

Ethnic Patriotism: Boston's Irish and Jewish Communities, 1880-1929

Author: Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/1831>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](http://escholarship@bc.edu),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2010

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Boston College
The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Department of History

ETHNIC PATRIOTISM:
BOSTON'S IRISH AND JEWISH COMMUNITIES, 1880-1929

a dissertation

by

MEAGHAN DWYER-RYAN

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2010

© copyright by MEAGHAN DWYER RYAN

2010

Ethnic Patriotism: Boston's Irish and Jewish Communities, 1880-1929

Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan

Advisor: Kevin Kenny

This dissertation examines the development of ethnic consciousness in Boston's Irish and Jewish communities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, focusing on several interrelated areas of analysis: religion, public service, ethnic nationalism, and popular culture. As the city's leading non-Protestant groups, Irish and Jews challenged ideas of Yankee superiority, arguing they could retain their ethnic culture and still be respected, patriotic citizens. Both groups consisted of a small middle class of businessmen and professionals and a large immigrant working class. From these factions emerged the competing voices of individuals who sought to find the best way to promote the compatibility of their religion, culture, and ethnic nationalist aspirations with American loyalties. After decades of trying to achieve full acceptance, Irish and Jews saw World War I as the ultimate test of ethnic patriotism; instead of conforming to a prescribed notion of Anglo-Protestant citizenship, they insisted on the centrality of their religion and culture to civic identity. Yet while their war service brought confidence in their rights as ethnic Americans, it did not bring total acceptance. By the 1920s, the Irish controlled local public life, but assumed a defensive posture toward the Yankee elite; Jews, meanwhile, were optimistic regarding interfaith cooperation, despite increasing antisemitism. This study expands on and moves beyond present studies of immigrant acculturation by adding a new comparative dimension. It examines the contested expressions of ethnic patriotism based on class, gender, and generation within two ethnic communities, demonstrating how ethnic groups utilized similar strategies to project a positive public image and articulate their place in society. It also shows

the intersection of local, national, and international concerns in the development of ethnic consciousness. Irish and Jews created hybrid ethnic cultures rooted in religion, cultural practices, and mass consumerism that would survive for decades in the city's entrenched ethnic neighborhoods.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: The Making of an Irish and a Jewish Boston, 1840-1900.....	18
Chapter 2: Irish and Jewish Political Mobilization, 1900-1917.....	68
Chapter 3: “If It Wasn’t For the Irish and the Jews”: Ethnic Patriotism on the Civic Stage, 1900-1917.....	109
Chapter 4: Waving Their Flags: The Compatibility of Ethnic Nationalism and Americanism, 1900-1917.....	151
Chapter 5: Yankee Doodle Paddy and Uncle Sammy: Ethnic Patriotism during World War I, 1914-1919.....	193
Chapter 6: Ethnic-American Assertion in the “Tribal Twenties,” 1919-1929.....	256
Conclusion: Legacies of Ethnic Patriotism in Boston.....	306
Bibliography.....	310

Acknowledgements

Many people have helped me to complete this dissertation. I would like to thank the faculty and staff of the History Department at Boston College, as well as the members of the Irish Studies Program. I am especially grateful to Kevin Kenny, my dissertation advisor, who was always available for advice and counsel and had a profound influence in shaping the project. He and my other committee members, James O'Toole and Susan L. Porter, as well as David Quigley, were invaluable for their generosity of time and insightful comments.

I would like to thank the Irish Studies Program for granting me the Irish Studies Fellowship, which allowed me time to research this project. I also received much-appreciated research grants from the Arthur & Elizabeth Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and the Clergy Discretionary Fund at Temple Israel of Boston, as well as financial support from the Citizen Scholarship Foundation of Wakefield, Massachusetts.

People at many research institutions provided exceptional assistance on this project. In particular, I wish to acknowledge Judy Garner of the American Jewish Historical Society; John Atteberry and the rest of the staff of the John J. Burns Library, Boston College; the staff of the Schlesinger Library; the staff of the Special Collections and Rare Book Room of the Boston Public Library; the staff of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives; and the staff of the Archives of the Archdiocese of Boston. I would also like to thank the members and staff of Temple Israel, especially Lisa Fagin Davis and Susan L. Porter.

My fellow graduate students in the History Department at Boston College have been a constant source of friendship, advice, and encouragement over the years. Members of the Irish Studies Writing Group, Adam Chill, Anthony Daly, Mark Doyle, and Ely Janis,

provided invaluable assistance in helping me to formulate the project. Members of the Americanist Writing Group, particularly Laura Baines-Walsh, Mimi Cowan, Ian Delahunty, Hidetaka Hirota, Bethany Waywell Jay, Jeff Malanson, Sarah Nytroe, and Greg Walsh, read multiple drafts of nearly every chapter. Their willingness to offer constructive feedback was a tremendous help. Special thanks as well to Kristen Adrien, Jill Bender, Jason Cavallari, Jen Cote, Niamh Lynch, Megan Myers, and Rebecca Rea.

My extended family and friends have provided love and support throughout my graduate career, as well as much-needed perspective and fun. My parents, Daniel and Rosemary, fostered my love of learning and provided me with a loving foundation. They, my brothers and sisters, and my nieces and nephews encouraged me along the entire process. Thank you to all of you.

Most of all, I want to thank my wonderful husband, Anthony, whose love, faith, support, and patience made it possible for me to complete this project. He deserves much more recognition than I can possibly give here. This dissertation is dedicated to him.

Introduction

In December 1917, William Cardinal O’Connell celebrated a Requiem Mass for the war dead of Boston’s Irish County Clubs. “While you are Irishmen, true to the traditions of your race,” he told his listeners, “let it be doubly true...that you are fervent, loyal, patriotic Americans.” In a like-minded statement the following June, Jacob R. Morse, president of Temple Israel, the city’s largest synagogue, praised the congregation’s multitude of wartime and community activities. “No one,” he stated confidently, “can doubt our loyalty, either as good Americans or good Jews.”¹ Such statements were common as immigrants and their American-born children attempted to reconcile ethno-religious ties with loyalty to their adopted nation. While some assimilated completely, most decried the ideology of the “melting pot” and “hyphenated Americanism.” Arguing that Americanization did not mean Anglo-Protestant conformity, they instead sought to demonstrate the compatibility of their religion, culture, and causes with American citizenship and nationality.²

This approach, which can be called “ethnic patriotism,” is crucial for understanding immigrant adjustment and the formation of group consciousness. Immigrants and their American-born offspring used the language of ethnic patriotism to further their identity and acceptance as ethnic Americans, understanding and articulating it in a variety of ways. Ethnic groups highlighted the contributions of their settlers, soldiers, and statesmen; compared their

¹ *Pilot*, 8 December 1917. *Temple Israel Bulletin*, June 1918, in Temple Israel Archives, Boston.

² Other historians have examined this process as it applies to specific ethnic groups. See Kerby A. Miller, “Class Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States: The Case of Irish-American Ethnicity,” in *Immigration Reconsidered: History Sociology and Politics*, ed. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 98-129; Thomas N. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism, 1870-1890* (New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966); Orm Overland, *Immigrant Minds, American Identities: Making the United States Home, 1870-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000); June Granatir Alexander, *Ethnic Pride, American Patriotism: Slovaks and Other New Immigrants in the Internar Era* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2004). Reed Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion, 1870-1965,” in *Faces of Community: Immigrant Massachusetts, 1860-2000*, ed. Reed Ueda and Conrad Edick Wright (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2003), vii, 14.

homeland nationalist causes to American foundation myths and the Revolution; enlisted to fight in American wars; held patriotic rallies and parades in their ethnic communities; incorporated patriotic elements into ethnic celebrations; and used patriotic language in religious, political, and cultural activities. The symbols, rituals, myths, and other expressions of ethnic patriotism provided a sense of unity for immigrant groups. They also served to demonstrate that ethnic attachments did not detract from one's loyalty to America, but instead enhanced it. Thus, the term implies more than simple acceptance of immigrant traditions—it encompasses an active embracing of both American patriotism and ethnic culture and causes.³ Yet what did ethnic patriotism mean to individuals within various ethnic groups? Who controlled the means of expression, and how did it take shape?

This study will demonstrate the central role that ethnic patriotism played in the development of group consciousness and ethnic identity in Boston's Irish and Jewish communities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁴ As the city's oldest non-Protestant groups, the Irish and Jews played an important role in challenging the Yankee notion that the only true American, particularly in Puritan Boston, had ancestors who came over on the Mayflower.⁵ Each community had an established, English-speaking middle class of businessmen and professionals, as well as a large immigrant working class. From these groups emerged the competing voices of individuals who struggled to “project a

³ Jonathan D. Sarna, “The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” *Jewish Social Studies*, n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999): 52. Gary Gerstle, *Working-Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914-1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Gerstle identifies four overlapping dimensions of Americanism: nationalist, democratic, progressive, and traditionalist.

⁴ As Timothy Meagher observes, “the history of American ethnic groups is understood best by exploring the complicated ways in which broad national trends interacted with unique local circumstances to shape ethnic adjustments.” *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 16. Other studies include Oscar Handlin's classic work, *Boston's Immigrants* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1941).

⁵ I use the term “Yankees” in this study to refer to native-born Protestant New Englanders of English descent.

positive civic image” of their loyalty to America, their faith, and their homeland in newspapers, public celebrations, and inter-group relations.⁶

Since the mid-nineteenth century, nativists feared non-Protestant immigrants overrunning America. While their service during the Civil War helped groups like the Irish and central European Jews achieve some respectability, the arrival of new waves of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, combined with economic depression, urbanization, industrialization, and labor radicalism, led to a resurgence of nativist feeling by the 1890s. In Boston, as in other industrial centers, rising immigration rates and Yankee movement to the suburbs caused the native-born population to drop significantly. By 1900, immigrants and their native-born children made up nearly seventy-five percent of the city’s overall population. Irish immigrants and Americans with at least one Irish-born parent predominated, making up forty percent of the total and fifty-six percent of the ethnic population. The next largest group consisted of Jews of Central and Eastern European birth and ancestry, at seven percent of the total and nine percent of the ethnic population. Over the next decade, high rates of immigration and natural increase for these groups, as well as Italians, Poles, French Canadians, and others, further increased the ethnic population.⁷

While the Yankee elite still controlled Boston’s intellectual, cultural, and financial institutions, they were quickly losing municipal power to ethnic politicians and businessmen. Consequently, Boston proved to be fertile ground for groups like the Immigration Restriction League (1894) and the Good Government Association (1903), which sought to

⁶ Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion,” 12-13.

⁷ United States Bureau of Census, *Twelfth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1900*; Reports 1, Population, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 798-802, 878-893; “Appendix A: The Jewish Population of Boston,” in *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna, Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 343.

reclaim control over federal and municipal policies. Over the next two decades, the belief in a morally superior Anglo-Protestant culture sparked increasing interest in American history and patriotism, as well as a greater awareness in “Progressive” civic responsibility.⁸

The entrance of the United States into World War I increased the pressure to be “One Hundred Percent American.” Yankee leaders told immigrants to remember their “first thrill of American liberty” and to fight for their adopted country. They also questioned immigrants’ “divided loyalties” based on their homeland’s relationship with American allies. Despite the devoted service of many ethnic Americans, the post-war Red Scare, labor riots, and the resumption of large-scale immigration heightened fears of the dangers that immigrants could bring into the country, culminating in the passage of the Johnson-Reed Immigration Restriction Act in 1924.⁹

Since their arrival in the early nineteenth century, the Catholic Irish “felt obliged to erect a society within a society” in Protestant Boston, historian Oscar Handlin argues, becoming “intensely aware of [their] own peculiar and exclusive identity.” By the early twentieth century, they dominated city politics and were a powerful force within the Catholic Church, labor unions, and public schools. Yet while some American-born Irish had achieved a degree of economic mobility, nativist discrimination and Catholic ideology fostered a culture of separation from other groups that future generations perpetuated. The attempts of Irish-born individuals like *Pilot* editor John Boyle O’Reilly and politicians Hugh O’Brien and

⁸ James J. Connolly, *The Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism: Urban Political Culture in Boston, 1900-1925* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

⁹ Historians have analyzed the experiences of various immigrant groups during World War I. Perhaps the best recent studies are Alexander’s *Ethnic Pride, American Patriotism* and Christopher M. Sterba’s *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Immigrants During the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2003) and which focuses on the social experiences and military service of recent immigrants. The best study of post-war nativism is John Higham’s *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, 2nd edition (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988).

Patrick Collins to establish civic and political cooperation with Yankee Democrats in the late nineteenth century gave way by the first decade of the twentieth century to the defensive strategies of American-born politicians like Martin Lomasney, John F. Fitzgerald, and James Michael Curley, who antagonized middle-class reformers and appealed to immigrant voters by emphasizing ethnic rivalries.¹⁰

Given its small size, Boston's German Jewish community did not experience the same level of discrimination in the mid-nineteenth century as the Irish. In fact, the reliance on a family-business economy allowed Jews to advance faster than other immigrant groups in America. By the late 1880s, middle-class Jewish leaders were thoroughly Americanized and many, including Rabbis Solomon Schindler and Raphael Lasker, Congressman Leopold Morse, and philanthropists Jacob and Lina Hecht, had attained prominence and influence among liberal Protestant Bostonians. The immigration of Eastern European Jews beginning in the 1880s exacerbated antisemitic feelings in the city and increased divisions within the Jewish community. Hoping to preserve their respectability, Jewish leaders led efforts to Americanize new arrivals and foster greater communal understanding. The newcomers settled in vibrant traditional working-class neighborhoods, promoting their own version of what "proper" American Jews should be, much to the dismay of the established elite. Yet as external pressures increased in the early 1900s, Boston's Jews learned to work together to promote communal unity, realizing that to Yankees at least, their religious, class, and cultural distinctions mattered little; they were all Jews.¹¹

¹⁰ Quote in Oscar Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants: A Study in Acculturation, 1790-1880*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), 176. Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 1-2. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*.

¹¹ Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Jews of Boston in Historical Perspective," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 7, 3.

To better understand ethnic acculturation in this period, one must consider the dynamic between immigrant culture and Americanization in the ongoing creation of a dual identity. Historians of immigration and ethnicity have long been concerned with how immigrants adjusted to, and identified themselves with, American society. Early “melting pot” theories argued that immigrants underwent a complete and rapid assimilation to a dominant Anglo-Protestant culture, but later studies demonstrated that ethnic groups adjusted to life in America while retaining and cultivating ethnic traditions well into the later generations. Within the last few decades, such historians as Kathleen Neils Conzen have begun to consider those “processes of cultural and social change whereby immigrants ceased to be ‘foreigners’ and yet did not become ‘One Hundred Per Cent Americans.’” Instead, they became “ethnic Americans of one kind or another.” There is much debate regarding the formation of ethnic identity, however. Werner Sollors and Lawrence H. Fuchs argue for the “invention of ethnicity,” whereby “immigrant settlers and their progeny were free to maintain...loyalty to their ancestral religions and cultures...while claiming an American identity by embracing the founding myths and participating in the political life of the nation.”¹² Gary Gerstle, Roy Rosenzweig, Lizabeth Cohen, George J. Sánchez, and others emphasize the complications that class, gender, and race engendered regarding the formation of ethnic group consciousness. By examining these multiple frameworks, Gerstle argues, one can see the “double sense of inventiveness and constraint” that shaped expressions of ethnic

¹² Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E. Pozzetta, and Rudolph J. Vecoli, “The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective from the U.S.A.,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12 (Fall 1992): 3. Werner Sollors, *The Invention of Ethnicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Lawrence Fuchs, *American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity, and the Civic Culture* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1990), 15.

identity within the context of Americanization.¹³ More recently, historians have acknowledged the ongoing importance of transnational connections in the creation of ethnic diasporas, extending beyond the nation-state.¹⁴

This study owes an obvious debt to the many excellent works written about Boston's Irish and Jewish populations, including Oscar Handlin's classic *Boston's Immigrants*, Stephan Thernstrom's *The Other Bostonians*, Thomas O'Connor's *The Boston Irish*, James J. Connolly's *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, Jonathan D. Sarna and Ellen Smith's collection of essays, *The Jews of Boston*, and Gerald Gamm's *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed*.¹⁵ It expands on and moves beyond these studies by adding a new comparative dimension. Examining the Irish and Jewish communities through a contrasting lens is useful in providing a more comprehensive view of ethnic patriotism in the Progressive Era. While the history of Boston's political affairs has been extensively covered for this period, most works only take into account Irish politicians and their battles with Yankee leaders, ignoring or diminishing relations with other groups. Those that do discuss other groups minimize their roles, particularly that of the newly politicized Jewish community. The value of a

¹³ Gary Gerstle, "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans," *Journal of American History* 84 (Sept. 1997): 524-558; Lizabeth Cohen, *Making A New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); George J. Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). Gerstle, *Working-Class Americanism*, 546. See also Russell Kazal, "Revisiting Assimilation: The Rise, Fall, and Reappraisal of a Concept in American Ethnic History," *American Historical Review* 100 (April 1995): 437-471; James R. Barrett, "Americanization from the Bottom Up: Immigration and the Remaking of the Working Class in the United States, 1880-1930" *Journal of American History* 79.3 (December 1992): 996-1020; Barrett, and David Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16.3 (Spring 1997): 3-44.

¹⁴ See Kevin Kenny, "Diaspora and Comparison," *Journal of American History* 90 (June 2003): 134-162.

¹⁵ Other studies include Dennis P. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983); Damien Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005); William Alan Braverman, "The Ascent of Boston's Jews, 1630-1918" (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1990).

comparative study is that it helps to overcome the tendencies toward exceptionalism that sometimes occur in analyses of single ethnic groups. Thus, this dissertation seeks to place the city's Irish and Jewish leaders in conversation with each other to better examine the important issues of the day and how such concerns influenced the development of ethnic group consciousness.¹⁶

I chose to conduct a study of Boston's Irish and Jewish communities because the groups demonstrate many valuable points of contrast and comparison, particularly in this time period. Although the numerical strength and political power of the city's Irish population dwarfed that of the Jews, the Jewish community made up for its small size and diversity by the ability of a significant number of individuals to gain influence and prominence in business and civic affairs. Another important distinction is that of multiple identities. Boston's Irish residents had ethnic, cultural, and religious identities that sprang from a common place—Ireland—and a shared past in that place. Their nationalism was a natural extension of those multiple identities, even though religiously, they were divided among a small number of Protestants and a large number of Catholics, the latter of whom shared their faith and their church with Italian, Eastern European, and French Canadian immigrants. Jews, conversely, came from a variety of geographical and political

¹⁶ Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 9. Various essays discuss the benefits of doing comparative history, including Raymond Grew, "A Case for Comparing Histories," *American Historical Review*, 85 (Oct. 1980): 763-778; Kenny, "Diaspora and Comparison"; George M. Frederickson, "Comparative History," in *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, ed. Michael Kammen (Ithaca, 1980): 457-473; Peter Kolchin, "Comparing American History," *Reviews in American History*, 10 (Dec. 1982): 64-81. In addition to Jacobson, *Special Sorrows*; Gerstle, *Working-Class Americanism*; and Sterba, *Good Americans*, several studies serve as useful models for doing comparative ethnic history, particularly for Boston, including Gerald Gamm, *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999); John F. Stack, *International Conflict in an American City: Boston's Irish, Italians and Jews, 1935-1944* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979). See also Hasia Diner, *Hungering for America: Italian, Irish and Jewish Foodways in the Age of Migration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001).

“homelands,” where they practiced religion in different ways, had different cultural traditions, spoke different languages, and had different educational and economic opportunities. While they all saw themselves as Jews, the term had multiple definitions, particularly in the United States, where synagogues were so autonomous (in sharp contrast to the Catholic Church) and cultural organizations so linked to religion and national origin. Zionism was not a shared identity tied to place or national origin in the same way as Irish nationalism. Instead, the idea of Palestine as a homeland was a Utopian vision born out of past persecution and a desire among traditional Jews for a messiah.¹⁷

Despite these differences, as Boston’s largest and most influential non-Protestant groups, the Irish Catholic and Jewish communities are comparable in many ways. Individuals in each group engaged in similar strategies to prove their ethnic patriotism, anxious to demonstrate the compatibility of their culture and American loyalties. Irish Catholic and Jewish leaders also shared the same concerns regarding acculturation, respectability, and power for the group as a whole. Finally, each group faced similar challenges in overcoming fractures within the community caused by class, culture, and immigrant generation.

In fact, to fully comprehend how individuals and groups understand and articulate their ethnic American identities, one must examine these “internal debates and struggles” within the group, particularly those caused by class, gender, regional origin, religion, and immigrant generation. As the Conzen group argues, “the symbolic umbrella of the ethnic culture” needed to cover as many members of the group as possible to promote ethnic advancement and defend the compatibility of ethnic culture with American ideals. By

¹⁷ Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2003), 2-3; Jacobson, *Special Sorrows*, 8-10.

examining the similarities and differences, as well as the interplays, between the various factions in the Irish and Jewish communities, I hope to gain a better perspective on how different groups overcame internal class, cultural, and religious tensions that could complicate the formation of a cohesive communal identity.¹⁸

To gain that perspective, this study focuses on five interrelated areas of analysis: class, religion, nationalism, politics, and popular culture. As Kevin Kenny writes, “Far from hindering assimilation, the development of an ethnic identity expressed through a rich institutional and associational life was the primary means through which the American Irish assimilated.” The same can be said regarding American Jews. Sarna argues that Jews in the United States engaged in an ongoing effort to “interweave their ‘Judaism’ with their ‘Americanism’ in an attempt to fashion for themselves some unified, ‘synthetic’ whole.”¹⁹

Various sources are integral to understanding and comparing the role of ethnic patriotism in Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities. The ethnic and mainstream press, for example, provided an important lens into ethnic communal life, detailing the activities of religious organizations, cultural societies, and social clubs. The *Pilot*, *Jewish Advocate*, and *Boston Globe*, among other newspapers, discussed the local, national, and international issues and events that concerned Irish Catholics and Jews in the city. As Robert Singerman notes, “Much of the theological and ideological battle for Jewish souls in nineteenth century America was played out through the Jewish press.” This is true for Irish Catholic newspapers

¹⁸ Conzen, et al, “Invention of Ethnicity,” 5-6. The best studies of Irish generational conflict are Meagher, *Inventing Irish America* and David Emmons, *The Butte Irish: Class and Ethnicity in an American Mining Town, 1875-1925* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1989). Jewish case studies include Ewa Morawska, *Insecure Prosperity: Small-Town Jews in Industrial America, 1890-1940* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996) and Gerald Sorin, “Mutual Contempt, Mutual Benefit: The Strained Encounter Between German and Eastern European Jews in America, 1880-1920,” *American Jewish History* 81 (Autumn 1993): 34-59.

¹⁹ Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish* (New York: Pearson Education, Inc., 2000), 148–149. Sarna, “Cult of Synthesis,” 52.

as well. Analyzing newspapers as creators of public discourse is vital for understanding changes in ethnic and patriotic language and behavior.²⁰

Also significant are the papers of ethnic leaders and the records of communal institutions. Middle-class men and women often articulated the language of patriotism and ethnic loyalty to their fellow Irish and Jews, necessitating “a careful and judicious illumination” of their roles in the community. As Victor Greene stresses, while such individuals often had different methods, goals, and conceptions in articulating group identity than working-class immigrants, they often imposed their own views of proper behavior, language, and respectability on the entire group.²¹

Chapter One discusses the formation of an Irish and Jewish middle class in Boston in the nineteenth century. Irish Catholic and Jewish leaders built vast networks of religious organizations, philanthropic institutions, cultural societies, and political clubs within the ethnic community to aid group adjustment and acceptance. Such support was crucial, they believed, for promoting upward mobility, ensuring respectability, and proving the compatibility of ethnic culture and religion with American ideals. Religious institutions, in particular, served as neighborhood community centers, providing information on Americanization, education, and employment along with spiritual guidance. As the leader of Boston’s Catholic population—which included Irish, French-Canadian, Italian, and Eastern European groups—Archbishop John Joseph Williams provided spiritual and secular

²⁰ Robert Singerman, “The American Jewish Press, 1823-1983; A Bibliographic Survey of Research and Studies,” *American Jewish History* LXXIII, No. 4 (June 1984): 422, 423. Francis Robert Walsh, “The *Boston Pilot*: A Newspaper for the Irish Immigrant, 1829-1908” (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1968);

²¹ Victor R. Greene, *American Immigrant Leaders, 1800-1910: Marginality and Identity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), 1987, x. See also Miller, “Class Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States.” Various studies examine the public activities of middle-class ethnics, including Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

guidance over a tremendous number of people. He sought to keep the archdiocese conservative and understated, favoring conciliation over Catholic visibility. His successor, William Cardinal O’Connell, however, took a combative, separatist approach, claiming that “the Puritan has passed; the Catholic remains.”²²

Jewish religious leadership was shared between Reform and Orthodox rabbis. Although the minority, assimilated Jews, such as Rabbi Solomon Schindler and Rabbi Raphael Lasker, nonetheless determined policies for much of the period under examination. In addition, they held visible positions of authority in the larger community in business, politics, and society, and tended to wield more influence with non-Jews. In the early twentieth century, their successors, Rabbi Harry Levi and Rabbi M.M. Eichler, would build on their accomplishments, often working with Protestants to facilitate interfaith understanding. Even so, Orthodox leaders, especially Rabbe Moshe Margolies, held more influence with the large Eastern European population.²³

Irish and Jewish Americans utilized the language of ethnic patriotism in a variety of public arenas that might be loosely grouped under the term “public culture.” Public culture incorporates both leadership efforts and grassroots activities that sought to shape the image of Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities in the eyes of the mainstream population.²⁴

Chapter Two examines the ways in which Irish and Jews used politics (both on the local and national levels), public education, the labor movement, and municipal housekeeping to educate immigrants, gain greater communal rights, and effect unity in the Progressive Era.

²² Cardinal O’Connell, quoted in James M. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O’Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1992), 5.

²³ “National Flags Unfurled Before Temple Israel,” Unid. newspaper clipping, undated, Temple Israel Archives.

²⁴ Thomas Bender, “Whole and Parts: The Need for Synthesis in American History” *Journal of American History* 73.1 (June 1986): 126.

Far from being undemocratic, they argued, such mobilization demonstrated their desire to become active, responsible citizens of their adopted city.

Ethnic groups also used the public arena to establish what Reed Ueda calls “a creative laboratory” for intergroup relations “where they could work out the intermeshing of particularistic group characteristics with a wider Bostonian and American public culture.”²⁵ Prominent as they were not only in politics, but also in the schools, police force, labor unions, and Catholic Church, the Irish were often the first “Americans” any new immigrant encountered. Consequently, other ethnic groups had to adjust not only to a prevailing Anglo-American culture that was becoming increasingly antagonistic toward immigrants, but also an Irish-influenced municipal structure. As such, it is important to examine Irish uses of patriotic language within this newfound political dominance, and how other ethnic groups—particularly Boston’s Jews—not only responded to these changes in leadership, but also articulated their own place in the civic arena. Jewish political activists attempted to bridge the divide between Irish politicians and Yankee reformers in their attempts to gain influence, but faced their own challenges trying to unify the assimilated German elite and newly politicized Eastern European immigrants, who had very different ideas concerning the role of ethnic causes in political mobilization.

Ever concerned with image, Irish and Jews also used the public arena to articulate the compatibility of their loyalty to their country, their religion, and their ethnicity. Chapter Three discusses Irish and Jewish celebrations of civic holidays and ethnic festivals in the pre-war era. Such “community rituals” were designed to exhibit ethnic pride and demographic

²⁵ Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion,” 12.

strength, as well as devotion to America. Through these events, Irish and Jewish Bostonians expanded the meaning of civic identity to make room for ethnic culture and contributions.²⁶

Chapter Three also explores the ways in which popular culture and consumerism shaped and transformed ethnic identity in this period. Immigrants and their offspring were eager participants in and creators of popular culture, sports, and mass entertainment.²⁷ The consumption of store-bought goods and American cultural practices allowed immigrant men and women to gain a “sense of belonging” in their adopted land in a way that was much easier to comprehend than the English language or voting laws. At the same time, however, mass culture often became a community divider, as individuals achieved middle-class status and sought to downplay popular ethnic stereotypes and ban controversial works.²⁸

Chapter Four examines the ways in which ethnic nationalism informed the actions of Boston’s Irish and Jews in the years before World War I. The themes of political and religious exile, as articulated by Kerby A. Miller, Matthew Frye Jacobson, and Allon Gal, fueled the participation of many Irish and Jewish Americans in the international Irish nationalist and Zionist movements. For many ethnic nationalists, Thomas Brown and Eric Foner argue, the goal of independence for or the creation of a homeland became an example

²⁶ Meagher, *Inventing Irish America*, 14.

²⁷ Gerstle, “Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans,” 544.

²⁸ Various historians have examined consumerism and popular culture in the creation of ethnic identity. See Marilyn Halter, *Shopping for Identity: The Marketing of Ethnicity* (New York: Schocken Books, 2000); Cohen, *Making A New Deal*; Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will*; Kathy Lee Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); Andrew Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption and the Search for American Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990); and William H.A. Williams, *'Twas Only an Irishman's Dream: The Image of Ireland and the Irish in American Popular Song Lyrics, 1800-1920* (Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

of American patriotism. Far from dividing loyalties, such efforts demonstrated immigrants' love of American liberty and democracy and proved they were not a conquered people.²⁹

At the same time, ethnic nationalism was the cause of much dissent within the communities. Most middle-class Irish Americans were constitutional nationalists who believed Home Rule was the most practical solution for Ireland, but many in the immigrant working class felt military force was the only way Britain would give up control. Many immigrants and American-born Jews alike argued that the United States was their new "promised land," but others believed the establishment of a homeland in Palestine was the only solution to the "Jewish Problem," and dedicated themselves to its fruition. The articulation of self-determination for small nations during World War I produced mass involvement in both struggles, but, while Zionists gained recognition at the Versailles Peace Conference, the Irish did not. By the mid-1920s, the creation of the Irish Free State in 1922 satisfied most Irish-American goals for respectability, even as Arab revolts in Palestine and increased antisemitism unified Jews regarding the need for a Jewish state.³⁰

In examining the development of ethnic patriotism, it is also important to consider its reception by Protestant Bostonians, or "Yankees." While some Americans were willing to acknowledge ethnic contributions and aid Americanization, others were adamant that immigrants leave political attachments to the homeland behind. As President Woodrow

²⁹ Kerby A. Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Jacobson, *Special Sorrows*; Allon Gal, "The Mission Motif in American Zionism, 1898-1948," *American Jewish History* 75.4 (June 1986), 370. Thomas N. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism, 1870-1890* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966); Eric Foner, "Class, Ethnicity, and Radicalism in the Gilded Age: The Land League and Irish-America," in Foner, *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 150-200.

³⁰ Two of the best studies of Irish-American nationalism and American Zionism for this period are Michael Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism: The Friends of Irish Freedom, 1916-1935* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005); and Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2003).

Wilson maintained, the “infallible test of a genuine American” was that “when he votes or when he acts or when he fights, his heart and his thought are nowhere but in the center of the emotions and the purposes and the policies of the United States.”³¹ Chapter Five discusses Irish and Jewish attempts to challenge the idea of “hyphenated Americanism” during World War I. Determined to prove that Irish Catholicism and Judaism were central to American loyalties, Irish and Jews volunteered to serve in the military and on the homefront, striving to ensure that their groups received the respect they deserved. At war’s end, they were confident that their war service would win them unquestioned acceptance as respected citizens, as well as increased tolerance for ethnic distinctions and nationalist causes.

By the early 1920s, the resumption of large-scale immigration and fears that America was being overrun by “less desirable races” led to increased calls for Americanization and restriction based on national quotas. Chapter Six examines the efforts of Irish and Jewish leaders to challenge these developments. They advocated a pluralist view of American culture, in which all groups regardless of national origin were accorded the same rights and pointed to their longstanding dedication to democratic principles and their service during the war to demonstrate their integral role in Boston and America. Irish Catholics and Jews also engaged in efforts to increase interfaith understanding and smooth class and ethnic tensions.

For many ethno-religious leaders, fostering ethnic consciousness was a vital aspect of the Americanization process. Through religious education, institutional life, and mainstream cultural practices, immigrants and their offspring found a compromise between traditional and American culture, creating a new hybrid culture in their attempts to negotiate between

³¹ Woodrow Wilson, quoted in G. Kurt Piehler, *Remembering War the American Way* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 79.

the two. In addition, through mass media like radio and the movies, Irish and Jewish Americans transmitted and popularized “authentic” ethnic identities to American audiences.

Historians have often viewed Boston as an ethnic battlefield, stressing the sharp religious, class, and political differences that divided groups since the nineteenth century. The enmity between the Irish and Yankees is well known, as are conflicts among working-class immigrants. Utilizing this comparative framework, however, one can see that despite their differences, the strategies that many individuals in Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities used to promote their acceptance in America were quite similar. Individuals were aware of the efforts of other ethnic groups and borrowed ideas for their own use. Jews, for example, gained confidence from Irish demonstrations of ethnic nationalism and political consciousness. At the same time, looking at the two groups pinpoints important differences between them. Irish politicians and clergy sought to surpass their Yankee and ethnic neighbors and maintained a defensive, separatist attitude; Jewish leaders utilized public culture to gain greater understanding through cooperative interfaith initiatives. Examining these similarities and differences provides much insight into understanding the legacies of ethnic patriotism in American society.

Chapter 1: The Making of an Irish and a Jewish Boston, 1840-1900

All that was good and beautiful in our dear native land, we should cherish forever. We have her faith and her honor to preserve and to make respected. We have sympathy with her trials and her efforts to be free. But we cannot, as honest men, band together in American politics under the shadow of an Irish flag.

—John Boyle O'Reilly, editor of the *Pilot*, regarding the convention of a proposed “Irish” party in Cleveland, Ohio, 1873³²

We must help [immigrants] become good citizens, so we may find among them a Morse, who was an honor to this day as its Congressman, and Hechts, Shumans...and others who are leaders among Boston's great merchants...The Christians of this land must exercise toleration toward them, and not believe they are bad because they have been driven from their homes. We must help them to become respected and reputable citizens of this city.

—Edward Goulston, President of Temple Adath Israel, address at the dedication of the Hebrew Sheltering Home, 1892³³

Waves of immigrants from Ireland, Germany, and other parts of Europe poured into Boston during the nineteenth century, leading to massive changes in the city's economic, political, and geographic makeup. As it transformed from a predominantly Yankee town into a multi-ethnic city, many Yankees saw immigrants' numbers, poverty, religious beliefs, and persistent attachment to foreign culture as a threat to a republican way of life, but immigrants attempted to reconfigure the meaning of American citizenship to incorporate their ethnic ideals. Even as nativist attacks gave way to attempts at understanding after the Civil War, tensions remained, particularly in the political and social arenas. Nevertheless, immigrants were confident that acceptance eventually would prevail.

Boston's Irish and Jewish communities were shaped within this context of societal change. As the city's largest non-Protestant groups in the nineteenth century, Irish Catholic and Central European Jewish immigrants were instrumental in helping redefine what it meant to be a “Bostonian” in this period. Ethnic leaders created networks of communal institutions, including religious organizations, philanthropic institutions, cultural societies,

³² Quoted in James Jeffrey Roche, *Life of John Boyle O'Reilly* (New York: Cassell Publishing Company, 1891), 141.

³³ Quoted in Arthur Mann, *Growth and Achievement, Temple Israel 1854-1954* (Boston, 1954), 33.

and political clubs, to aid group adjustment. Such support was crucial, they believed, for promoting upward mobility and group respectability, as well as proving the compatibility of ethnic culture, religion, and Americanism.

Yet even as economic mobility and increasing demographic strength gave these groups the influence they needed to gain a voice in city affairs, upper class “Brahmins” closed ranks, erecting barriers against the newcomers in social and financial institutions. Irish Catholics and Jews fought to make room for their groups in the city’s Protestant society, seeking acceptance as Americans, but keeping their culture and religion intact. Politicians, businessmen, clergy, and even ethnic nationalists tried to serve group interests and be models of proper citizenry for their immigrant constituents by working with their Yankee counterparts, rather than against them.

By the 1890s, Boston’s Irish and Jews had gained respect in certain arenas, but they were still not fully accepted as Americans. In addition, new waves of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe led to new calls to restrict immigration, fueled by Anglo-Saxon notions of superiority. In response, Irish and Jews defended their patriotism through historical scholarship, mass culture, public service, and, in 1898, support for the Spanish-American War. Even so, while the decade’s end saw greater conciliation among the city’s ethnic groups, political and cultural problems remained.

Immigrants in the Puritan City, 1820-1870

Boston was a fairly homogeneous city before the nineteenth century. The Puritan stronghold was not welcoming to outsiders, and the few who came quickly assimilated into the dominant Anglo Protestant society. The need to fill the labor demands of the region’s

massive construction projects in the 1820s and the expanding textile, railroad, and shipbuilding industries in the 1830s and 1840s brought large numbers of Catholic Irish immigrants for the first time. With the onset of the Great Famine in 1845, impoverished Irish peasants flooded Boston, swelling the population from 2,000 in 1820 to 35,000 in 1850. They were joined in the 1840s and 1850s by successive waves of immigrants from various parts of Europe, including small numbers of Jews fleeing from religious persecution and economic hardship in the central German provinces and Austria.³⁴

Most Irish and Jewish immigrants started off on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder in Boston. The impoverished Irish, in particular, had few skills and little education, so men worked mainly as day laborers, while unmarried women found employment in domestic service or the growing needle trades. German Jews overwhelmingly became peddlers and Polish Jews worked as tailors; both groups aspired to open small businesses, taking advantage of the opportunities offered by a growing consumer marketplace. For the most part, married Irish and Jewish women did not work outside the home, but instead took in boarders or helped out in the family shop. Like other working-class residents, Irish and Jewish immigrants lived in crowded, low-rent tenement neighborhoods in the South or North End, and were highly mobile, moving frequently in accordance with their finances and employment status. Boston was often the second or third stop for immigrants after

³⁴ Oscar Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1941), 1-53, 177, 243; Thomas H. O'Connor, *The Boston Irish: A Political History* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1995), 35, 1-31; Michael P. Quinlin, *Irish Boston: A Lively Look at Boston's Colorful Irish Past* (Guilford, CT: Globe Pequot Press, 2004), 1-29; Ellen Smith, "Strangers and Sojourners: The Jews of Colonial Boston," in *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna, Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 21-43; Stephen G. Mostov, "A Sociological Portrait of German Jewish Immigrants in Boston: 1845-1861," *American Jewish Studies Review* (1978): 127-130.

London, Quebec, New York, or Philadelphia, so most had some familiarity with the language and culture upon arrival.³⁵

Although immigrants retained strong ties to the homeland, they understood that economic opportunity was in America and were determined to make Boston their home. Irish and Jews established churches and synagogues, benevolent societies, schools, and hospitals to provide spiritual support and charitable aid. Such organizations also helped foster group consciousness in a city that was less than welcoming to non-Protestants, thus paving the way for future arrivals.

The most important Irish institution was the Catholic Church. The Boston Diocese was established in 1808 with a “mere handful” of French, British, and Irish parishioners in scattered churches stretching from Maine to Rhode Island. With the Irish migration, however, the diocese grew to include nearly 46,000 Catholics in Boston alone by 1860 (twenty-six percent of the city’s total population). The Irish soon dominated not just the pews but also the hierarchy, giving the Catholic Church in Boston a decidedly Hibernian character. The parish church influenced almost every aspect of immigrant life, serving both as a religious and a community center. Boston’s bishops, together with an army of priests and nuns, created a vast network of institutions to serve their Irish constituency, which included churches, schools, convents, and cemeteries. In 1829, Bishop Benedict Joseph Fenwick (1825-1844) established a weekly newspaper, the *Jesuit*, which Irish-born publisher Patrick Donahoe later bought and renamed the *Pilot*.³⁶

³⁵ William Braverman, “The Ascent of Boston’s Jews, 1630-1918” (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1990), 41.
³⁶ Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants*, 128, “Table II: Population of Boston and its Environs,” 239. Patrick J. Blessing, “Irish,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1980), 351. Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston in the Various Stages of Its Development, 1604 to 1943, Vol. III, 1966-1943* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944).

Unlike the hierarchical Catholic Church, American synagogues were autonomous organizations established by lay leaders who set ritual practices and hired clergy.³⁷ Boston's first synagogue, Congregation Ohabei Shalom, was founded in 1842 as a "permanent institution where [Jews] could observe life-cycle events and worship, study, and socialize as a community." Members hired a "hazan" (reader) and formed a mutual aid society, the Chevra Ahabas Achim (Society of Brotherly Love). Five years later, the congregation purchased land for a cemetery in East Boston, and, by 1852, they raised enough funds to build a small two-story synagogue on Warren (now Warrenton) Street in the South End.³⁸ Even so, religious, cultural, and economic differences between "Polanders" from northeastern German provinces and "Bayers" from the southern regions soon led to disagreements within Ohabei Shalom and the establishment of two breakaway congregations for the city's two thousand Jews: Congregation Adath Israel in 1854 and Congregation Mishkan Israel in 1858. Like Catholic churches, synagogues and burial societies were responsible for meeting members' spiritual as well as communal, educational, and charitable needs. Ohabei Shalom and Mishkan Tefila established daily Hebrew schools to teach German, Hebrew, Jewish history, and the Bible in 1858 and 1863 respectively; Adath Israel operated a Sabbath School.³⁹

³⁷ European synagogues were arms of a religious hierarchy, but America had few rabbis and no such structure. Sarna, *American Judaism: A History* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2004), 72-73; Leon A. Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue* (Boston: Brandeis University Press), 24-25.

³⁸ Solomon Schindler, *Israelites in Boston: A Tale Describing the Development of Judaism in Boston, Preceded by the Jewish Calendar for the Next Decade* (Boston: Berwick & Smith, [1889]), Chapter 1. Jeannette S. and Abraham E. Nizel, *Congregation Ohabei Shalom: Pioneers of the Boston Jewish Community* (Boston, 1982), 6-8. Albert Ehrenfried, *A Chronicle of Boston Jewry* (Boston, 1963), 332-345; Smith, "'Israelites in Boston,' 1840-1880," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 48-50; Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009), 2-8. Chevra Ahabath Achim membership lists, in Albert Ehrenfried Papers, Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

³⁹ Jick, 21-27; Jack Wertheimer, "Overview: The Synagogue in America," in *The American Synagogue: A Sanctuary Transformed*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 7; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 34; David Kaufman, "Temples in the American Athens: A History of the Synagogues of

As long as ethnic populations remained small, Protestants were fairly tolerant of their presence. As Irish immigration increased, however, nativists began to strike out against Catholics as the tools of a foreign prelate who sought to undermine America's sacred liberties. The worst episode of violence occurred in 1834, when nativist mobs burned an Ursuline convent in nearby Charlestown. By the 1850s, discrimination was politicized with the establishment of the American (or "Know-Nothing") Party, and nativist hostility became so widespread that it produced a siege mentality in the minds of Boston's Irish residents, creating a "culture of separation" perpetuated through the generations.⁴⁰ The *Pilot*, referred to as the "Irishman's Bible," became one of their best defenses against nativism, providing news from home and help adjusting to life in America. Donahoe and his editors urged readers to become citizens and register to vote as Democrats, arguing that they could "reach their economic, social, and political fulfillment in America without suffering any sense of conflicting loyalties."⁴¹

Conversely, Protestants did not consider the small Jewish population (125 families in 1850) threatening. Unlike the Catholic Church, which was under the control of a foreign

Boston," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 175; "History of Jewish Congregations," *Jewish Advocate*, 15 December 1939.

⁴⁰ As Handlin notes, "In every contact, the group acted apart from other sections of the community and became intensely aware of its peculiar and exclusive identity" (Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants*, 128, 176). Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 1-2; Jenny Goldstein, "Transcending Boundaries: Boston's Catholics and Jews, 1929-1965" (B.A. thesis, Brandeis University, 2001), 2-3; Thomas H. O'Connor, *Bibles, Brahmins and Bosses: A Short History of Boston* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 22. Prominent Yankees denounced such incidents, but the state appointed a committee to investigate convents in 1844.

⁴¹ Victor R. Greene, *American Immigrant Leaders, 1800-1910: Marginality and Identity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), 34-36. See also Francis Robert Walsh, "The *Boston Pilot*: A Newspaper for the Irish Immigrant, 1829-1908" (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1968); Ruth-Ann M. Harris and Donald M. Jacobs, ed., *The Search for Missing Friends: Irish Immigrant Advertisements Placed in the Boston Pilot, 1857-1860, vol. 1-4* (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1989-1995). Editors included Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Rev. John Roddan, Rev. Joseph Finotti, and John Boyle O'Reilly. The *Pilot* was the foremost American Catholic newspaper; sales increased from 500 copies in 1837 to 50,000 in 1850. By 1872, 100,000 copies were sold nationally. Donahoe was also Boston's most prominent Irish businessman; he ran a travel agency and immigrant savings bank and engaged in philanthropic activities.

prelate, American synagogues were more like Protestant churches, run by lay members. Also, intellectual Protestants who shared their Puritan ancestors' appreciation of Hebrew learning viewed Jews as a curiosity. In 1844, Reverend E.M.P. Wells attended Rosh Hashanah services at Ohabei Shalom. Impressed by worshippers' piety, and partly hoping they might eventually convert to Christianity, Wells referred to members as "brothers, as friends, as fellows." Similarly, the 1854 *Boston Almanac* described Adath Israel's South End synagogue as "tastefully decorated and pleasing in its appearance," noting the "ancient" ceremonies with interest. Even so, Jews did face some legal discrimination; rabbis could not legally perform marriages until 1892, and Massachusetts' strict "blue laws" preventing Sunday labor forced business owners to work on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, if they wanted to compete.⁴²

By the Civil War, Irish and Jewish immigrants had weathered the first stormy decades of American settlement. Although discrimination continued, historian John Higham observes that the war "inaugurated an era of immense industrial, agricultural, and geographical expansion." For a country greatly in need of soldiers, immigrants "seemed a national blessing." Those who did not enlist worked at armories, shipyards, and factories, gaining experience in trade unionism. The war also provided immigrant entrepreneurs in retail and clothing manufacturing with the opportunity to seek their fortunes.⁴³

Above all, the war gave immigrants the chance to demonstrate loyalty to their adopted land. Although Irish voters had overwhelmingly supported Democrat Stephen Douglas in the 1860 presidential election, when it came to the cause of the Union, the *Pilot*

⁴² "Appendix A: Jewish Population of Boston," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 343; Ehrenfried, *Chronicle of Boston Jewry*, 337-338. Mostov, "A Sociological Portrait of German Jewish Immigrants," 127-130. Smith, "Israelites in Boston," 53; "Work for Boston Judges," *New York Times*, 20 November 1886.

⁴³ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 14. O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 92-93; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 87-90.

declared, “Irish adopted citizens are true, to a man, to the Constitution.” They turned the “fighting Irishman” stereotype into a positive by volunteering in “highly visible numbers, self-consciously waving their green flag along with the Stars and Stripes.” Donahoe and other leaders recruited volunteers for the state’s Ninth and Twenty-Eighth Regiments, giving each soldier a gold piece as they departed for the front. The regiments also highlighted their Irishness; the Twenty-Eighth’s motto was “Faugh-a-Ballah” (“Clear the Way”), while the Ninth’s flag read, “Thy sons by adoption; thy firm supporters and defenders from duty, affection and choice.” As symbols of this new acceptance, Governor John Andrew declared that the patriotism of the “adopted citizens” would long be remembered and honored, while Harvard University granted Bishop Fitzpatrick an honorary degree in 1861.⁴⁴ The number of Jewish soldiers was much smaller than the Irish, but they still served in greater proportion than their total population. At least 227 Jews served in state regiments, and several became officers. Jews were anxious to display patriotism in other ways as well. When President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated in 1865, for example, Boston synagogues participated “as equals in the rites of national mourning.” Like their neighbors, they draped their houses of worship in black crepe, closed their businesses, and held memorial services. They also said Kaddish for the president.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Edward Wakin, *Enter the Irish American* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973), 119. William J. Laubenstein, “John Boyle O’Reilly” (unpublished manuscript, 1973), 226, in John Boyle O’Reilly Papers, John J. Burns Library, Boston College; O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 86-93. Richard J. Carwardine, “Lincoln, Evangelical Religion, and American Political Culture in the Era of the Civil War,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association* (Winter 1997), www.historycooperative.org/journals/jala/18.1/carwardine.html, accessed 15 February 2010. For more on the regiments, see Christian G. Samito, *Commanding Boston’s Irish Ninth: The Civil War Letters of Colonel Patrick R. Guiney, Ninth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1998). See also Jay P. Dolan, *Immigrant Church: New York’s Irish and German Catholics, 1815-1865* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992).

⁴⁵ Temple Israel Board Minutes, 18 April 1865, in Temple Israel Archives; Sarna, *American Judaism*, 122; *Boston Traveller*, April 20 1865.

Such evidence of patriotism and loyalty furthered the acceptance of Irish and Jews in Boston after the war. While the world of Yankee commerce and finance remained closed to outsiders, the conflict had opened new areas of business to immigrant entrepreneurs, including the shoe and textile industries. This group was joined by new immigrants, who increasingly came as family groups or as part of a chain migration. By 1880, Boston had more than 70,000 Irish-born residents, making up more than half of the city's foreign-born population, which was larger than in any other American urban center. By 1900, there were 72,000 Irish born, as well as thousands more who were of Irish parentage or descent. Jewish immigration also increased, shifting from central to eastern Europe by the 1880s, due to newly restrictive government policies in the Russian Empire. As a result, the Jewish population grew from 5,000 in 1880 to 20,000 in 1895.⁴⁶

As in the past, most of these new immigrants found employment in area factories. A family wage economy, along with membership in benevolent associations and labor unions, allowed many to achieve some economic mobility. Also, the ethnic community required doctors, lawyers, grocers, and saloonkeepers, and contractors, ensuring the creation of a “dynamic urban ethnic marketplace” where those who provided such services earned the “enviable reputation of being men of wealth and standing.”⁴⁷ The Irish remained heavily concentrated in unskilled labor, domestic service, and the needle trades, but managed to

⁴⁶ Marcus L. Hansen, “The Second Colonization of New England,” *New England Quarterly* (October 1929), 553; Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants*, 246; Smith, “Israelites in Boston,” 52. For population, see United States Census (1880, 1900); “Appendix A: Jewish Population of Boston,” 343. To compare numbers with other cities, see Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish: A History* (New York: Longman, 2000); Hasia R. Diner, *A Time for Gathering: The Second Migration, 1820-1880* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Gerald Sorin, *A Time for Building: The Third Migration, 1880-1920* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).

⁴⁷ Dennis P. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 82.

send remittances back to Ireland.⁴⁸ Although businesses were difficult to sustain due to economic conditions and latent discrimination by Yankee creditors and real estate agents, enough had survived and flourished by the 1880s that the middle class grew from ten to thirty-eight percent of the overall Irish population.⁴⁹ Boston's Jews experienced even greater economic success, particularly in retail and manufacturing. Jewish men and women, like the Irish, married within the community. The small population and integrated business networks aided group advancement; as earlier arrivals, who had begun as peddlers and clerks, became successful retailers, merchants, and bankers, they provided others with charitable aid and employment. By the 1880s, there was a stable working class and many established businessmen.⁵⁰

Living patterns reflected this upward mobility. While new arrivals continued to live in the North End slums, working-class families increasingly moved to better tenements in the "old" South End and West End. White-collar workers, entrepreneurs, and professionals moved to triple-deckers or bought single-family homes in the "streetcar suburbs"; the Irish moved to Dorchester, South Boston, Jamaica Plain, and Charlestown, while Jews moved to

⁴⁸ American remittances sent through private channels and communal organizations totaled £52 million (\$260 million) between 1848 and 1900 (Kenny, *American Irish*, 139). Diner, *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 43-105.

⁴⁹ Ryan estimates that 27% of Irish small businesses folded between 1880 and 1890, which could not be "attributed entirely to weaknesses in Irish character, fluctuations in the market economy, or lack of business acumen" (*Beyond the Ballot Box*, 84). Timothy J. Meagher cites a similar study of social mobility among Worcester's Irish shoe workers, noting that most Irish who established a shop soon went back to the shoe industry, unable to make a profit. See *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 48-49. For Irish in other New England cities, see, for example, Brian C. Mitchell, *The Paddy Camps: The Irish of Lowell, 1821-61* (Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Alan Dawley, *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976).

⁵⁰ Smith, "Israelites in Boston," 52-61; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 80-120, 162; Mostov, "Sociological Portrait of German Jewish Immigrants," 137-150; Burton Samuel Kliman, "Jewish Brahmins of Boston: A Study of the German Jewish Immigrant Experience, 1860-1900" (Senior honors thesis: Brandeis University, 1978), 172-173.

the “new” South End and Roxbury. A few wealthy entrepreneurs from both groups moved to the Protestant-dominated Back Bay.⁵¹

Ethnic newspapers emphasized the importance not only of economic mobility for individual and group success, but also communal leadership. The “heroes of the community” were those who helped their countrymen through charitable efforts, club activities, or political accomplishments. Both the *Pilot* and the *Hebrew Observer*, published by Rabbi Solomon Schindler from 1883 to 1886, regularly featured articles about such communal leaders as John Boyle O’Reilly, journalist and poet; Patrick Collins, lawyer and politician; Andrew Carney, peddler and tailor turned entrepreneur; Leopold Morse and Abraham Shuman, textile manufacturers; Jacob Hecht, shoe manufacturer; and Jacob’s wife, Lina, a noted philanthropist, praising their efforts to improve group image.⁵²

The Challenges of Economic Mobility and Acculturation

As immigrants and their American-born children climbed the economic ladder, they sought a balance between assimilation and ethnic tradition by establishing communal networks of religious institutions, philanthropic associations, and ethnic cultural societies. Such organizations encouraged religious observance, provided for the impoverished and new arrivals, and instilled ethnic consciousness. At the same time, they helped aid adjustment to American life.

⁵¹ Sam Bass Warner, *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870-1900* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978); Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 82-84. Smith, “Israelites in Boston,” 52-61; Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 13-14, 25-27.

⁵² Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 118; Francis R. Walsh, “John Boyle O’Reilly, the Boston *Pilot*, and Irish-American Assimilation, 1870-1890,” in *Massachusetts in the Gilded Age: Selected Essays*, ed. Jack Tager and John W. Ifkovic (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 151-158.

Religious institutions played a vital role in this process. The United States was a safe haven for exiles and a place to practice their faith in peace; as their numbers increased, Irish Catholics and Jews struggled to adapt religious observance to mainstream American society. The Catholic Church, in particular, experienced widespread expansion and prosperity after the war, and outnumbered all Protestant denominations combined by the 1870s. Boston became an archdiocese in 1875; the Cathedral of the Holy Cross was consecrated the same year in the South End, which the *Pilot* called “the greatest religious event for the Catholics of this generation in New England.” Dozens of churches, schools, and hospitals were also built in this period to serve the expanding Irish multitudes, as well as increasing numbers of Germans, French Canadians, Poles, and Italians.⁵³

Archbishop John Joseph Williams led the archdiocese from 1866 to 1907. Born in Boston in 1822 when it was “a city of lanes, alleys, courts, and crooked streets,” the quiet Archbishop Williams sought to keep the church conservative and understated, favoring conciliation over Catholic visibility. If “immigrants simply followed American laws and became lovers of American justice,” he argued, “they would become not only good citizens but also good Catholics.” Williams even refused an offer to become America’s second cardinal, anxious not to “highlight a kingdom within a kingdom.” Although working-class Irish made up the bulk of his constituency, he preferred the company of Yankee Catholics, not understanding that immigrants needed “a special type of solidarity” from their church and its leaders. During his tenure, Catholics were split between liberal Americanists like

⁵³ Lord, Sexton, and Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston*, 3, 52-55, 64; *Pilot*, 18 December 1875. Donna Merwick, *Boston Priests, 1848-1910: A Study of Social and Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); James M. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O’Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992); Dolan, *Immigrant Church*; Kenny, *American Irish*, 163-171.

Williams, “who welcomed the development of a distinctive American flavor to the church,” and ultramontanes who believed in the church’s indivisible, “literally catholic” nature as defined by its infallible leader, the pope. This ongoing debate shaped relations with Protestants and fueled controversy regarding Catholics’ ability to be loyal Americans.⁵⁴

Jews also coped with religious acculturation in this period. With financial success, American-born Jews began “a co-mingling of the Jewish and non-Jewish world,” leading to parental fears of intermarriage or conversion. Hoping to ensure their religious survival in a heterogeneous, secular country where religion was voluntary, some Jews advocated for stricter adherence to tradition, but others sought to adapt ritual to American practices. Some congregations chose to imitate Protestant churches with English-language sermons and prayer books, and organs and choirs, hoping such “modernizations” would make services seem less foreign and more respectable, thus attracting more members to “ensure the strength and continuity of Judaism.”⁵⁵ In 1863, Adath Israel was the first Boston synagogue to initiate gradual reforms when the board began to consider adding music to services. Mishkan Israel followed suit by implementing organ music and “family” (mixed) seating in pews, and in 1871, Ohabei Shalom voted for the “curtailment of lengthy prayers, establishment of a choir, and strict observance of order.”⁵⁶ In 1872, Adath Israel voted to introduce “moderate reform fitting the spirit of the time,” adopting Protestant terms for offices and functions (such as “sexton” instead of “shamas” and “minister” instead of

⁵⁴ Merwick, *Boston Priests*, 144, 3; 148-161; O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 76-77.

⁵⁵ Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue*, 153, 174-179; Sarna, “The Evolution of the American Synagogue,” in *Americanization of the Jews*, ed. Robert M. Seltzer and Norman J. Cohen, (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 221-225; Sarna, *American Judaism*, 75-128.

⁵⁶ Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue*, 182-194; “Temple Ohabei Shalom, Reform,” in *The American Synagogue: A Historical Dictionary and Sourcebook*, ed. Kerry M. Olitsky and Marc Lee Raphael (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1996), 171; *Advocate*, 15 December 1939.

“rabbi” or “hazan”), family pews, and a chorus and organ. In 1874, the board hired Reform advocate Solomon Schindler (1874-1894) as “preacher”; he would lead the congregation further along the path of reform.⁵⁷ Conversely, Mishkan Israel and Ohabei Shalom ultimately chose to adopt the Conservative ritual, seeking to maintain traditional Jewish elements while instituting moderate changes. In addition, new congregations were established that were of the “Orthodox type,” such as Shaaray Tefila (Gates of Prayer), whose 1876 charter committed it to “the worship of Jehovah according to the orthodox ritual of Polish Jews.”⁵⁸

Schindler and Raphael Lasker, Ohabei Shalom’s rabbi from 1876 to 1903, became the city’s most influential Jewish leaders. Schindler had fled Germany in 1871 after protesting the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine during the Franco-Prussian War. As a rabbi, newspaper editor, and charitable leader, he sought to bring Judaism “abreast with the time and to win for it the respect of the Gentile world,” hoping to “educate the Jew for his position as a citizen.” Rabbi Lasker had immigrated from Posen in 1858, working in Ohio and New York before coming to Boston, where he also served as the editor of the *New Era Jewish Magazine* (1901-1903). Although he was more conservative than Schindler, traditional Jews still criticized his services as “a veritable mockery, a humbug and a sham,” his practice of taking summer vacations, and his lackluster charitable activities.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Board Minutes, 29 March 1863, 2 April 1865, 9 April 1865, 11 May 1873, 16 August 1874, 30 August 1874, in TI Archives. Other reforms included discontinuing bar mitzvah in favor of confirmation and abandoning two-day holiday observances. See Schindler, *Israelites in Boston*, Chapter 2; Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 13-18; Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue*, 182-194.

⁵⁸ Many of Ohabei’s younger members (50% of the total) left to join Adath Israel after a dispute over family pews. Mishkan Israel merged with Shaaray Tefila in 1895 to become Mishkan Tefila. Joseph Lebowich, “Jews in Boston till 1875,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 12 (1904), 112; Smith, “Israelites in Boston,” 59; Kaufman, “Temples in the American Athens,” 186-187.

⁵⁹ Schindler, *Israelites in Boston*, Chapter 5. Arthur Mann, *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1954), 54-57; *Jewish Herald*, 2 June 1893; Braverman, “Ascent of

In the 1880s, Adath Israel overtook Ohabei Shalom in size and prominence, attracting the city's leading Jewish businessmen, lawyers, and philanthropists, whose desire for cultural assimilation made them more comfortable in a synagogue that had adopted civic practices commonly seen in American churches. In 1876, Adath Israel arranged a religious service and fireworks display in honor of the nation's centennial, which was the first of many American celebrations. The congregation's new Columbus Avenue synagogue, built in 1885 in the fashionable South End, cemented its position as Boston's most influential Jewish institution. The dedication ceremony connected its traditional past with its commitment to a Reform future and ecumenical cooperation. "We have built this temple," President Edward Goulston, an English-born tobacconist, declared to the assembled congregation and guests, "that its products shall be good and true men and women, imbued with reverence and loyalty to God, and with patriotism and loyalty to the country we live in."⁶⁰

Immigrants' economic success and religious acculturation produced some complications, however. The increasing strength of Boston's Catholic Church encouraged the hope that the Irish "might now at last dream of enjoying in fact the full liberty and equality promised them by the letter of American law." Irish politicians initiated campaigns to gain religious liberty for Catholics in public institutions, and secure public funds for Catholic organizations (long used for Protestant ones). Nativist opposition to these attempts,

Boston's Jews," 413, n63. Schindler also published the *Jewish Chronicle* from 1890 to 1893. This last criticism of Lasker was a bit unfounded, as he served with Schindler as the directors of the United Hebrew Benevolent Association from 1881 to 1903. Schindler, however, was much more involved; he served as the director of the Federation of Jewish Charities (1883-1899) and the Leopold Morse Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews and Orphans (1889-1909). Ebert, "Community and Philanthropy," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 223; "He Gave His Best," *Globe*, 25 October 1893, 1; *Advocate*, 7 May 1915.

⁶⁰ TI Board Minutes, 30 September 1877. "Jewish Dedication," *Boston Herald*, 4 February 1885. "Adath Israel," *Globe*, 4 February 1885. Guests included the mayor, public officials, Protestant ministers, and notable Jewish rabbis.

however, revealed that while the days of virulent “No-Popery” violence were over, anti-Catholic sentiment was not dead in Boston.⁶¹

One of the most volatile issues was the “school question,” which caused tensions to flare well into the 1890s. Boston was the birthplace of public education; the first free school was founded there in 1635, and in the early nineteenth century, educator Horace Mann, advocating the advantages of a literate electorate, had pioneered a citywide system of non-sectarian, tax-supported education. In 1852, the State Board of Education passed the first compulsory attendance law, hoping to prevent truancy and ensure that young immigrants were schooled in “American feelings” and became “morally acclimated to our institutions.” While a few parishes and synagogues had schools as early as the 1840s, Catholic and Jewish immigrants overwhelmingly chose to send their children to the free public elementary schools, believing they would “have greater success in life, and obtain positions more easily.” Even so, parents complained about the Protestant-focused curriculum, which included daily prayers and textbooks with anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish rhetoric. Religious leaders urged patience, not wanting to provoke hostility, but many Catholics spoke out against blatant injustices, such as an 1859 case in which a boy was whipped for refusing to use the King James Bible. By 1864, such protests led to the first Catholic elected to the Boston School Board.⁶²

⁶¹ Lord, Sexton, and Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston*, 64; M. Heanne d’Arc O’Hare, *The Public Career of Patrick Andrew Collins* (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1959), 99.

⁶² O’Connor, *The Hub: Boston Past and Present* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001), 104. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 58-62; Janet Nolan, *Servants of the Poor: Teachers and Mobility in Ireland and Irish America* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 54-55; O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 80. The number of Ohabei Shalom children who went to public school was so high that the synagogue’s school closed after only five years due to low enrollment. Kaufman, “Temples in the American Athens,” 175; *Advocate*, 15 December 1939. John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (W.W. Norton & Company, 2003), 7-11.

In 1875, the Vatican urged American bishops to establish parish schools, but Boston was slow to comply; by 1884, it had only thirty-five. Faced with a continued influx of impoverished immigrants, Archbishop Williams felt it more imperative to build churches and charitable institutions. In fact, some priests believed parochial schools were “too radical for Massachusetts” and would heighten nativist rancor. Father John O’Brien, pastor of East Cambridge’s Church of the Sacred Heart and editor of the local *Sacred Heart Review*, argued for promoting greater tolerance through public school attendance. Another group, however, called “the Schoolmen,” advocated for Catholic schools. Father Thomas Scully, pastor of Cambridgeport’s St. Mary’s Church, went so far as to denounce from the altar, deny absolution, and even refuse the Last Sacraments to those who sent their children to public schools. Both sides appealed to the archbishop, who decreed that, while parishes should ideally construct parochial schools, parents could send their children to public schools in exceptional cases. As late as 1907, only two-fifths of Catholic children attended parochial schools. It was left to Williams’ successor, Cardinal William H. O’Connell, to develop the archdiocese’s school system. Nevertheless, Williams did encourage the establishment of other educational facilities, including Boston College (1863) and St. John’s Seminary (1884).⁶³

For Jews, one of the biggest problems that came of living in a Christian world was Sabbath attendance. Because Jewish holidays and the Saturday Sabbath conflicted with the six-day workweek, religiously observant workers risked losing their jobs. In addition, merchants who catered to a broad clientele could not afford to close their stores on

⁶³ Lord, Sexton, and Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston*, 79-85; Merwick, *Boston Priests*, 110-116. Nearly all the younger clergymen were Boston College graduates and many alumni were prominent in professions and politics. Daniel P. Toomey and Thomas C. Quinn, *Massachusetts of To-Day: A Memorial of the State Historical and Biographical Issued for the World’s Columbian Exposition* (Boston: Columbia Publishing Company, 1892), 71.

Saturday. Rabbi Schindler's solution was Sunday services, which, he argued, had been successfully adopted elsewhere and would strengthen Judaism. Many flatly opposed the proposal as the "initial step toward the complete assimilation of the Jew," but the Adath Israel board, while skeptical, did allow him to institute a Sunday evening lecture series. Schindler used these lectures to address such topics as education, immigration, socialism, and Christian theology, hoping to keep his congregation "abreast with the time and to win for it the respect of the Gentile world." Reprinted in the press, the lectures affirmed Schindler's position as the Jewish voice in non-Jewish Boston, and Adath Israel as the city's most progressive Jewish institution. Schindler also contributed to leading journals and spoke on the lecture circuit; in 1888, he was elected to the Boston School Board, where he served for six years, following Lasker, who had served from 1882 to 1888.⁶⁴

The Sunday services issue also highlighted growing fissions within the Jewish community. Despite his fame, Schindler gradually grew apart from his congregation both theologically and bureaucratically; they finally parted ways in 1894. In his place, the temple hired Charles Fleischer, a twenty-three-year-old, German-born graduate of Hebrew Union College, who, they hoped, would bring the congregation into the mainstream Reform movement. The young rabbi's charisma and intelligence captured the attention of Boston's intellectual elite. Fleischer, who thanked God that "I have not been born an American, so that I might have a chance to achieve my Americanism," encouraged interfaith connections and turned Adath Israel into a "civic forum." He also gave lectures across New England on

⁶⁴ Smith, "Israelites in Boston," 61. Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 83-95. Kerry M. Olitzky, "The Sunday-Sabbath Movement in American Reform Judaism: Strategy or Evolution?" in *American Jewish History*, Vol. 2. *Central European Jews in America, 1840-1880*, ed. Jeffrey S. Gurock (New York: Routledge, 1998), 84, 77; Schindler, *Israelites in Boston*, Chapter 3. "Unitarianism and Judaism" (16 December 1888); "Nationalism as a Religion" (21 November 1890).

a variety of religious, political, and social subjects, including capital punishment, immigration restriction, women's rights, "family limitation," and urban planning.⁶⁵

Assimilated Jews' adoption of religious and cultural reforms increased their differences with the Eastern European immigrants, who were largely more traditional. While earlier arrivals were part of a larger group of migrants who chose to leave politically unstable Central Europe in search of economic opportunity, the newcomers were refugees with few resources who had fled the pogroms and poverty of the Russian Empire. Lithuanians had established the first Eastern European shul in the early 1870s, meeting in rented rooms along Hanover Street in the North End. In 1888, Beth Israel, commonly referred to as "the Baldwin Place synagogue" due to its location off Salem Street, was established. Led by the Lithuanian Rabbe Moshe Zevulun Margolies, the leading traditional rabbi in Boston, it soon became the neighborhood's central synagogue, hosting lectures, club meetings, and a Hebrew school. By 1900, the city had fifty-three synagogues, most of them traditional "landsmanschuls." To Schindler, the problem with the small shuls springing up all over Boston's North End was their failure to "grasp the spirit of Americanism," but new arrivals viewed Reform practices as "symbols of the diluted new-world Jewishness."⁶⁶

Class and cultural disagreements also became apparent in charitable endeavors. Since before the Civil War, Boston's extensive Catholic and Jewish charitable networks included various institutions to care for the "dependent and deviant" at every stage of life and need,

⁶⁵ "He Gave His Best," *Globe*, 25 October 1893; *Advocate*, 7 May 1915. For more on Schindler's contentious relationship with his congregation, see Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 19-40. For Fleischer's lectures, see, for example, *Globe*, 8 January 1900, 3; *Globe*, 1 February 1897, 7. He also served on the School Board (1896-1900).

⁶⁶ Kaufman, "Temples in the American Athens," 186-187. Arnold A. Wieder, *The Early Jewish Community of Boston's North End* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1962). Schindler, *Israelites in Boston*, Chapter 3. Landsmanschuls were religious societies established by immigrants from the same region, such as the Vilna Shul in the West End.

such as hospitals, orphanages, old-age homes, homes for delinquent children, and employment offices. Through this multifaceted approach, ethno-religious leaders demonstrated they could care for their own, thus relieving the public burden and, hopefully, lessening nativism. Catholics believed in ongoing support for the most destitute, arguing that the salvation of the soul was more important than material wealth, while Jews focused on providing immigrants with temporary relief to help them become self-sufficient. Even so, the groups had two goals in common: protecting impoverished coreligionists from Protestant proselytizing and helping them to become respectable Americans.⁶⁷

Hostile to the Protestant vision of reform as “an infallible guide along the straight path of progress to ultimate perfectibility,” and fearful of state and private attempts at conversion, Catholic philanthropies attempted to not only care for the poor’s earthly needs, but also to save their eternal souls. Most institutions were run by the archdiocese and religious orders of priests and nuns, but groups like the Charitable Irish Society (1737) and the Society of St. Vincent de Paul (1869) raised funds to support diocesan organizations and provide food, fuel, and clothing directly to needy families. In 1896, they also initiated a port protection program for female Irish immigrants. The needy thus received both material and spiritual aid, and givers fulfilled their obligations of Christian charity and benefited their own souls. Ideally, these dual goals would lessen the gulf between rich and poor and strengthen Irish Catholic’s distinctive identity and “shared purpose” as a group. For St. Vincent de Paul president Thomas Ring, a Boston-born paper exporter, society membership represented

⁶⁷ Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants*, 130-132; Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 23-31. Susan Walton, “To Preserve the Faith: Catholic Charities in Boston, 1870-1930,” in *Catholic Boston: Studies in Religion and Community, 1870-1970*, ed. Robert E. Sullivan and James M. O’Toole (Boston: Archbishop of Boston, 1985), 67-68; Ebert, “Community and Philanthropy,” 213-215. Catholic orphans, for example, were often placed with rural Protestant families to aid their conversion.

“fellowship and a commitment to the organized church,” and a duty for “the children sprung of a common ancestry, born into a common faith,” as well as to newer immigrant groups. Members solidified this common heritage through a “friendly visitors” system in which workers visited the homes of the poor to establish connections and determine their level of need.⁶⁸

Jewish charitable institutions, such as the United Hebrew Benevolent Association (1864) and Hebrew Ladies Sewing Circle (1869), also focused on hard work and self-improvement. The rapid influx of immigrants in the 1880s led to a proliferation of new, overlapping organizations. Communal leaders established the Federation of Jewish Charities in 1895 (FJC, now the Combined Jewish Philanthropies) to coordinate their efforts, inspired by a suggestion that Rabbi Schindler, as director of the United Hebrew Benevolent Association, had made in 1883. Influenced by modern charitable methodologies, the FJC established guidelines for granting aid to the “deserving poor” and protecting them from Christian proselytizing. It also stressed the importance of citizenship, seeking to quickly “bring the foreigner into touch with our American institutions.”⁶⁹

As this quote demonstrates, training newcomers to be “proper” Jewish and Catholic Americans was just as important to middle-class philanthropists as providing material aid. In 1891, for example, a group of moderately prosperous Eastern European merchants formed

⁶⁸ Thomas F. Meehan, “Boston,” in *Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume II*, ed. Charles G. Herbermann, et al (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907); Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants*, 130-132; Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 23-31. Deirdre M. Moloney, “A Transatlantic Reform: Boston’s Port Protection Program and Irish Women Immigrants,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Fall 1999): 50-66. Walton, “To Preserve the Faith,” 67-68, 79. See also Thomas F. Ring Papers, Burns Library.

⁶⁹ Many American Jews opposed this migration, believing large number of “foreign” refugees damaged their acceptance and progress. Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 13-14, 30-33; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 162, 121-122; Smith, “Israelites in Boston,” 62; Ebert, “Community and Philanthropy,” 213-215, 223-224.

the Benoth Israel Sheltering Home in the North End to provide temporary shelter to “deserving Israelites,” aid in finding employment, and help becoming “worthy citizens.” Speaking at the dedication, Jacob Hecht, a wealthy, German-born entrepreneur and philanthropist, opined that immigrants should to “rid themselves of their old-world, un-American lifestyles” and adopt American “habits.” He urged Jewish charities to work with the public schools to remake immigrants in the image of Americanized German Jews, who could “go anywhere and be respected.”⁷⁰ Such attempts were often ineffective, however, due to managers’ desire to control newcomers and inability to understand or appreciate their culture. Catholic parish aid committees placed restrictions on charity; they insisted that applicants keep their houses clean and abstain from alcohol to qualify for assistance. They were “ashamed of the poverty and deviance of Irish immigrants even as they expressed loyalty to them.”⁷¹

Charitable work was of particular significance for Catholic and Jewish women, not only as the recipients, but also as the givers of aid. One of the largest independent Catholic women’s groups, the Young Ladies’ Charitable Association of Boston, raised money through monthly subscriptions. It established a variety of services for the sick and impoverished regardless of creed, including establishing a home for consumptives, conducting home visits, providing burial services, and operating a children’s library and working girl’s club. The

⁷⁰ *Jewish Chronicle*, 23 October 1891; Ebert, “Community and Philanthropy,” 227; Allon Gal, *Brandeis of Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 16-17, 34. Hecht was president of the Benevolent Association, president of Boston’s branch of the American Committee Ameliorating the Condition of the Russian Refugees, and founding president of the FJC. He and his wife Lina were also members of various elite Protestant institutions. Goulston echoed Hecht at the 1892 dedication of the Hebrew Sheltering Home. Every Jew should to help new arrivals “become respected and reputable citizens of this city,” he argued, finding among them another Morse, Hecht, or Shuman.

⁷¹ Walton, “To Preserve the Faith,” 69, 83, 97-103; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 121-122; Sarna, “Jews of Boston in Historical Perspective,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosovsky, *Jews of Boston*, 7.

Hebrew Ladies Sewing Circle, led by Lina Hecht, purchased cloth and hired poor women to make garments to be distributed in immigrant neighborhoods. In 1889, it organized a “Deutsches Fest” at Boston’s Horticultural Hall to raise funds for charity, but also to showcase ethnic culture.⁷² The following year, Hecht established the Hebrew Industrial School, financed by her husband, Jacob. Loosely modeled after the Protestant settlement houses cropping up in America’s immigrant enclaves, the school sought to help children become “wage earners, breadwinners and self-respecting intelligent citizens” in the mold of “good” American Jews like the Hechts, but in a kosher environment acceptable to religiously observant parents. The school featured gender-specific programs; girls were taught sewing, reading, and subjects to further their “moral and intellectual development,” while boys were lectured on patriotic topics. Director Golde Bamber, a Russian Jewish graduate of Boston University, also ran a “soap and water” club to teach children about cleanliness, hoping such lessons would transmit to their families to help them “assimilate American ideas.”⁷³

A “Continuing Desire to Associate Among Themselves”

⁷² Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 202-203. Barbara Miller Solomon, *Pioneers in Service: The History of the Associated Jewish Philanthropies of Boston* (Boston, 1956), 8, 11; “Deutches Fest: Hebrew Citizens with Open Purses,” *Globe*, 10 December 1889. Deirdre M. Moloney, *American Catholic Lay Groups and Transatlantic Social Reform in the Progressive Era* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁷³ Solomon, *Pioneers in Service*, 51. Ebert, “Community and Philanthropy,” 213-217; *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 January 1892; “American Principles Taught,” *Globe*, 28 January 1900, 22; “Hebrew Industrial School,” *Advocate*, 11 August 1905. Golde Bamber, “Russians in Boston,” *Lend a Hand Monthly: A Record of Progress* 8 (March 1892), 170, 172. It later became the Hecht Neighborhood House (today the Boys and Girls Clubs of Allston-Brighton). Settlement houses were run by middle-class women and college-educated social workers. Some of Boston’s earliest were the North Bennet Street Industrial School, which Pauline Agassiz Shaw founded in 1881; Andover House (South End House), founded by Robert A. Woods in 1891; and Denison House in the South End, established by Emily Greene Balch and Vida Scudder in 1892. Woods also wrote studies of urban neighborhood life, such as *The City Wilderness: A Study of the South End* (1898).

Some Irish and Jewish charities created a sense of group consciousness for the community that was “defined,” as Kevin Kenny writes, “in a specific, middle-class, respectable manner.” The Charitable Irish Society, for example, took pride in its colonial, non-sectarian roots, holding graveside for former members in the Old Granary Burial Ground on Decoration Day. Their annual St. Patrick’s Day banquets and Ladies’ Night dances were highlights of the Irish social calendar. The Purim Association held the first of many “brilliant” balls in 1896 to raise funds for Jewish charities. Attended by civic and communal leaders, these events attracted extensive press coverage of their speeches, decorations, and attendees’ costumes. As opposed to the caricatures contained in *Harper’s Weekly* and other publications, such images conveyed the message that not only could ethnic leaders care for their own, but also that their culture rivaled that of Brahmin Boston.⁷⁴

Immigrants of all economic backgrounds expressed the “continuing desire to associate among themselves” as Irishmen and as Jews in this period. Since their earliest arrival, immigrants had banded together for society and recreation. In Boston, as elsewhere, parishes, synagogues, and voluntary societies organized outings that featured dancing, music, athletic events, and militia marches. Immigrants also created a vast array of institutions that “constantly and inseparably coupled” devotion to ethnic and religious tradition with “an unwavering attachment to their adopted country,” helping Americans of foreign stock maintain their cultural identity while also aiding their adjustment to mainstream society.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Kenny, *American Irish*, 148. Greene, *American Immigrant Leaders*, 19-20. “A Grand Good Dinner,” *Globe*, 18 March 1883, 2; “Merry Dancers,” *Globe*, 14 January 1886, 1; “Purim Ball a Brilliant Spectacle,” *Globe*, 9 February 1900, 5.

