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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Hasia Diner, a noted scholar on the Jewish-American experience, observed that the period between 1924 and 1948 was one of the “most momentous periods in Jewish history.” During this quarter century, Jews experienced a worldwide depression, an escalation in anti-Semitism, Nazism, World War Two, and the Holocaust, but the period ended more optimistically with a marked decrease in anti-Semitism and with the Jews re-establishing a national homeland after living in the Diaspora for almost two thousand years. Diner asserts that this period “raised wrenching questions about the future of the Jews and severely tested the proposition that real emancipation would be possible and that modernity would mean true integration for the Jews.”

As the crisis facing European Jews increased in severity, Jews living in the United States were in the best position to address the challenges facing the worldwide Jewish community during this period and to help Jews in other parts of the world. Jews in America did not experience war raging in their own backyard and were, in the eyes of some historians, not directly involved in the Holocaust but sat on the sidelines while it was occurring. American Jews were among the first to recover from the depression, propelling them into the middle class faster than their non-Jewish contemporaries. New immigration restrictions severely limited the arrival of new Jewish immigrants into the United States, altering the character of the community as more acculturation occurred and Jews became more integrated into the cultural, social, and political mores of America. Anti-Semitism may have been prevalent in America, but significant violence against Jews was rare in the United
States, and American democratic principles theoretically gave American Jews the ability to freely advocate, protest, and plead for help on behalf of European Jews and for such other Jewish concerns as a Jewish homeland. Additionally, by the time of World War II, the American Jewish community had created a sophisticated and well-established institutional infrastructure designed to service the needs of American Jews and Jews abroad.

Despite the advantages enjoyed by American Jews, many historians who write about the experience of American Jews during this period argue that infighting and lack of coordination hampered efforts of American Jewish leadership, both individually and organizationally, to save the Jews of Europe and to otherwise promote Jewish interests during World War II.5 While the trope of ineffectual national Jewish leadership is prevalent in the historiography of this era, historians often ignore or minimize the important work that American Jews did in their local communities during the war. Local Jewish leaders led well-coordinated efforts in their communities, raising funds, participating in the war effort, fighting anti-Semitism, maintaining social service organizations and other organizational infrastructure to service their community, and otherwise defending, advocating, and promoting Jewish interests in America and abroad.

The Jews of Detroit were an example of the dichotomy between the perceived ineffectual national leadership and successful local leadership during this time period. Despite the fact that dissonance and fractionalization affected Detroit Jews on many levels, as was the case in many Jewish communities in America, during the wartime years the Jews in Detroit participated in a number of record
breaking fundraising campaigns, served in leadership roles in both communal and civic organizations including wartime organizations, organized and led institutions to service those in need in their community and abroad, and fought anti-Semitism. Furthermore, leaders in the Detroit Jewish community took coordinated steps to inform Detroit Jews about the conditions of European Jews (to the extent known), and to keep Jewish Detroiters apprised of issues of vital importance to the community.

Detroit Jewish leaders’ ability to coordinate, organize, educate, and inform the Jews of Detroit was greatly enhanced when in 1942 the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation, the most dominant Detroit Jewish communal organization (Detroit Federation), formed a strategic alliance with a newly established English language Jewish newspaper, the Detroit Jewish News (the Jewish News), founded by Philip Slomovitz in early 1942. Slomovitz spent most of the previous two decades in Detroit writing for and editing English language Jewish periodicals, which Slomovitz referred to as “English-Jewish periodicals,” the term that will be used in this essay. He began his career at The Detroit News, but joined the staff of the Detroit Jewish Chronicle (Chronicle) in the early 1920s and spent most of the next two decades there, building his reputation in the Jewish community and rising to become the editor of the Chronicle, at the time the only English-Jewish newspaper in Michigan.

The Chronicle had been publishing for over twenty-five years when Slomovitz started the Jewish News. Despite this competition, and the turmoil of the times, leaders of the Detroit Jewish community embraced and supported the Jewish News and made it the Detroit Jewish newspaper “of record.” The Jewish News was
established in response to the desire of many mainstream Jewish leaders in Detroit for a quality community organ that would engage in ethical business practices and would fairly report on not only local, but national and international events and inform its readership on issues of importance to the Jewish community while promoting the work of Detroit Federation and its constituent organizations. Not only was Slomovitz encouraged by community leaders to start the *Jewish News*, but some of the most important leaders invested in the paper, and more than three dozen of the most prominent community members agreed to participate on the paper’s advisory board. Additionally, Detroit Federation leaders, some of whom were also *Jewish News* investors, risked the prestige and reputation of Detroit Federation and opened Detroit Federation to charges of ethical conflicts and unfair practices by entering into a unique partnership with the *Jewish News* that allowed the *Jewish News* to grow and thrive in its first years.

On the surface, the founding of the *Jewish News* seems to be an example of a powerful theme that runs throughout the history of Jews in America—that of dissension and disunity. After all, a competing English-Jewish newspaper in the same town could split the local community. The Detroit Federation/*Jewish News* relationship was indeed controversial and created some tension among some local Jews, but an examination of the first months of publication of the *Jewish News* through the lens of the Detroit Jewish community in 1942 reveals that the relationship was symbiotic and provided mutual benefit to Detroit Federation and the *Jewish News* and ultimately, to the Jews of Detroit. The *Jewish News*, as a popular, centrist, community-based newspaper, was a valuable communicative tool for
Detroit’s leading Jewish organizations, serving as a powerful voice to reach a good portion of Jews living in Detroit and in other smaller cities in Michigan. The alliance provided Detroit Jewish leaders with an effective platform to promote their agenda of civic and community commitment, social services, and informing the community about not only local communal organizations and activities, but national and international news and issues of vital importance to Jews.

The relationship also provided Slomovitz the opportunity (and competitive advantage over the Chronicle) to make the Jewish News the English-Jewish newspaper “of record” in Detroit and Michigan, allowing Slomovitz to champion his worldview of Judaism and achieve his stated goals of fighting anti-Semitism, advocating Zionism and other causes, and educating his readership about local, national, and international events. Slomovitz also used the Jewish News to advocate for communal involvement and to keep Jews and non-Jews fully informed as to matters of importance to Jews. 7 His claim in the first issue that he would provide that information without partisanship and present all points of view did not prove to always be true, but he still established the Jewish News as the best source in Detroit for news and opinions about issues affecting the Jewish community locally, nationally, and internationally, and demonstrated that a strong newspaper could counter the prevailing theme of dissension in American Jewish communal life by providing a reputable community voice.

Early historians exploring the Jewish experience in America did not focus on local communities, or if they did, their focus would be the City of New York, the largest Jewish community in the United States. It was not until the last quarter of
the twentieth century that historians began to explore local Jewish communities that existed outside of New York. As historian and archivist Judith Endelman has noted, one cannot fully understand the American Jewish experience without looking beyond New York to the dozens of medium sized cities and communities in the Midwest, South, and West. Gerald Sorin breaks down these local histories into three broad categories: celebrations of the local community aimed at a popular audience but without much historical analysis or argument; studies that are densely populated with details of institutions and personage but are neither particularly analytical or oriented to the popular audience; and studies that attempt to situate the local community into the narrative of American Jewry and test generalizations about larger themes in Jewish history.

Local Federations or other local Jewish institutional groups or local or state historical groups have commissioned some of the local Jewish communal studies. In Columbus, Ohio, for example Marc Lee Raphael’s study of the Columbus Jewish community was commissioned by a joint project of the local Federation and the Ohio Historical Commission. In Detroit, the Jewish Welfare Federation History Committee commissioned a study of the Detroit Jewish community, which resulted in two volumes—Robert Rockaway’s *The Jews of Detroit: From the Beginning, 1762-1914* (1986) and the sequel to that volume, Sidney Bolkosky’s *Harmony & Dissonance: Voices of Jewish Identity in Detroit, 1914-1967* (1991). These volumes share many of the same attributes and actually can be seen as an amalgam of all three of Sorin’s categories. Both were written as celebrations, but both contained a great deal of detail as to institutions and personages in their goal to explore “Jewish
identity,” i.e. what it meant to be Jewish in Detroit. Both also explore larger themes in American Jewish historiography, including relationships between German Jews and Eastern European Jews, relationships between the Jewish community and other communities in Detroit, transformative effects of acculturation and assimilation, mobility (geographically, socially, and economically) and evolution of the local institutional infrastructure. Both seem to suggest that there is little in Detroit Jewish history that is inappropriate to the general American Jewish historical narrative, although, as one reviewer has noted, Bolkosky asserts, without much supporting evidence, that “in no other American city were the pressures of industrial modernization so greatly applied to Jews.”

