dismissed, for they are divine. Even the Talmud had declared that the Torah spoke in the language of the people, \textit{locuta est lex lingua hominum}, so that they should be able to understand its meaning. Maimonides regarded Judaism not as a dead corpse but as a living religion. He could not imagine that the precepts given to the Jews should have no basis in reason; he was sure that there must have been a motive. He made it clear that every precept given to the Jews was for some social purpose. He believed that the precepts were given to the Jews to improve their intellect and morals, and to make them a holy nation.

The keynote of Maimonides' interpretation of the precepts was that they were for the benefit of the people themselves rather than for some advantage to God. In this respect, he followed the teachings of the prophets and the Pharisees. God receives nothing through the people's observance of the precepts. If a man obeys the laws, his obedience enures to his own good.

Maimonides rejects the claim of some people who regard themselves as perfect and believe they do not need the precepts for further perfection of their character. He holds that the Jewish Law is divine and immutable and, since the human being is never perfect, to be observed forever. Law was divinely given, it is to be universally applied, and is to be followed irrespective of times or places. It is not medicine, the administering of which depends upon varying conditions, persons and times.
The view that certain laws no longer have a *raison d'être* and need not be observed, is a mistaken one. Furthermore, the Jewish law must not be abrogated, because the chain of Jewish history might be broken. Maimonides observed even the customs to which he was opposed, since they had been maintained by the Jews for many generations; he followed the tradition so as not to destroy the unity of the Jewish people. However, he did not engage in the practices which were based on superstitions or some tenet to which Judaism was opposed. The precepts would be abolished only when the Jewish people as a whole reached perfection, that is in the *Olam Haba* (The Future World). It would not be necessary to observe the commandments and precepts there. The righteous would sit with crowns on their heads and enjoy the Divine Glory.

The Moreh Nebukim work was translated into Hebrew by Samuel ibn Tibbon during the lifetime of Maimonides, and later by Jehudah Al-Harizi. It was translated into Latin in the thirteenth century, and later it appeared in a number of other languages. Many commentaries have been written on it, the most outstanding ones being by Moses Narboni, Shem-Tob, Profit Duran (Efodi), Crescas, and Isaac Abarbanel.

Maimonides was not only a great philosopher and Talmudist, but also a well-known physician whose fame had spread through the entire country. Members of the nobility as well as the common people sought his medical advice.

It was said that the King of the Franks in Ascalon (Richard) invited Maimonides to become his physician, but that Maimonides declined the honor. He was not eager to live in the Christian countries where the Jews were so greatly persecuted. He preferred his adopted land. By education and by culture, he felt himself more akin to the Moslems than to the Christians.

Abd al Latif, the well-known physician of Bagdad, said that one of his reasons for spending some time in Egypt was to make the acquaintance of Musa ibn Maimun. The
Arabic poet and kadhi, al Said ibn Sena al Mulk, wrote a poem in honor of Maimonides, in which he said:

"Galen's art heals only the body,
But abu-Amrun's, the body and the soul.
His knowledge made him the physician of the century.
He could heal with his wisdom, the sickness of ignorance.
If the moon would submit to his art
He would deliver her of her spots
At the time of the full moon, cure her of her defects,
And, at the time of her conjunction, save her from waning."

Maimonides practised medicine very conscientiously. He was so busy that he could not read many of the medical works he would have liked to read. He regretted this, for, as he told ibn Aknin, a lover of truth cannot have sound theories on medicine unless he can prove them by reference to the proper sources. He never prescribed drugs as long as he could cure the patient by a proper diet. He resorted to drugs for his patients only when absolutely necessary. He never wrote a prescription unless its efficacy was assured by the great masters in medicine.

In his writings on medicine, as in his writings on the Talmud, he used lucid language and arranged his ideas logically and systematically. He attempted to consider critically all that had been previously written on the subject. He was a voluminous writer of medical works, which were composed in Arabic, in the simple semi-philosophical style of Averroës and Avicenna. Some of his books were translated into Hebrew and Latin. His book, "Aphorisms," (Fusul Musu) *Pirke Moshe*, which consists of fifteen hundred Aphorisms, and is divided into twenty-four chapters, is one of his important contributions and deals with various phases of medicine. He treats here of anatomy, physiology and pathology, of aetiology, and specific therapeutics. He deals with different causes of fever; he writes about gynecology, the practice of personal hygiene, gymnastics, and physical training.

Another popular medical book that he wrote deals with the General Rules of Health. It was dedicated to the Sultan, el Afdal. Maimonides pays considerable attention to rules
on diet, and he stressed the importance of taking care of one's stomach. He realizes the ill effects caused by constipation, and shows how this might be avoided. He warns against overeating, to which he traces many illnesses. People do not overfeed their cattle, yet they do gorge their own stomachs. They even do not take the necessary physical exercise. Maimonides says that one should consult a physician not only when seriously ill but when showing even the slightest symptoms of illness. One should not wait until one becomes dangerously sick, when it may be too late. Convalescents and elderly people, especially, should frequently consult their physicians. He does not agree with those who believe that nature alone would effect a cure and that one can altogether dispense with drugs.

He believed that wine moderately taken is healthful; that it is a remedy in curing illness; that it is more conducive to the health of older people than that of younger people; and that it is particularly strengthening to those who are aged and feeble. Unfortunately, many people indulge in it to the point of intoxication, when it is very injurious to the body. He demolishes the false theory of those who held that intoxication once a month is beneficial.

In this book, he also laid great stress upon cleanliness, as important in preserving the general health and serving as an aid in healing many diseases. He emphasizes the value of breathing fresh, dry air as necessary to keep the body in health.

He wrote other books on medicine and dealt with such themes as asthma, hemorrhoids, reptile poisons. He also wrote a book on sex, in which he named drugs to be administered and certain foods to be eaten or avoided to cure various maladies.

His own activities as a physician and his daily routine he fully described in a letter to Samuel ibn Tibbon in a unique autobiographical passage:

"I dwell at Mizr [Fostat] and the Sultan resides at Kahira [Cairo]; these two places are two Sabbath days' journey [about one mile and a half] distance from each other. My duties to the Sultan are very heavy. I am obliged to visit him every day, early in the morning; and when he or any of his children, or any of the inmates
of his Harem are indisposed, I dare not quit Kahira, but
must stay during the greater part of the day in the
palace. It also frequently happens that one or two of
the royal officers fall sick, and I must attend to their
healing. Hence, as a rule, I repair to Kahira very early
in the day, and even if nothing unusual happens, I do
not return to Mizr until the afternoon. Then I am
almost dying with hunger. I find the ante-chamber
filled with people, both Jews and Gentiles, nobles and
common people, judges and bailiffs, friends and foes—a
mixed multitude, who await the time of my return.

"I dismount from my animal, wash my hands, go
forth to my patients, and entreat them to bear with me
while I partake of some slight refreshments, the only
meal I take in the twenty-four hours. Then I attend
to my patients, and write prescriptions and directions
for their several ailments. Patients go in and out until
nightfall, and sometimes even, I solemnly assure you,
until two hours and more in the night. I converse with
and prescribe for them while lying down from sheer
fatigue, and when night falls I am so exhausted that I
can scarcely speak.

"In consequence of this, no Israelite can have any
private interview with me, except on the Sabbath. On
that day the whole Congregation, or, at least the
majority of the members, come to me after the morning
service, when I instruct [advise] them as to their pro-
cedings during the whole week; we study together
a little until noon, when they depart. Some of them
return, and read with me after the afternoon service
until evening prayers. In this manner I spend that
day."

In his letter to Aknin, he deplored the fact that his
time was so taken up that he could not pursue his studies
or even read any books.

VI.

During the last years of his life, Maimonides reached
the highest position possible for a Jew in Egypt. His
authority as a physician was well-established and he had
great influence in the court of el Afdal. And yet, he remained
the same modest man that he had been in his early days in Morocco. He regarded his position as one of great responsibility and was not unduly flattered because of the personal fame and success it brought him. With his influence at Court, he did whatever he could to help his brother-Jews scattered over the world. When Saladin conquered Palestine and Jerusalem, Maimonides persuaded him to permit the Jews to settle there. In his various letters, he encouraged many communities throughout the Diaspora to remain loyal to Judaism. He also became the recognized authority on rabbinics. Even some of his previous opponents accepted his decisions.

A large correspondence developed between him and the scholars of other countries, particularly Palestine and Provence.

Maimonides took a keen interest in Jewish affairs in Egypt. He was very active in obtaining ransom money for many Jewish prisoners who were captured during the wars between the Moslems and the Crusaders. He wrote letters to different communities to obtain the necessary funds to release the victims. The payment of ransom for the release of Jewish captives he considered a supreme duty of the whole Jewish people. With the assistance of other rabbis, he prepared various Takkanot (Ordinances) to improve the social life of the Jews in Egypt.

Since he was very busy and occupied with numerous duties, he issued all the orders to be followed during the week at his home in Fostat where the congregation used to assemble every Sabbath.

An aristocrat by nature, he was, nevertheless, democratic in his relations with ordinary people. In letters to friends, who had been his guests, he always remembered to send regards from his servants whom he treated as equals in his household. Because he regarded scholarship as the acme of human attainment, he believed that the public should provide for the needs of those engaged in study. He did not, however, hold that a student should be exempt from work because he believed it to be below his dignity. A man should not derive his income from his studies but should be engaged in some gainful occupation, no matter how humble.
That Maimonides was richly endowed with humane feelings is shown by his attitude towards the slave and the laborer. Although he never advised complete abolition of slavery, which was a recognized institution in his day, yet he sought to ease the conditions of the slaves and to modify harsh laws governing them. He disapproved of cruelty, in any form, to slaves, whether pagan or Jewish. In principle, he was opposed to slavery and advised the Jews rather to hire employees than to buy slaves. In litigation between employer and employee, Maimonides usually showed an inclination to favor the employee.