⁷⁵ Ellen Smith, “Israelites in Boston,” 57. Peter Condon, Thomas F. Meehan, E.J. Devine, D. Montcrieff O’Connor, A. Hilliard Atteridge, “Irish in America,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume VIII*, ed. Charles G. Herbermann, et al (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910); Kerby Miller, “Class, Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States: The Case of Irish-American Ethnicity,” in *Immigration*

Catholic organizations like the Catholic Union and local branches of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH) strove to preserve Irish traditions and protect Catholicism. St. Patrick's Day, in particular, was an opportunity to exhibit not only a love of Ireland, but also pride in Irish-American achievement. Working-class Irishmen frequented neighborhood saloons, which served as informal clubs where they could discuss union issues, ward politics, and the latest Irish news, all "while enjoying a five-cent beer and a 'free lunch.'" They also attended sporting events and the popular theater, where they could see such athletes as boxer John L. Sullivan and plays by Irish entertainers like Dion Boucicault and Harrigan and Hart. Catholic temperance societies lobbied against prevalent alcohol consumption, hoping to end harmful stereotypes and improve overall group image.⁷⁶

By the 1870s and 1880s, Irish immigration was increasingly dominated by Irish speakers from the rural west, many of whom sought to maintain Gaelic culture and sports in America. In 1874, one such immigrant, P.J. Daly, established the Philo-Celtic Society in Boston to promote the Irish language; twelve years later, he founded a bilingual newspaper, the *Irish Echo*. Society members displayed "a middle-class gentility to which many Irish aspired," as their efforts coincided with the resurgence of Yankee interest in British heritage in America and offered a way to fight back against assertions that Ireland was uncivilized. Mobility was also highlighted through the formation of elite men's societies. In 1883, for

Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics, ed. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 97-129.

⁷⁶ Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 113-120; Michael P. Quinlin, *Irish Boston: A Lively Look at Boston's Colorful Past* (Guilford, Conn.: Globe Pequot Press, 2004), 101-112. Although many church leaders condemned the AOH for its links to violent secret societies like the Molly Maguires in Pennsylvania, the nearly 7,600 members of Massachusetts' branches declared they were "peaceful, thrifty, hard-working and law-abiding citizens" ("No Connection with Mollies," *Globe*, 27 April 1878, 2). Between 1886 and 1907, national membership quadrupled. Timothy J. Meagher, *Columbia Guide to Irish American History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 114-115. Kevin Kenny, *Making Sense of the Molly Maguires* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

example, Thomas Ring established the Clover Club, modeled after the Protestant Union and St. Botolph's Clubs, which excluded most Catholics and Jews.⁷⁷

The membership of Jewish organizations reflected communal fragmentation, as assimilated Jews of central European heritage and Eastern European immigrants rarely socialized with each other. Many societies were formed along class lines, such as the exclusive male Elysium Club and Comus Club, founded in the 1880s and 1890s, whose members were largely from Temple Adath Israel and Temple Ohabei Shalom. Meanwhile, the Young Men's Hebrew Association, founded in 1875, provided upwardly mobile Jews with classes, employment assistance, and recreation. Jews also joined local neighborhood branches of the Jewish benevolent association, B'Nai B'rith.⁷⁸

Even so, Jewish immigrants demonstrated the desire to maintain cultural traditions. Many German Jews joined the Turnverein, a German athletic and social club, and German branches of American fraternal organizations like the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, but membership rarely lasted beyond the first or second generation, as American-born Jews were less concerned about German culture and language. Adath Israel, for example, stopped writing board minutes in German by 1879, and stopped teaching it in the 1880s. Conversely, Eastern European Jews often socialized entirely within their "landsmanschaften," maintaining Yiddish through newspapers, shuls, and cultural organizations.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Quinlin, *Irish Boston*, 94, 98; Daly established more schools over the years, in conjunction with his role as secretary of the Gaelic League in America. Úna Ní Bhroiméil, *Building Irish Identity in America, 1870-1915: The Gaelic Revival* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 33-57, 68-69. Paul Darby, "Gaelic Sport and the Irish Diaspora in Boston, 1879-1890," *Irish Historical Studies* xxxiii, no. 132 (November 2003), 387-403.

⁷⁸ Schindler noted this discord in 1883, complaining that the YMHA took "great interest" in Russians, but "entirely neglected" Poles and Germans. *Hebrew Observer*, 14 December 1883; Smith, "Israelites of Boston," 57-59.

⁷⁹ Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants*, 156, 161; Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*, 5-7. Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 16, 33-34. Braverman, "Emergence of a Unified Community," 76-77.

For decades, Irish Americans had retained a keen interest in Irish culture and politics. Earlier in the century, the Boston Irish had supported Daniel O’Connell’s efforts for constitutional nationalism, but with memories of the Famine and exile strengthened by the Young Ireland movement of the late 1840s and the Fenian movement in the 1860s, new immigrants advocated physical-force republicanism. The aim of these organizations, as well as Clan-na-Gael in the 1870s, was to “rid Ireland of English rule by providing American money and manpower to encourage insurrection.” They were led by such political exiles as John Mitchel, Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, and John Devoy, who, as the most influential hard-line republicans in America, wielded tremendous power on both sides of the Atlantic.⁸⁰

Patrick A. Collins and John Boyle O’Reilly were two of the most prominent Fenians in Boston. The Irish-born Collins worked as an upholsterer’s apprentice as a young man. He joined the South Boston Fenian Circle in 1864; two years later, he became a recruiting agent for New England. This work gained him a large following that aided his election as a state representative in 1867. He worked to ease restrictions on Catholics in public institutions and earned his law degree from Harvard in 1871. O’Reilly, born in Meath, became a reporter and typesetter. In 1863, he joined the Fenians and enlisted in the British army to help organize Irish soldiers. When plans for an uprising went awry in 1865-1866, O’Reilly and others were captured and sent to Australia. He escaped in 1868 and sailed for America, arriving in Boston in 1870, where he became the editor of the *Pilot*.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Kenny, *American Irish*, 126-128, 171-173; Thomas N. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism, 1870-1890* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966), xiii-xv, 17-41, 64-74; Kerby A. Miller, *Exiles and Emigrants: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

⁸¹ O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 101-102; O’Hare, *The Public Career of Patrick Andrew Collins*, 1959). Roche, *Life, Poems and Speeches of John Boyle O’Reilly*, 8-133; Mann, *Yankee Reformers*, 24-51.

In the 1880s, Collins and O'Reilly, like many other Irish Americans, became disillusioned with physical force nationalism. Instead, they gave their support to Charles Stuart Parnell's emerging Home Rule movement, which O'Reilly called "a greater effort for political equality than any that Ireland has yet seen." At Parnell's request, they organized local branches of Michael Davitt's Land League, a land reform program that linked the struggles of American workers with that of Irish peasants, and Collins briefly served as national president.⁸² Even Archbishop Williams, normally cautious in advocating Irish causes, publicly declared his support for "any movement founded on correct principles, tending to redress the grievances" of the Irish people.⁸³

Irish Americans saw little conflict with ethnic nationalist activity; as Collins remarked, "Ireland to us is father and mother, and America is the wife," signifying the love they bore their homeland even as they attached themselves to their new country. Even so, historian Thomas Brown notes, much energy was spent "justifying immigrant loyalty to Ireland and reconciling it with their loyalty to the United States," particularly as nativists pointed to such involvement when claiming the Irish were unfit for American citizenship. In the inaugural issue of his newspaper, the *Republic*, in March 1882, politician Patrick Maguire disputed James Russell Lowe's claim that it was "impossible for a man to be an Irishman and an American at the same time." Instead of "selfishly enjoy[ing] the blessings of republican institutions in America," Maguire argued, an Irish American should work to extend liberties

⁸² Roche, *Life, Poems and Speeches of John Boyle O'Reilly*, 127-129, 141. As O'Reilly wrote to Devoy regarding Fenianism, "That 'meanly-sounding word with its associations of defeat, dissension and trickery,' was 'a millstone on the neck of our nationality'" (O'Reilly to Devoy, 28 January 1871, quoted in Laubenstein, "John Boyle O'Reilly," 190. O'Reilly, Collins, and Cahill, 9 April 1880, in O'Reilly Papers; Collins and E. Moody, "Irish Rights," *Globe*, 12 February 1881, 1; *Republic*, July 1, 1882; O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 111. Ely Janis, "The Land League in the United States and Ireland: Nationalism, Gender and Ethnicity in the Gilded Age" (Ph.D. diss.: Boston College, 2008).

⁸³ Williams, quoted in O'Hare, *Public Career of Patrick Andrew Collins*, 240; *Pilot*, 5 February 1881.

to Ireland and other “down-trodden” countries, becoming “not only a good Irishman but a good American.” Thus, nationalism served a dual function; in helping Ireland become free, Irish Americans would prove their loyalty to democratic ideals, achieve respectability, and gain the experience needed to influence social and political movements.⁸⁴

As Meagher notes, “such nationalism, often dressed up in rhetoric resonant with American heroes and ideals and comparing Ireland’s struggle to the American Revolution, attracted strong support from native-stock Yankees and easily complemented the aspirations and ideals of liberal Catholicism,” unlike physical-force nationalism. Jewish merchant Abraham Shuman, who had a personal friendship with O’Reilly and other Irishmen, also came to support the Home Rule cause. Along with fellow Adath Israel member Charles Weil, he contributed aid to suffering famine victims in 1880 and joined the Land League in 1881. A former president of the United Hebrew Benevolent Association, Shuman argued that the “truest way” to help the Irish was to “aid them to help themselves”; thus, Home Rule was vital for the development of Irish business.⁸⁵

Few American Jews had a similar devotion to a nationalist ideal in the late nineteenth century. Most assimilated Jews were cosmopolitans who advocated for the complete incorporation of Jews into their adopted nations. They identified with worldwide Jewry in

⁸⁴ *Republic*, July 1, 1882; *A.O.H. Journal*, March 1880, 4. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism*, 28. *Republic*, March 25, 1882. Russell, the U.S. ambassador to Great Britain, was referring to Irish-American nationalists being arrested while visiting Ireland; British citizenship laws still claimed the Irish-born as British subjects, regardless of whether they had become naturalized Americans. See Kenny, *American Irish*, 171-179; Janis, “Land League in the United States and Ireland”; Eric Foner, “Class, Ethnicity, and Radicalism in the Gilded Age: The Land League and Irish-America,” in Foner, *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 150-200.

⁸⁵ Meagher, *Columbia Guide to Irish American History*, 112. Shuman to T.J. Murphy, 22 March 1889, in O’Reilly Papers. *Globe*, 17 February 1880, 1; “Ireland’s Condition,” *Globe*, 11 October 1886, 4; “View of Irish Question,” *Globe*, 1 October 1888, 6; *Globe*, 18 April 1893, 9. “Friend of Irish Goods,” *Globe*, 16 September 1890, 4; *Pilot*, 8 June 1907. As the largest American purchaser of Irish lace and tweed, Shuman was credited with revitalizing those industries (*Pilot*, 16 April 1910).

religion only and, while they donated to impoverished colonizers and scholars in Palestine, they were opposed to the idea of the “Return.” In 1885, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations adopted the principles of the Pittsburgh Platform, which reimagined Judaism as a progressive religion that rejected ceremonies “not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization,” as well as Messianism and Zionism. Rabbi Solomon Schindler voiced the thoughts of many assimilated Jews in Boston when he stated there was no need to wish for a savior or yearn for a Jewish homeland. “In the United States,” he argued, “the Hebrews had freedom of religion and speech, enjoyed the ballot, could aspire to political office, and enjoyed the privileges of citizenship. Why then return to Palestine?”⁸⁶

Although proto-Zionist groups existed in Europe and the United States as early as the 1840s, modern Zionism—the movement to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine—did not develop until the 1890s, largely as a form of religious nationalism. In many ways, it was a Utopian vision born out of a desire among traditional Jews for a messiah combined with a reaction to incidents of persecution in the East, particularly the Russian pogroms of the early 1880s, and the continuance of antisemitism in the West, highlighted by the 1895 espionage trial of French army officer Alfred Dreyfus. Early Zionist groups attracted only a small following, mainly among traditional Jews, and focused mainly on colonization schemes rather than the attainment of a Jewish nation-state. Others, particularly members of the Bund, the Jewish nationalist wing of the international socialist movement, were opposed to Zionism, but combined ideas of Jewish nationalism with a plan of class struggle. Others,

⁸⁶ “Declaration of Principles: The Pittsburgh Platform,” 1885 Pittsburgh Conference, http://ccarnet.org/Articles/index.cfm?id=39&pge_prg_id=3032&pge_id=1656 (accessed 10 October 2008). Schindler, *Messianic Expectations and Modern Judaism* (Boston: S.E. Cassino and Co., 1886), 201-205. Ehrenfried, *Chronicle of Boston Jewry*, 389; Schindler, “History of the Congregation Temple Adath Israel,” in Rabbi Solomon Schindler Papers, TI Archives; Sarna, *American Judaism*, 125. Mann, *Growth and Achievement*, 53-56. Schindler later came to support Zionism.

however, especially Eastern European immigrants, transferred their ideal of the “promised land,” or the “Goldenah Medinah,” to the United States.⁸⁷

Boston’s fragmented Jewish community only gradually began to incorporate Zionist ideology. In 1891, a young Russian student at Harvard established B’nai Zion Society, a Zionist cultural organization in the North End; by year’s end, there were more than 100 members, many of whom marched in Boston’s 1892 Columbus Day parade with a prototype of the Zionist flag. Four years later, inspired by British Zionist Theodore Herzl’s influential treatise, *The Jewish State* (1896), the newly established Hebrew National Association organized a mass meeting in Boston and enlisted more than 400 new members. In 1898, they formed an advisory body, the Zionist Council of Greater Boston, to “propagate the Zionist spirit” and raise funds to buy land in Palestine. Much of this activity was confined largely to the immigrant enclaves of the North and West Ends; as a result, Zionism would not become a community-wide movement in Boston for years. Nevertheless, as historian Matthew Frye Jacobson argues, the “ongoing debate on the question of Jewish nationality did draw upon and further popularize a shared vocabulary of ‘peoplehood,’ group rights, and political sovereignty” among Jews in Boston, as elsewhere, laying the groundwork for later growth.⁸⁸

“Awaken a Fuller Appreciation of Their Worth as Citizens”

⁸⁷ Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2003), 2-3; Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975), 12-24; Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 8-10, 41-43.

⁸⁸ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 202, 216. This flag later appeared at the Second Zionist Congress in Switzerland in 1897 (*Advocate*, 17 June 2004). “Growth of Zionism in Boston” *Maccabean* 2 (May 1902): 241-243. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 81-85. Cohen, Jacobson, *Special Sorrows*, 53. Chapter 4 will discuss Herzl’s influence in greater depth.

Although Irish and Jewish Americans wanted to maintain ties to the ethnic community both at home and abroad, they also sought to make themselves at home in their adopted city. Rising immigration and Yankee movement to the suburbs caused Boston's native-born population to drop significantly while the urban population increased. "Eager to realize an explicitly American dream and at the same time keenly conscious of their heritage," Robert Wiebe argues, ethnic Americans "wanted broader opportunities, firmer security, and the right to select their own leaders."⁸⁹

Although political power was still largely in the hands of the Protestant elite, the city's ethnic vote increased 195 percent in the years after the Civil War, allowing immigrants to gain influence as Yankee Democrats sought to regain control from the Republicans.⁹⁰ While some leaders fostered divisions, others bridged ethnic boundaries, emphasizing "comity over conflict" and insisting "intergroup cooperation was now the dominant character of the city's public life."⁹¹ For the Irish community, which still consisted primarily of laborers, political power was "equal to the Catholic Church's hierarchy as an engine of social mobility for gifted, ambitious Irish-Americans."⁹² The Irish had a long history of political activism due to their large population, command of the English language, and involvement in labor unions, and they quickly began to elect their own to power. The first Catholic on the Boston Common Council was elected in 1857, the first alderman in 1870,

⁸⁹ Stephen Thernstrom, *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis, 1880-1970*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 12-13. Between 1880 and 1890, for example, Boston's total population increased 24% (362,839 to 448,477); 18% was through migration from rural New England, Canada, and overseas; only 6% was from native increase. Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Way, 1967), 50.

⁹⁰ O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 95-99; Geoffrey Blodgett, "Yankee Leadership in a Divided City," *Journal of Urban History* (August 1982), 371-396. The native-born vote, meanwhile, only grew about fifteen percent.

⁹¹ Connolly, *Triumph of Urban Progressivism*, 17.

⁹² Arthur Mann, quoted in William H.A. Williams, *'Twas Only an Irishman's Dream: The Image of Ireland and the Irish in American Popular Song Lyrics, 1800-1920* (Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 140. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 93-94.

and the first Congressman in 1882. Jews also gained political influence well beyond their numbers, influential as they were in business and the law. The ward system was especially attractive to lawyers, who saw politics as useful for attracting clients. The first Irish Catholic member of the Boston School Board in 1864 was lawyer Joseph Fallon, who was later appointed Boston's first Catholic judge (1872); the first Jewish member (1876) was lawyer Godfrey Morse, who was later the first Jew appointed to the Common Council (1882).⁹³

In the 1870s and 1880s, Yankee Democrats—many of whom left the Republican Party in 1884—sought alliances with ethnic leaders, hoping to take advantage of the immigrant vote. They catered especially to the large Irish voting bloc, declaring support for Irish causes to gain help in electing Yankee Democratic mayors, who, in turn, provided Irish ward bosses with patronage and local control over their precincts. This strategy helped Democrats dominate politics in the late nineteenth century and eased the transition of political power. While Irish-American leaders were anxious to work with Yankee leaders to assist their group's advancement, they did not “merge into one homogenous ruling elite.” Protestants still had a “self-conscious identity as a socially distinct and economically powerful group,” and Irish politicians understood their power was dependent upon their standing within the Irish community.⁹⁴

Well known for his Irish nationalist activities, Collins was one of the first Irish politicians to benefit from the Yankee alliance. He became active in the national Democratic

⁹³ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston's Jews,” 259, 205-207. Some leaders advised against following the “alluring voice of the siren, politics,” believing the “shamelessness and intrigue and the selfishness of office seeking” was too tempting, but Ryan observes that more than half of the Irish attorneys practicing between 1861 and 1917 were involved in politics. Irish names dominated politics in 68 of the state's cities and towns by 1890.

⁹⁴ Damien Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924” (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 7. See also O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 132-146.⁹⁵ O'Hare, *Public Career of Patrick Andrew Collins*, 122-202; O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 101-112; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston's Jews,” 207.

Party in the 1870s, and, with fellow lawyers Thomas Gargan and Godfrey Morse, organized the Massachusetts Young Men's Democratic Club. After serving several years in the state legislature, he ran for Congress in 1882 in the newly created Fourth district, which included the North End, South End, East Boston, and South Boston—all heavily immigrant neighborhoods and predominantly Democratic wards. Even so, realizing the precariousness of the Irish position, Collins was anxious to keep ethnic interests out of American politics. “I kneel at the altar of my fathers, and I love the land of my birth,” he declared in 1876, “but in American politics, I know neither race, color, nor creed.” Nevertheless, his immigrant background was not forgotten in his work to protect the rights of naturalized citizens.⁹⁵

Collins' first law client was Godfrey's brother, Leopold Morse, a Bavarian immigrant and former peddler turned successful merchant and politician. As Morse's business grew, he extended his circle of acquaintances, becoming friendly with influential communal leaders. After his marriage to Georgianna Ray, the daughter of a prominent Episcopalian attorney, he became active in the national Democratic Party. In 1872, he was nominated for Congress in a Republican district in which he did not reside; four years later he was elected, serving until 1885. Although not religiously observant, Morse was a member of Adath Israel and supported Jewish charities. Rabbi Schindler, in fact, described him as the model American Jew, whose “good, sound, common-sense has taught him the great lesson that in this our glorious country a man must be a good citizen, a good American first.”⁹⁶ As the *Globe* recalled, Leopold was so universally popular that during one congressional campaign he was

⁹⁶ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston's Jews,” 201-207; Ehrenfried, *Chronicle of Boston Jewry*, 623; *Globe*, 6 August 1942. Schindler, *Israelites in Boston*, Chapter 5. Morse's siblings, including Godfrey, were active members of Congregation Adath Israel. Leopold also established the Boston Home for Infirm Hebrews and Orphans, later named in his honor after his death in 1892. Godfrey served as the home's president in 1904, and as vice-president of the Elysium Club.

nominated while on a voyage back from his native Bavaria. Upon Morse's return, Collins presided at a dinner in his honor at the Parker House. "I arrived in Boston from Bavaria at one o'clock," Morse commented, "and at three I am nominated for Congress." The Irish-born Collins jokingly replied, "That's the way we treat you foreigners."⁹⁷

Members of the Irish and Jewish middle class were anxious to avoid claims of sectarianism in this period. In his capacity as the editor of the *Pilot* from 1876 to 1890, John Boyle O'Reilly wielded much influence over Irish voting habits in Boston. Like Collins, he argued for keeping Irish nationalism out of American politics, as "we cannot, as honest men, band together...under the shadow of an Irish flag." He also objected to those politicians who sought votes by calling themselves "a friend to the Irish" and sporting green carnations on Saint Patrick's Day. O'Reilly had taken out naturalization papers the day he arrived in America, and he reminded immigrants that only through the ballot would they gain a voice in the city. Unabashedly, he declared his support for the Democratic Party. "The *Pilot* is a Democratic paper. We say so without reservation, exclusion or exception," he wrote. "The principles of Democracy as laid down by Jefferson are to us the changeless basis of sound politics and healthy republicanism. We are not Democratic simply as being partisan; but we are partisan because we are Democratic."⁹⁸ Conversely, Rabbi Schindler, while personally a Democrat, ran the *Hebrew Observer* as a non-partisan newspaper, emphasizing the importance of naturalization and the need for Jews to become involved in public life to offset suggestions that they were forming a "state within a state." Despite a short-lived Jewish German Independent Club (1883), most agreed with him and sought to avoid the creation of

⁹⁷ "Hon. Leopold Morse," *Globe*, 16 December 1892, 9; Ehrenfried, *Chronicle of Boston Jewry*, 623.

⁹⁸ Laubenstein, "John Boyle O'Reilly," 201-203, 206.

a “Jewish vote.” Many Jews were anxious to avoid anti-Semitic attacks, argued that special interests limited their ability to be impartial citizens and, like Archbishop Williams, felt that highlighting religious issues would “antagonize” Protestants; religion should “never mingle with their politics.”⁹⁹

Other immigrants, however, promoted group interests. Patrick Maguire, an estate developer and leader of Boston’s Democratic City Committee, controlled municipal politics through much of this period. In 1882, he established a weekly newspaper, the *Republic*, to “advance the interests of the Irish people both in Ireland and America.” It “championed all things Irish and attacked all things Republican as anti-Irish.” By thus exploiting the ethnic struggle, Maguire increased his support among Irish Catholic Democratic voters and achieved leadership of the local party.¹⁰⁰

In 1883, a year after Collins’ election to Congress, Maguire decided the time was ripe to try to elect an Irish mayor. He chose Hugh O’Brien, a printer and financier and the first Irish-born chairman of the Boston Board of Aldermen (1879). Well-spoken, solidly middle class, and uninfluenced by sectarian interests, O’Brien was the perfect candidate to quiet Protestant fears regarding the Irish working-class vote. Although he lost in 1883, he won a year later, largely due to Maguire’s encouragement of ward bosses to visit each household in their neighborhoods to ensure every eligible Irishman would vote for him. As a result, O’Brien swept fifteen of Boston’s twenty-five wards in 1884 to be elected Boston’s first Irish-born Catholic mayor. To prevent him from appointing Irish supporters to key positions, the state legislature passed several bills just before his inauguration that limited the

⁹⁹ *Hebrew Observer*, 23 October 1883; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews, 210-211.

¹⁰⁰ John T. Galvin, “Patrick J. Maguire: Boston’s Last Democratic Boss,” *New England Quarterly* Vol. 55, no. 3 (September 1982): 392-415; O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 117-121.

mayor's power, including a required civil service exam for public employees and a state-appointed commission to oversee liquor licensing and the police department. Even so, O'Brien proved to be fiscally conservative and socially responsible; he cut taxes, widened the streets, established the commission to create the Emerald Necklace park system, and even built a new public library in Copley Square, enlisting Republicans to oversee these projects.¹⁰¹

Even so, O'Brien's popularity during his four terms in office and the Irish ability to determine public policy made many Protestant Yankees nervous, and he was voted out in 1888. There was also conflict between the Irish electorate and Protestant Republicans over a variety of other issues, including control over Boston's police force, liquor licensing, and, most significantly, the public schools. Continued religious controversy over the inspection of parochial schools and use of anti-Catholic textbooks led to an outbreak of tension in 1888. Protestant groups responded to Catholic protests and increased political power by forming a "Committee of One Hundred" devoted to removing Catholics from the school board. Leading up to the election, political groups like the Independent Women Voters, led by Eliza Trask Hill, held meetings to mobilize Protestant voters, particularly women, who could vote in school board elections since 1879. In the end, eleven Protestants were elected and one Jew—Rabbi Solomon Schindler, who ran as a "non-sectarian, non-partisan" candidate with endorsement from all sides. Strong Protestant voter turnout also ensured O'Brien's defeat for reelection. Republicans would control the board and the mayor's office into the 1890s.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Ibid. Other cities had already elected Irish mayors, including San Francisco in 1867.

¹⁰² Polly Kaufman, "Julia Harrington Duff and the Political Awakening of Irish-American Women in Boston, 1888-1905," in *Women of the Commonwealth: Work, Family, and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*, ed. Susan L. Porter (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 166-168; Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 18-20. Women could also be elected to the board since 1875. Catholic women voters came out in force for the first time in 1888. For Schindler, see *Globe*, 29 October 1888, 3; *Globe*, 5 November 1888, 3; *Globe*, 12 December 1888, 1.

Due to the school issue, the 1893 depression, the rise of the nativist American Protective Association, and the influence of William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic alliance began to break down in the mid-1890s. As a string of Yankee mayors curtailed public spending, the support for politicians like Patrick Maguire weakened and a new group of independent ward politicians emerged. Less willing to “wait patiently for political gifts from the patrician politicians,” men like Jim Donovan in the South End, Martin Lomasney in the West End, and John F. Fitzgerald in the North End gained power by exploiting the immigrant vote. Irish ward bosses saw the political process as a way to serve constituents’ day-to-day needs, generating jobs, assistance, and protection, in exchange for political patronage. Lomasney was particularly effective; all of the candidates supported by his political organization, the Hendricks Club, won election to the Boston City Council and the lower house of the General Court between 1887 and 1909.¹⁰³

For Jews, the Morses’ ability to succeed had seemed to demonstrate that with economic mobility and education, Boston offered “a life free from open anti-Semitism and the chance to become fully integrated American citizens.” Some Jewish Democrats gained office, including Polish-born Isaac Rosnosky, a clothing merchant, who was the first Jew elected to the Massachusetts General Court and Common Council from the ward of powerful Irish boss “Smiling Jim” Donovan, and clothier Bernard M. Wolf, who became the first Boston-born Jew to win a city office and served on the executive committee of the Young Men’s Democratic Club from 1892 to 1902. A few Jews also became influential in the Republican Party, including A.C. “Cap” Ratschesky, a skilled political organizer, city

¹⁰³ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 220; O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 121-161. Bosses employed hundreds, brought city contracts to neighborhood businesses, and did “favors” in exchange for votes. For example, they distributed turkeys at Thanksgiving and Christmas, paid for funerals, and gave out free baseball tickets.

councilman (1889-1891), and Massachusetts' first Jewish state senator (1892-1894).

Ratschesky was also a philanthropist who believed that everyone deserved the chance to “acquire the skills necessary to become full participants in our democratic society.” Also, while certainly not as numerous or powerful as the Irish, Jewish politicians were influential within the Jewish community. The Morses, for example, were involved in Jewish charities; Rosnosky was president of Ohabei Shalom and a member of B'nai B'rith; Ratschesky was president of the Jewish Elysium Club.¹⁰⁴

Even so, it was with the increase of the Eastern European population (20,000 by the early 1890s) that more Jews became politically active, following the lead of the Irish, who had organized neighborhood political groups to agitate for their interests. As Samuel H. Borofsky of the Young Men's Hebrew Political Club pointed out, the club's goal was to register voters and educate them regarding “intelligent use of the ballot,” preventing their neighbors and politicians from saying the Jew “has come among us and lives among us, but he will not be with us.” Mobilization also helped protect Jewish interests from powerful Irish ward bosses; by the early 1900s, these men would recognize the strength of the Jewish vote, and search for candidates who would remain loyal to their political machines. Nevertheless, middle-class Jews continued to believe that “a Jew who mixed religion and politics” was “an enemy of the religion he professed and an unpatriotic citizen.” Schindler blamed “self-serving leaders” who claimed to “unite all the Hebrews of Boston in one political body.”¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston's Jews,” 93-210. Their elections led to greater gains for the community. Rosnosky, for example, secured the appointment of the first Jewish policeman from his ward, which helped guard against antisemitic attacks. Ebert, “Community and Philanthropy,” 227-236; “Abraham Ratschesky, Banker, Diplomat, 78,” *New York Times*, 17 March 1943.

¹⁰⁵ *Jewish Chronicle*, 2 October 1891, 21 August 1891. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston's Jews,” 202. *Hebrew Observer*, 4 September 1891.

Maguire's death in 1896 caused turmoil in Boston politics. Several of his supporters, including Patrick Kennedy of East Boston, John J. Corbett of Charlestown, and John F. Fitzgerald of the North End, formed a new organization to continue centralized control over city politics. This group, which Lomasney derisively called the "Board of Strategy," made a concerted attempt to reunite the divided factions by following Maguire's policy of seeking candidates with widespread appeal. In 1899, they chose Patrick Collins, who had just returned to Boston after serving as Consul-general in London (1893-1897), to run for mayor. His years of congressional and diplomatic service and reputation for fairness appealed to both Yankee and immigrant voters, while his legendary involvement with Irish nationalism guaranteed the support of the Irish-American electorate. Although reluctant to run again for office, Collins finally agreed, if "it would be in the best interests of the party." He lost in 1899 (due to Lomasney's opposition), but won two years later, defeating incumbent Thomas N. Hart by the largest majority in Boston's history (52,038 to 33,173) to become the city's second Irish-born Catholic mayor and uniting the city across ethnic and class lines.¹⁰⁶

Mayor Collins proved to be an impartial administrator with little tolerance for corruption—much to the delight of conservatives and the chagrin of ward bosses. Soon after his inauguration, he reportedly told one supporter who had mentioned the possibilities for "his Catholic friends," "I am first an American, second a Democrat, and third a Catholic." Yet while frugal in spending the city's money and adamant in his non-partisanship, Collins also understood the importance of patronage. Striving to mend rifts within the Democratic Party, he appointed Martin Lomasney's brother, Joseph, as the Superintendent

¹⁰⁶ Thomas H. O'Connor, *"The Better Sort": Patrick Collins and Boston Politics, 1865-1905* (Unpublished manuscript, 2006), 21-28.

of Bridges, put many of Lomasney's supporters on the city payroll, and named the Board of Strategy's James Donovan as Superintendent of Streets. Elected to a second term in 1903, Collins became the first Democratic candidate to carry every ward in the city, holding great promise for a new era of interethnic cooperation in city government. In addition, Collins' success seemed to demonstrate not only that the Irish had "the business skills needed" to run municipal government, but also, as the *Republic* declared, "the Celt has met and defeated the Puritan; more than all he has won him over to a recognition of his merit."¹⁰⁷

Proving their Worth as Loyal American Citizens

Irish and Jews also became involved in the public life of the city outside of politics. Abraham Shuman, one of the city's wealthiest Jewish merchants, owned a retail establishment on Washington Street that became known as "Shuman's Corner." Considered as a caring employer, he helped to form one of the city's first employee benefit associations and sponsoring company balls and summer outings. He was also a founder and president of the Boston Merchants Association and member of the Boston Athletic Association, Chamber of Commerce, and Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company. He was dedicated to his service for the Museum of Fine Arts and Boston City Hospital, on which board he served for decades with Collins and Mayor Hugh O'Brien. His good friend, John Boyle O'Reilly, a well-known poet, was a founder of the Papyrus Club, a club to promote "an enlightened and unprejudiced press," the Boston Athletic Association, the Catholic Union,

¹⁰⁷ Shannon, *American Irish*, 4; Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 42-43. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 25. M.P. Curran, *Life of Patrick A. Collins, With Some of His Most Notable Public Addresses* (Norwood, Mass.: Norwood Press, 1906), 188-190. O'Connor, *The Better Sort*, 4. "The Irish Achievement, *Republic*, 12 March 1904.

and several other organizations; he was also a darling of the liberal intelligentsia, including Wendell Phillips, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Rabbi Schindler.¹⁰⁸

O'Reilly also took on the mantle of reformer, using the editorial pages of the *Pilot* to speak out against social injustice. After the 1872 Orange Riots in New York, for example, he admonished Catholics and Protestants not to carry “our island bickerings into the view of America’s friendly cities,” earning the enmity of many Fenians. Likewise, he attacked Boston’s social and industrial systems that discriminated against newcomers and sought to reconcile Yankees and Irish through reasoning and charm, rather than by force. He defended other minority groups, including African Americans and Native Americans, making the connection with Daniel O’Connell, the “Great Liberator,” and the Irish struggle for freedom from Great Britain (although his liberality did not extend to women).¹⁰⁹ His friendship with Shuman and other Jews also led him to condemn antisemitism. Antisemitism was not the result of religious instruction, he argued, “because the most prejudiced are the least religious”; it was due to ignorance, Jewish clannishness, and jealousy of Jewish mercantile success. He advised Jews to mingle more with Christians and to diversify their business

¹⁰⁸ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 90-92; “A. Shuman Died,” *Globe*, 26 June 1918, 1; “Abraham Shuman Passes at 79,” *Advocate*, 27 June 1918; “Shuman Reelected,” *Pilot*, 11 May 1912. Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 130-132, 136-155; “John Boyle O’Reilly,” *Pilot*, 23 August 1890, 1; Mann, *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age*, 24-51; George E. Ryan, “Abe Shuman: ‘Best Friend’ of O’Reilly, Donahue, Collins, Et. Al.,” *Boston Irish News*, July 1985, 12. They likely met through the *Pilot*. Shuman advertised regularly, as he employed hundreds of Irish workers and hoped to access the Irish consumer base.

¹⁰⁹ For Orange Riots, see Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 140; Laubenstein, “John Boyle O’Reilly,” 226. For minorities, see Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 142, 226-227, 288, 341-343, 348; O’Reilly, “The Negro-American,” 7 December 1885, in Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 738-2; Mark R. Schneider, *Boston Confronts Jim Crow, 1890-1920* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1997), 161-169. Shuman praised O’Reilly’s reputation for fair-mindedness: “While true to his faith and his religion,” his “broad views and great heart allowed no distinction of race and creed to warp his impulses” (Catholic University Dedication booklet, 4 February 1892, O’Reilly Papers).

interests to help reduce tensions, but he had no real solution for antisemitism. He could only express his respect and affection for “the greatest race...that ever existed.”¹¹⁰

Yankees considered Collins, Morse, Shuman, and O’Reilly the “better sort” of immigrant because they overcame humble beginnings to establish successful careers, advocated a strongly patriotic American identity, and were involved in the larger community. Their coreligionists and countrymen also regarded them as model ethnic citizens whose methods, as Schindler noted in the *Jewish Chronicle*, “all boys in Boston would do well to take to heart.” In 1889, O’Reilly was chosen to deliver the address at the dedication of Plymouth’s Pilgrim Monument, a choice that symbolized to many “that the Irish had indeed begun to ‘arrive’ in the land of the Pilgrims and Puritans.”¹¹¹

Even so, as ethnic Americans gained influence in business and politics, “the optimistic Yankee humanitarian belief in the power of education and democracy to effect immigrant uplift gave way to devouring fear,” Jonathan Sarna notes, and “some members of old-line families came to believe that their race, their country, their whole way of life was imperiled.” As early as the 1870s, “Proper Bostonians,” or “Brahmins,” as termed by Oliver Wendell Holmes, had begun to close ranks as a social and financial elite, excluding those without “four or five generations of gentlemen and gentlewomen” behind them. While they disliked all immigrants, Higham observes, “distrust of the Irish and Jews went deeper.”

¹¹⁰ Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 342-343; Evans, *Fanatic Heart*, 215; Laubenstein, “John Boyle O’Reilly,” 226; Ryan, “John Boyle O’Reilly,” 13, 26. O’Reilly’s comments were in response to an article in the *American Hebrew* newspaper asking why prejudice of Jews existed among Christians. Refuting the idea that Jews were dishonorable businessmen, he claimed, “I know three men who are my ideals of merchantile [sic] honor, integrity, and business character. One is a Christian and two are Jews.” The three men he was most likely referring to were Donahoe, Shuman, and Leopold Morse.

¹¹¹ O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 132-146. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 91, 204-205. Roche, *Life of O’Reilly*, 335-7; James M. O’Toole, “Boston,” in *Encyclopedia of the Irish in America*, ed. Michael Glazier (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 59.

Wealth no longer ensured social standing; in fact, as Jews gained economic mobility, they began to be seen as “not only mercenary and unscrupulous but also clamorously self-assertive—a tasteless barbarian rudely elbowing into genteel company,” while the Irish continued to be associated with drunkenness and fighting. By 1891, few Catholics belonged to elite institutions and influential lawyer Louis D. Brandeis was the only Jew listed in the *Social Register*. Regardless, Brandeis still faced continual prejudice and complained that “antisemitism seems to have reached its American pinnacle” in Boston.¹¹²

Hoping to distinguish themselves from the newer immigrants, but improve group image overall, the Irish and Jewish elite highlighted their longstanding history in Boston. In *Israelites in Boston* (1888), a fundraiser for the Leopold Morse Home, Rabbi Schindler outlined the “glorious” history of the city’s Jewish pioneers and their success in business. In 1889, James Bernard Cullen wrote *The Story of the Irish in Boston*, chronicling the “generations of Irishmen [who] have made their home in Boston” and made their mark on municipal life. Not all of the early settlers were “hewers of wood and drawers of water,” he argued; instead, the “self-reliant and brainy Irishman” numbered among the “dignified” professionals and businessmen “of the time.”¹¹³

These efforts were expanded in the 1890s with the formation of the American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS, 1892) and the American Irish Historical Society (AIHS, 1897), which sought to disprove the “the false and absurd idea that the American people are

¹¹² Sarna, “Jews of Boston in Historical Perspective,” 9. The term “Brahmin” first appeared in 1860 in Holmes’ “The Professor’s Story” in the *Atlantic Monthly*, quoted in Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants*, 177. Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 26, 102. Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*, 30-31. For more on Yankee exclusion, see Barbara Miller Solomon, *Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965).

¹¹³ James Bernard Cullen, ed. *The Story of the Irish in Boston* (Boston: H.A. Plimpton, 1893), 1.

of the so-called ‘Anglo-Saxon’ race.”¹¹⁴ Founded by middle-class leaders as “non-sectarian” organizations designed to promote group respectability, the societies used history as a “weapon for social advancement” by highlighting the roles their groups played in the founding, settlement, safeguarding, and upkeep of the nation. In the process, historian Kenneth Moynihan argues, they would “magically transform themselves into the most American folk of all.”¹¹⁵ As the societies announced, “You find the most loyal and valorous American in the sons of an expatriated Irishmen,” while Jews were “patriots in time of war and philanthropists in time of peace.” Although membership was limited, their findings were nonetheless influential, reprinted in the ethnic press for the entire community to read.¹¹⁶

Groups like the American Protective Association continued to blame immigrants for society’s ills, arguing they could never fully meld into the American ideal. Nativist prejudices regarding immigrants’ social and mental inferiority, as well as radicalism and labor strikes caused by economic depression in the early 1890s, also led to calls for greater restriction of immigration. Influenced by their belief in Anglo-Saxon superiority, a group of Harvard-educated Bostonians established the Immigration Restriction League (IRL) in 1894, seeking

¹¹⁴ *Pilot*, 5 March 1898. Thomas Gargan, for example, waxed eloquent about the Irish influence in “moulding our own institutions and nationality,” arguing that “there never was such a race, and that we the American people are Celto-Germanic, like our British ancestors, with the Celt now, as ever before, largely predominating.” See also “Americans Not Anglo-Saxons,” *Pilot*, 2 July 1898.

¹¹⁵ Kenneth D. Moynihan, “History as a Weapon for Social Advancement: Group History as Told by Irish, and Black Americans, 1892-1950” (Ph.D. diss., Clark University, 1973), 23, 32, 37. The AJHS was established by Cyrus Adler of Philadelphia, Harvard professor Charles Gross, and diplomat Oscar Strauss, among others. The AIHS was conceived by Joseph Smith of Lowell and *Pilot* editor James Jeffrey Roche, as well as 28 others from various faiths. John J. Appel, “Immigrant Historical Societies in the United States, 1880-1950” (Ph.D. diss.: University of Pennsylvania, 1960); Appel, “The New England Origins of the American Irish Historical Society,” *New England Quarterly* Vol. 33, no. 4 (1960): 462-475; Bluford Adams, “New Ireland: The Place of Immigrants in New England Regionalism,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Winter 2005), 2-33.

¹¹⁶ Address of the President-General, *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society* 1 (1897), 272. Abraham Neuman, *Cyrus Adler: A Biographical Sketch* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1942), 55. Moynihan, “History as a Weapon for Social Advancement,” 47–52; Gross, “Organization,” 15. Nathan M. Kaganoff, “AJHS at 90: Reflections on the History of the Oldest Ethnic Historical Society in America,” *American Jewish History* 71 (1981–82), 472.

the passage of a literacy test to limit immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe.¹¹⁷

Although the IRL carefully fostered a bipartisan, non-sectarian image designed to appeal to a wide audience, members like Prescott Hall and Robert DeCourcy Ward were clearly motivated by antisemitism. Hall, for example, arguing that Jews controlled America's newspapers and financial institutions, sought to keep out any more "sons of Judas" to prevent further "social deterioration."¹¹⁸ Congressman Henry Cabot Lodge similarly expressed the views of many Bostonians when he stated that Jews "lack the nobler abilities which enable a people to rule and administer and to display that social efficiency in war, peace, and government without which all else is vain," while the Irish were ruled by their Pope and politicians. A former advocate of unrestricted immigration, Lodge had come to believe that the newer immigrants debased rather than contributed to society, and he provided the IRL with political backing for their attempts to implement literacy tests.¹¹⁹

With the restoration of economic prosperity by mid-decade, the anti-immigrant fervor calmed for several years. The resulting "return of confidence" sparked a new national pride, fueled by imperialist ventures like the Spanish-American War. The United States went to war against Spain in February 1898 to fight for Cuban independence and to revenge the explosion of the battleship *Maine*. As during the Civil War, the conflict proved to be a testing ground for ethnic patriotism, particularly for American Catholics, who saw it as an

¹¹⁷ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 26, 102. Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 183-184; O'Connor, *Bibles, Brahmins and Bosses*, 166-167.

¹¹⁸ When Fleischer asked Hall to demonstrate "a little more of Jesus, the Jew," Hall responded that Jesus was not a Jew, adding, "I think he would say that desirable institutions in any country should be preserved from the danger of destruction by the influx of aliens who cannot appreciate or perpetuate them." The Assistant Postmaster of Boston wrote in 1897 to the secretary of the Boston league, "No city in the world has discussed migration, emigration, and immigration as much as Boston" (Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 266-268).

¹¹⁹ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 94-105; Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 183-184. Henry Cabot Lodge, "The Restriction of Immigration," *North American Review* vol. 152 (January 1891): 27-37; Solomon, *Ancestors and Immigrants*, 59-81.

opportunity to counter “persistent nativist claims that they made unreliable citizens.” Initially, the *Pilot* and *Republic* questioned whether Americans wanted this war, “notwithstanding what the newspapers may say,” and defended the pope’s actions in seeking arbitration.¹²⁰ Even so, Irish Americans denied charges that they would ally with Catholic Spain; as Representative John F. Fitzgerald declared, “no more valiant, brave and heroic defenders of the national honor” would “be found” than American Catholics.¹²¹

In fact, the Irish community in America and Ireland demonstrated widespread support for the war, organizing flag-raising events that featured patriotic addresses and appearances by Grand Army of the Republic veterans, American and tricolor flags, and pictures of President McKinley and the battleship *Maine*.¹²² Irish-American men joined up in force when Massachusetts’ Ninth Regiment, the state’s Irish regiment from the Civil War, was called back into service. The AOH took an active recruiting role and donated American and Irish flags to fly at the head of the column. Although the *Boston Herald* questioned its propriety, the *Republic* argued that during the Civil War, the “glorious old Fighting Ninth” carried “the green flag from the day it left Boston to its return for final mustering out,” as did all other regiments of the Irish brigade, and “no stain of cowardice or disloyalty ever

¹²⁰ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 106. *Republic*, March 12 1898. “Loyalty of Catholic Citizens,” *Pilot*, 19 March 1898; O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 68. William O’Connell, then rector of the North American College, felt the war would have “a bad effect upon the business of the country, and of course as usual the poor will suffer.” O’Connell later would be troubled in his bid for the Boston archbishopric by the *New York World’s* “rascally and cowardly” accusations that he had given Cardinal Merry del Val 1,000 lire for a Spanish battleship.

¹²¹ Fitzgerald, quoted in Kristen L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 81.

¹²² “CCPA Hold Flag-Raising,” *Republic*, 21 May 1898; “Young Ladies Charitable Association,” *Pilot*, 28 May 1898. As Irish politician John Dillon announced, America’s “conflicts, interests and sentiments are Ireland’s” (*Republic*, 14 May 1898). See also “Patriotic Action of Catholic Sisters,” *Pilot*, 23 April 1898; *Pilot*, 30 April 1898; *Pilot*, 4 June 1898; “Ireland and the War,” *Republic*, 11 June 1898. The local Clan-na-Gael donated \$50 to Mayor Josiah Quincy for the *Maine* Monument Fund (*Republic*, 2 April 1898).

disfigured its field of pure green.” This regiment would carry the two flags “side by side,” despite the “sneers of non-combatants, Anglomaniacs, and the *Herald*.”¹²³

The war posed little conflict for Jews, who instead pointed to Spain’s former persecution of their ancestors as evidence of the empire’s depravity. Jews also held patriotic events, proudly displaying the flag at religious services, volunteered to fight, or provided assistance to the military. Abraham Shuman, for example, donated clothing supplies to the Ninth Regiment, stationed at Camp Dewey in Framingham, Massachusetts. “May you return with unbroken ranks from your march to the front,” he wrote to the company commander, “whither your noble and patriotic impulses for flag and country will have led you.”¹²⁴

By August 1898, the war in Cuba was over, but fighting continued in the Philippines and other Spanish territories, which the United States had also invaded. While Irish and Jews applauded Cuba’s liberation, highlighting their own involvement and linking such efforts to their own fights for freedom, liberal leaders condemned the annexation of the Philippines as contrary to American ideals, despite the “all-or-nothing jingoism” of the era. As early as June, the *Republic* had wondered what policy the American government would pursue in the Philippines, hoping it would deal well with Catholic religious orders. As American troops ravaged the countryside through the summer and fall, the ethnic press, in opposition to pro-imperialist Republican newspapers like the *Herald*, began to ask, “Have we been fair to the Philipinos?” Patrick Collins, *Pilot* editor James Jeffrey Roche, Charles Fleischer, and other ethnic leaders spoke out against imperialism. Fleischer, a committed Progressive, inveighed

¹²³ “Proving their Patriotism,” *Pilot*, 30 April 1898. “Fighting Ninth,” *Republic*, 4 June 1898. *Republic*, 18 June 1898. Fitzgerald later introduced a resolution for more Catholic chaplains (*Pilot*, 27 January 1900).

¹²⁴ “Jews Show Their Patriotism,” *Globe*, 1 May 1898, 6. “Practical Patriotism,” *Pilot*, 28 May 1898.

against President Theodore Roosevelt as an imperialist warmonger who had betrayed America's principles by maintaining the Philippines as a "colony."¹²⁵

As Matthew Frye Jacobson points out, many ethnic nationalists objected to imperialism based on the idea that their homelands were conquered nations. Irish nationalists in Boston pledged their "earnest and unswerving support to President McKinley in our present national crisis, but opposed "an alliance with any power, particularly England."¹²⁶ Irish nationalists also protested the Boer War, the British Empire's struggle against the Transvaal Republic in South Africa. In December 1899, 700 people attended a meeting at Monument Hall "under the shadow of Bunker Hill" to protest England's actions, which was the "same old policy of murder, robbery and confiscation pursued in Ireland for seven hundred years."¹²⁷ The *Herald* made a "strong and urgent plea for American sympathy with England," dismissing Irish support for the Boers as "a detestation of the English," but Irish-American leaders argued they would join the army in droves if America "extend to the brave Boer the sympathy which France gave to this country in '76."¹²⁸ In February 1900, demonstrating Irish Americans' continued association of American patriotism with anti-British sentiment, Maud Gonne, co-chair of the Transvaal Committee and co-founder of the new Inghinidhe na hÉireann (Daughters of Erin), addressed an enthusiastic audience of 8,000 at Tremont Theatre, flanked by the American, Irish, and Boer flags.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Jonathan M. Hansen, *The Lost Promise of Patriotism: Debating American Identity, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 34-35. *Republic*, 11 June 1898. *Pilot*, 15 October 1898; *Pilot*, 26 November 1898; *Republic*, 26 November 1898; *Republic*, 11 November 1899; *Pilot*, 28 April 1900; *Republic*, 24 December 1898; *Pilot*, 5 January 1901. Fleischer, "My Country, Right or Wrong," *Globe*, 8 January 1900, 3.

¹²⁶ Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 142-216. P.J. Conlon, "The Proposed Anglo-American Alliance," *Republic*, 2 July 1898. See also CIS president Michael J. Dwyer, in *Republic*, 4 June 1898.

¹²⁷ "Under the Shadow of Bunker Hill," *Republic*, 6 January 1900.

¹²⁸ "The *Herald* and the Boer War," *Republic*, 6 January 1900. "Boer's Country," *Republic*, 25 November 1899.

¹²⁹ Quinlin, *Irish Boston*, 117; *Pilot*, 24 February 1900. *Pilot*, 27 January 1900. *Pilot*, *Pilot*, 13 January 1900.

Conclusion

Despite the many economic, political, and social problems immigrants still faced, the late nineteenth century was by and large a time of confidence and prosperity—particularly for the upwardly mobile. Nativism against immigrants from Ireland, Germany, and elsewhere gradually gave way to attempts at understanding in the years after the Civil War. Communal support allowed for upward mobility for immigrants, ensuring group respectability, and maintaining group consciousness. In addition, Irish and Jewish achievements in business, philanthropy, and politics discredited nativist assertions that immigrants could not acculturate. Ethnic leaders, quick to protest against any evidence of “APAism,” were confident that they would be accepted as loyal Americans.

Yet as Oscar Handlin notes, while the Irish had formed “a cohesive and proud community” and competed “for Boston’s prized economic and political goods,” they remained “subordinate in Boston’s social system.”¹³⁰ Similarly, the Jewish middle class discovered that their economic mobility did not ensure a corresponding social status. The 1900s would bring new challenges with the continued immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe and the resurgence of nativism regarding Irish and Jewish political activism. Over time, however, cultural, social, and economic differences within the ethnic community would become less important as they began to realize that many Yankees made little distinction between the ethnic elite and impoverished new arrivals.

¹³⁰ Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants*, 176-177.

Chapter 2: Irish and Jewish Political Mobilization, 1900-1917

The future of the Celtic strain in New England is immense. Upon the Catholics of this community, rich in tradition as well as in hopes, is to fall the work of the future.

—*Republic*, 16 January 1904

There is of course no Jewish vote in the sense of the existence of a compact mass of opinion that can be bought, sold and delivered. But there are interests in every country and state which nearly everywhere tend to unite Jewish opinion. This makes a distinctly Jewish vote. Nor is there anything abnormal about it.

—*Boston Jewish Advocate*, 27 November 1908

The increasing economic mobility and demographic strength of Boston's Irish and Jewish communities helped increase group consciousness and raise visibility; with acculturation, individuals sought to ensure that "Boston was really their city and that its government belonged to them."¹ As faction-based ward politics replaced conciliation in the early twentieth century, politicians, reformers, and community leaders alternately cooperated with and contested each other to shape public opinion and determine the political agenda. Politicians appealed to an "Irish" or "Jewish" vote to influence public policy changes and garner power, while activists used grassroots methods to promote group interests in the civic arena. Through speeches, rallies, and parades, they appealed to the increasing numbers of immigrant constituents regarding certain candidates and causes. Far from being unpatriotic and undemocratic, they argued, such mobilization demonstrated new citizens' desire to contribute to the improvement of their adopted city.

Examining Irish and Jewish political development through a contrasting lens is useful in providing a more comprehensive view of ethnic patriotism in the Progressive Era. While the history of Boston politics has been extensively covered for this period, most works only take into account Irish politicians and their battles with Yankee leaders, ignoring

¹ William V. Shannon, *The American Irish: A Political and Social Portrait* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 204. Michael C. Connolly, "First Hurrah: James Michael Curley versus the 'Goo-Goos' in the Boston Mayoralty Election of 1914," *Historical Journal of Massachusetts*, Vol. 30, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 9.

or downplaying relations with other groups. Instead, this chapter seeks to place the city's Irish, Jewish, and Yankee politicians and activist leaders in conversation with each other to better examine the ways in which they dealt with issues affecting their community.²

Irish and Jews both fought against and contributed to class, cultural, and political divisions that impeded a unified approach to civic problems and complicated the ability to cross ethnic boundaries. Irish factions fostered a defensive posture against the Yankee establishment even as they asserted their dominance. In addition, prominent as they were in politics, the civil service, schools, labor unions, and the Catholic Church, the Irish were often the first “Americans” that new immigrants encountered. Consequently, other ethnic groups had to adjust not only to a prevailing Anglo-American culture that was becoming increasingly antagonistic toward immigrants, but also an Irish-influenced municipal structure. Jewish political activists attempted to bridge the divide between the Irish ward bosses and Protestant reformers in their attempts to promote communal interests, but they faced their own challenges trying to unify the assimilated German elite and newly politicized Eastern European immigrants. As a result of these developments, Irish and Jews would emerge as full, if not entirely accepted, participants in Boston's civic life by World War I.³

² See, for example, Thomas H. O'Connor, *The Boston Irish: A Political History* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1995); William V. Shannon, *The American Irish* (New York: Collier Books, 1974), 182-200; Steven P. Erie, *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840-1985* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988). James J. Connolly's *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism: Urban Political Culture in Boston, 1900-1925* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), conversely, incorporates a more balanced discussion.

³ This stand allowed the Irish to “continue to protest anti-Catholic discrimination when it was useful to do so,” yet become “insiders by gaining control of institutions that Protestants had long manipulated.” Paula Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 2. James R. Barrett, “Americanization from the Bottom Up: Immigration and the Remaking of the Working Class in the United States, 1880-1930,” *Journal of American History* 79.3 (December 1992): 996-1020; Barrett and David Roediger, “Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the ‘New Immigrant’ Working Class,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16. 3 (Spring 1997): 3-44.

An “Open and Aggressive Demand for Political Recognition”

By 1900, immigrants and their offspring made up nearly seventy-five percent of Boston’s overall population (405,000 out of 561,000), compared to Yankees, who represented eleven percent. Of this group, Irish immigrants and their offspring predominated at nearly 227,000, making up forty percent of the total and almost fifty-six percent of the immigrant population. Jews made up the next largest group, with 40,000 in 1900 (seven percent of the total and nine percent of the immigrant stock). Over the next decade, high rates of immigration and natural increase for these groups, as well as Italians, Poles, French Canadians, and others, caused the ethnic population to rise exponentially.⁴

Each community had an established middle class of professionals and small business owners, as well as a large working class.⁵ As in the past, most new arrivals settled in entrenched immigrant enclaves throughout the city’s twenty-five wards. Lower middle class second- and third-generation ethnics moved to the “streetcar suburbs” of Roxbury, South Boston, and Dorchester, forming even “more ethnically organized communities” than their old neighborhoods and perpetuating a localized ethnic identity that would last for generations. By the 1910s, Irish Americans made up forty percent of the population, dominating neighborhoods like South Boston (eighty-five percent), Charlestown, and parts

⁴ “Is Yankee Blood Dying Out?” *New York Times*, 10 October 1910. United States Bureau of Census, *Twelfth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1900*; Reports 1, Population, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 798-802, 878-893; “Appendix A: The Jewish Population of Boston,” *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna, Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 343. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 4. Other groups included British Canadians (11%), Germans (4.5%), English (3.4%), and African Americans (2%). As the *Republic* argued, the influx of “alien races” increased “unwarranted attacks” on the church by “bigots” and “Anglophiles,” but, its Irish leaders would strengthen it overall (*Republic*, 9 June 1900; *Republic*, 3 February 1906).

⁵ Dennis P. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 82-112; Stephan Thernstrom, *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis, 1880-1970* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); William Alan Braverman, “The Ascent of Boston’s Jews, 1630-1918” (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1990), 80-119.

of Dorchester and Roxbury. Jews made up twelve percent of the total. Eastern European Jews predominated in the North End (along with an increasing number of Italians, at eight percent of the total), the South and West Ends, and Roxbury. A small number of middle class German Jews settled in the “new” South End, Back Bay, and western suburbs.⁶

Ethnic newspapers emphasized this success to show how far their group had come. The *Pilot* boasted to advertisers that subscribers, who included the “farmer, trader, mechanic, professional man, cleric and laymen,” were “among the most intelligent and enterprising in any community.” Similarly, the *Boston [Jewish] Advocate* (founded in 1905) reported on the society of “the best Jewish people,” but was “devoted” to “elevating the immigrant, whose only asset is his desire to work and the will to become something better.”⁷

Irish and Jews soon discovered, however, that demographic growth and economic mobility did not ensure acceptance, as only a handful of ethnic businessmen found entry into Yankee financial institutions and even fewer belonged to Brahmin social clubs. Ethnic leaders sought to minimize internal tensions and promote communal unity. “We wish to do our share in solidifying the Jewish community,” the *Advocate* declared in 1905, “which should be one, instead of being scattered in jarring elements which do not coalesce.”⁸ Similarly, the *Republic* lamented, “Irish-Americans of today do not realize the strength of numbers they

⁶ Ueda, “Introduction,” in *Faces of Community: Immigrant Massachusetts, 1860-2000*, ed. Reed Ueda and Conrad Edick Wright (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2003), xi. Figures in Herbert Marshall Zolot, “The Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley: Curley and the Boston Scene from 1897-1918” (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975), 37-38. U.S. Census (1910). Robert A. Woods and Albert Kennedy, *Zone of Emergence: Observations of Lower Middle and Upper Working Class Communities of Boston, 1905-1914* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962); Allon Gal, *Brandeis of Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 29-30.

⁷ *Pilot*, 26 May 1900. “Editorial,” *Boston Advocate*, 26 May 1905.

⁸ When Jacob de Haas, an English immigrant and Zionist leader, purchased the press in 1908, he changed the name to the *Jewish Advocate* to make it “truly an advocate of things Jewish in no narrow or local sense” (*Advocate*, 16 June 1905). He later recalled that the “change of name meant something to me,” and that “some people were more nervous then than they are now about being known as Jews” (*Advocate*, 22 August 1918).

possess.” Boston’s “Kelts” needed “more aggressive and informed” leadership to assist in greater communication and sociability among the Catholic groups in the city. “If we expect these peoples to be with us, we must be with them.”⁹

Elective office remained one of the best routes to attaining mobility in Boston. A new generation of American-born politicians unapologetically focused on ethnic concerns and the representation they felt their increasing numbers deserved. Leaders encouraged immigrants to become citizens, anxious to gain their votes. Even so, many non-English speaking immigrants were slow to mobilize, allowing the Irish Democratic bosses to dictate ward-level politics.

While Patrick Collins and other politicians had practiced “politics of accommodation,” changes in the structure of city government after 1900, which gave more power to the mayor’s office and less to the city council, allowed factions to dominate. Created as much by neighborhood affiliations and personal loyalties as by political ideology and personal rivalries, factions prevented the dominance of one ward boss over another, thus fragmenting party control. As a result, Boston, unlike other cities, never had a citywide machine.¹⁰ The city’s most powerful bosses were Martin Lomasney in the West End (Ward 8), John F. Fitzgerald in the North End (Ward 6), and James Michael Curley in Roxbury (Ward 17), each of whom mastered the art of politics as entertainment—“the parades, the pole raisings, the displays of ‘red fire,’ the marching bands, the street corner speeches.” Such

⁹ *Republic*, 12 March 1904. *Republic*, 27 April 1907. The *Pilot* also wondered why Catholics were not represented in proportion to their numbers in local government.” *Pilot*, “The Submerged Two-Fifths,” 26 May 1900.

¹⁰ Shannon, *American Irish*, 4. Thomas H. O’Connor, *The Hub: Boston Past and Present* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001), 182. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 201-203.

tactics allowed them to win voters' "hearts and minds" with "big gestures, grandiose schemes," and "histrionic ethnic baiting."¹¹

Lomasney, Fitzgerald, and Curley came from similar backgrounds; each had immigrant parents who died young and each left school to support his family. Born in the West End, Martin Lomasney (1859-1933) received his first political job as a laborer in exchange for stumping for Samuel Tilden in the 1876 election. In 1885, he formed the Hendricks Club, which became the city's most powerful political organization. Although he held various elected offices, "the Czar of Ward 8" preferred to control the action behind the scenes; all of his candidates for the city council and the General Court won their elections between 1887 and 1903.¹² North Ender John F. "Honey Fitz" Fitzgerald (1863-1950) graduated from Boston Latin High School and attended Harvard Medical School for a year, but dropped out after his father's death and became involved in ward politics. He served in the Common Council and state senate and organized the Jefferson Club. He was the first Irish Catholic from New England in the U.S. House of Representatives and the first American-born mayor of Irish descent (1905-1907).¹³ Roxbury-born James Michael Curley (1874-1958) went to work young, but later earned a diploma from the Boston Evening High School. He was elected to the Common Council in 1899 and the U.S. House of

¹¹ Michael E. McGerr, *The Decline of Popular Politics: the American North, 1865-1928* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 40; 146-60; Jack Beatty, *The Rascal King: The Life and Times of James Michael Curley, 1874-1958* (Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 1995), 49, 165. Dennis P. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 121-123. Eric, *Rainbow's End*, 67-106.

¹² Leslie Ainley, *Boston Mahatma* (Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1949), 20-46; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 220-223; James J. Connolly, "Beyond the Machine: Martin Lomasney and Ethnic Politics," in Ueda and Wright, *Faces of Community*, 189-218. He served at various times as alderman, state senator, and representative in the General Court.

¹³ John Henry Cutler, *"Honey Fitz": Three Steps to the White House, The Life and Times of John F. (Honey Fitz) Fitzgerald* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962), 45-53. He served two more terms between 1910 and 1914.

Representatives in 1901, and organized the Tammany Club in 1902. He later became mayor and governor.¹⁴

As native-born Bostonians, Lomasney, Fitzgerald, and Curley were more confident in their Americanness than their Irish immigrant predecessors, but also more parochial in their outlook, participating in various communal activities to appeal to the large Irish-American electorate. Curley, for example, was an usher at St. Philip's Parish in Roxbury, a position that allowed him to meet voters, and a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH) and the Young Men's Catholic Association, where he honed his public-speaking skills. Fitzgerald belonged to the AOH and the Massachusetts Order of Foresters, and promoted his neighborhood affiliation by speaking of the "Dear old North End" and his supporters as "Dearos." In 1901, he bought the *Republic* from Patrick Maguire, revitalizing it with a mixture of political reporting, society news, and moralized serial novels that would appeal to middle-class Irish Americans.¹⁵

In defiance of John Boyle O'Reilly, who had scorned "professional Irish" politicians who sported "green ribands, green neckties, and green carnations," American-born bosses emphasized their Irishness whenever possible. Lomasney highlighted his family connections to Patrick Collins's birthplace in Fermoy, County Cork, and publicized a "pilgrimage" to the

¹⁴ Beatty, *Rascal King*, 37-51. "Life-Story of Mayor-Elect Curley," *Globe*, 18 January 1914, 57; Zolot, "Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley," 141-211. Other offices included alderman (1904) city councilman (1909-1911), mayor (1914-1918, 1922-1926, 1930-1934, 1946-1950), governor (1935-1937) and U.S. representative (1943-1947).

¹⁵ Zolot, "The Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley," 156-158. Damien Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 7; Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 42-43, 81. Glenn Stout, Richard A. Johnson, Dick Johnson, *Red Sox Century: One Hundred Years of Red Sox Baseball* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), 53-54.

Blarney Stone, which he kissed “reverently,” on a trip to Ireland in 1904.¹⁶ Curley and Fitzgerald also emphasized their county origins, but were not averse to fibbing about them to suit the occasion; realizing the “strong Irish affinity along county lines,” they did not want to “arouse antagonisms.”¹⁷

The object of such rhetoric was, of course, to gain votes, but even more important was the ability to provide patronage. Bosses sought to portray themselves as “more interested in results than in ethics or ideals”; whether this idea was true or not, they wanted their constituents to believe it. They understood that immigrants of all nationalities desired security—a steady job, respectable home, and opportunity for their children—and that the politician’s ability to provide help, whether it be interceding for those in trouble with the law, providing a turkey at Christmastime, or finding a civil service job for an unemployed man with a family, was worth a vote to constituents grateful for aid of any kind. Lomasney’s success was a direct result of his ability to deliver jobs to the residents of the West End and maintain his dominance even with the arrival of new immigrant groups. Fitzgerald also cultivated an image of magnanimity, protesting that “there is no favoritism” among his Irish, Italian, and Jewish constituents. This, the *Boston Sunday Post* claimed in 1902, was the secret of his rise “from a puny influence to a mighty dictatorship.”¹⁸

Yet while bosses touted their role as social welfare providers, in reality, it was in their best interests to ignore newcomers. Lomasney, who claimed to have made more citizens of

¹⁶ William J. Laubenstein, “John Boyle O’Reilly” (unpublished manuscript, 1973), 201, in John Boyle O’Reilly Papers, Burns Library, Boston College. “Lomasney Home, Having Kissed Blarney Stone,” *Boston Journal*, 19 July 1904, in Lomasney Scrapbook, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

¹⁷ Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 58-59; Leslie Ainley, *Boston Mahatma*, 93.

¹⁸ Ainley, *Boston Mahatma*, 50; Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 50, 76; O’Connor, *Boston Irish*, 101; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 223. “Abdication and Future Ambition of Ex-Congressman Fitzgerald,” *Boston Sunday Post*, 2 November 1902.

Jewish immigrants in his district than in any other, “only grudgingly incorporated” them into his organization “when their voting strength began to threaten his control.” Then, he would have his supporters meet them at the dock to immediately begin the naturalization process. Most bosses focused on their solid block of Irish-American voters, using various methods to retain them even when they moved out of the city. “Mattress voting,” for example, whereby lieutenants would pack supporters into boarding houses before the registration deadline, was a ubiquitous practice. Fitzgerald ensured that former North End residents retained legal addresses there for voting purposes (much as he did when he had moved to Concord Junction), and kept his “Dearo” constituency intact by organizing reunions every summer.¹⁹

Over time, however, Jewish activists, especially those of Eastern European birth or parentage who had received their political education working for Zionism, began to work to naturalize new arrivals. Following the example of their Irish neighbors, Jewish social workers and politicians argued that the “organization” of Jewish immigrants “was a great necessity for ultimate success.” By becoming citizens, historian Reed Ueda notes, immigrants “publicly legalized their allegiance and their claim to full acceptance as Americans.” Naturalization blurred generational divisions, creating “a common ground of shared civic identity and civic activity.” The Hebrew Citizen’s Club in the South End, for example, taught immigrants the “civic righteousness” needed to shape a “better and purer democracy,” arguing that “the ignorant and illiterate voter is an easy catch for the politician.” As Mary Antin argued in *The Promised Land* (1912), naturalized immigrants “became part of a democratic community, ‘relatives’ of George Washington.”²⁰

¹⁹ Connolly, “Beyond the Machine,” 190; Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 67-68; Ainley, *Boston Mahatma*, 57-60, 222.

²⁰ Braverman, “Emergence of a Unified Community,” 85. *Advocate*, 2 November 1906; *Advocate*, 11 May 1916.

By October 1906, the *Advocate* wrote jubilantly of an “unparalleled enthusiasm” for mobilizing the community. “In union there is strength,” the editors noted, “and today there is an evidence” that Jews “are banding themselves together for their mutual benefit and to promote the welfare of the entire community.” In particular, they praised the educated “younger element in public life,” which was “no longer content to be satisfied with the crumbs from the tables of the various political parties.” Instead, they were resolute that Jews should have “ample representation in civic affairs and in the affairs of the state.” Even so, by 1910, only forty-six percent of Boston’s voting-age immigrants were citizens, largely due to the complicated five-year naturalization process.²¹

Jewish candidates still attempted to challenge Irish political dominance, and as they bridged “the gap between American and Jewish ideals, the old objections of mixing ethnic ties with politics” gave way “to a new, open, and aggressive demand for political recognition.”²² In 1902, for example, Nathan Barnett, a Russian Jewish lawyer and bail commissioner, had run for the Board of Aldermen in Lomasney’s district. He claimed no personal animosity toward the “Mahatma,” but argued that, as Wards 6 and 8 were largely “foreign,” a “child of the ghetto” could “represent it better than one who is not of the fold.” Jews deserved the “chance to vote for one of their own,” a strategy that Irish politicians used against Yankee opponents.²³ Politician Louis Blumenthal went further; in 1903, he spoke at a rally for Mayor Collins and candidate for alderman, Samuel H. Borofsky, at the North Russell Street Synagogue, sponsored by the Hebrew Democratic Voters of Ward 8. Jewish

²¹ The 1906 Nationalization Act required immigrants to file a Declaration of Intention, fulfill residency and character requirements, demonstrate knowledge of English and American civics and history, and submit a citizenship petition. Successful applicants then took the oath of citizenship. Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion,” 8-12, 16-17.

²² Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 202-203.

²³ “As a Hebrew,” *Globe*, 28 October 1902, 14.

voters “were only tools in the hands of Alderman Lomasney,” Blumenthal declared, “who in return rewarded a few of them with paltry jobs.” As the *Herald* noted, Borofsky “did not ask for votes because he was a Hebrew, neither did he wish to be deprived of any votes because he was a Hebrew,” but, listing measures he had fought for that appealed to Jews, declared, “if the Hebrew vote would stand by him, he would surely receive the nomination.”²⁴

Despite the rhetoric against “bossism,” however, both politicians were quick to pay their respects to the Hendricks Club and disavow any personal animosity toward Lomasney. In fact, Fitzgerald, Curley, and Lomasney often sponsored or addressed immigrant meetings at election time. Their influence continued to be impressive, and Jews consistently voted for the bosses’ candidates. In fact, most working-class Jews in Boston primarily voted as Democrats in local elections, as opposed to a small number of elite Jews in Roxbury and the Back Bay who voted as Republicans.²⁵

Challenges to Irish Political Dominance: The Fight for Boston’s Schools and the Mayor’s Office

Jewish political awakening in Boston coincided with the rise of a reform movement that sought to challenge the dominance of the Irish bosses. Concerned about the city’s economic decline and influenced by the emerging government reform movement (launched in 1904 with the publication of muckraking journalist Lincoln Steffens’s *The Shame of the*

²⁴ “Hebrews Assail Hendricks Club,” *Herald*, 16 November 1903, in Lomasney Scrapbook.

²⁵ In national elections, immigrants were more likely to vote for candidates who promoted their group interests, rather than along party lines. In 1904 and in 1908, for example, Irish, Jews, and other groups voted en masse for Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft, largely on the recommendation of *Pilot* editor James Jeffrey Roche and other leaders. As the *Advocate* noted in 1908, “Democratic Hebrews as well as Republican” in Ward 8 “are getting ready to vote for Roosevelt,” and “we find our Irish-American voters, to a certain extent, are going to drop quiet ballots for ‘Teddy’” as well (*Advocate*, 27 November 1908). Roche, “Great Day for the Irish,” *Pilot*, 19 November 1904; “Hebrew Uprising for Roosevelt,” *Boston Journal*, 18 October 1904, in Lomasney Scrapbook; William B. Prendergast, *The Catholic Voter in American Politics: The Passing of the Democratic Monolith* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1999), 87-90.

Cities), a coalition of businessmen, elites, and reformers argued that applying streamlined business principles, instead of corrupt political maneuverings based on patronage, would make government run more economically and efficiently. Some favored appointing “the best men” for the job, rather than going through the partisan election process. Although Boston generally had a reputation for clean government under Mayor Collins and other leaders, local reformers called for greater oversight in city hall and the public schools through the establishment of such citizens’ organizations as the Public School Association (1898) and the Good Government Association (1903).²⁶

Progressives believed that “nonpartisan reform conducted according to the principles of sound administration” would help override the divisions that came with ethnic interests and keep the “best men” in control.²⁷ With this idea in mind, reformers established the Good Government Association (GGA) as a non-partisan, non-sectarian watchdog organization for municipal government, motivated by the actions of politicians such as James Michael Curley, who made headlines for taking a postal exam for a constituent in 1903, claiming, “he did it for a friend.” Although derided by Curley (who mockingly referred to them as the “Goo-Goos”) and others, a wide spectrum of the Irish and Jewish middle class supported the GGA’s objectives to stimulate “a sense of political duty” among Boston’s citizens and aid voters in electing “aggressively honest and capable men.”²⁸ To educate newly naturalized citizens, the organization held a series of interethnic “New Voters

²⁶ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*; Zolot, “Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley,” 39-62. For more on Yankee views of Irish political dominance, see Edward Alsworth Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People* (New York: Century Co., 1914), 260-263.

²⁷ Polly Welts Kaufman, “Julia Harrington Duff and the Political Awakening of Irish-American Women in Boston, 1888-1905,” in *Women of the Commonwealth: Work, Family, and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*, ed. Susan L. Porter (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 169.

²⁸ Beatty, *Rascal King*, 77-84. Curley was later convicted of fraud and was elected as alderman from his jail cell.

Festivals” on civic holidays. The 1903 festival was held on Patriot’s Day, organized by Mayor Collins, lawyers Thomas J. Gargan and Louis Brandeis, Rabbi Fleischer, philanthropist Henry L. Higginson, and Governor Curtis Guild, who urged immigrants to use their “keen Yankee common sense” to avoid the “bribe-giver” and “bribe-taker.”²⁹

The first organized challenge to Irish power came in the public schools. After the volatile elections of 1888 and 1889 that removed many Catholics from the school board, Irish and Protestant politicians had engaged in an unstable truce. As the Irish regained political strength, however, an activist coalition that included Brandeis, educator A. Lawrence Lowell, suffragist Mary Morton Kehew, and social worker Robert Woods, established the Public School Association (PSA) in 1898, arguing that several members were “politically motivated and unfit.” As board member Rabbi Charles Fleischer declared in 1899, the schools had become “the prey of sectarianism and partisanship” and needed rescuing from “the dominion of machine politics.” Vote for “noble, incorruptible, large-minded men and women,” he advised his congregation, who “will assume the safeguarding of our schools, and the preservation through them, of our beloved democracy.”³⁰

In 1900, Julia Harrington Duff, a former Charlestown schoolteacher, wife of a prominent Irish-American physician, and mother of three schoolchildren, became the first Irish Catholic woman elected to the Boston School Board. In her five years on the board (1901-1906), she sought to challenge Protestant control of the public schools, reform what she saw as a corrupt and discriminatory system, and maintain the teaching profession as a

²⁹ Allon Gal, *Brandeis of Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 14. *Globe*, 14 March 1904, 14. *Pilot*, 11 April 1903, *Pilot*, 31 March 1906. Brandeis, in particular, believed in using his position as a lawyer to public advantage, including the Boston Elevated Railway fight, work with trade unions, workingmen’s compensation, and savings bank life insurance. Other Jewish supporters included retail magnates Edward A. and Abraham Lincoln Filene, lawyer David A. Ellis, and community activist Max Mitchell.

³⁰ Burns, “Irony of Progressive Reform,” 138-144. Quote in *Globe*, 12 November 1899, 23.

source of employment for Irish-American women.³¹ In 1902, for example, she battled to replace outdated textbooks, challenging longtime member Emily Fifield, whose daughter's employer, a local publisher, had a standing order with the school board. Using the situation to her political advantage, Duff emphasized her "fearlessness" in exposing the "machinations of the wealthy book trusts." The *Pilot*, in particular, praised her efforts, observing, "She has begun a good work with her wonted courage and certainty of persistence in exposing the grip on the schools of the great school book companies." Despite denying any underhanded dealings, Fifield was ousted in the ensuing scandal.³²

Duff's primary focus, however, was the Boston Normal School. By 1901, the number of Irish-American graduates had increased to more than half of the total and far outnumbered other ethnic groups in the public school system, but Duff claimed they were no longer assured positions, as they now had to compete with college graduates. Teaching was one of the few white-collar careers for women of moderate means in this period; because most Irish women could not afford college, she turned it into a sectarian disagreement, arguing that Yankee administrators preferred to hire Protestants over Catholics, even if it meant going outside Boston. She launched a campaign for the formation of a city teacher's college, calling for "Boston Schools for Boston Girls!"³³

³¹ In her first speech in 1901, Duff argued for a principal of cookery to "encourage cooking in schools where it was neglected," implying that Yankee board members were out of touch. Kaufman, "Julia Harrington Duff," 170-171; *Globe*, 10 April 1901, 1. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 72. Kaufman, "Julia Harrington Duff," 167, 169-170. *Globe*, December 6, 1900, 9. Janet Nolan, *Servants of the Poor: Teachers and Mobility in Ireland and Irish America* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 54-55.

³² *Charlestown Enterprise*, 9 December 1905; "Hot Time at School Board," *Globe*, 29 January 1902, 5. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 72; Fifield had been a leader of the 1880s movement (*Pilot*, 8 February 1902).