Both Rockaway’s and Bolkosky’s books are valuable foundations upon which to base any research about Jews in Detroit. The nature of their topics meant that no particular area could be explored in depth, and there is a paucity of in-depth studies about Detroit Jews. Lila Corwin Berman has built upon their work with her study of the movement of Detroit Jewish neighborhoods in the twentieth century. She follows the Jews in Detroit as they move from older, inner city neighborhoods to newer neighborhoods in Detroit and then to the suburbs, evidencing not only physical, but social and economic, upward mobility. She argues that despite their residential movement out of Detroit, Detroit Jews retained an urban identity that kept them tied to the city, and in fact were in the forefront of a move back into the city in the twenty-first century.

This paper will build upon the work of these historians by examining another facet of the Detroit Jewish community in depth—the events and circumstances
leading to the founding of the *Jewish News*, the genesis of the paper’s unique relationship with Detroit Federation, the controversies surrounding that alliance, the comparative reporting and editorial policies of the *Jewish News* and the *Chronicle* during 1942, and how the *Jewish News* helped shape the way in which Detroit Jews responded to the events of 1942, in many ways a transitional and transformative year. The *Jewish News*’ superior reporting and coverage, combined with its alliance with Detroit Federation, played a key role in the efforts of Detroit Jewish leaders to motivate, inform and educate Jewish Detroiters, which in turn resulted in unprecedented successes in fundraising, unifying diverse communal factions to reach common goals, and organizing the Detroit Jewish community to face wartime challenges, both domestic and international. Sidney Bolkosky asserts in his book that “on the eve of European Jewry’s destruction, American Jews presented a bewildered and disunited front,” and that Jews in Detroit remained divided in the face of the tragedy besetting European Jewry.¹³ National Jewish leadership may have been ineffectual, but, despite Bolkosky’s assertion, local leadership, at least in Detroit in 1942, provided effective leadership, and in Detroit, the success of that leadership was in part due to the unique relationship between mainstream Detroit Jewish community leaders and the *Jewish News*.¹⁴

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In many ways it is not surprising that national Jewish leadership was viewed as uncoordinated, factionalized and full of internal dissent during this critical period. There never was a feeling of cohesiveness and cultural unity within the
American Jewish community. Even in its infancy, the Jewish population in America was not a cohesive group but rather remained decentralized and divided, fearful that forming a unified position on any issue created the impression of dual loyalty. Politically emancipated Jews in Western and Central Europe tended to reject any unified political approach, avoiding any chance of sparking anti-Semitic assertions that Jews were forming a separate state within a state, or that Jews cared more about their co-religionists than about their country. Jews did not share a unified political vision, and based partially on geography, were thus both Tories and revolutionaries during the Revolutionary War, and served in both the Union and Confederate armies in the Civil War. Many claimed to represent the Jewish community in America during the nineteenth century, but no person did. Given that the Know-Nothing Party had criticized unified Catholic political involvement in the 1850s, concerns about the possible response to Jewish political cohesion were well founded, for while animosity towards Catholics was based in part on fear of Papism and the long anti-Democratic history of Catholicism, Jews were even more exotic, foreign, and unfamiliar to the general Christian American population than Catholics. The issue of a Jewish political voting bloc came to the forefront during the 1868 election campaign of Ulysses Grant, who had infamously issued an order during the Civil War expelling all Jews from his military district. Grant’s adversaries made a concerted effort to create a cohesive Jewish vote but the Jews resisted, in large part because, as historian Jonathan Sarna has suggested, to vote as a bloc would “raise the ugly specter of dual loyalty suggesting that Jews cared more about
Jewish issues such as anti-Semitism than about the welfare of the country as a whole."^{17}

There were other reasons besides the perception of dual loyalty for the lack of cohesion among American Jews. The first Jews to arrive in America were Sephardic Jews from the Iberian Peninsula, but most Jews arriving in America before 1880 were considered “German Jews,” meaning Jews generally from areas that would become part of the independent German Republic later in the nineteenth century.^{18} Once in America, German Jews acculturated and adapted quickly to American social, political, and cultural mores. Most of these Jews did not completely assimilate, however, but maintained a separate Jewish identity in an Americanized form—they reformed Jewish ritualistic practices, creating the American Jewish Reform Judaism movement, and they terminated those Jewish ritualistic practices and customs that distinguished them from their Christian neighbors, except for rules against intermarriage.^{19} These Jews generally were not interested in forming any type of cohesive group or organization. In the 1850s Isaac Leeser was a cantor at a synagogue in Philadelphia who recognized the disparate nature of Jews in America—differences in religious practices, wealth, time spent in America, and so forth—but still wanted to form an association of synagogues to promote common ideas and practices. He only received two responses to his invitation to all American synagogues to join the association, and both responses declined his invitation.^{20} Although there was no unified organization among the German Jews, historian Avraham Barkai believed that as a group they laid the “religious, cultural, and institutional foundations of Modern American Jewry.”^{21}
Jewish immigration patterns to the United States shifted dramatically when Jews from Eastern Europe began to immigrate to America in great numbers, changing the demographics in the United States. Between 1880 and 1914 two million Jews, most from Eastern Europe, arrived in the United States, increasing the percentage of Jews in America from less than six-tenths of a percent to approximately three and one-half percent. Unlike the early German Jewish immigrants, this later wave of immigrants tended to settle in a few major urban centers rather than disperse through the country, resisting acculturation and retaining their religious and cultural practices. Hasia Diner observed that the perception of Eastern European Jews as more radical, urban, ethnic, resistant to change, and generally, more “Jewish” was simplistic but should not be “dismissed out of hand.”

After the great wave of immigration began in 1881, the German American Jewish community, many of whom had immigrated at least a generation earlier, viewed themselves, and were viewed by others, as the “elites” of the American Jewish community.” In Europe there had been enmity between Eastern European Jews and German Jews. The German Jews thought that the Eastern European Jews were uneducated and resistant to modernity, while the Eastern European Jews thought German Jews had completely lost their faith and Jewish identity. Tensions in America exacerbated these perceptions. Despite these tensions, the German American Jews were fully committed to assisting the newly arriving Eastern European Jews, partly out of a sense of duty but also as a way of protecting their status in the community. Louis Marshall, the most prominent American Jewish
leader during this time and the consummate German American Jew, actually learned Yiddish, the language spoken by most Eastern European Jews but eschewed by acculturated German Jews, to better bond with the arriving Eastern European Jews. German American Jews embraced progressive social reform as the best way to help the immigrants, but the methods were foreign to the Eastern Europeans, who felt that the procedures of the German charities were designed to humiliate and degrade those asking for relief. Paid staff and a scientific approach, with the paperwork, inquiries, caseworkers, and educational and training requirements, were not, in the eyes of many newly arriving Eastern Europeans, the way that Jews gave charity to other Jews. Many of those helped felt patronized or as “mendicants” and some Eastern European Jews refused all offers of charity and help.

The needs of arriving Eastern European Jews created a demand for various agencies and institutions to integrate the newcomers into American society. Jewish leaders in a given urban center would create a local infrastructure of social service, charitable, and educational agencies to fill this need. Throughout this period German American Jews established leadership roles in these various agencies that served the community, and were reticent to cede any control over any part of the infrastructure to the Eastern European Jews. When six thousand Eastern European Jewish immigrants, some of whom were radicals, created a short-lived organization in 1905 to hold mass rallies in support of American intervention in Russia and the purchase of arms for Russian Jews, the German American Jewish establishment became concerned that these activities would cause an anti-Semitic backlash and
would create the impression that all Jews were like the radicals. American Jewish communal leaders formed the American Jewish Committee in 1906 to counteract this group and to act as the unified voice of the Jewish community. Members of the American Jewish Committee focused on their Americanism and viewed Judaism in religious, but not ethnic, terms, and the organization reflected the acculturated, middle-to-upper class values of its members. Many American Jews, however, chafed at the elitist nature of the organization and its claim to speak for all. In 1918 Rabbi Stephen Wise formed the American Jewish Congress to counteract the attitudes and viewpoints of the American Jewish Committee. The two organizations often disagreed over policies and tactics and, despite their stated goals, exacerbated dissension and disharmony within the American Jewish community. One area of great tension between the two organizations was over the issue of Zionism—the notion of Jews creating a national homeland in Palestine. While the American Jewish Congress supported Zionist organizations, the American Jewish Committee opposed Zionism, fearing that support for Zionism would ignite old canards about dual loyalty that those in the American Jewish Committee had worked hard to overcome.