Charity, according to Maimonides, was one of the greatest institutions in Jewish life, ranking in importance next to ransom for release of Jewish captives. He divided the dispensers of charity into eight classes according to rising degrees of worth, the highest being those who make it possible for the needy person to establish himself in business so that he should not be compelled to apply for charity.

Maimonides lived at a time when people were persecuted in the name of religion. The Jews were persecuted in Spain and Morocco for not accepting Islam; and, in France and Germany, for not accepting Christianity. He believed that the Jewish religion was a heritage of the Jews alone, since they had voluntarily accepted it on Mt. Sinai; it ought, therefore, not be imposed upon other races or nations. But, if anyone wishes to embrace the Jewish religion, he should be made welcome. Although his forefathers were heathens, such a proselyte could, like the rest of the Jews, invoke God in the prayers which read: "God, our God, and the God of our fathers." Maimonides thus demonstrated that, although the Jewish religion had been accepted only by the Jews, it need not be confined to them alone or to Semites in general. Anyone who became a proselyte was entitled to all the privileges of a Jew. In this time, Christian lands were regarded as the homes of Christians only and Islamic lands of Moslems only. In his Constitution for the future Jewish State, Maimonides advocated equal rights for gentiles in Palestine. He maintained that under no circumstance should Jews forcibly compel them to accept the Jewish religion. The only requirement for citizenship for the gentiles was observance of the seven
precepts of Noah,—injunctions against idolatry, blasphemy, homicide, incest, robbery, dismembering live animals, and anarchy. These are not particularly Jewish laws but come under the class of *jus gentium*, the laws of society, and should be observed by every civilized person.

He displayed as liberal an attitude to the Karaites as he did to the followers of other religions. He did not consider them heretics nor abuse them, for, he held they had no choice when born and should not be held responsible for the schism introduced by their forefathers.

By his writings, Maimonides made many friends, but also many opponents. He was very devoted to his admirers and acted as a father toward them; yet, he showed no malice or vindictiveness toward his opponents. He had no fears that their slanderous attacks would harm him, and he forgave those who indulged in them because they profited thereby. He forgave particularly those who slandered him on account of their ignorance. He gave Rabbi Pinhas, one of his bitter opponents, some friendly advice, namely, not to leave Egypt, where he had established himself and was safe, for some Christian country where he might be persecuted.

Maimonides possessed great courage. When the question of faith and Judaism was involved, he disregarded all consideration for his own position or his personal safety, and fearlessly couched his views in writing even though he might be arrested by the Moslems for doing so. He wrote his letter to the Jews of Yemen at the risk of his life, because, with Judaism in danger, he was ready to sacrifice himself. In his book, *Moreh Nebukim*, he displayed outstanding boldness in openly saying that Mohammed was not the true prophet, for it must be remembered that the work appeared in a country where Islam was the dominant religion. He asked his pupil Aknin, not to transcribe it into Arabic characters since the entire Islamic world would then be able to read it and his life might be endangered. In all his writings, from the Commentary on the Mishna to the Mishne Torah, he showed independence and heroism. He set forth his views fully, although they were often antagonistic to those held by leading scholars as well as the masses. Many of his ideas were at that time considered
heretical among the Jews. His ideas on the Messiah were particularly bold. In a period when the masses as well as the Rabbis believed that the Messiah would have supernatural powers and would perform miracles, Maimonides was of the opinion that the Messiah would be a man born, and subject to death like any other mortal. He would conquer Palestine and unite the Jews into one nation. He would attempt no impossible physical changes in the world, perform no miracles, nor resurrect the dead. He would be a man like the Messiah, King David. In an age when not only the ordinary people but some scholars, as well, believed in superstition, he manifested great resoluteness in combating superstition and astrology, and wielded a sharp lance against them.

His personal life was not a happy one. As a boy, he had had to wander from city to city in his native country, Andalusia, in mortal fear of the fanatics (Almohades). When he came to Egypt, his father died, and then his brother David, the main support of the family, was drowned in the Indian Ocean where all his assets were also lost. He married when he was forty-nine years old. The only daughter of Maimonides died in her infancy. Abraham, his only son, was sickly throughout his boyhood. He himself suffered from illness. Already several years before his death, his hands used to tremble and he found it difficult to hold a pen.

Moses ben Maimon died on the twentieth of the month of Tebet, 4965 A. M., December 13, 1204 C. E. Both admirers and opponents bewailed his passing and voiced their great grief. Public mourning was declared in the entire country of Egypt and, for three days, Jews and Moslems lamented. A general fast was proclaimed in Jerusalem. A portion of the Torah which is called the *Tokahah* was read in the synagogues, and the *Haftorah* was read from the first book of Samuel, concluding with the now significant verse, "The glory is departed from Israel, for the Ark of God is taken."

There is current among the Jewish people the saying "From Moses until Moses (Maimonides) there arose none like Moses." This expression came into vogue as early as the thirteenth century. We may say this verdict of the
people is the verdict of history. Moses, the son of Amram, who delivered the Jews from slavery and led them to the Promised Land was the first to write a Constitution,—the Torah. The second Moses (Maimonides), who likewise cherished the hope that, as a result of the wars between the Crescent and the Cross, the Jews would return to their country, Palestine, also wrote a Constitution,—the second next to the Torah. The first Moses died, apparently a disappointed man because he did not enter into the Promised Land with the Jews. Moses, the son of Maimum, likewise died a disappointed man, for he did not live to see the restoration of the Jews in Palestine nor the return of prophecy to Israel.

VII.

Maimonides’ writings on Judaism influenced the theologians of the two sister religions, Islam and Christianity to a great extent. When the Moreh Nebukim was transcribed into the Arabic characters, soon after its completion, it took hold upon the Mohammedan world. Abd al-Latif, a contemporary Moslem theologian, read it; Arabic scholars lectured upon it to their pupils, and generally extolled it, except the section dealing with the theories on prophecy.

Maimonides’ influence upon Christian theologians was even more significant. As a result of the capture of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade in 1204, and the consequent revelation of the treasures of Greek literature to European scholars, the Church in the thirteenth century paid considerable attention to the writings of Aristotle. Through commentaries of Averroës, who owed his fame to the Jewish translation of his works, Christian theologians were introduced to Aristotle, who made a profound impression upon their thought.

The Scholastics read and studied the Moreh Nebukim extensively. Alexander of Hales, “the master and the father” of the Franciscan School, in his book “Summa,” frequently quoted Maimonides, as did also Albertus Magnus and John Scotus. Thomas Aquinas, who, in his lifetime, was accepted by the Dominicans as the greatest authority in theology, consulted the Moreh Nebukim frequently. Following in its author’s footsteps, he also tried to reconcile
religion with Aristotelian ideas. He drew freely upon the methods and arguments of Maimonides to whom he refers as Rabbi Moses. Although severe in his criticism of Maimonides, Spinoza was greatly influenced by him.

Maimonides' influence upon the Jews is inestimable. Every Jewish thinker of importance, from the thirteenth century to our own day, has felt the impress of his writings. Moses Mendelssohn was deeply indebted to him, and both Solomon Maimon and Nahman Korchmal drew their inspiration from the writings of Maimonides.

It was not through his Moreh Nebukim, however, but through his Mishne Torah that Maimonides exerted the greatest influence upon the Jewish people. This work made him the greatest authority in rabbinical law. Even his opponents did not deny its great importance. It was because Jewish scholars regarded it as so monumental in rabbinical law, that they were led to pay attention to the other great work of its author, the Moreh Nebukim. This work might otherwise have been ignored by the bulk of the Jews, as were the philosophical works of Ibn Daud and Ibn Ezra. The Mishne Torah became the standard book in Jewish Law. Commentaries and even books were written about it. Rules on how to study it were laid down by rabbinical scholars.

The Maimunist controversy, which began during his lifetime, and culminated in the burning of his books, the Moreh Nebukim, and the Sefer ha-Mada (the first book of the Mishne Torah) has not yet ceased. Many Jews still object to some of his doctrines, particularly his reasons for the precepts in the third part of the Moreh Nebukim. A controversy so enduring could have been inaugurated only by the writings of a talmudic scholar. Some scholars and thinkers may have passing influence upon some intellectuals; they may have followers and opponents, but only for a limited time. The philosophical writings of men like Abraham ibn Ezra and Levi ben Gershon have been almost completely ignored by the bulk of the Jewish people; they were not talmudic authorities like Maimonides.

Maimonides has guided the Jews for almost eight centuries and may well remain a guide indefinitely. In anticipation of the return of the Jews to Palestine and of the restoration
of Prophecy in Israel, he wrote the Mishne Torah as a Constitution for the Jewish people in Palestine and in the Diaspora. He showed great courage in advancing his theories on the Halaka. He introduced his own interpretations, he said, in the name of God and the Jewish people.