³³ One of the first nine Irish Americans to graduate from the school, Duff remained an active alumnus. For the professionalization of teaching and other professions, see Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Way, 1967), 118-120, 122. Nolan, *Servants of the Poor*, 43-45; Kaufman, "Julia Harrington Duff," 168-169; "Mrs. Duff Raps," *Globe*, 12 November 1902, 1. In 1905, there were at least 662 Irish-American teachers, as well as the superintendent George H. Conley and various headmasters. ("The Whole 'D'

These causes gave Duff tremendous support within the large Irish-American community, which she built on to organize the Democratic Citizens Party. In the 1902 elections, it succeeded in electing three new school board members, each averaging twenty thousand votes. Her ability to mobilize voters captured the attention of Fitzgerald and Lomasney, and they supported her reelection in 1903. The following year, the Democrats gained sweeping control of the board, electing several Irish Americans. Her “aggressive” tactics earned her enemies on the school board, however, including PSA members James J. Storrow (elected in 1901), and David Abram Ellis (elected in 1904).³⁴ She also attracted some Catholic enmity, particularly from businessman and Irish merchant and philanthropist Thomas B. Fitzpatrick, who supported the depoliticization of the school committee.³⁵ In response to such political machinations, Storrow proposed switching from an elected committee to a small, centralized, appointed board. In March 1905, he succeeded in getting a bill passed that reduced the number of members from twenty-four to five, eliminated subcommittees, called for open-door meetings, and prevented “grandstanding” speeches.³⁶

In 1905, an incident occurred that added impetus to Storrow’s bill and revealed the deep-seated resentment that not only reformers, but also other immigrant groups, had for Irish dominance over the schools. In June, a young Jewish teacher, Mildred Kallen, accused Headmaster Walter L. Harrington at the Washington Grammar School in the West End of improper behavior and misappropriating funds. The possibility of corruption was very alarming to Jews, as it not only violated the “community’s faith in good government,” but

Family: Just One Letter of the Alphabet, and the Lesson It Teaches,” pamphlet published by the *American Citizen*, 1905, 12-17, in Burns Library).

³⁴ Many came from first-time female Irish registered voters. Kaufman, “Julia Harrington Duff,” 176-177; *Globe*, 7 December 1902, 28; “Democratic Citizen’s Ballot,” in Lomasney Scrapbook. *Republic*, 17 December 1904.

³⁵ He argued that the PSA would “guard the educational interests of our children.” *Republic*, 10 December 1904.

³⁶ Kaufman, “Julia Harrington Duff,” 172, 177. “Smaller School Board Wanted,” *Globe*, 8 March 1905, 3.

also jeopardized their children's chances of gaining admission to the city's college preparatory high schools. Activist Robert Silverman circulated a petition for Harrington's removal, but this goal was complicated by the fact that Harrington's sister was Julia Harrington Duff, who was rumored to have helped him get the position. Duff convinced the school board that her brother was being maligned; after three months of discussion, instead of gaining Harrington's dismissal, Silverman was charged with criminal libel.³⁷

Silverman's fight for "clean and honest and upright management" in the schools soon attracted the attention of Jewish communal leaders and the Public School Association, and the case became a struggle for control of the public schools. For Progressives and Jews, the affair demonstrated once and for all why the "schools should be kept out of politics," but for many Irish, it was a fight to retain a source of major employment that, like other municipal jobs, they had marked as their own. In the end, the judge acquitted Silverman of criminal libel, but reprimanded him for relying on hearsay as evidence. Duff continued to defend her brother's record, and in September 1906, a school board subcommittee (which included Duff) dismissed the charges by majority vote. A dissenting member, however, urged removal, complaining he had been pressured to find otherwise. Outraged, Duff charged him, along with Silverman, Kallen, and Brandeis, of unjust accusations and conspiracy—attacks the *Advocate* found "shameful and unwarranted."³⁸

³⁷ Her brother was Harvard sociologist Horace Kallen (Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 229). Harrington had been passed over several times for promotion, and many felt his appointment in 1904 had been the superintendent's ploy to gain Duff's support for his reelection ("Holds the Key," *Globe*, 2 June 1904).

³⁸ *Advocate*, 22 June 1906. Supporters included Max Mitchell, the superintendent of Boston's Federated Jewish Charities, *Advocate* editor Jacob de Haas, and PSA members Louis Brandeis, James Storrow, and David Ellis. During the libel trial, Harrington admitted to smoking in front of students and using substitute teachers to do his personal business but denied misusing funds or acting as a "poor example" for students. "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 229-230; *Advocate*, 22 June 1906.

The incident demonstrated how Jewish leaders, in their desire to gain political recognition, worked with Yankee reformers to “wrestle control” from those Irish-American politicians who were not interested in cross-ethnic collaboration. The *Advocate* claimed that Duff, for example, “persistently opposed” various educational advantages for Jews, including evening educational centers (as opposed to Storrow, who supported them), the appointment of Yiddish interpreters, and textbook loans to immigrants in the North and West Ends. Such issues indicated a “real need to protect Jewish interests by organizing the city’s disparate Jews into a strong, unified, and vocal voting block,” *Advocate* editor Jacob de Haas argued. “Deplorable as the injection of sectarianism into public affairs may be,” unless Jewish voters unite to “punish the scoundrels and the criminals who are trading off their children in order to secure political advantages, they will have only themselves to blame.”³⁹

Duff and other Irish politicians, including John F. Fitzgerald, became the target of the “first self-consciously ethnic attack” on Irish political power on the ward level during the 1905 election.⁴⁰ Taking advantage of the political confusion surrounding Mayor Patrick Collins’ untimely demise that September, Fitzgerald quickly filed as a candidate in the Democratic primary, but the Board of Strategy backed Lomasney’s candidate, city clerk Edward Donovan. “Honey Fitz” used the bosses’ opposition to present himself as the independent candidate fighting the might of “the machine, the bosses, and the corporations” gaining the press’s attention by waging a whirlwind automobile campaign through the city wards.⁴¹ When Fitzgerald handily won the primary, Lomasney, in a characteristic move,

³⁹ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 235. *Advocate*, 8 December 1905. *Advocate*, 3 November 1905.

⁴⁰ James Connelly, *Triumph of Urban Progressivism*, 201.

⁴¹ *Herald*, 13 December 1905; Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 95-6; Ainsley, *Boston Mahatma*, 96-7; “Fitzgerald by 8182 in Vote of 92,000,” *Globe*, 13 December 1905, 1; James Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 80-83. The Board of Aldermen president, Irish-American Daniel Whelton, finished Collins’ term. As the *Globe* eulogized, “In a

supported Republican Louis A. Frothingham in the general election. Fitzgerald received the endorsements of former mayors Josiah Quincy and Nathan Matthews, but the GGA also supported Frothingham. GGA member Louis Brandeis, for example, although a registered Democrat, considered Fitzgerald “one of the worst types of the Democratic machine,” and campaigned for Frothingham on a non-partisan basis, arguing that he “if nominated will prove a strong candidate, and if elected an able and honest executive.”⁴² Such an attitude was not uncommon in the Progressive Era. “Where a shift in party allegiance had once been treason,” historian Robert Wiebe notes, “it became not only possible but in some circles popular, opening the way to various forms of nonpartisan and interest-group politics.”⁴³

By 1905, reformers and politicians alike also realized the importance of appealing to newly politicized ethnic voters. During a celebration of the 250th anniversary of Jewish settlement in America, for example, Brandeis gave a speech, “What Loyalty Demands,” in which he discussed the problems with voting as a distinct national group, but also used the occasion as an opportunity to convince Jewish leaders to support Frothingham’s campaign. Although hesitant to call for a “Jewish vote,” he argued that Jews could look to their own past for a history of moral leadership and break free from the “reign of fear or favor of the

time when many despair of municipal government in America, and all civic evils are often charged to immigration, this immigrant mayor lifted the mayoralty of Boston literally above all public criticism. He rose above all lines of race, or birth, or religion.” Thousands of residents contributed to a fund to build a memorial. Completed in 1908, the statue featured a bust of Collins flanked by two female figures representing his dual loyalties, Erin and Columbia. *Pilot*, 13 September 1905; O’Connor, “*The Better Sort*,” Chap. 7, 24-25.

⁴² Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 226; Brandeis to housing reformer Lawrence Turnure Veiller, 23 November 1905, in Melvin I. Urofsky and David W. Levy, ed., *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, Volume I (1870-1907): Urban Reformer*, (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1971), 378. Brandeis disliked Fitzgerald because of his support for the 1901 merger of Boston’s railway companies, which Brandeis had actively opposed. Conversely, Frothingham had supported Brandeis’ fight, and, although a political insider who had served as the Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and protégé of Republican leader Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Brandeis felt he possessed “the qualities which the people of Boston may rightfully look for in their Mayor.” Brandeis to Henry Sweetser Dewey, 13 November 1905, in Urofsky and Levy, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, Vol. II*, 372. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 82-83; Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*, 52-55; Philippa Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 57-60.

⁴³ Wiebe, *Search for Order*, 129.

Irish bosses.⁴⁴ Many Jews were inclined to agree. “The will of the Jewish people of Boston,” the *Advocate* argued, “will be law to their representatives just as soon as they begin to elect men responsible to themselves and not some boss.” As such, Jews should band “together to fight for candidates who were sympathetic to their cause.”⁴⁵

In 1905, the *American Citizen*, an anti-Catholic newspaper, published a pamphlet containing lengthy list of Catholic city employees to demonstrate the extent of Irish “graft” in City Hall. While many of these employees were “worthy, honest” men and women, the newspaper acknowledged, they were “slaves of the bosses” and subject to the “power of Rome,” as priests and nuns received “a generous slice” of their salaries. The pamphlet claimed that list proved that rather than being discriminated against, Irish Catholics raised the “race and religion” issue themselves. “American, German, Scandinavian, Italian, and Hebrew voters” need to “refuse to vote for an Irishman,” it argued, “until the salaried positions are equally distributed in proportion to merit among all the races.”⁴⁶

Fitzgerald also courted the immigrant vote. He had been one of the first Irish politicians to attend immigrant social functions as a campaign strategy. During the election, his supporters used the *Advocate* to tout his support of Jewish causes and appointments of Jews to municipal positions. In addition, Fitzgerald backed David Ellis’s reelection to the school board in an attempt to gain votes in Lomasney’s heavily Jewish ward.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Louis Brandeis, “What Loyalty Demands,” in Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis*, 230; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 227. Brandeis to Adolph Brandeis, 29 November 1905, and note 1 in Urofsky and Levy, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, Volume 1*, 386-387. Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*, 93.

⁴⁵ *Advocate*, 10 November 1905. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 202-203.

⁴⁶ “The Whole ‘D’ Family,” *American Citizen*, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8.

⁴⁷ *Advocate*, 10 November 1905. “Mr. Ellis in Roxbury,” *Globe*, 7 December 1906, 3; “Linehan is Aiding Mrs. Duff’s Candidacy,” *Boston Post*, 25 November 1906; “School Rally,” *Globe*, 10 December 1905, 4. Other prominent Irish Americans backed Ellis as well, including Matthew Cummings, national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and Edward McSweeney, an editor with the *Boston Traveler*.

When Julia Harrington Duff heard of Fitzgerald's "desertion," she accused him of "race prejudice and preferment" that deserved the "indignation and condemnation of every fair-minded citizen." She presented herself as the common man candidate, cataloguing her achievements to a sympathetic *Globe* reporter during a South Boston rally. She also benefited from the fact that while candidates such as Joseph M. Sullivan spoke of people's "disgust" with Duff's public record, they still believed that "lots of our people will not vote for a Jew."⁴⁸ The *Pilot* disagreed; its editors endorsed Ellis along with Fitzgerald, arguing that Boston's Jews, like the Irish, deserved representation "not as a favor, but as a right."⁴⁹ The *Advocate* congratulated Ellis on his widespread support, proclaiming that a vote for Duff was a vote for "grafters, self-seekers, and notoriety-hunters"; a vote for Ellis was for "an ornament at once to Judaism and to Americanism."⁵⁰ Although Lomasney delivered Ward 8 for Frothingham, Jews overwhelmingly voted for Fitzgerald, due to his support for Ellis, and voted against the "cantankerous" Duff. In the end, "Honey Fitz" won by more than 8,000 votes to become the city's first Boston-born Irish Catholic mayor, but Duff lost.⁵¹

After the election, the school board reopened the Silverman case and fired Harrington, leading the *Advocate* to declare Duff's defeat a "victory for the children." She continued to lose in future campaigns, even after regaining Fitzgerald's support in 1907. "She will explain it all by the failure of this deal, the knifing of that ward boss," de Haas

⁴⁸ She had made enemies of the "political, partisan, and prejudiced" PSA, the statisticians, and the "club mad" philanthropists, the reporter wrote, but "made friends of the hardworking families whose daughters found their true vocations as teachers in our public schools," "the men and women who wished to retain what they had fought for years—the ballot." "Surprised and Grieved," *Globe*, 9 December 1906, 1.

⁴⁹ "The Jewish Right to Place on Boston School Board," *Pilot*, 8 December 1906, 4.

⁵⁰ *Advocate*, 30 November 1906. *Advocate*, 29 September 1905; 8 December 1905; 28 September 1906.

⁵¹ O'Connor, *Boston Irish*, 175; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 234-235; Buenkner, "The Mahatma and Progressive Reform," 397-419. "Fitzgerald by 8182 in Vote of 92,000," *Globe*, 13 December 1905, 1.

wrote, but politics “played little part in her defeat. Jew, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike united to convince her she is undesirable as an educational leader in Boston.”⁵²

As the 1905 election made clear, reformers of various ethnic backgrounds were wary of Irish bosses’ political dominance in Boston. The GGA viewed Fitzgerald, in particular, as a brash upstart, fearing that corruption would become the hallmark of his tenure. Even so, during his first term he was popular with many immigrant groups. He called upon a new generation of leaders to lift Boston up from the “stagnation and decline” it had sunk into through Yankee leadership. As Connolly observes, “as an Irishman and a reformer, Fitzgerald embodied the drive for civic respectability that appealed to so many Irish.” He announced that those who “expected soft jobs” would be “disappointed. It is the purpose of the present chief executive to insist upon an adequate return for every dollar spent by the city.”⁵³ He promised to build a “bigger, better, busier Boston,” creating new business opportunities, jobs, schools, hospitals, and parks to provide benefits to all citizens. Despite his catering to immigrant voters during the election, however, Fitzgerald did little more than appoint a few Jews to key positions. His administration was clearly an Irish one.⁵⁴

Even with Fitzgerald’s apparent success as a mayor, the GGA was determined to continue its search for political graft. Hoping to heighten his image as a reformer, he proposed the creation of an independent Boston Finance Commission to investigate the city’s finances in 1906. The GGA soon took over, and as a result, the Commission reports

⁵² At her last school board meeting, Duff spoke at length with what the *Globe* called “the fervent eloquence born of a sister’s love,” but what the *Advocate* termed a “melodramatic” performance, declaring bitterly, “I am the prisoner. I have been condemned in the person of my brother.” See *Globe*, 17 December 1905; *Advocate*, 17 November 1905; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 230-231; *Advocate*, 13 December 1907.

⁵³ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 84. As the *Pilot* later stated, his excellent service would “vindicate not merely his own honor but the honor of every Catholic in Boston.” *Pilot*, 15 January 1910.

⁵⁴ O’Connor, “*The Better Sort*,” Chap. 7, page 26. *Republic*, 10 August 1907. See *Republic*, 3 February 1906.

portrayed an administration bloated with graft, corruption, and scandal, an image the press pounced on to create attention-grabbing headlines regarding the actions of various public officials in real estate transactions, the distribution of city contracts, and general inefficiency that created a “swollen” municipal budget. Although it never personally linked Fitzgerald to illegal activities, and the graft that it did uncover was relatively small compared to other cities, the Commission’s report did considerable damage by laying the blame squarely on the mayor’s administration. It claimed that his goal “was not merely to use or perfect the political machine,” but to “become the machine itself,” leading to the creation of a spoils system in Boston’s city government.⁵⁵ The end result was public embarrassment for Fitzgerald. He retained most of his working-class constituency but even with the help of Martin Lomasney, who joined forces with him in frustration over the GGA’s muckraking attempts, it was not enough. Many of his middle-class supporters abandoned him in his reelection campaign, and he lost to the Republican candidate, George A. Hibbard. Brandeis, in particular, expressed great satisfaction in writing to the new mayor, “I congratulate the City of Boston more than yourself.”⁵⁶

The Finance Commission continued its investigations during Hibbard’s term, and, in 1909, it proposed a new city charter that would centralize the government under the control of a powerful mayor and a weaker council, advised by a permanent Finance Commission. Its goal was to take partisan politics out of local government; council members would serve two year-terms while the mayor, who had almost total control over budgetary decisions and appointments, would serve four years. Party nominations would be replaced by petition,

⁵⁵ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 85-90. Burns, “Irony of Progressive Reform,” 148-153.

⁵⁶ Brandeis to Hibbard, 11 December 1907, in Urofsky and Levy, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, Vol. I*, 60. *Advocate*, 1 November 1907; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 236.

hopefully keeping Republican mayors in control and lessening the influence of Democratic Irish representatives. Voters were offered two choices: Plan One, an altered version of the current structure, with a weak mayor, a thirty-six member council with ward elections and candidates' retention of party designations, or Plan Two, the reform plan (described above). The battle to sway public opinion began immediately. Reformers argued that Plan Two would place power in the hands of the people, thus creating "a United Boston"; Plan One supporters felt municipal power should remain widespread, rather than with one person, who, Lomasney declared, could "be bought."⁵⁷ As Connolly points out, while the Plan Two support base was overwhelmingly made up of elite Yankee reformers, it also included many in the Irish and Jewish middle class, who clearly had group interests at heart. Members of the Irish elite were anxious to promote their independence from the bosses and appreciated the idea of direct, legitimate election of Irish candidates by the people. Jewish leaders sanctioned the plan because it provided the possibility of electing a Jew to the Common Council, nullifying the power of the ward bosses, and more efficiently delivering social services to the poor. Lomasney disliked Plan Two for the increased power it would bring to the mayor's office, but Fitzgerald saw its usefulness, as it allowed him to resume his reform mantle in his 1909 reelection bid. Leaders on all sides attempted to influence the working class vote, but ultimately, Plan Two won by a slim margin.⁵⁸

James J. Storrow and John F. Fitzgerald, two proponents of the Plan Two proposal, were the candidates in the first election to take place under the new plan, in 1909. Despite Fitzgerald's support for the plan, the GGA attempted to make the contest into one between

⁵⁷ Burns, "The Irony of Progressive Reform," 151; Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 92-93.

⁵⁸ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 96-97; Burns, "Irony of Progressive Reform," 152-153.

“the Best Man” and the “Boss,” while Fitzgerald presented it as a fight between the “Beacon Street Aristocrat” and “Fitzgerald the Democrat.” Both candidates appealed to immigrants on class and ethnic grounds. Fitzgerald’s Hebrew Citizen’s League declared he had “always championed the cause of the Jewish people,” reminding voters of his work with immigrants, his attempts to give Jews recognition in office, and most significantly, his support of David Ellis over Julia Duff in the 1905 School Board election. Ads for Fitzgerald and Storror regularly appeared in the *Advocate* in the run-up to the election, appealing to Jewish voters on the basis of both candidates’ record concerning Jewish issues and clean government. Storror, as a Progressive and the Good Government Association candidate, warned voters “against ‘Fitzgeraldism,’ a code word for the prospect of rampant corruption,” while Fitzgerald painted Storror a stooge of big business. This election was particularly significant; the newly revised city charter had instilled greater power in the mayor’s office, expanding the term to four years. As such, the winner would be more influential than ever.⁵⁹

In the end, Fitzgerald won a crucial victory due to support from immigrant constituencies and his core Irish-American electorate. For the time being, at least, he demonstrated the ability of the Irish-American political boss to appeal to immigrant voters based on their group concerns. As the Hebrew Citizenship League extolled, “He learned to know the Jewish people as they really are, and this friendship has always come to the surface in almost every public act of his in later years.”⁶⁰

Finding Solutions to Communal Problems

⁵⁹ Lomasney Scrapbook. Storror claimed Fitzgerald was not “a great friend of the Jewish race.” For response, see *Advocate*, 24 December 1909. O’Connor, *Hub: Past and Present*, 186.

⁶⁰ “Open Letter,” *Advocate*, 17 December 1909; *Advocate*, 21 March 1913.

As James J. Connolly argues, Progressivism was not dominated wholly by middle-class, native-born Protestant reformers or by partisan politicians. Men and women in Boston's Irish and Jewish communities tried to improve social conditions by advocating forward-thinking, group-specific goals in ethnic communal, religious, and labor associations. Each movement "encouraged people to imagine themselves as members of a specific social grouping," Connolly points out, "and then to act politically according to that loyalty," rather than just as a member of a political party. Through such activities, Robert Wiebe writes, individuals "increasingly met each other in broad areas of mutual concern" and learned political tactics to further their causes.⁶¹

Irish and Jewish Americans were involved in various reform movements, including aiding immigrants, organized labor, and female suffrage. As discussed in Chapter 1, the city's Irish Catholic and Jewish communities had extensive networks of organizations designed to aid residents through every stage of their lives, including the Federated Jewish Charities, Council of Jewish Women, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, St. Vincent de Paul Society, and the League of Catholic Women. Such groups helped lessen class and cultural tensions within the community, particularly as discrimination became more prevalent.⁶²

Unions and benevolent societies provided working-class Irish and Jews with an opportunity to effect change through collective action. Although many labor unions were ethnically organized, there were opportunities for cross-ethnic and cross-class alliances.⁶³ In

⁶¹ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 9, 38. Wiebe, *Search for Order*, 128-129.

⁶² Class tensions dissipated in Jewish communities, for example, as "classical Reform Judaism's social justice initiatives, by promoting philanthropic contacts between wealthier 'uptown' Jews and poorer 'downtown' ones, broke down barriers between the two worlds of American Judaism" and "each began to learn more about the other" (Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Judaism: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004, 196).

⁶³ In 1906, for example, the *Advocate* spoke of the divisions from "race, class and party interests." The Jewish worker will "never have any appreciable influence on elections," until he "ceases to vote as a partisan, worker

1902, for example, Philip Davis, a Russian Jewish graduate of Harvard College, and worker at the Civic Service House in the North End (a settlement house founded by community activist Meyer Bloomfield), helped young Jewish female garment workers organize trade unions. The groups joined with Irish labor leaders, including Mary Kenney O’Sullivan, Margaret Foley, and Julia O’Connor (leader of the Irish telephone workers union), to establish the Women’s Trade Union League (WTUL) in 1904, a cross-ethnic and cross-class organization devoted to gaining greater rights for working women, including better working conditions and suffrage. The group was one of the most influential in Greater Boston, along with Ignatius McNulty’s Boston Central Labor Union, which consisted of 116 affiliated local orders. One of the most effective examples of cross-ethnic unity was seen during the 1912 Strike of Bread and Rose in the textile factories of Lawrence, Massachusetts. As O’Sullivan later wrote, “Catholics, Jews, Protestants, and unbelievers, men and women of many races and languages, were working together in a common cause.”⁶⁴

Boston’s rabbis and priests, while anxious to not be seen as unduly influencing elected officials, also promoted ethnic political causes. Rabbis, for example, preached social justice and communal activism. Conservative and orthodox rabbis spoke out on such political issues as women’s suffrage and labor, which, they argued, were in keeping with the “spirit of Judaism.”⁶⁵ Rabbi Harry Levi of Temple Israel, Boston’s Reform congregation, an

or Jew and learns to vote as a Man, ENLIGHTENED and FREE.” “Jewish Labor Vote,” *Jewish Advocate*, 24 August 1906. Even so, workers did fight for communal causes. Jews, for example, agitated not to have to work on the High Holy Days (*Advocate*, 13 October 1905; “Jews Meet to Protest,” *Globe*, 23 September 1912, 4).

⁶⁴ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 115-116. Mary Kenney O’Sullivan, “Autobiography: The Necessity of Organization,” 252; Mary Kenney O’Sullivan Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University. Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁶⁵ Braverman, “The Emergence of a Unified Community, 1880-1917,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 84; *Advocate*, 9 November 1916; *Advocate*, 19 April 1917. In 1915, Levi joined others in criticizing “Birth of a Nation,” arguing that the groundbreaking silent film was “unpatriotic,” giving “new life not only in race

accomplished orator, was in great demand by both religious and secular organizations. Levi used his pulpit to educate his audience about Judaism and Jews, and to speak out against social injustice—particularly concerning child labor, immigration restriction, racism, women’s suffrage, and war. He never lost faith in the power of the ballot box and social service, and urged his listeners to give “the best that in you lies to the city, the state, the country in which you live.” The Jewish community was divided by ethnic, religious, and economic tensions, and rabbis worked together to foster communal unity. “Born abroad or here, Orthodox or Reform, we are all in the last analysis Jews, dependent on and responsible for each other,” Levi noted in 1917. “Our faith, our fate, is one.”⁶⁶

While Archbishop John Williams had been anxious to avoid accusations of sectarianism, his successor, William Cardinal O’Connell, was more assertive in his desire to have Catholics play a role in shaping civic affairs. As he declared at the archdiocese’s 1908 centennial celebration, Catholics “must make the history of the coming [century].” O’Connell’s personal political leanings were Republican, and he had a strong distaste for ward bosses like James Michael Curley. He was friendly with Fitzgerald, however, and even officiated at the wedding of Fitzgerald’s daughter, Rose, to Joseph P. Kennedy, in his private chapel in 1914. He was also close with several Protestants, including Governor Curtis Guild (1906-1909) and his wife, and President William Howard Taft, whose summer residence in Beverly he often visited. Such friendships were lauded as examples of “the fraternity of

hatred, but that sectional feeling that was born of the Civil War and which happily has been passing away.” “Calls Play Unpatriotic,” *Advocate*, 7 May 1915. “Symposium on Woman Suffrage,” 29 October 1915. See also Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009), 62-66.

⁶⁶ “A Year of Wonderful Communal Progress,” *Advocate*, 13 September 1917. *Advocate*, 15 December 1916.

American citizenship,” as Guild wrote in a letter to “William.” For O’Connell, they served to “underline Catholic patriotism.”⁶⁷

Just as his Jewish colleagues sought to convey the connections between American and Jewish teachings, O’Connell imbued Catholic politicians with the need to be true to Catholic ideology and asserted the compatibility of Catholicism with Americanism. In 1916, he addressed the annual convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies at Madison Square Garden, warning against the dangers of socialism and extolling the virtues of Catholic patriotism. Catholicism only grew stronger in America, he argued, while Protestantism was weakening, and America could rely on the church’s leaders to uphold the moral fabric of society. Catholic “civic allegiance” was not divided, he argued. “The Catholic Church and all her children abiding here love America with a sacred and undying love for the liberty she has promised to secure for her. Let America also learn to love the Catholic Church” as the “staunchest safeguard of American liberty.”⁶⁸

Unlike many of Boston’s rabbis, O’Connell and other Catholic leaders were overwhelmingly opposed to women’s suffrage. Women could best influence society by raising their children as good Catholics and by engaging in charitable work through the League of Catholic Women (founded in 1910), he argued, to follow the “municipal housekeeping strand of Progressivism.” As the *Pilot* noted in 1915, “the Christian woman in her home has unlimited power and her influence for good cannot be over-estimated”; although men made the laws, “she can influence men’s morals for good or for evil.” Some Catholic women, including Katherine Conway, editor of the *Pilot* and *Republic*, argued that

⁶⁷ Cutler, *Honey Fitz*, 192, 179. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 127-129. Regardless, O’Connell’s political influence was felt in many ways; in fact, the state legislature referred to him as “Number One.”

⁶⁸ “Talks to Young Men: Politics,” *Pilot*, 7 October 1911. O’Connell, “Our Country,” American Federation of Catholic Societies, Madison Square Garden, New York, 20 August 1916, in *Sermons and Addresses*, 160, 166, 167.

women lacked the physical strength of men and that their “over-sensitive consciences” prevented them from being able to make difficult political decisions.⁶⁹

Religious and communal leaders were both involved in one of the most important issues affecting ethnic Americans: sectarianism in public institutions. The Irish had been actively involved in combating Protestant sectarianism for decades. As they became more prominent in municipal government, they attempted to assert their influence to gain more rights for Catholics, including a day off for city employees on Evacuation Day (also St. Patrick’s Day) and granting greater measures for Catholics in public institutions. In 1911, the Massachusetts branch of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union succeeded in lobbying for saloons to be closed on Good Friday.⁷⁰

Jewish leaders approached the issue of sectarianism differently; instead of advocating for more rights for Jews, they called for complete separate of church and state. As School Board member David Ellis argued in 1906 regarding the public schools, no one class or church should impose its views on the “lives and liberties of our children.” Just like Catholics, Jews had “a right to demand that no bible or any other religious book...be made compulsory” in a child’s education. Over the next several years, religious leaders and community organizations like the Boston Jewish Sabbath Association sought to end discrimination against Jewish students, particularly concerning participation in school

⁶⁹ *Pilot*, 24 August 1912. *Pilot*, 7 May 1910; “Catholic Suffragists,” *Pilot*, 23 October 1915; *Pilot*, 15 April 1916. “There is No New Gospel of True Womanhood: Progressive Era Activism in the Boston League of Catholic Women.” *American Catholic Studies*, 118.2 (Summer 2007): 21-42. For quotes, see Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 72-73; “Christian Womanhood,” *Pilot*, 9 January 1915. Conway, “Why Women Should Not Have the Ballot,” *Pilot*, 9 March 1907.

⁷⁰ *Pilot*, 9 April 1911, *Pilot*, 7 October 1911. As John F. Quinn notes, “For Irish teetotalers, temperance was the most effective means of breaking down longstanding stereotypes about ‘drunken Paddies’ and gaining entry into the American mainstream.” “Father Mathew’s Disciples: American Catholic Support for Temperance, 1840-1920,” *Church History* vol. 65, no. 4 (December 1996), 624, 634.

Christmas pageants, scheduling exams or punishing absences on Jewish holidays, and antisemitism by other students or even teachers.⁷¹ Also, from 1906 through 1908, Jewish leaders waged a particularly fierce campaign against teaching the Irish language and history in the public schools, arguing that no one group should dominate over another—as opposed to the Irish, who saw it as a question of majority influence.⁷²

The sectarian debate came to a head in the 1910s with the introduction of an amendment to the state constitution denying appropriations to Catholic institutions. In 1915, Cardinal O’Connell congratulated Catholics for their efforts in blocking the amendment, arguing that its passage would have been as “much of a disgrace to Massachusetts as her old-time ‘Blue Laws.’” Catholic Americans asked for nothing but their due, he argued; “they have intelligence and manhood, and therefore understand their rightful position—and they intend to defend that position.” The issue reemerged two years later, and O’Connell again voiced his opinions, not, he assured nativists, as the Catholic archbishop, but within his rights as that “natural spokesman of my co-religionists” and as “a citizen of this State.” He argued for the need for moderate state assistance for private institutions, noting the expense that Catholics hospitals and schools saved Massachusetts, as well as the benefit in teaching and medical care, and urged vocal opposition to the amendment’s “bigotry.”⁷³ Most Jewish leaders, conversely, supported the anti-aid amendment, arguing that it provided for the

⁷¹ “Religious Education in Public Schools,” *Pilot*, 11 May 1901; *Advocate*, 9 November 1906; “Christmas in the Schools,” *Advocate*, 28 December 1906; *Advocate*, 4 January 1907. *Advocate*, 23 August 1917; *Advocate*, 13 September 1917.

⁷² *Advocate*, 23 February 1906. *Advocate*, 20 September 1907; *Pilot*, 30 May 1908; *Globe*, 31 May 1908, 25.

⁷³ O’Connell, “False Americanism,” 2 May 1915, and “State Aid,” 28 October 1917, in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence William Cardinal O’Connell, Archbishop of Boston, Volume V* (Boston: The Pilot Publishing Company, 1922), 26-28, 267-268. *Pilot*, 3 October 1914; *Pilot*, 8 January 1916.

separation of church and state and “guarantees the free exercise of religious liberty to every citizen.” Just as importantly, it prevented “interference” from any one sect.⁷⁴

While the issue of sectarianism tended to divide Irish Catholics and Jews, opposition to another issue, immigration restriction, brought them together in common cause. Between 1900 and 1914, 891,806 immigrants arrived in America, forty-five percent from eastern and central Europe and twenty-six percent from southern Europe. By 1910, immigrants made up almost fifteen percent of the United States population; in Boston, they represented more than thirty-six percent.⁷⁵ This increase caused a resurgence in popularity of the immigration restriction movement, orchestrated by the Immigration Restriction League (IRL). Under the leadership of Prescott Hall and Robert de Courcy Ward, the IRL became increasingly focused on economics and race as the central issues. As Ward argued in 1904, it was time to end the “sentimental” idea of America as a refuge for all the world’s peoples; the proper way to deal with problems such as Russian pogroms was to put pressure on the czar, not to keep America’s doors wide open. The continued inclusion of new immigrants in America, particularly the “undesirable” migrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, would lead to a “mongrel race” and the destruction of “American” characteristics. “Are we not fairly well satisfied,” he asked, “with the characteristics, mental and physical, of the old American stock? Do we not love American traits as they are?”⁷⁶

⁷⁴ See, for example, *Advocate*, 25 November 1910; “Fleischer on Hyphenated Americans,” *Advocate*, 16 December 1910; “Jews Support ‘Anti-Aid’ Amendment,” *Advocate*, 1 November 1917.

⁷⁵ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992, 110; Raymond L. Cohn, “Table 1: Immigration Volume and Rates,” in “Immigration to the United States,” <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/cohn.immigration.us>, accessed 3 September 2008; and “Table 19. Nativity of the Population for the 50 Largest Urban Places: 1870 to 1990,” U.S. Bureau of the Census, Internet Release date: March 9, 1999, <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/tab19.html>, accessed 3 September 2008.

⁷⁶ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 239; Robert de Courcy Ward, “The Immigration Problem: Its Present Status and its Relation to the American Race of the Future,” *Charities* 11 (6 February 1904). See also

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and his son-in-law, Essex County Congressman Augustus P. Gardner, supported the IRL's goals for new legislation, sponsoring an anti-immigration bill in 1906. In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a Congressional commission to examine the social and economic impact of the "new" immigration. After four years of study, Republican Senator William Dillingham of Vermont's Immigration Commission issued a forty-two-volume report in 1911 that argued for the inability of Southern and Eastern European immigrants to assimilate and blamed them for economic problems. The Commission also approved a literacy test as the best gauge of an immigrant's fitness. Senator Dillingham acknowledged that he supported the act only after learning it would reduce immigration from those regions by as much as thirty percent, while not affecting immigration from Northern and Western Europe. Over the next six years, the IRL worked for the passage of the literacy test.⁷⁷

Ethnic leaders played an active role in fighting the restriction movement "as a matter of self-defense," through organizational work, public opinion, and most importantly, political pressure. In 1907, the German-American Alliance and the Ancient Order of Hibernians signed an agreement to oppose all immigration restriction.⁷⁸ Jewish Americans were ever mindful of worsening conditions in Eastern Europe and the need for an American refuge. Irish and Jewish leaders in Boston spoke out about immigrants' contributions to their

Ward, "National Eugenics in Relation to Immigration," *North American Review* 192 (July 1910): 57-67; Ross, *Old World in the New*, 197.

⁷⁷ Barbara Miller Solomon, *Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989), 103-151; Cohn, "Immigration to the United States," <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/cohn.immigration.us>, accessed 3 September 2008. Jerome Karabel argues, "Though ostensibly a neutral act targeted at individuals, the legislation in fact applied the principal exclusion to European immigrants." Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton* (New York: Mariner Books, 2005), 78, 77. The law also further restricted Asian immigration.

⁷⁸ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 123.

adopted nation and America's history of welcoming new arrivals. As Rabbi M.M. Eichler of Temple Ohabei Shalom remarked in 1906, the founding fathers "always felt that Providence had intended this broad and fertile continent as an asylum for all the oppressed and the down-trodden peoples of the decrepit European monarchies."⁷⁹

Irish-American politicians recognized that the issue was a touchstone for their newly politicized immigrant constituencies, and that it gave them an edge over more conservative Yankee candidates who favored restriction. James Michael Curley, John F. Fitzgerald, James A. Gallivan, and others worked with community leaders to organize rallies and educate voters as to immigration restriction, particularly regarding their own individual record in fighting it. In June 1906, for example, some 500 representatives of Boston's immigrant communities held a mass "citizens" meeting at Faneuil Hall to protest the Gardner-Lodge anti-immigration bill then pending in Congress. Mayor John F. Fitzgerald, ex-Mayor Josiah Quincy (1896-1899), School Board chair James J. Storrow, and member David A. Ellis addressed the gathering, along with Max Mitchell, superintendent of the Federated Jewish Charities of Boston. They resolved that distribution was the problem of immigration, not restriction, and opposed educational testing. Immigrants "bring strong bodies, willing hands and enterprise," Quincy declared. "If they are not educated they will get educated here and will educate their children and make the very best of citizens out of them."⁸⁰

The *Pilot* took a firm stand against immigration restriction, praising the Catholic congressmen who opposed the anti-immigration bill, as well as Fitzgerald, who, when a congressman, "warmly defended the rights of the Hebrew immigrants." "The Catholics of

⁷⁹ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 123; Solomon, *Ancestors and Immigrants*, 196-197. *Advocate*, 3 August 1906, quoted in Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 241.

⁸⁰ "Stand By Immigrant," *Globe*, 7 June 1906, 8; "Restricted Immigration," *Advocate*, 8 June 1906.

Irish descent have taken to heart the scriptural warning, “For ye also were strangers,” the *Pilot* editor wrote, “and want all new comers to free America to get a “square deal.”⁸¹ Similarly, the *Advocate* made its position clear: “Jewish Voters, Attention! Before casting your ballot for congressman in your district, investigate how he stands regarding restrictive immigration. Do not vote for any candidate who favors any further restriction in our Immigration Laws,” as it would be “a vote against your own people.” Despite such opposition in ethnic communities around the country, Congress finally succeeded in passing the literacy test act in February 1917, overriding a veto by President Woodrow Wilson.⁸²

By the 1910s, immigration restriction and other ethnic concerns heavily influenced immigrant voting patterns. In 1912, for example, Irish and Jews voted for Woodrow Wilson because of the Democrats’ support for unrestricted immigration, while they voted for him again in 1916 due to his appointment of Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court and his position of neutrality during World War I (which began in 1914).⁸³ In the 1913 gubernatorial election between David I. Walsh and Augustus Gardner, and the mayoral election between James Michael Curley and Thomas J. Kenny, the pro-immigration candidates, Curley and Walsh, won. All of these events demonstrated the breakdown of the coalition between Yankee, Irish, and Jewish Progressives, particularly as the Good Government Association became connected with antisemitism and support for restriction.

Brandeis had first met Wilson during the 1912 presidential campaign, when the Progressive lawyer helped the candidate put together his “New Freedom” platform calling

⁸¹ “Catholic Congressmen and Immigration,” *Pilot*, 1 February 1908.

⁸² “Jingoism,” *Advocate*, 16 October 1908. “Immigration Debate,” *Advocate*, 18 December 1908. For Keliher, see “In the name of Decency,” Lomasney Scrapbook. *Advocate*, 8 February 1917.

⁸³ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 243. Irish voters were also influenced by their loyalty to the Democratic Party.

for limited federal government and opposition to monopolies. In February 1916, Wilson nominated Brandeis to the Supreme Court as the first Jewish justice. Although conservatives bitterly contested his nomination and signed petitions objecting to his “radical” record of anti-corporation muckraking and his Jewishness, he received strong support from reformers and other groups. The controversy raged for several months before his appointment was confirmed in June 1916. To prevent the appearance of conflict, Brandeis resigned his presidency of the Zionist Organization of America, but he remained active behind the scenes. His appointment “caused a great stir” throughout the country, particularly in Boston’s Jewish community, where he was already a hero. When his nomination was announced at a West End citizenship lecture, “800 men and women cheered for more ten minutes, many with tears of joy running down their faces.”⁸⁴

The 1913 gubernatorial election was the first chance that Bostonians had to voice their opinion on restriction with their votes. While the state Republican committee toned down its support for the measure, Gardner insisted on discussing it during the campaign. Thus, ethnic newspapers were “able to equate a vote for him as vote for restriction” and they campaigned vigorously for Democratic candidate David I. Walsh. Walsh, “the son of an alien,” was “by character, training and personal qualities” right for the job, and his election would be the “most perfect and precise answer that could be given to the Gardner view of American life and its needs.”⁸⁵

Walsh, like Curley, Lomasney, and Fitzgerald, was the son of immigrant parents who had died when he was young, his childhood in Clinton, located in rural central

⁸⁴ Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis*, 196-200; 291-293. “Brandeis Nominated to Supreme Court,” *Advocate*, 3 February 1916. “Buy Photo Card of Brandeis,” *Advocate*, 24 February 1916; “Wilson’s Letter to Brandeis,” *Advocate*, 11 May 1916; “Brandeis Confirmation Expected,” *Advocate*, 1 June 1916; *Advocate*, 8 June 1916.

⁸⁵ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 242.

Massachusetts, had not engendered the same bitterness toward Beacon Hill. In addition, Walsh and all of his nine siblings graduated from high school, and many went on to attain higher degrees; Walsh, in fact, graduated from Holy Cross College and Boston University Law School. Walsh launched his political career in 1910 when he gave his first speech at the state Democratic Convention. He set himself apart from the bosses by allying with reformers like Brandeis and clothing manufacturer Edward A. Filene. In 1912, he was elected lieutenant governor under Governor Eugene Foss and he became known as a champion of labor due to his sympathy for the Lawrence strikers, and an ardent supporter of women's suffrage. During the 1913 election, he received widespread support from liberal Protestants like President Wilson and Harvard president Charles A. Eliot. The fact that Walsh was Catholic "should not interfere with my ballot," Eliot wrote. "I voted for Mr. Walsh because only through him could I express my opinion."⁸⁶

As the state's first Catholic governor, Walsh proved to be efficient, liberal, and non-partisan; he appointed many women and Republicans to state commissions, and tried to improve the conditions of workers through evening school education and a workingmen's compensation bill. While his Catholicism and support for Irish nationalism were issues at times, Walsh would simply deflect questions regarding his faith or the lobby for aid for sectarian schools and other matters to "the Cardinal-Archbishop as my theologian."⁸⁷ As O'Connell assured Walsh after the election, "you know very well that personally I shall never attempt to inject any views of my own. I never have done so, and I never will do so." Even so, O'Connell wrote, "I shall always be happy to be of any service that I can," and "you may

⁸⁶ Dorothy G. Wayman, *David I. Walsh: Citizen Patriot* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), 46-49; Michael Edmund Hennessey, *Twenty Years of Massachusetts Politics from Russell to McCall, 1890-1915* (Boston: Practical Politics, Inc., 1917), 352. "Brandeis Endorses Walsh," *Advocate*, 29 October 1915.

⁸⁷ *Brookline Tablet*, 17 November 1914.

always count on my prayers for the successful administration of your responsible office.” In addition, he urged Walsh to remember his Catholicism. He took the same approach in dealing with Mayor Curley and other political bosses who felt he was too conciliatory in his dealings with the opposition.⁸⁸

The 1913 mayoral election was even more controversial. GGA leader George Nutter argued that Curley was “the worst yet,” and that “Boston has disgraced itself” with his election. Republicans and Protestants were “stay at homes,” while the Irish “were solid for the machine.” In addition, he notes, “The Jews also believed Curley was their friend because of his attitude against restriction of immigration.” In fact, Braverman argues, two out of every three Jews in Boston voted for Curley. The savvy ward boss promoted his work fighting immigration restriction, appearing at numerous labor rallies, Zionist functions, and peace demonstrations and ensuring that Jewish newspapers reported on these activities. In addition, while candidate Thomas J. Kenny was a well-respected school board member, he was hurt by his GGA endorsement due to that organization’s association with the Republican Party and immigration restriction.⁸⁹

Curley claimed his decision to run for mayor was due to his “desire to serve the people of my city, coupled with the love of home and Boston and the absolute certainty of my success despite what many believed to be great odds.” He disavowed bossism, noting,

⁸⁸ O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 126-127. O’Connell to David I. Walsh, 2 March 1914; William Cardinal O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 11:4. Even so, he did have his opponents. George Nutter, for example, noted bitterly after the election that “the State is turned over to Walsh... We expect at best a colorless regime, and shall be lucky if we have not a crowd of Irish incompetents landed upon his offices.” Michael Connolly, “First Hurrah,” 8-9.

⁸⁹ Nutter Diaries, 1 January 1914, 15 January 1914, quoted in Michael Connolly, “First Hurrah,” 8-9. *Advocate*, 17 December 1909; *Advocate*, 21 March 1913. *Advocate*, 8 January 1915; “Urge President to Veto Immigration Bill,” *Advocate*, 22 January 1915; “Immigration Bill Vetoed,” *Advocate*, 29 January 1915. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 230-233.

“The power has passed from the ward committee. It has little or no patronage to distribute and when one has not anything to give away in politics people don’t waste much time on him.”⁹⁰ Such speeches demonstrated Curley’s mastery of Progressive rhetoric. He consistently cast himself as the voice of “the people,” whom he defined as Boston’s working-class ethnic population, and highlighted his generosity toward them. Even Walsh characterized Curley as the “Mayor of the Poor,” although the two were frequently at political odds. His opponents were the “special interests” of the GGA and Yankee elite. As Connolly argued, “Curley’s career illustrated a broader shift toward personality-centered, publicity-oriented politics” and his shaping of the public discourse. Part of this process included a “public re-conception of Boston’s ethnic history,” in which the struggle between the Yankees and the Irish took on mythic proportions.⁹¹ Curley exacerbated these tensions by tweaking Protestant traditions, declaring in 1916, for example, “The New England of the Puritan and the Boston of rum, codfish and slaves are as dead as Julius Caesar.”⁹²

Despite this success, the support of immigrant voters could take Irish politicians only so far. In 1916, having lost his bid for reelection to Curley, John Fitzgerald ran against Henry Cabot Lodge for the U.S. Senate, in the first state election by popular vote. As active interest group voters, Jews voted for Fitzgerald en masse, willing to overlook corruption charges rather than vote for the restrictionist Lodge. Even so, Lodge won due to his strong support base in the rest of the state.⁹³

⁹⁰ Curley, “Life-Story of Mayor-Elect Curley As Told By Himself,” *Globe*, 18 January 1914, 57; Beatty, *Rascal King*, 48.

⁹¹ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 135, 137.

⁹² *Boston Herald*, 21 January 1916.

⁹³ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 243.

Curley fell victim to the same corruption charges in his 1917 reelection campaign against GGA candidate Andrew Peters. Implications of Curley's graft and accusations of disloyalty for his vocal support of Irish nationalism and German Americans during World War I "fanned the flames of group hatred in Boston." Such accusations led Curley to inject greater ethnic appeals into his campaign, aided by the editor of the AOH newspaper, the *Hibernian*, a close friend. The election was "a fight between the Irish and anti-Irish forces," the paper declared, appealing to "every red-blooded son of the race" to back the mayor's reelection campaign. Even more forcefully, the paper claimed, "A vote for Peters is a vote for the anti-Catholic, anti-Irish combination," comparing the GGA with the APA in maintaining "the race and religious issue in this city." Connolly claims that such harsh expressions became "the norm in Boston public life," particularly as "issues surrounding the war stoked ethnic consciousness." In the end, Curley lost his bid for reelection, foiled not by Peters, but by the multi-candidate, non-partisan system. Congressman James A. Gullivan of South Boston, whose platform was similar to Curley's, and Lomasney's candidate, Congressman Peter F. Tague of Charlestown, competed for the same Irish voters. The antagonism among various factions only grew during the war, particularly between Yankees and Irish, as "the question of home rule in Ireland would fuel the issue of Irish civic legitimacy in Boston."⁹⁴

Conclusion

In the first decade and a half of the twentieth century in Boston, the conciliatory methods of previous generations were replaced by more aggressive tactics and grassroots

⁹⁴ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 159-160.

efforts, helping to “fuel a process in which ethnic politics became interest-group activism.”⁹⁵ Ward-based politicians worked to appeal to an “Irish” or “Jewish” vote to garner power, while activists used grassroots methods to promote group interests in the civic arena. As native-born Bostonians, Irish ward bosses like Lomasney, Fitzgerald, and Curley were confident in their Americanness, but parochial in their outlook. Seeking to appeal to their core Irish-American constituency, they engaged in rhetoric and actions that emphasized their connection to the neighborhood and to Irish-American culture. They also sought to demonstrate their ability to provide patronage, realizing the importance of security to their working-class electorate. As new arrivals from Southern and Eastern Europe began to outnumber the Irish in some wards, bosses reluctantly included them, but only when their voting strength began to challenge their dominance.

Jewish leaders increasingly began to follow the Irish example and mobilize new immigrants to become citizens and active voters. Such organization was vital to attaining a voice for the ethnic community in city affairs and acceptance as Americans. Jewish political awakening in Boston coincided with the rise of a reform movement that sought to challenge the ascendancy of the Irish bosses. In response, Irish factions took a defensive posture against the Yankee establishment even as they asserted their dominance in the public schools and in city hall.

Ethnic communal activists attempted to bridge this divide as they promoted communal interests and improved social conditions. Labor leaders, suffragists, and charitable workers were largely successful in cross-ethnic and cross-class coalitions, but different

⁹⁵ James J. Connolly, “Beyond the Machine: Martin Lomasney and Ethnic Politics,” in Ueda and Wright, *Faces of Community*, 192.

religious ideologies and sectarian disagreements sometimes led to conflicting sectarian disagreements. Immigration restriction proved to be the most unifying issue for Irish and Jews in this period, helping to unify the communities across class and cultural lines as never before and fight for issues like naturalization, unrestricted immigration, and the prevention of discriminatory legislation helped shape the each group's collective identity.

By the 1910s, the alliance between Yankees and Jewish reformers was beginning to break down, due to Republican support for immigration restriction and associations with antisemitism. The ability of Irish-American politicians like James Michael Curley and David I. Walsh to present themselves as a candidate of the people or as operating outside of boss politics, gained them greater support among Jews and other immigrant groups. Curley, however, played on ethnic tensions, particularly between Irish and Yankees, giving new depth to the bitter enmity between the groups.

While divisions within and between ethnic communities along class, cultural, and religious lines remained, individuals were more likely to come together politically to support group interests, rather than object to such action as interest group activity. As a result of these developments, Irish and Jews emerged as full, if not entirely accepted, political constituents in Boston, and were eager to demonstrate their desire to take part in all aspects of civic life as ethnic Americans.

Chapter 3: “If It Wasn’t For the Irish and the Jews”: Ethnic Patriotism on the Civic Stage, 1900-1917

Tonight we meet in honor of St. Patrick, who was not an Irishman by birth, but by choice, and was such a shining example of what an adopted citizen ought to be that we, his children, should make the best possible citizens of this land of our adoption.

—Dr. P.J. Timmins, St. Patrick’s Day celebration, Boston Central Council of the United Irish League, Boston, March 1903²²⁶

Not merely as Jews, but as American citizens, we have gathered here to-night to testify to the undying loyalty and altruistic patriotism of the Jewish citizens to the great American ideals of liberty and democracy.

—Lee M. Friedman, Chair, Celebration for the 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States, Faneuil Hall, November 1905²²⁷

As Boston’s Irish Catholics and Jews gained political power and influence in the Progressive Era, they were determined to claim their right to participate in the civic life of the city on an equal footing with Yankee Protestants. They used this participation to cultivate group consciousness, promote their respectability, and advocate for ethnic interests. At the same time, they stressed their patriotism and intrinsic loyalty to American ideals, seeking to disprove nativists who argued that the only true Americans were those whose ancestors arrived on the *Mayflower*.

This public assertiveness was demonstrated in the many celebrations, parades, and rallies that Irish Catholics and Jews organized to commemorate ethnic anniversaries and celebrate civic holidays. Held in communal institutions and the city’s public spaces—streets, parks, theatres, and halls—on civic and religious holidays, such “community rituals,” as historian Timothy Meagher calls them, were designed to exhibit ethno-religious pride and demographic strength. At the same time, they were performances of “unquestioned” devotion to their adopted lands. Through these events, along with the speeches that filled

²²⁶ “St. Patrick’s Eve,” *Boston Globe*, 17 March 1903, 16.

²²⁷ Lee M. Friedman, Address at Faneuil Hall, 29 November 1905, quoted in “The 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society [PAJHS]* 14 (1906), 62.

the ethnic and mainstream press, Irish and Jewish Bostonians attempted to expand the meaning of civic identity to make room for ethnic contributions. Ethnic nationalists, for example, used the language of democratic ideals to defend attachments to cultural practices and independence movements, while religious leaders, concerned about the effects of Americanization on religious identity and practice, promoted their compatibility.²²⁸

The overarching goal of ethnic participation in any civic activity was the attainment of group respectability and acceptance. Often defensive in tone, many events claimed to represent the Irish or Jewish community as whole rather than specific factions; in this way, leaders hoped to overcome internal class, cultural, and religious tensions that could complicate the formation of a cohesive communal identity. Although not always successful, even the temporary achievement of these goals helped to improve group image and pave the way for greater acceptance on their terms.²²⁹

Becoming confident, accepted Americans involved more than flag-waving displays of patriotism, however. Irish and Jews in Boston also took part in mainstream cultural practices, such as popular music, consumerism, and sports. Like civic holiday celebrations, the consumption of movies, popular music, and store-bought goods allowed immigrant men and women to gain a “sense of belonging” in their adopted land in a way that was much easier to comprehend than the English language or voting laws. Similarly, participation in

²²⁸ Timothy J. Meagher, *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880–1928* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 14. Reed Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion: Civic Dimensions of Immigration, Naturalization, and Pluralism in Massachusetts, 1870-1965” in *Faces of Community: Immigrant Massachusetts, 1860-2000*, ed. Ueda and Conrad Edick Wright (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2003), 13-14. Jonathan Sarna, “The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” *Jewish Social Studies* n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999): 52-57.

²²⁹ Kathleen Neils Conzen, “Ethnicity as Festive Culture: Nineteenth-Century German America on Parade,” in *The Invention of Ethnicity*, ed. Werner Sollors (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 44-76; Mary P. Ryan, *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City during the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1997), 68-93; and John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 41, 83-84.

American sports like baseball provided a means to defend group honor, dispel ethnic stereotypes, learn democratic values, and develop civic pride. As more Irish and Jews became involved in cultural and athletic practices not just as spectators, but also as actors, musicians, players, and managers, they made them their own.²³⁰

“Preserve Strong...the True Virtues which Constitute Both Religion and Patriotism”

Religious institutions were among the most important intersecting points for ethnicity, religion, and Americanization within the Irish and Jewish communities. By the early twentieth century, Boston had dozens of Catholic parishes and at least twenty synagogues, all of which served as neighborhood centers where immigrant groups could not only obtain spiritual guidance, but also cultivate ethnic cultural ties and obtain lessons in Americanization. Although part of the archdiocese’s centralized hierarchy, Catholic parishes were very distinct entities, and Jewish synagogues were autonomous institutions of various sects, including Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox. As a result, the communities were very diverse, more so than in the nineteenth century, and leaders often were challenged with getting disparate subgroups to work together.²³¹

In the early twentieth century, Catholic leaders were overwhelmingly of Irish descent, which meant that the Catholic Church in Boston was strongly influenced by Irish tradition.

²³⁰ Other studies of ethnic consumerism and popular culture include Marilyn Halter, *Shopping for Identity: The Marketing of Ethnicity* (New York: Schocken Books, 2000); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Kathy Lee Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); Andrew Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption and the Search for American Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990) and William H.A. Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream: The Image of Ireland and the Irish in American Popular Song Lyrics, 1800-1920* (Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

²³¹ Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); William A. Braverman, “The Ascent of Boston’s Jews, 1630-1918” (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1990).

As discussed in Chapter 1, Archbishop John Williams (1866-1907) and the hundreds of parish priests in the archdiocese advised immigrants to follow American laws to help them become “not only good citizens but also good Catholics.” His coadjutor, William O’Connell, agreed; “A good Catholic,” he argued, “must be a patriotic and law-abiding citizen, for love of God inspires loyalty, and fidelity to one’s country.”²³² Yet while Williams urged conciliation with Protestants, O’Connell advocated a separatist, defensive posture in line with Pope Leo XIII’s criticism of American liberal Catholicism in 1899. As Meagher notes, no longer was accommodation seen as a good thing; instead, “to be ‘liberal’ meant to be a ‘toady’ or social climber who hid or apologized for his faith to win Protestant acceptance.” Instead, Catholicism was to be publicly celebrated and feted. The descendants of Puritans “wrote the history of the last century,” this son of working-class Irish immigrants from Lowell declared. “We must make the history of the coming one.”²³³ Pride in one’s homeland was part of this process, he informed ethnic groups. In 1908, a year after becoming archbishop, O’Connell addressed the Suffolk County Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH) at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross. “Sons of Patrick,” he exhorted, “Pray God that He may preserve strong in your minds and hearts the true virtues which constitute both religion and patriotism.”²³⁴

A strong proponent of centralization, O’Connell sought to control public expressions of Catholic loyalty. Unlike Williams, who had maintained a low profile,

²³² Donna Merwick, *Boston’s Priests, 1848-1910: A Study of Social and Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973). Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 260. “Religion and Country,” *Pilot*, 6 February 1915.

²³³ Timothy J. Meagher, *Columbia Guide to Irish American History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 114. James M. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O’Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 82; 88-89.

²³⁴ “Religion and Patriotism,” *Pilot*, 25 April 1908.

O'Connell was a master of publicity and attended many civic functions. He was invited to join Brahmin social clubs ordinarily closed to most non-Protestants, and he became friendly with many in the Protestant elite. His activities and appearances were reported on faithfully in the city's newspapers, which competed for the large Irish Catholic readership, and the *Pilot*, the official organ for the archdiocese as of 1908. O'Connell's growing celebrity and his belief in the compatibility of religion and patriotism inspired confidence among the city's large Irish Catholic population. The archbishop served as a "hero-leader," as historian James O'Toole terms it, raising Catholic prestige for a community whose religion had long been a source of discrimination. While they did not always agree with O'Connell, O'Toole notes, Boston's Irish would come to "glory in being at least as Catholic as the pope," particularly after the archbishop's elevation to the rank of cardinal in 1911.²³⁵

Because O'Connell was Boston's first cardinal, and one of only five in the United States, the entire city was excited by his elevation. It provided Catholics with an opportunity to celebrate their respectability and "bask in his reflected glow." A hometown contingent accompanied the new cardinal to Rome to receive his red hat, and he was welcomed home to cheering throngs who lined the "decorated streets made living canyons by great crowds of faithful and fellow citizens." Mayor John F. Fitzgerald issued an official proclamation

²³⁵ O'Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 87, 77, 82, 86-87. Attorney Daniel H. Coakley, for example, wrote to O'Connell in 1917 regarding apologetic Catholics. "Thank God who gave us you. Your militant stand has made kow-towing unpopular. Your splendid work is infusing into the younger set who have been taught by the elders to 'uncover,' a pride and a glory in religion and race which they are evincing in mixed company." Coakley to O'Connell, 17 February 1917; William Cardinal O'Connell Papers: General Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 3:12.

congratulating O'Connell and thanking him for the honor he had bestowed on the city. The month-long celebrations culminated in a triumphant homecoming parade in Lowell.²³⁶

Boston's rabbis were from varying class and cultural backgrounds and held divergent religious views. In 1900, the three most influential rabbis were Charles Fleischer of the Reform congregation, Temple Adath Israel (1894-1911); his predecessor, Solomon Schindler, the superintendent of the Federation of Jewish Charities; and Moshe Margolies of the North End's Baldwin Place Synagogue (1888-1908). As discussed in Chapter 1, Fleischer and Schindler advocated for assimilation and religious reform, while Margolies, the unofficial Chief Rabbi of Boston's immigrant Jews, argued for "unbending orthodoxy."²³⁷

By mid decade, they were joined by three American-educated Conservative rabbis, all of whom had emigrated from Eastern Europe as young men: Menahem Eichler of Boston's oldest synagogue, Ohabei Shalom in the South End (1905-1916); Phineas Israeli of Adath Jeshurun in Roxbury (1908-1918); and Herman Rubenovitz of Congregation Mishkan Tefila in Roxbury (1906-1966).²³⁸ Conservative Judaism had gained a following in Boston in the early twentieth century as immigrants and their American-born children sought a balance between Orthodoxy and Reform. These ardent Zionists shared an unfailing optimism regarding the future of American Judaism. The Jew "is no stranger here," Rabbi Eichler

²³⁶ O'Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 93-94; 116-117; *Pilot*, 3 February 1912; *Pilot*, 10 February 1912; *Pilot*, 2 March 1912.

²³⁷ Fleischer argued, "As law-abiding citizens, and accepting the custom of the country, we have formed the habit of hallowing Sunday as a day of rest" (Temple Israel Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, 20 October 1907, Temple Israel Archives, Boston). For Fleischer and Schindler, see Arthur Mann, *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1954), 52-72; Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009), 19-53. For Margolies, see David Kaufman, "Temples in the American Athens: A History of the Synagogues of Boston," in *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna, Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 186-189.

²³⁸ Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 197-8; *Advocate*, 4 November 1915; *Advocate*, 28 December 1907; *Advocate*, 24 June 1910; *Advocate*, 2 May 1913; *Congregation Mishkan Tefila, 1857-1983* (Boston: Congregation Mishkan Tefila), 10.

stated at his 1905 installation. “This country with its unbounded opportunities is as much the home of the Jew as that of the citizen of any other race or creed”; he has “complete freedom to practice his faith the way he wants.” He and the others urged their congregations to adopt “an enlightened, liberal conservatism” with “wholesome” regard for Judaism’s history, yet with the ability to “differentiate” between essential and nonessential elements, as befitted second-generation American Jews.²³⁹ Rabbi Rubenovitz introduced such moderate reforms as family pews and an organ and choir in 1906. “I do not desire to set up a new God, a new Judaism, a new religion,” he claimed. “I only desire to bring the old God, the old Judaism, the old religion to a generation that is being brought up under new conditions.”²⁴⁰

Boston’s Reform congregation, Temple Israel, also tried to present a balance of Judaism and Americanism. Rabbi Harry Levi, who succeeded Fleischer in 1911 when he left to form a non-sectarian congregation, was a moderate reformer who shared his colleagues’ optimism about the place of Jews in American life. Born in West Virginia of Polish immigrant parents, Levi was Boston’s first American-born rabbi. Like his conservative colleagues, he preached the need to maintain tradition, but, like his predecessors, argued for “modern” reforms and greater interfaith understanding. He accepted practices like Sunday services, vernacular prayers, and an organ and choir that helped Jews “blend” in American society, but felt that Jewish rituals helped maintain time-honored traditions. Levi preached a “practical patriotism,” urging his congregants to embrace their religion and their civic duties with the same zeal. “Between Americanism and Judaism there is no incompatibility,” he declared. “Judaism by way of its Old Testament exerted a deep influence on early American

²³⁹ “Rabbi Installed,” *Globe*, 18 September 1905, 3. “Lectures on the ‘American Jew,’” *Advocate*, 16 November 1906.

²⁴⁰ “The Synagogue and the Young Generation,” *Advocate*, 28 September 1906.

life. The fundamentals of Americanism are wholly Jewish. This kinship of spirit gives even larger promise to Judaism for the days that are still to come.”²⁴¹

In spite of their religious differences, Boston’s Jewish and Irish Catholic leaders shared a desire to foster connections between religion, ethnicity, and patriotism, emphasizing not only that they were patriotic Americans, but also that their religion was central to Americanism. Civic holidays provided a chance to demonstrate this compatibility. At Ohabei Shalom’s Thanksgiving Day services in 1907, Rabbi Eichler discussed the readiness of American Jews to respond to the call of patriotism and to combine religious and American ideals. “The ideal citizen,” he said, “is the upright, God-fearing, God-loving and God-trusting man.” The *Pilot* also encouraged this connection, noting, “A good Catholic way to begin the celebration of Thanksgiving is to attend Mass.”²⁴²

The Irish and Jews lauded historic American heroes, waxing poetic about George Washington’s favorable impressions of Irish soldiers in the Continental Army and Abraham Lincoln’s praise of Jewish contributions during the Civil War. These “spiritual soldiers of democracy,” as Rabbi Fleischer called them, provided immigrants with a shared heritage with Americans and should be “placed literally in a calendar of saints,” he argued in 1902, to be “referenced by our future Americans as apostles of our Republic.”²⁴³ They also compared the presidents to ethnic heroes. Judas Maccabaeus, one of Judaism’s “comparatively few

²⁴¹ *Advocate*, 29 March 1917. *Advocate*, 1 September 1911; *Advocate*, 2 March 1911; *Advocate*, 17 March 1911.

²⁴² *Advocate*, 29 November 1907. *Pilot*, 23 November 1912. Also significant were comparisons with New England’s Puritan ancestors. See early Zionist comparisons of Palestine with the Puritans’ safe haven of Boston (Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 217); Sarna, “Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” 6-7.

²⁴³ See “George Washington and the Irish,” *Pilot*, 24 May 1919; “Speaks on Lincoln at Ohabei Shalom,” *Advocate*, 21 September 1912. They also highlighted connections to the founding fathers. The American Jewish Historical Society published “Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Some American Jews”; the American Irish Historical Society boasted, “Daniel O’Brien married a cousin of George Washington.” *PAJHS* 20 (1911); *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society [JAIHS]* 25 (1926). For Fleischer, see B.O. Flower, “A Conversation with Charles Fleischer on Education and Democracy,” *The Arena*, Vol. 27, no. 5 (May 1902): 487.

known physical heroes,” was “the George Washington of ancient Israel; his brothers, Simon and Jonathan, “made together the Abraham Lincoln of their age.” Congressman Joseph O’Connell equated Washington’s love of liberty with that of Irish rebel martyr Robert Emmet, noting that the spirits of both men were combined in Irish Americans.²⁴⁴

The presidents’ birthdays often became communal events. Ohabei Shalom held an elaborate pageant to celebrate Lincoln’s centenary in 1909, while Archbishop O’Connell served on a committee to coordinate a citywide celebration. In 1917, the Knights of Columbus organized a patriotic mass meeting at Faneuil Hall on Washington’s Birthday to give “public testimony” to their “unswerving allegiance” to the idea that “the Catholic Church teaches patriotism as a fundamental principle of Faith.”²⁴⁵

Dedications of religious structures were also occasions to display patriotism, as well as upward mobility and demographic strength. As Paula Kane argues, such events “reflected contemporary social debates about their members’ status within a religious tradition, as well as their position” in the city. Adath Israel’s Commonwealth Avenue synagogue, built in 1907, was described by the *Herald* as “one of the most striking edifices in our city.” The white marble temple incorporated Middle-Eastern design elements symbolizing “the religion which has come to us from the most ancient time.” Its façade inscription, “Dedicated to the Brotherhood of Man. Consecrated to the Fatherhood of God,” expressed American ideals.

²⁴⁴ *Advocate*, 13 April 1906; “Lexington Day and Anniversary of Kishineff,” *Advocate*, 20 April 1906. *Pilot*, 7 March 1908.

²⁴⁵ Program Celebrating Lincoln’s Centenary Birthday, 1909; Congregation Ohabei Shalom; Box 1; Folder 5; American Jewish Historical Society, Hebrew College, Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY. *Advocate*, 27 February 1914. G.A. Hibbard to O’Connell, 7 December 1908; O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 5:12. *Advocate*, 18 December 1908. *Pilot*, 17 February 1917. “Lincoln Day,” *Pilot*, 16 February 1907; “Eulogy on Lincoln,” *Advocate*, 9 February 1906.

The structure's elegance reflected the congregation's growing wealth and prominence, and its dedication attracted local officials and national Jewish leaders.²⁴⁶

The dedication of East Boston's Congregation Ohel Jacob in 1908 also featured speeches by prominent local officials, including Rabbis Margolies and Eichler; Russian-born newspaper publisher Abraham Alpert, a representative of the Hebrew Immigration Aid Society (HIAS); and Irish-American Congressman John A. Keliher, a proponent of unrestricted immigration. It included a parade, led by the Zionist Sons of Freedom, past Jewish homes to the synagogue, all of which were decorated with American and Zionist flags. These celebrations of two very different congregations highlighted communal variations; while assimilation and respectability were the outstanding features of the Adath Israel dedication, Americanization and Zionism were publicly entwined at Ohel Jacob.²⁴⁷

Dedications were also occasions for Catholics to reiterate their commitment to the "Cross and the Flag," as Archbishop O'Connell was fond of preaching, with patriotic hymns sung and the American flag blessed. O'Connell viewed the construction of churches and schools as a "monument to Catholic strength." Between 1900 and 1920, the archdiocese had "remarkable" building activity; the architectural firm of Maginnis, Walsh and Sullivan designed twenty-four churches and the new Chestnut Hill campus for Boston College. In

²⁴⁶ Paula Kane, "'Have We No Language of Our Own?': Boston's Catholic Churches, Architects, and Communal Identity," in Ueda and Wright, *Faces of Community*, 135. *Herald*, 1 September 1907; "Handsomest Synagogue in the United States," unid. clipping, 2 September 1907, in Buildings Collection, Temple Israel Archives; *Advocate*, 30 August 1907; *Advocate*, 16 March 1906; *Advocate*, 25 March 1906. Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 45-47.

²⁴⁷ "East Boston Dedicates New Synagogue," *Advocate*, 11 September 1908. The dedication of a traditional Jewish shul usually included a procession where the Torah was carried into the synagogue.

1910, the *Pilot* noted that the flag dedicated at St. Margaret's Church in Dorchester would be "flung to the breeze" on holy days and civic holidays.²⁴⁸

Organizers strove to make patriotic displays "elevating and instructive in character, so that all of our fellow citizens may be impressed" and that their children especially may learn love of country, but the frequent reporting on the noticeable presence of "Old Glory" at Irish Catholic and Jewish events illustrates their defensiveness, even as they insisted on group acceptance. Jews honored the flag "on every possible occasion," the *Advocate* declared, pointing out its "colorful" presence at the groundbreaking for the new Home for Destitute Jewish Children in 1908 and the annual Patriot's Day children's party for the Hebrew Women's Sewing Society. In 1899, for example, the children performed five Revolutionary War-themed tableaux, including "Columbus," "Boston Tea Party," "Washington Before Trenton," "Peace and War," and a salute to the American flag, against a backdrop of patriotic bunting and flags. Also included were a reading of Longfellow's "Paul Revere's Ride" and patriotic songs. Eventually, this defensiveness wore thin; as the *Pilot* complained in 1911, "We are tired of reading that the Roman Catholic Church is not a peril to American institutions." "As if," the editor scoffed, "Catholics long years ago did not prove their loyalty to the flag with their very heart's blood," in reference to Irish participation in past wars.²⁴⁹

Insecure about their position in society, Irish Catholics and Jews sought opportunities to "prove" their contributions and their longevity in America. Two events, in particular, demonstrate this desire: the 250th anniversary of Jewish settlement in America,

²⁴⁸ Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 121-122. By 1915, the archdiocese had 117 schools (29 opened since 1907), 54,000 students, and 1100 teachers (*Pilot*, 4 September 1915). In 1926, O'Connell also built a new residence next to St. John's Seminary (O'Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 86). For church dedication, see *Pilot*, 24 December 1910.

²⁴⁹ "Patriot's Day," *Advocate*, 16 March 1906; *Advocate*, 30 October 1908. "Patriotic in Every Way," *Globe*, 20 April 1899. *Pilot*, 2 March 1912; *Pilot*, 11 November 1911.

held in 1905, and the centenary of the Archdiocese of Boston, held in 1908. The 250th anniversary of Jewish settlement in Dutch New Amsterdam was an eight-month-long, national celebration designed to chronicle Jewish progress in America. Locally, it was an occasion to highlight Jewish contributions to American life and also to foster unity among greater Boston's population of forty thousand Jews. As committee chair Lee M. Friedman, a local lawyer, influential community leader, and amateur historian, noted hopefully, the collaboration of the city's diverse Jewish organizations "will aid greatly not only in the celebration, but uniting the Jewish people of New England." As an expression of this solidarity, the *Advocate* called for "every Jewish window" to display the American flag—that "visible and beautiful emblem of citizenship."²⁵⁰

The opening service in June at Baldwin Place Hall in the North End was an occasion for emphasizing the compatibility of Jewish and American ideals. Speakers included Philip Davis, a settlement worker and labor organizer, who praised Eastern European immigrants' rate of assimilation, and Boston School Board member David Ellis, who urged new arrivals to become citizens. Rabbi Fleischer focused on the role of Jews in making democracy work. Jews arrived "well prepared by their religion, their history and their spirit, to take part in the making of America," he declared. "Here at last the Jew is at home again, no longer a stranger in a strange land."²⁵¹

The central event of Boston's festivities was the Thanksgiving Day celebration at Faneuil Hall, a location chosen for its symbolic linkage to the city's revolutionary past.

²⁵⁰ New York's Congregation Shearith Israel, the country's oldest active synagogue, and the American Jewish Historical Society organized the festivities, "eager to reinforce the image of the Jews' long-standing contribution to American life." *Advocate*, 21 July 1905; *Advocate*, 10 November 1905.

²⁵¹ *Advocate*, 2 June 1905. Charles B. Strecker, a Jewish Democratic politician, echoed these ideals at the closing service held at Ohabei Shalom in December. Show your "love and admiration for America," he urged, "by simply being 'the best type of Jew.'" *Advocate*, 1 December 1905; Braverman, "Ascent of Boston's Jews," 228.

Friedman reminded listeners that Jews were not “adopted children in an alien land,” but “part and parcel of the American body politic,” which “has wrought and achieved its ideals out of the countless patriotic sacrifices of successive generations.” Civic officials also participated, praising Jewish contributions and offering congratulations on at last finding a sanctuary from persecution. Governor-elect Curtis Guild, for example, commended Jews as “loyal and faithful citizens,” who “have shared willingly” in America’s trials “from the days of the Revolution until the present time.” Alluding to the Zionist and U.S. flags, he declared that to the “white of faith and the blue of hope” was added “the red of virile courage and to the single star of one great race the constellation representing not the States only, but the combined destinies of all the races that blend in ours.”²⁵²

Later that week, the New Century Club, formed in 1900 by Jewish professionals of Eastern European background, invited Progressive lawyer Louis D. Brandeis to speak about the duties of citizenship. This was the first time that Brandeis had addressed a Jewish gathering; although he was from a prominent German Jewish family and had many Jewish clients, he had previously stood aloof from Jewish activities. His speech, entitled “What Loyalty Demands,” reflected his egalitarian mindset and Progressive views. “There is room here for men of any race, of any creed, of any condition in life,” he argued, “but not for Protestant-Americans, or Catholic-Americans, or Jewish-Americans, nor for German-Americans, Irish-Americans, or Russian-Americans.” Despite this assimilationist viewpoint,

²⁵² Friedman, “The 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States,” *PAJHS*, 14 (1906), 62. For Guild’s speech, see *Advocate*, 1 December 1905; “250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States,” *PAJHS* 14 (1906): 66-67, 74-75. “Out of support for a Jewish nation-state, he later noted, would “come greater loyalty to America” (*Advocate*, 1 December 1905).

Brandeis, over the next decade, would come to see the affinity between American and Jewish ethical ideals, and eventually embrace Zionism.²⁵³

The October 1908 centenary of the Boston archdiocese provided a similar opportunity for Irish Catholics to display their unity and patriotism. Archbishop O’Connell planned the events of the weeklong celebration, detailed in an eight-page supplement in the *Boston Globe*, to reinforce his belief that “true patriotism springs from religious conviction” and that Catholics were naturally good Americans—an idea that had been denied so frequently in the past.²⁵⁴ In his sermon at the opening Mass, entitled “In the Beginning,” O’Connell traced the history of Protestant-Catholic relations, chronicling the enmity that began with the arrival of impoverished Irish immigrants. By 1908, he declared triumphantly, “The Puritan has passed; the Catholic remains. The city where a century ago he came unwanted he has made his own.”²⁵⁵

The Centennial was also a public display of the strength and influence of the city’s Catholic community, particularly its Irish element, which numbered approximately 225,000 by 1900—nearly forty percent of the city’s total population. In addition to a “general communion” at Holy Cross Cathedral, O’Connell required parish priests to hold daily masses with sermons to provide spiritual renewal. He instructed Catholics to wear a centenary badge and decorate their homes and businesses with flags and religious symbols,

²⁵³ “New Century Club Record Speaks for Itself,” *Advocate*, 4 March 1920. By-laws, 1926, 7-8; Boston New Century Club Papers; I-95; Box 1; Folder 1; AJHS. Louis Brandeis, “What Loyalty Demands,” quoted in Philippa Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 230. Brandeis’s work with immigrant workers caused him to later write to his father, “I am inclined to think there is more to hope for in the Russian Jews than from the Bavarian and other German. The Russians have idealism and reverence.” See Melvin I. Urofsky and David W. Levy, eds., *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, Volume I (1870-1907): Urban Reformer* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1971), 386-387.

²⁵⁴ O’Connell, “Letter to the Clergy of the Archdiocese,” *Globe*, 25 October 1908, S3. *Pilot*, 27 November 1909.

²⁵⁵ “‘In the Beginning,’ Sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Boston, William O’Connell, at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, 28 October 1908, Centennial of the See of Boston,” in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence, William Cardinal O’Connell, Archbishop of Boston*, (Boston, Pilot Publishing Company, 1911), 132-3.

“especially the cross.” Catholic organizations held massive outdoor meetings and parades as visible testaments to their “numerical power” and “active profession” of faith. The highlight was a 39,000-man procession of the archdiocese’s Holy Name Societies through the Back Bay and South End toward the cathedral. Along with the “conspicuous” presence of hundreds of American flags, the marchers waved green Irish banners and white and yellow papal flags in a bold assertion of their American, Irish, and Catholic loyalties. In the *Globe’s* summary, the parade of men, in their “neat and careful” dress of black suits and neckties, “looked like what it was, a body of American citizens,” illustrating a newfound confidence in their acceptance.²⁵⁶ Many Bostonians agreed; while the *Pilot* reported that some residents along the route closed their doors, others, including Jewish department-store owner Abraham Shuman and former Mayor Thomas Norton Hart, “opened their doors wide, inviting people to watch the parade from their porches.”²⁵⁷

Despite the focus on Catholic (particularly Irish) success, O’Connell acknowledged the continued problem of ethnic discord. “The gulf, though narrowed, is visibly still here. It needs only the occasion to reveal its presence,” he reminded Catholics. “We must face the

²⁵⁶ “O’Connell’s Letter to the Clergy,” *Globe*, 25 October 1908, 83; “Holy Name Parade Biggest Ever Witnessed in Boston,” *Globe*, 2 November, 1908, 1; O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 98-99, 121; Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 22-26. The parade stood in contrast to the popular devotional street festivals held in the Italian and Polish communities, which the Irish hierarchy frowned upon for their raucous nature and religious inaccuracies. Robert Anthony Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985) 55-56.

²⁵⁷ “Reaction Begins: The Fitzgeralds Go Abroad,” 73-134, in Katherine Conway Papers, Box 6: 12, John J. Burns Library, Boston College. As discussed in Chapter 1, Shuman was close to many Irish leaders, including O’Connell and *Pilot* editor Katherine Conway, and two of his children married Catholics. In 1907, he and his youngest daughter Lillian Shuman Dreyfus, a practicing Jew, were received in a special audience by Pope Pius X. “Mr. Shuman’s Return,” *Pilot*, 8 June 1907; Conway Diary, 18 July 1907, 26 July 1907; A. Shuman and family, correspondence with O’Connell, 1908-1927; O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 9: 18.

truth if we would be of real service to the cause of harmony.”²⁵⁸ In response, leading Protestants and Jews sought to promote the spirit of brotherhood by publishing congratulatory letters in the *Globe*. “With the immigration of continuing multitudes from Ireland and continental Europe,” wrote A.E. Dunning, editor of the *Congregationalist*, “the Roman Catholic church came together to care for the members of its communion.” Rabbi Eichler spoke of the parallels between Irish and Jewish progress and their neighborly relations. The praise of Charles Parkhurst, editor of the Methodist *Zion’s Herald*, was more faint. As a Protestant, he could “never accept nor justify” the church’s teachings, he wrote, but he applauded Catholic patriotism and charity, particularly in caring for “the immigrant hordes of their own faith which crowd our ports,” which were “a serious menace to peace and safety.”²⁵⁹ Such words reminded Catholics that they had yet to convince everyone of their ability to acculturate.