The American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee were two prominent national organizations in the American Jewish community, but the most prominent and important communal organization in most local Jewish communities in the 1930s and 1940s was the local Jewish Welfare Federation. Jews and Christians had always approached charity from different viewpoints. Charity comes from the Latin word “caritas,” meaning love, but the Hebrew word for charity,
“tzedakah,” comes from “tzedek,” meaning injustice. While Christians tended to give out of a sense of love, Jews gave out of an obligation to right the injustice of poverty. By the late nineteenth century, most local Jewish communities had established various charitable agencies to assist poor Jews. In the early twentieth century, leaders in many local Jewish communities realized that having myriad charitable organizations, each soliciting funds and providing similar services, created inefficiency, duplication, and waste. Community leaders would create an umbrella organization, typically called the Jewish Welfare Federation of the metropolitan area, and some or all of the charitable (and in some cases social service) Jewish agencies would become members. By 1945 over 90% of all Jewish communities covering 97% of all American Jews had Federations. Each Federation would conduct an annual major fundraising campaign, and then allocate collected funds and create budgets for those organizations under its umbrella, although each organization maintained a degree of independence. Federation officers and executive boards would allocate donations among international, national, and local organizations. By the mid-1930s local Federations served as a quasi-governmental revenue collector, and one historian has characterized the local Federations as equivalent to a volunteer Internal Revenue Service. The local Federation was typically the most powerful agency in the local community by virtue of its control of community funds.

Federations have been characterized as the essence of American democratic values, with the goal of bringing some semblance of order to organizational chaos. Despite this characterization, in many ways Federations were anti-democratic—
large donors, wealthy volunteer leadership, and professional staff made allocation and budgeting decisions, effectively depriving a majority of the community control over their funds.\textsuperscript{37} Additionally, established German American Jews led most Federations, and their failure to allocate funds in what was perceived as an equitable fashion, and their refusal to allow certain Jewish organizations (particularly those with socialist or communist philosophies, the membership of most of which were comprised of Eastern European Jews) to be part of the Federation umbrella, heightened tensions between German American and Eastern European Jews.

By the 1930s Eastern European Jews dominated the Jewish population in America and German American Jewish leaders were dying, but Eastern European Jews generally failed to accede to prominent leadership roles in the American Jewish community. This was true, in part, because although they formed a larger share of the Jewish population, they generally were not as financially successful as the more established German American Jews, and typically people of means have the luxury of taking leadership positions in these voluntary organizations.\textsuperscript{38} Some historians assert that this “vacuum of leadership” on a national level in the 1920s and 1930s caused the failure of the American Jewish community at a critical time: the community would not be led in the same way as their predecessors and the “rudderless” quality of American Jewish life in these decades failed to produce successor leadership for the roles previously taken by leaders in the German American Jewish community.\textsuperscript{39}
By 1942, however, two men did emerge as leaders of the national Jewish community—Rabbi Stephen Wise and Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. Silver, the younger and more aggressive of the two (he once banged his fist on Harry Truman’s desk, much to Truman’s chagrin), was in Slomovitz’s mind the predominant militant American Jewish leader during the 1940s. Wise, older (he had formed the American Jewish Congress in 1918) and less aggressive, had a close relationship with Franklin Roosevelt dating back to Roosevelt’s run for governor of New York, so close that some saw him as little more than a sycophant who had been “seduced” by Roosevelt. He led a number of important Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Congress and the Zionist Organization of America, but some historians believe that his total trust in Roosevelt was not helpful to the issues facing Jews during the war. Silver, in fact, declared himself a Republican because he believed that Jews lost political influence when they associated themselves so closely with one political party that the party could take the Jewish vote for granted. Wise and Silver represented a deep strategic split among American Jews as to how best to address issues of great concern, such as anti-Semitism and the crisis facing European Jews. Wise promoted quiet diplomacy “behind the scenes” without public displays (although he varied from this philosophy from time to time and endorsed a German boycott and organized a number of rallies) while Silver favored public pronouncements and otherwise “loud diplomacy.” Wise believed that getting European Jews into Palestine should have been the top priority of the Zionist movement, while Silver maintained that having Palestine become a national homeland for Jews was the main purpose of the Zionist movement, a position for
which he would later be criticized for subordinating the need to get Jews out of Europe and into Palestine to the desire to make Palestine the political national home of the Jews. Historians have criticized the two of them for sparking and promoting infighting and arrogance among the most influential Jews and Jewish organizations, contributing to what some view as grave political errors in their efforts to save European Jews and create a national homeland in Palestine.

CHAPTER 3

THE DETROIT JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Detroit Jewish community mirrored many of the characteristics of other American Jewish communities including challenges of dissension and dissidence, tension between German Jews and Eastern European Jews, and a Federation structure. Jews arrived in Michigan in the early eighteenth century, and by 1850 fifty-one Jews resided in Detroit, out of a total population of 21,019. The Jewish population grew progressively in Detroit, mostly through immigrants settling in the city. Very few immigrants came to Detroit directly from Europe, but rather most spent several years elsewhere before settling in Detroit. By 1900, approximately three hundred thousand people resided in Detroit, including five thousand Jews. Detroit was not a large center for Jewish activity—while Detroit had perhaps five thousand Jews in 1900, Chicago had eighty thousand Jews in 1903. By the third quarter of the nineteenth century a majority of Jewish Detroiters were middle and upper class, and by the 1870s a small group had become wealthy. While some Eastern European Jews arrived in Detroit in the 1880s, the true influx of Eastern European Jews into the city occurred in the twentieth century. In 1927, 75,000 Jews lived in Detroit, and by 1942, between 82,000 and 85,000 Jews
lived in Detroit out of a total population of 1,700,000, making Detroit the fifth or sixth largest Jewish community in the United States. By then, more than forty synagogues and well over one hundred sixty Jewish communal organizations of various types existed in the city. The vast majority of Jewish Detroiters were Eastern European Jews of modest means, but German Jews of greater social status, as well as some prosperous Eastern European Jews, led the major Jewish philanthropic and other Jewish organizations.

In Detroit, like in other Midwestern cities, social status and ethnic background may have divided the Jewish residents, but most Jews of all classes and backgrounds tended to live together either in the same neighborhoods or in neighborhoods very close to each other. Jewish Detroiters tended to reside together in specific neighborhoods in the city. Lila Corwin Berman asserts that the “shorthand of a neighborhood name in Detroit . . . did not simply designate a topographical area” but also “offered a rich indication of the kind of people who lived there.” The first neighborhood with a high concentration of Jews was the neighborhood known as “Hastings Street,” located east of the Detroit central business district by the Detroit River. As Eastern European Jews began settling in the Hastings Street neighborhood in large numbers in the first decades of the twentieth century, however, German Jews began to move north and west of Hastings Street, to an area known as “Oakland,” the neighborhood where Temple Beth El would relocate in 1922 and remain there for the next fifty years. Berman suggests that the reasons for moving were varied—some felt that the newcomers to Hastings were “uncouth and not worthy neighbors,” but the main motivating factor seemed to
be the ability to procure better housing.\textsuperscript{56} Additionally, during the two decades leading up to World War II, Jews continually moved out of Hastings to areas north and west, settling into two neighborhoods less than a mile East of Oakland known as “Twelfth Street” and “Dexter,” which neighborhoods adjoined one another. Congregation Shaarey Zedek straddled the two neighborhoods. While sixty percent of Detroit Jews lived in the Hastings Street neighborhood in 1920, by 1935 just over ten percent of Detroit Jews lived there, and eighty percent of the Detroit Jewish population lived in either the Dexter or Twelfth Street neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{57}

Berman asserts that the Twelfth Street neighborhood attracted Jewish families whose “wealth, politics and spiritual proclivities did not mirror those of the Temple Beth El leaders.” \textsuperscript{58} The homes within the neighborhood evidenced great class diversity, with great mansions in the Boston-Edison area of the neighborhood just a few blocks from duplexes and much more modest single-family residences. Unlike most other ethnic groups in the city, Jews in the two decades before World War II lived in shared class space, although they were aware of class distinctions in the community. The Twelfth Street neighborhood contained Orthodox and Conservative synagogues, secular and socialist institutions, and fifteen different Jewish supplementary schools.\textsuperscript{59} The Dexter neighborhood was less diverse from a class standpoint, with mostly middle- to upper-class residents, but those residents were diverse in terms of religious, political, and social beliefs. The closeness of the living spaces of the diverse Jewish population perhaps helped the established, wealthy, Jewish leaders in Detroit to focus on issues affecting those less fortunate in
the community and to develop the communal infrastructure that would exist in these neighborhoods.