The vision which Maimonides cherished, that the Jews would return to Palestine has, meanwhile, been partially fulfilled. The Mishne Torah must be rewritten in the same spirit in which he conceived it—faithful to the concept of historical Judaism as it prevailed among the Pharisees in the Second Commonwealth. It must be the work of rationalists who unite in themselves the authority of rabbinical law and the richness of modern secular knowledge, so as to bring into consonance Jewish life and religion in the Diaspora and in Palestine.
To associate Jews with farming may appear an anachronism. It still seems to be the general belief that, since their dispersion from their ancestral home, Jews have lost contact with the land so completely and irrevocably that in all of two thousand years they have never been able to thrust new roots into the soil. The truth is that during the whole Diaspora there never was a time when Jews were not engaged in agriculture to some extent. That more did not follow the plow was due largely to the fact that the lot of the majority of Jews was cast in countries where proscription against ownership of land and other restrictions barred access to the soil. Circumstances, not inclination or aptitude, forced them into occupations which did not necessitate a firm anchorage and which would enable them, when oppression became unbearable, to pull up stakes and move onward. When restrictions were lifted, Jews began to give vent to the agricultural urge. If the number on the land is still proportionately small, it must be remembered that it requires time to undo habits shaped during these many centuries. Yet, the Jewish agrarian population today is larger than most people suppose. Estimates lately made point to a world Jewish farm population of about 800,000. There is probably no country where Jews reside in which some are not occupied with agricultural pursuits. Russia, Palestine and, to a lesser degree, the United States, have witnessed large accessions in recent years.

In his "Agricultural Activities of the Jews in America", which appeared in the American Jewish Year Book for 5673, Leonard G. Robinson traced the beginnings of the

1 Thanks are due to Dr. Edward A. Goodwin of my staff for his valuable collaboration. G. D.
Jewish agricultural movement in the United States and sketched its history up to 1912. This article, therefore, will treat of the later phases of the movement, going over the ground which Robinson covered only where it is necessary to bring out the results of later research.

Agricultural Colonization—Past and Present

As Robinson points out, the first half of the 1880 decade was a period of Jewish colonization activity under pressure. The persecutions which broke out in Russia upon the accession to the throne of Alexander III caused many Russian Jews to seek refuge in other lands. Many came to America. The ingenuity of American Jewry was taxed to the limit to provide for the newcomers and to put them on the road toward self-support. Farming was conceived as an outlet for a number, all the more because some of them came here with that in mind. Within a few years, sixteen known attempts at agricultural colonization were made in such far-flung places as Louisiana, Arkansas, Kansas, North and South Dakota, Colorado, Oregon and New Jersey. Reference to these colonies, with the exception of Arkansas, was made by Robinson. But later explorations by this writer shed much additional light upon this hectic colonization era. The results of these studies were published in various English-Jewish magazines. Limitation of space precludes detailed treatment in the present article, but brief mention of the Arkansas colony is here given because it has not heretofore appeared in any history of this period.

In the spring of 1883, a group said to have numbered about 150 people set out from New York to settle on farms on a tract of land about midway between Little Rock, Arkansas, and Memphis, Tennessee, which had been offered as a site for a Jewish colony. Upon their arrival they found a thick forest utterly unfit for farming. The whole visible means of making even a precarious living was the cutting and selling of staves. Before the colonists had a chance to become acclimated, the summer was upon them. Temperatures ranging up to 110 degrees were not uncommon. Frequent and torrential rains produced myriads of mosquitoes. Soon malaria and yellow fever
afflicted nine out of ten of the colonists, and eighteen or twenty persons succumbed to the disease. With starvation staring them in the face, the colonists took flight and by September 1883, a bare half year after its inception, the colony had become a matter of history.

All the colonies of this decade had a brief existence except only those in New Jersey. In Louisiana, it was flood; in Arkansas, disease; in Dakota, hail, drought and prairie fire; in Colorado, aridity; and in Kansas, a combination of untoward circumstances, that contributed to the early demise of these ill-fated ventures. In Oregon, the trouble lay not in the physical but in the spiritual domain. But the underlying causes were the same in each instance. These colonies were conceived in haste and planned under stress without thought to those factors upon which successful colonization depends. Geographical location, character of land, fitness of colonists, capital needs, farm experience, leadership—none of these vital requirements received sufficient consideration. These people had to be settled quickly, and thought was concentrated only upon the dispatch with which that could be accomplished. Yet, these projects served a useful purpose. The sad thing is that the experience gained from them should have cost so much in human suffering. These debacles resulted in focusing attention upon the need of enlightened direction for the proper development of a Jewish agricultural movement, and led to the establishment of the Baron de Hirsch Fund out of which grew The Jewish Agricultural Society. Under that guidance and the impetus of its own momentum, the movement has had a steady and healthy growth until today there is a sizable segment of Jews who derive their sustenance in whole or in part from American soil, exemplifying the ideal for the attainment of which these pioneers struggled so valiantly.

The following decade witnessed further attempts at the formation of Jewish agricultural settlements: Woodbine in New Jersey, founded by the Baron de Hirsch Fund in 1891, and the Palestine Colony in Bad Axe, Michigan, founded in the same year. The former is included in Robinson's treatise and will be referred to again later in this article. No mention of the Palestine Colony is made by
Robinson, and brief treatment of that undertaking is, therefore, in place here.

The *dramatis personae* were, with one exception, Russian Jews from Bay City, Michigan, all recent immigrants and all peddlers. They bought a tract of cheap land upon a nominal cash payment. Less than $200 represented the total investment of the initial group of twelve. Under the impulse of early enthusiasm, the population of the colony quickly grew to fifty-seven. With the depression of 1893 and the almost impossible task of meeting heavy contract payments, the colony soon reached an impasse. Only the aid rendered by the Bethel Relief Society of Detroit, under the determined lead of Martin Butzel, and later a loan from the Baron de Hirsch Fund, enabled the colonists to struggle until the close of the century.

To complete the list of the minor colonies undertaken before 1900 and of the known defunct colonies since then, mention is made of Carp Lake, Michigan, 1882; Washington, D. C., 1883; Water View, Virginia, 1886; Hebrew Colonial Society, Endicott, Maryland, 1903; Arpin, Wisconsin, formed by the Milwaukee Agricultural Association, 1904 (a colony which lasted till 1910 and where one family is still farming); Flora, Illinois, 1908; Clarion Colony, Utah, 1910; Bay Minette, Alabama, 1912; the Ida Straus Colony, near Albany, Georgia, 1915; the Jingo Colony, Tennessee, 1916.

The Fellowship, 1912, and Ferrer, 1914, Colonies at Stelton, New Jersey; the Chatham Colony, near Chatham, New Jersey, 1923; the Harmonia Colony near Plainfield, New Jersey, 1924; and the Mohegan Colony near Peekskill, New York, 1925, were either not colonies in the accepted sense of the term or broke away from the colony idea, and farming in those places is now conducted on individual lines.

Within the last two years, two rather ambitious and distinctive colonization projects have been initiated. In the summer of 1933, the Sun Rise Cooperative Farm Community bought a tract of land in the vicinity of Saginaw, Michigan, comprising almost nine thousand acres and containing about eighty buildings of various kinds. A large quantity of livestock, farm machinery, and crops
planted on over 2000 acres were included in the purchase. The land had belonged to a large estate and was acquired at what was considered an extremely low price and on very favorable terms. The colonists were drawn from the radical elements in the large cities and the colony was conceived as a strictly collectivistic enterprise, with the land and all personal property belonging to the community and all farm operations conducted for its collective benefit. The colony has suffered defections in membership and has had new accessions. At the beginning of 1935, the colony contained 97 families comprising 300 individuals. It is still too early to predict the outcome, but it is worth while to watch the development of this experiment.

During the same year a project known as the Jersey Homesteads, Inc., was launched. This will be treated elsewhere.

THE PRESENT JEWISH FARM SCENE

Jewish agricultural progress may be said to have begun with the opening of the present century. It is significant that the movement made its real growth only after the colony idea was abandoned and Jews began to settle on farms as individuals. No actual Jewish farm census has ever been taken. The Jewish Agricultural Society considered the matter on several occasions but it deemed the cost to be disproportionate to the practical results that could be derived from such a census. The Society places at 80,000 the number of Jews who are wholly or partly engaged in farming and in kindred agricultural pursuits. But these figures, though based on more than mere conjecture, are presented simply as estimates. In a study of the Jewish population of the United States made in 1927 by the Statistical Department of the American Jewish Committee, under the direction of Dr. H. S. Linfield, it was estimated that there were 109,600 Jews living in rural territory. It may be assumed that many of them were engaged in some form of agriculture.

Taking the average size of the American farm as a base, and making allowance for the recent tendency of Jews to operate small farms (owing to proximity to metropolitan
areas and specialization in crops demanding only small acreage) the combined holdings of Jewish farmers will reach over 1,500,000 acres. Under normal conditions Jewish farm holdings, real and personal, could be considered as having a total gross worth approximating $150,000,000. They are, of course, subject to mortgage. Tenant farming is almost non-existent.

Jewish farmsteads range in size from the less than an acre intensive nursery to the 30,000 acre grain fields of a Jewish farmer in Kansas. They are to be found in all of our forty-eight states. The largest numbers are in the northeast and in sections of the middlewest, where the bulk of the general Jewish population is situated. The natural tendency of Jews is to settle in or near places that already contain Jewish farm groups because they are thus afforded a freer outlet for their gregarious inclinations and enabled to maintain their ties with relatives and friends in the cities. But there are some lone spirits to whom proximity to urban centers or propinquity to Jewish neighbors is of no concern.

There is no type of agriculture practiced in the United States which is foreign to the Jew. Dairying, poultry raising, truck farming, floriculture, orcharding, viticulture, cattle raising, tobacco, grain, cotton, sugar beets—in short, every branch of farming has its Jewish votaries. As a rule, Jewish farmers engage in those forms of agriculture which are generally practiced in their sections, and raise those crops to which their land is best adapted and which are most profitably marketable.

Within the compass of this treatise it is possible to give only a bird's-eye view of the Jewish farm scene in those states which contain the largest Jewish agrarian population—Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Michigan. But the treatment of these will suffice to afford a good glimpse of American Jewish farm life in general.