Celebrating New England’s Past: Ethnic Organizations and Civic Holidays

Irish Catholics and Jews also united patriotism and ethnic identity in their celebration of the Commonwealth’s Revolutionary heritage. Ethnic associations often led such efforts, holding banquets, rallies, and parades on civic holidays to emphasize their groups’ unique qualifications as patriotic Americans and their longevity in the country. Such “public ceremonies,” as historian Mary Ryan calls them, allowed groups to display demographic strength, respectability, and cultural pride.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁸ “‘In the Beginning,’ Sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Boston, William O’Connell, at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, 28 October 1908, Centennial of the See of Boston,” in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence, William Cardinal O’Connell, Archbishop of Boston*, (Boston, Pilot Publishing Company, 1911), 132-3.

²⁵⁹ “Greetings from Non-Catholics,” *Globe*, 25 October 1908, S7.

²⁶⁰ Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 223-227. Ethnic nationalist culture will be discussed in the following chapter.

The city's Irish and Jewish communities both had an active network of ethnic associations. Often organized by class and region, the institutions interpreted ethnic patriotism in various ways. Some, such as the American Irish Historical Society, the Charitable Irish Society, the American Jewish Historical Society, and the Elysium Club focused on upward mobility and group respectability. Others, like the Knights of Columbus (K. of C.) and the Young Men's Hebrew Association (YMHA) stressed adherence to religious principles and patriotism. Still others, including the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH), Irish county associations and the Federation of American Zionists, emphasized ethnic culture and nationalism. Individuals often held membership in multiple organizations, and taken together, the groups presented a complete portrayal of Irish and Jewish attempts to promote the compatibility of American patriotism, ethnic identity, and religious values.²⁶¹

The AOH and the K. of C. were among the largest and most influential organizations in Boston's Irish community. The AOH was a national fraternal benevolent organization of mainly immigrant working-class members, which emphasized the compatibility of Catholicism, Irish culture, and Americanism. Together with its Ladies Auxiliary, the AOH worked to "keep alive the love and tradition of Ireland" while "teaching our children to love and respect the tenets of this glorious Republic." As the president of an auxiliary branch noted in 1904, "The American flag is in evidence at all our meetings side by side with the green flag of dear old Erin," both of which "remind us vividly of all that is

²⁶¹ Politicians such as John F. Fitzgerald and James Michael Curley were active in their parish clubs, the AOH, and the K. of C.; religious leaders such as O'Connell and Levi served as chaplains to multiple organizations. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 96; Herbert Marshall Zolot, "The Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley: Curley and the Boston Scene from 1897-1918" (diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975), 156-158; John Henry Cutler, *"Honey Fitz": Three Steps to the White House, The Life and Times of John F. (Honey Fitz) Fitzgerald* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962), 58-59; Leslie Ainley, *Boston Mahatma* (Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1949), 93.

great and good of which they are emblematic.”²⁶² The K. of C. was a Catholic fraternal benevolent organization, founded in the 1880s by middle-class Irish Americans in New Haven, Connecticut. Unlike the AOH, “a distinctively Irish, Catholic body” known for its militant Irish Americanism, the Knights placed “no value on birthplace or descent” and raised “no question as to nationality or locality.” As State Deputy Joseph C. Pelletier declared in 1904, it “asks of the proposed member but one qualification—that he is a Catholic gentleman.”²⁶³ Nevertheless, both organizations asserted the legitimacy of Irish Catholic citizenship, social acceptance, and patriotism, largely through private ceremonies, social functions, and public celebrations.

Aside from synagogues and private clubs, the YMHA was the dominant Jewish organization in Boston. Organized in the 1880s to help ground young Jews in religious faith, the YMHA hoped “to cement the young men of Israel in a closer bond, in an indissoluble union...of social equality.”²⁶⁴ In the early twentieth century, the organization became a forum for Jews to discuss local and national issues. It provided Boston’s rabbis with an alternative pulpit and social leaders with an opportunity to raise awareness of ethnic causes. Unlike the German Jewish Elysium Club or the Eastern European New Century Club, the YMHA welcomed Jews of all cultural and religious backgrounds, advocating Americanism in a distinctly Jewish manner to develop “the best elements of our race.” Patriotism was an “extension of the Fifth Commandment, and who shall deny that obligation?” Superintendent

²⁶² *Republic*, 1 January 1898; Annie F. McSweeney, “The Catholic as a Progressive Clubwoman,” *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 20; “Catholic Women Who Lead,” *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 32-33, 36, 38.

²⁶³ *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 18. Christopher J. Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism: The History of the Knights of Columbus, 1882-1982* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), xii-xiii; Meagher, *Columbia Guide to Irish American History*, 114.

²⁶⁴ “Look on This Picture,” *Jewish Herald*, 2 June 1908, 2.

Jacob de Haas remarked in 1906. “In the end not we.”²⁶⁵ The organization provided educational instruction in English, civics, and American history, as well as Jewish culture and the Hebrew language to make possible the contribution of our share to the American ideal.” Only then “would the unnecessary sacrifice of the loss of our identity” be prevented.²⁶⁶ The middle-class and native-born officers of the YMHA and its ladies’ auxiliary, the Young Women’s Hebrew Association (established in 1912), also felt a responsibility to instill American values in their immigrant members. In 1915, for example, they proposed a nationwide “Americanization Day” to “demonstrate to the foreigner the necessity of becoming citizens and taking part in the government of this free and independent country; to inculcate in them a deeper love for America; and to have them pledge allegiance at the unfurling of the American flag.”²⁶⁷

These and other groups helped organize celebrations for civic holidays, such as Independence Day and Labor Day, which were widely observed in immigrant communities. Most communal celebrations consisted of picnics and field days at local parks and beaches, which spoke to the necessity of leisure in maintaining a proper American identity. At most of these gatherings, cultural activities mingled with American pastimes, demonstrating the amalgamation of ethnic and American culture for the working and middle classes. Zionist picnics featured running races and American sports such as baseball and American football. Baseball games and track events were eagerly anticipated aspects of Irish association field days, along with Gaelic football and hurling. Ethnic bands played “Yankee Doodle Dandy,” “America,” Irish ballads, and Jewish songs, while folk dancers shared the dance floor with

²⁶⁵ “Basis for a Y.M.H.A.,” *Advocate*, 26 October 1906:

²⁶⁶ “The Present Status of the YMHA,” *Advocate*, 16 March 1916.

²⁶⁷ “Organize YWHA,” *Advocate*, 14 June 1912. “Americanization,” *Advocate*, 18 June 1915; *Advocate*, 2 June 1905.

couples doing the latest cakewalks and waltzes. Often, ethnic lyricists put their words to American music, such as Boston's Rev. Dr. Pereira Mendes, who wrote "The Zion-Hymn" in 1905, sung to the tune of "My Country, 'Tis of Thee":

God, we implore of Thee,
End Zion's misery,
Send her Thy aid!
Send Thou her sons to heal
Wounds which the years reveal,
Woes which at last in weal
For aye shall fade.²⁶⁸

The city's Fourth of July observances at Faneuil Hall were more formal. Municipal officials and citizens listened to a prayer by a local clergyman, the reading of the Declaration of Independence, and an oration. During the Spanish-American War in 1898, Father Denis O'Callaghan, the pastor of St. Augustine's Church in South Boston, gave the oration, garnering the respect of the *Boston Transcript*, which wrote, "if our people will unburden themselves of their racial and sectarian prejudices, and read this oration with a receptive mind, it will have an influence upon them altogether for good."²⁶⁹ In 1915, Mayor Curley invited a Jew to speak for the first time: Louis Brandeis. By then a recent convert to Zionism, Brandeis spoke on its compatibility with Americanism, comparing the struggles of the Jewish "pilgrim fathers" who settled Palestine with the Pilgrims who had settled at Plymouth. "Zionism is the Pilgrim inspiration and impulse over again," he declared. "The descendants of the Pilgrim fathers should not find it hard to understand and sympathize with it." Such Utopian sentiments on Independence Day, and the fact that Boston was then

²⁶⁸ "Y.M.H.A. Baseball Team Plays Against M.J. Hurleys," *Advocate*, 9 June 1905; *Advocate*, 15 March 1907; *Advocate*, 7 July 1905; "John Boyle O'Reilly Football Club Ball," *Pilot*, 13 May 1905; *Pilot*, 3 July 1915. "Base Ball," in Mt. Pleasant Council Newsletter, 23 June 1910; Knights of Columbus: General Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 1:8. "Zion-Hymn," *Advocate*, 2 June 1905. For more on leisure, see Peiss, *Cheap Amusements*.

²⁶⁹ *Boston Transcript*, quoted in the *Pilot*, 16 July 1898.

hosting the convention for the Federation of American Zionists, demonstrated the extent of ethnic nationalism's acceptance, even as some factions protested divided loyalties.²⁷⁰

Irish and Jewish organizations also made connections between American and ethnic identity in celebrations of local civic holidays. Bunker Hill Day, for example, commemorating the Battle of Bunker Hill in 1775, was an important holiday in Charlestown, although little celebrated elsewhere. Irish associations like the neighborhood's "Bunker Hill" K. of C. Council and the Hibernians' Bunker Hill Guards made up significant portions of the annual Bunker Hill Day parade. For Jews, the holiday was an important testament to their colonial presence in the city; Judah Touro, a well-known Jewish philanthropist, had donated the money necessary to complete the Bunker Hill monument in 1843—a fact that Jewish leaders publicized heavily. In 1914, some Eastern European Jews adopted the holiday as a second Passover, symbolizing their exodus from the Russian Empire.²⁷¹

Patriot's Day, commemorating the Battle of Lexington and Concord, was also a popular holiday, particularly for city employees and schoolchildren, who had the day off. The K. of C. and the AIHS held yearly banquets, at which Irish nationalists likened Ireland's rebels to the Minutemen for their similar efforts to free their countries from "the yoke of England." Suburban AOH branches used the day to hold their St. Patrick's Day parades to

²⁷⁰ *Boston American*, 4 July 1915, quoted in Gal, "In Search of a New Zion," 31; Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis*, 258-264. William Braverman, "Emergence of a Unified Community, 1880-1917," in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 88.

²⁷¹ "Bunker Hill Guards," *Republic*, 1 January 1898; *Republic*, 2 July 1904; "Bunker Hill a Celtic Stronghold," *Republic*, 15 June 1907; "Judah Touro," *Advocate*, 16 June 1905; "Bunker Hill Day as Second Passover for Russian Jews," *Globe*, 14 June 1914, 46. See also Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *Zone of Emergence: Observations of the Lower Middle and Upper Working Class Communities of Boston, 1905-1914*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962), 50-52.

avoid competing with the large parade in Boston.²⁷² Jewish immigrants also compared this holiday to Passover, the “glorious Independence day” for the Hebrews—especially after 1903, when it coincided with a horrific pogrom in Kishineff, Russia. In 1906, the Federation of Jewish Organizations of Massachusetts held a mass meeting at Tremont Temple to celebrate the triumph of American freedom over Russian tyranny. Persecuted Jews had been “patriots for centuries,” event organizer Jacob de Haas declared, but in no other land had they “been given the privilege to demonstrate our love for country.” In addition, the celebration reminded Americans that Jews have “been a factor in this country, since it was known that this was a country.” Zionists in East Boston also held a rally to observe “Lexington Day” and the Kishineff anniversary, featuring addresses on citizenship, immigration, and Zionism.²⁷³

More than any other local civic holiday, however, Evacuation Day would achieve lasting importance, particularly for the city’s Irish community. The holiday, which commemorated the end of the British occupation of Boston during the Revolution, coincided with St. Patrick’s Day, thus giving Irish residents the perfect opportunity to emphasize their joint Irish and American loyalties. On St. Patrick’s Day, considered by many to be the “Irish Fourth of July,” Civil War veterans, politicians, and schoolchildren marched

²⁷² “Patriot’s Day Celebration of the AIHS at Lexington,” *Republic*, 28 April 1900; *Republic*, 19 March 1898; *Pilot*, 17 April 1908; *Pilot*, 19 March 1910; *Pilot*, 20 January 1911. The *Pilot* also listed Irish soldiers who had fought in the battle (“Anniversary Battle of Lexington and Concord,” *Pilot*, 30 April 1898).

²⁷³ “Sons and Daughters of Zion hold Annual ‘Patriot Party’ for Patriot’s Day,” *Globe*, 5 April 1903, 31; “Freedom and Responsibility,” *Advocate*, 13 April 1906; “Lexington Day and Anniversary of Kishineff,” *Advocate*, 20 April 1906. “Magnificent Demonstration,” *Advocate*, 13 April 1906. “Patriot’s Day,” *Advocate*, 16 March 1906. “Lexington Day and Anniversary of Kishineff,” *Advocate*, 20 April 1906. Reporter Leo Lyons spoke of the need for immigrants to become citizens. Rabbi Eichler and Albert Hurwitz, Boston Zionist Council president, made appeals for the Zionist movement.

proudly behind both flags in parades across America.²⁷⁴ In Boston, St. Patrick's festivities, capped by the Charitable Irish Society's banquet and civic ceremonies at Dorchester Heights in the heavily Irish neighborhood of South Boston, had coexisted separately for years, but in 1901, the city held a parade on the 125th anniversary of Evacuation Day, in which Irish societies featured prominently. Irish Americans highlighted the day's "double aspect" and their inheritance of the American *and* Irish revolutionary traditions.²⁷⁵

Over the next several years, Irish Americans assumed greater control over Evacuation Day festivities and gave them new life, aided by a succession of Irish-American mayors beginning with Patrick A. Collins in 1902. Like Patriot's Day, the day was declared a city holiday for municipal workers and schoolchildren—a measure that many Progressives protested, arguing that it was simply an excuse for Irish politicians to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. This argument did have some validity; although the event was officially separate from the Irish celebration, cultural elements gradually found their way into the civic parade. In 1904, seventy AOH divisions under the leadership of Suffolk County President Matthew J. Cummings (later national AOH president) marched on St. Patrick's Day for the first time in twelve years in conjunction with the city procession, beginning in Boston and ending in Dorchester. The large parade drew a massive crowd, due to the fact that, as the *Pilot* boasted, Bostonians finally realized "the Celtic element is the element that counts in this city."²⁷⁶

Non-Irish individuals also took part in the Evacuation Day festivities. In 1905, for example,

²⁷⁴ In Pat Rooney's 1883 song, "Is That Mr. Reilly?" the narrator noted that "when the White House and Capitol are mine," St. Patrick's Day "will be the Fourth of July." Williams, *'Twas Only an Irishman's Dream*, 138.

²⁷⁵ *Republic*, 16 March 1907; Damien Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 62-64. Mike Cronin and Daryl Adair, *The Wearing of the Green: A History of St. Patrick's Day* (London: Routledge, 2002). The parade route eventually moved to South Boston.

²⁷⁶ *Republic*, 12 March 1904; *Republic*, 19 March 1904. Zolot, "Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley," 36.

Rabbi Solomon Schindler was the principal orator at the civic ceremony in Dorchester Heights. In addition, Jewish politicians and organizations marched in the civic parade.²⁷⁷

While the parades highlighted the holiday's civic dimension, St. Patrick's Day was first and foremost a Catholic feast day. In the years when the holiday fell on a Sunday, the AOH opted to attend Mass as a body and instead parade on Monday; under Irish Catholic mayors, the Evacuation Day marchers did the same. In 1912, Boston's Hibernians joined the national order in a massive "demonstration of the faith of Ireland's children," attempting to organize half a million communicants on that day" to prove that the faith of Irish Americans "is as strong and virile as at any time in the history of our people." Monday's parades featured thousands of public and parochial schoolchildren along the route, who waved American flags as the marchers and floats passed by.²⁷⁸

Another sign of Catholic strength was seen in 1912, when President William Howard Taft was the guest of honor, along with the newly made Cardinal O'Connell, at the Charitable Irish Society banquet. President Taft had been a favorite with the American Irish since the Spanish-American War, when, as commissioner of the Philippines, he had arranged a settlement allowing the Catholic Church to keep its property there. His presence at the 1912 banquet demonstrated that connection, as well as the rising status of Boston's Irish leaders. The Irish also found pleasure in the fact that O'Connell now took precedence over the governor, mayor, and other leaders—an idea that some Protestants resented. Governor

²⁷⁷ "Saint Patrick's Day in Boston," *Pilot*, 25 March 1905.

²⁷⁸ "Half A Million Men at the Altar Rail," *Pilot*, 2 March 1912. "South Boston," *Pilot*, 9 March 1912.

Foss, for example, “testily refused” to attend when he realized that O’Connell, as a “prince of the church,” was considered royalty and ranked above him.²⁷⁹

In addition to participating in established civic holiday celebrations, ethnic Americans, particularly the Irish, also created their own. In 1907, during his first term as mayor, John F. Fitzgerald founded Old Home Week, a citywide, weeklong celebration of Boston and a reunion for former residents. Primarily an attempt to showcase Boston’s “glories” and boost business and tourism, the event also provided the city’s residents, both new and old, with an opportunity to demonstrate their civic unity, pride, and patriotism. Each day was devoted to a different theme, such as Founders’ Day, Patriots’ Day, Home Comers’ Day, Massachusetts Day, Women’s Day, and Military Day, featuring bazaars and banquets; pilgrimages to historic sites; an “old school boys” reunion at Faneuil Hall; fishing contests and baseball games; a balloon ascension and fireworks displays. Neighborhoods also held their own festivities and receptions.²⁸⁰

While various events paid tribute to Boston’s Puritan and Revolutionary past, others emphasized the contributions made by the city’s immigrant population. The Patriot’s Day pageant, for example, included remembrances of past glories along with a “living flag” of 5,000 immigrant schoolchildren singing patriotic songs. The spectacle “certainly typified American nationality in its personality,” the *Globe* commented, “for it contained the sons and daughters of nearly all the prominent nations of the world.” Ethnic and religious societies

²⁷⁹ “Taft at Charitable Irish Society Dinner,” *Pilot*, 9 March 1912; Program for the 1912 Charitable Irish Society Banquet, Charitable Irish Society Papers, Burns Library, Boston College. For Irish support of Taft, see Richard A. Abrams, *Conservatism in a Progressive Era: Massachusetts Politics, 1900-1912* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 65. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 97. The *Pilot* also reported on real or imagined insults against O’Connell upon his elevation, sensitive to charges of disloyalty. In 1912, for example, it objected to Rabbi Fleischer’s description of the new Cardinal as “presumably a loyal citizen of our Commonwealth” and his question of what “use he means to put his new dignity and power” (*Pilot*, 3 February 1912).

²⁸⁰ “Old Home Week Program,” *Globe*, 21 July 1907, 43; “With Grand Reception,” *Globe*, 30 July 1907, E11.

participated by holding bazaars and dances. A highlight was the New England Day parade marshaled by Vice President Charles Fairbanks. The procession of 10,000 marchers included military, police, and fire companies, brass bands, public works employees, and trade associations, as well as divisions of various ethnic and religious societies, including the AOH, Guards of Zion, and the Caledonian Club.²⁸¹

The prominent place that ethnic societies held in the week's festivities demonstrated that to the Irish-American mayor, at least, alternative definitions of "Boston" were not just acceptable, but welcome. Fitzgerald used the occasion to praise Boston's Irish-American residents, in particular. "None are prouder of her heroes of the Revolution, or her statesmen and poets of a later day," he declared, "than the Catholic citizens, especially those of Irish descent." Although Old Home Week did not become the annual tradition Fitzgerald hoped for, the event was an important example of citywide unity and at least a temporary acknowledgement of non-Protestants' fitness for civic participation—as well as the growing influence of Irish Americans in city government. Yet, as sociologist Edward Alsworth Ross argued in 1914, for many Yankees, the celebration focused too much on Irish achievements, symbolizing the extent to which the Irish dominated city affairs.²⁸²

Boston's Irish Catholics pushed for other days to add to the civic calendar that would highlight their contributions to American life. The establishment of Columbus Day, honoring Christopher Columbus, the Italian Catholic discoverer of America, was one of their most significant achievements, allowing them to highlight the "enormous" Catholic

²⁸¹ "Patriotism the Keynote," *Globe*, 30 July 1907, 1. "Busiest Week of Boston's Busiest Mayor," *Globe*, 4 August 1907, 23; "Parade of 10,000 Men," *Globe*, 31 July 1907, 4.

²⁸² *Pilot*, 27 January 1907. The *Globe* and the Boston Merchants Association declared the week an unqualified success, but plans for an annual "reunion" never panned out. "What Celebration Means to Boston," *Globe*, 4 August 1907, 1. Edward Alsworth Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People* (New York: Century Co., 1914), 260-261.

contribution to American history. Irish-American politicians and the Knights of Columbus led the charge, and in Massachusetts, their combined efforts finally succeeded in making Columbus Day a legal state holiday in 1910. Thousands attended a civic pageant and parade of local branches of the Knights, AOH, Holy Name Societies, and other organizations—40,000 marchers in total. President Taft, Governor Draper, Mayor Fitzgerald, Archbishop O’Connell, and other dignitaries reviewed the parade in the Back Bay.²⁸³

Columbus Day parades gained in popularity over the next several years. In 1911, the archdiocese exhorted “every Catholic man who is in a position to do so” to march in the parade “as a source of pride to make a public profession of the faith.” Mayor Fitzgerald, an ardent Americanist and city booster, led the procession on horseback; he stopped in front of the grandstand to lead an impromptu singing of “America,” followed by three cheers for “Boston.” His actions prompted the *Pilot* to “rejoice in the triumph of a fellow Catholic and glories of the flag of freedom.” In 1912, it suggested there “should be a law making it obligatory for paraders to carry the national flag” and rebuked parade organizers for its “conspicuous” absence. In 1913, the celebration’s Irish nature was emphasized by the addition of Irish society members dressed in “Gaelic costumes of the second and sixth centuries” in a preview of an Irish historical pageant to be held in New York that year.²⁸⁴

Even with the passage of the state law, however, not everyone accepted Columbus Day as a civic holiday. In 1911, the *Pilot* protested that while Columbus Day was a legal holiday “for all of her citizens,” some citizens did not want to participate due to rumors of graft, but noted defensively that the parade committee had actually returned a \$500 surplus

²⁸³ *Pilot*, 21 October 1905. *Pilot*, 23 July 1910; “Columbus Day,” *Globe*, 13 October 1910. *Pilot*, 15 October 1910.

²⁸⁴ *Pilot*, 7 October 1911. *Globe*, 13 October 1911, 1; *Pilot*, 21 October 1911. Women were less visible, working mainly behind the scenes to make floats and banners. *Pilot*, 21 September 1912. *Pilot*, 23 September 1913.

to the city. In 1913, the *Pilot* noted in disbelief that the *Boston Transcript* had protested the dedication of a flagstaff in Lawrence on Columbus Day as “un-American” in fear that the day honoring a Catholic would replace the Fourth of July as the main national holiday.²⁸⁵ Regardless, by the mid-1910s, many non-Catholics actively honored Columbus Day and Columbus. In October 1915, the Roxbury Ladies Biker Cholim Society, a Jewish benevolent association, celebrated the day with a mass meeting at Otisfield Hall. In addition, just as a popular Catholic topic was Columbus’ Irish crew members, Jewish antiquarians and lecturers speculated on the explorer’s Jewish origins and the Jewish financiers of his voyages. Such assertions were important, as they pointed to the longevity of the groups in America.²⁸⁶

When James Michael Curley became mayor in 1914, he went even further to downplay Boston’s Puritan traditions and emphasize Irish dominance. He insisted “there was an Irishman at the bottom of everything American,” claiming that Miles Standish was an Irishman hired by the Pilgrims, and that the Revolution began not on the road to Concord but in Portsmouth, New Hampshire by an Irish raiding party. Such taunts irritated Brahmins, but more importantly, demonstrated Curley’s confidence of the ability of Irish Americans to insert themselves so completely into the city’s public landscape. Their success paved the way for Jews, Italians, French Canadians, and other ethnic groups to do the same.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁵ *Pilot*, 4 November 1911; *Pilot*, 28 June 1913; *Pilot*, 20 September 1913. See also “Protesting Patriots,” *Pilot*, 1 June 1912; “Columbus Day Was Widely Celebrated,” *Pilot*, 16 October 1915.

²⁸⁶ *Advocate*, 15 October 1915. “Why Irish History Should Be Taught in the Boston Public Schools,” *Advocate*, 16 March 1906; “Columbus Day,” *Advocate*, 14 October 1926; “Columbus Day Speech,” *Advocate*, 18 October 1928. Oscar Strauss, *PAJHS* 6 (1897), 54; Herbert N. Casson, *JAIHS* (1907), 93; Sarna, “Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” 1-3. Zionists marched participated in the city’s 1892 parade with a prototype of the Zionist flag (*Advocate*, 17 June 2004).

²⁸⁷ Jack Beatty, *The Rascal King: The Life and Times of James Michael Curley, 1874-1958* (Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 1992), 168.

“Adopting America’s Game as Their Own”: Acculturation, Consumerism, and Sports

Immigrants’ efforts to gain a “sense of belonging” in their adopted land also applied to the consumption of American products and services, including movies, popular music, and store-bought goods, as well as American sports and leisure. Through such activity, historian Andrew Heinze notes, Irish, Jews, and other immigrant groups sought to prove their acculturation not only as political citizens, but also active participants in American mainstream culture. Consumerism was easier to comprehend than the English language or voting laws, and allowed immigrants to create a new identity without tremendous effort. In fact, one of the first things new arrivals did upon settling in America was to buy a set of American clothes, as one did not want to be considered a “greenhorn.” For many Jews, America represented the “promised land,” the “Goldenah Medinah.” It was not only a place free from persecution, but a country with an abundance of modern, urban material culture that “enriched the perception of the new world as a source of liberation and promise.” Ethnic consumerism was closely tied to the American belief in a rising standard of living; as immigrants and their American-born children rose from blue-collar positions of laborers, peddlers, and factory workers to white-collar professions of teacher, clerks, lawyers, doctors, and businessmen, access to and ability to purchase American products also improved.²⁸⁸

Irish and Jewish women were often primary influences in immigrant families’ transitions to American life, as housewives were responsible for household consumption habits. Historian Marilyn Halter notes that Crisco’s “innovative” kosher shortening, for example, was a particularly successful product in the Jewish sector, as it allowed Orthodox

²⁸⁸ Andrew Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption and the Search for American Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 4, 5, 91, 39.

Jewish women to create formerly prohibited lard-based dishes popular in American-style cuisine. “Thus,” she argues, “Crisco served as a vehicle for greater Americanization and uniformity rather than for heightening distinctive ethnic tastes,” demonstrating that ethnic identities were “fluid rather than fixed.”²⁸⁹ Irish women were influential in helping their families rise to “lace curtain” status, as those who had worked as domestic servants before marriage had witnessed the purchasing power of a middle-class salary, and wanted the same consumer goods for themselves once their husbands or sons could afford to buy them.²⁹⁰ Ethnic newspapers contained advertisements for a variety of American products personifying middle-class success, such as pianos, phonographs, chandeliers, and gold watches, which could all be found at local Irish and Jewish-run department stores, including Filene’s, Shuman’s, Leopold Morse Company, Gilchrist’s, and Fitzgerald’s. In addition, the society pages of ethnic and mainstream newspapers frequently contained accounts of weddings, charity balls, and other functions, filled with detailed descriptions of attendants’ dress. Such events were important reminders of ethnic success in Boston and were in direct opposition to nativist stereotypes and cartoons of ignorant immigrants.²⁹¹

Ethno-religious holidays were also opportunities to display a rising standard of living with the acquisition of new possessions. Easter Sunday required the purchase of new clothes

²⁸⁹ Halter, *Shopping for Identity*, 34-35; Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 151-152.

²⁹⁰ Margaret Lynch-Brennan, “Ubiquitous Bridget: Irish Immigrant Women in Domestic Service in America, 1840-1930,” in *Making the Irish American: History and Heritage of the Irish in the United States*, ed. Joseph Lee and Marion Casey (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 344-346. See also Lynch-Brennan, *The Irish Bridget: Irish Immigrant Women in Domestic Service in America, 1840-1930* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009), 62-66, 134-135, 142-146.

²⁹¹ For product and store advertisements, see the *Pilot*, the *Republic*, and the *Advocate*, 1900-1917, *passim*. For society events, see “Brilliant Wedding Ceremony at Roxbury,” *Globe*, 7 April 1899, 6; “Purim Ball a Brilliant Success,” *Globe*, 9 February 1900; “Purim Ball,” *Republic*, 20 February 1904; “Purim Ball Spectacle at Symphony Hall,” *Advocate*, 9 March 1906; “Zionist Council of Greater Boston Holds a Most Successful Concert and Ball,” *Globe*, 28 February 1900; “Green of Old Ireland Waved,” *Globe*, 15 January 1896, 7; “Charitable Irish Society Ball,” *Republic*, 22 January 1898; “John Boyle O’Reilly Football Club Ball,” *Pilot*, 13 May 1905; “Ladies of St. Brendan Reception,” *Pilot*, 8 February 1908; “Grand Ball for Michael Davitt UIL,” *Pilot*, 5 November 1910.

to wear to church, while the Jewish practice of keeping kosher meant buying new sets of dishes to use for Passover celebrations for some families. Local restaurants advertised their “Strictly Fresh Kosher” eating establishments in a “German home of good cooking served for ladies and gentlemen.”²⁹² Manufacturers increasingly marketed to these new ethnic audiences. Hood Milk advertised its kosher qualities in the *Advocate* and *Forverts*, while department stores purchased space in the *Pilot* and *Republic* to inform consumers of their religious departments for first communion, including sales on rosaries and other ephemera, or gifts of shamrock corsages on St. Patrick’s Day.²⁹³

In addition to marketing American products, ethnic newspapers increasingly contained advertisements from companies that sold ethnically themed consumer products, such as food items, clothing, books, music, and other goods. Merchant Abraham Shuman regularly traveled to Ireland to negotiate deals for Irish tweed, linens, and other products for his Boston wholesale clothing company. The B & B Paper Supply Company of Holyoke listed the benefits of Zion Bond paper, noting that not only was it good paper for writing and typing, but also that its purchase demonstrated that “you are a true Jew” and “true Zionist,” as three percent of gross sales went toward the Zionist National Fund.²⁹⁴ Such advertisements, as Marilyn Halter observes, offered an ethnic “cultural expression that [was] convenient, portable, intermittent, and symbolic.”²⁹⁵ Travel companies also began to

²⁹² Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 84. Restaurant ad, *Advocate*, 23 March 1916.

²⁹³ See, for example, Hood ad for kosher milk in English and Hebrew, *Advocate*, 24 March 1911; Gilchrist ad for rosaries, *Pilot*, 19 November 1910; St. Patrick’s Day ad, *Pilot*, 15 March 1913.

²⁹⁴ “Zion Bond Paper,” *Advocate*, 15 October 1915.

²⁹⁵ Marilyn Halter, *Shopping for Identity: The Marketing of Ethnicity* (New York: Schocken Books, 2000), 137, 168. Ad for record songs of the Russian people, in *Advocate*, 26 October 1916.

advertise travel to Ireland, Germany, and Palestine, hoping to appeal to an increasing number of middle-class, American-born ethnics with expendable cash.²⁹⁶

Consumerism sometimes became a source of conflict between immigrant parents and Americanized children. Working teenagers and young adults, for example, fought for the right to spend money on American clothes and entertainment, such as the nickelodeon, public parks, amusement parks, and dance halls. For hard-working young men and women, such forms of entertainment were necessary for tolerating the long hours at the factory, department store, or office. Many belonged to unions and attended night school, putting aside a little money every week to send to family back home or for marriage; they wanted to spend the rest on fun.²⁹⁷

For many young ethnic Americans, music and popular theater were not only forms of entertainment, but also important avenues for acculturation. Since the nineteenth century, vaudeville entertainers like Harrigan and Hart, Dion Boucicault, and Chauncey Olcott had helped introduce immigrants to America and America to immigrants. Olcott's *A Romance in Athlone* debuted at the Boston Theatre in 1900, featuring the hit song, "My Wild Irish Rose." This and other Olcott ballads, such as "Mother Machree," would later be popularized by Irish tenor John McCormack, who performed at Symphony Hall for the first time in February 1911 to resoundingly positive reviews. Musicologist William H.A. Williams argues, that it was, in fact, McCormack's renditions that gave Olcott's songs "a high polish and

²⁹⁶ See, for example, ads for new illustrated edition of *Picturesque Ireland*, in *Republic*, 1 January 1898; *Pilot*, 16 September 1905; *Pilot*, 6 October 1906; Irish Tweed Co., *Pilot*, 20 October 1900; "Ireland by Automobile" ad, *Pilot*, 21 March 1914.

²⁹⁷ For more information, see Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: York*; Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will*.

made them popular well beyond the Irish-American community.”²⁹⁸ Sheet music and, later, phonograph records were first marketed to ethnic audiences, but soon expanded to the mainstream market. Given the prevalence of Irish and Jewish performers and songwriters in popular theatre and Tin Pan Alley, the groups were also the frequent subjects of songs based in America, including “If It Wasn’t for the Irish and the Jews” (1912) and “Moysha Machree (They’re Proud of their Irisher, Yiddisher Boy)” (1916). The lyrics of the first, written by William Jerome (formerly Flannery—he changed his name to sound more Jewish) and Jean Schwartz, emphasize their dominance of various areas.

What would this great Yankee nation really, really ever do?
If it wasn’t for a Levy, a Monahan or Donahue.
Where would we get our policemen?
Why Uncle Sam would get the blues.
Without the Pats or Isadores
You’d have no big department stores
If it wasn’t for the Irish and the Jews.²⁹⁹

With the movement from vaudeville to Broadway and early film, entertainers like George M. Cohan also influenced how immigrants saw themselves. With his “superpatriotic flag-waving,” the Irish-American Cohan demonstrated that ethnic Americans were just as—if not more so—loyal and “mainstream” as any native Anglo American. He revealed his penchant for flag-waving in his first hit, *Little Johnny Jones* (1904), in which he called himself the “Yankee Doodle Boy” who gave his “Regards to Broadway.” His popularity among

²⁹⁸ Williams continues, “It is significant that most of Olcott’s recordings were on the ‘ethnic’ labels made for the Irish market, while most of McCormack’s were on the mainstream labels.” Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream*, 215. “Story of the Life of John McCormack,” *Pilot*, 31 March 1917.

²⁹⁹ Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream*, 129-30; Halter, *Shopping for Identity*, 36-37. Dennis P. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 116-119; See also Mick Moloney, “Irish-American Popular Music,” in Lee and Casey, *Making the Irish American*, 387-398; Moloney, “If It Wasn’t For the Irish and the Jews: Irish and Jewish Influences on the Music of Vaudeville and Tin Pan Alley,” Benjamin A. Botkin Folklife Lecture, American Folklife Center, Library of Congress, 1 December 2009, www.loc.gov/folklife/events/BotkinArchives/Botkin2009.html#dec1, accessed 15 January 2010; Michael Alexander, *Jazz Age Jews* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 131-167.

working-class ethnic Americans only increased when critics felt he was overdoing the patriotism angle, dismissing him and his plays as common.³⁰⁰ Cohan-style expressions of patriotism soon found their way into the ethnic press as average Irish and Jewish Americans gained confidence to declare their dual loyalties. In 1914, for example, eighteen-year-old Nathan Smolker, the Russian-born son of a junk peddler living in Chelsea, wrote a poem about America entitled, “The Home of the Jew,” in which he vocalized the feelings of many Jewish immigrants toward their adopted home:

The warm rays of hope entwined the outcast
For his dream was realized, realized at last.
He had come to that land where liberty first grew,
He had come to America, the home of the Jew.”³⁰¹

Sports were another way for ethnic Americans to participate in mainstream culture. Baseball, track, and football were popular leisure activities for children and adults. Even women and girls engaged in physical activity, taking advantage of the gymnasiums of settlement houses, parishes, and ethnic organizations, leisure activities like roller skating, bicycling, and swimming, and spectator sports like baseball. Also, such professional sports as boxing and baseball provided young men without education or social connections with a means of attaining fame and fortune.³⁰²

The Irish, in particular, embraced American athletics; Ireland had a long sporting tradition, and immigrants and their children quickly became active in baseball, boxing, football, and track in America. Beginning with America’s first sports celebrity in the 1880s, champion boxer John L. Sullivan, the “Boston Strong Boy,” Irish Americans proudly

³⁰⁰ Quoted in Michael Coffey, ed., *The Irish in America* (New York: Hyperion Press, 1997), 196.

³⁰¹ *Advocate*, 28 August 1914. For Smolker, see U.S. Census (1910), World War I Draft Registration Card, 1918.

³⁰² Stephen A. Reiss, *Touching Base: Professional Baseball and American Culture in the Progressive Era* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999). Linda Borish, “Jewish American Women, Jewish Organizations, and Sports,” in *Sports and the American Jew*, ed. Stephen A. Reiss (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998), 105-131.

embraced the stereotype of the fighting Irish. In 1900, James Connolly, a Harvard student from South Boston, became a new hero when he won the first gold medal in the first modern Olympics in the “hop, skip, and jump.”³⁰³

Eastern European Jews did not have a sporting tradition and thus some immigrant parents urged children to focus on their education and Jewish traditions. Young Jews, however, were just as enthralled by baseball and boxing as other American children. Athletics allowed them to release energy, defend their honor, gain social status in the neighborhood, and demonstrate that they were not greenhorns. Although not as numerous as the Irish, a few Jewish boxers, baseball players, runners, and collegiate football players gained some fame in this period. In fact, some Jewish boxers often fought under assumed Irish names to sound more “American,” in the hopes of gaining management and a larger fan base in a sport dominated by Irish Americans.³⁰⁴

As children grew up, collegiate athletic competition represented upward mobility and an important source of communal pride. Irish boys were hopeful that their skills might bring athletic scholarships or employment as players, coaches, or managers, while Jews viewed a college education as evidence of their achievement in a Christian world, and participation on their vaunted athletic teams as counterevidence against weakness. Harvard president Charles A. Eliot, for example, advised the Harvard Menorah Society to focus more on physical strength and stamina, in addition to studying. Similarly, while Rabbi Eichler was not happy about the competitiveness of college athletics, he agreed that Jews needed more physical

³⁰³ Ralph Wilcox, “Irish Americans in Sports: The Nineteenth Century,” in Lee and Casey, *Making the Irish American*, 450-455; Larry McCarthy, “Irish Americans in Sports: The Twentieth Century,” in *ibid.*, 457-470; Reiss, *Touching Base*, 7. Ryan, *Beyond the Ballot Box*, 115-116.

³⁰⁴ Reiss, “The Jewish American Boxing Experience, 1880-1950,” in Reiss, *Sports and the American Jew*, 63-66, 74; Ross, *Old World in the New*, 290.

activity, and proudly noted President Theodore Roosevelt's praise of Jews as good soldiers.³⁰⁵

For many Irish Catholics, participation in collegiate competition at elite schools provided the steppingstone needed to advance economically and socially. In 1904, for example, the editor of the *Republic* objected to the idea that the "principal callings" of Irish Americans were "baseball, pugilism, and politics," but recognized that college athletes' sacrifice and hard work would help prepare them for business. "Hogan, Hurley, Cooney and Shevlin," football players at Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, respectively, "are true sons of the Irish race"; when "the triumph on the field of athletic glory is but a memory," they would have their training and education to help them gain employment.³⁰⁶ Not everyone favored secular education, however. The editor of the *Sacred Heart Review* protested other newspapers' "spasms of joy" over the numbers of Irish Catholic athletes in "big non-sectarian" colleges, asking why were they not "attending colleges of their own faith?" Catholic higher education was "not only a religious but a patriotic responsibility," a 1915 *Pilot* editorial concurred. "The country needs well trained Christian citizens far more than well trained professional and business men."³⁰⁷ Regardless, collegiate competition helped athletes to gain the attention and respect of the mainstream Yankee population, particularly as their achievements dominated the sports pages of the city newspapers.

³⁰⁵ "Muscular Judaism," *Advocate*, 27 December 1907; "Agrees with President Eliot," *Advocate*, 3 January 1908. Jewish pride in their collegiate athletes continued into later decades. In 1919, for example, the *Advocate* featured the Horween Brothers, who "triumphed" for the Harvard football team. The following year, Arnold Horween was unanimously chosen as the first Jewish captain. As the *Advocate* crowed, "Who said the Jews were not athletes?" He was later hired as a coach (*Advocate*, 27 November 1919; *Advocate*, 22 January 1920; *Advocate*, 4 November 1920; *Advocate*, 11 March 1926).

³⁰⁶ *Republic*, 12 March 1904; *Republic*, 31 December 1904; *Republic*, 26 November 1904. Ronald A. Smith, "Harvard's Response to Excellence and Winning in College Athletics, 1869-1909," in *Massachusetts in the Gilded Age: Selected Essays*, ed. Jack Tager and John W. Ifkovic (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 164-190.

³⁰⁷ *Sacred Heart Review*, 1 July 1905, 5. "Boston College Grows," *Pilot*, 9 October 1915, 8.

Irish and Jewish communal institutions also sponsored teams in both ethnic and American sports that took part in inter-ethnic and inter-city leagues, most of which sported ethnic-sounding names and colors. The YMHA had a junior basketball team and an adult baseball team, which competed in 1905 against the M.J. Hurleys, the “best team in the city.” In 1910, the K. of C.’s Mt. Pleasant Council reported “an exceptionally fast team”; “there are high class players in the nine and some very good base ball is looked for.”³⁰⁸

Many Americans considered baseball, the country’s most popular spectator sport, to be the “most effective means of teaching civic virtues, democratic values, and respect for authority” to immigrants. Unlike boxing matches and collegiate football games, members of every class, race, and gender attended baseball games, creating a feeling of community and civic pride when “their” team won. In addition, most attendees had personal experience with the sport, whether through a neighborhood league or a pickup stickball game.³⁰⁹

As immigrants participated in baseball, whether through playing or watching, they “adopted America’s game as their own.” Many professional baseball players—as well as several managers and even owners—were immigrants or the sons of immigrants who came out of the same urban neighborhoods as their fans; thus, the sport provided players with a way out of poverty and fans with new ethnic heroes. As with other aspects of ethnic culture, Tin Pan Alley composers used the predominance of ethnic Americans in baseball as the basis for a variety of songs in this period, including “Finnegan the Umpire” (1890) by

³⁰⁸ Wilcox, “Irish Americans in Sports,” 450-455; Meagher, *Inventing Irish America*, 74-76. *Pilot*, 13 May 1905. *Advocate*, 9 June 1905; *Advocate*, 15 March 1907. For Irish sport, see Michael P. Quinlin, *Irish Boston: A Lively Look at Boston’s Colorful Past* (Guilford, Conn.: Globe Pequot Press, 2004), 101-112.

³⁰⁹ Jacob J. Bustad, “One Hundred Per Cent American?: Nationalism, Masculinity, and American Legion Junior Baseball in the 1920s” (M.A. thesis: University of Kansas, 2009), 51. Gerald R. Gems, *The Athletic Crusade: Sport and American Cultural Imperialism* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 10; Reiss, *Touching Base*, 11-53. A 1921 *Globe* immigrant guide cited baseball as representative of America’s “youthful” optimism, confidence, and sense of fair play (“Are You an Immigrant?” *Globe*, 28 August 1921, E2).

Monroe Rosenfeld, and “Jake! Jake! (The Yiddisher Ball Player)” (1913) by composer Irving Berlin and lyricist Blanche Merrill. A popular William Jerome and Jean Schwartz song, “They’re All Good American Names,” highlights the fact that by 1911, the typical “American” ball player was Irish or Jewish:

The men who lead the world today in all athletic games
Are brawny sons of Uncle Sam, with good old Yankee names.
Brady and O’Toole, Doolin and McColl,
McInemy and McBarney, Harrigan, McVey and Kearney...
Connie Mack and John McGraw—all together shout Hurrah!
There’s Rosenheimer, Jacobs, Weiner,
Gimble, Sax and Straus.
They’re all good American names!³¹⁰

The ethnic appeal of Boston’s team, the Boston Americans (renamed the Red Sox in 1907), was clear by the time of the first World Series, held in 1903 against the Pittsburgh Pirates. “Collins’s boys,” so named after their manager and third baseman, Jimmy Collins, included stars like pitcher Cy Young and various players of Irish and German backgrounds. The team’s fans avidly followed their progress in the press when not attending games at the Huntington Avenue Grounds.³¹¹

Perhaps the most dedicated fans were the Royal Rooters. The Rooters were a group of diehard Irish-American baseball enthusiasts that included Michael “Nuf Ced” McGreevey, owner of the Third Base Saloon, located across the street from the ball field, and North End ward boss John F. Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald’s participation was due not only to his love of the hometown team, but also the publicity, as it kept the colorful politician’s name in the press. The Rooters occupied reserved bleacher seats along the first base line and

³¹⁰ William Jerome and Jean Schwartz, “They’re All Good American Names” (1911), quoted in Roger I. Abrams, “Constructing Baseball,” *Cardozo Law Review* 23.5 (6 September 2002), 1600, 1598.

³¹¹ The first Jewish member of the Red Sox was Simon “Si” Rosenthal, who played outfield from 1925 to 1926. Born in Dorchester in 1903, Rosenthal grew up as a fan of the team, like other boys his age. See “‘Si Rosenthal Day’ at Fenway Park September 26,” *Advocate*, 24 September 1925.

attended each game in their Sunday suits and black derbies with ticket stubs stuck in the bands. Boxer James J. Corbett often accompanied them, while local hero and aging prizefighter John L. Sullivan chose to sit in the dugout with Collins. The antics of the Rooters became legendary, and their Irishness, as they rooted for their home team in this all-American game, was always apparent.³¹²

The team's Jewish supporters were just as dedicated, but faced a difficult dilemma during the 1903 series. Game One was on Yom Kippur, forcing Jewish players and fans, including the Pirates owner, Barney Dreyfuss, to decide whether or not to ignore their religious obligations and attend the game. This conflict would be repeated over the next several decades, most famously by Hank Greenberg of the Detroit Tigers during the 1934 World Series. In 1903, most Jews, including Dreyfuss, chose not to attend the game. He did, however, invite Rabbi Charles Fleischer and several Adath Israel members to attend Game Two as his guests. The episode illustrates that while Jews took quickly to baseball and other American pastimes, they were not yet powerful enough to influence decisions concerning its practice—not even a club owner.³¹³

Even so, many Jews enjoyed the game. Rabbi Fleischer, for example, was an avid baseball fan, taking every opportunity to attend games as a way to get out into the fresh air and enjoy the company of his “fellow beings.” He wrote about the game's “scientific” complexities as a contributing writer for *Baseball Magazine* (1908), a periodical published by

³¹² Abrams, “Constructing Baseball,” 1608, 1599, 1602-1603; Peter J. Nash, *Boston's Royal Rooters* (Charleston: Arcadia Press, 2005); Glenn Stout, Richard A. Johnson, Dick Johnson, *Red Sox Century: One Hundred Years of Red Sox Baseball* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), 53-54. After the 1903 victory, Fitzgerald tried to buy the club, but was outbid. Even so, the following year, his newspaper, the *Republic*, commemorated the team's win with a full-page pictorial spread (“Boston Honors Them!” *Republic*, October 15, 1904). For more on baseball and politics, see Reiss, *Touching Base*, 54-133.

³¹³ Abrams, *The First World Series and the Baseball Fanatics of 1903* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003), 18.

Boston Herald writer and minor league baseball secretary, Jacob (Jake) Morse (1885-1907), a member of the prominent local Jewish family. While not highly profitable, the magazine's focus on issues surrounding the game, such as controversial Sunday games and religious discrimination toward Jewish and Catholic players, as well as player analysis and statistics, earned it critical success. In one article, Fleischer discussed baseball's immigrant fan base as a commentary on ethnic acculturation, using himself as a prime example. "Though 'made in Germany,'" he wrote, "It was not long after being born again as a good American, that I was seized of an incurable case of baseball fever." Baseball, he argued, proclaimed the superior status of America as the "land of freemen and the 'home of the brave' umpire."³¹⁴

Irish and Jewish Americans also found ways to combine their love of American pastimes like baseball with ethnic nationalism. In 1918, for example, American members of the Jewish Legion introduced the sport to Jewish settlers in Palestine. Similarly, in May 1921, members of the New York Giants and other professional teams donated game receipts to the Irish Relief Fund—their way of aiding the Irish struggle against Great Britain.³¹⁵

Conclusion

Increasing demographic strength, economic mobility, and growing political awareness during the Progressive Era convinced many of Boston's Irish Catholics and Jews that they could influence local affairs to their benefit. As a part of this effort, Irish and

³¹⁴ Abrams, *First World Series*, 18; Charles Fleischer, "A Bit of Baseball Biography," *Baseball Magazine*, June 1908, 35-36. Thanks to Lisa Fagin Davis for this reference. Reiss, *Touching Base*, 19; Charles Bevis, "Jake Morse," *The Baseball Biography Project*, www.bioproj.sabr.org, accessed 8 September 2005; Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 44. The *Advocate* also noted cases of discrimination, advising spectators to "drop the taunting remarks about any player's religion and put your attention on the game." See, for example, "Play Ball!" *Advocate*, 9 April 1909.

³¹⁵ Paul Darby, "Gaelic Sport and the Irish Diaspora in Boston, 1879-1890," *Irish Historical Studies* xxxiii, no. 132 (November 2003), 387-403. "Americans Introduce Baseball to Palestine," *Advocate*, 15 August 1918. Ron Kaplan, "The Sporting Life," *Irish America* (February/March 2003).

Jewish leaders attempted to redefine the meaning of American identity by inserting their celebrations into Boston's civic calendar. Events like the anniversary of Jewish settlement in America and the Catholic archdiocese's centennial fueled optimism about the place of Irish Catholics and Jews in American life with their focus on tolerance and emphasis on the growing acceptance of ethnic culture.

Yet while Boston's Irish and Jewish leaders had similar views regarding their groups' right to acceptance, their methods and expressions were quite different. Irish demographic strength, political influence, and a strong tradition of parading provided for a very public assertion of Irish-Catholic patriotism. Through church dedications, mass outdoor rallies, street pageants, and parades through the city, immigrants and their American-born offspring loudly proclaimed their ethnic patriotism. Irish Bostonians participated in long-established civic holidays and created two of their own: a joint St. Patrick's Day/Evacuation Day celebration and the legislatively mandated Columbus Day. This was less true of Jewish Americans. While immigrants paraded on a small scale, particularly for wedding processions and synagogue dedications, middle-class Jews remained wary of public demonstrations of ethnic pride for fear of antisemitic outbursts, and instead gathered indoors in synagogues and private halls. Increasingly, however, Jews in Boston would be more assertive in taking events outdoors. Zionist organizations, political clubs, and labor unions, for example, organized massive parades with marchers, banners, and floats, all of which proclaimed their joint loyalties, or declared their right as Americans to protest inequality.

American consumerism, popular music, and sports also provided opportunities for Irish and Jews to participate in mainstream American culture. Buying American goods, listening to American music, or participating in American sports did not require education,

skills, or even knowledge of the English language, but they were, nonetheless, important ways in which immigrants and American-born ethnics demonstrated their acculturation. Yet even as they took part in American activities, Irish and Jewish Americans in Boston adopted them as their own, adding their cultural contributions along the way. Eventually, their efforts would lead to their domination of the stage, screen, sports stadium, and department store, where, in the process, they would transmit and popularize “authentic” ethnic identities to wider American audiences.

By the beginning of World War I, Boston’s Irish and Jews “stood firmly on the public stage.”³¹⁶ Their assertions of the compatibility of Americanism and ethnicity did not preclude objections to what President Theodore Roosevelt called “hyphenated Americanism,” as nativists, and even some Irish and Jews, believed that ethnic ties interfered with American loyalties, particularly after the United States entered the war. Even so, many Irish and Jews continued to promote their ideas of ethnic patriotism. Ethnic nationalists, in particular, argued that it was their love for American liberty that encouraged them to work harder to gain independence for their groups. This goal would be vital in the years leading up to America’s entrance in the European conflict, contributing much to the progress of the international movements.

³¹⁶ Ueda and Wright, *Faces of Community*, xi.

Chapter 4: Waving Their Flags: The Compatibility of Ethnic Nationalism and Americanism, 1900-1917

Our people have known how to suffer and how to die, but they have never learned how to abandon the faith of their fathers. Irishism and Americanism are one and the same. There is no man who swears allegiance to the United States so cheerfully as the Irishman. There is no man who takes an oath against foreign kings and particularly the king of Great Britain and Ireland with as much pleasure as the Irishman.

—Matthew Cummings, National President, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Address at a banquet in his honor, Boston, November 1906

There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and our experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American...Loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance.

—Louis D. Brandeis, “The Jewish Problem, How to Solve It,” Address to the Eastern Council of the Central Conference of Reform Rabbis, June 1915

Involvement in local politics and civic celebrations gave individuals in Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities a newfound confidence about promoting their group causes, while at the same time demonstrating their loyalty to their adopted land. They believed that while social, economic, and political differences often prohibited agreement on domestic issues, “nationalism provided a standard around which all could rally.” Fostering religion, language, and culture provided a foundation for group consciousness and respectability, they argued, and participation in nationalist activities, long viewed by nativists as a central reason why immigrants could not be true Americans, in fact demonstrated their love for the American principles of freedom and democracy. In this way, they refuted accusations of what Theodore Roosevelt called “hyphenated Americanism.”³¹⁷

³¹⁷ For quote, see Michael P. Mulcrone, “World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press” (Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1993), 106. Cecelia Elizabeth O’Leary argues that in spite of nativists’ disapproval, “liberal principles of association and expression” allowed ethnic Americans to “maintain dual allegiance to their homelands and the United States.” *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 220. See also Thomas N. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism, 1870-1890* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966), 28; Jonathan D. Sarna, “The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” *Jewish Social Studies* n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999).

This chapter examines the development of Irish nationalist and Zionist politics, culture, and ideology in Boston in the decade and a half before World War I. As the above quotes suggest, ethnic nationalism remained a hotly contested subject in America. Even so, these years were productive for both movements, which benefited greatly from the continued interest of thousands of immigrants and American-born ethnics. Many Irish and Jewish immigrants retained a sense of themselves as political and religious exiles, respectively, and were active participants in the Irish nationalist and Zionist movements.³¹⁸ Some provided important financial support, leadership, and publicity, while others maintained their ethnic attachment through religious observance, reading ethnic newspapers, involvement in cultural societies, participation in popular demonstrations, or even the consumption of material culture. While political independence for Ireland and the establishment of a homeland for Jews were the ultimate goals, just as important was demonstrating respectability and proving they were not a conquered people.³¹⁹

Despite their overall success, both movements were marked by factionalism in this period, as class and generational differences complicated the formation of unified nationalist agendas and the creation of appropriate cultural representations. Most middle-class Irish Americans were constitutional nationalists who believed Home Rule was the most practical solution for Ireland, but many in the immigrant working class felt military force was the only

³¹⁸ The concept of immigrant as exile has been explored in depth in Kerby A. Miller, *Exiles and Emigrants: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985; and Allon Gal, "The Mission Motif in American Zionism, 1898-1948," *American Jewish History* 75.4 (June 1986), 370.

³¹⁹ Building on Kerby A. Miller's ideas concerning middle-class cultural hegemony, historians have only recently begun to examine the notion of generational conflict within ethnic communities. See Miller, "Class, Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States: The Case of Irish-American Ethnicity," in *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, ed. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Timothy J. Meagher, *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001); Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrow: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2002); Sarna, "Cult of Synthesis," 64.

way Britain would give up control. Boston's Jews were also conflicted regarding Zionism; many immigrants and American-born Jews argued that the United States was their new "Promised Land," but others argued that active participation in the establishment of a homeland in Palestine presented the only solution to the worldwide "Jewish Problem." By 1914, these tensions would be complicated by the outbreak of World War I in Europe. America's declared neutrality increased protests against divided loyalties and made it imperative to prove the compatibility of ethnic nationalism with American loyalties.

"Awakening Interest Everywhere": the Revitalization of Ethnic Nationalism

The growth of the Irish nationalist and Zionist movements in the early twentieth century could not have been predicted in 1890. The Irish Home Rule movement and its program of social reform had dissolved in the wake of Charles Parnell's involvement in a divorce scandal in 1889 and his death from a heart attack two years later. The subsequent decade saw infighting within the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) and factionalism in the American Clan-na-Gael. Zionism, meanwhile, had yet to be established as a structured ideology or movement. Until the late 1890s, Jewish nationalism remained a Utopian vision of the religiously observant, on the one hand, who prayed for the Messiah and the return to Palestine, and secular Jews on the other, who sought ways to alleviate antisemitism and persecution of Jews in Europe.

In the 1890s, the Irish at home and abroad—home rulers and revolutionary nationalists alike—embraced the Gaelic Revival, a renaissance of Irish language, culture, and sport, to demonstrate their respectability and level of civilization as a people. In 1900, hopes for constitutional nationalism were revived in the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) under the

leadership of John Redmond. Four years later, Arthur Griffith established Sinn Féin, which joined revolutionary separatists in the quest for an Irish republic.³²⁰

By the late nineteenth century, Irish immigrants were increasingly Irish speakers from the western coast, many of whom had participated in the Land League and the Gaelic Revival. These immigrants brought a renewed sense of dedication to the Irish nationalist movement in America.³²¹ The United Irish League of America (UILA) was founded in 1901, largely by middle-class Irish Americans who sought to support Redmond's goal of parliamentary action and increase their respectability in the face of Yankee discrimination. Within a year, the UILA had 200 branches supported by Patrick Ford's *Irish World* newspaper, all dedicated to generating support for Home Rule. Militant revolutionaries, conversely, continued to agitate for full independence through the working-class IRB and the Clan-na-Gael, supported by John Devoy's *Gaelic American*.³²²

While Irish nationalism had a long history, the modern Zionist movement was established in 1896, when Austrian Jew Theodore Herzl published *Der Judenstaat* (*The Jewish State*). Influenced by increasing antisemitism in Europe and Jewish colonization schemes in Palestine, Herzl argued for true protection, Jews needed to create their own homeland through organized immigration.³²³ He and his supporters held yearly Zionist Congresses; at

³²⁰ For more on Irish nationalist politics, see Patrick Maume, *The Long Gestation: Irish Nationalist Life, 1891-1918* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Michael Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism: The Friends of Irish Freedom, 1916-1935* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 15-32; Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish* (New York: Longman, 2000), 192-194.

³²¹ As Linda Dowling Almeida observes, "every generation of Irish immigrants... carries with it the character of the Ireland they leave behind." *Irish Immigrants in New York City, 1945-1995* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2001), 11. William A. Williams, *'Twas Only an Irishman's Dream*, 178-179; Miller, *Exiles and Emigrants*, 102-130.

³²² Patrick Ford, "United Irish League's Appeal," *Boston Globe*, 29 November 1899, 6. Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2003), 40-45.

³²³ Theodore Herzl, *The Jewish State*, Harry Zohn, transl., introduction by Joseph Adler (New York: Herzl Press, 1970).

the first, held in 1897 at Basel, Switzerland, they announced their plan to “secure for the Jewish people a publicly recognized, legally secured home in Palestine.”³²⁴ Jews worldwide flocked to the cause, and oppressed Russian Jews saw Herzl as a savior, but he met opposition from Orthodox rabbis, who argued Zionists were “forcing” the hand of God, and Reform rabbis, who firmly believed in assimilation. The movement was also plagued by internal dissent, particularly over such issues as the location of the Jewish homeland and the role of Hebrew, which many considered important as an aspect of their religion, but not for cultural or nationalist purposes. These issues exacerbated Herzl’s persistent heart condition and contributed to his death in 1904. His colleague, Austrian physician Max Nordau, continued Herzl’s efforts to purchase land for colonization in Palestine and increase membership, particularly in the United States, where the movement benefited from the influx of Eastern European immigrants.³²⁵

The Federation of American Zionists (FAZ) was established in New York soon after the 1897 Basel Congress, and by 1898, there were twenty-four member organizations nationwide. Led by attendees of the European congresses, including Richard Gottheil (president, 1898-1904), an English-born Reform Jew and professor of Semitic languages at Columbia University, Reform Rabbi Stephen S. Wise (secretary, 1898-1902), and Conservative Jewish journalist Jacob de Haas (secretary, 1902-1905), the federation quickly

³²⁴ David G. Dalin, “Cyrus Adler, Non-Zionism, and the Zionist Movement: A Study in Contradictions,” *American Jewish Studies Review* X, no. 1 (Spring 1985), 61. Supporters included English playwright Israel Zangwill, author of *Children of the Ghetto* (1892) and *The Melting Pot* (1908), physician Max Nordau, and Herzl’s secretary, Jacob de Haas.

³²⁵ Palestine was the location of choice, but difficulties in gaining permission for Jewish colonization from the Turks, as well as an offer from the British of using Uganda in East Africa, split the movement into two camps. Richard Gottheil, “Zionism,” *Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, vol. 12, ed. Isidore Singer (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1901-1906), 673.

became the representative organization for the small American movement. De Haas edited their periodical, the *Maccabean* (1901), reporting on Zionist happenings worldwide. By 1901, the FAZ had 152 branches (eight thousand members), but very meager funds.³²⁶

The development of each movement in Boston was informed by these national and international circumstances. In 1900, hoping to demonstrate their unity with the Irish Parliamentary Party, a group of Irish journalists, politicians, businessmen, and professionals formed the Boston Central Branch of the United Irish League of America. The group's leadership was made up largely of middle-class Progressives, including Patrick Collins, soon to be elected the city's second Irish mayor; Thomas B. Fitzpatrick, a merchant and philanthropist; Reverend Denis O'Callaghan, pastor of South Boston's Gate of Heaven Church; and *Boston Globe* journalist John O'Callaghan, who served as the branch secretary. A personal friend of John Redmond, O'Callaghan played a central role in the national order and was instrumental in generating publicity, arranging visits from Irish leaders, and organizing the UILA's first national convention in Boston in October 1902.³²⁷

The UILA was joined to a lesser extent by the Clan-na-Gael, which consisted of middle-class leaders and a largely working-class membership. Both groups sought respectability for Boston's Irish population from the Yankee establishment by proving that the Irish did not come from a conquered race. The UILA, in particular, sought to "send messages of hope and sympathy across the water," and "stand as one man beneath the banner of unity against the common foe." These years were active for the UILA, with

³²⁶ Cyrus Adler and I.D. Morrison, ed., "Federation of American Zionists," in Singer, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 355; "Richard Gottheil: Reluctant Father of American Zionism," *Jewish Magazine* (November 2007).

³²⁷ For O'Callaghan, see Damien Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 45-57. *Pilot*, 23 August 1902; *Pilot*, 25 October, 1 November 1902. *Pilot*, 5 January 1918.

branches “being formed nightly,” according to the *Pilot*. Most of the money raised went to subsidize Irish members of parliament—a fact that Clan-na-Gael leaders like John Devoy and Daniel Cohalan resented, as these funds might have gone to the revolutionary struggle instead.³²⁸ In fact, as historian Damien Murray argues, the UILA’s ability to generate widespread support for Redmond’s Home Rule movement in Boston ensured that the militant Clan-na-Gael remained relatively weak compared to other cities.³²⁹

The city’s Zionist efforts were even more fragmented. In 1897, Richard Gottheil, the President of the New York-based Federation of American Zionists, and several Palestinian colonists spoke at a public mass meeting at Congregation Beth Israel in the North End, commonly known as the Baldwin Place synagogue, to discuss the organization of Zionist groups in Boston. Led by Lithuanian-born Rabbi Moshe Margolies, Baldwin Place was the center of immigrant culture and Zionist activity in the city.³³⁰ In 1899, the Zionist Council of Boston was established as a federation designed to better unite the efforts of younger recruits to “propagate the Zionist spirit through mass meetings, raising funds to buy Palestinian land, and countering anti-Zionist propaganda.” Membership soon doubled, reflecting the growth of the movement and increasing devotion of the new immigrants.³³¹

³²⁸ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 30, fn30. Salaries were introduced in 1911. Mulcrone, “The World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press,” 113.

³²⁹ “For Ireland’s Cause,” *Pilot*, 29 September 1900. Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 9-10, 39-41. Quotes from *Pilot*, 6 October 1900. “Another Ladies’ Branch of United Irish League in Boston,” *Pilot*, 15 February 1902; “UIL St. James Branch 10th Anniversary,” *Pilot*, 21 January 1911. It was not until the Easter Rising in 1916 that physical-force nationalism gained a large following in Boston.

³³⁰ “In the Interest of Zionism,” *Globe*, 26 December 1897, 17. David Kaufman, “Temples in the American Athens: A History of the Synagogues of Boston,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 186-189; 195-196.

³³¹ “Zionists to Confederate,” *Globe*, 16 October 1899, 9. “Meeting of Zionists,” *Globe*, 10 April 1899. William A. Braverman, “The Ascent of Boston’s Jews, 1630-1918” (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1990), 216; “Growth of Zionism in Boston,” *The Maccabean* 2 (May 1902): 241-3; *The Maccabean* 2 (June 1902): 321-337.

In 1900, the council held its first annual concert and ball, hosted by the member organizations and attended by their 1560 members. Anxious to emphasize their entwined loyalties, organizers decorated the hall with bunting, a large portrait of George Washington, flanked by American and Zionist flags, and portraits of the Zionist leaders Theodore Herzl and Max Nordau. At the center of the stage was the “seal of David, a large illuminated star, bearing in its center the word Zion in Hebrew.”³³² The connections between Zionism and Americanism were also noted in 1901 at the FAZ’s fifth annual meeting, held at Faneuil Hall in Boston. President Gottheil noted the symbolic importance of the historic structure and compared the Puritan’s safe haven of Boston with the Jews’ homeland of Palestine. “What the Puritans established on a ‘grand scale,’” he argued, Zionists hoped to “accomplish on a very small one.”³³³

Even so, the movement was primarily small and immigrant-based in Boston; the Federation contained sixteen societies with a total membership of 3500 in 1901, mostly centered in the North End. The Hanover Street reading room provided club headquarters, while discussions on the vital social and political question of the day were held at theatres, lunchrooms, and kitchen barrooms. Harvard social worker Horace Kallen, at a 1902 Twentieth Century Club meeting regarding recreation for North End residents with Max Mitchell, superintendent of the Federated Jewish Charities, and Meyer Bloomfield, a social worker at Civic Service House on Salem Street, observed that “the attitude of the revolutionists and socialists is softening toward the Zionists, and that movement seems to be

³³² Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*, 32. “Entertained About 2000. Zionist Council of Greater Boston Holds a Most Successful Concert and Ball,” *Globe*, 28 February 1900. Member organizations included the Theodor Herzl Association, Defenders of Zion, Volunteers of Zion, Hebrew National Association, Dorshai Zion 1 Dorshai Zion 3, Dorshai 4, Sons and Daughters of Zion, Lovers of Zion, Dorshaf Zion of Boston, and Dorshaf Zion of Chelsea.

³³³ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 217. See also *Globe*, 5 April 1903, 31.

doing for the elder Jew what the public school is doing for the child. Through Zionism the modern spirit is entering and leavening.”³³⁴ Kallen was part of a small circle of young Zionists in Boston that included journalists, academics, and rabbis, such as Menahem Eichler, rabbi of Temple Ohabei Shalom (1905-1916) and former president of the Boston Council; Herman Rubenovitz, rabbi of Congregation Mishkan Tefila (1906-1966); and Phineas Israeli, rabbi of Adath Jeshurun (1908-1918). They and others sought to instill a “national spirit into the hearts of young Jews” by reviving interest in Judaism, thereby fostering unity within the diverse community.³³⁵

Conversely, Irish nationalism attracted all segments of Irish society in Boston. At a Faneuil Hall rally during a 1906 visit by MP John Devlin, Mayor John F. Fitzgerald “evoked shouts of approval” with his assertion that “England had good reason to fear the consequences of an agitation which had its inception in Faneuil Hall—the hallowed cradle of liberty.” Bostonians had always supported the Irish cause; “no other city in America would send a more heart-felt message of cheer to the battling members of the Irish parliamentary party.”³³⁶ The press and politicians understood that the UILA’s message of unity and appropriation of such Irish revolutionary heroes as Robert Emmet and Wolfe Tone appealed to working-class immigrants and American-born Irish who aspired to middle-class standing and wanted to retain ties to Ireland. Its success was soon evident; in 1906, for example, treasurer Thomas Fitzpatrick reported that Massachusetts led in contributions to the

³³⁴ “North End Needs,” *Globe*, 18 May 1902, 28.

³³⁵ For Eichler, see *Advocate*, 4 November 1915; Israeli, *Advocate*, 28 December 1907, 24 June 1910; Rubenovitz, *Advocate*, 2 May 1913. “Talks for 5,000,000,” *Globe*, 14 January 1907, 1. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 245; Allon Gal, *Brandeis of Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 150-156.

³³⁶ *Republic*, 3 February 1906. Fitzgerald’s newspaper declared itself “the acknowledged leader among Irish-American and Catholic newspapers loyal to the Home Rule Party” (*Republic*, 17 September 1904).

national association with a total of \$19,036.³³⁷ The next year, Archbishop O’Connell joined UILA national president, Michael J. Ryan of Philadelphia, at a meeting to discuss the organization’s aims, thus demonstrating the church’s approval of the movement. O’Connell retained a “deep interest in the welfare of the great cause” and was a frequent donator to Redmond’s party. Their purpose was to feature Home Rule as continuation of the old Land League measure to help the poor and spread democracy in Ireland; British conservatives and Unionists, as opponents of Home Rule, were “privileged interest groups blocking the will of the people.”³³⁸

By mid-decade, more American-born Jews were becoming interested in Zionism as well, and Zionist council member Albert Hurwitz began to note the “awakening interest everywhere” in the movement. Much of this new interest was due to the arrival of former FAZ secretary, Jacob de Haas, who moved to Boston in 1905 to head the local Young Men’s Hebrew Association (YMHA). Three years later, he became the editor of the *Boston Advocate*. Zionism was a primary feature of the periodical from the beginning, presenting all sides to the Zionist question. De Haas’s arrival helped generate much-needed enthusiasm and support for the movement from the German Reform middle class and elite, an emerging group of conservative Americanized immigrants and their American-born children, as well as the new Eastern European arrivals. By 1913, there were several Jewish newspapers in Boston, including a few published in Yiddish.³³⁹

³³⁷ “UIL Convention in Philadelphia,” *Pilot*, 13 October 1906.

³³⁸ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 50. See, for example, O’Connell to Michael F. Ryan, UILA president, 1 October 1912; William Cardinal O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 9:11.

³³⁹ “Can Get Palestine,” *Globe*, 28 December 1905, 13. “Zionist Mass Meeting to be Held,” *Globe*, June 12, 1902, 8; *Advocate*, 16 June 1905. De Haas had relocated to New York in 1902. *Boston Blatt* (estab. 1912), *Boston Jewish American* (1908), *Boston Jewish Voice* (1913, with an English supplement), *Dos Naye Wort* (monthly, 1913,

Initially, most Reform Jews were anti-Zionist. In 1888, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) had removed references to the “Return” to Palestine from rituals and prayer books, and in 1898, the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) had argued that “America was the Jews’ Jerusalem and Washington their Zion.”³⁴⁰ The middle-class members of Boston’s Reform congregation, Temple Adath Israel, including Rabbi Charles Fleischer and Rabbi Emeritus Solomon Schindler, did not believe in the “Return” and were also cautious supporting activities that could be construed as disloyal.³⁴¹ When Rabbi Harry Levi arrived in 1911, he expressed sympathy with Zionism, but felt it was “impracticable.” Like his predecessors, he felt that Jews should keep their culture, but “loyalty to America” should come before “every other loyalty.”³⁴²

Over the next several years, however, European pogroms and the immigration restriction movement gradually convinced more of Boston’s German-American Jewish community to support Zionism, despite Reform Judaism’s official position against it. As Rabbi Eichler proclaimed at a Faneuil Hall mass meeting to aid Russian massacre victims in 1905, “the Jewish problem will never be solved as long as the root of all our troubles is

Independent Workmen’s Circle of Boston), and *Young Men’s Hebrew Association Review* (monthly, 1913). *American Jewish Year Book* (1913), 328-333.

³⁴⁰ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 202. Gottheil, “Zionism,” in Singer, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12, 675-680; Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Judaism: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 201-207; Ben Halpern, “The Americanization of Zionism, 1880-1930,” in *American Zionism: Mission and Politics*, ed. Jeffrey S. Gurock (New York: Routledge, 1998), 125-142; Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2003).

³⁴¹ For Schindler’s opinions on Zionism, see *Advocate*, 3 March 1906; *Advocate*, 10 March 1906; *Advocate*, 18 January 1907; *Advocate*, 25 January 1907; *Advocate*, 1 February 1907; *Advocate*, 8 February 1907; *Advocate*, 30 July 1909; *Advocate*, 1 October 1909. Schindler came to accept Zionism as “a legitimate solution to the Jewish problem for those in whom ‘race propensities’ were ‘a strong and vital force’” (Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 250). See also *Advocate*, 2 October 1914; *Advocate*, 20 November 1914. Although not a Zionist, Fleischer was interested in the movement as “an attempt to restore Jews to a nationality” and “one of the solutions of the Jewish problem,” urging non-Zionists to give “it more serious thought.” “Will Jews Return to Palestine?” *Globe*, 28 March 1900, 2. “This Grim Jest,” *Globe*, 23 January 1905, 2. “Unites Jewish Ideals,” *Globe*, 1 December 1902, 14; “Fleischer on Zionism,” *Advocate*, 11 December 1908.

³⁴² “Interesting Zionist Discussion,” *Advocate*, 19 January 1912, 4; “Temple Israel,” *Advocate*, 9 November 1916.

intact, as long as we are a nation scattered among the nations,” he declared. “Zionism is the only national policy which is likely to solve once for all the Jewish question.” In 1907, de Haas addressed the Temple Adath Israel Women’s Society, protesting the idea that “one cannot be a Zionist and a good American and citing the undoubted “patriotism of the Irish-American with his allegiance to a free Ireland, or the German with a fervent patriotism for his motherland.” These groups, he argued, are proclaimed “better Americans for this fact” because “these dual patriotisms are natural.”³⁴³

“Keep Alive the Fires” of Ethnic Nationalist Culture

The growth of Irish nationalism and Zionism in Boston in this period was due, in part, to an international ethnic cultural renaissance. Maintaining, or, in the case of Hebrew, creating, national languages, history, music, and sports was just as important as political freedom in proving a people’s contributions to civilization. In addition, such cultural efforts played an important role in fostering group consciousness among the American-born generations.

The promotion and study of Irish language and culture was a way for Irish Americans to contribute, even peripherally, to the nationalist struggle and demonstrate Ireland’s glorious past, thus raising their own status in the United States. “Journalists reminded the immigrants of the ‘greatness’ of the old country,” historian Úna Ní Bhroiméil notes, encouraging the idea “that the Irish constituted a distinct and superior race complete

³⁴³ *Advocate*, 19 January 1905. “Factors for Zionism,” *Globe*, 11 March 1907, 3. See also *Advocate*, 12 March 1914; *Advocate*, 7 May 1915. “Brandeis Speaks to Sisterhood,” *Advocate*, 4 December 1914.

with admirable traits and worthy characteristics.”³⁴⁴ Just as Irish immigrants believed the preservation of the Irish language and culture was “the most effective national weapon” in the nationalist arsenal, Zionists believed that the revival of Hebrew as a living, spoken language was vital to Zionist efforts to create Jewish colonies in Palestine and foster Jewish pride, in addition to the maintenance of religious traditions.³⁴⁵ The founder of the Hebrew Revival, Ben Jehuda, an immigrant to Palestine in the 1880s, Louis Brandeis notes, recognized what the “leaders of other peoples seeking rebirth and independence have recognized—that it is through the national language, expressing the people’s soul, that the national spirit is aroused, and the national power restored.”³⁴⁶

In addition to its role as a fundraising body, the UILA also played an important cultural function, through its connections with Boston’s Irish language schools.³⁴⁷ Branch meetings consisted of nationalist addresses, readings, and songs. Many organized Irish dancing parties, musical events, sports, and opportunities for studying Irish history and language—traditions that illustrated Irish contributions to civilization.³⁴⁸ In 1901, the Boston Central Branch’s Ladies Auxiliary arranged a St. Patrick’s Day program at Cheverus Hall, which was “tastefully decorated” with red, white, and blue bunting and an Irish flag from “Bantry, Rebel Cork.” Speakers discussed the nationalist cause and “the fact that the Irish

³⁴⁴ Úna Ní Bhroiméil, *Building Irish Identity in America, 1870-1915: The Gaelic Revival* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 29-31. The formation of the Gaelic League in Ireland in 1893, for example, had placed the Gaelic Revival “at the heart of the Irish collective consciousness.”

³⁴⁵ *Pilot*, 11 January 1908. Mark A. Raider, “Pioneers and Pacesetters,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 257.

³⁴⁶ Brandeis, “Rebirth of the Jewish Nation,” in Jacob de Haas, *Louis D. Brandeis: A Biographical Sketch* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1929), 166. “The Jewish Problem, How to Solve It,” address to the Conference of Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis, New York, June 1915, in Louis D. Brandeis, *Brandeis on Zionism: A Collection of Addresses and Statements by Louis D. Brandeis* (Washington, DC: Zionist Organization of America, 1942), 27-8.

³⁴⁷ P.J. O’Daly’s school raised \$1400 for the infant organization in 1900 (“Gaelic School,” *Pilot*, 13 January 1900).

³⁴⁸ See, for example, 15 February 1902; *Pilot*, 1 October 1910, 5 November 1910.

people still possess a language which educated men are proud to speak.” The program also included “patriotic” pieces and songs sung in Irish.³⁴⁹

The Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH) also strove “to help preserve Irish nationality in Ireland, the fountain head of the race” by cultivating Irish principles and traditions in its members. The order “is banded together to keep alive the fires of Irish nationality and to assist and protect the Catholic religion,” state president Matthew Cummings, also a member of Clan-na-Gael, noted in 1906.³⁵⁰ The AOH had seventy-four men’s divisions and thirty-eight ladies auxiliaries in Suffolk County in 1902. By 1904, the year of Cummings’ election, it was the largest Irish organization in Massachusetts, boasting 260 divisions and 26,000 members, while its Ladies Auxiliary had 15,000. Most members were working-class and Irish-born, “driven from their native soil by the oppression of England,” who had come to Massachusetts to “gain liberty and advancement in life,” and efforts were made to recruit American-born professionals.³⁵¹ With Cummings’ influence, the AOH embarked on a campaign to further the mission “to keep alive a racial pride, and to preserve the traditions, ideals, literature, language and music of our race.”³⁵² “All experience has shown that England never granted justice to any people unless the demand was backed by force of some kind,” he noted. “Now is the time to make preparations, so that when England is engaged in a continental war, as she will be in the near future, Ireland will have 100,000 men ready to receive arms from a foreign ally.” This was the policy of Washington

³⁴⁹ “Ladies Auxiliary of Boston Central Branch, INL,” *Pilot*, 9 March 1901.