Jewish leaders created the first Detroit Jewish philanthropic organizations within twenty years after the first Jews had settled in Detroit. In 1869 the two major synagogues operating in Detroit, Temple Beth El and Congregation Shaarey Zedek, established the “Gentlemen’s Hebrew Relief Society,” Detroit’s first general Jewish philanthropic institution, later known as the “Beth El Hebrew Relief Society,” even though members of Shaarey Zedek remained involved. By the mid 1870s the Society was very active and by the 1880s, most of their work dealt with Eastern European immigrants. The continuing arrival of Jewish immigrants increased demands so that by the turn of the twentieth century a number of Jewish organizations provided philanthropic, training, educational, and other services to the poor and immigrant Jewish populations in the city. At the same time, however, this amalgam of organizations had become unwieldy and somewhat inefficient. As the Jewish agencies multiplied, more people, turned down by one agency, found another agency to grant their request, whether fraudulent or not. The congestion of the Jewish population meant that the poor were not being adequately supported and the youth programming was not very good. Concerned about the inefficiencies and congestion, the new charismatic rabbi of Temple Beth El, Rabbi Leo Franklin, proposed that all of the Jewish philanthropic agencies in Detroit unite and form one unified federation. Four of the organizations agreed to federate and became the founding agencies of United Jewish Charities in 1899. The objective of the federation was to increase efficiency, avoid duplication, consolidate fundraising, and in general improve services to the deserving poor. In 1926 the leaders of United Jewish Charities formed
Detroit Federation as a more formal and efficient way to manage the various agencies that came under its umbrella. By 1938, Detroit Federation was probably the sixth largest Federation in the country, but collected more donations and attracted more volunteers and clients for its services than Federations in other, larger American cities.64

Detroit Jewish agency leaders also had a rich history of participating in secular, civic affairs. For many years Simon Heavenrich, a founder of the Hebrew Ladies Sewing Society and an officer and board member of Beth El, served as commissioner and president of the Board of Poor Commissioners, a city agency formed to help impoverished Detroiter.65 Martin Butzel, also a board member and officer of Beth El, was on the Board of Directors of the Detroit Association of Charities, and was also the City of Detroit Public Lighting Commissioner.66 David Simons, who was the first president of United Jewish Charities, was a member of the Public Lighting Commission and was also one of the first elected to the new nine man Detroit City Council.67 The civic duty tradition carried into the 1930s and 1940s. Abe Srere, who served as Detroit Federation president (among other communal roles) during much of World War II, was also active in both the American Red Cross and the Detroit Community Chest, and Henry Wineman, the first Detroit Federation president and a leader in many other communal agencies, was a leader in both the Detroit Community Chest and, during the war, the Detroit War Chest. Fred Butzel, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of Detroit Federation in 1942, was so active in the Jewish community that a service award is still given yearly in his name to an honored member of the community. Butzel was also active in so many civic organizations (including organizing the Boy Scouts in Detroit) that the Detroit Free Press named him Detroit’s Most Valuable Citizen in 1947.68
Established German American Jews created, funded, and staffed most of the Detroit Jewish communal organizations serving the newly arriving Eastern European Jewish population but tensions built between the German Jews and the Eastern European Jews. Initially, Detroit Jews sympathized with the immigrants because of the horror of the pogroms and the conditions in Russia. As migration increased, however, many Jewish Detroiters became apprehensive. The press called the immigrants “an incursion and threatening tide.” Fred Butzel recalled that many felt the need to Americanize the Eastern Europeans for the long-term residents’ protection, fearing that the immigrants might jeopardize their own status in relation to non-Jews if they allowed large numbers to remain un-acculturated. Butzel believed that genuine sympathy, combined with this fear, drove many of the charitable efforts. Jews worried about press stories showing the Eastern European community in a harsh light, and there were plenty of such articles. Many stories appeared in the paper about anti-Semitism, both in the United States and abroad, adding to the concerns of the local community. Several local articles praised Jews and argued against the wave of anti-Semitism, but established Jews remained concerned about being undesirably grouped with the newcomers.

There is mixed evidence about the level of animosity between German Jews and Eastern European Jews in Detroit at the end of the nineteenth century, although apparently the gap between them widened in the early part of the twentieth century. Divisions among Detroit Jews, at least at the end of the nineteenth century, related more to religious practices and class, rather than purely to country of origination. For example, Shaarey Zedek was founded by a group of Beth El members who were upset about the changing ritualistic practices at Beth El. Similarly, the creation of the Jewish Relief
Society in 1891, an organization funded by dissident former members of the Beth El Hebrew Relief Society who belonged to Shaarey Zedek, appears to have resulted from unfortunate remarks made over religious practices, and could not be really deemed to be ethnic in origin, since both Beth El and Shaarey Zedek had heavily German memberships.

The two groups did recognize the animosities and struggled with them. On the one hand, David Heineman, the president of Reform congregation Beth El, spoke at the laying of the cornerstone of Congregation Beth Jacob, an Orthodox synagogue comprised of Eastern European Jews, and Rabbi Grossman, a leader of the Eastern European Jewish community in Detroit, was also invited to speak. On the other hand, Heineman was a prominent member of the Phoenix Club, a club where not only wealth counted to be a member, but the applicant had to be “refined and cultured,” a slap at the newly arriving Eastern Europeans. The Women’s Club of Temple Beth El changed its name to the Jewish Women’s Club “to break down social and religious barriers,” yet a roster of 179 members does not contain any names that are clearly Russian or Polish. Jewish leadership pleaded for understanding and compassion, but by the mid 1920s, the Jewish community was rife with dissension on many fronts, particularly between the acculturated German Jews and less acculturated Eastern European Jews.

The time period from the mid-1920s until America’s entry into World War II was a particularly challenging period for Detroit Jews. Anti-Semitism was an increasing problem throughout the United States, and Detroit seemed to be a hotbed of anti-Semitic activity. Father Charles Coughlin, the head priest of the Shrine of the Little Flower Church in Royal Oak, Michigan (a Detroit suburb) became a nationally
known figure as a radio sermonizer and editor of a newspaper published by his church. At his peak, he had a radio audience of over thirty million listeners, and his broadcasts and newspaper articles became increasingly tinged with anti-Semitism.\textsuperscript{81} Michigan had one of the largest chapters of the Ku Klux Klan in the nation, and the demagogue Gerald L. K. Smith, who talked frequently about “Christ-killers,” moved to Michigan to run for the United States Senate.\textsuperscript{82}

Tensions increased among disparate factions of Detroit Jews, even among members of Temple Beth El, the oldest, largest, and most prestigious synagogue in Detroit. By the beginning of the 1940s Temple Beth El had been led by Dr. Leo Franklin for over three decades. Although most of the members of Beth El were prosperous, established, German Jews, the membership divided deeply over the issue of Zionism. When Dr. Franklin, an avowed non-Zionist, retired in 1941, the popular associate rabbi and active Zionist, Leon Fram, did not become the head rabbi, an act that infuriated many Zionist leaning members of the congregation. The controversy over Rabbi Fram led to a group of members (including the then president of Beth El) leaving Beth El and starting a new synagogue, Temple Israel, hiring Rabbi Fram as their first rabbi.\textsuperscript{83} Bolkosky asserts that during this time period, there was no unified Jewish community, but rather “several communities each almost hermetically sealed with very little continued interchange among them” and much antagonism between them.\textsuperscript{84}

New challenges intensified dissonance in the community by 1942, although some of those challenges were not unique to Detroit or to Jews in general. The country was learning to adapt to a wartime setting, creating additional tensions and
burdens. Jews were stereotypically caricatured as desiring to avoid military service, but in fact the percentage of Jews in the service was much greater than the percentage of Jews in the general population.\textsuperscript{85} In Detroit, between nine and ten thousand men and women uprooted their lives for military service during the war.\textsuperscript{86} Shortages of labor and inventory caused many retail businesses, an industry in which Jews were over-represented, to close. In Detroit, over 2400 retail establishments closed in 1942.\textsuperscript{87} Detroit, as the “Arsenal of Democracy,” experienced a rapid increase in population as workers came from across the country to work in the various factories and war industries in Detroit, causing housing shortages and adding to the workload of various charitable and social service agencies in the city.\textsuperscript{88} As early as January 1942, Isidore Sobeloff, the executive director of Detroit Federation, reported that various constituent agencies already felt the effects of the war, both in terms of programming and financing.\textsuperscript{89} By July, the Detroit Jewish Community Council was struggling with creating organizational activities to support civilian defense and other auxiliaries.\textsuperscript{90}

Jews became vulnerable to new threats of anti-Semitism as many blamed the war, and the fact that their loved ones had to fight in it, on the Jews.\textsuperscript{91} Additionally, as more information about the plight of European Jewry became known, 1942 was a year in which it became painfully clear that what was happening to the Jews of Europe was unlike anything that had plagued Jews before.