CONNECTICUT.—Connecticut contains some of the oldest Jewish farm settlements in the United States. The settlements in Chesterfield and Colchester both had their beginnings in 1891. The former has declined, while the latter has grown into an active Jewish agricultural community. Besides Colchester the chief Jewish farm centers
are those around Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, New London, Norwich and Middletown, but Jewish farm families are scattered throughout the entire State. There are probably more diverse forms of farming practiced by Jews in Connecticut than in any other State. The Connecticut River Valley contains fertile fields especially adapted to tobacco raising. Large tobacco plantations were developed by Jews where both broad leaf and shade grown tobaccos are produced. During the World War period and for several years thereafter, the tobacco planters enjoyed great prosperity. Tobacco acreage was expanded. Dwellings which would grace the suburban periphery of a metropolitan city were constructed. Communal life was at its height. Then came the slump in the tobacco market. A hard period for the tobacco farmers ensued. Many farmers turned from tobacco to potatoes, and Jewish potato growers are now among the foremost in the State. In 1933, the largest individual producer of this crop was a Jew who raised in the neighborhood of 50,000 bushels. With the advent of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, an upswing has set in and these farmers' prospects have shown marked improvement.

Dairying, poultry raising, vegetable and fruit growing, constitute the other chief lines of farming in the State. The Jewish farm unit is large in size, an eighty or hundred acre farm being not uncommon. Except for pasture and woodland, the farms are fairly well cultivated and well stocked. The Connecticut Jewish farmer makes his living almost wholly from the soil. Summer boarding and rooming form part of the farm economy on some farms in scenically favored sections, but largely as a subsidiary rather than a major source of income.

The State contains intensive industrial areas which provide splendid outlets for farm products. The State's agricultural policy is directed toward the stimulation of the home market for home-grown products. Competition from the outside is reduced by regulations strictly defining marketing requirements. As a result, milk, poultry and other products command higher prices than in the neighboring States.
Jewish farmers have their local organizations for social, religious and recreational activity. Several of the large sized groups have their communal buildings. Some settlements are so close to towns and cities that they can participate in Jewish life there. Connecticut is the one State where the local Jewish farm associations are federated into a central state organization. In general agricultural and local affairs, the Connecticut Jewish farmers are part and parcel of their respective communities.

New Jersey.—New Jersey has been properly termed the cradle of the Jewish farm movement in the United States. As already mentioned, the Jewish settlements in South Jersey are the sole survivors of all the early attempts at Jewish colonization in this country. Their proximity to large cities, in itself an advantage, made possible the enlistment of the active interest of public-spirited Jews in New York and Philadelphia, and saved these settlements from the fate that befell the distant colonies. The so-called South Jersey Colonies—Alliance, Rosenhayn, Carmel, Norma, Brotmanville, Garten Road—have been historicized by many Jewish writers, among them Charles S. Bernheimer, Jacob G. Lipman, Leonard G. Robinson, Philip R. Goldstein, Katherine Sabsovich, Samuel Joseph, Boris D. Bogen, Gustav Pollak, and lately in “Yovel” published on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Alliance Colony. Although still popularly referred to as colonies, these settlements never actually were colonies in the accepted sense of that term. From the beginning to the present time, farm ownership was vested in individuals. The farms were originally developed as truck farms, with strawberries, beans, sweet potatoes and peppers as the principal crops. Later, poultry was introduced and is now an important source of income. Although the high hopes entertained by their founders were not fully realized, the colonies have been able to maintain their continuity as Jewish farm centers, and today, though most of the original settlers have passed on, the children of some are still there, and a third generation of Jewish farmers is beginning to grow up.

Founded as an agro-industrial settlement, Woodbine has of late years developed a fresh agricultural impetus. Aided
by the Baron de Hirsch Fund and The Jewish Agricultural Society, new farmers have come in and modern poultry plants have been built up. As in the South Jersey Colonies, some Woodbine farms are in the hands of the children of the original settlers. The present Mayor is the grandson of a Woodbine pioneer.

With metropolitan New York near its northern extremity and Philadelphia dominating its southern end, and its many shore resorts, New Jersey has a large consuming public within short range, affording many farmers the opportunity of marketing without the intervention of middlemen. The same factors are favorable to the development of agro-industrial settlements such as have grown up around New Brunswick, Plainfield and Bound Brook, within the New York radius, as well as around the district contiguous to Philadelphia. Hence, the State has long been a favored locale for Jewish farm-seekers, and the Jewish farm population has grown here more rapidly than in other states. Jewish farm settlements and individual farmers are found in every part of the State, and New Jersey probably contains more Jewish farmers in proportion to the general Jewish population than any other state of the Union.

Varied types of farming are pursued, with poultry and truck farming in the lead. In Monmouth and Ocean Counties, around Lakewood, Toms River and Farmingdale, Jews are the predominant element in poultry farming. They have displayed unusual aptitude in mastering both the scientific and practical phases of poultry husbandry and are engaged in all branches of the industry. Their commercial plants range from a thousand to ten thousand bird capacity, entailing considerable investments for building and equipment and requiring large operating costs. New Jersey egg and poultry products command the highest prices on the New York market. Monmouth County, which ranks among the first ten agricultural counties in the United States, contains more Jewish farmers than any other county in the State. Jewish farmers around Freehold, Perrineville, and Englishtown raise substantial acreages of potatoes, the County's leading crop; also many acres of tomatoes, sweet corn and a large variety of other vegetables.
Buying and marketing cooperatives exist in virtually every Jewish settlement. Although formed mostly by Jews, they are not exclusively Jewish in their membership. They afford a splendid example of a union of effort which, though economic in its primary aim, also makes for better understanding among interracial groups. The Central Jersey Farmers Cooperative Association is a good example. Founded by a handful of Jewish farmers, it has grown to a membership of over one hundred and fifty Jews and non-Jews. Jewish poultry farmers also took an active part in federating local marketing associations into a state federation. The Jewish farmers in and around Perrineville formed the first credit union organized by farmers under the New Jersey law. Other Jewish groups were likewise the first to apply for charters for credit unions under the recently enacted Federal law.

The Jewish farming communities of New Jersey are well integrated, facilitating social activity and cooperative endeavor. Local Jewish organization is stronger here than among other Jewish farm groups. Practically every settlement has its own community center for religious, educational and social purposes.

**NEW YORK.**—Not until the turn of the century was there any marked farming activity in New York State. Now, Jewish farmers may be found in various parts of the State, including Long Island. The densest Jewish rural population in the State, indeed, in the entire United States, is centered in Sullivan and Ulster Counties. Once Jews began to go thither, a steady stream of migration was set in motion, attracted, no doubt, by the scenic beauty of these picturesque regions, their invigorating climate and their accessibility to metropolitan New York. Even before the advent of the Jew, these counties had been favorite summering places for people from the city. Following the economy of the older stock, the newcomers combined summer boarding with farming, to provide an added source of income to that which could be derived in short growing seasons from none too fertile soil. Gradually, boarding assumed larger proportions until, in the years preceding the depression, luxurious summer hotels were put up, hostelries embodying every modern device for comfort, convenience
and recreation. It is estimated that over a quarter of a million people spend their vacation periods in these pleasant mountain regions.

As the practice of summer vacationing became more general among modestly-circumstanced folk, a unique institution was evolved—the rooming house, distinguished from the boarding house, in that guests rent rooms only, and do their own cooking and housekeeping. In the beginning there was little to commend this, other than the fact that it brought the opportunity of a summer vacation within the range of families of small earning power. But rooming houses have been steadily improved. Overcrowding has been largely eliminated and sanitation standards lifted. These summer enterprises have screened the agricultural activity of the mountain regions, and there is a tendency to frown upon the so-called "boarding house" farmer. Yet a volume of farming, by no means inconsiderable, is carried on in this vacation hub, not a little by the very people who conduct the boarding and rooming places. There is probably more farming being done in these two counties now than at any time in their entire history. Leaving out of consideration the big hotels, the virtue of the combination of farming with boarding or rooming lies not only in providing farmers with additional income, but also in bringing a ready market for their farm products to their very doors.

A dairy section before the settlement of Jews, dairying still predominates in this region. Dairy herds have been improved with tested cows. Poultry farming on a commercial basis has been appreciably developed, and a Jewish farmer, a former New York City boy, was made president of a cooperative egg auction operating in five counties. Parenthetically, it might be mentioned that he is also president of the local Grange, the oldest farm organization in America. Potatoes are being raised in larger quantities than ever before and cauliflower as a commercial crop was introduced by Jewish farmers.

The Jewish farmers of the mountain districts brought in a large number of Jews engaged in business and professions. The population of the villages of Woodridge, Mounta ndale, Hurleyville and South Fallsburgh, is preponderately Jewish.
The larger villages, Ellenville, Liberty and Monticello, have considerable Jewish populations. Ellenville contains 145 Jewish families, seventy of which were drawn from neighborhood farms. Because of its central location, Ellenville was selected as the seat of the branch office opened by The Jewish Agricultural Society in 1920 to serve the territory.

Groups of Jewish farmers are located in Rensselaer County in the environs of Nassau, East Nassau, Schodack and Brainard, within easy access of Albany and Troy. The first settlers went there in 1894, but it was not until ten years later that the movement thither actually began. Here, dairying, poultry raising, and a mixed form of farming are practiced. Summer boarding is very modest when compared with the Ulster-Sullivan districts. Within the last decade, Rockland County has witnessed an influx of Jewish farmers. This section is unique in that, though it is almost at the door of the metropolis and land values are high, Jewish farmers carry on an intensive type of farming on good-sized farms.