³⁵⁰ “Executive for 200,000,” *Globe*, 28 October 1906, 17. More practically, it served as a benevolent society for its members, who paid dues in exchange for medical and death benefits.

³⁵¹ Few American-born Irish were interested in the organization, however. *Republic*, 27 August 1904, 1.

³⁵² “Sons of Erin Gather,” *Washington Post*, 8 October 1906, 5. Annie F. McSweeney, “The Catholic as a Progressive Clubwoman,” *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 20; *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 32-3, 36, 38.

and Wolfe Tone, and the “only policy that will make Ireland a prosperous nation, self-ruled and self-sustaining.”³⁵³

The UILA, AOH, and other organizations worked to educate Irish Americans on the need to preserve the Irish language for “the special purpose of vindicating the Irish race against the foul slanders of centuries by English writers.” In 1896, P.J. O’Daly and others had formed the Gaelic League of Boston, with an accompanying school, holding an annual “feis” (festival) as an appeal to Irish-speaking heads of households to speak Irish in the home for the benefit of the children, attracting hundreds to the literary and dancing exercises. The Boston organizations hosted the Gaelic League convention and the national AOH convention in 1900.³⁵⁴ As one student, Thomas J. Hurley, wrote to the *Republic* in 1898, “The Gaelic or Irish language is at last being awakened from its long sleep, and is now engaging the attention of the most learned historians, chronologists, and scholars of the present day.” Thus linking knowledge of the Irish language with national unity and strength, Hurley and other proponents of the Gaelic schools argued that the movement “requires the united effort of the entire race to give the returning tide its due force, until Ireland becomes a nation.”³⁵⁵ In 1908, Father Mahan of Sacred Heart Parish gave a Memorial Day sermon in Irish at Holy Cross Cathedral in 1908, at the request of P.H. Brogan, president of the recently formed Ollam Fodia Society. “The Irish tongue preserves our identity as a race,” he

³⁵³ “Mr. Matthew Cummings,” *Globe*, 29 September 1901, 28; “Hits at Both,” *Globe*, 30 September 1904, 3; *Pilot*, 13 July 1901, 3 August 1906, *Post*, 26 February 1906, 5; *Pilot*, 24 November 1906.

³⁵⁴ “Irish Language Movement,” *Pilot*, 9 March 1901, 28 March 1903. “AOH Convention,” *Pilot*, 5, 12, 19 May 1900.

³⁵⁵ “Irish Language Movement,” *Republic*, 12 March 1898.

declared. “It is alone the living monument of the intellectual power and activity of the ancient Irish race.”³⁵⁶

Irish language study was only one aspect of the Irish cultural nationalist mission to instill “race pride.” In 1904, Cummings proudly noted the AOH’s efforts in “insisting that its members must be practical Catholics; its grand work in placing Irish history in the Catholic schools, its success in driving from the stage those who would caricature our race.” These achievements fostered group consciousness and offered a response to those who argued for Anglo-Saxon superiority. The order also maintained the importance of Irish dances, socials, and festivals to celebrate Irish culture. In 1900, for example, the AOH sponsored a “Feis Ceoil Agus Shanachus” (“Festival of Irish Minstrelsy, Song and Story”), featuring Gaelic folk songs, “gems of Irish opera,” Irish harp and bagpipe music, and addresses in Gaelic and English. It also held athletic field days featuring “favorite Irish pastimes in America,” including hurling and Gaelic football, as well as cycling, track and field, and baseball. The seventh annual July 4th “monster field day” of AOH Division 72 in 1916, was an “all important event for the lovers of Gaelic sports” in Greater Boston, promising to draw nearly 20,000 people. Football and hurling teams featured such names as the “Napper Tandys,” “Wolfe Tones,” “Emmets,” “Shamrocks,” and “Redmonds,” and “Young Irelands.” Mayor James Michael Curley, an active AOH member, started the road race.³⁵⁷

Immigrants also organized societies to highlight the history, traditions, and industries of their native counties. The Knights of St. Brendan and the Corkmen’s Social and Benevolent Association were among the first to be established in 1905, and the Dublin

³⁵⁶ *Pilot*, 30 May 1908; “Preached in Gaelic,” *Boston Daily Globe*, 31 May 1908, 25.

³⁵⁷ *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 16. *Pilot*, 20 January 1900; *Pilot*, 6 August 1910. *Pilot*, 1 July 1916. *Globe*, 30 May 1905, 5.

Association was founded in 1907 to publicize such Irish industries as the production of poplin and other textiles. By 1911, Boston had groups representing each of Ireland's twenty-six counties, federated through the Council of Irish County Clubs.³⁵⁸ Like the AOH, the societies primarily served a social and cultural function, sponsoring balls, feiseanna, field days, and other events to promote Irish cultural traditions, but, as "an Irish Association could no more exist without 'Nationalism' than the human body without a soul," many also had a nationalist component as well.³⁵⁹ Most of the groups were supporters of Home Rule; in November 1911, for example, the first annual ball of the County Tyrone Club became a celebration of the success of the Irish Home Rule bill, to be presented to Parliament in early 1912. At the ball, attendees received a telegram from a Tyrone MP, who wrote, "Tell the exiles from Tyrone that Ireland will most probably secure her liberty in 1913, but most certainly not later than 1914. The House of Lords can block the way no longer." Other clubs were more inclined to favor revolutionary politics.³⁶⁰

While the Irish cultural revival primarily had nationalist roots, Jewish cultural and educational efforts were more often aspects of Jewish particularism, rather than nationalist impulses, per se. Perhaps the most influential cultural organization for young, upwardly mobile Jews was the Harvard Menorah Society. Founded in 1906 by Henry Hurwitz and other students, the organization sought to create an intercollegiate movement to cultivate pride in their Jewish heritage among those who otherwise might have been tempted to downplay their backgrounds. Harvard President Charles Eliot was a strong supporter of the

³⁵⁸ *Globe*, 30 May 1905, 5; *Pilot*, 3 March 1906; *Pilot*, 25 August 1906; *Pilot*, 27 October 1906; *Pilot*, 5 January 1907; *Pilot*, 19 January 1907; *Pilot*, 18 March 1911.

³⁵⁹ *Pilot*, 26 January 1907.

³⁶⁰ "Parliament Secured," *Pilot*, 4 November 1911.

society and addressed its first meeting in 1907.³⁶¹ At the third annual banquet in 1909, Hurwitz and Horace Kallen, then a sociology graduate student, promoted the idea that the more loyal Jews members were, the better Americans they would become. Kallen, in particular, saw an important connection between ethnic culture and Americanism—a belief he arrived at only after much internal conflict between his American and Jewish allegiances. As he would later articulate in his groundbreaking theory of “cultural pluralism,” he argued that immigrants did not have to choose “between rival absolutes, but instead, he “legitimized the intersection of comparatively independent loyalties.”³⁶²

A variety of communal efforts were also established in this period to provide opportunities for Jewish religious education, particularly for new immigrants. As Eichler declared, Eastern European Jews “brought a strong force for conservatism, a reverent regard for the torah as the word of God, and above all, love for the Hebrew language and literature which is essential to the preservation of our religion.” All of these qualities provided “a vital force of a religious consciousness that will give a new direction to Judaism in this country.”³⁶³ The Hebrew language served an important religious function for observant Orthodox immigrants, who saved their pennies to send their sons to the “cheder” (Talmudic school), despite the emphasis on public education and assimilation that caused some to neglect such learning. The Boston Zionist Council, synagogues, and charitable organizations sought to alleviate the problem, setting up full-time Hebrew schools in the immigrant

³⁶¹ Gal, “In Search of a New Zion,” 23.

³⁶² John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, revised ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 206, 208.

³⁶³ “Lectures on the American Jew,” *Advocate*, 9 November 1906.

neighborhoods. In 1908, one new synagogue, the Yavne Congregation in the West End, incorporated Zionism as part of its mission.³⁶⁴

The idea of a “living” Hebrew language was an important “manifestation of the possibility of the revival of things Jewish” in this period. At one rally held in May 1909, Kallen, speaking in Yiddish, discussed the necessity of providing better Hebrew schools and more modern methods of instruction. That same year, a coalition led by Rabbi Eichler, the Council of Jewish Women, and the Federated Jewish Charities established the Central Jewish Committee to organize religious and educational work among the city’s immigrant Jews.³⁶⁵ Even Rabbi Harry Levi lent his support to the effort. “The solution of the Jewish problem lies not in colonization or nationalization or assimilation, but in consecration based on education,” he argued in 1912. “Keep religion out of the public school but construct enough religious schools” to house “those who, belonging to us by birth, are not yet ours by religious worth.”³⁶⁶ In 1915, the West End YMHA opened a Sunday school in its new quarters on Mt. Vernon Street, with five hundred in attendance on opening day. The governing principles of the organization were “Judaism, Americanism and humanitarianism.” The Zionist Council and Zion Literary Society worked to educate young immigrant Jews, organizing lectures on Jewish history and culture and mass meetings for neighborhood Zionist societies.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁴ David Kaufman, *Shul With a Pool: The “Synagogue-Center” in American Jewish History* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 1999), 197.

³⁶⁵ For quotes, see “Teaching Hebrew,” *Advocate*, 30 April 1909; “Living Hebrew,” *Advocate*, 28 May 1909. “Successful Rally Held by Zionists,” *Advocate*, 7 May 1909. *Advocate*, 14 May 1909.

³⁶⁶ “Rabbis Plead for United Efforts on Part of the Boston Community,” *Advocate*, 26 January 1912, 1, 8.

³⁶⁷ “Enrolls 300 Children,” *Globe*, 19 April 1915, 9; “West End YMHA in New Home,” *Globe*, 26 April 1915, 9. In 1915, Coleman Silbert, the director of religious school department for the YMHAs of New England, published guidelines for organizing Jewish-themed clubs and activities, recommending, for example, that a club “choose a name which shows that it is Jewish.” So, in addition to clubs named after George Washington, William McKinley, and Betsy Ross, clubs were named after Theodore Herzl, the Maccabees, and Naomi.

Organizations dedicated to Hebrew language study were also established, including the Jewish People's Institute's Evrio Hebrew School in 1915 and the Hebrew Educational Alliance opened in Roxbury. Such activities "elevate[d] our race in this country," *Y.M.H.A. News* editor Sumner Shore noted in 1916. "Men who formerly denied their identity, today proclaim loudly and proudly that they are Jews. Even our Gentile neighbors are gaining more respect for us." Jews were "now raising our heads as a free people ought to."³⁶⁸

Popular Representations of Ethnic Nationalist Culture

Civic, religious, and ethnic holidays provided opportunities for visible displays of cultural attachments and national pride on the popular level. They also provided opportunities for nationalist leaders to disseminate propaganda and engage in fundraising for the cause. Popular culture and consumerism increasingly played an important role in ethnic holiday observance, not just for immigrants, who hoped to meld ethnic culture with American practices, but also for American-born generations who sought a connection with an "authentic" ethnic experience. As the generations clashed, the middle class attempted to ensure that "proper" representations of ethnic culture were utilized to protect community respect and status.

St. Patrick's Day was America's most popular ethnic holiday, offering the newly ascendant Irish a chance to display cultural identity, solidarity, and pride. The Irish Charitable Society, an elite organization of Protestant Irish, had held Boston's first

Silbert also noted that "Hebrew is our holy language, the language of our sacred writings, and should be dear to us." "Clubs for Jewish Work in Y.M.H.A.s and Y.W.H.A.'s," by Coleman Silbert, director Religious School Department, Associated Young Men's Hebrew Associations of New England (New York, 1915); Boston Y.M.H.A.-Hecht House Records; I-74; Box 21; American Jewish Historical Society; Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY.

³⁶⁸ Sumner S. Shore, "Zionism and Y.M.H.A.," *Advocate*, 6 July 1916.

celebration in 1724, and by the late 1800s, the society's annual banquet attracted elected leaders and prominent citizens. Working-class immigrants continued to hold street celebrations. In 1841, for example, more than 2,000 Irish marched loudly through the North End after attending mass. By the 1890s, the AOH organized the parades, complete with bands, marchers, and floats. With the attainment of municipal control, Irish politicians invested the holiday with civic authority; Hugh O'Brien closed the Boston Public Library in the 1880s to allow workers to attend celebrations. In 1901, Patrick Collins gave city employees a paid day off to jointly celebrate St. Patrick's/Evacuation Day, organizing commemorations in conjunction with the AOH and other groups to bring the dual celebration together in an official manner. The highlight was a parade of bands and marchers that wended its way from South Boston into the Back Bay, resulting in, as one reporter observed, "an out-pouring of genuine rejoicing, a boiling over, in a word, of jovial patriotism and effervescent vitality." Post-parade celebrations included an official city dinner, the annual Charitable Irish Society banquet, and countless other public and private events throughout Boston. The dual parade became an annual tradition, but the Suffolk County AOH reinstated the strictly Irish parade in 1911.³⁶⁹

Celebrations highlighted immigrants' joint connections to Ireland and America, often concluding with a toast to "the land we left and the land we live in."³⁷⁰ Common themes included those of exile and homesickness for Ireland, hopes for her eventual freedom, expressions of loyalty to their adopted country, praise for those Irish who had fought in the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, and prayers for the Catholic Church. As Victor

³⁶⁹ Peter F. Stevens, "Southie's Big Parade Didn't Come Easily," *Dorchester Reporter*, March 17, 2005. "AOH of Suffolk County Call for St. Patrick's Parade Again," *Pilot*, 3 December 1910.

³⁷⁰ Williams, *Was Only an Irishman's Dream*, 112.

Greene notes, St. Patrick's Day was important to Irish "adopted citizens" throughout the United States "partly because it reminded them of the compatibility and basic similarity of being both Irish and American."³⁷¹ As the Irish moved up the economic ladder, they celebrated St. Patrick's Day in other ways as well. Most ethnic organizations held an annual "Irish Night," including dancing, temperance banquets, whist parties, parish socials, and music concerts. In 1898, for example, the Gaelic school entertainment was a fundraiser that featured two halls for Irish and American dancing and a musical recital of the singing in Irish of "Patrick's Day," "O'Donnell Abu," the prayer of St. Patrick, and an original poem, "Flags of All Nations." Boston's neighborhood dance halls also held celebrations. St. Alphonsus Hall in Roxbury held an annual two-day event "Irish Celebration," which included "songs, stories, and scenes of the Old Country, with bagpipes, fiddlers and jig, reel and hornpipe dancers" with a special presentation by local performers. AOH Division 25's St. Patrick's celebration at Commercial Hall in 1917 featured a lecture on the life of St. Patrick, as well as vocal and instrumental numbers by the division's auxiliary group and a celebrated local choral group, the St. James Choir. The evening ended with a communal singing of "A Nation Once Again" and "The Star-Spangled Banner."³⁷²

St. Patrick's Day also became a time to police representations of the Irish national character. Anxious to demonstrate that respectable Irish Americans did not engage in raucous behavior on this national and religious feast day, nationalist organizations attempted to control public and private celebrations in the city. In 1903, for example, the Gaelic League vowed to abstain from drinking—a stereotype that had become so much a part of popular

³⁷¹ Victor R. Greene, *American Immigrant Leaders, 1800-1910: Marginality and Identity* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987), 20-21.

³⁷² *Republic*, 18 March 1898. *Pilot*, 9 March 1912. *Pilot*, 24 March 1917.

culture.³⁷³ The commercialization of the holiday, with the selling of greeting cards with stage Irish representations, also drew criticism from middle-class Irish organizations. A *Pilot* editorial in March 1911, for example, complained of the “vile postal cards and coarse caricatures,” urging “every man and woman of Irish blood, and every Celtic society” to take “vigorous action when any such affront is offered.”³⁷⁴ In 1914, the national AOH president presented “a practical plan” on “How to Celebrate St. Patrick’s Day,” including attendance at mass. Cardinal O’Connell urged Irish Catholics to live up to the ideals of St. Patrick, emphasizing the day’s “ecclesiastical” and “national” importance.³⁷⁵ At the Charitable Irish Society’s 1915 banquet, members pledged “anew its allegiance” to America “on a day when the allegiance and the loyalty of men of the Irish race are not doubted.” “Once and for all let it be known that we are within our rights in celebrating this day in Boston,” James O’Sullivan of Lowell stated emphatically, “for it was here that the British shook the dust of this country from their feet forever.” Others inveighed against nativists “whose sole idea of true Americanism is birth on this soil.”³⁷⁶

The significance of Chanukah, Sukkoth (the harvest celebration), and Passover as Jewish festivals of consumption was also demonstrated in this period. Historian Andrew Heinze notes that the observance of these minor festivals expanded in importance due to the “new awareness of mass-marketed plenty in America” in direct competition or in concurrence with Christian holidays.³⁷⁷ Chanukah, for example, attained new significance due to its proximity to Christmas. Many Jews considered Christmas not so much a Christian,

³⁷³ “Gaelic League and St. Pat’s Day. No drinking to excess for them,” *Pilot*, 14 March 1903.

³⁷⁴ Meagher, *Columbia Guide*, 302. *Pilot*, 18 March 1911.

³⁷⁵ “How to Celebrate St. Patrick’s Day,” *Pilot*, 7 March 1914. “Mass at Cathedral,” *Pilot*, 14 March 1914.

³⁷⁶ “Pledge Loyalty to the Country: St. Patrick’s Day Speakers Put America Above All Else,” *Globe*, 18 March 1915, 1.

³⁷⁷ Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 71.

as an American, holiday, and participated in traditions like tree-trimming and gift-giving as part of their acculturation, a fact to which the many Christmas-themed ads in the *Advocate* attests. Reform and Conservative rabbis advocated holding festivals for children, complete with small trinkets as presents, as a countermeasure. Chanukah also became a way to link American and Jewish ideals. Jews considered the “joyous” victory of the Maccabees over the Greeks an ancient example of Jewish democracy, similar to the American Revolution.³⁷⁸ Chanukah was “a struggle of the Jews today as well as of those of two thousand odd years ago,” Louis Brandeis observed in 1915. “It is a struggle of America as well as Palestine.”³⁷⁹

Other festivals and holy days emphasized Jewish cultural and national identity. Purim, for example, became an opportunity to demonstrate communal solidarity. The Purim balls of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which allowed Jews to display both their wealth and benevolence, gave way in the 1910s to community-wide children’s celebrations. Organized by synagogues, the YMHA, Hebrew schools, and other organizations, and led by Rabbi Rubenovitz, Albert Hurwitz, and Jacob Morse, the 1916 event involved 3000 children in a program at a Boston theatre. The purpose of the celebration, which included a religious service, historical tableaux, Jewish folk dances, and Purim melodies, was to “revive the old Purim spirit, to afford the Jewish public of Boston an exhibition of the educational work carried on in the Religious Schools of this city, and to give a demonstration of communal solidarity and union.”³⁸⁰ These celebrations also became opportunities to unite the community across class and cultural lines to connect with a Jewish identity, rather than German or Eastern European. The 1916 Chanukah celebration at

³⁷⁸ “Feast of Lights,” *Advocate*, 18 December 1908, 8.

³⁷⁹ Louis D. Brandeis, “A Chanukah Message: A Jewish Red Letter Day,” *Advocate*, 2 December 1915.

³⁸⁰ “Combined Boston Purim Celebration,” *Advocate*, 27 January 1916.

Temple Israel's North End branch school featured a playlet and the singing of "quaint Jewish folk songs," which, teachers argued, "seemed to awaken some latent characteristics even in the children."³⁸¹

Just as St. Patrick's Day became a day to celebrate Irish and American loyalties, so too did Chanukah, Purim, and other Jewish holidays become events to emphasize Jewish religious values and cultural ideals. The high holy days and Passover became occasions to remind Jews of all backgrounds that they "possessed a culture different from that of their host society." Being able to celebrate the High Holy Days was an annual struggle, and the ethnic press reported faithfully on businesses and schools that required Jews to attend on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. Passover was also a reminder of Jews' status as exiles. At the end of the annual seder, during the ritual remembrance of the flight from Egypt, families would solemnly declare, "L'shanah haba'ah b'Yerushalayim ("Next year in Jerusalem"). Passover in Eastern Europe, as historian Andrew Heinze observes, had been marred by the ever-present threat of anti-Semitic violence, so "the American Passover became an important time of reflecting on the new conditions of Jewish life" and, like Thanksgiving, give thanks for the "deliverance" of the Jewish people. The United States was a new promised land for many immigrants, and this fact was symbolized at the Passover seder by changing the traditional declaration to "Next year, in America!"³⁸²

As a family holiday, Passover also provided a chance to demonstrate communal unity across class, cultural, and generational lines and for immigrant parents to impart Jewish

³⁸¹ *Temple Israel Bulletin*, January 1917.

³⁸² Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975), 6. Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 81. As Heinze notes, such violence was prompted by "fear of the blood libel, the hideous accusation that Jews would kill a Christian child in order to get blood for the preparation of the Passover matzoh, filled the air of early spring with horrible visions of mass slaughter at the hands of a superstitious peasantry.

history, melodies, and traditions to their American-born children. In 1908, for example, the Moeth Chitim Association, or Passover Aid Committee, invited synagogues, charities, and other Jewish organizations to consolidate their efforts to help the poor celebrate a traditional Passover. Member groups donated food and funds for family gatherings and also conducted services for the homeless, prisoners, and inmates of public institutions.³⁸³ In 1912, Temple Israel initiated a Congregational Seder to reintroduce Reform Jews to the “interesting and impressive” ceremonies of Passover. The temple’s Sisterhood distributed copies of the “haggadah” to the religious school children to encourage families to hold their own seders at home.³⁸⁴ Heinze also acknowledges the role of the community in ensuring the continuance of certain modes of behavior, such as eating matzahs; “by exerting pressure on each other at Passover,” he argues, “newcomers kept the anchors of cultural identity.”³⁸⁵

In 1914, the FAZ organized the first Zion Flag Day to be held on Purim. Designed as a fundraising event for the Zionist national fund, participants distributed flags, badges, sashes, and signs to represent the “rebirth of the Jewish nation” and to garner support and funds to purchase land in Palestine. During World War I, Zion Flag Day became an important propaganda tool and source of income for the movement due to the inability of Europeans to contribute to the support of Palestinian settlements.³⁸⁶ In 1915, the event was moved to Chanukah and held over the eight days to “make the work easier and the success greater.” As Rabbi Stephen S. Wise noted at a meeting at Temple Ohabei Shalom, the

³⁸³ Barbara Miller Solomon, *Pioneers in Service: The History of the Associated Jewish Philanthropies of Boston* (Boston, 1956), 85-6.

³⁸⁴ Thinking its work done, the temple discontinued the seder in 1921, but members mourned the loss of the popular event and it was reinstated in 1929. Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2009), 59.

³⁸⁵ Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 82.

³⁸⁶ I.H. Rubin, Secretary, Jewish National Fund Bureau to Stone, 22 November 1916; Stone Papers; Box 1; Folder 4.

December holiday had great meaning regarding the Zion flag. “Every comrade who participated” would appreciate this fact, given the “notable increase of Zionist sympathy” in Boston.³⁸⁷ Beginning in 1915, women also organized Zion Flower Days on American holidays like Washington’s Birthday and the Fourth of July, actively promoting the duality of American and Jewish ideals of freedom in their attempts to aid settlers in Palestine.³⁸⁸

Irish nationalism and Zionism also entered American popular musical culture. The Irish nationalist movement inspired several popular hits by composers like Victor Herbert, a staunch Irish nationalist, as well as the revival of such “classics” as “Wearing of the Green,” popularized in the 1860s in *Arrah na Pogue*. The Irish, always considered pugnacious, became a race of fighters in such songs as “Ireland’s Flag of Green” (1907), which took note of the “world-wide reputation” of the Irish for “brave and bold” warriors. “Some bright day,” it hoped, there would be a battle for “home rule for ever” and “independence on their flag of green.”³⁸⁹ Such songs inspired Irish Americans to embrace a positive self-perception of such qualities, particularly in Boston. In 1912, for example, the *Pilot* commented on a *New York Herald* article criticizing the Irish reputation for fighting. “Yes, indeed,” the editorial stated proudly. “One only has to look at the honor roll of the men who give their lives for this country to know that Ireland sent us some real fighters.”³⁹⁰

Jewish composers also composed tunes with Zionist overtones. Most were written for a popular audience, such as Richard Howard’s “I’m Building a Palace in Palestine”

³⁸⁷ “Zion Flag Day,” *Advocate*, 23 January 1919. “Rabbi Wise Wins Boston,” *Advocate*, 29 October 1915. I.H. Rubin, Secretary, Jewish National Fund Bureau for America, 22 November 1916; Elihu David Stone Papers; P-555; Box 1; Folder 4; American Jewish Historical Society; Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY.

³⁸⁸ “Flower Day, Washington’s Birthday,” *Advocate*, 19 February 1915; *Advocate*, 4 July 1918.

³⁸⁹ For Home Rule in popular songs and “Ireland’s Flag of Green,” written by Mack Keller and Frank Orth (New York, 1907), see Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream*, 179-180, 186.

³⁹⁰ *Pilot*, 1 June 1912.

(1916), published by Daly Music in Boston, which placed American pastoral themes of rose gardens and love for a girl named “Alice” in an exotic palace setting in Palestine.³⁹¹ Samuel H. Borofsky and Isaac Goldberg, two local Zionists, wrote a song specifically for the 1915 Zionist convention in Boston entitled “Come Home to Palestine,” utilizing common symbolic themes of memory, exile, and homecoming:

Come home to Palestine, Come home to me
Come home to Palestine, O'er land and sea.
Oh, Come home to skies of blue, Come home if your heart is true,
Homeward come to Palestine, I'm waiting for you.

Not far from ancient Zion's mount, In the olive treasure trove,
Not far from Rishon LeZion With its golden orange groves
Is the garden of Tel-aviv Where the exile builds his shrine,
I hear a voice that's calling Come home to Palestine.³⁹²

For many, the popularity of such tunes emphasized the importance of promoting “proper” representations of ethnic culture, especially given the continued proliferation of “stage Irish” and “stage Jewish” caricatures on the vaudeville stage and in the emerging movie industry. In both communities, such images in popular culture contributed to sharpening divisions along class lines, particularly as working-class immigrants “initially located on a social periphery, gradually reshaped the mainstream and became a part of it.”³⁹³ In 1903, middle-class Irish American had looked with horror at Synge’s *Playboy of the Western World*, which, they felt, represented the worst of the stage Irishman character, and began to speak out against it. As historian Marion R. Casey points out, “this kind of sensitivity

³⁹¹ “I’m Building a Palace in Palestine,” words and music by Richard Howard (Boston: Daly Music Publisher, 1916) in Kennedy, “When Palestine Played the Palace,” 385-6.

³⁹² “Come Home to Palestine,” Samuel F. Borofsky, lyrics; Isaac Goldberg, music (Boston, Zionist Bureau for New England, 1915), in Charles A. Kennedy, “When Palestine Played the Palace: Vaudeville Interprets the Balfour Declaration,” *The United States & the Middle East: Cultural Encounters*, YCIAS Vol. V, 2002, 384-385.

³⁹³ William H. A. Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream*, xi-xii; Williams, “From Lost Land to Emerald Isle: Ireland and the Irish in American Sheet Music, 1800-1920,” *Eire-Ireland* 26 (Spring 1991): 19-45; Lawrence J. McCaffrey, *Textures of Irish America* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1992).

heralded an era in which the Irish would no longer be passive victims of stereotyping.”³⁹⁴ Similarly, while the Yiddish theatre provided immigrants with an introduction to American culture, many assimilated Jews believed it “contained the atmosphere of the ghetto” and promoted the stereotype of the ‘stage Jew.’” De Haas led a campaign against the “stage Jew” in Boston theaters that, he noted in indignation, were often owned or managed by Jews. At one show in Revere Beach, he noted indignantly, the “cheering was led by Jews.”³⁹⁵

The desire to ensure that ethnic culture remained respectable drove middle-class leaders to closely monitor representations of their group in the press and in popular culture. Irish Bostonians looked with pride on Irish artists, writers, and musicians who were received with honor by Yankee institutions. In 1904, for example, the poet William Butler Yeats lectured on the Gaelic Revival at Harvard University and Wellesley College, where he “was surprised to find the interest that was taken in his poems and dramas by college students and lovers of literature,” particularly in his most famous work at the time, *Cathleen Ni Hoolihan*.³⁹⁶ That same year, Maud MacCarthy, a young Irish violinist, played at Boston’s Jordan Hall for “the best people” to rave reviews. In pointed contrast to the stage Irish character found on the vaudeville stage, the *Republic* enthused, “Under Miss MacCarthy’s bow, the soul of a race is revealed.” Such occasions elevated the status of Irish folk songs not only among

³⁹⁴ Marion R. Casey, “Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture, 1890-1960” (Ph.D. diss.: New York University, 1998), 88-89.

³⁹⁵ “National Language?” *Advocate*, 20 December 1907; “A Visit to the Yiddish Music Hall,” *Advocate*, 22 February 1907. “Revilers of the Jew,” *Advocate*, 19 July 1907, “Cheering Led by Jews,” *Advocate*, 2 August 1907, “Stage Jew,” *Advocate*, 9 August 1907, “Stage Jew, Rowdyism was Rampant,” *Advocate*, 23 August 1907.

³⁹⁶ “The Sods of Ireland are Singing,” *Republic*, 19 November 1904, 9.

musicians, who, the article observed, enjoy them for “their human expressiveness and plentitude of melodious invention,” but also among mainstream audiences.³⁹⁷

Jewish organizations also engaged in efforts to make Jewish culture respectable. Temple Israel, for example, fostered Jewish culture among its members through exhibits on Jewish ceremonials. The music committee, organist and choirmaster Henry L. Gideon, and the choirs also gave concerts at Symphony Hall and offered improved musical selections for religious services. Yet while some wanted to be entertained with “modern” music, others hoped to be “impressed” with “some old Jewish music,” arguing, “our children should hear [Ein kelohenu] every Sabbath so they may know it as well as they know *America*.”³⁹⁸

Combating “Hyphenated Americanism”

Since the 1890s, Americanization campaigns had focused on attempts to teach immigrants to become assimilated citizens. While understanding the natural affection and sympathy that immigrants had for the land of their birth and ancestry, such leaders as Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt believed that to become loyal Americans, immigrants needed to leave old world ties behind. Wilson noted in 1914 that “the infallible test of a genuine American” was that “when he votes or when he acts or when he fights, his heart and his thought are nowhere but in the center of the emotions and the purposes and the policies of the United States.” Otherwise, they would remain “hyphenated Americans,” Roosevelt declared in 1915, a “tangle of squabbling nationalities,” each “at heart feeling

³⁹⁷ “McCormack to Give Concert in Symphony Hall,” *Pilot*, 25 January 1911; “Miss MacCarthy’s Triumph,” *Republic*, 23 January 1904, 11; *Republic*, 6 February 1904, 12. See also “The Parish as a Social Center,” *Republic*, 5 November 1904, 4.

³⁹⁸ Temple Israel Board Minutes, 14 January 1912, 13 Oct 1912, 11 January 1914, in TI Archives.

more sympathy with Europeans of that nationality than with the other citizens of the American Republic.³⁹⁹

Ethnic nationalists disagreed with this assessment, arguing that adherence to the struggle to free an ancestral homeland encouraged immigrants to become better Americans. Many Yankee leaders supported this belief, noting that ethnic activities actually aided Americanization. Robert A. Woods and Albert Kennedy, for example, believed that “characteristic national institutions, some holding to the past, are sane and healthy.” In communities where immigrants were not included in local life, they argued, “the growth of foreign institutional loyalties ought to be helped and encouraged rather than hindered.” The Irish, they pointed out, were a particularly strong example of the success of ethnic attachments in helping immigrants to acculturate; their “strong religious loyalties and their efficient church organization will be found in the long run to have accomplished a powerful work in the difficult problem of Americanization.” They urged Jews to do the same.⁴⁰⁰ Governor Curtis Guild agreed. As he declared at a 1906 AOH banquet in honor of regional president Matthew Cummings, “No man is worth his salt who is not proud of his race, his religion, and the land of his birth. It is well to be fond of the old land, as it is right to be loyal to the new. We are all of us immigrants, or the children of immigrants.”⁴⁰¹

In an attempt to demonstrate the compatibility of Irish nationalism and Zionism with American loyalties, ethnic Americans transformed the nationalist struggle into an emulation of American bravery and a demonstration of shared republican identity. As

³⁹⁹ Wilson, quoted in *Ann Arbor Daily Times-News*, 19 January 1912, in Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 95. Roosevelt, “Hyphenated Americanism,” Address to the Knights of Columbus, Carnegie Hall, New York City, 12 October 1915, in *ibid.*, 106.

⁴⁰⁰ Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence: Observations of the Lower Middle and Upper Working Class Communities of Boston, 1905-1914*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962), 144-5.

⁴⁰¹ Curtis Guild, quoted in “The Americanism of Irish Blood,” *Pilot*, 24 November 1906.

historian Michael Doorley argues, many Irish-American nationalists believed that “the Irish question could only be solved by the incorporation of American democratic principles into the political structure of Ireland.” Centuries of battling British tyranny had made Irish immigrants perfect American citizens, already familiar with the fight for freedom that defined the United States.⁴⁰² As the *Pilot* noted in the eulogy for Thomas J. Gargan, a longtime Boston politician, lawyer, and Irish nationalist, “his love for the land of his fathers, far from diminishing his devotion to American institutions, only served to make it burn more brightly in his breast the sacred fire of patriotism and to render him a keen and zealous advocate of the American system of government.”⁴⁰³ Similarly, Matthew Cummings proclaimed that AOH members “were always ready to defend this, our country, and no more loyal American citizens live than the members of this great organization.”⁴⁰⁴

Irish nationalists and politicians used this tactic in protesting British influence in America, particularly concerning the issue of “entangling alliances.” As historian Carl Wittke notes, the Irish had “become intensely American,” but they had melded this loyalty with that of Ireland, insisting “they hated England” not only for Ireland’s sake, but also “for the good of the United States.”⁴⁰⁵ In 1905, for example, Acting Mayor Daniel A. Whelton presided over a mass meeting at Faneuil Hall to protest a treaty with Great Britain, then an issue in the Senate, due to Britain’s refusal to discuss Irish self-determination.⁴⁰⁶ AOH President Cummings also opposed the alliance as counter to Washington’s intentions, and led the AOH in 1906 in joining with the National German-American Alliance to protect the

⁴⁰² Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 26.

⁴⁰³ *Pilot*, 8 August 1908.

⁴⁰⁴ Cummings, “Hibernianism in Massachusetts,” *Republic*, 10 December 1904, 16.

⁴⁰⁵ Carl Wittke, *The Irish in America* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1956), 161.

⁴⁰⁶ “Boston Sentiment Opposes Any Treaty or Alliance With England,” 30 January 1905, in Martin Lomasney Scrapbook, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts.

interests of both groups, particularly regarding the issue of alliances with Britain and immigration restriction.⁴⁰⁷ They repeated this argument when an Arbitration Treaty came up before the Senate in 1911. Again, separatist Irish-American nationalists joined forces with German American organizations that opposed the measure in a letter-writing campaign to Congress. Devoy prided himself that they gave no objections to the treaty that might not have been made by “a lineal descendant of the Pilgrim Fathers.” Congressman James Michael Curley, member of the foreign affairs committee, and Matthew Cummings both protested the treaty at a German American meeting at Faneuil Hall in July.⁴⁰⁸

By the 1910s, American Jews also began to speak out more for Jewish causes, having learned that “instead of having to choose between competing allegiances, they could be both American and Jewish.”⁴⁰⁹ The most vocal proponent of this idea was Louis D. Brandeis. A secular Jew for most of his life, Brandeis underwent a gradual conversion to Zionism between 1909 and 1913. In April 1913, he formally declared his “unequivocal declaration of his personal participation in the Zionist party” and joined the Zionist Association of Boston.⁴¹⁰ Over the next year, he became more involved in the national movement; he spoke at public rallies and eventually became head of the Provisional Executive Committee for

⁴⁰⁷ *Pilot*, 24 November 1906; “All Honor Cummings,” *Globe*, 15 November 1906, 1. “A.O.H. Allied with Germans,” *Globe*, 25 January 1907, 16. Congressman O’Connell later noted that a British alliance would fail due to the “undying and unrelenting opposition of millions of the Irish-American citizens who combine in their Americanism the indignation of the exile and warning of Washington.” *Pilot*, 7 March 1908.

⁴⁰⁸ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 28-30. “As Menace to This Country,” *Globe*, 31 July 1911, 1.

⁴⁰⁹ Sarna, “Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture,” 64.

⁴¹⁰ Progressive lawyer Louis D. Brandeis, known as the “people’s lawyer” for his efforts on behalf of labor. Jacob de Haas first met with Brandeis in 1909, periodically interviewing him on other matters. In a 1912 interview, Brandeis gave a tacit expression of sympathy for the Zionist movement, although he remained firm in his earlier concerns regarding American loyalties. Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 247-248; *Advocate*, 9 December 1910. *Advocate*, 30 November 1906; *Advocate*, 8 March 1907; *Advocate*, 20 September 1907; *Advocate*, 27 December 1907; *Advocate*, 24 December 1909; *Advocate*, 4 November 1910; *Advocate*, June 1911; *Advocate*, 28 May 1915. Allon Gal, “In Search of a New Zion: New Light on Brandeis’ Road to Zionism,” *American Jewish History* vol. 68, no. 1 (September 1978), 22. *Advocate*, 4 April 1913.

General Zionist Affairs (the most important Zionist organization during World War I). Brandeis' interpretation of Zionism was "conspicuously mission-oriented," his biographer Allon Gal writes, extolling the Jewish virtues of morality, brotherhood, and intelligence, as well as their influence on American democratic ideals. As an idealist, Brandeis never expected or wanted American Jews to immigrate to Palestine, but held Zionism as a standard of Judaism to which all should aspire. A born organizer, he helped transform a small, immigrant-driven group into a large, American-based movement, which increased from 15,000 to 200,000 members during the course of his presidency and the war. "Members! Money! Discipline!" was Brandeis' rallying cry.⁴¹¹

As historian Jonathan Sarna notes, Brandeis was the "the preeminent twentieth-century exemplar of American Jewish synthesis," and "proof that a great American did not have to be Christian." Brandeis reinterpreted Zionism to make it more acceptable to acculturated Jews, generating greater support among this group for the movement. "There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and our experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American," he argued. "Loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist."⁴¹² He explained the compatibility of Zionism with American citizenship by distinguishing between political and cultural loyalty: "A true American, can give of his strength, his money, his power, and his personal influence to aid the cause of others and still not remove one spark of his true Americanism." He continued, "The Zionist cause has nothing at all to do with Americanism any more than the Irish Nationalist movement has

⁴¹¹ Gal, "The Mission Motif in American Zionism," 363-364.

⁴¹² Brandeis, "The Jewish Problem, How to Solve It," quoted in Jacob de Haas, *Louis D. Brandeis: A Biographical Sketch* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1929), 185. Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis*, 262-268.

Irishmen all over the country send thousands of dollars yearly to aid the cause of Ireland and still many of those men are the leaders in their perspective cities and states and would feel keenly any statement that would be made against their being true Americans.” Only through nationhood, he argued, could Jews attain the respect they deserved.⁴¹³

Brandeis worked to improve relations between the “Jews of longer American life and better education” who led the American Jewish Committee, and Eastern European Zionists of the FAZ and smaller *landsmanschaften*, but the AJC resisted. When President Wilson appointed him to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1916, the group launched a campaign to force Brandeis to resign from the Zionist movement, “claiming that his continued leadership of it while a justice would violate propriety.” He resigned his Jewish offices, but remained involved until 1921.⁴¹⁴

Cries of hyphenated Americanism grew louder after the outbreak of World War I in Europe in June 1914. With America’s declared neutrality, it became more difficult for Irish nationalists and Zionists to justify continued association with international causes. Even so, Irish and Jews in Boston, as elsewhere, maintained their commitment to the nationalist struggle, cognizant that the war presented greater opportunities for freeing their homeland than ever before.

In Ireland, the situation was worsening even before the war broke out. Conservatives and Ulster Protestants were fiercely opposed to Home Rule. Led by cabinet member Edward Carson, who threatened to block an army-funding bill unless Ulster was excluded from the measure, Unionists formed the Ulster Volunteer Force in early 1913 as a

⁴¹³ “Americanism vs. Zionism,” *Advocate*, 30 August 1907. “Why I am a Zionist,” *Advocate*, 15 March 1907; *Advocate*, “Pioneers of Zion,” 7 February 1908.

⁴¹⁴ Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis*, 268-269.

paramilitary organization dedicated to using force to prevent the imposition of Home Rule. By the end of 1913, Irish nationalists responded in turn with the creation of the Irish National Volunteers, made up of members of the Irish National Brotherhood and the Irish Parliamentary Party, and supported by Irish Americans. Eventually, the membership grew to over 180,000 by mid-1914, posing a threat in leadership to John Redmond, who sought to control the organization, and initiating a split between constitutional and revolutionary nationalists in America as well.⁴¹⁵

The Home Rule bill finally passed the House of Commons in June 1914 and was signed into law in September 1914. In the meantime, however, Great Britain had declared war on Germany and Austria-Hungary, and Home Rule was put on hold for the duration of the conflict. Redmond offered his support for Britain and urged Irishmen to volunteer for British military service. Most Irish in Ireland and America backed Redmond. By early fall, it was becoming evident that most Irish Americans did not want to support a British war. In November, for example, the Boston Gaelic Society announced its opposition to Irish men fighting in the British army during the war, while the UILA even cancelled its planned annual convention in New York, fearful that the major divisions in the organization and Irish America would be revealed.⁴¹⁶

In March 1916, moderates and revolutionary nationalists established the Friends of Irish Freedom at the Irish Race Convention in New York, in opposition to the UILA. The purpose of the meeting was to demonstrate their opposition to the Redmondite forces and

⁴¹⁵ Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 120-123. Ronald Gault Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I" (M.A. Thesis, Clark University, 1962).

⁴¹⁶ Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 123-125.

declare their loyalty to the United States' policy of neutrality. A week later, Curley, the provisional chair of the state FOIF branch, called a meeting at Faneuil Hall to vote on Massachusetts' support for the resolutions made at the New York meeting.⁴¹⁷

In April 1916, Irish nationalists in Dublin took advantage of the British preoccupation with the war to mount a rebellion on Easter Monday. The plan had been in place for some time; Clan-na-Gael had asked the German ambassador to America for guns and ammunition to fight Britain, collaborating with Sir Roger Casement, but they had not been successful. Poor communications led to Casement's capture and before his message to abort the insurrection could go through, the rebels went ahead with their plans. A week of bitter fighting passed before the rebels were crushed. Although the revolt was initially condemned as the work of a "mob" aided by German espionage, the execution of the rebel leaders generated greater support for Irish independence at home and abroad. The Proclamation of the Irish Republic, which declared that Ireland was a sovereign state guaranteeing religious and civil liberty and equal rights and opportunities, clearly revealed the influence of the American Declaration of Independence, and the expectation of aid from Ireland's "exiled children in America." In fact, the FOIF had been created with the Clan-na-Gael's full knowledge that a rebellion was being planned for Easter week, recognizing that the new organization would be able to benefit from American reactions to the rising.⁴¹⁸

In Boston, the rebellion and outrage over the execution of its leaders unified most of Boston's Irish community under the revolutionary banner. Many joined the FOIF, which

⁴¹⁷ *Globe*, 4 March 1916, 8; *Globe*, 12 March 1916, 11; "Friends of Irish Freedom," *Globe*, 16 April 1916, 144. Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 131-132. Boston delegates included Eugene Curran, Francis A. Campbell, Fred McLaughlin, Matthew Cummings, District Attorney Joseph Pelletier, Joseph Lomasney (brother of Martin), and John J. Curley (brother of James).

⁴¹⁸ Mulcrone, 123.

organized Irish Relief Fund rallies to aid relatives of the rebels, and even UILA supporters began to falter in their support of Redmond and Irish participation in the war.⁴¹⁹ Speaking to members of the Boston Gaelic Society, FOIF branch president Matthew Cummings called the uprising “justifiable.” While the volunteers were mourned as “martyrs,” he declared, “what a glorious record, that, instead of dying like dogs on foreign battlefields for the British Empire, they gave up their lives at home fighting for freedom.”⁴²⁰ Even moderate nationalists supported the Irish Relief Fund, formed to aid the rebels’ families. The fund committee elected America’s three cardinals as honorary presidents, and thus the Catholic Church gave tacit approval of this new view of Irish American nationalism. Fundraising was aided by visits from relatives of the executed leaders, including Nora Connolly, daughter of socialist James Connolly. “His dying wish,” she informed a *Globe* reporter at the office of Mayor James Michael Curley, “was that his family should go to America, and there tell the world the true story of the Irish uprising and the reborn spirit of the Irish people.”⁴²¹

Irish-American nationalists demonstrated new solidarity at the biennial AOH convention in Boston that July, bringing together the moderate and radical elements. The message of the convention was absolute loyalty to America, antipathy for Britain’s Irish policies, and support for an Irish republic, whose cause would be heard at a post-war peace conference. Even so, unity was threatened later that summer when it became clear that John Redmond had been persuaded to temporarily exclude the six northeastern counties of Ulster from the Home Rule Bill. Redmond later discovered that Lloyd George had privately

⁴¹⁹ Murray, 134. “Call for Meeting in Faneuil Hall,” *Pilot*, 19 May 1917. Committee: Peter Conroy, James Sullivan, Jeremiah Carroll, William P. Fraber, William Donlan, Michael Roban, and Mrs. Charles Forester. Devoy, casement, and James Connolly branches.

⁴²⁰ “Calls Irish Revolt Justifiable,” *New York Times*, 15 May 1916, 2.

⁴²¹ “Brings to America True Story of Irish Uprising,” *Globe*, 20 August 1916, 1; *Globe*, 8 February 1917, 9.

assured Carson that this exclusion would be made permanent, and he withdrew from negotiations, but the damage was done and his influence was lost with the majority of Irish and Irish Americans.⁴²²

By the end of 1916, with the formation of a new Sinn Féin party, republican nationalists gained the ascendancy. In November, for example, the Boston Clan branches held a rally for 500 in Franklin Hall to raise funds “to arm the Irish patriots ‘to strike another blow for liberty in Ireland.’” As the *Pilot* noted in March, Ireland was “slumbering like a great volcano,” ready to “burst its bonds some day and destroy England.” By April, the United States was in the war, and Irish hopes were transferred to President Wilson and his promise of self-determination for all nations.⁴²³

The outbreak of the war also presented an opportunity for Zionists, who hoped that an Allied victory over the Ottoman Empire would lead to the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. As the situation in Europe worsened, leadership of the world Zionist movement increasingly fell to American Jews, and as FAZ president, Louis Brandeis became the de facto leader of the World Zionist Organization. As one German Jew wrote to the *Advocate*, “involuntarily I turn my eyes toward America...is Brandeis the one, the ‘Chovenaue’ to lead us all...Does he realize his enormous task, his great privilege, his historic opportunity?”⁴²⁴

Even so, American Zionists declared “strict” neutrality at their annual convention in Boston in 1915. They did not seek to “wrest from the Turks the sovereignty of Palestine,” they argued, but asked only for “the same freedom” to fulfill Jewish “national individuality” that European groups demanded. Refuting charges of disloyalty, Zionists insisted that “to be

⁴²² Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish,” 76-79; *Hibernian*, 1 August 1916.

⁴²³ “Give Funds Arm Rebels in Ireland,” *Globe*, 24 November 1916, 2. *Pilot*, 3 March 1917.

⁴²⁴ “German Jews Look to U.S. For Salvation,” *Advocate*, 11 December 1914, 1.

a good American means to aid in any movement whose object is liberty and freedom for an unfortunate people.”⁴²⁵

Much like the AOH convention held in 1916, the 1915 Zionist convention was an example of the “new spirit of civic acceptance.” As Reed Ueda notes, the *Boston Post* called it “a popular gathering, representative not of class but essentially and collectively of American citizenship.”⁴²⁶ The streets were bedecked with American and Zionist flags, while Mayor Curley gave them a key to the city and had the Public Gardens’ central flowerbed arranged in the shape of the Star of David.⁴²⁷ The entire community was involved in organizing “the most wonderful gathering of Jews ever held in the United States,” minimizing, at least temporarily, their differences in the hopes of a “revived Jewish commonwealth.”⁴²⁸

Like Irish-American nationalists, American Zionists found new hope when the United States entered the conflict in April 1917, but it was in November that they began to feel that a Jewish state was a real possibility. After years of negotiations by Baron Walter Rothschild, Chaim Weisman, Nahum Sokolow, and other Zionists in Britain and America, Britain’s Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, issued a “declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations” approved by the British cabinet. The government “viewed with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people,” he wrote, promising that it would “use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement in this

⁴²⁵ “Zionists Declare Position,” *Advocate*, 2 July 1915. Brandeis resigned after his Supreme Court confirmation, but retained influence. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 197, 161-201. *Advocate*, 23 July 1915; *Advocate*, 15 July 1915; *Advocate*, 15 January 1915; “Zionists Remain Neutral,” *New York Times*, 27 March 1915, 4. Gerald Sorin, *A Time for Building: The Third Migration, 1880-1920* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 207-213.

⁴²⁶ Braverman, “Emergence of a United Community,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, 88; Ueda, “Frameworks for Immigrant Inclusion,” in Ueda and Wright, *Faces of Community*, 14.

⁴²⁷ “Floral Tribute to Jews in Public Garden for Zionist Week,” *Advocate*, 18 June 1915.

⁴²⁸ Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews,” 252-253. *Advocate*, 25 June 1915, *Advocate*, 2 July 1915.

object.”⁴²⁹ As Marc A. Raider notes, the Balfour Declaration “infused Boston Zionism with an unprecedented level of optimism and energy.”⁴³⁰ In Boston, Louis Kirstein called the declaration an “inspiring call” to American Jews “to become whole-heartedly active in getting men and money for the movement,” as “works” were needed now, not “words.” Rabbi Eichler, the new leader of the New England Zionist Bureau, believed the declaration was “not only a passive recognition of Israel’s claim, but also a solemn pledge of active help.” A “loyal Jew” now had the “duty” to “give his strength, his influence, his money, in a word, his all,” to the movement.⁴³¹

Conclusion

In the decade and a half before World War I, Irish and Jews justified their continued ethnic loyalties by arguing that ethnicity and nationalism helped them to become better Americans. Fostering religion, language, and culture provided a foundation for group consciousness and respectability, they argued, while participation in nationalist activities, long viewed by nativists as a central reason why immigrants could not become true Americans, demonstrated their love for the American principles of freedom and democracy.

Civic, religious, and ethnic holidays provided opportunities for displaying cultural attachments and national pride on the popular level through parades and festivals. Popular culture and consumerism increasingly played a role in ethnic holiday observance, not just for immigrants, who hoped to meld ethnic culture with American practices, but also for American-born generations who sought a connection with an “authentic” ethnic experience.

⁴²⁹ Foreign Office, November 2nd, 1917.

⁴³⁰ Raider, “Pioneers and Pacesetters: Boston Jews and American Zionism,” 260.

⁴³¹ *Advocate*, 22 November 1917.

Yet the meaning of authenticity was a matter of contention, particularly for middle class leaders, who attempted to ensure that their group was represented with propriety.

The outbreak of World War I was a turning point for both movements. Practically, the conflict presented opportunities, particularly as world leaders became preoccupied with the fighting. The war introduced the concept of self-determination for small nations, allowing nationalist leaders to gain support from the international community. Even so, it also presented challenges. While many leaders expressed support for ethnic cultural and nationalist activities, nativist opponents inveighed against the divided loyalties of groups who claimed a devotion to two flags. As America geared for preparedness, those who would assert their ideals of ethnic patriotism in response to challenges at home and abroad faced unprecedented obstacles. Irish nationalists utilized American principles of democracy and neutrality to protest British control of Ireland, while the difficulties of European Zionists necessitated American Jews to assume control of the movement, refocusing efforts in the United States and leading to greater support from government leaders.

With America's entrance in the war, continued support for ethnic nationalism was controversial, but most Irish and Jews joined the fight with enthusiasm, as an Allied victory promised freedom for their homelands. Revolutionary separatism became the dominant form of Irish nationalism and Zionism achieved new respectability, as the goal of a Jewish homeland became a distinct reality for the first time with the Balfour Declaration. What did not change was the continued adherence to ethnic patriotism and the idea that ethnic culture was compatible with American loyalties and ideals.

Chapter 5: Yankee Doodle Paddy and Uncle Sammy: Ethnic Patriotism during World War I, 1914-1919

Irishmen, remember to-day, it is to God and America that Ireland must look for the vindication of all that her dead have died for. It is because America has not been willing to stand idly by that the children of every small nation of the earth may rejoice that there is...such a blessed land as America. Therefore, while you are Irishmen, true to the traditions of your race, let it be doubly true also that you are fervent, loyal, patriotic Americans.

—William Cardinal O’Connell, “A Manifold Thanksgiving Day,” Address to Boston’s Irish County Clubs, Holy Cross Cathedral, 29 November 1917

This war is being fought for the principle of nationality and the freedom of all nations, including Jews. Every Jew in order to prove himself a hundred per cent American must back this principle. Register in favor of Zionism and avoid being a slacker.

—“To the Jews of Brookline,” *Jewish Advocate*, 7 November 1918

After decades of trying to achieve full acceptance in Boston, Irish and Jewish Americans saw participation in World War I as the ultimate test of ethnic patriotism. Utilizing their well-honed organizational and political skills, Irish and Jewish men and women helped mobilize the city’s war effort; thousands joined the military, where universal conscription served as an equalizer for soldiers of different ethnic backgrounds, while those on the home front participated in relief work, food conservation, and Liberty Loan rallies. Yet, as the above quotes suggest, loyalty to ethnic Americans did not mean conformity to a prescribed notion of citizenship, and they objected to government-sanctioned campaigns of “100 percent Americanism” that “implied a vision of American culture that was Anglo-centric and Protestant.”⁴³² Instead, they insisted that Irish Catholicism and Judaism were central to American patriotism and highlighted their groups’ contributions to American

⁴³² As John Higham explains, “100 percent Americanism” was a term used by individuals who “belligerently demanded universal conformity organized through total national loyalty.” *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 204-212. Damien Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924” (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 241; Nancy Gentile Ford, *Americans All!: Foreign-Born Soldiers in World War I* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2001), 44. See also Hans P. Vought, *The Bully Pulpit and the Melting Pot: American Presidents and the Immigrant, 1897-1993* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004), 132-154; Cecilia Elizabeth O’Leary, *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002): 236; Christopher M. Sterba, *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Americans during the First World War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

institutions. In recognition of the importance of religious freedom and in an attempt to promote religious tolerance, they provided much needed spiritual and material support to their “Paddies” and “Sammies” in the service.⁴³³

Despite the “ever-present shadow of hyphenism” and America’s declared neutrality before 1917, the war made it clear that Irish and Jewish Americans, as well as others of European stock, maintained strong ties to the homeland, and did not hesitate to express views reflecting those connections.⁴³⁴ When the United States finally entered the war in April 1917, President Wilson’s “Fourteen Points,” including the promise of self-determination for small nations, convinced most ethnic Americans that they could link their struggles with the Allied cause—regardless of what side their homeland was on. A small, but vocal, minority of Irish-American nationalists resented allying with England, but most now saw an Allied victory as their best chance to gain Irish independence. Similarly, the Russian Revolution removed most Jewish-American objections, while the British government’s Balfour Declaration gave Zionists hope of attaining a Jewish state in Palestine.

At war’s end, Irish and Jews in Boston, as elsewhere, were confident that their active participation in the war effort would prove their loyalty and win them unquestioned acceptance as respected citizens, as well as increased tolerance for ethnic distinctions. Furthermore, Irish nationalists and Zionists hoped to convince President Wilson and the Allies to champion their causes at the Versailles Peace Conference. Both groups launched grassroots public relations campaigns, which resulted in mixed success. Post-war complications brought new challenges, putting their gains at risk in the 1920s.

⁴³³ “Sammy,” like “doughboy,” was a term for American soldiers during the war. See, for example, “Once Newsies now Sammies: Boston Has 46 Jewish Newsboys in Service,” *Jewish Advocate*, 22 November 1917.

⁴³⁴ Barbara Miller Solomon, *Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), 202-203.

The “Contagion of International Strife”: America and Neutrality

When the European war began in August 1914, the United States adopted an official policy of neutrality, which President Woodrow Wilson urged citizens to adhere to “in thought as well as deed.” From the first, however, Americans clashed over the conflict and the role their country should play. Pacifists and socialists argued that it was an “uncivilized” war brought on by colonial greed, but the thirty-two million Americans of European birth or parentage lobbied for their nationalist movements and raised funds for their countrymen in war-torn regions. German Americans supported the Central Powers out of loyalty to the Fatherland, while Poles and Slavs hoped for an Allied victory to ensure independence from Austria-Hungary. British and French-Canadian Americans also identified with the Allies. Irish and Jews were more ambivalent, reflecting longstanding hatred toward England and Russia, sympathy for Germany, conflicting viewpoints on Irish nationalism and Zionism, and the ongoing debate over dual loyalties.⁴³⁵

Various factors influenced the opinions of the Irish and Jewish communities in Boston, as elsewhere, in the first years of the war. While Irish Catholics aided war refugees in France and Belgium and praised the valor of Catholic soldiers on both sides, William Cardinal O’Connell warned that American involvement in the “selfish” European conflict would be foolhardy. “Both as Christians and as Americans,” he declared in 1915, Catholics “have not only the right, but the duty, of remaining neutral, of avoiding the contagion of international strife, and of laboring with universal fraternity for world peace and amity” to

⁴³⁵ David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); 11. Joseph P. O’Grady, ed., *Immigrants’ Influence on Wilson’s Peace Policies* (Louisville, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1967); Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 94-154. Most relief funds had ethnic origins (*Boston Globe*, 1 August 1915, 44).

build unity among Boston's ethnic groups.⁴³⁶

Even so, Irish Americans were concerned with how the war would influence the struggle for Irish freedom. As discussed in Chapter 4, the Boston Irish had been following the progress of the current Home Rule bill closely in the pages of the *Pilot*, the *Republic*, and the *Hibernian*. The British Parliament passed the bill in June 1914, and the king signed it into law in September, a month after Great Britain entered the war, but implementation was put on hold for a year. After John Redmond's Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) announced its support for the conflict, thousands of Irishmen joined the British military. In America, members of the United Irish League and the Ladies Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH) pledged their loyalty to Redmond and the Irish volunteers and donated heavily to the Irish Soldier Fund, part of the British War Relief Fund. Others, however, were disappointed that Redmond would support Britain's commercial war. Members of the AOH and the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts argued that IPP members were unpatriotic Irishmen, undeserving of leadership. For many, parliamentary nationalism was no longer a viable solution to Ireland's ills, especially when Home Rule was put on hold for the war's duration, and they joined with physical-force nationalists to seek a new republic.⁴³⁷

Boston's diverse Jewish community had an even harder time constructing a unified position on the war. Across America, many Jews of Central European stock favored

⁴³⁶ "Catholic Soldiers and Sailors in Service of Germany," *Pilot*, 29 August 1914. "Holy Father Issues Encyclical on Peace," *Pilot*, 21 November 1914; "Cardinal's Peace Prayer," *Pilot*, 9 January 1915. For quote, see William Cardinal O'Connell, "Catholic Position," address at Mount Benedict Council, Knights of Columbus, 28 November 1915, in O'Connell, *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, Volume V* (Boston: Pilot Publishing Company, 1922), 82. James J. Hennessy, *American Catholics: A History of the American Catholic Community in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 225. For more on O'Connell's policy of neutrality, see James M. O'Toole, *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O'Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 150-153.

⁴³⁷ Ronald Gault Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I" (M.A. Thesis, Clark University, 1962), 23-27; "Germany Assures Ireland of Desire for her Freedom," *Globe*, 23 November 1914, 1.

Germany over Russia, whose antisemitic policies were responsible for persecuting so many of their people. Others, however, held the British perspective, believing that Germany was “so thoroughly under control of military despotism that it can no longer distinguish between right and wrong.”⁴³⁸ Still others were fiercely neutral; Jews did not “have much to gain” by a victory on either side of “this bloody and unnecessary strife,” the *Advocate* editorialized the week the war broke out. “Teuton and Slav have this in common—anti-Semitism in most of its forms.” Also, conscription could affect thousands of Jews on both sides of the conflict.⁴³⁹

These concerns encouraged Zionists to continue working for a Jewish homeland, but as Europe became embroiled in the bitter stalemate of trench warfare, Americans necessarily took over management of the international movement. A major concern was preventing the enmity of the Ottoman Empire, which had joined the Central Powers in October 1914.

Louis Brandeis quietly favored the Allies, arguing in March 1915 that the war was caused not just by economic ambitions or treaty violations, but also the “longing of the people for self-development” and “the mistaken belief” that this “requires the subjection of other peoples.” Nevertheless, Zionists declared “strict” neutrality at a convention in Boston that July. They did not seek to “wrest from the Turks the sovereignty of Palestine,” but instead asked only for the freedom to fulfill Jewish “national individuality.”⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁸ Dora Lourie Klein, a Lithuanian-born teacher in Boston and president of the Jewish Women’s Anti-Tuberculosis League, was traveling in Europe when the war broke out, stranding her in Switzerland for several months. Diary, 20 August 1914 entry, <http://july1914.blogspot.com>, accessed 30 September 2009.

⁴³⁹ *Advocate*, 11 December 1914; *Globe*, 24 January 1915, 38; “On War-Trodden Fields,” *Globe*, 31 January 1915, 25. Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust* (Omaha, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), 199-201. *Advocate*, 30 July 1915. *Advocate*, 31 July 1914. “Jewish Recipient of German Iron Cross,” *Advocate*, 24 February 1916. *Advocate*, 21 August 1914; “Russian Jews in England to Serve in British Armies,” *Advocate*, 3 August 1916; *Advocate*, 20 November 1914; *Advocate*, 9 October 1914. “400,000 Jews Can Be Called to Arms,” *Advocate*, 31 July 1914.

⁴⁴⁰ *Advocate*, 11 December 1914. *Advocate*, 12 March 1915. “Zionists Declare Position on War,” *Advocate*, 2 July 1915. Brandeis resigned after his Supreme Court confirmation, but retained influence. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 197, 161-201. “Look Pleasant, Please,” *Advocate*, 23 July 1915; *Advocate*, 15 July 1915; *Advocate*, 15

Despite these differences, Boston's Jews were united in their desire to aid their European coreligionists. This "disaster, in which the whole world shares, falls with disproportionate weight upon the Jewish people," the *Advocate* argued; as the German and Russian armies battled their way along the Eastern Front, two million Jews were left devastated in their wake.⁴⁴¹ In an unprecedented example of cooperation among the different factions, relief efforts soon coalesced under the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Brandeis, Louis Kirstein (vice president of the New England Jewish War Relief Committee), and A.C. Ratshesky (president of the Federated Jewish Charities), worked to establish Boston's branch in December 1914. Efforts were successful; a War Relief Day in March, for example, attracted 25,000 people and raised \$348,000 for various relief funds. In 1915, former Boston School Board chair David A. Ellis presided over a rally featuring Mayor James Michael Curley, author Mary Antin, and local rabbis, generating nearly \$100,000. Acknowledging the sympathy many Americans felt for European Jewry, President Wilson declared a national "Jewish War Relief Day" in January 1916. The proclamation was "the biggest and broadest advertisement" American Jews ever had, serving as "a Presidential permission to assert themselves" in their communities—many for the first time.⁴⁴²

In spite of American support for Jewish relief campaigns, some ethnic groups became susceptible to anti-hyphenate attacks. The United States was neutral, but it developed significant trade and diplomatic relationships with the Allies, and farmers and manufacturers were major suppliers of food and munitions. Many Americans already

January 1915; "Zionists Remain Neutral," *New York Times*, 27 March 1915, 4. Gerald Sorin, *A Time for Building: The Third Migration, 1880-1920* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 207-213.

⁴⁴¹ *Advocate*, 1 January 1915; "2,000,000 Jews Destitute," *Globe*, 31 January 1915, 24.

⁴⁴² "War Relief Day For Jews," *Christian Science Monitor*, 8 March 1915, 5. *Advocate*, 24 September 1915. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 168-171. *Christian Science Monitor*, 28 January 1916, 5. Bostonians contributed more than \$333,000 for the fund.

sympathized with Britain, and Allied reports of atrocities in France and Belgium increased anti-German feeling. In addition, although Wilson denied the existence of a conspiracy, his administration helped create the impression that some German Americans, and even some Irish Americans, were engaged in espionage. Such allegations were troubling; Germans were widely admired for their economic mobility and acculturation, while the Irish had attained a substantial presence in municipal politics, education, and labor.⁴⁴³ The initiation of German submarine warfare, leading to the 1915 destruction of the ocean liner *Lusitania* carrying 136 Americans, increased discrimination against German Americans, and accusations of German aid to Irish nationalists fueled charges of Irish-American disloyalty.⁴⁴⁴

For many assimilated German Jews, the new anti-German sentiment caused them to increasingly identify more as Americans and as Jews. “It behooves the Jew to be American in every particular in life,” Temple Israel president Louis Strauss declared, “and show his loyalty by his exemplary behavior and reverence for his country. Only in his religious life shall he remain apart from his neighbor.” Rabbi Harry Levi, who was of Polish parentage, agreed. Those who “endanger our interests from within are first hyphenated Americans,” Levi announced. “Dual loyalty is an impossibility, one can no more be loyal to two different countries than to be in two different places at the same time.”⁴⁴⁵ Other assimilated Jews,

⁴⁴³ In fact, a sociologist had named Germans the “best ethnic type” in Boston in 1903 (Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 194-233). See also Gary Gerstle, “Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans,” *Journal of American History* 84 (September 1997): 530; Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 27-133; James R. Barrett and David Roediger, “Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the ‘New Immigrant’ Working Class,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16.3 (Spring 1997): 3-44.

⁴⁴⁴ American newspapers relied on British news agencies instead of hiring correspondents, but some attempted a balanced tone in editorials (*Globe*, 23 May 1915, 8; *Globe*, 30 August 1914, 53; *Globe*, 9 May 1915, 14). Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I,” 16-19; Michael Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism: The Friends of Irish Freedom, 1916-1935* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 35. Many believed the ship was carrying Allied munitions. See, for example, *Globe*, 9 May 1915, 8.

⁴⁴⁵ “Rabbi Levi Honored by Temple Israel Brotherhood,” *Advocate*, 27 January 1916. *Advocate*, 13 April 1916.

however, became Zionists, arguing that their activities did not violate America's policy of neutrality, but instead displayed democratic ideals.

Many German and Irish Americans resented how Anglo Americans proclaimed support for England with no repercussions. They agreed with journalist Randolph Bourne that the "Anglo-Saxon element," like every dominant race," imposed "its own culture upon the minority peoples." America was not "forever bound" to British tradition, the *Pilot* declared. *All* hyphens should be discouraged, with no "truckling to British diplomacy any more than to Teutonic."⁴⁴⁶ Irish Americans proclaimed they were the "real and true Americans" for adhering to the neutrality policy—not the "disloyal and un-American Anglophile" Yankee elite, those "folks born in Canada," and the "children of Erin who have achieved social standing by the simple process of turning their coats."⁴⁴⁷

Irish Americans sympathized with German Americans based on this joint resentment of Yankee support for the British. A "small minority of extreme pro-German sympathizers" had made all German Americans suspect, the *Pilot* argued, as opposed to the "rabid pro-British sentiment."⁴⁴⁸ Soon after the war began, the AOH and other groups voted to continue working with the National German-American Alliance to block Anglo-American treaties. In August, the Roxbury Irish National Volunteers attended a meeting of the Alliance at Faneuil Hall to protest the "unfair treatment of the German people and government by the American press." Matthew Cummings and other Irish nationalists fostered Irish-German relations by appearing at such functions and inviting Germans to Irish celebrations,

⁴⁴⁶ Randolph Bourne, "Trans-National America," *Atlantic Monthly* 118 (July 1916): 86-97. *Pilot*, 23 October 1915.

⁴⁴⁷ "Un-American," *Pilot*, 9 October 1915, 8. They also excoriated detractors of the Church, the "bulwark today against atheism and anarchy" ("Pledge Loyalty to the Country," *Globe*, 18 March 1915, 1).

⁴⁴⁸ "Pledge of Loyalty," *Pilot*, 22 May 1915. *Pilot*, 31 October 1914; "America Over All," *Pilot*, 8 July 1916, 4.

including a 1915 Robert Emmet celebration hosted by the Clan-na-Gael, which featured Jeremiah O’Leary, the head of the American Truth Society, and Alliance secretary Robert Sturn, and closed with the German national hymn, “Watch on the Rhine!” and the “Star-Spangled Banner.”⁴⁴⁹ Mayor Curley did all he could to help German Americans, including one Bostonian held on espionage charges. Although John Redmond and other IPP leaders protested, even Boston’s moderate Irish denounced those who tried to “stir up anti-German sentiment and embroil the United States in the war.”⁴⁵⁰

Even so, by 1916, the anti-hyphenate campaign and pressures to join the Allies caused some Irish Americans to be more cautious in expressing support for Germany. At the New York Irish Race Convention in March, the newly formed Friends of Irish Freedom (FOIF) asserted their pro-Americanness, not pro-Germanness. As Mulcrone argues, the delegates promoted a “distinctly non-Anglo-Saxon definition of American identity.” Support for Ireland did not mean disloyalty to America; while Irish Americans preferred to stay neutral, they would fight if their country went to war. In recognition of this aim, Curley advocated “Sinn Féin Americanism,” objecting not only to Irishmen fighting in the British army, but also to Irish Americans singing, “Watch on the Rhine!” Delegates at the July AOH

⁴⁴⁹ The AOH also advocated flying the Irish flag on German holidays as a show of solidarity. See *Pilot*, 5 September 1914; “Germans Call for Fair Play,” *Globe*, 31 August 1914, 1. “To Meet with Germans,” *Globe*, 29 August 1914, 3. “Meeting Cheers ‘Watch on Rhine,’” *Globe*, 8 March 1915, 9; “Clan-na-Gael,” *Globe*, 26 June 1916, 13; Ford, *Americans All*, 17-22.

⁴⁵⁰ “Boston Man is Released,” *Globe*, 23 November 1914, 1. Although anti-German feeling existed in Boston, there was little outright discrimination. In 1915, the *Boston Traveler* denounced German-American attendees of a neutrality meeting, but several thousand Germans celebrated Kaiser Wilhelm’s birthday on Boston Common with no protest (“Germans Urge Arms Embargo,” *Globe*, 1 February 1915, 1; “Germans in Boston Celebrate,” *New York Times*, 28 January 1915, 3). *Pilot*, 24 October 1914; *Pilot*, 1 July 1916. Redmond believed most Irish Americans supported the Allies and the 245,000 Irish soldiers fighting in France (“Redmond Raps Irish Teutons,” *Globe*, 2 October 1915, 8).

convention in Boston also declared their loyalty to America, antipathy for Britain's Irish policies, and resolve that Ireland's cause be heard at a post-war peace conference.⁴⁵¹

Nevertheless, many in the FOIF and Clan-na-Gael continued to link hatred for Britain with pro-German sentiments, particularly after the April 1916 Easter Rebellion in Dublin, but always in the context of American patriotism. Nine thousand attendees at an Irish Relief Fund rally in May, for example, resolved that support for Britain's policies was "disloyal to the American Republic and unfaithful to the principles of American liberty," and speakers compared Germany's aid to the Irish rebels to French assistance to American revolutionaries.⁴⁵² In December, Cummings, now president of the state FOIF, sent a resolution to Washington protesting the deportation of 10,000 Irishmen to English munitions factories, comparing it to Germany's use of Belgian workers. Yet while some politicians sympathized with the Irish, Wilson and his advisors still favored the British; they leaked information regarding German-Irish munitions shipments and did not lodge an official protest over Sir Roger Casement's execution for treason. Such actions led to rumors of a secret British-American partnership, despite assurances from Wilson's Irish Catholic secretary, Joseph Tumulty, that the president supported Irish freedom.⁴⁵³

⁴⁵¹ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 37-42. The Boston Irish endorsed the FOIF at a Robert Emmet celebration later that month (*Globe*, 13 March 1916, 11). Mulcrone, "World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press," 121. Curley used the term to link American neutrality with revolutionary separatism and class interests. See *Globe*, 20 March 1916; Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 131-132. For AOH, see Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I," 76-79.

⁴⁵² *Globe*, 16 May 1916, 4. *Herald*, 16 May 1916, 8; Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 141-143. Mulcrone, "World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press," 129. "Clan-na-Gael Memorial," *Globe*, 26 June 1916, 13; "Give Funds Arm Rebels in Ireland," *Globe*, 24 November 1916.

⁴⁵³ "Wholesale Deportation of the Irish People," *Pilot*, 9 December 1916. See editorials in *Pilot* on 4 August 1916 and August 1916; Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I," 78-81. New York nationalists were under greater suspicion, particularly Jeremiah O'Leary, and his brother-in-law Judge

Much of the antipathy toward ethnic nationalism had to do with the preparedness fever sweeping the country in 1916. In May, Boston organized a citywide preparedness parade in line with Wilson's national campaign. Mayor Curley issued a proclamation for Bostonians to fly the colors at their homes and business, many of which closed for the day. One hundred thousand men and women marched to "express an appreciation of American ideals and the safeguarding of our common country."⁴⁵⁴ City employee unions, police and firefighters, worker's unions, and ethnic and religious societies, such as the Boston Holy Name Societies and the West End Young Men's Hebrew Association (YMHA) all marched to express patriotism and "a proper defense for its ideals and institutions."⁴⁵⁵ Yet while most citizens supported preparedness, some protested the martial fervor. Rabbi Levi, for example, believed it led to warmongering, warning that "the hysterical apostles of an exaggerated preparedness are also home enemies." In fact, many elite Irish and Jews joined the League to Enforce Peace and the Women's Peace Party, while immigrant workers joined anti-war labor and socialist associations.⁴⁵⁶

Even so, another incident in 1916 provided Irish and Jews with an opportunity to demonstrate how they could be "counted upon in a national crisis." In March, General Francisco "Pancho" Villa invaded border towns in Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico in retribution for the lack of American support for his 1915 candidacy for the Mexican presidency. In response, 250,000 National Guardsmen decamped to the Mexican border. In

Daniel Cohalan, the head of Clan-na-Gael and the New York chapter of Sinn Féin, who had received assistance from the German ambassador to plan revolts in Ireland (Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 122-127).

⁴⁵⁴ "Asks Everyone to Wear a Flag," *Globe*, 21 May 1916, 1; "Host of Nearly 100,000 Will Parade," *Globe*, 27 May 1916, 1.

⁴⁵⁵ Curley to O'Connell, 18 May 1916; William Cardinal O'Connell Papers: General Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 4:7. "Social News," *Advocate*, 25 May 1916.

⁴⁵⁶ *Advocate*, 13 April 1916. See, for example, *Advocate*, 18 May 1916; *Advocate*, 22 June 1916.

Boston, as elsewhere, Irish and Jews eagerly praised their “boys at the front.” The Jewish soldier “is unconditionally American” and “ever prepared to make sacrifices for the country that has given him great opportunities to succeed,” lawyer David A. Lourie declared to the Chelsea Zionist Association. Sumner S. Shore, the Russian-born editor of the *Y.M.H.A. News*, also argued that Jews “who live under Old Glory are Americans in the fullest sense of the word, and in time of war there will be no hyphen preceding that word.”⁴⁵⁷

Chaplain M.J. O’Connor of the Massachusetts’ famed Ninth Regiment similarly praised the “faithful” and “efficient” service of Irish soldiers in weekly letters to the *Pilot*. “Not only are they reflecting high credit on their Church and themselves,” he wrote, “but they are also adding to the glory of their beloved old Bay State.” The Ninth was the “only command that did not lose a man”—a feat attributed to the men’s Catholic faith, their “guide and their safety through all sorts of danger to soul and body.”⁴⁵⁸ Catholics praised the military’s preparation for future professions, the guarantee of the “best of spiritual and material care,” and its religious toleration. Most naval ships had chaplains and the “Stars and Stripes were hung behind the altar” at mass, the *Pilot* enthused, while “the Irish American Catholic boy works side by side with the Baptist youth of the southwest and neither will know the creed of the other unless he happens to see him go to church.”⁴⁵⁹

Although Wilson increasingly favored preparedness, he continued to advocate neutrality until after the November election. In June, he introduced Flag Day, protesting *all*

⁴⁵⁷ *Advocate*, 18 May 1916. “Our Army and Navy YMHA’s,” *Advocate*, 4 November 1915; “Serving Uncle Sam,” *Advocate*, 11 May 1916, 7; “Honor Roll,” *Advocate*, 13 July 1916. *Advocate*, 13 January 1916. Christopher J. Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism: The History of the Knights of Columbus, 1882-1982* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 190-192.

⁴⁵⁸ *Pilot*, 13 May 1916. “Massachusetts Men are Model Soldiers,” *Pilot*, 29 July 1916. “Ninth Regiment Boys Coming Home,” *Pilot*, 11 November 1916. Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I,” 87-89.

⁴⁵⁹ *Pilot*, 8 July 1916; *Pilot*, 3 July 1915, 5. *Pilot*, 28 October 1916.

hyphenate activity, whether from immigrants or “native” Americans. This move gained him support among many Irish Americans who had begun to think of him as an anti-Catholic Anglophile. As loyal Democrats, they overwhelmingly supported his re-election campaign; in fact, he carried seventy percent of the vote in South Boston. Wilson also received sixty percent of the vote in Boston’s Jewish wards, due to his criticism of immigration restriction and his appointment of Supreme Court Justice Brandeis.⁴⁶⁰

Several events in 1917 influenced American opinion on the war. In January, Wilson attempted to negotiate a “peace without victory” between the combatants, but before that could happen, Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare, convinced that their improved UBoats could starve Great Britain into submission before the United States could come to its rescue. Wilson severed diplomatic ties in early February in protest. Also, the abdication of Czar Nicholas II after the February Russian Revolution removed a major impediment regarding Allied claims of fighting for democracy. Finally, in March, Britain intercepted a telegram from German Foreign Minister Arthur Zimmermann to Germany’s Mexican ambassador proposing an alliance in exchange for territories lost to America. These incidents, as well as Allied propaganda regarding possible German sabotage of industrial areas in the United States, convinced most Americans it was time to join the war.⁴⁶¹

Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities reacted to these events in different ways.

Jews believed the Russian Revolution was “a triumph for the whole world” inspired by the

⁴⁶⁰ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 118; Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I,” 85-87; Braverman, “Ascent of Boston’s Jews”: Appendix: Analysis of Jewish Voting Patterns in Boston, 271; Table 1: Presidential Elections: Boston’s Jewish Vote, 278. William M. Leary, Jr., “Woodrow Wilson, Irish Americans, and the Election of 1916,” *Journal of American History* 54.1 (June 1967): 72. Wilson received 35% of the state vote.

⁴⁶¹ “Germany Now to ‘Sink All Ships,’” *Globe*, 3 March 1917, 2. Kennedy, *Over There*, 10-19. Russia would experience another revolution in October, leading to the Bolshevik takeover. By December, Russia ended hostilities with Germany.