To add to the dissonance of the community, in 1942, the publishers of the \textit{Chronicle}, the only English-Jewish newspaper serving Detroit (and thus the sole source for news about Jewish affairs for Jews in Detroit who could not read the
Yiddish newspapers) and Slomovitz, the Chronicle editor, parted ways under what appeared to be acrimonious circumstances. Leaders in the community showed their displeasure with both the Chronicle and the publisher's actions by supporting Slomovitz’s new venture, the Detroit Jewish News. The new publication was embraced by mainstream Jewish Detroiters at the expense of the Chronicle.

Detroit had a somewhat unique history in terms of the English-Jewish press serving Jews in the city. One way in which the Detroit Jewish community differed from others was that most other large Jewish communities had an English-Jewish newspaper prior to the beginning of the twentieth century, but an independent English-Jewish newspaper did not exist in Detroit until 1916, when the Chronicle started publishing.92

The first English-Jewish newspapers in America originated in the middle of the nineteenth century and were independent, vibrant, innovative, and national, featuring intellectual discussions and scholarly articles. Joseph Leeser, who first tried to create an association of synagogues in the 1850s, was more successful in creating a national Jewish newspaper, the Occident and the American Jewish Advocate.93 Since there was no national organization or leadership for American Jews in the middle of the nineteenth century, Jews across the country looked to the Occident to answer questions about ritual and behavioral aspects of Judaism and to shape their Jewish identity in the new country.94 The early national Jewish newspapers (i.e. newspapers with almost exclusively Jewish content) emerged as, in the view of Jonathan Sarna, “instruments of Jewish enlightenment.”95 Historian Naomi Cohen described the early Jewish newspapers as “pioneers of American
Jewish defense.” As the newspapers became local towards the end of the nineteenth century, the papers declined in quality and became narrowly focused. Reporting became shallow and intellectually dull, and community and social announcements took up a majority of the content. Most English-Jewish papers avoided all controversies, and while this was probably due in part to typical local newspaper management’s concerns about making as many people as possible happy to increase advertising and subscription revenue, management of English-Jewish papers also desired to project an image of consensus within the American Jewish community and to avoid any topic that would spark the interest of anti-Semites. Historian Jonathan Sarna wrote that anti-Semitism had a “chilling effect” on the English-Jewish press, suggesting that while there were numerous controversies and scandals within the various groups of American Jews, the press would not address the controversies to avoid giving anti-Semites substance for their anti-Semitic views. Although the national papers had advocated various positions and the publishers viewed themselves as potential agents for change, as most of the local papers evolved, the publishers would not publish anything controversial or attempt to influence thinking, but would merely report local activities. Stephen Wise derisively called the papers, most of which were published once a week, “weaklies.” Rather than face the tension inherent in the role of Jewish journalist as a reporter and the role of Jewish journalist as a shaper of community, editors sidestepped the issue completely and focused on non-controversial and harmless topics like social and communal events.
Historian Henry Feingold noted that the opinions of the American Jewish community are best gleaned from the English-Jewish press.\textsuperscript{102} For many Jewish American communities in the 1930s and 1940s, however, gleaning such opinions would be difficult because of the low quality of the local newspapers. Despite the general deficiencies in the English-Jewish press, the newspapers did serve a valuable purpose. The press linked a dispersed population to organized Jewish communal life and served to nurture a feeling of unity notwithstanding what author Daniel J. Elazar characterized as “institutional rivalries, clashing views, and tensions endemic to American Judaism’s denominationalism.”\textsuperscript{103} The press also served as a great source for institutional and social history of a Jewish community, if even through the social announcements and other local items of interest published in the most mundane issues of such a paper. Back issues of a local community’s paper would serve as the reference guide for what the community had done in the past, how issues had been addressed, and how the community had been transformed through the decades. The English-Jewish press would also serve as a kind of “baseline” guide to its readership of ethnic issues not covered in other press or other sources. Most ethnic press was written in the language of ethnicity and died as the ethnic group became acculturated and lost their ethnic language, but the Jewish press was different and survived as Jews became assimilated into American society because there was a strong tradition of an English-Jewish press existing from the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century, a time when the Jewish population in America was still relatively small.\textsuperscript{104}
In 1916, New Yorker Anton Kaufmann saw a business opportunity in starting an English-Jewish newspaper in Detroit and hired Samuel J. Rhodes to be his first editor of the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle*. A story celebrating the thirty-first anniversary of the start of the paper stated, "there was considerable opposition on the part of many people who felt that the Jewish people had no need for a voice of their own."\(^{105}\) The paper succeeded, however, and Joseph Cummins acquired the paper. Cummins acted as editor and asked his brother-in-law, Jacob Schakne, to work on the paper with him.\(^{106}\)

Some time in the early 1920s, Cummins hired Philip Slomovitz to be the editor of the *Chronicle*. Slomovitz was born in 1896 in Nowogrodek, in the Russian province of Minsk.\(^{107}\) His family moved to the Russian city of Lida, where he earned a diploma from the government sponsored Russian-Jewish school, completing the equivalent of a high school education at 13. His family immigrated to the United States in 1910 and settled in New Jersey, where he became deeply interested in politics. His uncles were politicians in New Jersey, and Slomovitz would attend political meetings (held bilingually, in English and Yiddish) with them, where he met his local congressmen. Only in his early teens at the time, he convinced one of the congressmen to start sending him the *Congressional Record*, which he received and read for the next sixty years. He also was one of the national organizers of Young Judea, a Zionist youth organization, and he claims that he spent all of his spare change on attending Zionist conferences or buying Zionist literature. He spent a year at Rhodes Preparatory School in New York, and then enrolled at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.
His time at University of Michigan set him on his life’s path. He found a love of journalism and became the night editor of the *Michigan Daily*. He also continued his close association with Jewish life both by serving as president of the Menorah Society, the predecessor to the Hillel campus organizations, and by cofounding a Zionist student organization at the University of Michigan. After college he found a job with the *Detroit News* as a reporter on the copy desk. He also contributed weekly to the *Detroit News* religious page, writing articles about the Jewish National Fund and other Zionist organizations and topics. Once he started working, he spent his spare and leisure time organizing young men and women for the Zionist cause.  

After two years with the *Detroit News*, Slomovitz began working for the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle*, and a few years later he went to New York to edit two different Jewish publications. He came back to Detroit to edit a new English-Jewish newspaper, the *Jewish Herald*. The *Jewish Herald* offered comprehensive coverage of the Detroit Jewish community, and was full of ideas and idealism, but stayed in business for only a short time before the *Chronicle* owners bought the paper and closed it. Slomovitz became editor of the *Chronicle* once again and stayed there until 1942.  

During his time at the *Chronicle*, Slomovitz established a national reputation as an editor and also became a Detroit Jewish communal leader. He founded the Detroit branch of the Jewish National Fund and held offices in the local and national chapters of many communal organizations, such as the Zionist Organization of America and the American Jewish Congress. Always an advocate of Jewish education, he was instrumental in establishing the United Hebrew Schools of
Detroit. He founded the American Jewish Press Association in 1942 and served as its president for the first ten years of its existence. He was also a founder of the World Federation of Jewish Journalists and was a vice president of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. He was a born leader and organizer, driven and independent, and even though he was legally blind for most of his life, he typed his own material until he was 92. Perhaps because he came to Detroit as a young adult, rather than being born and raised in Detroit, he did not associate solely with other Eastern European Jews but made lifelong friends with a diverse range of Jews in the city, including many of the leaders of Detroit Federation and other important Jewish institutions.