Synagogues and Jewish community center buildings are found in every sizable farm community throughout the State. Some villages have more than one. There are Talmud Torahs and Yiddish schools. In Sullivan and Ulster Counties, farm and village are close enough together to fuse activities. There are local Jewish organizations of all kinds, and branches of the large national Jewish organizations. Monticello and Liberty have hospitals built under Jewish auspices and maintained largely by Jewish contributions. Jews are members of school and village boards and hold civic office. Jewish farm girls teach in neighboring grade and high schools. Jewish young men raised on local farms have returned to these sections to practice professions.

Local farm cooperatives have been built up. In Sullivan and Ulster Counties, the farm associations are federated into a bi-county organization. The hotelmen in these counties have their Mountain Hotelmen’s Association which publishes its own paper devoted to the interests of both hotelmen and farmers. The outstanding accomplishment
in the field of cooperation is a chain of five cooperative fire insurance companies with headquarters at Woodridge. Starting in 1913 with one company and a small amount of insurance, the volume of business has grown to almost twelve million dollars of insurance risks. These companies save their members many thousands of dollars annually in insurance premiums.

**MICHIGAN AND OHIO.**—The earliest historical record of Jewish farm effort in Michigan is the Palestine Colony (1891) already referred to.

The actual settlement of Jewish farmers began about thirty or more years ago, encouraged by the late Rabbi A. R. Levy of Chicago and The Jewish Agriculturists' Aid Society of America of which he was the founder. With the development of the automotive industry, the Jewish population of Detroit grew, and soon some Jews began to settle on farms within a radius of fifty to seventy-five miles from the city. Now there are Jewish farmers in the vicinity of every fair-sized city in the State. The largest numbers are in southwestern Michigan, whither they went from Chicago.

South Haven was originally a general farming area. Later, Jewish farmers turned to poultry and developed one of the largest commercial poultry groups in the section. In and near South Haven there have long been summer resorts. Twenty-five years ago there were only two or three Jewish boarding houses. Since then a number of expensive modern hotels have been built up, and some Jewish farmers have changed from farming to boarding. But the boarding business of the district is confined almost wholly to the places bordering Lake Michigan, and only a small percentage of Jewish farmers cater to summer guests. With the coming of the farmers, the Jewish urban population of South Haven slowly increased; it now numbers about seventy-five families. Assisted by a loan from The Jewish Agricultural Society, the urban and rural residents erected a synagogue and community center building, which would do credit to a community of much larger size.

In the neighborhood of Benton Harbor, Jews specialize in fruit-growing of various kinds. They have become
experts in raising berries, fruits and vegetables. Farms range in size from ten to eighty acres, and some Jews have paid as high as $1000 per acre. In the Eastern part of Michigan, the Jewish farmers near cities raise mostly truck and poultry, and those in the outlying districts run dairies and practice general farming. The Jewish farmers of Michigan also produce the specialties peculiar to the state,—celery, sugar beets, mint, etc. Though hard pressed as all farmers were during the depression years, the Jewish farmers were still able to donate several truck-loads of foodstuffs to the drought-stricken farmers in Arkansas and to contribute quantities of farm produce to soup kitchens in Chicago.

The Jewish farm settlements in Ohio are grouped around Cleveland and Youngstown, and there are individual Jewish farmers scattered over the State. About thirty years ago there was a small settlement near Cincinnati fostered by the late Boris D. Bogen, then head of the Federated Jewish Charities of that city, and by the late Professor Gotthard Deutsch of the Hebrew Union College. The settlement gradually dwindled because better opportunities during the World War and early post-War periods lured the younger element to the city, and the older people followed. The largest group in the State is located in the vicinity of Geneva, about forty-five miles from Cleveland, where Jews commenced to settle on farms about twenty-five years ago. Conforming to local practice, they engaged in viticulture as a specialty. They made rapid strides, increased their grape acreage and built up their vineyards until, at the height of the industry’s prosperity (in the middle nineteen-twenties), the Jewish group, though a small minority, produced over sixty percent of the grapes raised in that section. Grapes brought high prices and land values soared. The neighborhood banks and non-Jewish businessmen pointed to the new element as a strong factor in the upbuilding and progress of Geneva. Unfortunately, specialization was pushed too far. When the cumulative effects of prohibition and competition from other grape areas made themselves felt, grapes dropped drastically in price and the grape-growers had little else
to fall back upon. Depression added to their woes, and the farmers of this section have for some time been confronted with critical conditions. Benefiting by their hard experience, they have in late years begun to diversify their fruit culture and to raise dairy, poultry and other products.

**Depression and Its Effects**

In a discussion of any phase of contemporary activity, the economic upheaval that set in in 1929 looms up as a big factor. In the years between 1929 and 1932, the cash income from farm marketings fell sixty percent. The best thought of the nation was put to work to find a solution to the farm problem. Through the Federal Farm Board, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration in its various ramifications, the Federal Government took comprehensive measures to lift farm prices, lighten the debt load and ease the credit strain. As a result of these measures and a general upswing, the farmer’s tenure was made more secure and farm income was brought up. Yet, 1934 was still forty percent behind 1929.

In common with their fellows, Jewish farmers severely felt the effect of the depression. But it is fortunate that only a minority concentrated on those agricultural staples which had been in the slough for ten years or so, since the export markets on which they depended began to decline. Most Jews are engaged in those branches of farming—dairying, poultry, vegetable and small fruit farming—which have suffered not so much from overproduction as from underconsumption, because of lack of domestic buying-power for the products of the farm. The initial operation of the agricultural adjustment program resulting in the increase of the cost of feed without a compensatory rise in the price of poultry and dairy products, worked to the disadvantage of farmers in these branches. But these farmers were not as hard hit as were the producers of the major export crops, and the inequities under the A.A.A. are steadily being corrected. Again, the effects of the agricultural slump were more severe in the hinterland
than in districts near large centers of population, especially in the Northeast. Most Jewish farmers are located in regions fairly close to cities. This is a distinct advantage. Markets are more favorable. Nearby farmers, especially Jews who have friends and relatives in the city, can engage in direct selling, thereby eliminating the middleman's profit. Such farmers can also supplement their incomes by using surplus housing accommodations for summer roomers or boarders. Coming from trades, many Jewish farmers can even in hard times find some city work to add a little to farm income. While these features by no means gave immunity, they mitigated the effects of the depression. Government aids, the help of The Jewish Agricultural Society, not always through loans but through advice and encouragement, were important factors. Doubtless many Jewish farmers stuck because they saw nothing to which they could return in the city. But the fact remains that there has been no general flight of Jews from the farm. A study, the findings of which are set forth in a later section of this article, shows that out of three hundred farmers among whom statistics were gathered, two hundred and sixty-two have been on their farms for more than five years and two hundred and forty-four for more than ten years. Jewish farmers have, by and large, managed in one way or another, to withstand the depression.

**Agro-Industrial Plan of Settlement**

The depression has given rise to cross currents of opinion as to effective methods to bring about recovery. Some students of affairs advocate the curtailment of agricultural production and the absorption of large numbers of farmers into industry. Others hold that a key to improvement is the turning of our unemployed city workers to the land. A third school of thought maintains that a good approach lies in the decentralization of industry and the redistribution of population through a combination of farming with industrial work.

Part-time farming is not new. There were always people who drew their living partly from farming and partly from industrial earnings. Some of these evolved into full-fledged
successful farmers. The Jewish Agricultural Society has long regarded this combination as a good means of establishing those who, for one reason or another, were not ready to launch immediately into full-time farming. The essence of the Society's idea is settlement on farms within commuting distance of cities, making possible entrance into farming without immediate severance from city occupations. The plan implies farms of small acreage, the high cost of land close to cities imposing that restriction. On a farm of this kind a moderate but appreciable amount of farming can be carried on by the farm wife and children while the wages of the head of the family continue to come in. Besides, most industries have slack seasons even in normal times which, with other spare hours, can be profitably employed on the farm. The family's food bill is cut down, the overhead of the farm about equals the rent of a city apartment and, since the farm is close to the city, the products, mainly eggs and poultry with some vegetables and small fruit on the side, can be readily marketed. The possibility of emergence into straight farming is always present. But, whether or not this is the ultimate result, the worker is provided with proper housing in healthful surroundings where his children can be in wholesome contact with nature, where the family can escape the city's drawbacks and yet take advantage of the city's opportunities.

The agro-industrial combination was followed to some extent by Jews long before the depression, in fact as far back as the South Jersey colonization period. With the trend on the increase, suitable small farms became scarcer and several groups bought tracts of land in New Jersey and elsewhere for subdivision. Chatham and Harmonia in New Jersey and Mohegan in New York, previously mentioned, are examples. Lacking guidance, they made mistakes which retarded their agricultural growth. To give this type of project proper direction, the Society in 1926 began to help in building an agro-industrial settlement in Bound Brook, New Jersey. Before the depression the settlement grew steadily to almost forty families and the settlers made good progress. Indeed, the outlook was so encouraging that in 1929 the Society launched a project
of its own along the same lines. It bought a tract of land two and three-quarter miles from the center of New Brunswick, New Jersey, and subdivided the land for development and resale in small units. After the initial group of nine had been settled, the economic storm broke out and operations have been temporarily suspended.

The agro-industrial idea began to spread in boom years and some of the earlier settlers yielded to the natural temptation to expand too quickly and to give up their city jobs too soon. Unfortunately, the depression came before they had been on their places long enough to strike firm root. During the last few years, agro-industrialists did not fare so well, principally because city work, the back-bone of the plan, was scarce. Some families were compelled to drop out. But this form of settlement, if undertaken on a more modest scale, will still afford an opportunity for those to get into farming who cannot command the means to go immediately into full-time farming or are fearful of cutting themselves off abruptly from their city moorings.