“spirit of American patriotism” and democracy, and celebrated with a mass rally attended by Mayor Curley and other notables.⁴⁶² Some continued to protest involvement in Europe, but the new Russian government’s assurances of Jewish freedom, combined with Germany’s actions, inspired most American Jews to support the Allies. “I am no enemy of Germany,” Jewish retail magnate Edward A. Filene stated, “But if we allow them to destroy international law because their needs call for it, we shall only be producing future war.” He urged Americans to “get behind our president and proclaim to all the world that the protection of the weak is something for which Americans will be willing to sacrifice their all.”⁴⁶³ Jewish leaders raised a subscription fund to equip and train a voluntary militia, the Guard of Israel, under Captain B.J. Riseman of the Massachusetts Fifth Regiment. Army Reserve Lieutenant Bernard L. Gorfinkle, a director of the YMHA’s Army & Navy Organization and a veteran of the Mexican conflict, implored Jews to “DO SOMETHING,” whether it be enlisting in the National Guard, joining drill squads to learn the “fundamentals of soldiering with your Jewish friends,” or volunteering in some capacity to demonstrate “patriotism and a feeling for service.”⁴⁶⁴

Jews of various backgrounds were anxious to prove that their religion and patriotism were not in conflict. In early April, Roxbury’s Blue Hill Synagogue held a “grand patriotic meeting” attended by the mayor. Temple Israel members, with their German roots, demonstrated their “firm belief” in President Wilson with a flag ceremony. As two large

⁴⁶² “Talk on ‘Russia Today’ at Twentieth Century Club,” *Globe*, 1 April 1917, 11. *Advocate*, 29 March 1917, 1. Chaired by Meyer Bloomfield, the event featured Mayor Curley, Alice Stone Blackwell, Rabbi Levi, Mary Antin, and Robert A. Woods. Israel Zangwill, “New Jewish State May Rise in Far Siberia,” *Globe*, 22 July 1917, 46.

⁴⁶³ *Advocate*, 22 March 1917; *Advocate*, 5 April 1917. Diplomat Oscar Straus informed Allied ambassadors that American Jews were “pro-Ally, *not* pro-German” (*Advocate*, 29 March 1917).

⁴⁶⁴ “Volunteers for Jewish Company Wanted,” *Advocate*, 22 March 1917; *Advocate*, 12 April 1917; *Advocate*, 29 March 1917; *Advocate*, 29 March 1917. Two hundred joined by April. See also Sterba, *Good Americans*, 34-40.

American flags were unfurled on either side of the synagogue's double doors, Rabbi Levi declared, "The better Jews we are the more American we shall be and the better Americans we are, the better Jews we shall be." Mishkan Tefila dedicated an American flag over the ark during their Passover service, which also featured a patriotic music program and addresses on citizens' duties "toward flag and country at this hour of crisis."⁴⁶⁵

Cardinal O'Connell, along with the rest of the American hierarchy, wrote to the president to assure him of Catholic loyalty, but he also warned his flock "not to rush into a paroxysm of false patriotism," pointing out that those "who hysterically wave flags and shout hysterically for one thing today" are as likely to "shout just as hysterically for its opposite tomorrow." Instead of "strenuously protesting" their loyalty as though it "required proof," Catholics should "arouse patriotism in others," such as those profiting by the war through the manufacturing of munitions.⁴⁶⁶ Even so, some Irish Americans still feared that anti-war German Catholics and "Sinn Féiners" would "bring the loyalty of [all] Catholics into question." Local Knights of Columbus councils, for example, held a "patriotic meeting" at Faneuil Hall to celebrate Washington's Birthday as part of the order's nationwide observance, anxious to publicize the "unswerving allegiance" of American Catholics, who were taught "patriotism as a fundamental principle of Faith."⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶⁵ *Advocate*, 5 April 1917. *Advocate*, 29 March 1917. *Advocate*, 5 April 1917, 2; "National Flags Unfurled Before Temple Israel," Undated clipping, Temple Israel Archives, Boston. *Advocate*, 5 April 1917, 2; "Raised at Temple Israel," *Globe*, 2 April 1917; Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Waltham, Mass., Brandeis University Press, 2009), 66-68. *Advocate*, 5 April 1917.

⁴⁶⁶ "Pledge Loyalty of Catholics," *Pilot*, 28 April 1917; "President Writes to the Hierarchy," *Pilot*, 19 May 1917. "The Cardinal's Example," *Pilot*, 3 March 1917. Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I," 100-102. O'Connell to James J. Walsh, 20 February 1917; O'Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 11:5.

⁴⁶⁷ Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 193-194; Leary, "Woodrow Wilson, Irish Americans, and the Election of 1916," 72. *Pilot*, 17 February 1917, 5; "For Nation-Wide Observance," *Globe*, 4 February 1917, 35.

Conversely, Irish nationalist groups continued to uphold neutrality. The Friends of Irish Freedom actively protested an American alliance with England and involvement in an “unjust” war. During a Washington’s Birthday celebration, the pro-German Joseph Smith declared, “Should any foe attempt to invade our American shores, I want every Irishman to shoulder his gun and get under the American flag, but not one drop of Irish blood should be spilled for England.” Others cited Washington’s ideas regarding entangling alliances. In late March, the *Pilot* was still reprinting *Irish Press and News Service* reports, including one doubting that “America could be drawn into a war which has made a human shambles of Ireland.”⁴⁶⁸

On April 2, Wilson addressed a joint session of Congress to ask for a declaration of war, reiterating his rationale for the country’s involvement and his vision for peace that he had outlined in January. America’s quarrel was with the German leadership, he emphasized, not the people themselves; it was a fight “for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.” Four days later, the country was at war.⁴⁶⁹

“We Are of All Races; Today We Are One—Americans”

Once the United States entered the war, the government undertook a full-scale “mobilization of emotion” to get citizens behind the war effort, understanding the

⁴⁶⁸ “Will Not Fight to Aid Britain,” *Globe*, 22 February 1917, 1. “Lying Bulletins Spread in Ireland,” *Pilot*, 24 March 1917.

⁴⁶⁹ Woodrow Wilson, *War Messages*, 65th Cong., 1st Sess. Senate Doc. No. 5, Serial No. 7264 (Washington, D.C., 1917). Wilson, *Peace Without Victory*, 64th Cong., 2nd Sess., Senate Doc. No. 685. Kennedy, *Over There*, 10-25.

importance of cultivating national unity in light of the tensions and divisions the European conflict had already engendered. Less than a week after the declaration, Wilson established the Committee on Public Information (CPI), headed by George Creel, an investigative journalist and politician. Creel's committee of artists, journalists, academics, and advertising executives used posters, parades, speeches, songs, and films to "sell" the war to the American public and publicize American war aims to European audiences. He also engaged sports heroes, movie stars, and volunteer "Four-Minute Men" to give short patriotic addresses at theaters and social clubs.⁴⁷⁰

The CPI and other agencies emphasized that *all* Americans, native-born and immigrant alike, were vital contributors to the war effort. This idea was visibly reinforced with posters designed by Howard Chandler Christy and other artists. One popular theme featured immigrants on a ship getting their first glimpse of the Statue of Liberty; taglines reminded them that they came to America for freedom and exhorted them to fight, conserve food, or buy Liberty Bonds. Another displayed a female figure of Columbia unrolling a military honor roll containing "foreign" names, captioned "Americans All!" Often interpreted by historians as assimilationist messages, most ethnic Americans, in fact, viewed these posters as an indication that while their customs were different, their loyalty was not in question. Encouraged by the idea that "every" American was needed, they hoped fighting and working together would increase tolerance of ethnic distinctions.⁴⁷¹ Also influential with ethnic groups was the CPI's prominent usage of American flags and patriotic songs at rallies, particularly "The Star-Spangled Banner." Entertainers like George M. Cohan wrote spirited

⁴⁷⁰ Kennedy, *Over There*, 119, 105-107; Ford, *Americans All*, 23.

⁴⁷¹ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 216; Ford, *Americans All*, 15, 23-25. See, for example, *Advocate*, 4 October 1917.

melodies such as “Over There,” a marching tune designed to rally the country’s patriotic spirit, and the Broadway hit, “You’re a Grand Old Flag,” which celebrated devotion to the national banner. This self-proclaimed “nephew of my Uncle Sam born on the Fourth of July” was raised in the tradition of Irish-American vaudeville, and his unabashed flag-waving resonated deeply with ethnic Americans.⁴⁷²

Inspired by such tunes, Jewish and Irish Bostonians penned their own patriotic lyrics. In October 1917, lyricist Samuel Borofsky, who had already achieved local fame with his Zionist tunes, offered ten dollars to an *Advocate* reader who could compose the best melody to his new patriotic hymn, “God Save America.” His verses emphasized past and present Jewish military valor, as well as an appreciation of the religious and political freedom America provided:

Many foes may rise to strike,
Old Glory from the fore,
Let ‘em dare and we’ll fight for fair,
As our fathers fought before.
Sound the call, we’ll rally all,
To defend the flag and home,
Oh liberty we love you true,
We’ll live or die for you.⁴⁷³

In May, local Bostonian John J. Walsh published a poem in the *Pilot* entitled, “Loyalty.” His verses contained similar patriotic sentiments as those of Borofsky; England was now America’s ally, and “no hybrid choice must swerve us now.” Walsh, however, referenced specific Irish-American war heroes, rather than vague mentions “our fathers’

⁴⁷² Barbara L. Tischler, “One Hundred Percent Americanism and Music in Boston During World War I,” *American Music* 4.2 (1986): 165-169; John McCabe, *George M. Cohan: The Man Who Owned Broadway* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1973), 1; Michael Coffey, ed., *The Irish in America* (New York: Hyperion Press, 1997), 196.

⁴⁷³ *Advocate*, 4 October 1917.

service.” He also emphasized the shared slavery of Ireland and America under England, rather than America as an immigrant refuge:

The Flag that Barry, Meagher, Shields
Triumphant bore o’er waves and fields
Ensanguined, still floats high
And never must its bright folds trail—
While beats the heart of sturdy Gael—
Beneath a foreign sky.⁴⁷⁴

Despite the positive messages of ethnic patriotism and acceptance, the CPI and other government agencies also worked to uncover dissent. In June, the government passed the Espionage Act, authorizing Postmaster General Albert Sidney Burleson to ban or censor “treasonous” materials and denounce those who questioned government war policies. Burleson “did his duty with a vengeance,” suppressing one journal for suggesting the government raise taxes to pay for the war, and another for criticizing leaders. Others were censored for reprinting Thomas Jefferson’s advocacy of an Irish republic and questioning Britain’s support for a Jewish state.⁴⁷⁵ Although Wilson weakly protested some of Burleson’s harsher actions, he did little to stop them. In fact, he supported the passage of the repressive Sedition Act in May 1918, which permitted Attorney General Thomas W. Gregory to punish “disloyal utterances” against the government, the flag, and the military.⁴⁷⁶ Officials placed notices in the ethnic press asking individuals to do their “patriotic duty” by reporting “disloyal acts” and “seditious utterances.”⁴⁷⁷ These government actions increased suspicion of “un-American” behavior and empowered nativist groups like the American Protective

⁴⁷⁴ John J. Walsh, “Loyalty,” *Pilot*, 11 May 1918.

⁴⁷⁵ Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 134; Kennedy, *Over Here*, 81-88; Ford, *Americans All*, 23-24. Judge Daniel Cohalan, John Devoy, and Jeremiah O’Leary declared their support for America but protested Britain’s Irish policies. Cohalan was threatened with the loss of his office, Devoy’s *Gaelic American* was suppressed, and O’Leary was jailed for violating the Espionage Act (he was not acquitted until 1919). The *Irish World* and *Freeman’s Journal* were banned in April 1918 (Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62-63).

⁴⁷⁶ Kennedy, *Over Here*, 119, 63, 75-81. Hansen, *Lost Promise of Patriotism*, 175.

⁴⁷⁷ *Advocate*, 27 June 1918; *Advocate*, 4 July 1918, 8; *Advocate*, 11 July 1918. Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 207-222.

League to slander and assault pacifists, socialists, and labor radicals, as well as “unpatriotic” German Americans. “One Hundred Percent Americanists” condemned German culture, renamed German foods, and suppressed German-language publications. Private and government agencies also called for heightened Americanization programs for all immigrants.⁴⁷⁸

In Massachusetts, Governor Samuel McCall and Mayor Curley appointed public safety committees soon after America declared war. The state committee included prominent Yankee, Irish, and Jewish leaders such as City Council President James J. Storrow, businessman A.C. Ratshesky, and Suffolk County District Attorney General Joseph Pelletier, while the city committee also had a wide representation from these groups. Pelletier and other anxious leaders recommended taking a survey of foreign-born non-citizens and posting guards around banks and public institutions to prevent anarchist plots. Boston’s immigrant anti-war protesters, however, did not engage in violent acts for the most part; instead, socialist and workingmen’s organizations gathered legally through permits issued by Mayor Curley, who cited the right of every citizen to freedom of speech and assembly. Nevertheless, in June, a Boston Workers Council’s planned peace parade and rally on Boston Common turned into a riot, as servicemen and civilians disrupted the march and destroyed nearby Socialist Party headquarters. Many leaders condemned the incident, arguing that no one had the right to disrupt a lawful assembly, regardless of patriotic intent, but Curley and his archrival, former Mayor John Fitzgerald, used the incident as a political tactic; Fitzgerald

⁴⁷⁸ Ford, *Americans All*,” 23-24.

charged the mayor with treason for supporting the marchers, while Curley accused Storrow of revoking their permit.⁴⁷⁹

Fear of reprisal against German Americans was also prevalent. John A. Walz, president of the state German-American Alliance, for example, complained of “impudent” efforts to force loyalty oaths from German immigrants, particularly by the National Security League, a vigilante preparedness group whose mission undermined “the foundations of American democracy and liberty.” Also, in November, Dr. Karl Muck, the German-born conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, was denounced for not playing the “Star-Spangled Banner” at a concert in Providence, Rhode Island. For the most part, however, the small size of the city’s German community, as well as the support of Irish and Jewish leaders, ensured that there were fewer incidents in Boston than elsewhere.⁴⁸⁰ Rabbi Levi advised Americans not to “hate,” otherwise “patriotism may degenerate into jingoism.” Undoubtedly thinking of the German ancestry of many of his congregants, he declared, “Let us fight and fight to win, but let us fight with vision and with justice.”⁴⁸¹ The FOIF also empathized; at a rally to commemorate the first anniversary of the Easter Rising, members adopted a resolution sympathizing with the “cruel position” in which the war put German Americans.⁴⁸²

⁴⁷⁹ “Pelletier Warns of Danger from Anarchists,” *Globe*, 3 April 1917, 10. “Hurls Treason Charge at Mayor,” *Globe*, 6 July 1917, 1. *Globe*, 2 July 1917, 1-3; “Strongly Condemn Riots of Sunday,” *Globe*, 3 July 1917, 1; “Hurls Treason Charge at Mayor,” *Globe*, 6 July 1917, 1; *Globe*, 7 July 1917, 7. For more on Curley, see Herbert M. Zolot, “Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley: Curley and the Boston Scene From 1897-1918” (Ph.D. diss: State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975). Curley’s actions influenced his defeat to Andrew Peters in that year’s mayoral election.

⁴⁸⁰ Beatty, *Rascal King*, 200-203. “Walz Defiantly for German Government,” *Globe*, 13 August 1917, 3. Tischler, “One Hundred Percent Americanism and Music in Boston During World War I,” 164-176.

⁴⁸¹ Levi, “War and Peace,” *Advocate*, 26 April 1917, 2.

⁴⁸² “Sympathy is Shown to Germans in U.S.,” *Globe*, 24 April 1917, 3.

Some radical Irish nationalists also resisted America's alliance with Great Britain and opposed conscription and liberty loans, which, they claimed, were designed to pay England's war debts. Jewish and Irish labor leaders and pacifist groups also continued to oppose the war. Most Irish and Jewish Bostonians, however, were eager to broadcast their support once America was in the war.⁴⁸³ As Cardinal O'Connell announced during Holy Week, "There is but one sentiment permissible to-day—absolute unity. We are of all races; today we are one—Americans." True to the practice of patriotism he constantly preached, he argued that given Germany's actions, America had to declare war. Every citizen needed to "strengthen her, to hearten her, and to stand faithfully by her until her hour of trial has passed and her hour of glorious triumph shall arrive."⁴⁸⁴ Similarly, Henry H. Levenson, grand master of the Zionist Sons of Israel, proudly pointed out that Jews had always "responded to the call of the nation, and they will do so at this time." During a joint Thanksgiving service, Rabbis Levi, Nowak, and Rubenovitz also pointed to the importance of spreading American democratic ideals for the benefit of their European coreligionists.⁴⁸⁵

For ethnic nationalists, the declaration "presented opportunities as well as difficulties."⁴⁸⁶ Wilson stressed that America fought not for its own gains, but for a stable, democratic society. "No peace can last," he declared, "which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the

⁴⁸³ For anti-war attitudes, see Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I," 108-110; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62; Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 121; Sterba, *Good Americans*, 153-163. The German Jewish women's association, Frauen Verein, for example, held a Fourth of July celebration in 1917 that included a flag-raising ceremony and communal singing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" (*Advocate*, 5 July 1917).

⁴⁸⁴ *Pilot*, 14 April 1917. Whittle, "Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I," 104-110; Michael Williams, *American Catholics in the War: National Catholic War Council, 1917-1921* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1921), 3-7.

⁴⁸⁵ "Jewish Americans Wanted," *Advocate*, 14 June 1917, 8. *Advocate*, 22 November 1917.

⁴⁸⁶ Michael Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62.

governed.”⁴⁸⁷ His words allowed nationalists to link America’s role as the promoter of self-determination with their struggles—regardless of which side their “small nation” was on—and sought to convince the government to support their cause. For Zionists, America’s entrance made the goal of a Jewish state in Palestine a real possibility, as the Jews of Europe certainly fit Wilson’s description of a people governed without consent, but it “shattered the possibility of securing Ireland’s liberation through England’s defeat at the hands of Germany,” making it vital that Irish self-determination become part of America’s war aims.⁴⁸⁸

Many Irish Americans chose to look at American involvement as a positive development for Ireland. O’Connell, for example, advised his flock to lift their “hearts in gratitude to God” that America was in the war, as its “holy ideals—justice for all, the rights of small nations, the independent sovereignty of distinct peoples—will triumph in the end.”⁴⁸⁹ Even before the formal declaration, nationalists urged Irish Americans to appeal to Wilson to exert pressure on Britain to “deal with Ireland in accordance with the principles for which they are fighting in Europe.” It was time for the government to act, they argued; “far beyond the circle of the professional Irish-American politicians,” Americans wanted the Irish question settled.⁴⁹⁰

How it would be settled was still up for debate. Moderates advocated for Home Rule, believing it was “politically inexpedient” to support republicanism now that Britain was

⁴⁸⁷ Woodrow Wilson: Peace Without Victory, 64 Congress, 2 Session, Senate Document No. 685: “A League for Peace.”

⁴⁸⁸ Mulcrone, “World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press,” 186; Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 140-142; O’Grady, *The Immigrants’ Influence on Wilson’s Peace Policies*, 9-10, 56-60.

⁴⁸⁹ “A Manifold Thanksgiving Day,” Address to the Irish County Clubs, Holy Cross Cathedral, Thanksgiving Day, 1917, in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses*, 281-284. He spoke similarly in support of a free Poland.

⁴⁹⁰ “Seek Aid in U.S. and Dominions,” *Globe*, 9 March 1917, 1. *Pilot*, 30 June 1917; *Pilot*, 15 September 1917; *Pilot*, 21 April 1917; *Globe*, 24 April 1917, 3; *Pilot*, 9 June 1917; *Pilot*, 20 October 1917.

an ally. At a meeting in May, Curley, Pelletier, and others called for the immediate enactment of Home Rule, in response to a conciliatory visit to America by British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour. Conversely, Boston FOIF branches and the Irish County Clubs Central Council joined others nationwide in petitioning Congress to “insist” that England grant Ireland immediate and absolute independence; the United States was “honor bound” to apply their stated war principles “impartially in all cases of peoples held in subjection of Germany, as Belgium, or of England, as Ireland.” The national petition contained 500,000 signatures, illustrating Irish Americans’ belief that this demand was perfectly in keeping with their patriotism.⁴⁹¹ “We Irish yield to no other class of citizens in our loyalty and we fling the lie back in the teeth of those who utter it,” John Devoy asserted at a Boston FOIF meeting in December. America owed Ireland her assistance as payment for the “splendid service” of her Irish sons. As Patrick J. Cassidy, an AOH member and a private in the 101st Machine Gun Company serving in France, later observed, “Can America have lost countless numbers of her best blood in a struggle so sacred,” only to “see one of her allies grounding down that Nation of Nations?”⁴⁹²

Nevertheless, Wilson was not willing to do more than recommend the speedy enactment of Home Rule to the British government as a means of further cooperation between the nations. He would not insist on a republic—nor would the British grant such a request, despite their desire to curry American favor. The threat of conscription in Ireland and the escalation of violence between Protestant Loyalists and Catholic nationalists in

⁴⁹¹ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 143; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62-66; *Globe*, 3 May 1917, 1; *Pilot*, 5 May 1917. *Pilot*, 19 May 1917; *Pilot*, 22 December 1917.

⁴⁹² *Pilot*, 1 December 1917. Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I,” 108-110; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62. For quote, see *Pilot*, 6 July 1918. Nationalists claimed 50,000 Irish had volunteered since 1916 in their “full duty toward the Allies.”

Ulster, as well as John Redmond's death in March 1918, destroyed any hope of a parliamentary solution as long as the war continued. Nationalists became increasingly frustrated with British policies and argued that "no permanent peace is possible until the English Government permits justice to take the place of coercion."⁴⁹³ Regardless, Irish-American groups, such the newly established Irish Progressive League, continued to petition Congress, insisting they had "the right to assume that Ireland's claim to self-determination shall be championed and defended by this great republic of ours" and denying there was "any conflict between Ireland's desire for freedom and our great war for human freedom."⁴⁹⁴ At the same time, however, concerned about perceptions of Irish-American loyalty in the increasingly tense wartime environment, the FOIF proclaimed confidence in Wilson at the August 1918 Irish Race Convention, hoping he would champion the Irish cause at a post-war peace conference.⁴⁹⁵

Zionists also sought Allied support for a Jewish homeland based on Wilson's stated war aims and the hardships of European Jewish refugees. While the Irish insisted on immediate support for Ireland, Zionists hoped that a Jewish state would become a possibility with an Allied victory at war's end, and lobbied Wilson and Congress for inclusion in any post-war peace plans. Louis Brandeis had considerable leverage in Washington as an associate justice of the Supreme Court and political ally of President Wilson and he played a

⁴⁹³ Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 142-144; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62-80. The Wilson administration did protest British attempts to link the Irish republicans with Germany, and there is some evidence to suggest that the CPI may have secretly channeled funds to nationalists in Ireland. For Irish conditions, see *Pilot*, 6 April 1918; *Pilot*, 16 March 1918; *Pilot*, 20 April 1918; *Pilot*, 27 April 1918; *Pilot*, 4 May 1918; *Pilot*, 27 July 1918; *Globe*, 15 September 1918, 50.

⁴⁹⁴ *Pilot*, 14 September 1918; *Pilot*, 2 March 1918; *Pilot*, 23 March 1918. Tension also grew between the FOIF and the Irish Progressive League over the issue of Americanism. Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 62-80.

⁴⁹⁵ For convention, see "Supreme Convention and Irish Republic," *Pilot*, 25 May 1918; "Test is Ireland," *Pilot*, 10 August 1918. "LAOH Confident in the President," *Pilot*, 10 August 1918; "President's War Policy Applauded," *Globe*, 29 August 1918, 3; "Patriotism was Convention's Note," *Pilot*, 31 August 1918.

key role in negotiations to gain American recognition of Zionist claims and support for aid to Jews in Europe and Palestine. Although Wilson would not publicly endorse the movement until August 1918, he privately gave his support, and various European allies announced their approval throughout the spring and summer of 1917.⁴⁹⁶ “The fate of the Jewish people is closely connected with that of the American people,” Isaac Harris avowed at a demonstration sponsored by the Zionist Organization of Greater Boston in May—a fact that attendees emphasized by subscribing \$35,000 in Liberty bonds.⁴⁹⁷

Yet while American support was important, Zionists understood that their best chance at a Jewish state was a Turkish defeat at the hands of British troops fighting in the Middle East. Thus, the real turning point came in November 1917, when, after two years of negotiations, Secretary Balfour wrote to Baron Walter Rothschild to pledge the government’s sympathy for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. They would “use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object,” he wrote, insistent, however, that non-Jews in Palestine and Jews in Europe would maintain their civil and religious rights. The Balfour Declaration made a Jewish nation a real possibility and also served as the spark needed to energize the Zionist movement in America. The FAZ (renamed the Zionist Organization of America in 1918) had 15,000 members in 1914; by end of the war, it boasted nearly 200,000.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁶ “Jewish Home for Jewish Nation Considered in Washington,” *Advocate*, 26 April 1917; “Allies Will Support Jewish State in Palestine,” *Advocate*, 24 May 1917; “England, France, Italy & Catholic Church Approve Zionist Aims,” 31 May 1917; “Pope Approves Zionism,” *Advocate*, 12 July 1917. “Wilson Endorses Zionist Movement,” *Advocate*, 5 September 1918. Brandeis also met with Balfour on his April 1917 visit to Washington (Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 207-209).

⁴⁹⁷ *Advocate*, 24 May 1917. *Advocate*, 31 May 1917. “Zionists Subscribe \$35,000 to War Loan,” *Globe*, 29 May 1917, 2. Philippa Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 269-273.

⁴⁹⁸ Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 145, 212-213; Sterba, *Good Americans*, 169-172. The British felt a Jewish state would ensure control over the Suez Canal. The *Advocate* believed Arabs “would be amply protected,” as “Jews

Zionists everywhere reacted with “wild enthusiasm” at the news. Praise of the declaration filled sermons and speeches for months and the Zionist Association of Greater Boston immediately launched a campaign for new members. Louis Kirstein chaired a celebration featuring a “unique” flag ceremony in which American and British servicemen marched down the center aisle carrying the American and British flags, followed by a group with the Zionist flag. As each flag was placed on the platform, the audience burst forth with the “Star-Spangled Banner” and the Zionist hymn, the “Halikvoh.” Speakers lauded the Balfour Declaration and the impending conquest of Jerusalem.⁴⁹⁹ Over the next several months, Zionists highlighted their common purpose with the Allies. “This war is being fought for the principle of nationality and the freedom of all nations, including Jews,” one Zionist notice asserted. “Every Jew in order to prove himself one hundred per cent American must back this principle. Register in favor of Zionism and avoid being a slacker.”⁵⁰⁰ An Allied victory would not only help to spread American democratic ideals, but also establish a Jewish state. Zionists began to prepare for that day with the establishment of the Palestine Restoration Fund, which raised money to buy land for Jewish settlement.⁵⁰¹

Some American Jews chose to join the Jewish Legion (39th Battalion of the Royal British Fusiliers), organized just before the issuance of the Balfour Declaration to help

would not be such fools as to give them the least cause for any reasonable grievance.” Others were not as certain. *Advocate*, 23 August 1917.

⁴⁹⁹ *Advocate*, 8 November 1917; “Zionists Building High Hope on Balfour’s Letter,” *Globe*, 10 November 1917; *Advocate*, 15 November 1917; *Advocate*, 7 February 1918; *Advocate*, 5 September 1918. *Advocate*, 22 November 1917.

⁵⁰⁰ *Advocate*, 7 November 1918. *Advocate*, 22 August 1918. Eichler and Levi debated the matter soon after the British capture of Jerusalem, hailed as a major victory. Eichler believed a Jewish nation-state was imminent, but Levi, while expressing sympathy for the movement, doubted many Jews would immigrate and feared the possibility of a religious war between Jews and Arabs (*Advocate*, 3 January 1918). The American Jewish Committee endorsed the declaration in April 1918, but emphasized American Jewish loyalty.

⁵⁰¹ *Advocate*, 20 December 1917; “Flag Day a Success in Greater Boston,” *Advocate*, 3 January 1918, 1; “Palestine Restoration Fund Issue,” *Advocate*, 31 January 1918; “Restoration Fund Oversubscribed,” *Advocate*, 21 February 1918; *Advocate*, 28 November 1918; *Advocate*, 23 January 1919; *Advocate*, 24 April 1919.

liberate Palestine. British Jews flocked to America to raise funds and recruit soldiers for the unit. Because America was not at war with Turkey, only those Jews exempt from the draft could join, making up half of the 10,000-member unit, including hundreds from New England.⁵⁰² In April 1918, the battalion marched through Boston on the way to their training camp in Nova Scotia, “spurred on by the Maccabean spirit which has been dormant in their veins for two thousand years,” the *Advocate* wrote, “carrying the flags of Uncle Sam, Great Britain, and Zion, and singing the national anthems of the allied nations.” Although concerns regarding dual loyalties persisted, the battalion was a source of unity and pride for Jews, who had long desired to fight for their homeland like Polish, Czech, and Slovak Americans. Instead of relying on other nations to free Palestine, as one Legionnaire promised, “We, the Judeans, will show the world what straight-backed, courageous martial-spirited Jews are and what they can do,” thus strengthening their claims to a Zionist state.⁵⁰³

“Loyal to Faith and Country”: Paddy and Sammy in the Service

Now that their American and ethnic nationalist concerns had converged, Irish and Jews committed themselves to the war effort, believing that it gave them a “sense of participation and belonging.” They recognized that as in previous wars, “the most powerful of all the symbols of loyalty” was military service.” In May 1917, Congress passed the Selective Service Act requiring all men aged 21 to 30 to register for the draft. The American Expeditionary Force (AEF) consisted of a small contingent of professional troops and

⁵⁰² The Battalion helped open the way to Damascus for the ANZACs in 1918. Ford, *Americans All*, 38-41.

⁵⁰³ *Advocate*, 11 April 1918. Nearly all of the soldiers spoke Hebrew and kept the Sabbath (*Advocate*, 8 August 1918, 5). Dora Askowith, “A Message to the Jewish Women of America,” *Advocate*, 4 July 1918. “A Thousand Strong,” *Advocate*, 11 April 1918, 8. *Advocate*, 7 November 1918. The women’s Zionist organization, Haddasah, the youth association, Young Judea, and the workers group, Poale Zion, initiated campaigns to send doctors, nurses, and medicine to aid the soldiers and Jewish settlements in Palestine (Sterba, *Good Americans*, 171).

National Guardsmen, as well as millions of new recruits. By June, Spanish-American War veteran General John J. Pershing and his staff were in London to prepare for the first arrivals, the Twenty-Sixth “Yankee” Division, formed from New England’s National Guard regiments and new draftees, led by Major General Clarence Random Edwards.⁵⁰⁴

Driven by their desire to prove their group’s loyalty, ethno-religious leaders were active military recruiters. “You constitute . . . part of the great heart of America,” Cardinal O’Connell told soldiers at Framingham’s Camp McGuinness in August 1917, “which yearns for a lasting peace and is willing to offer her best that all the peoples of the earth may be rescued from the perpetual menace of war.”⁵⁰⁵ Rabbi Levi reiterated this idea in September, when he, O’Connell, and other leaders participated in a rally on Boston Common for the first detachment of troops leaving for Camp Devens in Ayer, as he implored soldiers not to become “Prussianized,” but to “hold fast” to American and religious ideals.⁵⁰⁶ Their active involvement in military recruiting demonstrated the importance of ethnic participation in, and support for, the war effort. While initial government recruitment was slow, community leaders inspired thousands in their neighborhoods, including many men with dependents and immigrant aliens who waived their exemption clauses. In total, foreign-born Americans constituted eighteen percent of the National Army.⁵⁰⁷

⁵⁰⁴ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 215. Kennedy, *Over Here*, 42. Thomas H. O’Connor, *Bibles, Brahmins, and Bosses* (Boston: Trustees of the Boston Public Library, 1991), 186-187. The United States fought as an “Associated Power” to retain independence, requiring new guidelines to quickly recruit, train, and equip thousands of troops. The Yankee Division saw action at Belleau Wood, Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne Forest.

⁵⁰⁵ “Christian Soldiers,” Address at Camp McGuinness, 31 August 1917, in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses*, 250.

⁵⁰⁶ *Advocate*, 27 September 1917. Levi Scrapbook, 23 September 1917. The group of 1,514 men included 200 Jews.

⁵⁰⁷ Kennedy, *Over Here*, 42. Although the state gave a \$10 monthly bonus to National Guard enlistees, many citizens waited to be drafted into the National Army, preferring to earn money in high-paying factory jobs or claim exemption based on dependents, while workers in some mill towns organized to obstruct the draft (“Bay

Irish and Jews gloried in the bravery of their servicemen and defended their record by touting their group's legacy of service to the United States. In June 1917, for example, Jacob de Haas railed against a recruiting officer on Boston Common who protested that Jews were given rights upon arrival in America but did not enlist in great numbers. Promising that "no insult reflecting on the patriotism of Jews will be allowed to pass," de Haas reported the officer to civic officials.⁵⁰⁸ Sumner Shore saw the incident as an opportunity to chastise soldiers who changed their names to sound more "Yankee." It was important to have "more genuine Jewish names among our boys in Khaki to show that we have never been and are not slackers."⁵⁰⁹

Just as Jews hoped to dispel stereotypes of physical weakness or laziness, Irish Americans hoped that the "image of the two-fisted, freckle-faced Irishman who is twice as brave as anyone else" would become "positive features of American legend." As Governor David I. Walsh had stated in 1915, the Irish would defend America, as they had in the past, "because of its promise of hope, of happiness and prosperity to all mankind."⁵¹⁰ O'Connell defended this idea at a fundraising concert by John McCormack for the 101st U.S. Regiment in June 1917. Catholics "will not be found waving flags or blustering about patriotism," he declared, but they would "go out quietly from the lanes of peace with the marching millions," asking God's blessing. Similar to the Zionist demonstrations in celebration of the Balfour Declaration, the concert was an amalgamation of sentimental Irishness and American patriotism. To cheering crowds, McCormack opened and closed with the "Star-

State to Give Soldiers \$10 a Month," *Globe*, 5 April 1917, 12). Nearly 4,800,000 men served in the AEF (Hennessy, *American Catholics*, 225).

⁵⁰⁸ "Pearson's Attack on Jewish Recruits Raises Storm," *Advocate*, 7 June 1917, 1.

⁵⁰⁹ *Advocate*, 21 June 1917. *Advocate*, 13 September 1917.

⁵¹⁰ Joseph M. Curran, *Hibernian Green on the Silver Screen: The Irish and American Movies* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 87-88. "Pledge Loyalty to the Country," *Globe*, 18 March 1915, 1.

Spangled Banner” and sang renditions of his popular “Mother Machree” and the wartime favorite, “It’s a Long Way to Tipperary.”⁵¹¹

Although many Americans hoped that compulsory military training would serve as a melting pot to “break down distinctions of race and class,” Irish and Jews emphasized the loyalty of their doughboys to their religion and culture just as much as to American principles.⁵¹² Catholic boys “are loyal sons of America, in war as in peace,” the *Pilot* asserted, “because patriotism and piety are twin lessons taught them by their Church.” To highlight this fact, 18,000 soldiers attended mass at Camp Devens in Ayer, Massachusetts in October 1917. The following May, 40,000 Catholics attended mass at Fenway Park; the flags on the altar and martial music created “the most sublimely inspiring spectacle” ever “witnessed out of doors in New England.”⁵¹³ Rabbi Nowak of Ohabei Shalom also extolled Jewish patriotism. Ancient Israel was “the chief inspiration for the founding of our American democracy,” he declared during a sermon on Washington’s Birthday, as exemplified by the Liberty Bell’s Levitical engraving, “Proclaim ye liberty throughout the land.” Jewish soldiers would continue to “give proof to our love for the democratic ideal,” finding a place “in the immortal halls of fame.” Synagogues also held patriotic services for the military.⁵¹⁴

The most visible and poignant expression of ethnic patriotism was the “war service” flag. Displayed by American families and institutions, the white flag bordered in red

⁵¹¹ “The Catholic Position,” 21 June 1917, in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses*, 134, 136. Formerly the famed Ninth Massachusetts, the 101st was commanded by Colonel Edward L. Logan. *Pilot*, 15 June 1918; Michael E. Shay, *The Yankee Division in the First World War: In the Highest Tradition* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2008), 2-3.

⁵¹² *Congressional Record*, House, 65th Congress, 1st sess., April 5, 1917, 319, quoted in Kennedy, *Over Here*, 17-20. States’ rights advocates, meanwhile, were concerned about the enlistment of African Americans.

⁵¹³ “The Truest Patriots,” *Pilot*, 27 April 1918. *Pilot*, 13 October 1917. *Pilot*, 11 May 1918; “40,000 at Solemn Military Mass,” *Pilot*, 1 June 1918; “Inspiring Spectacle at Camp Devens,” *Pilot*, 29 September 1917. See also Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 16.

⁵¹⁴ *Advocate*, 7 March 1918. See also “Jewish Loyalty to Nation,” *Advocate*, 29 November 1917, 1.

contained a blue star for each serviceman (gold for those who died)—unalterable proof of their “patriotic fervor” and “magnificent response to their country’s call.” Like other organizations, Irish and Jewish institutions unfurled large multi-star banners in great number, holding elaborate dedication ceremonies to publicize the service of their members and promote communal unity.⁵¹⁵

Catholic parish flags averaged 150 to 400 stars, while that of the largest, Our Lady of Perpetual Help in Roxbury, had nearly 1,000. By July 1918, in fact, Archdiocesan records showed that 32,000 Catholics had responded to the “call of the colors.” “No Catholic can help but thrill with exultation,” the *Pilot* enthused, “to behold the mute yet eloquent testimony of the parish’s patriotism in the star-crowded service flag that waves above the House of God, typifying the union of love of God and country.”⁵¹⁶ Such patriotism was not limited to Irish parishes; the Italian Parish of the Sacred Heart unveiled a flag with 360 stars, while the German Holy Trinity Church dedicated a flag with thirty-four stars, twelve of which represented members of Boston’s only “distinctly German” K. of C. council.⁵¹⁷ Jewish organizations also held elaborate ceremonies. In April 1918, for example, Mishkan Tefila unfurled a sixty-six-star service flag before an audience of veterans and servicemen. At its fiftieth anniversary celebration in June, Roxbury’s Temple Hamedrosh Hagodal, the city’s largest Eastern European synagogue, unveiled a bronze tablet with the names of its servicemen. The event also featured a parade of congregants, servicemen, and children reviewed by various officials, including Lieutenant Governor Calvin Coolidge, Mayor Peters,

⁵¹⁵ “Stirring Proofs of Patriotism,” *Pilot*, 19 January 1918; *Pilot*, 27 April 1918.

⁵¹⁶ *Pilot*, 5 January 1918; *Pilot*, 14 September 1918; *Pilot*, 6 July 1918; 13 July 1918. *Pilot*, 26 January 1918. *Pilot*, 11 May 1918. The flag of South Boston’s St. Eulalia’s Parish had 215 stars arranged to form its name (*Pilot*, 1 December 1917).

⁵¹⁷ “Patriotic Work of Local Italians,” *Pilot*, 3 August 1918. *Pilot*, 23 March 1918.

and Rabbi Louis M. Epstein. Later that summer, an East Boston synagogue held a patriotic service to unveil a 100-star flag.⁵¹⁸

Ethnic organizations also had this goal. AOH divisions, for example, displayed service flags to keep an “accurate and historical record” of its 3,000 servicemen and remitted their dues for the duration. In November, the Irish County Clubs unveiled a flag with 1,471 stars at a “patriotic” meeting in Hibernian Hall and subscribed \$100,000 in war bonds. Speakers declared their joint support of the war effort and Irish independence, praising Irish-American soldiers as “true Americans first and last.”⁵¹⁹ In November 1918, the state YMHA and YWHA held a mass flag ceremony at their annual convention in Springfield. As “the stirring strains” of the national anthem swelled through the hall, Jewish Boy Scouts unfurled the YMHA service flag containing 5,100 stars, representing more than half of the statewide membership. “How many organizations, Jewish or Gentile,” the *Advocate* asked proudly, “Could equal this record?”⁵²⁰

Even more significant was the “social, moral and religious consolation” that ethnic and religious organizations offered to soldiers and sailors in training camps and overseas.⁵²¹ Since the Civil War, the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) had served as the primary civilian vehicle providing morale, welfare, education, and recreation to the American military, but in 1917, the National Catholic War Council (NCWC) and the Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) gained authorization to oversee religious and welfare work for the one million

⁵¹⁸ *Advocate*, 25 July 1918; *Advocate*, 4 April 1918. *Globe*, 10 June 1918, 4. *Advocate*, 1 August 1918.

⁵¹⁹ *Pilot*, 28 September 1918; *Pilot*, 26 October 1918; *Pilot*, 27 October 1917; *Pilot*, 12 January 1918; Whittle, “Opinion of the Boston Irish Toward World War I,” 104-106. “County Associations Flag has 1471 Stars,” *Pilot*, 2 November 1918. The AOH also declared St. Patrick’s Day to be a “patriotic day” (*Pilot*, 2 February 1918).

⁵²⁰ “Damn the Torpedoes! Full Steam Ahead!” *Advocate*, 28 November 1918, 4.

⁵²¹ O’Connell, for example, invited parish priests to say special prayers for the 101st Regiment (Richard J. Haberlin, Secretary to O’Connell, 30 August 1918; O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 3:3.

Catholic and 250,000 Jewish servicemen in the National Army and Navy. Eventually, these and other organizations formed the United War Work Council, which worked together to raise funds for morale work for all soldiers.⁵²²

The NCWC was organized to help institutions work together “as Catholics,” dividing war functions between the primarily Irish-American groups that made up the Committee on Special War Activities and the Knights of Columbus’ Committee on War Activities.⁵²³ The Knights established recreation centers in military training camps, work they had begun during the 1916 Mexican border conflict to provide an alternative to YMCA huts, which charged for use of their facilities, and, they claimed, contained anti-Catholic literature in their reading rooms. Conversely, the Knights’ non-sectarian motto was “Everybody Welcome, Everything Free,” with costs paid by donations and member assessments.⁵²⁴ The Jewish Welfare Board also united the morale efforts of diverse religious and cultural organizations, including the Young Men’s Hebrew Association, Council of Jewish Women, B’nai B’rith, and other groups. Soon after America entered the war, the JWB began recruiting volunteer rabbinic chaplains and lay field workers, known as “Star of David men,” to provide services for Jewish soldiers in the training camps.⁵²⁵

⁵²² William Howard Taft, ed., *Service With Fighting Men: An Account of the Work of the American Young Men’s Christian Associations in the World War* (New York: Association Press, 1922); Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 190. For numbers, see Hennessey, *American Catholics*, 226; Guide to the Records of the American Jewish Committee-Office of Jewish War Records, 1918-1921, I-9, AJHS, <http://findingaids.cjh.org/?pID=109196>, accessed 12 November 2009.

⁵²³ *Pilot*, 25 August 1917; Williams, *American Catholics in the War*, 93, 122. The AOH created comfort kits for soldiers, provided each with a *Book of Prayer and Song*, and established a relief fund (*Pilot*, 27 October 1917; *Pilot*, 12 January 1918).

⁵²⁴ Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 193-196. “More than \$1,000,000 Subscribed Now,” *Globe*, 28 October 1917, 56; *Pilot*, 9 June 1917; *Pilot*, 4 August 1917; “Knights of Columbus Buy Liberty Bonds,” *Pilot*, 27 October 1917; *Pilot*, 10 November 1917; Recognition of Broad Work by the K. of C.,” *Globe*, 6 January 1918, 35). *Pilot*, 17 November 1917; “Great Success of McCormack Concert,” 8 June 1918; “No Line is Drawn on Race or Creed,” *Pilot*, 14 September 1918.

⁵²⁵ Sterba, *Good Americans*, 77; “Guide to the Records of the National Jewish Welfare Board, 1889-1995,” AJHS,

Locally, the groups founded centers in Boston and at military training camps across the state. Camp Devens in Ayer, for example, was established in July 1917 as the training facility for the National Army's 76th Division. The YMCA was by far the largest operation at the camp with fourteen buildings administered by a paid staff of eight and fifty volunteers.⁵²⁶ The Knights built three huts, which they staffed with twelve secretaries from the Ayer and Boston councils and outfitted with space for religious services and entertainments, a library, piano, and basketball hoops. Chaplains also provided Catholic services, including eleven field masses on Sundays, attended by 18,000 men.⁵²⁷ The Jewish Welfare Board's state branch coordinated efforts with the War Emergency Bureau of the Associated YMHA's of New England to supply soldiers with kosher food, taught classes in English, Jewish history, bible study, and provided entertainments, while local rabbis held religious services. Originally Jewish volunteers at Camp Devens shared space in a YMCA hut, adding small touches such as YMHA stationery ("nothing can sadden Jewish parents more than letters on Christian stationery and nothing can gladden it more than letters in Jewish stationery"), but they opened their own facilities in August 1918 so Jewish soldiers could worship and "feel at home." Nevertheless, like other welfare centers, the JWB hut was a non-sectarian space "with no distinctively Jewish physical properties." Such efforts, soldiers asserted, helped promote "a feeling of good-will" between soldiers of different faiths.⁵²⁸

<http://findingaids.cjh.org/?pID=186993>, accessed 25 October 2009.

⁵²⁶ "A YMCA Hut, Camp Devens, WW1 Cantonment," in Roger Batchelder, *Camp Devens* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, Publishers, 1918).

⁵²⁷ Williams, *American Catholics in the War*, 130. P.H. Callaghan to Committeemen of Commission of Religious Prejudices, 27 November 1917, 10 October 1917; Knights of Columbus [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 2:5. "Knights of Columbus, Camp Devens, WW1 Cantonment," in Batchelder, *Camp Devens. Pilot*, 9 February 1918; *Pilot*, 9 March 1918.

⁵²⁸ "Hebrews Plan War Work," *Globe*, 28 October 1917, 53. Coleman Silbert, "Jews and Judaism at Ayer," *Advocate*, 8 November 1917. According to Silbert, there were 2150 Jews at Camp Devens—5% of the total of 43,000. *Advocate*, 4 November 1915. Shore, "Serving Uncle Sam," *Advocate*, 11 May 1916. *Advocate*, 15 August

Welfare agencies also provided religious services to Catholic and Jewish soldiers. By late 1917, the government had authorized the appointment of 181 priests and an unspecified number of rabbis to serve as chaplains for the AEF, supplemented by voluntary chaplains funded by the welfare agencies. Together with lay volunteers, as well as chaplains of other faiths, priests and rabbis ensured that the soldiers were protected against the temptations of military vice and provided with spiritual guidance. As Army Chaplain M.J. O'Connor, reported regarding "Mass soldier boys" in France, they "are leading cleaner, purer and more wholesome lives than when at home."⁵²⁹

The Chaplain's Aid Association supplied priests with rosaries, crucifixes, and catechisms to distribute among the men, as well as vestments, sacred vessels, and altar bread and wine to celebrate mass, which was held several times a week, as the men "went by the hundreds" to receive Communion.⁵³⁰ In fact, many Irish Catholic soldiers expressed increased religious devotion. Sergeant-Major Maurice Twomey of Lynn, for example, was happy to learn that Mass was celebrated aboard ship during the crossing to France. "A lot of us went to Confession and have received every day," he told his parents. "You can just bet that a fellow feels as if he is truly starting off the day right when he has the good luck to be able to attend Mass and receive Holy Communion." Lieutenant F.J. Gillis concurred. "My

1918; Silbert, "Building Like Y.M.H.A. Indispensable at Camp Devens," *Advocate*, 10 January 1918. *Advocate*, 20 December 1917.

⁵²⁹ "More Than \$1,000,000 Being Subscribed Now," *Globe*, 28 October 1917, 56. The Knights deployed 200 chaplains to France. K. of C. camps in France were so ubiquitous that soldiers referred to the secretaries as "Casey" (Sterba, *Good Americans*, 191-194, Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 199-200, 215, 227; "Message to Boys of Division 25, A.O.H.," *Pilot*, 6 July 1918). For O'Connor, see, for example, *Pilot*, 27 October 1917. For morality issues, see *Pilot*, 22 December 1917.

⁵³⁰ Williams, *American Catholics in the War*, 121-129, 280, 294-296. It also supplied the soldiers with spiritual tracts in various languages. *Pilot*, 9 February 1918, 1; "Faithful to God; Loyal to Country," *Pilot*, 31 August 1918.

Communion on Sunday will be a fervent one,” he wrote home after one battle in France. “I learned how sincerely a chap can say an Act of Contrition when I was in the first line.”⁵³¹

The Jewish agencies focused on recruiting volunteer chaplains, ameliorating anti-Semitism, and dealing with religious issues affecting Jewish soldiers, including special food, Chanukah gifts, and Jewish holidays. The JWB created a prayer book containing the liturgies for all three of Judaism’s branches to distribute to soldiers along with prayer shawls, kosher food, and other items. The *Advocate* applauded their efforts, noting, “The soldier who is properly taken care of both spiritually and morally will make a better defender of his country.”⁵³² The Welfare Board’s efforts did not extend overseas until 1919, due to a lack of funds, so Jewish soldiers at the front dealt with a shortage of chaplains and welfare services. Even so, like Catholics, they demonstrated a newfound religiosity. Corporal R. J. Riseman and Lieutenant Gorfinkle, for example, often held makeshift religious services on Friday evenings and Sunday afternoons. “Over here I have become very religious” and “converted several of the boys,” including one man “who darvins [sic] every morning and night and does not smoke on Saturdays,” Gorfinkle attested. “I seem to have such a feeling of safety and confidence because of the Lord being with me.”⁵³³

The rabbi shortage particularly influenced the army’s ability to ensure proper Jewish burials at the front—a problem that first arose in December 1917 with the death of Herbert

⁵³¹ Maurice A. Twomey, to Eugene and Catherine Twomey, 9 September 1918; Maurice A. and Eleanor Twomey Papers; Box 1:1; author’s possession. “With the Men in the Trenches,” *Pilot*, 13 April 1918.

⁵³² “Special Food for Jewish Soldiers,” *Advocate*, 11 October 1917; *Advocate*, 8 November 1917. Gorfinkle to Ida Gorfinkle, 16 April 1918; Colonel Bernard Louis Gorfinkle Papers; P-664; Box 1, Folder 3; American Jewish Historical Society, Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY. *Advocate*, 1 November 1917.

⁵³³ Sterba, *Good Americans*, 194-196. Riseman later went on to receive his certificate of ordination (*Advocate*, 4 July 1918, 8; *Advocate*, 11 July 1918). *Advocate*, 10 January 1918. Gorfinkle to sister Ida, 16 December 1917, 18 December 1917; Gorfinkle to mother, 26 May 1918, 12 August 1918, 17 August 1918, 4 September 1918, 17 September 1918, 21 September 1918; Gorfinkle Papers; Box 1; Folder 2-3. *Advocate*, 5 September 1918).

J. Wolf, a Jewish bugler and one of three enlisted sons of a prominent German-born Boston police inspector. Because there was no set protocol for Jewish burials, Gorfinkle, a fellow congregant at Ohabei Shalom, received permission to arrange a military funeral that met traditional Jewish requirements. “Your son was laid away with military honors amid the tears of his companions, the firing squad and the last taps,” he later informed Inspector Wolf. The funeral itself was “as Jewish and orthodox as possible”; Corporal Riseman conducted the service, donning a tallis (“just for the sake of symbol tho’ it is not proper”) and reciting the appropriate Hebrew prayers. After the service, the men repeated Kaddish and sat shiva, saying Kaddish again the following Sabbath eve.⁵³⁴ Yet despite the Jewish funeral, the army marked Wolf’s grave with a cross rather than the Star of David, a common mistake that was not rectified until July 1918, when the JWB finally convinced the War Department to place the “double triangle” over Jewish graves in France.⁵³⁵

By 1918, many argued that the “melting pot of the Army had done its work”; the men “were no longer Irish-Americans, Italian-Americans, or any kind of hyphenate,” instead, “All had become American soldiers.”⁵³⁶ Ethnic loyalties persisted, but soldiers attested to a newfound acceptance of other groups. As Lieutenant Gorfinkle wrote in 1918, “The K. of C.’s are doing great work up front,” and “give away everything,” such as cigarettes, candy, and gum, “while the ‘Egrech Em Saw Ah’ [YMCA] sell everything and

⁵³⁴ Gorfinkle to Inspector Wolf, 15 December 1917, in *Advocate*, 10 January 1918; Gorfinkle to sister Ida, 16 December 1917; Gorfinkle Papers; Box 1; Folder 2-3. Wolf died of scarlet fever. Boston newspapers made much of him as the city’s first casualty, and Ohabei Shalom held an elaborate memorial service in his honor. *Advocate*, 27 December 1917; *Advocate*, 20 December 1917; “Son of Inspector Wolf Dies in Service Abroad,” *Globe*, 17 December 1917, 1; “Burial of Young Wolf Described,” *Globe*, 29 December 1917, 4.

⁵³⁵ *Globe*, 5 May 1918, 4. Gorfinkle to mother, 15 April 1918, 11 May 1918, 15 May 1918, to Ida Gorfinkle, 16 April 1918; Gorfinkle Papers; Box 1; Folder 3. “Double Triangle Over Jewish Graves,” *Advocate*, 25 July 1918; *Advocate*, 21 June 1920. After the war, the JWB generated a list of Jewish casualties to ensure graves had appropriate markers.

⁵³⁶ “Great Crowd Thrilled by Army-Navy Parade,” *Globe*, 20 April 1918, 1. Sterba, *Good Americans*, 175-201.

won't even give a pen point away."⁵³⁷ Similarly, Lyman Rollins, the 101st Infantry Chaplain, claimed, "This life is revealing to us one thing, Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, we are coming to know and understand one another." While they had their ethnic and religious distinctions, they were still "brothers and comrades" in a universal cause.⁵³⁸

"Practical Patriotism" on the Home Front

This spirit of tolerance, cooperation, and service extended to civilian work on the home front. The production of munitions, equipment, and provisions needed to supply the AEF and its allies required the full dedication of the country's finances and industries, as well as the support of the American people at large. Various war agencies organized central committees to coordinate activities and resources at the national, state, and local level and serve as a channel of communication and cooperation between the public and private sector. To gain public acceptance for this vast economic reorganization, administrators launched a widespread propaganda campaign appealing to Americans' patriotism and spirit of self-sacrifice.⁵³⁹

Irish Catholic and Jewish leaders in Boston, as elsewhere, played an important role in the domestic war effort. Mayor Curley, for example, proved to be the perfect wartime mayor, always ready to participate in a dinner, rally, or parade to motivate his constituents and promote communal cooperation. The Council of National Defense recognized the importance of ethnic involvement, and cultivated it by praising immigrant contributions to

⁵³⁷ Gorfinkle to Ida, 18 October 1918; Gorfinkle Papers; Box 1; Folder 3. He told his family and friends to contribute to the K. of C., Salvation Army, or Red Cross.

⁵³⁸ "Chaplain Rollins' Keen Interest in Jewish Soldiers," *Lynn Telegram*, clipping, n.d.; Gorfinkle Papers; Box 3; Folder 1.

⁵³⁹ For more on the creation of the various government war agencies, see Kennedy, *Over There*, 93-143.

American culture and enlisting the aid of ethnic and religious leaders to serve on various public committees. War administrators also drew on the existing resources of the Archdiocese of Boston and the Federated Jewish Charities. Mary A. Barr, the chair of the Women's Way Relief Committee appealed to Cardinal O'Connell to ask Boston's Catholic women to participate in patriotic war work "under the teachings of their Church."⁵⁴⁰ In response, O'Connell reminded his flock of the "debt of gratitude" they owed to America; the "more practical their Catholicity, the more public-spirited and patriotic they will be and the more prized their citizenship."⁵⁴¹ Similarly, A.C. Ratshesky, FJC president, Louis E. Kirstein, a member of the United War Work Campaign and the U.S. Quartermaster Department, and Max Mitchell, the director of the Committee on Citizens of Foreign Birth and Descent, implored Jews to "demonstrate practical patriotism" as a way to give back to the "land of equal opportunity."⁵⁴²

Two of the most influential agencies in the lives of ethnic Americans were the War Industries Board, which set prices and determined goods to be produced for the war effort, and the National War Labor Board, which protected workers' rights in exchange for a "no strike" pledge from unions. Anxious to meet the military's demand for uniforms, munitions, and ships, and competing with the military for manpower, manufacturers advertised for English-speaking workers, including minorities like women and African Americans, by appealing to their patriotism and their pocketbooks. "This country gives you a home,

⁵⁴⁰ Ida Clyde Clarke, *American Women and the World War* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1918). "Women's War Relief Work in Archdiocese," *Pilot*, 26 January 1918. Two delegates from each parish served on the Committee.

⁵⁴¹ Henry L. Higginson to O'Connell, 16 May 1917, O'Connell to Higginson, 18 May 1917; O'Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 5:12. "Practical Patriotism," address at the Federal Reserve Bank, 16 October 1917, in O'Connell, *Sermons and Addresses*, 265-266. "Our Service Flags," *Pilot*, 24 November 1917.

⁵⁴² *Advocate*, 26 September 1918, 8. *Advocate*, 16 August 1917; *Advocate*, 13 September 1917. Others expressed similar sentiments. See, for example, *Advocate*, 10 January 1918; *Advocate*, 10 January 1918.

protection, education, opportunity. If you cannot enlist you can get steady work with good pay in shipyards working for the government,” promised one notice for the Quincy shipyards in the *Jewish Advocate*. “Coppersmiths are now in demand so it is probable” they “will be exempt from the draft.” High wages contributed to a general feeling of good will in New England, quieting, at least temporarily, the labor unrest of the decade.⁵⁴³

With the newfound discovery of the potential of “woman power,” as ethnic women enthusiastically joined the Army Nursing Corps, Naval yeowomen units, YWCA war branches, and the Red Cross.⁵⁴⁴ Although Irish and Jewish women had been involved in relief efforts since the war began, the non-denominational Red Cross provided the largest range of services, including travelling canteens, nursing and hospital services, and an almost all-female motor corps. By war’s end, one of the organization’s major functions was working to control the worldwide influenza epidemic.⁵⁴⁵ Women organized Red Cross chapters through their churches, synagogues, and cultural societies to produce garments, surgical dressings, and comfort kits for soldiers and European civilians. Such work was considered necessary for all loyal women; in response to posters urging women and girls to “knit your bit,” yarn companies advertised in the ethnic press regarding sales of army and navy yarns “at cost” to “encourage patriotic knitting.”⁵⁴⁶ Ethnic leaders expressed great pride in such

⁵⁴³ *Advocate*, 14 June 1917, 8. Because so many men were needed to fight, women and minorities were in greater demand for work previously closed to them, presenting opportunities to earn higher wages.

⁵⁴⁴ Synagogues, churches, and ethnic organizations also honored the service of their “dough girls.” Temple Israel, for example, included their six servicewomen in a May 1918 memorial service: Selah Lampis, Anna Raphael, Yeowoman, Gertrude Spitz, Frances Stern, Sylvia Burrows, Yeowoman, and Helen Weiscopf, Yeowoman. *TI Bulletin*, June 1918.

⁵⁴⁵ *Advocate*, 3 October 1918, 1; *Pilot*, 12 October 1918.

⁵⁴⁶ “AOH Auxiliaries Busy with Red Cross Work,” *Pilot*, 30 June 1917; *Pilot*, 25 May 1918; *Advocate*, 4 April 1918; “America’s Women and America’s Cause,” *Advocate*, 25 July 1918; Rabbi Harry Levi, “Temple Israel and the War,” *Advocate*, 30 January 1919. For evidence of sectarianism, see Rabbi Abraham Nowak, “Red Cross vs. Red Shield,” *Advocate*, 10 January 1918; “Sectarianism in the Order,” *Pilot*, 2 March 1918; *Advocate*, 25 July 1918;

accomplishments in their communities. “Wars are won at home as much as in the trenches,” Sumner Shore declared. “No one has ever accused our energetic young women of being less patriotic than the men.” Others hoped women’s contributions would lead to greater post-war advances for them. It was “no longer a man’s world,” Rabbi Levi noted, “as much as a woman’s world,” as he championed equal pay, suffrage, and legal rights. Some Catholics, however, while applauding women’s essential “national service,” were anxious to preserve “the poise and dignity that becomes womanhood and safeguards both health and morality.”⁵⁴⁷

Like Red Cross work, food conservation was an area in which women played an essential, if somewhat traditional, role. America’s entrance in the war increased the need to enhance and conserve the nation’s food resources. President Wilson appointed Herbert Hoover, the Commissioner for Relief in Belgium, to head the Food Administration, making him responsible for ensuring the supply, distribution, and conservation of food for the American troops and their allies. Rather than instituting policies of mandatory food rationing, as in Europe, Hoover mobilized American public opinion behind voluntary sacrifice. Restaurants, housewives, and schoolchildren signed pledge cards to “do their part” to conserve foodstuffs, reduce waste, substitute ingredients in recipes, and plant “victory gardens” so canned goods could be saved for the troops. Promising, “Food will win the

Sterba, *Good Americans*, 153. Conrad & Company, *Advocate*, 21 February 1918. See also O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 235-236.

⁵⁴⁷ *Advocate*, 11 July 1918; *TI Bulletin*, 25 July 1918. Rabbi Levi, “A Man’s World,” *Advocate*, 9 May 1918; “Woman’s World Now Says Rabbi,” *Advocate*, 13 May 1918. “Women in Place of Men Workers,” *Pilot*, 26 January 1918.

war,” Food Administration posters compared food to ammunition and urged Americans to adhere to wheatless Mondays, meatless Tuesdays, and porkless Saturdays.⁵⁴⁸

The ethnic press emphasized the importance of food conservation by linking ethnic and patriotic values. The *Pilot* issued notices in favor of this “practical and imperative patriotic duty,” and urged Catholic women to can their own fruits and vegetables to save commercially tinned products for the troops.⁵⁴⁹ The *Advocate* agreed. It was “unpatriotic act to use canned goods when fresh products are easily available,” and “every Jewish home can help build up this surplus.”⁵⁵⁰

In cooperation with ethnic and religious leaders, Food Administration dieticians and home economics experts held conferences at local churches, synagogues, and ethnic organizations to teach women how to can their own produce, eliminate waste, and reuse garbage, often using these events as opportunities to teach immigrants about healthy diets. Temple Israel members Gertrude Spitz and Frances Stern, for example, members of the Federal Food Conservation Committee, held a conference at the synagogue in October 1917, drawing hundreds of participants. The following January, the League of Catholic Women held a conservation conference at St. Cecilia’s Church, along with a food exhibit to demonstrate techniques for immigrant women. Realizing that many poor Catholic immigrants had no means of conserving the fruit and vegetables the government had urged

⁵⁴⁸ The high production of food was also a priority; recognizing that money would spur farmers to produce more crops than simple patriotism, he urged Allied purchasing commissions to guarantee fixed prices for crops. This policy, combined with voluntary conservation methods, was incredibly successful; by 1918, exports of wheat, meat, sugar, and other foodstuffs had tripled since before the war. Kennedy, *Over Here*, 118-119; Kenneth Elle, *Herbert Hoover* (Boston: Twayne, 1980); August Heckscher, *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1985).

⁵⁴⁹ “A Patriotic Duty,” *Pilot*, 4 May 1918.

⁵⁵⁰ “We Can Help Our Allies,” *Advocate*, 1 August 1918.

them to plant, parishes opened their church kitchens to them and enlisted the help of middle-class Irish-American women to assist them.⁵⁵¹

In many respects, such activities were an extension of upwardly mobile Irish and Jewish women's (and men's) roles as philanthropic leaders. Ethnic leaders were often charged with conducting Americanization campaigns and teaching immigrants about war activities. Louis Kirstein's wife, Rose, for example, chaired an educational campaign to teach Eastern European Jews about Liberty Bonds, holding daily meetings at settlement houses in the West and North Ends to explain in Yiddish how to purchase bonds, what their value was, and the "reasons why every Jewish woman should do all in her power to subscribe to them."⁵⁵² Similarly, a "Jewish Committee of One Hundred" was organized to help rally "apathetic" immigrants to buy war bonds. As committee member Elihu Stone argued, immigrants did not fully understand the "sacred ideals" that America had "resolved to defend, with our treasure and blood," but they were "devoted to the flag," and willing to listen, if appealed to "with systematic propaganda" inviting their "active cooperation."⁵⁵³

Participation in the various Liberty Loan campaigns demonstrated the loyalty of Boston's Irish and Jewish communities "in concrete form." Liberty Loans and war stamps were vital means by which the government paid for the war. Like other government agencies, the War Finance Commission, chaired by President Wilson's son-in-law, Treasury Secretary William Gibbs McAddo, understood the importance of popularizing the war and launched a campaign to appeal directly to specific groups. A variant of the aforementioned

⁵⁵¹ *Advocate*, 18 October 1917. *Pilot*, 26 January 1918.

⁵⁵² "Jewish Women Organize for Liberty Loan," *Advocate*, 4 April 1918.

⁵⁵³ Elihu Stone to Alexander Whiteside, chair, Liberty Loan Executive Committee, 17 October 1917; Elihu David Stone Papers; P-555; Box 5; Folder 26; American Jewish Historical Society, Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY.

Christy poster, for example, featured immigrants gazing at the Statue of Liberty with a tagline that implored them to “Buy Bonds!”⁵⁵⁴

Ethnic leaders appealed to their readers’ ethnic patriotism and religious loyalties, reminding them, “To us, above all others, America stands for Freedom, Progress and Opportunity. Shall we not show our appreciation by liberally subscribing?”⁵⁵⁵ Similarly, during the Second Liberty Loan drive in October 1917, O’Connell appealed to Catholics to buy bonds as a way to support their Catholic servicemen and the chaplains who catered to their spiritual welfare.⁵⁵⁶ The following April, an All-American Liberty Loan Parade inaugurated the third campaign on the first anniversary of America’s entry into the war. Meant to “arouse general enthusiasm” among foreign-born residents, the parade, Rabbi Eichler noted, was composed of “all nationalities and creeds marching with a common purpose to show their loyalty to their flag and their willingness to help their Government.” It included at least 100 organizations, such as city workers, relief organizations, veterans, military bands, churches, trade unions, and ethnic societies, all carrying their war-service flags. Significantly, ethnic organizations combined American flags and red, white, and blue sashes with their nationalist colors and emblems. Days later, the Jewish Liberty Loan Committee held a patriotic demonstration and concert at Gordon’s Olympia Theatre in Scollay Square. Attended by thousands of Jews, the event featured such communal leaders as

⁵⁵⁴ “Practical Patriotism,” in O’Connell, *Sermons and Addresses*, 265-266. Kennedy, *Over There*, 100-106, 145. Taxation only accounted for a third of the \$35.5 billion dollars needed to fund the war effort and pay farmers and manufacturers for goods produced for the armies; the rest was raised through subscription.

⁵⁵⁵ *Advocate*, 11 April 1918. Another named April 21st “Adopted Americans Day,” and asked immigrants to “pledge anew their loyalty to the country of their adoption.” *Globe*, 22 April 1918.

⁵⁵⁶ See also “Knights of Columbus Buy Liberty Bonds,” *Pilot*, 27 October 1917; “Order of Hibernians,” *Pilot*, 27 October 1917. “Jews Subscribe Million in Hour,” *Advocate*, 1 November 1917.

Ellis, Mitchell, Kirstein, and Alexander Whiteside, chair of the Executive Committee for Foreign Citizens.⁵⁵⁷

Irish and Jews again linked patriotic and ethno-religious sentiments during the “Fighting Fourth” campaign launched on Columbus Day, 1918. President Wilson proclaimed the anniversary of the discoverer of America, “Liberty Day,” and a “time for celebration by purchasing” liberty bonds. Noting the day’s special meaning for American Catholics, the K. of C. responded enthusiastically to the drive, in spite of the influenza epidemic. The city’s Jewish community launched an appeal during the High Holy Days, urging individuals to give “tzedakah” (charity) in return for the “the eternal gratitude we owe to this Great Republic” as a “haven of refuge.” Wilson’s endorsement of the Zionist movement in August further showcased “the generous spirit of America toward Israel,” while confidence in their compatibility was illustrated with side-by-side notices in the *Advocate* for the Fourth Liberty Loan and the Zionist Organization of America.⁵⁵⁸

Participation on the home front was a clear indication that ethnic groups supported the war not because of coercion, but because of their desire to demonstrate their patriotism. Such activities deepened Irish and Jewish claims to acceptance as legitimate American citizens and their continued association with ethnic causes. The lesson of participation “was plain,” Cardinal O’Connell declared. “If we are first of all true and loyal Catholics...the

⁵⁵⁷ “Jews to Take Part in Liberty Loan Parade,” *Advocate*, 28 March 1918. *Advocate*, 4 April 1918. *Advocate*, 4 April 1918. *Advocate*, 4 April 1918, *Advocate*, 11 April 1918. At another parade to be held on the Fourth of July, organizations representing twenty-two immigrant groups planned to march with their national flags to the Common, where each group would sing its national hymn (*Advocate*, 27 June 1918)

⁵⁵⁸ “Columbus Day as “Liberty Day,” *Pilot*, 5 October 1918. “Jewish Liberty Loan Committee Issues an Appeal,” *Advocate*, 19 September 1918. *Advocate*, 3 October 1918. Committee workers among citizens of foreign birth and descent noted that they received “cheering responses wherever they go, and the people despite the fact that rallies and parades have been banned, because of the influenza epidemic, are subscribing bravely.”

world is bound to recognize us as the finest type of American.”⁵⁵⁹ Temple Israel President Jacob R. Morse similarly praised the congregation’s war service record. “No one, he stated confidently, “can doubt our loyalty, either as good Americans or good Jews.” War activities also brought the larger community together in “common purpose,” particularly as groups expanded their contact with government agencies and each other. The spirit of cooperation was clear, Dora Askowith, a Boston academic, wrote in 1918, “Whether it is the buying of liberty bonds,” the “furthering of the YMCA, Red Cross, Jewish Welfare Board, or Knights of Columbus Drives,” or giving “one’s all, either in material means or in human life.”⁵⁶⁰ Thus, the war emboldened many immigrants to look beyond their ethnic circle during the conflict, and after.

“One Great Clarion Call for the Motherland of Their Race”

After weeks of negotiation, the Armistice finally took effect on November 11, 1918. In Boston, as elsewhere, leaders declared a “day of general rejoicing” and organized victory parades. Cardinal O’Connell ordered the “Te Deum,” or “hymn of thanksgiving,” to be chanted at every parish, while other churches and synagogues held “victory services,” at which clergymen urged patience for returning servicemen, mercy for the enemy, and cooperation between nations. “The self-centered policies of yesterday are gone for good,” Rabbi Levi declared. “We have become a world federation in which each part is much more dependent on the rest than ever it realized.”⁵⁶¹

⁵⁵⁹ Scholars have noted the same phenomenon for other groups. See Sterba, *Good Americans*, 131-201; Ford, *Americans All*, 16-44. “His Eminence Speaks to Knights of Columbus,” *Pilot*, 8 May 1918.

⁵⁶⁰ *Temple Israel Bulletin*, June 1918, TI Archives. *Advocate*, 4 July 1918.

⁵⁶¹ *Globe*, 12 November 1918, 9. Levi, “The Armistice and After,” *Advocate*, 21 November 1918.

With hostilities ended, America turned its attention to demobilization and reconstruction. The government launched the Fifth Liberty, or “Victory,” Loan, to pay for the war, Hoover accelerated food relief for Europe, and the military began the process of getting the troops home from France.⁵⁶² Some units became part of the army of occupation in Germany, but it took six more months to organize steamship passage for the rest. A lucky few were able to travel or visit relatives in Europe, but most soldiers kept busy with drills, sports, and entertainments provided by the various welfare agencies. Back home, the K. of C. and YMHA helped soldiers to transition back to civilian life by providing welfare and employment assistance in the training camps, and sought to maintain their newfound religiosity by promoting membership in their orders. The K. of C. sought members “devoted to Catholic ideals” to continue its charitable work and fight bolshevism, while the YMHA focused on bringing Jews “back to religion.” As one leader declared, “Good Jews mean good citizens and good Americans. The war has broken down the barriers between Jews and Gentiles, Catholic and Protestant. We are all together in this war and we must be together after.”⁵⁶³

As soldiers arrived home, Americans held religious services, parades, and other celebrations to welcome their “returning heroes.” The 101st Infantry came home in time to march in South Boston’s annual Evacuation Day parade in 1919—a fitting occasion, the *Pilot* proudly noted, as “it is said that South Boston contributed more men to the various branches of the service of the country than any other section of similar size.” The K. of C.

⁵⁶² *Advocate*, 24 April 1919; *Pilot*, 3 May 1919.

⁵⁶³ Sterba, *Good Americans*, 197-198; Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 224-227. Temple Israel’s choir director, Henry Gideon, joined the Over There Theatre League, which provided music and entertainment for the troops in France (*Advocate*, 2 January 1919). *Pilot*, 21 December 1918; *Pilot*, 8 March 1919; *Pilot*, 22 March 1919; “K of C Order Will Fight Bolshevism,” *Pilot*, 5 April 1919; *Advocate*, 14 November 1918, 7. *Advocate*, 24 April 1919.

and Irish societies held receptions for the 5,000 servicemen of “Southie,” as well as the thousands of other Irish soldiers in other neighborhoods. Jewish servicemen were similarly feted; Jewish Welfare Board representatives greeted them as their ships came into the docks, and in February, the YMHA sponsored a Victory Ball for returning servicemen. Churches and synagogues also held Memorial Day services to honor their war dead.⁵⁶⁴

Communal appreciation was also demonstrated in more lasting tributes. St. Mary’s Church in Charlestown, for example, dedicated a memorial window to honor the parish’s 1100 servicemen, including the nineteen who died. The National Catholic War Council, American Jewish Committee, AOH, YMHA, and other groups compiled honor rolls to document the thousands who served. As *Advocate* editor Joseph Brin noted, an honor roll was “a patriotic address in itself”; “strong evidence of what Jews have always done—stood shoulder to shoulder with their Gentile brethren” to defend America.⁵⁶⁵ In later years, Irish and Jewish “doughboys” remained active in Armistice Day celebrations, military reunions, and veteran associations, ever conscious of the “honor and prestige” their war service brought them and its legitimization of their role as ethnic Americans.⁵⁶⁶

Most importantly, war participation gave ethnic Americans confidence to assert ethnic concerns. The *Advocate*, for example, protested “un-American” anti-Jewish patronage signs and discrimination against immigrants, including one Russian Jewish couple whose four sons fought in France, and had certainly “earned the right” to live in America. Jews also engaged in a campaign to raise awareness of pogroms sweeping across Eastern Europe at the

⁵⁶⁴ “South Boston Will See Her Brave Boys,” *Pilot*, 22 February 1919; *Pilot*, 10 May 1919. “Returning Jewish Heroes Welcomed,” *Advocate*, 23 January 1919; “YMHA Victory Ball,” *Advocate*, 6 February 1919.

⁵⁶⁵ *Pilot*, 7 June 1919. *Pilot*, 6 October 1917; *Advocate*, 28 March 1918; *Advocate*, 14 November 1918.

⁵⁶⁶ Sterba, *Good Americans*, 196-198; Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 224-227. Shay, *Yankee Division in the First World War*, 25; *Advocate*, 6 November 1919; *Pilot*, 10 November 1928. *Advocate*, 22 July 1920.

end of the war, just as Allied leaders met at Versailles to determine the status of “liberty-loving Poland.”⁵⁶⁷ A meeting at Tremont Temple in May featured such luminaries as former President Howard Taft, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator David I. Walsh, Governor Calvin Coolidge, and activist Alice Stone Blackwell, proving to Boston’s Jews that their concerns mattered to non-Jewish leaders. In December, a “Jewish Protest Day” against massacres in the Ukraine and Poland included a solemn parade, in which hundreds of veterans marched in uniform as a visible reminder of what the Allies “owed” the Jews. At an accompanying rally, Cardinal O’Connell’s representative, Reverend Michael J. Scanlan, denounced the atrocities and assured Jews of Catholic sympathy.⁵⁶⁸

The pogroms exemplified the importance of ensuring minority rights at the Versailles Peace Conference. Convened in January 1919, the conference was to be a “world tribunal to make disposals and restorations, solve multifarious problems, define boundaries, consider the formation of a League of Nations, and, last but not least, relieve the smaller and oppressed nationalities.” Because of the idealistic promises of his Fourteen Points, President Wilson faced pressure from all sides; although the British and French wanted reparations, the Germans expected “peace without victory,” and various ethnic groups demanded self-determination.⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁷ *Advocate*, 25 July 1918; *Advocate*, 18 July 1918. See also *Advocate*, 28 November 1918; *Advocate*, 12 December 1918. Sterba, *Good Americans*, 207-209; *Advocate*, 5 December 1918. Relations between Jews and Poles in America also soured as Polish leaders denied the attacks. *Advocate*, 16 January 1919; *Advocate*, 23 January 1919; *Globe*, 2 June 1919, 12. Boston’s Poles held a protest meeting in June (*Globe*, 9 June 1919, 1).

⁵⁶⁸ *Advocate*, 22 May 1919; *Advocate*, 18 December 1919; *Advocate*, 25 December 1919. Scanlan’s speech was possibly an attempt to make up for O’Connell’s words to Polish Catholics in June. He denounced the attacks, but doubted the Poles, “as Catholics,” could be the perpetrators (*Pilot*, 14 June 1919). Coolidge expressed similar ambivalence when Elihu Stone protested his attendance at a Polish Day event. Coolidge to Stone, 22 January 1919; Stone Papers; Box 3: Folder 4.

⁵⁶⁹ “A Jewish Cause,” *Advocate*, 13 March 1919.

Like the Poles, Czechs, and other groups, American Irish nationalists and Zionists lobbied intensely to gain a hearing by citing their war service and the legitimacy of their causes, but, while highly organized and politically connected, the two groups did not have universal support. Although Wilson had earlier been in favor of Home Rule for Ireland, by 1919, he was tired of “unreasonable” Irish-American demands for a republic and worried about maintaining Anglo-American cooperation and British support for the League of Nations. Conversely, he publicly endorsed Zionism, even though a Jewish state in Palestine ran counter to the ideal of self-determination for Arab residents. Over the next six months, as the Allies deliberated the treaty, Irish nationalists and Zionists operated intensive propaganda campaigns to influence public opinion and the peace commission’s decision.⁵⁷⁰

Although Irish nationalists never stopped lobbying during the war, many Irish Americans had avoided appearances of disloyalty. After the Armistice, however, they “raised their voices in one great clarion call for the motherland of their race,” realizing “there was a difference,” as historian John B. Duff notes, “between being pro-German in 1916 and being in favor of Irish self-determination in 1919.” They had more than proved their patriotism; it was time that America keep its promise of assistance.⁵⁷¹ Nevertheless, the Friends of Irish Freedom were conscious of the president’s reluctance to risk British enmity. “It is plainly evident that Wilson will ignore the Irish question,” Boston’s Matthew Cummings remarked to FOIF president Daniel Cohalan, except when “his hand is forced by public opinion.”