In some ways, issues of the *Chronicle* during the late 1930s and early 1940s are not much different from early issues of the *Jewish News*, not surprising given that Slomovitz was the editor of the *Chronicle* during this period. On the other hand, there are certain points of view and news articles in these issues of the *Chronicle* suggesting that Slomovitz may not have had free reign over the editorial content of the paper or the type of news that was included. For example, the first issue published after Kristallnacht, the two-day riots in Germany in 1938 perpetuating violent and murderous acts against Jews and destroying Jewish businesses, had a front-page article about a seventeen-year-old Jew who assassinated a German diplomat in Paris, which was the pretext for the riots that swept through Germany the next two days. The article, however, mentions little about the riots or the damage to the Jewish community in Germany. There were two editorials about the assassination in this issue. In the first, Slomovitz asserted that violence was not the
path followed by Jews and criticized the actions of the assassin, observing that the Jewish way for addressing redress was by “patience and humility.” The second editorial stated that while a boycott against the Nazis was acceptable, a boycott against the German people was not, and noted that the German people were also victims of the Nazis. The concepts of “patience and humility,” and distinguishing between the Nazis and the German people, portraying the German people as victims, would be concepts continued in the Chronicle editorial pages well after Slomovitz left the Chronicle, but not concepts that appeared in the editorial content of the Jewish News.

It is possible that the events of Kristallnacht occurred after that week’s edition of the Chronicle had been put to bed, but the next week’s front page had one small story about Roosevelt leading world reaction in protest against persecution of German Jews, while the majority of the front page, and most of the issue, was devoted to Jewish Education Month. Jewish education was an important issue for Slomovitz, but it is difficult to understand why the issues of November 11 and November 18 had so little to report about Kristallnacht, a seminal event in the history of Nazi anti-Semitism. At the time, the Chronicle had access to all major Jewish wire services and was able to report international news, and yet little appears. It seems most likely that this lack of information about a critical international event would have frustrated sophisticated Jewish readers.

Although the news reporting and editorial content may not have reflected Slomovitz’s opinions entirely, in other ways the paper did focus on issues important to Slomovitz. Slomovitz aggressively fought against anti-Semitism, and he used the
Chronicle as a tool in that fight, running numerous editorials and articles exposing anti-Semites and anti-Semitic activities. He stood at the front of the battle against Charles Coughlin and the Chronicle regularly reported on Coughlin’s activities and the efforts being made to stop him. The Chronicle also covered Henry Ford during his anti-Semitic period, through his apology and his announcement after Pearl Harbor that anti-Semitism is “un-American.” Different Chronicle issues included articles about an East Coast radio station being denied a license because of anti-Semitic content and criticizing a Saturday Evening Post article (written by a prominent Jew) that could be viewed as anti-Semitic.

Many of the issues included articles about the Zionist movement and the movement to create a Jewish army (i.e., an army comprised of Jews fighting as a separate nation, but under British command), both causes dear to Slomovitz. Articles highlighted various important figures supporting the movement for a Jewish army or for a national Jewish state in Palestine, and reported the activities of various Zionist organizations in the United States and abroad. Many editorials supported the notion of a Jewish army, including one that was harshly critical of a New York Times editorial opining that a Jewish army would be a “Zionist army.” The Chronicle editorial called the New York Times editorial a “stab in the back.” The Chronicle generally appeared to be less militant in its Zionist approach than Slomovitz, however. The January 2, 1942 issue included an opinion piece on the front page supporting the notion of turning a portion of the Dominican Republic into a Jewish settlement. The author, a Jewish philanthropist who, according to the article, held many high positions in Zionist organizations, acknowledged that many
Zionists would criticize his position because any such move would relieve some of the pressure to create a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. Indeed, running such an article undoubtedly caused concern among many ardent Zionists in the Detroit area.

Using the month of January 1942 (the last full month that Slomovitz worked for the Chronicle) as a representative sample of the editorial and news content of the Chronicle towards the end of Slomovitz’s time at the paper, it appears that the Chronicle spent a lot of time reporting on and editorializing about Palestine and the Jewish army, on efforts to unify the American Jewish community, and on local issues like the failure of the wealthy Jews in Detroit to provide funding for a Jewish hospital or the efforts of the Detroit Orthodox Jewish community to close Jewish supported grocery stores on the Sabbath. The paper did include numerous articles about Jews serving in the military, ranging from Hank Greenberg re-enlisting to the many brave acts that Jews in the army were performing. While there was some reporting on the crisis facing European Jewry, there was not a lot of emphasis on that reporting. There was almost no reporting on Detroit Federation or the Allied Jewish Campaign.

CHAPTER 4

THE FOUNDING OF THE DETROIT JEWISH NEWS

Slomovitz left the Chronicle in February 1942 and there are a number of different versions of why he left and under what circumstances. Slomovitz asserts that the owners of the Chronicle wanted to replace him with a member of their family, so he obtained the support of some leaders of the Jewish community and left
the Chronicle to start the Jewish News. The owners of the Chronicle at various times asserted that following the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the Chronicle experienced a significant revenue drop and that they could no longer afford to keep Slomovitz, but that they told Slomovitz he could stay until April 1942. A story in the Chronicle several years after his departure, however, claimed that Slomovitz “did not see eye to eye” with the Chronicle owners, which is why he went to New York originally, and again was not “in accord” with the owners when he voluntarily left in 1942.

Slomovitz’s version actually seems less likely, for a number of reasons. First, for over three years after Slomovitz left, the Chronicle staff box (the insert in a newspaper listing the management team, contact information, and so forth) did not include any new name as editor as one would expect if a relative had replaced him. His name was merely deleted from the staff box and Jacob Margolis, who had formerly been listed as publisher, was listed as publisher-editor. Second, there were areas of business and quality disagreement between Chronicle management and Slomovitz. Slomovitz recalled that he objected to the Chronicle’s slogan—“The Only Anglo-Jewish Newspaper Printed in Michigan”—since the term “Anglo” referred to Great Britain, but his superiors insisted on using “Anglo-Jewish.” Slomovitz also objected to the quality of local community coverage as compared to what the Jewish Herald had done, and, at one point, also noted that he was the only employee and was responsible for all aspects of the paper.

Finally, the Chronicle’s editorial policies were frequently inconsistent with the more pro-Zionist and centrist Slomovitz views, so there would have certainly
been tensions in this critical area. The current publisher of the Jewish News advised that it is a community-wide belief that Slomovitz left the Chronicle because it was not invested in the Zionist movement enough—that the Chronicle of the 1930s did not advocate for Zionism with Slomovitz’s passion. A seventieth anniversary edition of the Jewish News supports this position and provides that, following Pearl Harbor in December 1941, Slomovitz began to search for a new job that would pay more and through which he could promote his view of Jewish life and Zionism, since the creation of a Jewish national homeland was not a “priority” for the Chronicle. Leonard Simons, a community leader, original investor in the Jewish News, and a lifelong close friend of Slomovitz, said that local Jewish leaders wanted a paper adhering to Zionist values, adding credence to the notion that Slomovitz and Chronicle management did not agree on the paper’s editorial policies towards Zionism.

The editorials in the Chronicle after Slomovitz left the paper reveal the left-leaning policies of the Chronicle’s owners and editor, a position shared by a portion of the American Jewish population at that time, especially among Eastern European Jews, but an unpalatable position to the more centrist Slomovitz and mainstream Jewish leaders. At least one editorial published by the Chronicle shortly after Slomovitz left the paper advocated for a balanced discussion about a bi-national state in Palestine equally controlled by Arabs and Jews, a position antithetical to most mainstream Zionists, including Slomovitz.