The subsistence homesteading projects being developed by the United States Department of the Interior are a species of agro-industrial farming except that they generally restrict production to home consumption. In that sense, they are industrial rather than agricultural. Such a project is the Jersey Homestead, Inc. being developed under government aegis and with grants from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads and the Public Works Administration. Eight contiguous farms, containing 1203 acres, near Hightstown, New Jersey, were bought, and the plans call for the establishment of two hundred families drawn largely from the ranks of Jewish needle-workers. Each family is to invest $500. A garment factory is to be located in the colony. Large dairy and poultry enterprises are to be conducted cooperatively, but the farming of the individual homesteaders will be limited mainly to raising vegetables for family consumption. The actual settlement of families was scheduled to begin in the summer of 1935. In some Jewish circles, the venture is regarded as having significant possibilities in opening an avenue for the rehabilitation of large bodies of unemployed and displaced Jewish
workers. But it is hardly likely that many, if any, government grants for other specifically Jewish homesteading projects will be forthcoming, surely not sufficient to make an appreciable dent in the ranks of Jewish industrial workers. For that matter, large-scale Jewish farm settlement, be it part-time farming, full-time farming, or both, would be exceedingly costly—so costly that mass transplantation movements as envisaged by some enthusiasts are likely to remain for a long time the devout wish of their protagonists. For monetary considerations, if for no other, it appears that the Jewish farm movement must, for some time at least, depend for its growth upon the individual and small group mode of settlement through which the movement has thus far been built up.

JEWISH AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

Although a number of Jewish agencies were, at various times since 1881, formed to promote Jewish farm settlement, the Jewish farm movement has not been a subsidized one. The aim has always been to render a type of aid which any self-respecting man can accept without the sacrifice of dignity. Some of these agencies were set up to carry out a specific colonization project and had a brief existence. Others had a wider scope. Only those that are still functioning will be treated here.

BARON DE HIRSCH FUND.—A history of the Baron de Hirsch Fund, written by Dr. Samuel Joseph, was recently published. It presents a complete account of that organization from its birth in 1891 to the present time. The Fund’s activities covered a wide range. Its establishment gave the Jewish agricultural movement the support and direction which it had heretofore lacked. The Fund founded Woodbine, and, in 1894, established the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School there. The school was the first in the United States to impart secondary education in agriculture. It was maintained until 1917 and had a total student body of over 1000. The Fund aided individual farmers in Connecticut and New Jersey, and, as already stated, gave succor to the struggling Palestine Colony in Michigan. With the creation of The Jewish Agricultural Society, the Baron
de Hirsch Fund withdrew from direct agricultural work except in Woodbine, but it always regarded farming as its major interest. Its annual subsidies to The Jewish Agricultural Society have been continued without interruption and it has, on many occasions, made considerable sums available to the Society in the form of loans. A review of the Society's work is, therefore, also a review of the Fund's agricultural activities.

The Jewish Agricultural Society, Inc.—In 1900, the Baron de Hirsch Fund joined the Jewish Colonization Association—also a Hirsch foundation with headquarters in Paris—in founding The Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society. At first, the objects of the new Society were not solely agricultural. They included removal of immigrants from crowded cities, and other industrial features. As the agricultural phase of the Society's work assumed progressively larger dimensions, the industrial activities were gradually reduced and finally completely abandoned. In 1922, the Society dropped the word "Industrial" from its name. At the same time it deleted the word "Aid" so as to remove all implications of eleemosynary favor.

In the beginning, the Society was little more than a lending agency. Agricultural credit was deplorably scarce in general, much more so for a new element. As the movement toward the farm grew and the Society's knowledge and experience of the needs of Jewish farmers became broader, its activities were expanded, until there was evolved a program which comprehends virtually every phase of farm life—farm employment, farm settlement, farm credit, agricultural extension, rural sanitation, and social, religious and, to some extent, welfare activities.

The Farm Employment Department was conceived as an instrumentality to afford vocational preparation for farm-minded Jewish youth. Many of the young men sent out to work on farms undertook it simply as a means of obtaining the necessary schooling for later farm operation. The Department has functioned since 1908 and effected 17,723 placements in thirty-two states.

The purpose of the Society's Farm Settlement Department is "the gradual creation of a class of real farmers."
The Society has studiously avoided all extravagant back-to-the-land propaganda. In the past seventeen years, the post-War period, 17,884 persons applied to the Society for advice about establishing themselves on farms. Through the direct instrumentality of this Department, 1356 families were settled; indirectly, a much larger number. It may be conservatively estimated that the Society was responsible in one way or another for the settlement of ten thousand persons in fifteen states during that period. Avoiding the mistakes of the early colonization efforts, when families were placed in the distant hinterland, the policy has been to locate new farmers not too far from Jewish urban centers, in sections where Jewish farmers had already settled. In this way a number of fairly compact Jewish agricultural communities were developed.

The Extension Department was the Society's response to the recognition that farming for the Jew is an acquisition, not an inheritance, and that the problem of making a Jewish farmer is a problem not only of craftsmanship but also of adjustment. The design was to supplement rather than supplant governmental extension service, and the Society still draws freely upon that service. The most effective instrument in the Society's extension work is the individual farm visit through the medium of which important agricultural information is brought directly to the farmer's door by men expertly trained and temperamentally equipped. During the year 1934, a total of 2,957 visits were made. Supplementing its work with individuals, the Department assists farmers in organizing themselves for cooperative buying and selling, and for other community purposes. Since 1908, the Department has published The Jewish Farmer, an agricultural magazine in Yiddish. It has also published agricultural text-books in Yiddish, and now issues monthly farm bulletins. This Department also maintains a purchasing service bureau to help farmers buy materials of approved quality at reduced prices. It conducts an agricultural night school for farm aspirants at its headquarters in New York. Between 1908 and 1930 the Society awarded 340 scholarships to children of Jewish farmers and other farm-minded Jewish youth to enable them to pursue agricultural courses at state agricultural
colleges. The awards have been discontinued because of budgetary limitations.

The Society made, first, outright grants and, later, loans without interest to help the erection of synagogues and community centers in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin. In religious and kindred activities, it cooperated with the United Synagogue of America, the Jewish Chatauqua Society, and the National Council of Jewish Women, to the last two of which it, for a time, granted annual subsidies.

The Society maintains a Sanitation Department which carries on work to promote higher standards of cleanliness and to improve sanitary conditions in and about the farm home. This activity is confined mostly to the Jewish farm districts in New York and Connecticut, but other sections are occasionally reached. During the course of the year 1934, a total of 644 sanitary inspections were conducted. Through the media of educational talks, lectures and demonstrations, an audience estimated at 7,500 was reached that year.

The Farm Loan Department reaches those farmers who cannot obtain loans through other sources. Hence, loans are, with few exceptions, made against junior mortgages—a form of security not generally acceptable by lending institutions. The broadened Federal farm credit established during the past two years, part of which is purely of an emergency character, while temporarily easing the strain, did not lift the burden from the Society's shoulders. In its thirty-five years, the Society granted 11,441 loans aggregating $7,167,686 to farmers in forty states. This phase of the Society's work is unique in that, unlike endowed foundations where capital is invested purely for the sake of income, and unlike membership societies which depend upon uninterrupted support from the public, both the Society's capital and income are made to serve the very objectives for which the Society was founded. The income is employed to defray administration expense and the cost of a ramified educational service. The principal constitutes a revolving fund out of which farm loans are made. The difficulty has been that, with the growth in the number of Jewish farmers, the demands
upon the fund have outrun its capacity, and that, latterly, slow repayments caused by hard times have retarded rotation. Some years ago, the Society contemplated a drive for funds but abandoned the idea because it did not wish to compete with the various fund-raising campaigns for relief abroad. Before the onset of the depression, losses resulting from farm loans constituted less than five percent of the Society's turnover, over a period of almost thirty years. Since the depression, losses have naturally risen. The Society looks upon these losses simply as an item in the cost of building up a Jewish agricultural movement in the United States.

NATIONAL FARM SCHOOL.—The National Farm School was founded in 1896 by the late Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf of Philadelphia. It is located near Doylestown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. With its associated farms, the School comprises twelve hundred acres, with spacious educational halls, student dormitories, modern farm buildings, fine livestock, and a full complement of up-to-date farm machinery. The course of instruction extends over three years, equally divided between classroom and laboratory instruction, and actual field work on the fields, in dairies, orchards, poultry plants, greenhouses, vegetable gardens, etc. A total of 972 boys have been graduated, over thirty-five percent of whom are engaged in agriculture or related pursuits. Among its graduates are such well known figures as Bernhard Ostrolenk and Jacob J. Taubenhaus, of whom mention will be made later. A history of the school, written by Herbert D. Allman, its President, will have made its appearance before this article is published.

FEDERATION OF JEWISH FARMERS OF AMERICA

The Federation differs from the agencies just treated in that it was an organization formed by the farmers themselves. It was, as its name indicates, a league of local Jewish farmers' associations. The Federation was formed at a convention held in New York City in 1909 and grew from a membership of thirteen to sixty-three constituent societies in eleven states. It entered into many phases of
Jewish farm life—economic, social and religious—and held yearly conventions and several expositions in New York City at which farm products raised by its members were exhibited. The Jewish Agricultural Society gave the Federation not only moral encouragement but liberal financial support. As the Jewish farmers grew in number and importance, it became increasingly evident that their economic problems could not well be dissociated from those of the communities in which these farmers resided. On the other hand, the non-economic problems with which the Federation dealt were of a purely local character, varying in different communities. Interest in the Federation, therefore waned, and, since 1922, the Federation has been inactive.