⁵⁷⁰ Levi, “Peace Congress and the Jews,” *Advocate*, 9 January 1919; *Advocate*, 14 November 1918; *Pilot*, 30 November 1918; *Pilot*, 7 December 1918. Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 121-144; O’Grady, *Immigrants’ Influence on Wilson’s Peace Policies*, 67-77, 305-317. Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 81-83. Also, the State Department objected because America had never declared war on Turkey. Antisemitism undoubtedly played a role as well.

⁵⁷¹ “Friends of Irish Freedom,” *Pilot*, 13 April 1918. John B. Duff, “The Versailles Treaty and the Irish-Americans,” *Journal of American History* Vol. 55, no. 3 (December 1968): 587. *Pilot*, 21 June 1919. *Pilot*, 30 November 1918.

Thus, the Friends initiated a vocal, grassroots movement that would compel the American government to pressure Britain regarding Irish independence.⁵⁷²

In early December, the FOIF organized “Self-Determination for Ireland” Week. Meetings emphasized “unswerving loyalty” to America, attracting thousands of people, including servicemen. Illustrating the movement’s new mass appeal, Mayor Peters expressed his hope, like “all American citizens,” to see a “satisfactory” resolution for Ireland, while newly elected Senator David I. Walsh and Cardinal O’Connell openly announced support for Irish self-determination. At one meeting on Boston Common, for example, O’Connell declared that as “one in whose veins flows the purest of Irish blood,” it was his “duty to aid her just and righteous cause.” He also voiced his confidence, like others, in Wilson’s ability to work for “entire and unequivocal justice to the Irish nation.”⁵⁷³

Later that week, O’Connell demonstrated his national influence in a speech entitled, “Ireland: One and Indivisible,” at New York’s Madison Square Garden, sharing the stage with Cohalan, John Devoy, and other FOIF leaders. Justice for Ireland was the “test of sincerity” for the Allies, he declared to the 12,000 attendees. “Ireland must be allowed to tell the world...how she wishes to be governed. Speak up Ireland; make the world hear you! Wake up England, for the world is watching you!” The respected prelate’s speech was hailed as “a trumpet-call to the race,” which increased broad-based support for the FOIF. Cohalan also asserted Irish-American patriotism. “The Irish race in America have freely given their

⁵⁷² Cummings and Cohalan, quoted in Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 82. Also, the *Pilot* reported, the British *Daily Mail* warned that “sooner or later, [the Irish issue] will rise to plague us; it will embarrass us at the peace conference; it will be a source of discord...between the United States and ourselves” (*Pilot*, 23 November 1918).

⁵⁷³ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 84. *Pilot*, 14 December 1918. *Pilot*, 21 December 1918; “Ireland’s Claims Must Be Considered,” *Pilot*, 7 December 1918. O’Connell also sent a private message to the British ambassador in Washington asking for recognition of Ireland’s self-determination (O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 234).

blood and lives and linked themselves with everything so essentially American,” he avowed, that “they may now say...‘stand for the people whose sons have stood for you and show grateful recognition so well as vindicate right and justice.’” The convention voted to present Wilson with resolutions upholding Irish rights to self-determination as a people deprived of self-governance by force.⁵⁷⁴

The Friends capitalized on the movement’s newfound popularity by inviting various Irish-American societies to participate in the third Irish Race Convention, which convened in Philadelphia on Washington’s Birthday. Five thousand individuals attended, including Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, who, endorsing the movement for the first time, read out the resolution to “pledge our best efforts to unify and solidify” American opinion behind national self-determination for Ireland. To help achieve this goal, the FOIF endorsed the Irish Victory Fund, raising \$1.5 million that the first day. These publicity efforts, as well as the deteriorating situation in Ireland, helped increase membership from 6,000 in February to 70,000 in December.⁵⁷⁵ Emboldened by their success, convention attendees also appointed a delegation to present President Wilson, briefly returned to the United States during a lull in peace negotiations, with their resolutions. Wilson agreed to the meeting, but demanded Cohalan’s exclusion based on his previous German involvement, ironically boosting the judge’s status among Irish Americans. The president also hoped to pacify those who believed that ignoring the Irish situation would harm Democrats in the 1920 election and damage chances for the peace treaty’s ratification. Boston FOIF leader Peter Conroy, for example, had reminded Senator Walsh in early February that Democrats should “repay the

⁵⁷⁴ *Pilot*, 14 December 1918; O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 233-235. Rev. Florence J. Halloran to O’Connell, 12 December 1918; O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 5:9. *Pilot*, 5 April 1919.

⁵⁷⁵ *Pilot*, 1 March 1919. *Pilot*, 1 March 1919. Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 92.

debt it owes to the Irish race. If it fails us there, we shall fail the Democratic Party.” Even so, Wilson flatly refused to champion Ireland or to pressure Britain. The new League of Nations would address Home Rule, he argued; he refused to interfere in Britain’s “domestic affair” in the meantime.⁵⁷⁶

Irish Americans clearly disagreed. While they recognized the distinction between Ireland’s situation and that of nations ruled by the Central Powers, they believed self-determination was a principle that should “apply equally to all people.” Despite their disappointment in Wilson, they continued to petition their local officials and Congress to support Irish freedom, with much greater success. In early March, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution asking the peace conference to “favorably consider” the Irish cause. While not a declaration of action, it was still seen as a major victory. That St. Patrick’s Day, Boston, like other cities, “fairly seethed with the discussion of ‘The Irish Question’” as citizens gathered to “proclaim their unchanging resolve to ‘Fight the Good Fight’ until Justice and Freedom and Peace” were won.⁵⁷⁷ Based on the growing strength of the republican movement in Ireland, and Wilson’s refusal to assist their cause, the FOIF was also now more willing to advocate openly for outright independence, rather than the ambiguous “self-determination.”⁵⁷⁸ In April, the third anniversary of the Easter Rising was

⁵⁷⁶ *Pilot*, 8 March 1919. Wilson was vindicated in the 1920 elections, as Irish and Germans still voted Democratic Conroy, quoted in Duff, “Versailles Treaty and the Irish-Americans,” 587. In fact, Vought notes that Lloyd George later congratulated him on his handling of the “impossible” Irish, and Wilson commented that he would have granted home rule, “but not the movie rights”; he felt that the Irish were incapable of self-government, at this point. Vought also argues that the controversy stirred up feelings of religious prejudices in Wilson. (Vought, *Bully Pulpit*, 121, 142-144).

⁵⁷⁷ “Asks that Ireland’s Cause Be Considered,” *Pilot*, 15 February 1919; *Pilot*, 22 February 1919; *Pilot*, 1 March 1919. “St. Patrick’s Day,” *Pilot*, 15 March 1919. “Everywhere the Key-Note was Self-Determination,” *Pilot*, 22 March 1919.

⁵⁷⁸ As Michael Doorley argues, Cohalan’s emphasis on Americanism to win broad-based support had irked American representatives of Sinn Féin, who insisted on stronger language to avoid confusion regarding their goal (*Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 85-87).

celebrated with the FOIF-sponsored “Recognition of the Irish Republic” Week. In Boston, thousands gathered at rallies featuring the “generous display” of the Irish Republican flag, the Irish Freedom Fund, and speakers representing all classes of Irish America, as well as representatives of the Dáil Eireann. Attendees pledged continued cooperation in securing American recognition of the Irish republic, as well as support for gaining Ireland a hearing. Such meetings continued through the summer.⁵⁷⁹

Early in the war, American Jewish leaders had also discussed the need for a representative agency to defend Jewish interests in the peace negotiations, given their diverse cultural makeup and concerns. The Zionist Organization of the America, obviously, was focused on obtaining rights to Palestine, but the non-Zionist American Jewish Committee (AJC) was more concerned about providing relief for, and protecting the civil liberties of, European Jews, especially given the situation in Eastern Europe. After years of negotiations, disagreements, and delays, the American Jewish Congress met at Philadelphia in December 1918. Delegates included Louis Brandeis, Harvard Professor Felix Frankfurter, Louis Kirstein, and Jacob de Haas, as well as two AJC members, Jacob Schiff and Louis Marshall, who had recently become sympathetic to Zionism. The delegates elected a commission to represent American Jews at Versailles and wrote a petition asking for recognition of a Jewish homeland and civil liberties in the new sovereign European states.⁵⁸⁰ Like the Irish

⁵⁷⁹ “Boston’s Voice for Free Ireland,” *Pilot*, 5 April 1919. Speakers included Cohalan, Devoy, Cummings, LAOH president Mary McWhorter, Mayor Curley, O’Connell’s representative Father Splaine, Martha Moore Avery, FOIF president Peter E. Magennis, secretary Diarmuid Lynch, and East Galway TD Liam Mellows (“Recognition of Irish Republic,” *Pilot*, 19 April 1919; *Pilot*, 26 April 1919; *Pilot*, 19 April 1919). For other meetings, see *Pilot*, 10 May 1919; *Pilot* 17 May 1919; *Pilot*, 28 June 1919.

⁵⁸⁰ Resentful of Zionist control, some Jewish organizations opted out of the Congress, including some members of the AJC, the United American Hebrew Association (UAHC), the International Order of B’nai B’rith, and the National Workingmen’s Committee. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 164-194, 224-230; *Advocate*, 10 February 1916; “Wilson in Favor of Jewish Congress,” *Advocate*, 5 July 1917. “Jewish Congress Postponed Until Peace is in Sight,” *Advocate*, 16 October 1917; *Advocate*, 12 December 1918. In 1917, 15,500 in Boston had

nationalists, Zionists also appealed to politicians. In Massachusetts, they received the support of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator David I. Walsh, and Governor Calvin Coolidge, as well as the state's House of Representatives, which became the first state body to endorse both principles.⁵⁸¹

Even so, many American Jews continued to believe that a Jewish state would have a negative effect on their position elsewhere. The AJC had only reluctantly endorsed the Balfour Declaration, while the Central Conference of Reform Rabbis (CCAR) and the United American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) adopted resolutions in opposition.⁵⁸² In Boston, the main opposition was Temple Israel, whose membership consisted mainly of upwardly mobile, assimilated Jews. Although some members, such as Louis Kirstein, were Zionists, the temple was officially non-Zionist. "All Jews have a religious, historical and sentimental interest in Palestine," Rabbi Levi avowed, but there was an "absurdity" to "swearing allegiance to two different flags." The board held to this position, voting unanimously against the Congress's petition when the Zionist Bureau circulated it. The "very meaning of freedom is unintelligible to them," Rabbi Eichler declared in disbelief. "Fortunately, it is only the very insignificant minority of our people that takes this attitude."⁵⁸³

Non-Zionists continued to associate the movement with immigrants, arguing that they actually represented the majority of native-born Jews, as well as those foreign born

voted for delegates, including Frankfurter, Kirstein, Mitchell, Henry H. Levenson, Nathan Pinanski, Mrs. S. Goodman, Julius Meyer, David Stern, and Albert Hurvitz. Joseph Brin attended as the *Advocate's* representative (*Advocate*, 14 June 1917, *Advocate*, 21 June 1917). For results, see "Jewish Cause," *Advocate*, 13 March 1919; "Memorandum for Jewish State," *Advocate*, 26 March 1919.

⁵⁸¹ *Advocate*, 21 November 1918. *Advocate*, 20 February 1919. Representative Elihu D. Stone introduced the measure. Coolidge to Stone, 22 January 1919; Stone Papers; Box 3: Folder 4.

⁵⁸² "Rabbis Oppose Jewish Nation in Palestine," *Globe*, 5 July 1918, 15.

⁵⁸³ *Advocate*, 19 December 1918. "Zionist Petition Rapidly Circulating," *Advocate*, 16 January 1919.

“who have lived here long enough to thoroughly assimilate American political and social conditions.” In March, a group of prominent non-Zionists drafted an appeal to Wilson that countered the Jewish Congress’ petition. They sympathized with Zionist aims to secure oppressed Jews a refuge in Palestine, but feared the limitation of citizenship rights in Europe; Jewish war service had “once and for all shattered the base aspersions of the anti-Semites which charged them with being aliens in every land, incapable of true patriotism,” and they hated to jeopardize these gains. Several Bostonians signed the appeal, including Temple Israel Rabbi Levi, President Jacob R. Morse, and trustee Lee M. Friedman, causing a storm of criticism. One *Advocate* reader linked non-Zionists with the “Bolsheviki,” arguing they were “bathing in patriotism, to hide [their] German birth,” and called for two Boston signers to resign from the Jewish Relief Committee. Another reader, however, felt his words were “undemocratic, un-American, and out of joint with the spirit of the time.”⁵⁸⁴ Temple Israel trustee A.C. Ratschesky addressed the controversy at the UAHC’s convention in Boston that May, lamenting that “America is the best homeland the Jew has ever found and yet many seem to be discontented here.” Backing this statement, the UAHC reaffirmed its resolution that Reform Jews were “Jews in religion and Americans in nationality”; they did not seek “any national homeland,” as “Israel is at home in every free country.”⁵⁸⁵

In the meantime, Jewish delegations from Great Britain and the United States went to Paris to plead their case. Minority rights were assured, at least in the short term, as part of a series of treaties with the new European states, while the American Middle East

⁵⁸⁴ M. Aronson, *Advocate*, 3 April 1919. The signers were Abraham Koshland and Julius Eiseman. Alexander Rose, *Advocate*, 17 April 1919. Naomi Wiener Cohen, “The Reaction of Reform Judaism in America to Political Zionism,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 40 (1950-1951): 367-369. See also Naomi W. Cohen, *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2003), 39-63.

⁵⁸⁵ *Advocate*, 22 May 1919; “Urges Jews to Work for Their Religion,” *Boston Herald*, 22 May 1919, 6.

Commission's recommendations included the establishment of an independent state in Palestine as a British protectorate. Jews would be invited to settle the region, and, as a minority group, promised a mandate under the League of Nations. Despite this support, a Jewish state was by no means assured, given British and French struggles over the territory. Also, after an investigating commission sent to the region discovered that few Arabs favored Jewish settlement, it realized that a minority state was hardly consistent with Wilson's ideals of self-determination. Even so, Britain was finally granted the Palestinian mandate in April 1920 at a conference in San Remo, Italy, with the understanding that a "Jewish national home" would be established that guaranteed the rights of Arab citizens. Although Arabs protested, Zionists hailed the decision as a great victory, and immediately issued a call for a convention to begin preparation for Jewish settlement.⁵⁸⁶

The FOIF also sent delegates to Paris. The American Commission on Irish Independence was charged with convincing the British to allow the Irish representatives, Eamon de Valera, Arthur Griffith, and Count George Noble Plunkett, to plead their case. While ultimately not successful, the commission generated much publicity and kept enthusiasm at a fever pitch upon their return to America. For example, delegate Michael J. Ryan of Philadelphia, a former leader of the United Irish League of America, spoke at Boston's Mechanics Hall in June, along with Cardinal O'Connell and Judge Cohalan, regarding the Irish question, which, he argued, was "far more pertinent at this time than the woes of Armenians, Serbians, or Czechs or even the sufferings of Belgium." For the *Pilot*, sympathy for Ireland and American patriotism went hand in hand. "It would have brought

⁵⁸⁶ *Advocate*, 29 April 1920. Jews throughout Greater Boston held meetings and parades in celebration of the San Remo Agreement. See, for example, *Advocate*, 24 June 1920; *Advocate*, 24 June 1920.

tears to the eyes of our soldiers across the seas,” it remarked, “to have seen the patriotic promptness with which the audience rose en masse when the strains of the ‘Star Spangled Banner’ broke forth.” At the same time, the “American” crowd’s “cold resentment” of England was evidenced by the subscription of \$100,000 for the Irish National Fund. O’Connell reiterated this idea, claiming Britain could no longer contend that Ireland was an internal affair, but one of “universal justice” and “the universal principle of self determination.” In addition, although the Irish question was ultimately ignored in Paris, Cohalan thanked the U.S. Senate for its “patriotic and sympathetic action” in passing the Borah Resolution, expressing support for Irish aspirations for self-government by a vote of 60-1, with an amendment requesting a hearing for Ireland.⁵⁸⁷

Hoping to benefit from Irish-American outrage over the peace conference, President Eamon de Valera embarked on an eighteen-month-long fundraising tour to of the United States that summer. Boston, like other cities, was “stirred to its very depths” upon his arrival in June. During his stay, de Valera and his secretary, Harry Boland, like countless Irish politicians before, held several mass meetings at which they referenced events of the Revolution and compared Irish and American principles of freedom and democracy. At Bunker Hill, the Irish president noted that just as America’s defeat at Charlestown prepared for victory at Yorktown, so too would Ireland’s defeats lead to her independence. At Fenway Park, the Irish delegation addressed a crowd of 50,000, joined by Mayor Peters, Senator Walsh, and local Irish leaders. Acknowledging fears of disloyalty, Boland noted that they did not come to “interfere in American politics,” but to ask Irish Americans to “join their voices in communion” with Irish at home, “to ask that here in America you claim the debt America

⁵⁸⁷ *Pilot*, 14 June 1919.

owes Ireland.” Walsh, meanwhile, argued that Irish Americans owed it to their ancestors and those “who died for the USA,” to bring about “the promise of a new day, of a new hope, when the flag of our ancestors will wave in triumph and in freedom.” Claiming to speak for all of Irish America, he declared, “There can be no league of peace until Ireland is free.”⁵⁸⁸

The League of Nations would prove to be the most controversial aspect of the Treaty of Versailles for Irish Americans and other groups. Wilson succeeded in getting his prize included in the final version of the treaty, which the delegates signed on June 28, but Congress still had to ratify it. Given the extent of Wilson’s compromises in Paris, the treaty and the league engendered much debate. Most Irish Americans were opposed to the league as an alliance with England and lobbied intensively against the organization, arguing that it supported imperialism and endangered American international autonomy.⁵⁸⁹ Jews were also divided. In Boston, several Jews, for example, including Rabbis Israeli and Levi, supported the league, believing it would help realize the “dream” of universal peace and justice, but others, including Chaplain Abraham Nowak, argued that the League was “a weapon of war” similar to the Monroe Doctrine, controlled by “majority will.” Instead, he advocated Bolshevism, which was “not anarchism.”⁵⁹⁰ Senators Lodge, Walsh, and William Borah led the fight against the treaty and the League of Nations in Congress. Doorley notes that for Lodge and Borah, the ethnic causes became “convenient means of gaining allies.” Walsh,

⁵⁸⁸ “Great Irish Leader Honored by Boston,” *Pilot*, 5 July 1919; *Pilot*, 28 June 1919.

⁵⁸⁹ Nationalists railed against the league throughout 1919 (see, for example, *Pilot*, 19 April 1919; *Pilot*, 3 May 1919; *Pilot*, 14 June 1919). Doorley notes that the spending of FOIF funds to combat the league was a source of contention between American and Irish nationalist factions (see *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 95-104).

⁵⁹⁰ Israeli, *Advocate*, 5 December 1918, 2; Levi, “America Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow,” *Advocate*, 13 February 1919; Nowak, *Advocate*, 16 January 1919. John H. Flanagan, “United States Senator David I. Walsh and the League of Nations Issue, 1918-1920” (M.A. thesis: University of Detroit, 1962).

while certainly influenced by the Irish struggle, also insisted on the League's inefficacy. Irish-American nationalists viewed the League's defeat in America as their greatest achievement.⁵⁹¹

Conclusion

Most Irish and Jewish Americans saw their participation in World War I as a clear test of their ethnic patriotism. Even before the United States entered the conflict, ethnic Americans lobbied for the support of their homeland in the struggle; such efforts were perfectly in keeping with American neutrality, they argued, despite protests against “hyphenated Americanism,” because of the clear Anglo-American bias toward the Allies. After April 1917, President Wilson’s “Fourteen Points” allowed ethnic nationalists to link America’s role as the promoter of self-determination with their fight for independence—regardless of which side their “small nation” was on. For Zionists, the Balfour Agreement and America’s entrance made the goal of a Jewish state in Palestine a real possibility, but hopes of Irish liberation through an English defeat were disappointed, necessitating that Irish self-determination become part of American war aims.

Once their wartime concerns had converged, Irish and Jewish Americans committed themselves to the war effort, but they did not simply melt into the dominant culture. Despite an often determined and organized campaign of conformity and intimidation during the war, most ethnic Americans objected to the government’s Anglo-centric campaigns of “100 percent Americanism.” Instead, Irish Catholics and Jews emphasized their patriotism and fought to ensure that their groups received the respect and recognition they deserved.

⁵⁹¹ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 102-103. Alan J. Ward, *Ireland and Anglo-American Relations, 1899-1921* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), 189-213. “Senator Lodge Champions Senator Walsh’s Americanism,” *Newsletter of the Irish National Bureau*, No. 20, 14 November 1919, in Burns Library.

As in the past, Irish and Jewish Americans realized that military service was the most powerful example of loyalty. Thousands joined the new American Expeditionary Force, serving with great distinction. Irish and Jews gloried in the bravery of their servicemen, proudly displaying the service flags that were the evidence of their service. Organizations like the Knights of Columbus and Jewish Welfare Board oversaw religious and welfare work for the thousands of Catholic and Jews in the service, and many reported an increased religiosity as a result of their efforts. Their non-sectarian morale services also promoted a feeling of good-will and cooperation among soldiers of different faiths that lasted beyond the war camp. Ever conscious of the “honor and prestige” their war service brought them, Irish and Jewish “doughboys” remained active in Armistice Day celebrations, military reunions, and veteran associations.

In response to government propaganda campaigns appealing to Americans’ patriotism and spirit of self-sacrifice, Irish and Jewish Americans also participated wholeheartedly in the domestic war effort. Men and women viewed relief work, conservation efforts, Red Cross work, and Liberty Loan rallies as an opportunity to “demonstrate practical patriotism” and give back to their adopted homeland that had given them freedom. Their widespread participation was a clear indication that ethnic Americans supported the war not because of coercion, but because of their desire to demonstrate their patriotism. Such activities deepened Irish and Jewish claims to acceptance as legitimate American citizens and brought the larger community together in common purpose.

After the Armistice, Irish and Jews turned their attention to gaining independence for their homelands. Confident of their success, American Irish nationalists and Zionists lobbied intensely to gain a hearing by citing their war service and the legitimacy of their

causes. In the end, although the Versailles conference failed to yield the desired results for both groups, they did not lose hope, but instead continued their struggles after the war.

As historian Christopher Sterba acknowledges, “the war did not transform relations between native-born and immigrant groups for all time and for the better.” Discrimination still existed, and would, as ethnic Americans were beginning to realize, only increase after the war.⁵⁹² In the 1920s, both groups contended with various unresolved issues, including immigration restriction, labor radicalism, and ethnic nationalism, that challenged their hard-won acceptance during the war. Despite, or perhaps because of, a resurgence of nativism, Irish and Jews in Boston became more outspoken in political advocacy for their communities and their engagement in ethnic causes, ever mindful of their wartime service and their status as loyal Americans.

⁵⁹² Sterba, *Good Americans*, 196.

Chapter 6: Ethnic-American Assertion in the “Tribal Twenties,” 1919-1929

The war has brought out the best that was in us all...We have made our sacrifices and they were enormous, but today [Irish] Catholics see their power as a social unit and are determined to see to it that the unity they showed in war-times is expressed in a visible way in peace-time. There can be no question about Catholic loyalty or sincerity any more. There never were any grounds for such suspicions...Such illusions in the future will be unpardonable.

—“Catholic Unity,” *Pilot*, 1 February 1919

The campaign shows the true Americanism of the entire Jewish Community, and has added to the esteem in which we are held...the old spirit of Jewry is not being lost in its modern setting” and “our Americanism is better on account of that spirit. The center of modern Jewry has shifted to America, and it therefore behooves all Jewish communities to take an interest in Jewish communal affairs, so that they may be better Americans through that participation.

—Louis E. Kirstein, director, Boston Federation Campaign, *Advocate*, 13 November 1919

In the aftermath of World War I, Irish and Jews in Boston, like immigrant groups elsewhere, confidently expected that their wartime service had won them acceptance as loyal citizens, respect for their ethnic distinctions, and sympathy for their nationalist causes. This confidence proved to be premature, however, as fears of subversion and disorder manifested in the Red Scare’s crusade against foreigners, radicals, and labor agitators. Unperturbed, Irish Catholics and Jews continued to assert their cultural and religious identities within the context of Americanism, seeking to enhance their group consciousness and prove their contributions as ethnic patriots.

Mass involvement in ethnic nationalist movements was part of this process, building on the wartime emphasis on self-determination. American Zionists continued to agitate for a Jewish homeland, encouraged by the British mandate in Palestine, while the onset of the Anglo-Irish War enhanced Irish-American efforts to gain recognition for the Irish Republic, despite their rejection at the Versailles Peace Conference. Even so, both movements faced internal disagreements over American and European priorities, contributing to problems that limited their support from mainstream America. The creation of the Irish Free State in

1922 satisfied most Irish-American goals for respectability, although a minority continued to agitate for a republic. Arab revolts in Palestine and increased antisemitism unified American Jews regarding the need for a Jewish state, but delayed the possibility for implementation.

By the early 1920s, the resumption of large-scale immigration and fears that the United States was being overrun by “less desirable races” led to increased calls for Americanization and restriction based on national quotas. “The decade was one of ongoing cultural warfare centered around issues of race, ethnicity, and religion,” historian John F. McClymer writes. “Questions of who was a ‘real’ American” dominated politics.⁵⁹³ Irish and Jewish leaders in Boston, as elsewhere, protested these developments. Stressing a pluralist view of American culture, in which all groups regardless of ethnicity or creed are accorded the same rights, they pointed to their longstanding dedication to democratic principles and their service during the war to demonstrate their integral role in the country. They also engaged in efforts to increase interfaith and interethnic understanding.

Mass migration ended with the passage of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act, but immigrants continued to face discrimination and pressure to conform to Anglo-Protestant ideals. As the 1920s drew to a close, ethnic leaders were determined to ensure the durability and respectability of ethnic and religious culture. Through religious education, institutional life, and mass media such as radio and movies, immigrants and their offspring found a compromise between traditional and American culture, creating a new hybrid culture in their attempts to negotiate between the two.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹³ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925*, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 167-169. John F. McClymer, “Passing from Light into Dark,” <http://www1.assumption.edu:80/ahc/1920s/Passing.html>, accessed 5 April 2010.

⁵⁹⁴ Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours For What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City*,

“Freedom Now is What He Wants for His Own Native Land”

As discussed in Chapter 5, the heady months after the Armistice saw gratitude toward the immigrant soldier and declarations to fulfill the pledge of self-determination for those “races who have done so much for America.” Regardless of the veracity of such promises, the confidence they inspired allowed ethnic Americans to believe they were acting “not as undigested hyphenates fighting for a foreign cause, but as patriotic Americans pursuing a logical extension of America’s basic beliefs.” As a result, ethnic nationalist movements garnered mass appeal in the postwar period and achieved great strides for various “small nations,” especially an Irish republic and a Jewish state in Palestine.⁵⁹⁵

By 1916, Irish nationalists had gained the support of communal leaders like Cardinal O’Connell, whose involvement was evidence of the movement’s respectability and who encouraged large numbers of American-born Irish to participate. In addition, in the aftermath of the Irish failure at Versailles and the League of Nations controversy, such popular songs as Charles Lawlor’s “Irish Liberty” (1920) stated that Ireland deserved independence due to Irish service during the war:

An Irish boy in Yankee land sailed across the sea,
To fight for Uncle Same and France—for home and liberty,
He fought the fight and victory won—for freedom took his stand,
And freedom now is what he wants for his own native land.”⁵⁹⁶

1870-1920 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Andrew R. Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption, and the Search for American Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990); Marilyn Halter, *Shopping for Identity: The Marketing of Ethnicity* (New York: Schocken Books, 2000).

⁵⁹⁵ David I. Walsh, “Our Debt and Duty to the Immigrant,” *Advocate*, 13 March 1919. June Granatir Alexander, *Ethnic Pride, American Patriotism: Slovaks and Other New Immigrants in the Interwar Era* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2004), 44. Timothy J. Meagher, ed., *From Paddy to Studs: Irish-American Communities in the Turn of the Century Era, 1880-1920* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 12-13. For tributes, see *Advocate*, 21 November 1918; *Pilot*, 4 January 1919; *Advocate*, 29 April 1920; *Pilot*, 28 February 1920.

⁵⁹⁶ In 1920, for example, President Eamon de Valera received an honorary degree from the College of the Holy Cross. De Valera to Cardinal O’Connell, 30 November 1921; William Cardinal O’Connell Papers: General

Not everyone countenanced this rationale, however. With the outbreak of the Anglo-Irish War, Anglophile groups such as the Loyal Coalition and the Orange Order painted the rebels as socialists and discouraged American support by emphasizing a shared Anglo-Saxon identity at events like the 1920 *Mayflower* tercentenary. Nativists, including social worker Joseph Lee, also renewed attacks on Irish America. “The hatred of everything English or American that is preached every Sunday by Cardinal O’Connell,” he wrote, “gives some line on the real Americanism of one section of the Irish and also of the kind of a life they would lead Ulster if they had her in their power.”⁵⁹⁷ As in the past, Irish Americans responded by highlighting their democratic ideals and comparing the Irish struggle with the American Revolution. It was “NOT un-American to agitate in this country FOR FREEDOM for any subject race,” the Irish Victory Fund Advisory Committee insisted, but it was “un-American to agitate in this country AGAINST FREEDOM for any subject race.”⁵⁹⁸

As the war in Ireland intensified through 1921, Irish Americans followed events closely. The Irish Republican Army (IRA) engaged in systematic guerilla attacks on the Royal Irish Constabulary, leading to many casualties and resignations, and, finally, the creation of

Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 4:9. See also O’Connell’s speech in *Newsletter of the Irish National Bureau*, No. 25, 19 December 1919; “Ex-Service Men Demand Fulfillment of War-time Pledges,” *Newsletter of the Irish National Bureau*, No. 27, 2 January 1920; “Ireland’s Cause Forcefully Presented,” *Pilot*, 6 March 1920; “Ireland’s Cause Strongly Endorsed,” *Pilot*, 18 September 1920. For song lyrics, see William H.A. Williams, *’Twas Only an Irishman’s Dream: The Image of Ireland and the Irish in American Popular Song Lyrics, 1800-1920* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 188.

⁵⁹⁷ Damien Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924” (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005), 222-245; Michael Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism: The Friends of Irish Freedom, 1916-1935* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 123-124. Quote in Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 41-42.

⁵⁹⁸ IVFAC Open Letter to the Loyal Coalition, March 1920, quoted in Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 319. One nationalist compared “humorous” protests regarding the “mystical Hibernian Republic” and its “sinister efforts” to “undermine” the American government to British loyalists. Francis A. Campbell, “The ‘Blue Light’ Patriots of America or the Loyal Coalition of Toryism and Storeyism,” 30 March 1920, in John J. Burns Library, Boston College. See also *Pilot*, 1 May 1920; *Pilot*, 5 June 1920.

the infamous “Black and Tans,” a contingent of ex-soldiers who had served in the Great War. These troops harassed, beat, and murdered civilians and destroyed private properties to gain information. In October, the lord mayor of Cork, Terence MacSwiney, died after a seventy-four day hunger strike to protest his internment for sedition. In November, Michael Collins’s IRA squad killed fourteen intelligence officers, after which the Black and Tans opened fire at a Gaelic football game at Dublin’s Croke Park in reprisal, killing twelve. The day became known as “Bloody Sunday.”⁵⁹⁹

Such events mobilized Irish Americans as never before. In Boston, the Charitable Irish Society, Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH), Irish county associations, Knights of Columbus (K. of C.), and labor unions raised funds for humanitarian relief and in support of the recognition of the Irish republic. After MacSwiney’s death, the Friends of Irish Freedom (FOIF) and the AOH organized a parade and mass rally on Boston Common, during which Senator David I. Walsh spoke to a crowd of 100,000. In subsequent months, Boston received a flurry of visits from MacSwiney’s widow and sister, the new Lord Mayor of Cork, and others. Tributes flooded the Irish press; local poet Denis A. McCarthy compared MacSwiney to Crispus Attucks, who was similarly “crowned with martyrdom.”⁶⁰⁰ Martin J.

⁵⁹⁹ For more on the war, which lasted from January 1919 to July 1921, see Michael Hopkinson, *The Irish War of Independence* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2002). For letters and reporting, see, for example, Shane Leslie, “Complete System of Militarism Now Reigns Through Ireland,” *Pilot*, 10 January 1920; “Gives Vivid Account of Conditions in Tralee,” *Pilot*, 4 December 1920; Mary Kenny O’Sullivan to Sarah Farrelly, 21 March 1923; General J.L. Fausett to Kenny O’Sullivan, 21 August 1920, Mary Kenny O’Sullivan Papers, Box 5, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University.

⁶⁰⁰ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 302-320. For relief efforts, see, for example, *Pilot*, 23 April 1923; *Pilot*, 23 July 1921. For MacSwiney, see, for example, Charitable Irish Society resolution, 15 September 1920, in Charitable Irish Society Papers, Burns Library; *Pilot*, 11 September 1920; *Pilot*, 6 November 1920; Joanne Mooney Eichacker, *Irish Republican Women in America: Lecture Tours, 1916-1925* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2003). Denis A. McCarthy, “Terence MacSwiney,” Denis A. McCarthy Irish Collection, Special Collections Department, Boston Public Library.

Walsh's poem, "Our Hero," published in a local K. of C. council's publication, *The Monument*, reaffirmed connections with Ireland and the romantic theme of exile:

Oh, Terence MacSwiney, you are far from our view,
And the love in our hearts is staunch and true.
For you died of old Ireland and the Shamrock so green;
In the pages of history your name will be seen...

Old Ireland, God bless you, some day you'll be free
And the sweet bells of Shandon, so close by the sea,
Will ring out sweet music as often done before,
And welcome our Exile to Erin once more.⁶⁰¹

Enthusiasm was also demonstrated during President Eamon de Valera's second visit to Boston in September 1920. One hundred thousand individuals welcomed him at the station and lined the streets to his hotel. The next day, the *Globe* claimed, half a million Bostonians watched a parade that included his motorcade, bands, drum corps, veteran groups, Irish soldiers, and 12,000 "loyal sons and daughters of his beloved Erin" carrying small American and Irish flags, along a three-mile route to Boston Common, where de Valera addressed waiting crowds.⁶⁰²

A similar sense of solidarity was felt during St. Patrick's Day festivities the following March. As historian Damien Murray points out, South Boston's Evacuation Day parade increasingly became a celebration of Irish-American nationalist identity in this period, a fact that many Yankees resented, even with the emphasis on American patriotism. In 1921, military officials declared that soldiers would not participate if the Irish republican flag were included. Irish nationalists dismissed the "British" warning and turned the parade into a "militant expression of Irish American nationalism." With the flags of the Irish and

⁶⁰¹ Martin J. Walsh, "Our Hero," *The Monument*, February 1921; Knights of Columbus: Correspondence [Archives, Archdiocese of Boston] Box 3:1.

⁶⁰² *Pilot*, 11 September 1920; *Globe*, 12 September 1920, 1; "Crowd Hears de Valera, 500,000 View Parade," *Globe*, 13 September 1920, 1; *Globe*, 13 September 1920, 1.

American republics prominently displayed along the parade route, 6,000 individuals, including 255 members of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic (AARIR) who proudly marched carrying the Irish flag.⁶⁰³

The outpouring of support did not mask growing divides within the movement, however. In Boston, conflict had already emerged between older immigrant and native-born middle-class conservatives (like local FOIF president Matthew Cummings), who emphasized the need to fight British propaganda, and other groups, including liberal professionals, more recently arrived immigrants, and members of county clubs and labor unions, who focused on the Irish conflict. It became clear during de Valera's American visit that these divisions were present in the international movement as well. De Valera's goal was to raise money to support the Irish war and obtain immediate American recognition of the Irish Republic. FOIF leaders John Devoy and Judge Daniel Cohalan, however, wanted to use funds to counter British propaganda and defeat the League of Nations, which they believed was part of a British plan to limit American sovereignty. Cohalan also argued for the more moderate term, "self-determination," understanding that many Americans felt the Irish situation was a British domestic matter, and would resent a foreigner intervening in American politics. FOIF leaders also attempted to control radical groups like the Irish Progressive League, which supported a female picket of the British embassy in Washington.⁶⁰⁴

In an attempt to counter the FOIF's influence, de Valera established the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic (AARIR) as a fundraising and lobbying

⁶⁰³ For parade, see *Globe*, 17 March 1921, 1; *Globe*, 18 March 1921, 1, 8; Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 317-324.

⁶⁰⁴ Murray, "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 267-271, 213-215; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 127-137; Ward, *Ireland and Anglo-American Relations*, 215-225.

group to gain congressional support for the Irish Republic. As Murray argues, the AARIR provided “the basis for the expression of an Irish-American socio-political ideology that incorporated Catholic concepts of social justice and left-wing activists’ support for the expansion of citizens’ rights.” Popular with middle-class leaders like Cardinal O’Connell and Senator Walsh, as well as progressives, labor groups, and women, it had 800,000 members at its height (250,000 in Massachusetts). After a successful fundraising campaign in which Boston led the nation (raising half of the \$1 million total), IFV Treasurer John J. Hearn of Boston became the AARIR national secretary. Also, unlike the FOIF, the AARIR received women on an equal basis as men, and many became presidents of local councils. This was a welcome change for many Irish; as Judge Charles S. Sullivan declared at the Charitable Irish Society’s 1921 Ladies Night Dance, “Woman has come to stay in our public life and her influence will benefit us politically, financially, morally and socially.”⁶⁰⁵

Although to the Irish, Great Britain was the hated conqueror that withheld Irish freedom, to Zionists, Britain held the key to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Realizing this dichotomy, the British attempted to gain American Jewish loyalty. At a Zionist meeting to celebrate the League of Nations’ San Remo Agreement granting Britain the Palestine mandate in 1920, a British official recommended that Jews “show their gratitude” by doing all they could to strengthen the “bond of friendship” between Britain and America. Further, he warned them to “beware of the ingratitude that is being shown in

⁶⁰⁵ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 247, 278-281, 304-308. As Catholic women’s involvement in suffrage and social reform movements declined, many turned to the Irish struggle to maintain a public presence. The George Frisbee Hoar Council, for example, was led by Mrs. Frank Scanlan, and most of its members had belonged to the Margaret Brent Equal Suffrage League. The leaders of the Martha Washington and Terence MacSwiney Councils included socialists Maura Quinn and Margaret Ryan, who were also active in the Boston unit of the White Cross (an Irish-American nursing unit organized to assist in the Anglo-Irish War).

this country against Great Britain as ‘something that we must contend against’—most likely in reference to Irish-American nationalist propaganda.⁶⁰⁶

Although they needed British support, Zionists felt a great affinity for the Irish struggle. In a 1922 address to Boston Zionists, for example, Rabbi Alexander Goldstein of Russia used Ireland, currently negotiating their treaty with Britain, as an example of a successful nationalist movement that generated much worldwide support. Jews could learn much from the Irish example, he argued, and urged them to “extend their greetings to that country.” In addition, like Irish nationalists, Zionists also emphasized compatibility with Americanism. As Versailles delegate and Harvard law professor Felix Frankfurter argued at a Dorchester Zionist meeting in 1919, “The loyalty of the Jew to his race is in no way inconsistent with his loyalty to America because such loyalties are not antagonistic.”⁶⁰⁷

Zionists in the United States and Europe were of different minds regarding priorities for Zionism and a new state in Palestine. After visiting Palestine in 1919, Louis Brandeis, elected the honorary president of the World Zionist Organization in 1920, envisioned a self-sustaining agrarian, almost Utopian, state based upon Jeffersonian ideals, in which Jews would constitute the majority, but Arabs would share in the full rights of citizenship. He believed the primary concern should be building up the economy and physical landscape to support immigration. Chaim Weizmann, the British leader of the Palestine Commission, argued for building schools and an administrative infrastructure, land reclamation, and

⁶⁰⁶ “Zionists Parade in Boston Despite Rain,” *Advocate*, 24 June 1920, 8.

⁶⁰⁷ “Call for Help for Palestine,” *Globe*, 2 January 1922, 2; “De Valera, Dethroned Agitator, Born of Jewish Parentage?” *Advocate*, 18 October 1923. “Open Forum,” *Advocate*, 18 December 1919. “Zionism from A to Z? Alpert’s ‘Latest Hit,’” *Advocate*, 27 May 1920. Known as “Ish Kovno,” the “Jewish Billy Sunday,” Alpert embarked on a lecture tour for the New England Zionist Bureau and ZOA. Mark A. Raider, “Pioneers and Pacesetters: Boston Jews and American Zionism,” in *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna, Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), 263.

language maintenance. The men disagreed on many issues, including cultural programs and fundraising. Brandeis argued for the need to secure economic aid from all possible sources, regardless of whether they came from Zionists, causing Weizmann to accuse him of being “lacking in historic understanding of Jewish life and wanting in Jewish soul.”⁶⁰⁸

The disagreement highlighted a fundamental difference between the European and American movements: while European Zionists were single-mindedly focused on achieving a Jewish homeland, American Zionists included acculturated Jews who were self-conscious about their American loyalties and Jews of Eastern European background, whose mindset was more in line with that of Weizmann. After a disastrous conference in London in the summer of 1920, which Brandeis left after refusing to have the American delegation take part in world Zionist affairs, ZOA secretary Louis Lipsky and other cultural Zionist adherents began to express discontent with Brandeis’s leadership. In April 1921, Weizmann visited America, providing Lipsky’s group with a focus and a new project—a financial fund called Keren Hayesod—as well as valuable support at the annual convention in Cleveland. Ultimately, Brandeis resigned from the ZOA, along with president Julian Mack, Jacob de Haas, Felix Frankfurter, Stephen S. Wise, Henrietta Szold, and Horace Kallen.⁶⁰⁹

At the end of 1919, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) had 200,000 members and a budget in the millions of dollars, but due to the controversial split and the post-war recession, membership figures quickly dropped to 25,000, causing leaders to refocus on consolidating political, economic, and cultural gains. In fact, one of the most

⁶⁰⁸ Strum, *Brandeis*, 273-290. “Brandeis Drafts Important Palestine Memorandum,” *Advocate*, 7 October 1920. Brandeis urged Jews to visit Palestine, telling them, “You will enjoy the greatest experience of your life.”

⁶⁰⁹ Philippa Strum, *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 273-290. Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust* (Omaha, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), 269, 246-298. See “Resolution Aims at Commercializers of Zionism,” *Advocate*, 27 May 1920.

significant achievements in this period was the Lodge/Fish Resolution. In 1922, Republican Elihu D. Stone, the president of the New England Zionist Region, convinced Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, to co-sponsor a resolution stating American support for a “national home for the Jewish people” in Palestine, provided that the rights of non-Jewish communities and holy places be protected. Historian Mark A. Raider argues that the unanimously adopted resolution “was a shrewd tactical maneuver aimed at mollifying American Jews” in the wake of anti-immigration legislation, with no real bearing on British foreign policy. Even so, Jews hailed Lodge as a hero—one whose “name shall forever be linked with those of Cyrus and Balfour in Jewish History”—and the resolution as evidence of the “perfect harmony” between Americanism and Zionism.⁶¹⁰

Above all, Zionists argued, colonization was a practical endeavor, requiring the financial, business, investment, and educational support of all American Jews. Thus, despite the low ZOA membership, fundraising remained paramount, particularly as European Jews increasingly began to immigrate to Palestine. Raider points out that “the image of ‘New Palestine’—‘land of the new hope, land of the present and the future, and land of the West’—resonated with Jewish ideals as well as the American myths of pioneering, progress, and self-reliance.”⁶¹¹ As Max Shoolman, chair of the Greater Boston Zionist Committee, declared during a 1922 campaign, “No Jew has the right, at this time, to withhold his support from Palestine.” Even Temple Israel’s Rabbi Levi, a non-Zionist, endorsed such efforts for

⁶¹⁰ In 1921, Lipsky told Stone that the Roxbury and Mattapan districts were the only groups “really doing anything” in Boston, and called for greater recruitment. Lipsky to Stone, 27 January 1921; Elihu David Stone Papers; P-555; Box 2; Folder 4; American Jewish Historical Society, Newton Centre, MA and New York, NY. For quote, see Raider, “Pioneers and Pacesetters, 264. Lodge Palestine Resolution, 1922; Stone Papers, Box 1; Folder 12.

⁶¹¹ Raider, *The Emergence of American Zionism* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 44. Urofsky, *American Zionism*, 332-341. The Brandeis group established the Palestine Development Council and Palestine Endowment Funds, which supported the establishment of Hebrew University in Jerusalem, for these purposes.

“humanitarian” reasons. Similarly, during the United Palestine Appeal’s 1925 Jewish National Fund Flag Day, Jews were encouraged to wear the “little white and blue flag” as a “symbol of our deep sympathy” for “our pioneers in Palestine.”⁶¹²

Brotherly assistance remained the watchword for all Zionists, regardless of faction, through the end of the decade. “We are assembled here in the spirit of Jewish patriotism and Jewish determination to work, labor and sacrifice until the establishment of a national Jewish state in Palestine will be a complete reality,” Stone declared at the 1926 National Zionist Conference, held in Boston. “There can be no crisis in Palestine so long as the Zionists in America are resolved to make their contribution and are determined to extend a hand of brotherly help across the water to the builders of Zion.” As many had done before him, Stone compared the Puritan settlers with the pioneers in Palestine, reiterating the hope of many Zionists that the movement would help to “create a better understanding between the Jews and the non-Jews.”⁶¹³

While American Zionists were reunited by the end of the decade with the return of Brandeis’s followers to the ZOA, the movement was influenced by outbreaks of violence in Palestine. Most Zionists had failed to appreciate the depth of Arab nationalist hopes and resentment of Jewish control in the wake of the breakup of the Ottoman Empire. Those who did blithely expected that Arabs and Jews would eventually peacefully co-exist under a

⁶¹² *Advocate*, 12 October 1922; *Advocate*, 5 October 1922: p1, 8. In 1923, the *Advocate* made much of the fact that the Temple Israel religious school donated \$25 to help rebuild the Holy Land, arguing that the act demonstrated “how deep-rooted” support for Palestine was in Boston even among non-Zionists. *Advocate*, 6 December 1923. *Advocate*, 30 September 1926; *Advocate*, 21 October 1926. For last quote, see *Advocate*, 10 December 1925.

⁶¹³ Elihu D. Stone, address at National Conference on Palestine in Boston, 20 November 1926; Stone Papers; Box 1; Folder 26. He also paid tribute to Chaim Weizmann, in attendance at the meeting, declaring, “You are our leader.” For last quote, see Stone, address at Annual Regional Zionist Convention, Old Orchard Beach, Maine, 19 June 1927; Stone Papers; Box 1; Folder 26.

Zionist regime. With the uncertainty and confusion of the Palestine Mandate and a lack of British control in the region, a series of Arab uprisings began to occur as early as 1921. Although the high commissioner, a British Jew, claimed that mass Jewish immigration would be discouraged, a Jewish state remained an important hope for Jews around the world, particularly with the rise of antisemitism and the implementation of increasingly restrictive immigration legislation in America and Europe. As Rabbi Levi noted in 1929, “We American Jews of course will not go to live in Palestine,” but “thousands in various parts of the world, living hopeless lives in their present unhappy surroundings, will go if they can find the way to do so. We must help them find the way.”⁶¹⁴

Although Zionists continued to have with unresolved hopes for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, Irish nationalists attained their goal of a free Ireland, albeit with stipulations. After eighteen months of fighting, British authorities and Sinn Féin signed a truce in July 1921 and began negotiating peace talks. The resulting Anglo-Irish Peace Treaty included two compromises: dominion status for Ireland and partitioning the six counties in Ulster to remain part of the United Kingdom. Although the Irish Dáil ratified the treaty in January 1922, de Valera and other diehard republicans opposed it, particularly the oath of allegiance to the king, which, they argued, “seemed to symbolize the betrayal of the republic.”⁶¹⁵ De Valera resigned as Dáil president and the IRA split into pro and anti-Treaty factions. Eventually, open conflict broke out, resulting in a civil war that lasted from June 1922 to mid

⁶¹⁴ Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975), 236-242, 301-305. Levi, “Palestine Again,” sermon given 17 November 1929, Rabbi Harry Levi Papers, TI Archives. Christians in Palestine also resented “Jewish aggression,” arguing that there were so many Jewish immigrants that they would soon be the majority (“Protest Against Palestine Policy,” *Pilot*, 25 July 1925).

⁶¹⁵ Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 143, 138-154. Bill Kissane, *Politics of the Irish Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). Although problematic, the Irish delegation accepted both, under pressure to accept their best offer or resume all out warfare.

1923. At the end, Michael Collins, Arthur Griffith, and several others were dead. These developments were just as disruptive to the American movement. The AARIR supported de Valera, while the FOIF denounced the treaty and refused to support the former president. Most Irish Americans, however, supported the treaty; although a republic was the ultimate goal, they felt the Free State was a good compromise. By 1922, reports claimed the Irish Free State “was doing wonderfully,” causing *Republic* editor Katherine Conway to note gleefully, “Who shall say that the Irish can’t govern themselves?” Similarly, Matthew Cummings noted the new feeling of respectability that Irish freedom gave Irish Americans, as they were no longer a conquered people. Thus, with the Irish question settled, for the most part, Irish-American groups turned their attention to problems in the United States.⁶¹⁶

“Champions of the Spirit of Americanism”

Based on their close cooperation during the war and the support for ethnic nationalist movements, ethnic leaders expressed great hope for acceptance in the immediate post-war period. “When Catholic, Protestant and Jew can live, suffer, fight and die together for America,” Senator David I. Walsh confidently declared in May 1919, “there can be no doubt but that the ‘melting pot’ has been a huge success.” Never again would an immigrant or an American-born ethnic be thought of “merely as a foreigner,” but “as a fellow-

⁶¹⁶ Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 326-332; Doorley, *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism*, 138-154. Conway Diary, 20 January 1922, Katherine Conway Papers, Burns Library. *Pilot*, 25 March 1922. The *Pilot* and the *Globe* reflected middle-class views and supported the Free State, arguing that it was the end of 700 years of oppression. Even so, the *Pilot* noted that security remained a problem during the Civil War (*Pilot*, 20 May 1922; *Globe*, 3 April 1922, 1). In the spring of 1922, representatives of the new Irish government visited Boston and received a rousing welcome from Matthew Cummings, Colonel Edward Logan, and other middle-class leaders, despite the presence of protestors at a Faneuil Hall mass meeting. Anti-treaty supporters operated in Boston for several years, but, in 1926, de Valera formed Fianna Fáil, announcing his willingness to take the oath and enter the Dáil, thus dampening the effectiveness of the American groups.

American, just as much as a descendant of the most aristocratic blue-blooded man who can trace his ancestors to the Mayflower.”⁶¹⁷

Americans soon soured on international affairs, however, particularly with the battle over the League of Nations, socialist revolts in various European countries, and the resumption of large-scale immigration. Domestically, industrial centers like Massachusetts experienced a post-war economic slump as manufacturing dropped. When businesses tried to reverse such wartime gains as higher wages and better working conditions, workers initiated strikes in the textile industry, telephone company, and Boston Police Department. The police strike, in particular, imperiled public order and exacerbated ethnic tensions between a largely Irish police force and “inept Yankee” leadership, while May Day riots in Roxbury and other cities raised concerns over “Bolshevism.”⁶¹⁸ Finally, such high-profile cases as the 1921 murder trial of Italian anarchists Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti highlighted fears of immigrant radicalism.⁶¹⁹

These issues prompted the creation of large-scale Americanization campaigns aimed at “making real citizens out of aliens” in the public schools, settlement houses, churches, and factories. While most Americanization programs sought to transform immigrants into

⁶¹⁷ David I. Walsh, “Our Debt and Duty to the Immigrant,” *Advocate*, 13 March 1919.

⁶¹⁸ Zachary M. Schrag, “Nineteen Nineteen: The Boston Police Strike in the Context of American Labor,” www.schrag.info/research, accessed 7 November 2005. For strike and riot, see Damien Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston,” 289-298, 185-193. Murray argues that Irish Americans were divided by class on the police strike. The riot occurred when police and soldiers confronted Irish socialists leaving the Dudley Street Opera House. Although Governor Calvin Coolidge and District Attorney Joseph Pelletier (a local FOIF leader) praised the soldiers, many of those arrested argued they had been simply walking when they were accosted. For Catholic reactions to socialism, see “The Menace of Bolshevism,” *Pilot*, 3 May 1919, 1.

⁶¹⁹ Many later came forward to support the men, including Harvard professor Felix Frankfurter. Michael Alexander, *Jazz Age Jews* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 69-185. Even Cardinal O’Connell asked Governor Fuller to consider clemency. Even so, the men were executed in 1927. O’Connell to Governor Alvan T. Fuller, 10 August 1927; O’Connell Papers: General Correspondence; Box 5:3. James M. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O’Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 161-165.

acculturated Americans and foster appreciation for “immigrant gifts,” many engaged in outright attacks on ethnic culture, coercing immigrants to replace old world ways with “civilized” American customs that would create the best “national type.” Hoping to deflect accusations of radicalism, ethnic leaders became “champion[s] of the spirit of Americanism,” seeking to demonstrate their group’s loyalty to American ideological principles, rather than conformity to Anglo cultural practices.⁶²⁰ In Boston, as elsewhere, Irish Catholics and Jews focused their Americanization and welfare efforts on new immigrants. The *Pilot* and *Jewish Advocate* encouraged them to learn English, become citizens, and improve their grasp of American principles. In 1919, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society organized an “Americanization Day” on Washington’s Birthday to “intensify ‘the loyalty and devotion’ of Jewish immigrants” and demonstrate “the importance of complete Americanization.” Similarly, the Catholic Italian Civic League (whose leadership included Italians and Irish) and the John Boyle O’Reilly Club organized courses to train immigrants in “true Americanism.” Thus, acculturated leaders encouraged immigrants to embrace their ideals of respectability.⁶²¹

In fact, many ethnic leaders initially welcomed the national return to conservatism. As stated, middle-class Irish Catholics were eager to demonstrate their abhorrence for socialism, while Jewish Republicans worked to return their party to power after the war. In Massachusetts, Republicans like Elihu Stone and Judge David A. Lourie, Independent Max Mitchell, and normally “ardent” Democrats Louis Kirstein and Abraham Alpert, organized to support Governor Coolidge in his reelection campaign in the wake of the Boston Police

⁶²⁰ *Advocate*, 13 March 1919; Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 41; Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 7-9, 13.

⁶²¹ Joseph B. Egan, *Citizenship in Boston* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1925), 83. *Advocate*, 16 September 1920. *Advocate*, 8 July 1920; *Pilot*, 7 February 1925. *Globe*, 26 January 1919, 6. *Pilot*, 8 March 1919; *Pilot*, 26 April 1919. Other groups included the AOH, the League of Catholic Women, and the Council of Jewish Women.

Strike. Arguing in support of “law and order” and Coolidge’s “persistent policy of one hundred per cent Americanism,” they explained that “whenever law fails, the Jewish people cannot be happy because other people take advantage of the lawlessness and the Jews get the worse of it.” Thanks to their efforts, the *Advocate* claimed, the “bulk of Jewish citizenship” voted for Coolidge who “otherwise would have been deceived.”⁶²²

The country’s desire for “normalcy” was seen in 1920, with the election of Republican Warren G. Harding as president and Coolidge as vice-president. Many Americans were frustrated with Wilson and the Democrats, including immigrant groups whose demands had not been addressed at Versailles. These groups overwhelmingly voted for Harding, and he won in a landslide. In New England, he captured all but one county.⁶²³

Even so, middle-class ethnic leaders continued to emphasize the compatibility of Americanism and ethnic culture. Boston’s Edward F. McSweeney, a former Immigration Commission chair and head of the Knights of Columbus’ Historical Commission, featured Catholic and Jewish “immigrant gifts” in a textbook series called “The Alien Contribution to America.” He preferred the term “assimilation” over “Americanization”; the former was a “blending of civilization, traditions and customs,” as opposed to the latter, which worked toward the “amalgamation of races.” The *Pilot* defended Catholic respectability by sarcastically asking whether “the native Indians” would have considered “our boasted Pilgrim Fathers” as “undesirable citizens” and “debated how they might Americanize them.”⁶²⁴

⁶²² “Jews Indorse Coolidge,” *Advocate*, 30 October 1919; “Coolidge’s Election Aided by Jews,” *Advocate*, 6 November 1919; “Massachusetts Triumphant,” *Advocate*, 6 November 1919.

⁶²³ Nathan Miller, *The 1920s and the Making of Modern America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 2004).

⁶²⁴ Christopher J. Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism: The History of the Knights of Columbus, 1882-1982* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 261-273; Murray, “Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic

Jews also continued to highlight the compatibility of Jewish and American traditions. In October 1922, for example, Temple Israel's religious school held a play entitled, "America and the Jew: A Pageant for Thanksgiving." With such lines as "There is a land—bright, blessed land—the Promised Land, in truth, Where Freedom, Plenty, Wisdom, Love—all beckon to our youth," playwright Fanny Barnett Linsky highlighted the connections between the Book of Ruth's depiction of Israel's "joyful harvest" and America's feast day. As Jonathan Sarna argues, the play demonstrated that "Thanksgiving was not only for the Children of the Mayflower." The play proved so popular that United Association of Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) published it as an educational tool.⁶²⁵

For many ethno-religious leaders, fostering group consciousness was another vital aspect of Americanization. As the *Advocate* declared, "A test of one's Judaism is not passive acceptance of Jewish connections, but determination to establish the fact of being Jewish." Religious leaders called for a Jewish (and Catholic) newspaper "in every home."⁶²⁶ The Knights of Columbus, the Young Men's Hebrew Association (YMHA), the League of Catholic Women, and the Council of Jewish Women embarked on widespread membership drives, hoping to encourage patriotism among the young and combat the effects of modernism. Jacob L. Wiseman, president of the Associated YMHA of New England, urged Jews to "develop a proper social and communal spirit" and donate funds to build a

Democratic Liberalism in Boston," 239-242. *Pilot*, 12 April 1919; O'Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 166. Edward F. McSweeney to Cardinal O'Connell, 15 November 1922; Knights of Columbus: Correspondence; Box 3:4.

⁶²⁵ Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture," *Jewish Social Studies* n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999): 61; Fannie Barnett Linsky, *America and the Jew: A Pageant for Thanksgiving Day* (Cincinnati, 1923), 5, 13-14, 19-20. For other Linsky plays, see "Let's Give a Pageant," *Advocate*, 6 October 1927; Meaghan Dwyer-Ryan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009), 70, 74-75.

⁶²⁶ Reading a Jewish paper "silently says to all: 'Here is a Jew who wants you to have no doubt that he is Jewish through and through'" (*Advocate*, 20 November 1919). "A Catholic Paper in Every Home," *Pilot*, 28 December 1929.

community center. The Knights experienced a vast increase in membership as it recruited the new Catholic immigrants. Reflecting a self-confidence born out of its wartime organization and a “general trend toward centralization,” the local councils succeeded in their longtime goal of building a Catholic social center in Boston in 1919, which encompassed many of the same functions as their wartime camps. The K. of C. also battled prejudice, as evidenced, it argued, in the case against National Advocate and Suffolk County District Attorney, Joseph Pelletier, who was accused of blackmail and fraud in 1922 by Boston’s Watch and Ward Society.⁶²⁷

One of the most significant areas of adjustment was in religious practice. Even Orthodox Jews of Eastern European descent sought to “reconcile their fathers’ religion with their own strongly patriotic feelings.” In 1914, for example, Roxbury’s Blue Hill Avenue Synagogue, led by Rabbi Phineas Israeli, instituted such innovations as Friday evening services, a Junior Congregation, and the Menorah Institute. When Israeli left in 1918, younger members established Conservative temples, including Kehillath Israel in Brookline (1924) and Young Israel of Greater Boston (1928). Rabbi Louis M. Epstein also held Friday evening services at Roxbury’s Crawford Street Synagogue to attract “the Americanized Jew,” particularly workers who could not attend on Saturdays. Like earlier Reform rabbis, his goal was to “reinvigorate Sabbath attendance and the religiosity of Jews at home” through a decorous service with sermons and congregational singing in Hebrew and English, which

⁶²⁷ Jacob L. Wiseman, “Y.M.H.A.: Creating a Jewish Communal Consciousness,” *Advocate*, 23 October 1919. “Boston to Have Fine Social Center,” *Pilot*, 1 November 1919. Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, xiv, 228-286; Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 66-71. Although the national leadership supported Pelletier, he resigned his position in 1923.

attracted 1000 individuals every week.⁶²⁸ Similarly, Rabbi H.H. Rubenovitz sought to make Mishkan Tefila a “model” synagogue. “It must be liberal in doctrine and practice,” he declared in 1919, have a “comprehensive” program, and be “Zionistic.”⁶²⁹ By 1920, there were also two Reform temples: Ohabei Shalom had called Reform advocate Rabbi Samuel J. Abrams to the pulpit that year, while Temple Israel, Boston’s largest congregation, also maintained “a power and an influence” in this period, largely because of Rabbi Levi, who served as a “bridge” for those who sought a balance between modernity and Jewishness.⁶³⁰

Catholic immigrants had less autonomy regarding religious practice. The Irish so dominated the American church that, as historian James O’Toole writes, “They almost ceased to be recognizable as a distinct group within it.” With the influx of the “newer Catholic races,” as Cardinal O’Connell called them, the parish continued to be the center of ethnic communal activity, and immigrants responded to Irish hegemony with demands for their own priests, sermons in their own languages, the right to maintain their customs and have their children taught in ethnic parochial schools, and, most importantly, to establish their own parishes, which O’Connell was willing to grant only if it was economically feasible. Still, by 1925, non-Irish parishes made up twenty-five percent of the archdiocese’s total. O’Connell encouraged the maintenance of cultural traditions, but he emphasized loyalty to Catholicism and Americanism above all else. “The great Catholic Church was not meant for

⁶²⁸ David Kaufman, *Shul With a Pool: The “Synagogue-Center” in American Jewish History* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 1999), 207-211; Kaufman, “Temples in the American Athens: A History of the Synagogues of Boston,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 196-197. *Advocate*, 13 September 1917. In 1919, the Crawford Street synagogue added a choir and printed English and Hebrew hymnbooks to allow those who could not read Hebrew to participate in the service (*Advocate*, 6 November 1919). Epstein moved to Kehillath Israel in 1925.

⁶²⁹ “Would Make Mishkan Tefila a Model Institutional Synagogue,” *Advocate*, 25 December 1919.

⁶³⁰ *Advocate*, 25 March 1920. Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 68-71, 78. This combination proved so popular, in fact, that membership increased from 433 to 700 families between 1920 and 1929.

one nation, but for all nations,” he declared. For many immigrants, this meant conformity to Irish-American ideals, particularly for those living in parishes run by Irish priests, nuns, and lay leaders. Also, because the Irish were so ubiquitous in unions, city government, and public schools, conflict among the Catholic groups was a constant source of tension in Boston.⁶³¹

Religious education was one area in which leaders attempted to find common ground. Both Catholics and Jews struggled with the question of “how to keep the young within the fold.”⁶³² For Catholics, parochial schools promoted a unified belief system and guarded against Protestant proselytizing. Non-Irish groups built schools to a greater extent than the Irish, primarily because of the language issue. By 1924, the *Pilot* noted that fifty schools had been established in the archdiocese since 1907, serving more than 85,000 students. Even so, children were not immune to acculturation, and, by the second generation, most ethnic parish schools taught children in English. As one Italian member of Sacred Heart Parish in the North End explained, “Altho’ we are Italians...we want to bring up our children in the American ways and ideas.” In fact, the *Pilot* argued, the parochial school did “more for God, Church and country” than any other institution; “the Catholic, if he be true to the principles taught him in his parish school, is the best type of citizen.”⁶³³

Jewish education included full-day Talmud Torah schools, Zionist Hebrew schools, synagogue Sunday schools, and many informal chiders. In 1920, the Federated Jewish Charities formed the Bureau of Jewish Education, combining the association in charge of

⁶³¹ For quote, see Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston in the Various Stages of Its Development, 1604 to 1943, Vol. III, 1866-1943* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944), 189. O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 145, 147, 144-165. “Parish as Catholic Social Centre,” *Pilot*, 18 October 1919.

⁶³² *Advocate*, 14 April 1927.

⁶³³ O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 169-172. “Growth of Catholic School System Under Cardinal O’Connell,” *Pilot*, 8 December 1923; “Parochial Schools to Open September 9,” *Pilot*, 6 September 1924; “The Parochial School,” *Pilot*, 14 November 1925. Cohen notes similar experiences for Catholic immigrants in Chicago (*Making a New Deal*, 83-94).

communal religious schools with a teacher-training program that later became Hebrew Teachers College. A high school course was added in 1923. The bureau was responsible for the curricula of twenty-four Hebrew schools and thirteen Sunday schools, which included Jewish history, religion, and language, as well as American values. In fact, as the *Advocate* argued, the “finest piece of Americanization work” that Jews could do was make “Hebrew Schools fit places for American children.” By 1927, 6,000 Jewish children were enrolled, but 11,000 remained unaffiliated, highlighting the need for continued efforts to attract Jewish families.⁶³⁴ Temple Israel’s school focused on Jewish ethical teachings, catering to those who wanted their children to have a religious, but not a Hebrew, education. It also operated five branch schools throughout Greater Boston, serving a total of 800 children, many of whom were the children of Orthodox immigrants.⁶³⁵

To meet the needs of this new generation, churches and synagogues embarked on ambitious construction projects to enlarge existing structures or build new ones. As in the past, processions and festivals often accompanied dedications as public demonstrations of religious pride.⁶³⁶ Between 1920 and 1930, the Archdiocese created thirty-two new parishes and built numerous church and schools. Parishioners raised funds through building drives and special collections during Mass.⁶³⁷ At least nine synagogue structures were also built or purchased. Following a national trend, several congregations sought to bring “all aspects of

⁶³⁴ Joseph Reimer, “Passionate Visions in Contest: On the History of Jewish Education in Boston,” in Sarna, Smith, and Kosofsky, *Jews of Boston*, 287-293. Quote in *Advocate*, 27 February 1919. “Urges Jews to Work for Their Religion and Not for a National Homeland,” *Boston Herald*, 22 May 1919; *Advocate*, 14 April 1927.

⁶³⁵ Although optional classes were available, Hebrew study remained controversial. One parent believed it would “widen the breach” between groups, as Hebrew was “closely associated with a religion that already suffers from intolerance.” *TI Bulletin*, February 27, 1929; *TI Bulletin*, 9 January 1929; *TI Bulletin*, 22 May 1929; “Temple Israel Choir Sings Yiddish Songs,” *Globe*, 6 June 1921, 4; Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 58-62, 69-71, 218n25.

⁶³⁶ See *Advocate*, 3 November 1921; *Advocate*, 22 November 1923; *Pilot*, 12 February 1921; *Pilot*, 20 October 1928.

⁶³⁷ O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 146, 209; Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 129-132.

Jewish activity, prayer, assembly, and learning under one roof” in “synagogue-centers.” Mishkan Tefila saw its proposed structure as the locus of Jewish activity in Roxbury-Dorchester; Temple Israel’s leaders hoped their ambitious design for a “Temple Centre” on the Riverway would secure their position as the “leading congregation of Boston.”⁶³⁸

Synagogues, churches, and ethnic organizations were “uniquely powerful socializing agencies” which strove to promote cultural and religious identity as well as Americanization. They developed networks of activities for every age group designed to encourage greater involvement within the community, such as choirs, bands, literary societies, prayer groups, and social clubs. The Catholic Youth Organization (CYO) and the YMHA organized inter-group sports leagues for boys and girls, strengthening “through teamwork and competition, players’ emotional commitment to the group.” Parish and synagogue dances and teas provided opportunities for young people to meet friends and potential mates. Similarly, the AOH and Irish county organizations held annual field days for “lovers of Gaelic sports.” Finally, adult religious organizations like the Holy Name Society, K. of C., B’nai B’rith, and the UAHC encouraged the development of a national religious consciousness through annual conventions. Such activities ensured that Americans of foreign stock socialized mainly within the community and avoided the temptations of modernization, which, above all, included intermarriage.⁶³⁹ They also highlighted the continued leadership of middle-class

⁶³⁸ Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, the father of Reconstructionist Judaism, first promoted this idea in the 1910s. *Advocate*, 8 March 1923; *Advocate*, 21 May 1925; *Advocate*, 17 September 1925. Kaufman, *Shul With a Pool*, 261-274. *Advocate*, 30 September 1920. Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis, *Becoming American Jews*, 72-79. The meeting house and religious school wing were completed in 1928, but the congregation abandoned the rest of the project due to lack of funds.

⁶³⁹ For quotes, see “YMWA Basketball Squad,” *Advocate*, 19 February 1925; “Gaelic Athletic Association,” *Pilot*, 8 October 1927. For dances, see *Pilot*, 11 March 1922; *Pilot*, 1 September 1928. For conventions, see *Pilot*, 20 August 1924; *Pilot*, 27 September 1924; *Advocate*, 9 December 1920; *Advocate*, 19 May 1921. *Pilot*, 17 September 1927. McClymer, “Passing from Light into Dark.” Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 54, 55.

professionals and businessmen. Religious and ethnic leaders maintained standards of respectability and morality, monitoring movies, music, and other forms of popular culture.⁶⁴⁰ Catholic and Jewish women, for example, engaged in municipal housekeeping activities “designed to extend women’s roles into public life,” such as social welfare programs, labor unions, and legislation.⁶⁴¹

“Break Down the Barriers of Racial and Religious Prejudice”

Many Americans believed that the close cooperation among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants during the war prefaced a new era of interfaith understanding. “The war has brought Jew and non-Jew so much nearer each other,” Rabbi Levi noted in December 1918. “There is less of prejudice of Christian against Jew, less of suspicion of Jew against Christian.” Even so, concern over the growing power and corruption of urban culture gave strength to anti-radical and traditionalist trends, evidenced in heightened religious, ethnic, and racial tensions and a longing for a mythical Anglo-Saxon past. The beginning of the decade saw an increase in antisemitism, the resurgence of mass movements like the Ku Klux Klan, Prohibition, and religious evangelicalism, and the growing popularity of “scientific” theories of Anglo-Saxon superiority. As historian James J. Connolly points out, these issues

⁶⁴⁰ The Catholic Church’s Legion of Decency policed sexuality and violence in movies. See “Purifying the Films,” *Pilot*, 8 July 1922; Frank Walsh, *Sin and Censorship: The Catholic Church and the Motion Picture Industry* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996); Rabbis also excoriated the dangers of modernization (Feingold, *A Time for Searching*, 36-39).

⁶⁴¹ Jewish women, for example, raised funds for Beth Israel Hospital, concerned that it be, as lawyer Jennie Loitman Barron declared, “conducted in a manner worthy of the Hebrew race.” Address at hospital victory banquet, 30 October 1927, in Jennie Loitman Barron Papers, Box 6:105, Schlesinger Library.

were not new, but “they were given an immediacy by the rise of mass communications in the daily press and eventually the radio.”⁶⁴²

In 1920, automaker Henry Ford issued a series of articles in his newspaper, the *Dearborn Independent*, called “The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem.” Jewish conspiracies, he claimed, ran the banking industry, had undue influence with the president, and fostered radicalism and socialism, basing his charges on the Russian forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In response, Jewish leaders launched an attack against Ford. *Advocate* publisher Alexander Brin, for example, urged his readers to “do your duty” by protesting antisemitism and defending their Americanism. Prominent Christians also denounced Ford and defended Jewish patriotism.⁶⁴³

Another disturbing case was Harvard University’s Jewish quota controversy. Jewish immigrants traditionally valued education, and for those in cities like Boston and New York, a college education was more accessible than ever before, thanks to the multitude of schools located on the subway lines. By 1920, Jews made up twenty percent of Harvard’s undergraduate population and an even larger percentage of other colleges (forty percent at Columbia University, for example). Despite Jews’ acknowledged dedication to academic excellence, many universities claimed that many, particularly commuter students of Eastern European descent, lacked the social graces and school spirit that American Protestant university culture called for, and began to institute restrictions on the number of Jews admitted. In 1922, Harvard president A. Lawrence Lowell, a known immigration

⁶⁴² Levi, “The War and the Future of Liberal Judaism,” *Advocate*, 5 December 1918. James J. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism: Urban Political Culture in Boston, 1900-1925* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 172-173.

⁶⁴³ For the *Advocate*’s coverage of the Ford controversy, see *Advocate*, August 1920 through February 1921, *passim*. Brin urged Jews to give their children a Jewish education, not be “super-sensitive,” and “respect and obey the laws” of their community (*Advocate*, 31 March 1921).

restrictionist, appointed a committee to examine “the principles and methods for more effectively sifting candidates for admission,” and limit the number of Jews admitted. Even though Harvard had not been overly accommodating to Jews in the past—consistently scheduling exams on the High Holy Days, for example—Jewish alumni were outraged at the idea of quotas, and launched a campaign to have the committee reconsider its objectives. In a way, they succeeded; the 1923 report did avoid a quota system, but it recommended limiting the size of entering classes and drawing more candidates from the interior of the country. When Jewish admissions continued to increase, Lowell instituted other means of restriction, including more specific questions regarding religion and parentage on applications.⁶⁴⁴

Long a target due to their “foreign” religion and political power, Catholics also experienced discrimination from a new quarter in the 1920s. Inspired by D.W. Griffith’s motion picture spectacular, *The Birth of a Nation* (1915), a revived Ku Klux Klan (KKK) advocated 100 percent Americanism and presented itself as the righteous defender of small-town white Protestant America. While Klan rhetoric and violence in the South was directed primarily against African Americans, the KKK in the North built on anti-Catholicism and antisemitism. In New England, it struck a chord among Swedes, Ulster Scots, and other Protestant groups who resented Irish Catholic political strength. Alarmed by successful membership rallies in the Worcester area, the Knights of Columbus organized protests

⁶⁴⁴ Jewish populations of other schools were much higher: New York University’s Washington Square College was 93% Jewish; City College of New York and Hunter College were 90%. Columbia was later reduced to 20% with the institution of quotas. Marcia Graham Synott, *Half-Opened Door: Discriminations and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979); Henry L. Feingold, *A Time for Searching: Entering the Mainstream, 1920-1945* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 13-24; Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton* (New York: Mariner Books, 2005), 87-109. For local discussion, see *Advocate*, 1 June 1922 through 29 June 1922, 12 October 1922, 12 April 1922 through 29 April 1922; *Advocate*, 2 September 1920; *Advocate*, 14 October 1920.

against local Klan activities. The press also denounced the KKK and called on state leaders to do the same. As the *Boston Transcript* argued, the Klan sought to “destroy the ‘cement that binds the Union’”—a “fearless and forceful stand” the *Pilot* heartily commended.⁶⁴⁵

Such events demonstrated that Catholics and Jews could not be complacent or leave the fight to the Knights of Columbus or the B’nai B’rith’s Anti-Defamation League. Leaders vowed to “break down the barriers of racial and religious prejudice” by striving to “interpret Americanism and uphold the best standards of American citizenship.” As one individual, fired for refusing to work on Yom Kippur, wrote indignantly, “I was discharged because I exercised my rights as a true American Jew in observing the Day of Atonement—the most sacred day in the Jewish calendar.”⁶⁴⁶ The *Advocate* took a “militant stand” against antisemitic propaganda and promoted “better understanding between peoples of all religious beliefs.” Similarly, the *Pilot* sought to “enlighten and teach others” by “giving the public the Catholic point of view on all questions, breaking down prejudices among the enemies of religion, instructing, encouraging, and uplifting the faithful.”⁶⁴⁷

In response, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants attempted to increase interfaith understanding in Boston throughout the 1920s. Politicians highlighted their efforts on behalf of their immigrant constituents and denounced religious nativism. In 1924, Governor

⁶⁴⁵ *Pilot*, 25 November 1922. See also *Pilot*, 16 December 1922; *Advocate*, 15 September 1921; *Advocate*, 12 October 1922. In 1923, the KKK held a recruiting rally at a local hall, led by R. Eugene Farnsworth, a Klan leader from Maine, who spoke about Catholic control in New England. In response, the Knights of Columbus, already organized against the KKK for its forgery of a fake K. of C. oath of allegiance, began protesting local Klan activities, culminating in the break up of a “Konvocation” of 15,000 in October 1924. Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 273-286; Timothy J. Meagher, *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 306-311; John F. McClymer, “The KKK in the 1920s,” <http://www1.assumption.edu:80/ahc/1920s/Eugenics/Klan.html>, accessed 5 April 2010. Other states mounted campaigns against the Klan as well. See Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 291-299.

⁶⁴⁶ Harry H. Weiner, “Discharged for Not Working on Yom Kippur,” *Advocate*, 30 September 1920, 6.

⁶⁴⁷ *Boston Traveler*, 30 September 1924, quoted in *Advocate*, 1 January 1925. *Advocate*, 30 December 1920. *Advocate*, 17 March 1927. *Pilot*, 5 December 1925. See also *Advocate*, 3 February 1921; *Advocate*, 29 December 1921.

Samuel Walker McCall published *Patriotism of the Jew*, hoping to refute the “accusation that the Jew can be true to no country and is lacking in the capacity for patriotism.”⁶⁴⁸ The K. of C. engaged in a concerted defense of Catholics and Jews, publishing a history of Jews as part of their “Racial Contribution” series. Even Cardinal O’Connell, while not overly active in interfaith efforts, corresponded with rabbis and ministers, invited them to Catholic events, and denounced antisemitism. In 1921, for example, his signature was prominently displayed in a national memorial against Ford’s antisemitic propaganda.⁶⁴⁹ In 1929, 100 well-known Catholics, Protestants, and Jews met at Harvard for a roundtable discussion on intolerance. Participants concluded that ignorance and misunderstanding bred bigotry and that education would help overcome difficulties. Yet, as Father Michael J. Ahern argued, the challenge was conveying that message to “the masses where the bulk of religious prejudice exists.”⁶⁵⁰

Perhaps the most far-reaching results were achieved by Temple Israel. For decades, Rabbi Levi and the congregation had demonstrated a “firm feeling of fraternity” with other synagogues and Protestant churches through pulpit exchanges, joint Thanksgiving Day services, and auxiliary fellowship meetings. In 1924, Levi began broadcasting his Sunday sermons throughout New England over the Yankee Radio Network. Believing the Sunday service had “much to offer of spiritual and humanitarian value which is universal in its scope,” the congregation hoped the sermons would “eliminate much of the existing

⁶⁴⁸ *TI Bulletin*, 25 January 1921. Samuel Walker McCall, *Patriotism of the Jew* (New York: Plymouth Press, 1924), 7.

⁶⁴⁹ “Sen. Walsh Pledges Aid to Fight Prejudice,” *Advocate*, 6 January 1921; “Ex-Mayor of Boston, James M. Curley, Raps Ford,” *Advocate*, 3 February 1921. *Advocate*, 8 September 1921; “An Irishman’s Estimate of the Jewish People,” *Advocate*, 1 June 1922; Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 270-271; “K. of C. Offers a Just Rebuke,” *Advocate*, 3 March 1921. *TI Bulletin*, April 1 1924; *TI Bulletin*, 15 November 1924; *Advocate*, 15 September 1921; *Advocate*, 20 January 1921. By the 1930s, relations grew tenser; despite O’Connell’s denunciations, Catholics supported radio priest Charles Coughlin, while Catholic gangs terrorized Jews who happened to cross their paths (O’Toole, *Militant and Triumphant*, 247-248).