Whether Slomovitz truly left because he was about to be terminated for family or economic reasons, or whether he voluntarily left for more contentious
reasons, Slomovitz was able to start the *Jewish News* with the financial assistance of some of Detroit’s most active Jewish leaders. Slomovitz may have solicited those leaders for financial support or his investors may have enticed Slomovitz to start his own newspaper. In an interview with Robert Rockaway, Slomovitz implied that he solicited the funds. The 50th Anniversary issue of the *Detroit Jewish News* reported that Slomovitz “rallied his resources, rallied his community and some of its biggest names” to start the newspaper. In a separate article in the 50th Anniversary issue, however, Leonard Simons recalled that he and his friend Walter Field wanted to help Slomovitz start his own newspaper and it was “time to afford Mr. Slomovitz his own voice.” The author of a letter published in the April 5, 2002 edition of *The Jewish News*, however, claims that Simons told the letter writer that Maurice Schwartz “called a meeting of a small group of Jewish leaders to back Phil Slomovitz in creating a new English-Jewish newspaper for Detroit. It was felt that Detroit needed what Phil had to offer.” The truth is undoubtedly an amalgam of all of the above. 127

There is also some ambiguity as to the relationship between Slomovitz and the investors. Slomovitz told Rockaway that the investors loaned the money to him, but the same article that quotes Leonard Simons in the 50th Anniversary issue characterized the investors as preferred stockholders. Detroit Federation minutes and other documents in the Detroit Federation archives seem to confirm that the investors were indeed shareholders, although they were later bought out by Slomovitz. 128 Whether the investors were stockholders or lenders, however, even those competitors to the *Jewish News*, who would shortly object to the apparent
conflict between the role of those investors as board members of the Jewish News and as board members of Detroit Federation, acknowledged that the investors had not participated in the Jewish News for financial gain.\textsuperscript{129}

In any event, the investors were active and leading figures among Jewish Detroiters and included Federal District court Judge Theodore Levin, philanthropists Maurice Aronsson and Maurice Schwartz, Detroit Federation executive director Isidore Sobeloff, and three past or present presidents of Detroit Federation—Henry Wineman, Abraham Srere, and Fred M. Butzel. All were leaders of Detroit Federation, but until they invested in the Jewish News, most of them had not been known as ardent Zionists, especially since many of them belonged to Temple Beth El, the leading synagogue in the city at that time whose membership, under Rabbi Franklin’s influence, tended to not support Zionism. Their investment in the paper, however implicitly associated them with the Zionist cause.\textsuperscript{130} The investors raised a total of nineteen thousand dollars, which would be worth approximately two hundred ninety thousand dollars today.\textsuperscript{131} Maurice Schwartz invested ten thousand dollars and was named a publisher along with Slomovitz.\textsuperscript{132} All investors and Slomovitz formed the board of directors, and Slomovitz also created a community advisory board drawn from leadership of most aspects of Jewish life in Detroit, as well as Bay City, Jackson, Flint, Pontiac, and Saginaw.

When Slomovitz started the Jewish News in 1942, the Chronicle had been the established English-Jewish newspaper in Detroit for over a quarter of a century, yet the investors risked not only their monetary investment but also their community relationships by endorsing a competing newspaper and, in some cases, by becoming
associated with the strongly pro-Zionist position that would surely be advocated by that newspaper. Leonard Simons recalled that the investors, all committed advocates of Detroit Federation, were unhappy with the *Chronicle’s* treatment of Detroit Federation, and knew that Slomovitz would be a better advocate for Detroit Federation matters. Several factors probably led the investors to conclude that the time was right for a new English-Jewish newspaper in Detroit run by Slomovitz.

First, many of the investors and others in leadership positions wanted a newspaper more reflective of and advocating for the overall community. Slomovitz asserted in the first issue that the *Jewish News* was the only "community sponsored paper in the U.S." He meant that, in addition to prominent leaders providing the initial capital to start the paper, the advisory board would keep the paper grounded in all aspects of the diverse Detroit Jewish population. Slomovitz ardently believed in building and promoting Jewish life and Jewish ideas both locally and nationally. He used the newspaper to not only report about but to support Jewish agencies and organizations. Henry Wineman, who along with Fred Butzel were the two leaders in the Detroit community most associated with reaching out to all different groups of Jewish Detroiters, wrote in his endorsement of the first issue of the *Jewish News* that there were “many opportunities for a paper . . . to accomplish much good for the Jewish community.” Despite his lofty goals of fairly reporting on all aspects of the diverse Jewish community, however, Slomovitz represented Jewish Detroiters’ mainstream thinking. A portion of the community was sympathetic to socialist or communist policies, but Slomovitz was not interested in pursuing that point of view. In 1951, when Slomovitz was in the process of buying
the Chronicle, he sent a memo to his lawyer stating, among other things, that the Jewish News was to assume no responsibility for the employees of the Chronicle, since the Chronicle had “two pro-Communist columnists whom I won’t take even under point of a gun.” 137

Second, in addition to a desire for a community-based paper, many of the investors cited a need for a high quality paper in Detroit, suggesting that either the quality of the Chronicle had suffered or that they expected it to suffer with the loss of Slomovitz. Simons remarked that without Slomovitz, the “Chronicle didn’t have a paper.”138 Isidore Sobeloff asserted that “All the Jewish news gathering services in the world are of little value, if once having gathered the news, there is not an appropriate channel for disseminating that news.”139 Abe Srere wrote Slomovitz about the quality of the Jewish News, complimenting the paper’s unbiased dissemination of news, as opposed to “other papers in circulation.”140 Sidney Bolkosky noted that the Jewish News resulted from a “crusade, then a mission to establish higher standards for Jewish news reporting.”141 Fred Butzel, a Jewish News investor and board member, and perhaps the most important communal and civic leader at the time, endorsed the paper in its first issue with a front-page quote that read “A Well Published Jewish Paper In Detroit Is Long Overdue.”142 The April 3, 1942 issue of the Jewish News contained a number of endorsements (likely at least some, if not most, requested by Slomovitz) that implicitly and explicitly revealed the perceived shortfalls of the Chronicle: “a community without an opinion is like an empty shell”; “the founding of the paper shows that Jewish communities want to produce an organ to give our people the type of information necessary to cause
action to occur”; “Never before has there been such a great need for alert, informed and devoted Jewish journalism.” Many minutes of Detroit Federation’s governing bodies spoke of the need for an English-Jewish newspaper with sound editorial policies and responsive to community needs.

Third, Slomovitz’s vision for the newspaper paralleled the mainstream desires of Detroit Jewish leadership. A letter that Slomovitz sent to the Jewish community in March 1942 soliciting for subscriptions for the new paper stated that an English-Jewish newspaper needed to be more than a gossip source and should keep its readership fully informed of “what is transpiring in the world at large, in American Jewry, and in the principal communal agencies functioning in our midst.” He claimed in the letter that until now, information necessary to understand the Jewish position on various issues was not accessible to Jews in Detroit (suggesting, perhaps, among other things, that the Chronicle’s dissemination of information about Zionism was not as strong as Slomovitz would have wanted) and the Jewish News, as a community newspaper, would place service to the community over profit—words that would have been very comforting to mainstream Jewish leaders.

Fourth, the editorial direction of the Chronicle, at least as suggested by various editorials printed in the Chronicle in the months after Slomovitz left, also suggests why mainstream leadership would have wanted a different newspaper. In addition to the editorial advocating a bi-national solution in Palestine, an anathema to mainstream Zionists, the Chronicle published several editorials in the first seven months after Slomovitz left advocating for a federation of European countries—in
effect, a United States of Europe as opposed to balkanizing or otherwise weakening Germany, and also several editorials opining that the German people were as much the victims of the Nazis as other victims in Europe and that there should be no collective punishment.146 These types of editorials would have little appeal to a population reading weekly about the horror and extent of the atrocities committed by the German army against the Jews, and also did not really have any specifically Jewish application.

Additionally, many of the Chronicle editorials reveal the left leaning views of the owners and editors. Many Jews had similar views, and there were many socialist leaning institutions in the broad umbrella of Jewish organizations, such as Workmen’s Circle and the Zionist Labor Party, but the mainstream leadership, mostly comprised of very successful businessmen, would have wanted a more centrist editorial policy. For example, on May 8, in an editorial about the Stalinist regime that again pushed for a European republic, the Chronicle editors stated that they were willing to accept Stalin at his word when Stalin claimed that he had no territorial desires. The editorial ended: “This much we know for a certainty: that should the policy pursued up till now continue after the war, the Jews of the Soviets will not suffer from the plague of anti-Semitism.”147 There are editorials about French, Jewish, and German workers, and also multiple editorials advocating justice and defending the civil rights of anti-Semites. When a member of the anti-Semitic Crusader White Shirts was convicted, the editors noted that justice had been served and then remarked that “Some of our impatient and impulsive friends would have us suspend” the legal protections afforded “well known, vicious anti-Semites” in the
hurry to convict these types of people.\textsuperscript{148} Another editorial asserts that all people must be included in a just peace and there must be an equitable sharing of raw materials and industrial resources, including an equitable sharing with the Axis countries.\textsuperscript{149} Not all advocates of civil rights were necessarily socialists, or on the left side of the political spectrum, but the overall tenor of these editorials is consistent with a kind of secular, sometimes atheistic, Jewish Democratic Socialism and Humanism then popular among certain Eastern European Jews.