The constituent societies of the Federation furnished the nuclei for the establishment of a system of cooperative agricultural credit. Between 1911 and 1915, nineteen cooperative credit unions were formed in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Massachusetts, to each of which The Jewish Agricultural Society lent a thousand dollars at two percent interest, to start operations. These credit unions were managed cooperatively by the farmers themselves and were designed to supply emergency credit. They functioned for a number of years, but, beginning in 1918, they were gradually liquidated. The farmers viewed credit unions as free loan societies, not as miniature banks which they really were.

This experience gained from Federation and Credit Unions gave the farmers a good training in organization and a better understanding of the principles underlying cooperative endeavor, and thus led to the sounder farmers' associations and the more stable cooperatives that were formed later.

In concluding this section it should be said that the Jewish farm movement has not depended for growth solely upon the efforts of service agencies. There would have been Jewish farmers were there no agencies, and some farmers would have climbed to heights independently, as indeed they did. But these agencies unquestionably accelerated the pace of progress in both number and quality.
SUCCESSFUL FARMERS

There is no branch of farming in which some Jews have not excelled. The few cases given here are not cited as typical of the average but as interesting examples of fine achievement.

On Long Island, a man who was brought up on the lower east side of New York City, is so outstanding in vegetable growing that his fields are selected by the New York State Experiment Station for researches in various types of truck growing. He is the crop reporter for the United States Department of Agriculture—a post given only to leading farmers.

A former sweater manufacturer in Brooklyn, New York, is now a leading tomato grower in Monmouth County, New Jersey. Even when other farmers find it hard to dispose of their output, buyers compete with one another for his crop.

Near Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a graduate of an agricultural school in Germany operates hothouses wherein are raised products that have won many medals and trophies for their excellence.

A graduate of the National Farm School, who started his farming career on the proverbial shoestring, conducts a nursery which supplies evergreens to the Conservation Department of the State of Connecticut for use in the State's forestation work.

Within the past few years two brothers have built up in Massachusetts what is probably the most perfectly mechanized poultry plant in the country. The plant has a capacity for a flock of twenty thousand laying hens and large quantities of chicks for sale to other poultry farmers.

In the Benton Harbor, Michigan, district, a young Jewish farmer and his wife, both children of farmers, keep a dairy herd of forty high-grade cows and produce grade A milk. They also raise a variety of truck crops and operate an orchard from which they harvested as many as 12,000 bushels of apples alone in one season. Their mode of fruit culture has called forth the commendation of the State’s fruit experts. A similar combination is successfully carried
on by a man who started over twenty years ago when he was past fifty.

In the fertile Connecticut River Valley, there is a Jewish farmer who started his career almost thirty years ago, soon after his arrival in this country. He and his brother-in-law, who became his partner, had a combined capital of $500, and The Jewish Agricultural Society granted them a loan of $400. This year, this man is raising sixty-five acres of shade tobacco (a high-grade type) and fifty acres of potatoes, requiring the seasonal employment of seventy-five men and an operating cost of $20,000. Probably the largest potato grower in Connecticut is a Jewish farmer, the president of the Connecticut Potato Growers' Marketing Association.

A graduate of the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School was for a time the hog expert of South Dakota. Later, he became a seedsman and, in a state-wide competition last year, he won seven first, and four second, prizes.

One of the foremost breeders of White Leghorns in the entire country, formerly a shoe manufacturer, now runs a poultry farm in Ulster County, New York, which has become a Mecca for poultrymen seeking information on up-to-the-minute poultry practices. Breeders from Great Britain have paid as high as four dollars a piece for his eggs.

In Greene County, New York, along the banks of the Hudson, a Jew, formerly a laborer for the Knickerbocker Ice Company, started raising mushrooms about fourteen years ago in a run-down ice-house leased from the company. Later he bought the property, added to it and developed it, and today he has a $75,000 plant with private docks, and an annual turnover reaching as high as $60,000. His son and his son-in-law also operate a large mushroom farm in the same neighborhood.

A Jewish family is the largest producer of cattle and of blue-grass seed in Kentucky. The founder was a lecturer on land and livestock improvement at the University of Kentucky.

In the Sacramento River Delta, California, a Jewish farmer raised over a hundred thousand dollars worth of asparagus and broccoli last year. Another California
farmer, a graduate of the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School, who was foreman of the poultry plant at the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, operates a 150 acre farm which yields, among other crops, 500 tons of peaches and pears and 60,000 pounds of beans.

A Jewish florist produces the largest volume and greatest variety of flowers raised by a single individual in the metropolitan New York area. His output for retail sale is said to be the largest in the country. Incidentally, the biggest independent establishment for the construction and equipment of green-houses is owned by two Jewish brothers of Brooklyn, New York.

Vineland, New Jersey, is regarded as the cradle of modern commercial poultry husbandry. A Jewish family, the head of which has been farming in the United States and Canada for about fifty years, conducts one of the most up-to-date poultry farms in the entire district. Numerous prizes have been awarded the operators at poultry shows and official egg-laying contests. The senior classes of the State's agricultural college are frequently taken to this farm to study the poultry methods practiced there. As part of the farm economy, an appreciable acreage of vegetables is intensively cultivated under overhead irrigation. The poultry enterprise is in charge of the sons, while the vegetable venture is under the active direction of the father, a man past seventy.

A father and a son operate two duck farms on Long Island, the combined annual capacity of which is over a quarter million ducks. A New York commission house vouchsafes the information that they are the largest duck-growers on the Island, which probably means in the whole country. The plant is highly mechanized and ultra-modern in every particular. The father is the usual immigrant type, while the son is a member of an exclusive golf club.

Reference has already been made to a thirty-thousand-acre wheat farm in Kansas. Its owner, now a State Senator, has shipped as high as a million bushels of wheat from his domain in a single year. His services to his community and to the State were recognized some years ago when his fellow townsmen declared a special holiday in his honor.
CONTRIBUTION OF JEWS TO AGRICULTURE

The numerical representation of Jews in farming is small, yet Jews have made notable contribution to American agriculture in the realms of science and economics and in related agricultural fields. Jews are found on the staffs of agricultural schools and colleges, experiment stations, in extension service, in state and federal agricultural bureaus, and in scientific work for commercial concerns. Some noteworthy achievements are here briefly recorded.

Jacob Joseph Taubenhaus is the Chief of the Division of Plant Pathology and Physiology at the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and the author of several important books on plant diseases.

Selman A. Waksman is microbiologist at the New Jersey State Experiment Station and at the New Jersey Agricultural College Station. Though related more directly to the study of soils, his researches have also been of value to science in general.

Moses N. Levine, associated at various times with the Kansas State Agricultural College, the University of Minnesota, and the United States Department of Agriculture, is one of the leading pathologists in the country. He won special distinction through his researches in the diseases that attack grain.

Myer Edward Jaffa, Emeritus Professor of Nutrition at the University of California, and, at various times, Chief of the Bureau of Foods and Drugs in the California State Department of Health, Director of the State Food and Drug Laboratory, and Special Agent and Food Expert of the United States Department of Agriculture, did much to advance the interest of the fruit growers of California and elsewhere through his studies of the health-giving properties of fruit.

Joseph A. Rosen, the last Superintendent of the Baron de Hirsch School at Woodbine, and now in charge of the vast Jewish agricultural reconstruction work being carried on in Russia, was responsible for the introduction into the United States of Rosen Rye, a variety which grows on soil of moderate fertility.
Charles B. Lipman, Dean of the Graduate Division and Professor of Plant Physiology at the University of California, is one of the foremost soil scientists in this country. Lately, his discovery of the presence of bacterial life in meteorites created somewhat of a sensation in the scientific world.

Jacob G. Lipman, brother of Charles B., is the Dean of Rutgers College of Agriculture, the Director of the New Jersey State Experiment Station, and one of the world's authorities on soils. He has served as president of the International Society of Soil Science, and was president of the first International Congress of Soil Science held in Washington, in 1927. Last year, he was called by the United States Government to direct a national soil survey. Professor Lipman is the author of standard works on soil science, a member of scientific bodies in various lands, and the recipient of honorary degrees from universities in several countries. Last year he was awarded the Chandler medal by Columbia University,—a rare distinction.

The late H. L. Sabsovich, a graduate of the Zurich Polytechnicum, organized an agricultural department in the University of Colorado, which was probably the first of its kind in the west. He was the first superintendent of the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School.

Bernhard Ostrolenk, formerly the director of the National Farm School and now instructor in economics in the College of the City of New York, is the author of works on agricultural economics and a writer in that field.

Leonard G. Robinson, a former general manager of The Jewish Agricultural Society, assisted in framing the federal farm loan law enacted in 1916, and organized, and became the first president of, the Federal Land Bank of Springfield, Mass., one of the twelve regional banks of the federal system.

Louis H. Bean was on the research staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the United States Department of Agriculture from 1923 to 1933, when he became Economist in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture and Chief of the Agricultural Industrial Relations Section in the Division of Program Planning of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.
Nathan Koenig, a graduate of the Connecticut State Agricultural College, joined the staff of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in June 1933. Later, he became the assistant chief of the Administration's press section and, in November 1934, he was placed in general charge of the Administration's information activities in the twelve northeastern states.

Mordecai Joseph Ezekiel is the economic advisor to the United States Secretary of Agriculture. He played an important role in shaping the policies of the old Federal Farm Board and of the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He represented the United States in the world wheat conference held at Rome last year.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the Secretary of the Treasury, who served on the Board of The Jewish Agricultural Society and as its Vice-President, was selected by President Roosevelt to organize and head the Farm Credit Administration. In that capacity he brought into being the largest and most comprehensive farm credit system that has ever been devised in any country.