⁶⁵⁰ “The Seminar at Harvard University To Consider the Relations of Catholics–Jews–Protestants, Under the Auspices of the Calvert Round Table of Boston, November 12 and 13, 1929,” 39, in Levi Papers.

prejudice” against Jews. After his first broadcast, Levi received over 150 letters, “almost all...from Christians” expressing “a happy surprise and appreciation” for his sermon, as well as a former ignorance or dislike of Jews. “I am happy to know that your ideas of God, of fellowship and of brotherhood,” one listener commented, “are identical” with those of “our dear old priest at St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church.” As Levi told the *Boston Traveler*, such letters demonstrated that “people of every shade of opinion, frankly confessing to prejudices against the synagogue and its people, have as frankly given assurance of a fairer, juster and more religious attitude henceforth.”⁶⁵¹

Radio proved to be a popular medium, and the K. of C. soon suggested a Catholic broadcast, consisting of musical entertainments and a lecture “giving the Catholic viewpoint on questions of current importance.” Warning of the “dangers to faith that may come to Catholics from listening to non-Catholic expositions of religion over the radio,” the *Pilot* heartily approved of instituting Catholic programming. Five years later, O’Connell initiated a Sunday afternoon radio show, generating a “gratifying” public response.⁶⁵²

Ethnic politicians made the most of interfaith connections by highlighting their support for immigrant constituents, which resulted in greater success at the polls. In 1921, for example, James Michael Curley was elected mayor largely because people believed he had “the people’s interests at heart,” unlike the Good Government Association, which “lost the battle for public opinion” by being linked to conservative anti-radicalism. “If there is any real difference between the Goo-Goos and the Ku Klux Klan I cannot see it,” Curley insisted,

⁶⁵¹ *TI Bulletin*, 16 January 1924. Morris Morse to Felix Vorenberg, 4 January 1924; Harry Levi, Report to the Board of Trustees, 3 February 1924, both in Levi Papers. *TI Bulletin*, 13 February 1924. “Rabbi Levi Says Radio ‘Blessing,’” *Boston Traveler*, 13 March 1925, 12. For similar religious radio shows in Chicago, see Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 135-136.

⁶⁵² *Pilot*, 11 April 1925. Edmund J. Brandon to O’Connell, 29 September 1925; Knights of Columbus: General Correspondence; Box 3:10; *Pilot*, 5 October 1929.

also pointing out that the anti-Irish Loyal Coalition had endorsed his opponent, John R. Murphy, chair of the Boston Finance Commission.⁶⁵³ Curley also benefited from the fact that his core electorate of solidly lower middle-class Irish Americans, many of whom held city or union jobs, was already mobilized. In addition, Boston's population only grew about four percent in the decade from 748,060 to 781,188. Conversely, suburbs grew 18.5 percent (from 503,676 to 615,555) as the middle class moved there from city neighborhoods. The result was the removal of many of the impediments to Irish municipal power.⁶⁵⁴

Even so, it was due to Curley's focus on ethnic tension in this period, Connolly argues, that "the vision of the city as a battleground between a predominately Irish 'people' and a small set of Brahmin 'interests,' with an activist government seen as a weapon in the contest, came to define public life in Boston." Curley campaigned on a platform of activism, promising greater results on issues that affected ordinary citizens, particularly ethnic Americans, such as street and sewer construction and maintenance, streetcar fares, a committee on public health, and other matters. Once elected, the mayor embarked on a massive public building program that included multiple parks, bathhouses and beaches in ethnic neighborhoods, as well as social reforms, including an old age pension and employment bureau to assist unemployed veterans.⁶⁵⁵

Despite such programs, Boston's newer immigrant voters held considerable hostility for the politically dominant Irish. The city's immigrant population had grown tremendously (Italians constituted 95 percent of North End residents by 1920, for example), but while

⁶⁵³ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 185, 164, 184. Connolly quotes a 1921 *New York Times* editorial: "Presumably the GGA connotes in too many Boston minds the Back Bay, evening dress, Rolls Royces and 'the interests.'"

⁶⁵⁴ Ibid, 170-171. Stephen P. Erie, *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840-1985* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988), 107, 101.

⁶⁵⁵ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 163, 165-167.

Jews and Italians increasingly mobilized, they still had few representatives due to entrenched Irish power. Irish bosses had previously “used the new immigrants as a battering ram to challenge Yankee political hegemony,” but conciliation was no longer necessary by the 1920s. Fitzgerald maintained an iron grip over his “Dearos” in the North End, while Lomasney “carefully recruited promising Italian and Jewish politicians as minor club functionaries” in the West End, reserving key positions and elected office for the Irish. No Italians were elected to the city council or state legislature before 1930, and, only in Dorchester’s Fourteenth Ward were Jews able to control the ward committee and elect city councilors. As a result, Italians only “grudgingly” gave their votes to Irish candidates, but several influential Jews became Republicans. Elihu Stone, for example, ran for state senator in 1920 as a Republican, and sent out flyers to remind Jewish voters, “It is the duty of every citizen to help secure proportional *Jewish Representation* in our *Legislature*.” Thus, elections were not only an issue of political party, but also of ethnic activism.⁶⁵⁶

One of the most notable contests was Jennie Loitman Barron’s 1925 campaign for the Boston School Board. Women were an important voting constituency by the 1920s, but there was little cross-class unity among Boston’s female voters. During the 1921 election, for example, when the League of Women Voters (LWV) supported Murphy despite Curley’s record of social reform, it led him to link the group with the GGA and appeal directly to “Irish-American women” to vote for him, demonstrating that most women voted along

⁶⁵⁶ Erie, *Rainbow’s End*, 101, 118. Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 181. Ward 17 Stone campaign flyer, 1920; Stone Papers; Box 2; Folder 17. Both Curley and Senator Walsh lost their re-election bids in 1924, the year of Coolidge’s landslide victory, but regained their seats in 1926 in the uproar over immigration restriction and ethnic prejudices. This is not to say that they had support across the board; in fact, Jewish Republicans campaigned heavily against Walsh, arguing that he had not done enough for Jews while in office. The *Advocate* endorsed Republican William Butler, but Jewish Democrats supported Walsh. *Advocate*, 28 October 1926.

ethnic lines.⁶⁵⁷ In 1925, Barron, a lawyer, teacher, and LWV member, ran as a Republican and the only woman on the Public School Association ticket. Barron's campaign literature promoted her upbringing in the West End by Russian parents, her childhood in Boston's public schools, and her Zionist activity, claiming she was a "devoted public servant to her own people and to the community at large." Pamphlets also emphasized her role as a wife and mother, complete with pictures of her loving family, pointing to her success as a modern woman who combined "a career with home life." Voters were urged to "Put a Mother on the School Committee"—the first, in fact, since Julia Harrington Duff, the hated pawn of the Irish bosses. Barron polled more than 70,000 votes, easily winning the election.⁶⁵⁸

In 1928, many ethnic Americans mobilized behind Democratic candidate New York Governor Alfred Smith in his campaign for president against Herbert Hoover, a practiced government administrator. Born of Catholic immigrant parents in New York's Lower East Side, Smith was a loyal member of the Tammany Hall political machine. He rose to national prominence during the 1924 Democratic Convention, when he had protested the candidacy of William Gibbs McAdoo, who had strong supporters in the Ku Klux Klan. Smith's candidacy was "an acid test of our right to the title American citizen," Curley argued. In the North End, residents formed an "Italians for Smith" club, while Curley campaigned for Smith around New England.⁶⁵⁹

Despite Smith's popularity among ethnic Americans, Hoover won the election in a landslide. Catholics cried religious discrimination, but republicans worked hard to dispel this

⁶⁵⁷ Curley also appealed to the League of Catholic Women (Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 178-184).

⁶⁵⁸ Louis E. Kirstein to Mrs. E. Van Noorden, 30 June 1925 and leaflet for Open Forum Speakers Bureau, Jennie Loitman Barron Papers, Box 4:70, Schlesinger Library. Barron was so popular that in 1929, Curley almost lost his reelection campaign by challenging her during a radio speech. See "Curley Loses Thousands of Votes by Attacking Mrs. Barron," *Advocate*, 7 November 1929.

⁶⁵⁹ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 191-192.

perception. Jewish supporters, for example, argued that religious and ethnic intolerance had played no role in the campaign; “These are sham issues to screen the qualities of the Democratic Presidential nominee and the real issues of the campaign.” In addition, the *Advocate* reminded Jews of Hoover’s role as Food Administrator during World War I, claiming that he “prevented the Polish pogroms.”⁶⁶⁰ Smith’s Catholicism was only part of the story, however. In many ways, the election was the culmination of the struggles of the decade: small town against big city, Protestants against Catholics and Jews, and conservative Americans against radical immigrant aliens.⁶⁶¹

This last cause was the most important of the 1920s. In spite of the strength of ethnic politicians at the municipal level, ethnic and religious prejudice was the basis of the ongoing campaign to restrict immigration. The Immigration Restriction League (IRL) had finally succeeded in getting the literacy test passed in 1917, but never had enough support for further legislation. After World War I, however, as John Higham notes, the recession and the resumption of large-scale immigration “virtually swept from the American consciousness the old belief in unrestricted immigration” and destroyed “the historic confidence in the capacity of American society to assimilate all men automatically.” These developments reinforced the dangers of Europe’s “inferior races” for many Americans and strengthened calls for national quotas.⁶⁶²

By the 1920s, proponents of scientific racism and eugenics, such as Madison Grant, IRL vice president and author of *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), helped popularize the notion of a hierarchy of European racial groups: Nordics from Northern and Western

⁶⁶⁰ Smith won in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, as well as in six southern states. *Advocate*, 1 November 1928.

⁶⁶¹ The real importance of the election, however, was the mobilization of millions of ethnic Americans behind the Democratic Party. Franklin Roosevelt would reap the benefits of that coalition in the 1930s.

⁶⁶² Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 301.

Europe (including Anglo-Saxons), Alpines from Eastern Europe (including Jews), and Mediterraneans from Southern Europe. Eugenicist Theodore Lothrop Stoddard concurred. “The melting pot was an absurd fallacy,” he wrote in *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy* (1920); mixing the races only created “mongrels.” Thus, IRL leaders now had evidence to defend America’s right to exclusion. Puritan settlers of “selected stock” gave “the general tone to the country,” Joseph Lee argued; if immigration continued unabated, the superior Anglo-Saxon race would soon be extinguished.⁶⁶³

In addition to “the refined gentlemen of the Immigration Restriction League” and the “crude racists of the Ku Klux Klan,” support for restriction also came from the American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, and patriotic societies. Concerned about high unemployment due to demobilization after the Armistice, Samuel Gompers and other leaders urged the temporary suspension of immigration. Dominated by older-stock immigrants and their American-born children, the AFL also argued that immigration had “exceeded the nation’s capacity to unify and Americanize,” citing dangers of Bolshevism from Eastern European Jews and anarchism from Southern Europeans.⁶⁶⁴

This support, combined with newfound scientific respectability and the continued influx of “undesirable” European refugees, ensured that new immigration legislation “was all but inevitable.” In 1920, Congressman Albert Johnson, chair of the House Immigration Committee, called for a two-year suspension of immigration, arguing it was the only way to block the entrance of dissidents. The following year, Congress passed the Emergency Quota

⁶⁶³ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 81, 84. Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 68-90. Grant’s ideas had entered the national consciousness by 1921, popularized by the *Saturday Evening Post*, America’s most read magazine. For Lee, see Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 41.

⁶⁶⁴ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 305-307. Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 17-19.

Act, which restricted total immigration to 355,000 per year and set quotas at three percent of the number of foreign-born of each nationality present in the United States as of the 1910 census. It also required the passage of a permanent policy within fourteen months. Although the act introduced the concept of numerical restrictions, nativists believed that using the 1910 census as a basis for quotas still provided for an unacceptably high number of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. Instead, they called for a two-percent quota based on the number of foreign-born of each nationality present in 1890 and reducing the total number of immigrants to 155,000 a year. Because there were many fewer Eastern and Southern European immigrants in America in 1890, this plan would reduce their share to fifteen percent of the total, rather than forty-five percent using the 1910 numbers.⁶⁶⁵

The plan achieved the desired effect of limiting undesirable immigration, but it was blatantly discriminatory and thus subject to criticism. As Connolly argues, ethnic leaders believed that the United States, which “was supposed to be culturally open and tolerant,” seemed “ready to cut off immigrants and their children from the fruits of American society.” In 1920, for example, the *Pilot* had pointed out the impracticality of the literacy test; it was not a “true test of fitness,” as the “educated agitator has caused more harm in the country than all the illiterates who have entered our ports.” In addition, “thousands of the boys who fought in the war came to this country without the ability to pass this test,” not to mention native-born Americans who could not read. “Misfortune,” the editor argued, “should not be

⁶⁶⁵ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 104. Numbers for the 1921 law were based on the 1910 census because the 1920 results had not yet been compiled (Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 19-21). Because the bill took immediate effect, there was much confusion at the ports. Boston’s mayor, Andrew Peters, wrote to President Harding regarding refugees who had set sail before the quotas were put into place. See Hans P. Vought, *The Bully Pulpit and the Melting Pot: American Presidents and the Immigrant, 1897-1993* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004), 166-211.

penalized.”⁶⁶⁶ Similarly, the *Advocate* declared that the foreign-born Jews who had served in the famed “Lost Battalion” were “lauded for their bravery and courage,” and their stories were “death blows” to immigration restriction.⁶⁶⁷ Leaders also highlighted their groups’ contributions to America, adherence to democratic principles, conservatism, and patriotism to demonstrate their fitness for citizenship; Henry Raphael Gold, president of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, for example, argued that Jews were “full-fledged Americans” even before coming to America.⁶⁶⁸

Thus, nativists had to find an alternative means of restriction “that would discriminate without appearing to do so.” In March 1924, Senator David Reed, chair of the Senate Immigration Committee, and John Trevor, a leading proponent of restriction, proposed a system of quotas based on the “national origin” of the population as a whole in 1920, not just its foreign-born component. Trevor argued that the 1921 law actually discriminated against native-born Americans and northwestern European immigrants because it was based on the number of immigrants; to be completely impartial, Congress should base quotas on the national origins of the *whole* population. Under Trevor’s plan, sixteen percent of the total was apportioned to Eastern and Southern Europeans and eighty-four percent to Northern and Western Europeans. In this way, he declared, his quotas, while similar to the two-percent plan based on the 1890 census, were “undiscriminatory” because each nationality was given just representation. In May, Congress passed the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act on the basis of Trevor’s recommendations. The new law allowed for a total

⁶⁶⁶ Connolly, *Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism*, 172, 163. “The Literacy Test,” *Pilot*, 6 March 1920. See also protests against ideas of Anglo-Saxon superiority in *National Bureau of Information*, FOIF, Vol. 2, No 42, 16 April 1921.

⁶⁶⁷ “Jews in ‘Lost Battalion,’” *Advocate*, 13 February 1919. “Restriction Denounced,” *Advocate*, 23 October 1919.

⁶⁶⁸ Henry Raphael Gold, “Guide the Immigrant Do Not Bar Him!” *Advocate*, 6 January 1921. “Our Record,” *Advocate*, 8 November 1923; “Full-Fledged Americans Before Landing,” *Advocate*, 25 November 1920. See also “All Join in Fight Against Johnson Bill,” *Advocate*, 24 January 1924; *Advocate*, 17 January 1924.

of 155,000 immigrants per year using temporary quotas based on two-percent of the foreign-born population in 1890, with the provision that national origin quotas be determined by 1927. It also excluded any immigrants ineligible for citizenship (this was aimed primarily at Japanese and other Asian immigrants). With these provisions, historian Mae Ngai argues, the law not only ranked Europeans in a hierarchy of desirability, but also “divided Europe from the non-European world...distinguishing between white persons from white countries and so-called colored races, whose members were imagined as having no countries of origin.” In acknowledgement of the need for cheap labor by southwestern agriculturalists, however, as well as diplomatic and trade interests, no restriction was placed on immigration within the Western Hemisphere.⁶⁶⁹

The Quota Board, led by Census Bureau statistician Joseph A. Hill of Boston, incorporated these distinctions into its design for a permanent national origins quota system, particularly in its categories of classification. “Native stock,” for example, referred not to native-born Americans, but to individuals descended from the country’s white population at the time of its founding. The board also disqualified all nonwhite inhabitants from the population figures used to determine quotas, including immigrants from the Western Hemisphere and their descendants, Asian immigrants (who were ineligible for citizenship) and their descendants, African Americans, and Native Americans. The purpose of such provisions was to increase quotas for northwestern European groups, but the task of defining America’s national origins and determining each group’s proportion to the total population was complicated by the board’s reliance on “woefully incomplete” census and

⁶⁶⁹ Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 22-23, 27. The act also instituted overseas consular inspection, passports, and visa issuance. Vought, *Bully Pulpit and the Melting Pot*, 105.

immigration records dating back to the first census of 1790, which did not record nativity or ancestry. Also problematic were the post-war changes in European boundaries, which required adjusting the assignment of origins and quotas to fit new political nation-states.⁶⁷⁰

Ethnic leaders actively protested the idea of quotas based on racial distinctions and the methodological problems of using questionable census records to determine the country's national origins. As Judge David Lourie reminded the Massachusetts Congressional delegation in 1924, "we sent the flowers of our manhood to defeat spurious theories of racial superiority and we decreed it as alien to the spirit of our modern civilization." Now, however, "in America, this Teutonic conception of 'superiority' is assumed in our immigration laws."⁶⁷¹ It was more imperative than ever to prove the colonial heritage of Irish and Jewish Americans and have their numbers counted. "These laws are haphazard, unscientific, based on unworthy prejudice, and likely, ultimately, to be disastrous in their economic consequences," Edward F. McSweeney declared in the foreword to his Racial Contributions series, and "all the more reason that the priceless heritage of racial achievement by the descendants of various racial groups in the United States be told."⁶⁷² The Massachusetts Jewish Committee also advocated enacting "a fair and undiscriminatory" immigration law.⁶⁷³ Representative John J. Douglas of Massachusetts argued that the Irish Free State had a much lower quota than it should—evidence that the experts had

⁶⁷⁰ Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 23. Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia became sovereign states in 1918; Ireland was partitioned in 1921, creating the Irish Free State and Northern Ireland, which remained part of the United Kingdom.

⁶⁷¹ "Statement by Judge Lourie to Mass. Congressmen and Senators," 1924; Stone Papers; Box 4; Folder 12.

⁶⁷² For McSweeney, see Kauffman, *Faith and Fraternalism*, 270.

⁶⁷³ Massachusetts Jewish Committee, 10 December 1926; Stone Papers; Box 4; Folder 12. *Advocate*, 13 January 1927. David I. Walsh, "The Fallacy of Restrictive Immigration," *Advocate*, 11 July 1929.

“swallowed...completely” the myth of the “Scotch-Irish” that Irish-American historians had worked so hard to disprove.⁶⁷⁴

To quiet criticism from opponents, who had already succeeded in postponing the implementation of the quota system twice and continued to work for the law’s repeal, Hill commissioned immigration historian Marcus Lee Hansen and genealogist Howard Baker to examine the national origins of America’s 1790 white population. Utilizing a more effective method of analyzing surnames, their calculations reduced the quota for Great Britain and Northern Ireland (which held the lion’s share of the total) by more than twenty thousand, from eighty-two percent to sixty-seven percent of the board’s previous estimate. Their results were the basis of the Quota Board’s third and final report to Congress, finalized in 1929. Even so, the concept of determining national origins remained problematic. As Hill noted, “when the law speaks of the number of inhabitants having a particular national origin, the inhabitant must be looked upon as a unit of measure rather than a distinct person,” particularly in cases of intermarriage, where, “if we have, for example, four people each of whom had three English grandparents and one German grandparent, we have the equivalent of three English inhabitants and one German inhabitant.” Thus, Ngai argues, “its methodology assumed that national identities were immutable and transhistorical, passed down through generations without change.” The debate over the national origins quota

⁶⁷⁴ Scotch-Irish immigrants were counted toward Britain’s quota. Douglas referenced the work of Michael J. O’Brien of the American Irish Historical Society, who wrote *A Hidden Phase of American History* (1920) to disprove the Scotch-Irish myth. John Bantry, “What the Irish Affront Means,” *Boston Post*, 11 May 1926, in Archives of the American Irish Historical Society, New York; Marion R. Casey, “Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture, 1890-1960” (Ph.D. Diss., New York University, 1998), 150-153. In fact, the Irish Free State ended up with the third largest quota at 17,853 (after Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Germany). Also, despite the fervor, fewer Irish were actually coming to America by the mid-1920s, and Ireland rarely met her quota. See *Pilot*, 22 May 1926; “Irish Emigrants Less Than Quota,” *Pilot*, 15 May 1926; “Prosperity of Ireland,” *Pilot*, 28 December 1929.

system continued to mount through the fall 1928 presidential elections and into early 1929, as lobbyists on both sides intensified their efforts to influence Congress. In February, Congress and newly elected President Hoover accepted that the board's calculations were "as near as we can get on this matter of determining the national origins, practically," and they became law.⁶⁷⁵

The Search for Authenticity: Ethnic American Popular Culture

The passage of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act ended mass immigration, but immigrants and their offspring continued to face discrimination and pressure to conform to Anglo-Protestant ideals. As Connolly argues, the combined forces of conservatism "sharpened ethnic sensibilities and increased ethnic consciousness in the city and throughout the nation." To maintain ethnic consciousness, it became imperative not only to "keep the young within the fold" through religious activism and education, but also to find new ways of defining oneself as Irish or Jewish. As in the past, ethnic Americans used popular culture and mass consumerism to "perpetuate an interest in ethnic affairs" and incorporate "America's national symbols into ethnic undertakings." In the process, they created a hybrid ethnic American culture.⁶⁷⁶

Irish and Jewish products had been advertised for years in the *Pilot*, *Advocate*, and other newspapers. Department stores like Jordan Marsh and Filene's, as well as specialty stores like Griffin's Clothiers, advertised Irish linen, tweeds, and china to upwardly mobile ethnic Americans, while Jewish grocers such as the Rabinovitz Brothers' Chain Store

⁶⁷⁵ Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 32-35.

⁶⁷⁶ Alexander, *Ethnic Pride, American Patriotism*, 10. See also Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 147, 54-56.

Creameries (later Shop and Shop Supermarkets) sold Manischewitz Matzo and other Jewish goods. Realizing the importance of encouraging ethnic loyalty, local Irish and Jewish businesses also advertised in church and synagogue bulletins and event programs and sponsored organizational sports teams. In the 1920s, Irish nationalist and Zionist organizations increasingly promoted products from the homeland, urging their American compatriots to “buy Irish” or “buy Jewish.” One 1922 Palestine Products Company ad, for example, urged Jews to “buy Palestine almonds, direct from Richon Le Zion, Palestine.”⁶⁷⁷

American companies realized the growing power of the ethnic consumer and appealed to their ethnic interests. The *Boston Sunday Advertiser*, for example, extensively covered the Anglo-Irish War and included “thrilling” stories by Michael Collins, Eamon de Valera, and other leaders. In 1921, the *Advertiser* included a free book on “Ireland’s Fighting Songs,” just in time for Saint Patrick’s Day. Similarly, the *Boston American* argued, “whether your sympathies are with Erin in her fight for freedom or with Britain, you want all the news of the history-making negotiations.”⁶⁷⁸

Advertisers also marketed American products to ethnic audiences. As discussed in Chapter 3, products like Maxwell House Coffee and Crisco had been advertised in ethnic newspapers since 1900. By the 1920s, targeted marketing most frequently appeared in the *Pilot* and *Advocate* near ethnic and religious holidays. During Lent, for example, stores and

⁶⁷⁷ See, for example, C.F. Hovey Company ad for Irish linens of “our own importation,” *Pilot*, 14 August 1920; C.G. Maguire ad for Irish homespun tweeds, *Pilot*, 28 March 1921; “Tell your Tailor to Stock Irish Goods,” *Newsletter of the National Bureau of Information, FOIF*, No. 9, 28 August 1920. Manischewitz ad, *Advocate*, 15 March 1923; Rabinovitz ad, *Advocate*, 17 March 1927; Palestine almond ad in *Advocate*, 7 September 1922, 2; See also Casey, “Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture,” 189-193, 201-205; Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 111-112.

⁶⁷⁸ For ads for Irish war coverage, see *Pilot*, 12 March 1921; *Pilot* 15 October 1921; *Pilot*, 4 February 1922. *Boston American* ad, *Advocate*, 22 September 1921 and *Pilot*, 24 September 1921. See also *Boston Sunday Post* ad for Irish coat of arms, “a fine 17th of March souvenir,” *Pilot*, 11 March 1922; *Boston Advertiser* ad for series on Irish genealogy, *Pilot*, 13 April 1929

manufacturers advertised religious articles, such as rosary beads, catechisms, and statuary, as well as food, such as codfish cakes (a Lenten staple) and clothing for Easter.⁶⁷⁹

Advertisements touting kosher products peppered the *Advocate* near Passover, due to the newspaper's growing readership of Jews of Eastern European descent. As the manufacturers of Oakite cleanser claimed, "On this Passover Liberty comes to the woman," by promising to end the drudgery that came with making the home "clean and kosher" for Passover. Others featured food products, such as Mazola Oil, endorsed by a leading rabbi. While manufacturers had marketed to immigrant women for decades, some advertisements also pointed to a growing trend to appeal to a new creation—the discerning American "Jewish housewife." Coleman's Fashion Shop, for example, claimed that "the Jewish woman of today" was known as "the smartest dresser wherever women of fashion are assembled."⁶⁸⁰

Ethnic and religious holidays were also becoming increasingly important occasions for maintaining ethnic identity. "The 17th of March is one of those days which knit together for the moment the scattered children of a nation, and thrill them with a common joy," the *Pilot* editorialized in 1925. "On this day the sons and daughters of the Gael...remember the blood that is theirs and are proud of it." St. Patrick's Day became an occasion for advertising Irish products and for Irish-themed ads, demonstrating the commercial possibilities of the holiday. As the holiday became more widely celebrated, new trends included wearing green, putting out Irish-themed decorations, and sending Irish-themed cards. One novel ad for

⁶⁷⁹ Jordan Marsh ad, *Pilot*, 11 March 1922. Davis Bros.' Codfish Cakes ad, *Pilot*, 5 March 1927.

⁶⁸⁰ Ads for Mardi-Gras Tea in *Advocate*, 30 March 1922 and 29 March 1928; Oakite ad in *Advocate*, 22 March 1928. Matzo ad, in *Advocate*, 15 March 1923. Mazola ad, in *Advocate*, 13 January 1927. Maxwell House coffee ad in *Advocate*, 23 February 1928. Other kosher product advertisements included Rokeach soap, in *Advocate*, 23 February 1928. Ethnic advertisements coincided with Eastern European Jewish immigration and American concerns about sanitary conditions. American-born ethnics usually kept kosher only during Passover. See Halter, *Shopping for Ethnicity*, 33-35; Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance*, 174-177; Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 110.

emerald jewelry from jeweler Shreve, Crump and Low was entitled, “The Wearing of the Green.”⁶⁸¹

As the ethnic homeland increasingly became a place of memory and fantasy, those who had family in the “old country” maintained contact through letters and visits.

Romanticized travelogue movies featuring the Irish countryside were commonplace by the 1920s, and Jewish films about Eastern Europe were also becoming popular. In 1928, for example, one local theater showed “A Trip to the Old Country,” which showcased one hundred Russian and Polish Jewish cities. “See the town where you were born or where your folks came from,” the ad enticed. More common, however, were Zionist-sponsored movies about the Jewish settlement of Palestine, targeting American Jewish audiences, who were largely ignorant about the region.⁶⁸²

The emerging tourist industry perpetuated these romanticized film images. Cunard and White Star advertisements for excursions to Ireland and Palestine appeared in the *Pilot* and *Advocate* early in the decade. In July 1922, the AOH organized a “pilgrimage to Erin,” which, it hoped, would “have a durable and favorable influence upon the pilgrims themselves” in terms of “sentimental aspects” to “every true son and daughter of kindly, generous Erin.” The Irish Free State began a concerted effort to attract American tourists with the establishment of the Irish Tourist Association in 1925. As historian Marion Casey argues, “tourism depended on a positive image that was somehow more ‘authentic’ than the

⁶⁸¹ “St. Patrick,” *Pilot*, 14 March 1925; *Pilot*, 16 March 1929. Shreve, Crump and Low ad, *Pilot*, 12 March 1921. For more on St. Patrick’s Day, see Casey, “Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture,” 266-318; Mike Cronin and Daryl Adair, *The Wearing of the Green: A History of St. Patrick’s Day* (London: Routledge, 2002), 164-168.

⁶⁸² *Advocate*, 9 February 1928. For Irish films, see Peter Flynn, “Coming into Clover: Ireland and the Irish in Early American cinema, 1895--1917” (Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2008). For Zionist films, see Stone Papers; Box 6, Folder 7. “Israel” was not used to refer to the Jewish homeland in Palestine until the 1940s.

real Ireland.” The *Pilot* touted the “excellent” tourist conditions in Ireland and the “many historical and entrancing landmarks” and firmly disputed “reports of dangers from stray bullets and the breakdown of public utilities or by reports of famine conditions.” By mid-decade, advertisements and articles emphasized the trend of many Irish Americans of going home to the “old country” for Christmas and on summer group excursions, as well as Ireland’s appeal as a stopover for American travelers en route to continental Europe.⁶⁸³

American Jews increasingly viewed Palestine as a tourist destination with the increase of European immigration after the 1920 San Remo Agreement. In 1926, for example, a group of prominent New England Jews organized a two-month cruise and “pilgrimage” to the Holy Land to see “what is being done to rehabilitate it.” Another ad for a “pilgrimage to Palestine” on the Cunard Line’s *Mauretania*, with its “special Kosher kitchen for Jewish travelers,” referenced the Seder refrain, “next year, in Palestine,” noting that now American Jews could make it a reality; “Visit Jerusalem, see the dawn of a new Jewish Homeland” and the “progress made by Jewish Pioneers.”⁶⁸⁴

For most ethnic Americans, however, such excursions remained beyond their means; instead, ethnic culture was localized in the urban neighborhood. Young people created much of the new hybrid ethnic American culture. While many leaders bemoaned the dangers of modernization from new communications media, such as the phonograph player, radio, and film, young adults were eager to explore these alternative means of cultural diffusion.

“Interests that seemed unorthodox at home,” Lizabeth Cohen notes, were “pursued in

⁶⁸³ *Pilot*, 18 February 1922; *Pilot*, 12 March 1922; “July Date of Hibernian Pilgrimage to Erin,” *Pilot*, 15 April 1922; “Conditions in Ireland Excellent for the Tourist,” *Pilot*, 27 June 1925. *Pilot*, 27 November 1926; “Ireland Draws Many Americans at Christmastide,” 10 December 1927; *Pilot*, 6 August 1927. Casey, “Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture,” 222; particularly 256-265 for Irish culture tours and home visits by “returned Yanks.”

⁶⁸⁴ *Advocate*, 11 March 1926; *Advocate*, 2 February 1928.

ethnic company at neighborhood movie houses, club rooms, and dance halls.” In fact, while Anglo-Protestants might still dominate elite institutions, ethnic Americans ruled most mass media forms. By including elements of their own ethnic cultures, they confidently proclaimed that they were “the equals of self-styled ‘real’ Americans.”⁶⁸⁵

The music industry had long recognized the profitability of the ethnic market. As phonograph players became less expensive, companies increasingly produced records to appeal to Americans of all ethnic backgrounds. Music shops catered to specific clienteles, such as Ludwig and Company Piano Manufacturers, which sold “Hebrew records from your favorite Cantors and artists” and the latest songs from the Yiddish theater. Fitzgerald’s Victrola Shop advertised the latest “Irish gems for discriminating parents,” including Irish tenor John McCormack’s latest hits. Irish music was especially marketable due to the large urban Irish-American market, and immigrant musicians recorded Tin Pan Alley songs and dance tunes for Columbia Records and ethnic labels. In 1926, Justus O’Byrne DeWitt opened O’Byrne DeWitt House of Irish, a store and travel agency in Roxbury’s Dudley Square. Recently arrived from New York after the death of his mother, Ellen, who was instrumental in establishing the Irish record industry in America, De Witt sought to create an all-encompassing Irish experience. At his shop, one could take music lessons, purchase music books and instruments, and book passage to Ireland. He later formed the Copley label, recording Irish musicians exclusively.⁶⁸⁶

⁶⁸⁵ Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 144-145. McClymer, “Passing from Light into Dark.”

⁶⁸⁶ Victrola ad, *Advocate*, 19 February 1925. For Irish record ads, see *Pilot*, 19 February 1921; *Pilot*, 20 December 1922; *Pilot*, 18 December 1926. Quote in *Pilot*, 12 March 1927. As one ad noted, anyone “with a drop of Irish blood in his veins” would play the featured Irish tunes “again and again” (*Pilot*, 13 March 1920). Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 105-106. For O’Byrne DeWitt, see Susan Gedutis, *See You at the Hall: Boston’s Golden Era of Irish Music and Dance* (Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University Press, 2005), 149-158. Neely’s Irish Music Box (*Pilot*, 6 January 1923); South Boston Music Company (*Pilot*, 12 December 1925).

By the early 1920s, radio helped facilitate the dissemination of ethnic music. Early radio consisted of talk shows, nationality hours, labor news, church services, and local musical entertainment. They became another way to identify with ethnic tradition and bring people together, as houses and shops that had radios became gathering places. Boston radio featured religious programs, Yiddish music shows, and “Irish Hours.” Joseph O’Leary, of the Irish Minstrels band hosted one of the first Irish music programs on WEEI. He used the popular show to promote his band, sell recordings, and feature other local performers, such as Dan Sullivan’s Shamrock Band and Terry O’Toole’s Irish Echoes. Thus, Irish music served “as both an ingroup affirmation of Irish traditional culture as well as a positive display of Irish self-identity to the general public.”⁶⁸⁷

Movies similarly presented positive ethnic types to American audiences. Irish and Jewish characters were especially prevalent, given the plethora of entertainers in the vaudeville and movie industries. Popular films like “America’s favorite comedy, “Abie’s Irish Rose” (1925), and the first “talkie,” Al Jolson’s *The Jazz Singer* (1927), featured Irish and Jews as Americanized individuals, but within their ethnic domain. They also discussed various problems of the American-born generations, including assimilation, the immigrant generational divide, and intermarriage. Cohen notes that working-class ethnics viewed such films for most of the decade in their neighborhood theater, where “the spirit of the community” was “carried over into the local movie hall.”⁶⁸⁸

⁶⁸⁷ Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 133-135. Gedutis, *See You at the Hall*, 21-27; Mick Moloney, “Irish Music in America” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1992), 551; Meaghan Dwyer, “The ‘Irish Hour’: Irish Radio Programs in America,” *Foilsiii* 2.1 (Spring 2002): 19-30. For quote, see Rebecca S. Miller, “Irish Traditional and Popular Music in New York City: Identity and Social Change, 1930-1975,” in *New York Irish*, ed. Ronald H. Bayor and Timothy J. Meagher (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 485, 484.

⁶⁸⁸ *Advocate*, 9 February 1928; “The Jazz Singer,” *Advocate*, 22 March 1928; “Abie’s Irish Rose,” *Advocate*, 24 September 1925. Feingold, *A Time for Searching*, 86-87. Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 122-123.

Live entertainment also remained important for Boston's Irish and Jewish immigrant communities. The Yiddish theatre was increasingly popular with immigrant Jews, serving as a connection to Eastern Europe and "a bridge between avante-garde Continental drama and American drama." Jewish plays appealed to the audience's emotions, and encouraged active engagement. A permanent Yiddish theatre was finally established in Boston in the late 1910s at the Grand Opera House on Washington and Grover Streets. Founded by noted Yiddish actor Jacob Kalich and his wife, actress Molly Picon, the company averaged four performances a week, including literary productions, melodramas, and light comedies. Julius Nathanson bought the company in 1920 and continued to further the theater's popularity. In 1923, for example, the "Golden Bride" was the "biggest hit of the Jewish stage," seen by 42,000 people in Boston.⁶⁸⁹

The Yiddish theater was only one venue where Jews gathered together. Jewish leaders also initiated entertainment that would appeal to the suburbanizing middle class. The Boston Pops, for example, featured an annual "Zionist Pops Night" at Symphony Hall, featuring Jewish ritual music and folk songs. Held under the auspices of the Daughters of Zion, it was billed as "An Evening for Every Zionist, Every Jew in the community." In addition, synagogue clubs, college dances, resorts, and summer camps brought Jewish young adults and children together in a Jewish-oriented setting. They helped to preserve group culture and provided the potential for meeting future Jewish mates.⁶⁹⁰

Irish Bostonians socialized in a variety of settings. Middle-class Irish Catholics associated largely within their parish or in ethnic cultural organizations, but for many

⁶⁸⁹ *Advocate*, 30 September 1920; "Made Possible a Permanent Yiddish Theatre in Boston," *Advocate*, 7 October 1920. *Advocate*, 1 November 1923. Feingold, *A Time for Searching*, 64.

⁶⁹⁰ Zionist Pops Night, *Advocate* April 19, 1928. For resorts, see Feingold, *A Time for Searching*, 41-42. For camps, see, for example, Camp Shari for boys and girls, in Ware, Massachusetts. Ad in *Advocate*, 22 March 1928.

working-class Irish, music remained the center of informal gatherings, known as “kitchen rackets,” as well as more formal affairs.⁶⁹¹ Beginning in the 1920s, Irish immigrants gathered at Irish dance halls, particularly those in Irish-dominated Dudley Square in Roxbury. The largest was Hibernian Hall, built in 1913 as the headquarters for nearly two-dozen divisions of the AOH. This and other dance halls became centers of Irish music and dance in mid-twentieth century Boston. Taking their cue from the larger Irish dance hall circuit in New York, Boston’s halls featured céilí music, Tin Pan Alley songs, and new forms of American music. Those musicians and bands who had recorded their music or played on the radio received a special status, often “becoming legends” in the community.⁶⁹²

For the 70,000 Irish immigrants who lived in Boston in the 1920s, as well as the 210,000 American-born Irish, the dance halls not only provided opportunities to further “individual liberation,” as Mick Moloney notes, but also “encouraged social and cultural continuity in the Irish and Irish American community.” As one long-time resident remembers, young Irish-American women “would ride the streetcars” to the hall, “where they danced with their choice of strapping young lads fresh off the boat from Galway, Cork, Wexford, or Kerry.” This function was clear, as was another—alcohol was not available at the halls. The object was to meet friends and dance; those who wanted a pint had to go to nearby bars. Immigrants met individuals from their hometowns in Ireland, were introduced

⁶⁹¹ Author interview with Mary McManus Dwyer, 24 April 2003; Ide O’Carroll, *Models for Movers: Irish Women’s Emigration to America* (Dublin: Attic Press, 1990), 38; Gedutis, *See You at the Hall*, 29-34.

⁶⁹² Michael P. Quinlin, *Irish Boston: A Lively Look at Boston’s Colorful Past* (Guilford, Conn.: Globe Pequot Press, 2004), 128. Gedutis, *See You at the Hall*, 23, 35-79. By the 1940s, traditional music lost its popularity due to the rise of big band music and the linking of céilí music with the lower class, but it continued to be a vital link between the generations.

to future spouses, and gained new connections in Boston. The halls also served as informal employment networks, as immigrants compared notes on jobs.⁶⁹³

Conclusion

Even as Irish and Jews in Boston realized that their expectations of acceptance after World War I were premature, they continued to assert the compatibility of their ethnic culture and religion with American loyalties. Post-war Americanization campaigns targeted anarchists, radicals, and labor agitators. In response, Irish and Jews emphasized their group's loyalty to American ideological principles, rather than conformity to Anglo cultural practices.

Part of this process included greater participation in the fight for Irish freedom and the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Despite internal disagreements in both movements and protests from mainstream Americans, ethnic nationalists fought for recognition for their homelands, all the while insisting on their adherence to democratic ideals. In the end, the creation of the Irish Free State satisfied the desire for independence and respectability for most Irish Americans, but a Jewish state remained a not-too-distant dream for American Zionists until the 1940s.

The focus on conservatism and Americanism in the 1920s gave an added strength to the forces of antiradicalism and traditionalism in many segments of society, evidenced in heightened religious, ethnic, and racial tensions and a longing for a mythical Anglo-Saxon past. Highlighting their contributions as ethnic patriots, Irish and Jewish leaders fought antisemitism and anti-Catholicism, and engaged in efforts to increase interfaith

⁶⁹³ Mick Moloney, foreword, Gedutis, *See You at the Hall*, xiv, 94-95. Bill Forry, "The Capital of Irish America," *The World of Hibernia* 6.1 (Summer 2000), 32-34.

understanding. Politically, ethnic Americans increasingly identified with the Democratic Party, largely as a reaction to the conservatism of the Republicans during the 1920s. Local politicians like Mayor James Michael Curley benefitted from this backlash, as ethnic Americans believed his calls for activist government reflected their best interests, as opposed to the patrician Good Government Association. Over time, Jews, Italians, and other ethnic groups responded to Irish political dominance with their own attempts at ethnic activism. Even so, the growing popularity of “scientific” theories of Anglo-Saxon superiority led to the passage of immigration restriction laws based on national quotas.

Despite such problems, the 1920s saw an increase in ethnic consciousness for Boston’s Irish and Jewish communities. Continued discrimination and pressure to conform to Anglo-Protestant ideals encouraged group cohesion by minimizing internal class and cultural divisions. With the end of mass migration and the increase of suburbanization, ethnic leaders were determined to ensure the durability and respectability of ethnic and religious culture. Through a combination of religious education, popular culture, and mass consumerism, American-born generations created a hybrid ethnic culture that would survive for decades in Boston’s entrenched ethnic neighborhoods.

Conclusion: Legacies of Ethnic Patriotism in Boston

This dissertation has presented a comparative study of ethnic acculturation and group consciousness. Focusing on two ethnic groups in one American city, it has demonstrated the overarching role that ethnic patriotism plays in the ongoing formation of ethnic American identity. As the case of Irish and Jewish communities in Boston reveals, even during periods of intense nativism, Americanization did not mean Anglo-Protestant conformity. Instead, these groups proved the centrality of Irish Catholicism and Judaism to American patriotism and emphasized the compatibility of ethnic culture and nationalist causes with American democratic ideals. Although they failed to achieve the lasting acceptance they sought through participation in civic activities, politics, and war service, they did gain a new respectability. In addition, the nativist backlash of the 1920s, while disturbing for its demonstration of continued prejudice, contributed to a greater sense of unity for the city's Irish and Jewish communities. American-born ethnics remained committed to maintaining ethnic identity and culture through organizational life and mass media.

This study follows the approach of such historians as Kathleen Neils Conzen, Gary Gerstle, and Jonathan Sarna, who argue for the idea of multiple Americanisms. The men and women in Boston's Irish and Jewish communities were by no means united in their expressions of ethnic identity. Instead, class, gender, religion, and immigrant generation informed their individual experiences and complicated the formation of a cohesive communal identity. In hopes of overcoming these tensions and promoting group unity,

factions reacted to internal and external pressures by claiming to represent the community as whole.⁶⁹⁴

In the late nineteenth century, communal support allowed for upward mobility for immigrants, which in turn helped to maintain group consciousness and achieve group respectability. Irish and Jewish accomplishments in business, philanthropy, and politics discredited nativist assertions that immigrants could not acculturate. By the beginning of the twentieth century, increasing demographic strength and economic mobility helped to raise Irish and Jewish visibility in the city, but the groups still fought for influence in municipal affairs, civic participation, and political action. As faction-based ward politics replaced conciliation, politicians, reformers, and community leaders alternately cooperated with and contested with each other to shape public opinion and determine the political agenda. Ethnic voter mobilization demonstrated new citizens' desire to help improve their adopted city. Even so, continued immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe and increasing political influence led to a resurgence of nativism. Irish and Jews began to realize that many Yankees made little distinction between the ethnic elite and the new arrivals, which helped to minimize internal communal differences.

This public assertiveness was demonstrated in greater civic engagement and commemorations of ethno-religious events. Events like the anniversary of Jewish settlement in America and the Catholic archdiocese's centennial fueled optimism about the place of Jews and Irish in American life, and emphasized the growing acceptance of ethnic culture

⁶⁹⁴ Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E. Pozzetta, and Rudolph J. Vecoli, "The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective from the U.S.A.," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12 (Fall 1992), 3-41; Gary Gerstle, "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans," *Journal of American History* 84 (September 1997): 524-558; and Jonathan Sarna, "The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture," *Jewish Social Studies* n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999): 52-79.

and contributions. Involvement in political causes and civic celebrations gave individuals in Boston's Irish and Jewish communities a newfound confidence to promote their group causes while demonstrating their loyalty to their adopted land. Dismissing charges of "hyphenated Americanism," ethnic nationalists used the language of American democratic ideals to defend their continued attachment to cultural practices and homeland independence struggles. Even so, ethnic nationalism remained a hotly contested subject during the Progressive Era. Irish and Jews argued that fostering religion, language, and culture provided a foundation for group consciousness and respectability, while participation in nationalist activities demonstrated their love for the American principles of freedom and democracy.

After decades of trying to achieve full acceptance, Irish and Jewish Americans saw World War I as the ultimate test of ethnic patriotism. Although it was a time of suspicion and crisis, they made it into an opportunity to express loyalty by helping to mobilize war effort and joining the military in large numbers. Emphasizing the importance of religious freedom, they provided religious and material support to servicemen of all denominations at home and overseas. At the same time, they linked their nationalist struggles to Wilson's promise of self-determination for small nations.

At war's end, Irish and Jews in Boston, as elsewhere, were confident that their participation in the war effort would prove their loyalty, gain them unquestioned acceptance as respected citizens, and win independence for their homelands. This confidence proved to be premature, however, as fears of subversion and disorder manifested in the Red Scare's crusade against foreigners, radicals, and labor agitators. Unperturbed, Irish Catholics and Jews continued to assert their cultural and religious identity within the context of

Americanism, seeking to enhance their group consciousness, prove their contributions as ethnic patriots, and continue efforts for Irish independence and a Jewish homeland, with limited success in both.

By the early 1920s, the resumption of large-scale immigration and fears that America was being overrun by “less desirable races” led to increased calls for Americanization and restriction based on national quotas. Irish and Jewish leaders in Boston, as elsewhere, protested these developments, stressing their devotion to the American principles of democracy and freedom to demonstrate their group’s integral role in the country. They also engaged in efforts to increase interfaith understanding and smooth class and ethnic tensions. With the passage of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act, the period of mass migration ended, but immigrant groups continued to face pressure to conform to Anglo-Protestant ideals.

As the 1920s drew to a close, ethnic leaders were determined to ensure the durability and respectability of the ethnic and religious community. Continued discrimination encouraged group cohesion by minimizing internal class and cultural divisions, even as suburbanization increased. Popular music and sports provided opportunities for Irish and Jews to participate in mainstream American culture, but in the process, ethnic Americans adopted them as their own by adding their cultural contributions along the way. As a result, Irish and Jews created a hybrid ethnic culture, rooted in traditional and symbolic ethnic practices, mass consumerism, and local adaptations that would survive for decades in Boston’s entrenched ethnic neighborhoods.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

American Irish Historical Society, New York, New York

Daniel F. Cohalan Papers
Friends of Irish Freedom Papers

American Jewish Historical Society, Hebrew College, Newton, Massachusetts

Abraham Alpert Papers
Boston Hebrew Immigration Aid Society Papers
Boston New Century Club Papers
Boston YMHA-Hecht House Papers
Bureau of Jewish Education of Boston Papers
Combined Jewish Philanthropies Papers
Congregation Mishkan Israel Papers
Congregation Beth Israel Papers
Congregation Ohabei Shalom Papers
Colonel Bernard Louis Gorfinkle Papers
Independent Order of B'rith Abraham Papers
Louisa May Alcott Club, Boston Papers
Abraham C. Ratshesky Papers
Elihu David Stone Papers
United Hebrew Benevolent Association of Boston Papers

Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio

Abraham Alpert Papers
Albert Ehrenfried Papers
Fanny Goldstein Papers
Rabbi Solomon Schindler Papers

Archives of the Archdiocese of Boston, Boston, Massachusetts

Knights of Columbus Papers
League of Catholic Women Papers
William Cardinal O'Connell Papers

Boston Public Library, Boston, Massachusetts

James Michael Curley Papers
Fanny Goldstein Papers
Immigration Restriction League Papers
Dennis A. McCarthy Irish Collection

John J. Burns Library, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

Charitable Irish Society Papers

Katherine Conway Papers
Patrick Collins Papers
Friends of Irish Freedom Pamphlet Collection
John Boyle O'Reilly Papers
Mary Boyle O'Reilly Papers
Thomas F. Ring Papers
"The Whole 'D' Family: Just One Letter of the Alphabet, and the Lesson It Teaches," pamphlet published by the American Citizen, 1905.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts

Charitable Irish Society Papers
Martin Lomasney Papers

National Archives and Records Administration (accessed via Ancestry.com)

U.S. Federal Census, Schedule 1 (Population); 1840-1930
U.S. Naturalization Records Indexes, 1794-1972
World War I Draft Registration Cards, 1917-1918

Arthur & Elizabeth Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Jennie Loitman Barron Papers
Margaret Lillian Foley Papers, Women's Rights Collection
Mary Kenney O'Sullivan Papers, Women's Rights Collection

Temple Israel Archives, Temple Israel, Boston, Massachusetts

Board of Trustees Minutes, 1863-1929
Brotherhood Collection
Rabbi Charles Fleischer Papers
Rabbi Harry Levi Papers
Rabbi Solomon Schindler Papers
Sisterhood Collection
Temple Israel Bulletin, 1907-1929
Women Whose Lives Spanned a Century Oral History Project

Author's Collection

Maurice A. and Eleanor Twomey Papers

Oral Histories

Mary McManus Dwyer, interview by Meaghan Dwyer, 10 May 2003, audiotape.

Newspapers and Journals

Boston Globe. Boston, Mass., 1874-1929
Boston Hebrew Observer. Boston, Mass., 1883-1886

Boston Herald. Boston, Mass., 1863-1929
[Boston] Jewish Advocate. Boston, Mass., 1905-2008
Boston Jewish Herald. Boston, Mass., 1893-1894
Jewish Chronicle. Boston, Mass., 1891-1893
Journal of the American Irish Historical Society, New York, NY, 1897-1924
New York Times. New York, NY, 1863-1929
Pilot, Boston, Mass., 1890-1929
Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, New York, NY, 1893-1924
Republic, Boston, Mass., 1898-1918
Sacred Heart Review, Cambridge, Mass., 1880-1918

Published Primary Sources

“The 250th Anniversary of the Settlement of the Jews in the United States,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 14 (1906).

Antin, Mary. *The Promised Land*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912.

Bamber, Golde. “Russians in Boston,” *Lend a Hand Monthly: A Record of Progress* 8 (March 1892).

Batchelder, Roger. *Camp Devens*. Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, Publishers, 1918.

Bourne, Randolph. “Trans-National America,” *Atlantic Monthly* 118 (July 1916): 86-97.

Brandeis, Louis D. *Brandeis on Zionism: A Collection of Addresses and Statements by Louis D. Brandeis*. Washington, DC: Zionist Organization of America, 1942.

Clarke, Ida Clyde. *American Women and the World War*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1918.

Cohen, George. *The Jews in the Making of America*. Boston: The Stratford Co., 1924.

Cullen, James Bernard, ed. *The Story of the Irish in Boston Together with Biographical Sketches of Representative Men and Noted Women*. Boston: H.A. Plimpton, 1893.

Curran, M.P. *Life of Patrick A. Collins, With Some of His Most Notable Public Addresses*. Norwood, Mass.: Norwood Press, 1906.

De Haas, Jacob. *Louis D. Brandeis: A Biographical Sketch*. New York: Bloch Publishing, 1929.

Fleischer, Charles. “A Bit of Baseball Biography,” *Baseball Magazine* Vol. 1, no. 2 (June 1908): 35-36.

- Hennessey, Michael Edmund. *Twenty Years of Massachusetts Politics from Russell to McCall, 1890-1915*. Boston: Practical Politics, Inc., 1917.
- Herbermann, Charles G., Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, John J. Wynne. *The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume VIII*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. 1910.
- Herzl, Theodore. *The Jewish State (Der Judenstaat)*, Harry Zohn, transl., with an introduction by Joseph Adler. New York: Herzl Press, 1970.
- Kallen, Horace. "Democracy *Versus* the Melting Pot," *The Nation* 100.2591 (25 Feb. 1915): 190-194, 217-220.
----- . *The Structure of Lasting Peace*. Boston, 1918.
- Levi, Harry. *1919 Sunday Service*. Boston: Temple Israel, 1919.
----- . *A Rabbi Speaks*. Boston: Chapple Publishing Co., 1930.
- Linsky, Fannie Barnett. *America and the Jew: A Pageant for Thanksgiving Day*. Cincinnati, UAHC, 1923.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot. "The Restriction of Immigration," *North American Review* vol. 152 (January 1891): 27-37.
----- . "Lynch Law and Unrestricted Immigration," *North American Review*, vol. 152 (January 1891): 602-613.
- McCall, Samuel Walker. *Patriotism of the Jew*. New York: Plymouth Press, 1924.
- McSweeney, Edward F. *De-Americanizing Young America: Poisoning the Sources of our National history and Traditions*. Boston: p.p., 1920.
----- . ed. *Studies in History*. Knights of Columbus, 1922.
- O'Brien, Michael J. *A Hidden Phase of American History: Ireland's Part in America's Struggle for Liberty*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1920.
- O'Connell, William Cardinal. *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston*. Boston, Pilot Publishing Company, 1908-1929.
- Roche, James Jeffrey. *Life of John Boyle O'Reilly*. New York: Cassell Publishing Company, 1891.
- Ross, Edward Alsworth. *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*. New York: The Century Co., 1914.
- Schindler, Solomon. *Israelites in Boston. A Tale Describing the Development of Judaism in Boston, Preceded by the Jewish Calendar for the Next Decade*. Boston: Berwick & Smith, 1889.
----- . *Messianic Expectations and Modern Judaism*. Boston: S.E. Cassino and Co., 1886.

Simmons, S[imon]. *The History of Temple Ohabei Shalom, Principal Events from Its Organization in 1843, to the Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration on February 26th, 1893*. Boston, 1893.

Singer, Isidore. *Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1901-1906.

Taft, William Howard, ed. *Service With Fighting Men: An Account of the Work of the American Young Men's Christian Associations in the World War*. New York: Association Press, 1922.

Williams, Michael. *American Catholics in the War: National Catholic War Council, 1917-1921*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1921.

Woods, Robert A. *The City Wilderness: A Study of the South End*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1898.

Americans in Process: A Study of the North and West Ends. Boston, 1902.

Woods Robert A. and Albert Kennedy. *Zone of Emergence: Observations of Lower Middle and Upper Working Class Communities of Boston, 1905-1914*, second edition. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962.

Secondary Sources

Abrams, Richard A. *Conservatism in a Progressive Era: Massachusetts Politics, 1900-1912*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Abrams, Roger I. "Constructing Baseball," *Cardozo Law Review* 23.5 (6 September 2002): 1597-1608.

-----, *The First World Series and the Baseball Fanatics of 1903*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003.

Ainley, Leslie G. *Boston Mahatma*. Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1949.

Adams, Bluford. "New Ireland: The Place of Immigrants in New England Regionalism," *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Winter 2005), 2-33.

Alexander, June Granatir. *Ethnic Pride, American Patriotism: Slovaks and Other New Immigrants in the Interwar Era*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2004.

Alexander, Michael. *Jazz Age Jews*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Almeida, Linda Dowling. *Irish Immigrants in New York City, 1945-1995*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2001.

- Appel, John J. "Immigrant Historical Societies in the United States, 1880–1950." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1960.
- "Hansen's Third Generation 'Law' and the Origins of the American Jewish Historical Society," *Jewish Historical Studies* Vol. 23, no. 1 (Jan. 1961): 3–20.
- "The New England Origins of the American Irish Historical Society," *New England Quarterly* Vol. 33, no. 4 (1960): 462–475.
- Barrett, James R. "Americanization from the Bottom Up: Immigration and the Remaking of the Working Class in the United States, 1880-1930," *Journal of American History* Vol. 79, no. 3 (Dec 1992): 996-1020.
- Barrett, James R. and David Roediger. "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16.3 (Spring 1997): 3-44.
- "Irish Everywhere: The Irish and the 'Americanization' of the 'New Immigrants' in the United States, 1900-1930," *Irish Studies Colloquia*, Boston College, September 2003.
- Bayor, Ronald H. and Timothy J. Meagher, ed. *The New York Irish*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins: University Press, 1996.
- Beatty, Jack. *The Rascal King: The Life and Times of James Michael Curley, 1874-1958*. Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 1995.
- Bender, Thomas. "Whole and Parts: The Need for Synthesis in American History," *Journal of American History* 73.1 (June 1986): 120-136.
- Blodgett, Geoffrey. "Yankee Leadership in a Divided City: Boston, 1860-1910," *Journal of Urban History*, 8 (August 1982): 371-396.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Braverman, William Alan. "The Ascent of Boston's Jews, 1630-1918." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1990.
- Brown, Thomas N. *Irish-American Nationalism, 1870-1890*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- Buenker, John D. "The Mahatma and Progressive Reform," *The New England Quarterly*, 44 (Sept. 1971): 397-419.
- Bustad, Jacob J. "'One Hundred Per Cent American': Nationalism, Masculinity, and American Legion Junior Baseball in the 1920s." M.A. thesis: University of Kansas, 2009.
- Casey, Marion R. "Ireland, New York and the Irish Image in American Popular Culture, 1890-1960." Ph.D. diss.: New York University, 1998.

Cohen, Elizabeth. *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Cohen, Naomi W. *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897-1948*. Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2003.

----- . "The Reaction of Reform Judaism in America to Political Zionism," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 40 (1950-1951): 367-369.

Congregation Mishkan Tefila, 1858-1983. Stoughton, MA: The Alpine Press, Inc., 1984.

Connolly, James J. *The Triumph of Ethnic Progressivism: Urban Political Culture in Boston, 1900-1925*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.

----- . "The World's Only Oppressed Majority: Writing the History of the Boston Irish," A Talk Given to the Friends of the Alexander M. Bracken Library, 12 April 1999, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Connolly, Michael C. "First Hurrah: James Michael Curley versus the 'Goo-Goos' in the Boston Mayoralty Election of 1914," *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* Vol. 30, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 1-16.

Conzen, Kathleen Neils. "Ethnicity as Festive Culture: Nineteenth-Century German Americans on Parade." In *The Invention of Ethnicity*, ed., Sollors, Werner. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Conzen, Kathleen Neils, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E. Pozzetta, and Rudolph J. Vecoli. "The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective from the U.S.A.," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12 (Fall 1992): 3-43.

Cronin Mike, and Daryl Adair, *The Wearing of the Green: A History of St. Patrick's Day*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Curran, Joseph M. *Hibernian Green on the Silver Screen: The Irish and American Movies*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Cutler, John Henry. *'Honey Fitz': Three Steps to the White House, The Life and Times of John F. (Honey Fitz) Fitzgerald*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962.

Dalin, David G. "Cyrus Adler, Non-Zionism, and the Zionist Movement: A Study in Contradictions," *American Jewish Studies Review* X, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 55-87.

Darby, Paul. "Gaelic Sport and the Irish Diaspora in Boston, 1879-1890," *Irish Historical Studies* Vol. xxxiii, no. 132 (November 2003): 387-403.

- Dawley, Alan. *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Deutsch, Sarah. *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Diner, Hasia. *Hungering for America: Italian, Irish, and Jewish Foodways in the Age of Migration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . *A Time for Gathering: The Second Migration*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- . *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The Immigrant Church: New York's Irish and German Catholics, 1815-1865*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Doorley, Michael. *Irish-American Diaspora Nationalism: The Friends of Irish Freedom, 1916-1935*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005.
- Duff, John B. "The Versailles Treaty and the Irish-Americans," *Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (December 1968): 582-598.
- Dwyer, Meaghan. "The 'Irish Hour': Irish Radio Programs in America," *Foilsú* 2.1 (Spring 2002): 19-30.
- Dwyer-Ryan, Meaghan, Susan L. Porter, and Lisa Fagin Davis, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009.
- Egan, Joseph B. *Citizenship in Boston*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1925.
- Ehrenfried, Albert. *A Chronicle of Boston Jewry From the Colonial Settlement to 1900*. Boston, 1963.
- Eichacker, Joanne Mooney. *Irish Republican Women in America: Lecture Tours, 1916-1925*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2003.
- Elle, Kenneth. *Herbert Hoover*. Boston: Twayne, 1980.
- Emmons, David. *The Butte Irish: Class and Ethnicity in an American Mining Town, 1875-1925*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Erie, Steven P. *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840-1985*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988.
- Ethington, Philip J. "Recasting Urban Political History," *Social Science History* 16 (Summer 1992): 301-333.

- Fein, Isaac M. *Boston—Where it All Began. An Historical Perspective of the Boston Jewish Community*. Boston: Boston Jewish Bicentennial Committee, 1976.
- Feingold, Henry L. *A Time for Searching: Entering the Mainstream, 1920-1945*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Flanagan, John H. "United States Senator David I. Walsh and the League of Nations Issue, 1918-1920." M.A. Thesis: University of Detroit, 1962.
- Foner, Eric. *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Ford, Nancy Gentile. *Americans All: Foreign-Born Soldiers in World War I*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2001.
- Formisano, R.P. and C.K. Burns, ed. *Boston 1700-1980: The Evolution of Urban Politics*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- Forry, Bill. "The Capital of Irish America," *The World of Hibernia* Vol. 6 No. 1 (Summer 2000): 32-34.
- Frederickson, George M. "Comparative History." In *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, ed. Michael Kammen, 457-473. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Friesel, Evyatar. "The Americanization of American Jewry: Old Concept, New Meanings" *American Jewish History* 81, no. 3-4 (1994): 321-330.
- Fuchs, Lawrence. *American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity, and the Civic Culture*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1990.
- Flynn, Peter. "Coming into Clover: Ireland and the Irish in Early American Cinema, 1895-1917." Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2008.
- Gamm, Gerald. *The Making of New Deal Democrats: Voting Behavior and Realignment in Boston, 1920-1940*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- . *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Gal, Allon. *Brandeis of Boston* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1980.
- . "The Mission Motif in American Zionism, 1898-1948." *American Jewish History*, 75 (June 1986): 363-385.

- Galvin, John T. "Patrick J. Maguire: Boston's Last Democratic Boss," *The New England Quarterly* 55.3 (September 1982): 392-415.
- Gedutis, Susan. *See You at the Hall: Boston's Golden Era of Irish Music and Dance*. Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University Press, 2005.
- Gems, Gerald R. *The Athletic Crusade: Sport and American Cultural Imperialism*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 2006.
- Gerstle, Gary. "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans." *Journal of American History*, 84 (Sept. 1997): 524-558.
------. *Working-Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914-1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Glans, Rudolf. *Jew and Irish: Historic Group Relations and Immigration*. New York: Waldon Press, 1966.
- Goldman, Karla M. *Beyond the Synagogue Gallery: Finding a Place for Women in American Judaism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Goldstein, Jenny. "Transcending Boundaries: Boston's Catholics and Jews, 1929-1965." Senior thesis, Brandeis University, 2001.
- Greene, Victor. *American Immigrant Leaders, 1800-1910: Marginality and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- Halpern, Ben. "The Americanization of Zionism, 1880-1930." In *American Zionism: Mission and Politics*, ed. Jeffrey S. Gurock, 125-142. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Halter, Marilyn. *Shopping for Identity: The Marketing of Ethnicity*. New York, Schocken Books, 2000.
- Handlin, Oscar. *Boston's Immigrants: A Study in Acculturation*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- Hansen, Jonathan M. *The Lost Promise of Patriotism: Debating American Identity, 1890-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Hansen, Marcus L. "The Second Colonization of New England," *New England Quarterly* (October 1929): 539-560.
- Harris, Ruth-Ann M. and Donald M. Jacobs, ed. *The Search for Missing Friends: Irish Immigrant Advertisements Placed in the Boston Pilot, 1857-1860, vol. 1-4*. Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1989-1995.

Heckscher, August. *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1985.

Heinze, Andrew. *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption and the Search for American Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Hennessey, James J. *American Catholics: A History of the American Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Hentoff, Nat. *Boston Boy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986.

Herberg, Will. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*. New York: Anchor Books, 1960.

Higham, John. *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, revised ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

----- . *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, 2nd ed. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988.

Hoganson, Kristen L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Hopkinson, Michael. *The Irish War of Independence*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2002.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

----- . *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Jaher, Frederick Cople. *The Urban Establishment: Upper Strata in Boston, New York, Charleston, Chicago, and Los Angeles*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Janis, Ely Matthew. "The Land League in the United States and Ireland: Nationalism, Gender and Ethnicity in the Gilded Age." Ph.D. diss.: Boston College, 2005.

Jick, Leon. *The Americanization of the Synagogue*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 1992.

Kaganoff, Nathan M. "AJHS at 90: Reflections on the History of the Oldest Ethnic Historical Society in America," *American Jewish History* 71 (1981–82): 466-485.

Kane, Paula. *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900-1920*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Kaplan, Dana Evan. *American Reform Judaism: An Introduction*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003.

Ron Kaplan, "The Sporting Life," *Irish America* (February/March 2003).

Karabel, Jerome. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. New York: Mariner Books, 2005.

Kaufman, David. *Shul With a Pool: The "Synagogue-Center" in American Jewish History*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 1999.

Kaufman, Polly Welts, "Julia Harrington Duff: An Irish Woman Confronts the Boston Power Structure, 1900-1905." *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* 18 (1990): 113-37.

----- "Julia Harrington Duff and the Political Awakening of Irish-American Women in Boston, 1888-1905." In *Women of the Commonwealth: Work, Family, and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*, ed., Porter, Susan L. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

Kauffman, Christopher J. *Faith and Fraternalism: The History of the Knights of Columbus, 1882-1982*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Kazal, Russell. "Revisiting Assimilation: The Rise, Fall, and Reappraisal of a Concept in American Ethnic History," *American Historical Review*, 100 (April 1995): 437-471.

Kennedy, Charles A. "When Palestine Played the Palace: Vaudeville Interprets the Balfour Declaration," *The United States & the Middle East: Cultural Encounters*, YCIAS Vol. V, 2002, 384-385.

Kennedy, David M. *Over There: The First World War and American Society*, twenty-fifth anniversary ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kenny, Kevin. *The American Irish*. New York: Longman, 2000.

----- "Diaspora and Comparison;" *Journal of American History*, 90 (June 2003): 134-162.

----- *Making Sense of the Molly Maguires*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Kissane, Bill. *Politics of the Irish Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Kivisto, Peter, and Blanck, Dag, ed., *American Immigrants and Their Generations: Studies and Commentaries on Hansen Thesis after Fifty Years*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990.

Kliman, Burton Samuel. "The Jewish Brahmins of Boston: A Study of the German Jewish Immigrant Experience, 1860-1900." Senior honors thesis. Brandeis University, 1978.

Kolchin, Peter. "Comparing American History," *Reviews in American History*, 10 (Dec. 1982): 64-81.

Laubenstein, William J. "John Boyle O'Reilly." Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

- Leary, William M. Jr. "Woodrow Wilson, Irish Americans, and the Election of 1916," *Journal of American History* Vol. 54, no. 1 (June 1967): 57-72.
- Lee, Joseph, and Marion Casey. *Making the Irish American: History and Heritage of the Irish in the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Lord, Robert H., et al., *History of the Archdiocese of Boston in the Various Stages of Its Development, 1604 to 1943, Volume Three*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1944.
- Lynch-Brennan, Margaret. *The Irish Bridget: Irish Immigrant Women in Domestic Service in America, 1840-1930*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009.
- Mann, Arthur, ed. "Charles Fleischer's Religion of Democracy: An Experiment in American Faith," *Commentary* (June 1954): 557-65.
 ----- . *Growth and Achievement: Temple Israel 1854-1954*. Boston: Congregation Adath Israel, 1954.
 ----- . *Yankee Reformers in an Urban Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Maume, Patrick. *The Long Gestation: Irish Nationalist Life, 1891-1918*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- McCabe, John. *George M. Cohan: The Man Who Owned Broadway*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1973.
- McCaffrey, Lawrence John. *Textures of Irish America*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1992.
 ----- . ed. *Irish Nationalism and the American Contribution*. New York: Arno Press, 1976.
- McClymer, John F. "E Pluribus Unum: America in the 1920s,"
<http://www1.assumption.edu:80/ahc/1920s/default.html>, accessed 5 April 2010.
- McGerr, Michael E. *The Decline of Popular Politics: the American North, 1865-1928*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- McGreevy, John T. *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Meagher, Timothy J. *Columbia Guide to Irish American History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
 ----- . *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
 ----- . ed., *From Paddy to Studs: Irish-American Communities in the Turn of the Century Era, 1880-1920*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986.

-----, "Why Should We Care for a Little Trouble or a Walk Through the Mud? St. Patrick's and Columbus Day Parades in Worcester, Massachusetts, 1845-1915," *The New England Quarterly* 58. 1 (March 1985): 5-26.

Merwick, Donna. *Boston's Priests, 1848-1910: A Study of Social and Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Meyer, Michael A. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Miller, Kerby A. "Class, Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States: The Case of Irish-American Ethnicity." In *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, ed. Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

-----, *Exiles and Emigrants: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Miller, Nathan. *The 1920s and the Making of Modern America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 2004.

Miller, Rebecca S. "Irish Traditional and Popular Music in New York City: Identity and Social Change, 1930-1975." In *New York Irish*, ed. Ronald H. Bayor and Timothy J. Meagher. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Mitchell, Brian C. *The Paddy Camps: The Irish of Lowell, 1821-61*. Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

Moloney, Deirdre M. *American Catholic Lay Groups and Transatlantic Social Reform in the Progressive Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

-----, "A Transatlantic Reform: Boston's Port Protection Program and Irish Women Immigrants," *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Fall 1999): 50-66.

Moloney, Mick. "If It Wasn't For the Irish and the Jews: Irish and Jewish Influences on the Music of Vaudeville and Tin Pan Alley," Benjamin A. Botkin Folklife Lecture, American Folklife Center, Library of Congress, 1 December 2009,

<http://www.loc.gov/folklife/events/BotkinArchives/Botkin2009.html#dec1>, accessed 15 January 2010.

-----, "Irish Music in America." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1992.

Morawska, Ewa. *Insecure Prosperity: Small-Town Jews in Industrial America, 1890-1940*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Mostov, Stephen G. "A Sociological Portrait of German Jewish Immigrants in Boston: 1845-1861." In *American Jewish History, Vol. 2. Central European Jews in America, 1840-1880: Migration and Advancement*, ed. Gurock, Jeffrey S., 243-274. New York: Routledge, 1998.

- Moynihan, Kenneth D. "History as a Weapon for Social Advancement: Group History as Told by Irish, and Black Americans, 1892-1950." Ph.D. diss., Clark University, 1973.
- Mulcrone, Michael P. "World War I Censorship of the Irish-American Press," Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1993.
- Murray, Damien. "Progressivism, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Catholic Democratic Liberalism in Boston, 1900-1924." Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2005.
- Nash, Peter J. *Boston's Royal Rooters*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Press, 2005.
- Neusner, Jacob. "The Impact of Immigration and Philanthropy upon the Boston Jewish Community (1880-1914)." *Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society* 146 (1956): 71-85.
- Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- , "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924." *Journal of American History* Vol. 86, No. 1 (June, 1999): 67-92.
- Ní Bhroiméil, Úna. *Building Irish Identity in America, 1870-1915: The Gaelic Revival*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003.
- Nizel, Jeannette S. and Abraham E. *Congregation Ohabei Shalom: Pioneers of the Boston Jewish Community. An Historical Perspective of the First One Hundred and Forty Years, 1842-1982*. Boston, 1982.
- Nolan, Janet. *Servants of the Poor: Teachers and Mobility in Ireland and Irish America*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.
- O'Carroll, Ide. *Models for Movers: Irish Women's Emigration to America*. Dublin: Attic Press, 1990.
- O'Connor, Thomas H. *Bibles, Brahmins, and Bosses: A Short History of Boston*, 2nd ed. Boston: Trustees of the Public Library of the City of Boston, 1984.
- , *The Boston Irish: A Political History*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1995.
- , *The Hub: Boston Past and Present*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001.
- , "The Better Sort": *Patrick Collins and Boston Politics, 1865-1905* (Unpublished manuscript, 2006).
- O'Grady, Joseph P. ed. *Immigrants' Influence on Wilson's Peace Policies*. Louisville, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.
- O'Hare, M. Heanne d'Arc. *The Public Career of Patrick Andrew Collins*. Ph.D. Diss., Boston College, 1959.

- O'Leary Cecelia Elizabeth. *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Olitzky, Kerry M. "The Sunday-Sabbath Movement in American Reform Judaism: Strategy or Evolution?" In *American Jewish History, Vol. 5. The History of Judaism in America: Transplantations, Transformations, and Reconciliations, Part Two*, ed. Jeffrey S. Gurock. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- O'Toole, James M. *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O'Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston, 1859-1944*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Overland, Orm. *Immigrant Minds, American Identities: Making the United States Home, 1870-1930*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Peiss, Kathy Lee. *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Piehler, G. Kurt. *Remembering War the American Way*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.
- Prendergast, William B. *The Catholic Voter in American Politics: The Passing of the Democratic Monolith*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1999.
- Quinlin, Michael P. *Irish Boston: A Lively Look at Boston's Colorful Irish Past*. Guilford, Conn.: Globe Pequot Press, 2004.
- Raider, Mark A. *The Emergence of American Zionism*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Reiss, Stephen A. *Sports and the American Jew*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998.
----- *Touching Base: Professional Baseball and American Culture in the Progressive Era*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Rosenzweig, Roy. *Eight Hours For What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Ryan, Dennis P. *Beyond the Ballot Box: A Social History of the Boston Irish, 1845-1917*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.
- Ryan, George E. "Abe Shuman: 'Best Friend' of O'Reilly, Donahue, Collins, Et. Al.," *Boston Irish News*, July 1985, 12.
- Ryan, Mary P. *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City during the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1997.

Samito, Christian G. *Commanding Boston's Irish Ninth: The Civil War Letters of Colonel Patrick R. Guiney, Ninth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1998.

Sarna, Jonathan D. *American Judaism: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

----- "Contemporary Reform Judaism: An Historical Analysis," KAM Isaiah Israel, Chicago, 12 February 2008.

----- "The Debate Over Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue," in Gurock, Jeffrey S., ed. *American Jewish History, Vol. 5. The History of Judaism in America: Transplantations, Transformations, and Reconciliations, Part Two*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

----- "The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture," *Jewish Social Studies* n.s., 5 (Fall-Winter 1999): 52-79.

----- "The Greatest Jew in the World Since Jesus Christ: The Jewish Legacy of Louis D. Brandeis," *American Jewish History* 81 (1994): 346-364.

Sarna, Jonathan D., Ellen Smith, and Scott-Martin Kosofsky, ed. *The Jews of Boston*, 2nd edition, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005.

Schneider, Mark R. *Boston Confronts Jim Crow, 1890-1920*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1997.

Seltzer, Robert M. and Norman J. Cohen, ed. *The Americanization of the Jews*. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Shannon, William V. *The American Irish*. New York: Collier Books, 1974.

Shay, Michael E. *The Yankee Division in the First World War: In the Highest Tradition*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2008.

Silverstein, Alan. *Alternatives to Assimilation: The Response of Reform Judaism to American Culture, 1840-1930*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1994.

Singerman, Robert. "The American Jewish Press, 1823-1983; A Bibliographic Survey of Research and Studies," *American Jewish History* LXXIII, No. 4 (June 1984): 422-444.

Solomon, Barbara Miller. *Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.

----- *Pioneers in Service: The History of the Associated Jewish Philanthropies of Boston*. Boston, 1956.

Sorin, Gerald. "Mutual Contempt, Mutual Benefit: The Strained Encounter Between German and Eastern European Jews in America, 1880-1920," *American Jewish History* 81 (Autumn 1993): 34-59.

----- *A Time for Building: The Third Migration, 1880-1920*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

- Stack, Robert. *International Conflict in an American City: Boston's Irish, Italians and Jews, 1935-1944*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Steffens, Lincoln. *The Shame of the Cities*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1965.
- Sterba, Christopher M. *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Immigrants During the First World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2003.
- Stevens, Peter F. "Southie's Big Parade Didn't Come Easily," *Dorchester Reporter*, March 17, 2005.
- Stout, Glenn, Richard A. Johnson, Dick Johnson, *Red Sox Century: One Hundred Years of Red Sox Baseball*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Strum, Philippa. *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Sullivan, Robert E. and James M. O'Toole, ed., *Catholic Boston: Studies in Religion and Community*. Boston: Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston, 1985.
- Synnott, Marcia Graham. *The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Tager, Jack and John W. Ifkovic, ed., *Massachusetts in the Gilded Age: Selected Essays*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985.
- Thernstrom Stephan. *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis 1880-1970*, Second Edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Tischler, Barbara L. "One Hundred Percent Americanism and Music in Boston During World War I," *American Music* Vol. 4, No. 2 (1986): 164-176.
- Ueda, Reed and Conrad Edick Wright, eds. *Faces of Community: Immigrant Massachusetts, 1860-2000*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2003.
- Urofsky, Melvin I. *American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975.
- Urofsky, Melvin I., and David W. Levy, eds. *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis*, 5 Vols. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1971-1978.
- Vought, Hans P. *The Bully Pulpit and the Melting Pot: American Presidents and the Immigrant, 1897-1933*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004.
- Wakin, Edward. *Enter the Irish American*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973.

- Walsh, Francis Robert. "The *Boston Pilot*: A Newspaper for the Irish Immigrant, 1829-1908." Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1968.
- Ward, Alan J. *Ireland and Anglo-American Relations, 1899-1921*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Warner, Sam Bass *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870-1900* (2nd Ed.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Wayman, Dorothy G. *David I. Walsh: Citizen Patriot*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1952.
- Wertheimer, Jack, ed. *The American Synagogue: A Sanctuary Transformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Whittle, Ronald Gault. "The Opinion of the Boston Irish Community Toward World War I." M.A. thesis, Clark University, 1962.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Way, 1967.
- Wieder, Arnold A. *The Early Jewish Community of Boston's North End. A Sociologically Oriented Study of an Eastern European Jewish Immigrant Community in an American Big-City Neighborhood Between 1870 and 1900*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1962.
- Williams, William H.A. "From Lost Land to Emerald Isle: Ireland and the Irish in American Sheet Music, 1800-1920," *Eire-Ireland* 26 (Spring 1991): 19-45.
-----'. *'Twas Only an Irishman's Dream: The Image of Ireland and the Irish in American Popular Song Lyrics, 1800-1920*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996.
- Wittke, Carl. *The Irish in America*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana, 1956.
- Zolot, Herbert Marshall. "The Issue of Good Government and James Michael Curley: Curley and the Boston Scene from 1897-1918." Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975.