In founding the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy, David Lubin rendered a service to agriculture which was world embracing. At a meeting held in October 1934, a tribute to Lubin's memory was paid by delegates from the sixty-three nations represented in the Institute.

A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

Late in 1934, The Jewish Agricultural Society made a study which enables one to view Jewish farm life through the eyes of those who are living it. The study covered three hundred Jewish farmers residing in seventeen states, the majority in the northeast and middlewest. This cross-section may not reflect the status in the whole country with absolute accuracy. Yet it is a fairly representative sample. The facts adduced, with certain deductions therefrom, are presented solely with the view to giving, through the mouths of the farmers themselves, the answer to the question so often asked—"Who is the Jewish farmer?"
Almost sixty percent of the farmers comprised in the study are in the prime of life, under fifty. Only ten percent are over sixty. The largest age group is that between forty and fifty,—thirty-eight percent. Eighty-one percent have been in this country twenty years or more, while only a fraction of one percent have been here less than ten years. Only four percent are natives. The bulk of present-day Jewish farmers are foreign-born who came here early in life,—probably early enough to reap the benefit of some American schooling. That is why less than one percent cannot speak English, and why eighty-eight percent claim ability to read and write it. That also accounts for the fact that eighty-three percent are citizens, and three percent declarants.

American Jewish farmers are recruited from a large diversity of occupations: common labor, skilled trades, white-collar occupations, business and manufacturing, and even the professions. The needle and fur trades make up the largest group,—twenty-eight percent. Farmers and farm laborers constitute seven percent. Fifty-one percent of the farmers studied stated that they had had some farm experience. Seven percent attended farm schools or agricultural colleges here or abroad. The “experience” of the others probably consisted of work as farm laborers or on parental farms. Manifestly, the American Jewish farmer is not indigenous to the soil, but simply the immigrant Jew transplanted from American city to American farm.

The figures as to capital reveal that many Jewish farmers made the plunge into farming on slender means. Over twenty-one percent had a capital of not more than $500. Thirty-seven percent could boast of accumulations reaching up to $1000. Only fifty-seven percent had as much as $2000, while but fourteen percent were in the over $5000 class. The farmers in the smaller financial brackets are those who settled earliest, when farm lands were cheaper. It is evident that the Jewish agrarian population is not made up of urban failures. The immigrant Jew who comes to our shores destitute of means and is able to lay by even a small nest-egg must have achieved some measure of success in his city work.
General farming predominates—thirty-three percent—with poultry ranking next at thirty-two percent. Then comes dairying, eighteen percent, followed by truck, ten percent. Many of the farmers that are engaged in specialized farming also raise other crops, the specialty being a major, not an exclusive, line of production. Close to half the farmers surveyed have some supplemental source of income, chiefly boarding or rooming, or city work on the part of the head, or of some member of the family.

The survey revealed the interesting fact that the majority were not wholly motivated by the urge to better themselves financially, nor, as many believe, by considerations of health. In sixty-one percent, the driving force was the longing to exchange the restraints and inhibitions of the city for the peace and freedom of the country. This desire was expressed in such statements as: “To seek a quiet life,” “To live close to nature,” “Realization of life’s ambition,” “Tired of city life and working in shop.” Health, either of the head, or of some member, of the family, was a factor in only thirteen percent of the cases. Eighteen percent gave economic reasons. One man vouchedsaied the information that he went for “speculation” and another “as an experiment.”

The data on tenure disclosed that thirteen percent of the farmers have been on their farms less than five years, while sixty-nine percent have been on their places over ten years, twenty-two percent over twenty years,—a fine indication of their stability. Ninety percent said that they would rather be on the farm now than in the city, eight percent expressed preference for the city, the rest were uncertain. Probably this singularly large percentage in favor of the farm is attributable not so much to smug satisfaction with prevailing farm conditions as to the realization by farmers that, with city conditions what they are, the farm is the better place for them.

To the question as to what benefit, if any, the farm brought to the farm family, ten percent said that they derived no benefit. One farmer, in disappointment, avowed that the benefits were not what he had expected, that the farm made slaves of his family; another, that it meant lots of hard work; two said that it threw them into debt.
One farmer made the simple assertion that the farm did him no harm, and one that, while it meant hard work and little pay, the farm brought good health. But by far the largest number, over eighty percent, recorded advantages in such terms as: "A more natural, healthful and honest living," "A home," "Contentment," "Independence," "Better outlook on life," "Enough to eat," "Peace of mind," "No worry about a job," "Old age insurance."

Many still picture the farm as drab and dreary and the farmer's life as crude and primitive. Yet the survey shows that seventy-six percent of the farms have sanitary plumbing; eighty-two percent, electricity; fifty-two percent, furnace heat. This is much higher than the average for American farms, owing partly to the fact that Jews had become accustomed to these conveniences in the city, and partly because some farmers cater to summer boarders as an adjunct to their farm operations. Sixty-nine percent have telephones; eighty-two percent, radios; sixty-nine percent own passenger automobiles,—again high figures.

The Jewish farmer is a man of social tendencies. Sixty-two percent of those surveyed belong to organizations; not a few, to several. These include farmers' organizations of various descriptions, synagogues, fraternal societies, lodges, labor unions and cooperative associations. Jewish farmers hold official positions in their respective communities, such as member of the school board, justice of the peace, member of fire or police department, town supervisor, deputy sheriff.

Data pertaining to farm children showed that thirty-seven percent of children over eighteen years of age have remained on the farm. About fifteen percent of those who left follow professional callings: medicine, law, engineering, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing, science, accountancy, pedagogy and social work. Forty percent had received a high school, and twenty-two percent, a college education. Some of the high school students will no doubt later enter the college group. Less than forty percent of the children in the cases studied received some form of religious instruction.

The farmers were almost unanimous in saying that they are getting along well with their non-Jewish neighbors. Over ninety percent described the relationship as good, nine percent as simply fair. "Just fine," "Excellent,"
"Splendid," "Better than with Jewish neighbors," was the tenor of the replies. Only one farmer out of the entire three hundred is not on friendly terms with his Christian neighbors.

The farmers were asked to state what they regarded as necessary for success in farming, and why, in their opinion, some Jewish farmers fail. Capital and experience, the latter in the sense of a rudimentary knowledge of farm practices, were given first place, and the lack of them was assigned as the main cause of failure. But "cooperation of wife and family," "hard work," "perseverance," "brains," "thrift," "love of the land," were also regarded as essentials. A few farmers, evidently laboring under stress, expressed themselves rather poignantly on the requisites for success: "Plenty of money and lots of hard work," "Either to have Rockefeller as a partner or to work forty-eight hours a day," "No idealism."

In view of the aroused interest on the part of various Jewish groups in a back-to-the-land movement and their advocacy of farm colonies, the opportunity was seized to obtain the reaction of the farmers themselves to colonization. The question was: "Do you believe in a form of farming where the land and equipment are owned by a colony and not by the individual farmer, and where the farm work is done under central management on a colony farm?" The arguments in favor were based on the premises that a colony would make possible the utilization of heavy machinery beyond the means of individual farmers, that it would meet the competition of the "big" farm, that it would provide security in case of incapacity, that it would enhance the opportunities for cultural life. On the other side, it was maintained that this form of settlement runs counter to the American spirit of freedom, that it robs the individual of initiative, that it dulls his incentive and destroys his independence, that it is "too difficult for farmers to work in harmony," that "even with competent management such a colony would not be better than its most incompetent individual."

Thirty-eight percent recorded themselves in the affirmative, but most of these hedged their replies with reservations
and qualifications that transform expressed approval into virtual disapproval, for example,—"Theoretically it is better to do farming cooperatively, but we have not such human material that would make it possible"; "Yes, if such could be controlled by federal or state government with individual privileges"; "It may succeed when the members are tied by a single religious or social ideal, when the members fit in physically and financially and have the backing of a strong organization (outside) or the government."

To judge by the tenor of the replies, the desire to be the possessor of one's own farmstead outweighs such benefits as may be derived from "colony" farming.

Fundamentally, all Jewish agricultural activity must revolve around the ability of the families settled on farms to wrest a livelihood from the land. No other consideration should count. The Jew who chooses farming is impelled by precisely the same considerations that move people to select other occupations,—the rewards, material or otherwise, that he expects to derive. He need not be glorified for his daring and deserves no halo for his spirit of enterprise. Neither should he be regarded with pity or condescension. Though his journey has latterly taken him over rough roads, he has, according to his own testimony, found in fair measure the compensations which he hoped to secure.

More Jews are today thinking in terms of the farm, than in any other period in the whole of American history. The disruption resulting from the withering depression has caused the eyes of the displaced worker, the dislocated white-collar man, the hard-pressed small merchant, the crowded-out professional, the groping youth, to turn to the farm. In any plan of Jewish vocational readjustment, farming must play an important part. Because adjustment in farming is costly, the drift to the land is not likely to assume the dimensions that enthusiastic proponents would wish it to attain. Many a promising farm aspirant will not be able to surmount the monetary barrier. If the
present economic uncertainties continue, this problem may present a challenge to American Jewry.

Every people in every age has regarded its farm class as vital not only for bodily sustenance, but also for physical, mental and spiritual virility. American Jewry is far too urban both in habitat and in occupational composition. Too often is the charge heard that the Jew has neither inclination nor aptitude to toil or to till. An agricultural strain contributes strength and balance to Jewish life. A sturdy, upstanding Jewish farm class is a leaven in the cause of good-will and better understanding.