While desire for community, quality, and more palatable editorial content may have been good reasons for the investors to back a second English-Jewish newspaper in Detroit, the biggest reason was certainly the publisher and voice of the new paper, Philip Slomovitz. By 1942 Slomovitz had an established reputation in the American Jewish community, both as an activist and as a newspaper editor. He was called one of the leading editors of the English-Jewish press.\textsuperscript{150} The mainstream leadership admired his credo—“never to be silent where there is the merest semblance of injustice anywhere . . . and, to speak out without malice.”\textsuperscript{151} He was a leading figure in the Zionist movement and a crusader in the fight against anti-Semitism. His activism and reputation allowed him to establish relationships with any number of important political figures as well as national and local Jewish communal leaders. He was not afraid of adversity and believed in an aggressive style of activism but in accordance with his credo, when there was dissension among Jews over a given issue, he could maintain and foster relationships with those with whom he disagreed. Leaders in Detroit Federation viewed him as the true source of reporting at the \textit{Chronicle}—so much so that one administrator at Federation
requested that the *Chronicle* file be renamed the Slomovitz file since most of the file contained correspondence between Slomovitz and Detroit Federation.\textsuperscript{152}

Many of his relationships would serve both him and the Jewish community well over the years. He met Senator Arthur Vandenberg at a talk at Temple Beth El in 1929 and established a close friendship with him that lasted over twenty years.\textsuperscript{153} He saw Vandenberg, formerly a conservative newspaper publisher from Grand Rapids, as a “warm friend of the Jewish people and a supporter of the concept of a Jewish state.”\textsuperscript{154} Vandenberg was the leading Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a committed isolationist until Pearl Harbor, when he became an internationalist wanting the United States at the center of a new world order.\textsuperscript{155} Slomovitz introduced Vandenberg to the Zionist movement and Vandenberg became a committed supporter and founding member of the American Palestine Committee.\textsuperscript{156} He remained Vandenberg’s connection to the Zionist movement and would sometimes serve as an intermediary when a leading Zionist wanted to meet with Vandenberg.\textsuperscript{157} Slomovitz wrote in Vandenberg’s obituary that Vandenberg never showed “the slightest interest” in Slomovitz’s political preferences.\textsuperscript{158}

The voluminous correspondence between Slomovitz and Vandenberg demonstrates the warmth of their friendship. In addition to the warm salutations and closings in many of their letters, Vandenberg would advise Slomovitz of matters that were confidential, trusting that Slomovitz would neither publish them nor share them with other members of his Zionist organizations.\textsuperscript{159} When the *Jewish News* ran into financial trouble over mailing rates shortly after beginning
publication, Vandenberg arranged for Slomovitz to meet with an associate Postmaster General who resolved the matter very favorably to Slomovitz. In August 1942 Slomovitz wrote an editorial defending Vandenberg, who was the subject of an article entitled “Nazi Missionaries Were Sent to See Senator Vandenberg,” saying that it is a common error to identify a person as an anti-Semite because a “subversive clique” pays him a visit. Slomovitz declared that nothing in Vandenberg’s record would show him to be a bigot.

Slomovitz had good relationships with a number of other important political figures, including Michigan’s other senator, Prentiss Brown, and Secretary of Treasury Robert Morgenthau, and he corresponded with Franklin Roosevelt. He also had friendships with both Abba Hillel Silver and Stephen Wise. Slomovitz called Silver “brilliant” in an editorial and maintained a warm correspondence with him throughout this period. Slomovitz reminisced that he had a “special warm relationship” with Wise, but when a major philosophical difference between Wise and Silver split the Zionist movement in 1945, Slomovitz advocated for Silver, rather than Wise.

In addition to the quality of Slomovitz’s work and his many relationships, the investors were most desirous of maintaining a public forum for Slomovitz’s advocacy on various Jewish issues. The Jewish community was deeply divided on how to best advocate various Jewish positions, particularly approaches to anti-Semitism, both in Europe and in America. Beginning in 1933, the American Jewish Congress and Jewish War Veterans both supported aggressive action and public demonstrations to combat rising Nazism, but the American Jewish Committee
favored back room discussions and private meetings, fearing that public
demonstrations could backfire and make the situation worse for German Jews. The
American Jewish Committee approach, also favored by B’nai B’rith, was
euphemistically known as the “sha-sha” or “hush-hush” approach—increased
prominence could exacerbate existing anti-Semitism.165 The fears of those favoring
the “sha-sha” approach were certainly real. An article in the August 28, 1942 Jewish
News reported that in response to Allied bombing of the Nazi-occupied city of
Dieppe, the infuriated Nazis blamed the Jews, increased deportation, closed all
synagogues, and demanded the return of Jews who had managed to escape to
Switzerland.166 If the Nazis reacted that strongly to an Allied raid, it was not hard to
imagine the reaction of the Nazis to intense public advocacy by American Jews.
Furthermore, the FBI discovered a plot to injure hundreds of prominent American
Jews and arrested over one hundred fifty German aliens in connection with the
plot.167 Aggressive action could clearly lead to personal danger.

While Slomovitz appreciated the issue’s divisiveness, he was a strong
believer in aggressive and public advocacy. He saw his role as a defender of
American ideals and Jewish traditions and wanted to use his forum to strongly
advocate for those ideals. He believed that a newspaper must ardently urge effective
action and that the reason that many English-Jewish newspapers verged on failure
was their wishy-wishy editorial stances. “Wake up!” he quoted from a Jewish Press
Service release in an editorial praising another periodical known for its aggressive
action, “This is the age of fighting—not whining—Jews.”168
Slomovitz also had a good deal of business savvy. He unabashedly approached friends and important leaders, including Franklin Roosevelt, to ask for an endorsement or a special exclusive holiday greeting. The first issue had little content about Europe, but Slomovitz made sure to include a nice article about Maurice Schwartz’s son making a high school athletic team. He published an “advertisement” in every early issue either promoting the paper to potential advertisers or pleading with readers to patronize those who advertised and then tell the advertisers that the patron read about their store in the Jewish News. He was also not afraid to play “hardball” to make sure that the Jewish News was the source for the most current news about the Jewish community in Detroit. When one well respected rabbi in town asked Slomovitz to run an article about an upcoming event a week after an article about the event appeared in the Chronicle, Slomovitz refused to run it, even though the rabbi pointed out that his refusal would result in less funds being raised for a good cause. He also impressed upon synagogues and other Jewish organizations that it was only equitable to give him their news before releasing it to the daily papers, even if it meant a delay in reporting the news, so he would not be “scooped.” A combination of Slomovitz’s business savvy, relationships, and reputation bode well for the nascent Jewish News, and within months of the founding of the paper the Jewish News was outdistancing the Chronicle, 3,000 subscribers to 1,800. According to Slomovitz, The Jewish News, despite some financially hard times during the war, eventually became the most profitable English-Jewish newspaper in the United States.
The first issue of the *Jewish News* came out on March 27, 1942. It was divided into two parts. The first part of sixteen pages contained endorsements, letters of congratulations, and statements about the publisher’s goals. The second part of twenty-four pages contained the “actual” first edition, with news, articles, features, and advertisements. The first section’s front-page headline announced the paper’s arrival and included a subheading stating that both local and national leaders greeted the “appearance of a community sponsored *Jewish News.*” The section was filled with quotes and endorsements supporting the paper, including a front-page endorsement from Stephen Wise, stating that Slomovitz wrote “Intelligently, Readably and Effectively.” The first section also included a few pages in which Slomovitz “answered” self-asked questions, such as: What guarantees the future and success of the paper?, Who will receive the paper?, Why will people read the paper?, and why the *Jewish News* had “enormous advertising value.” In response to the question of why people would read the paper, Slomovitz predicted that as the only “community sponsored paper” in the United States, the paper would contain important and interesting news for every Jew. The last page of the section identified all of the directors on the *Jewish News* board and all of the members of the community advisory committee.

Letters of congratulations and endorsements were individually reproduced on full pages in the first section, including letters from several of the board members noting that the paper would have an “honest editorial policy,” a “genuine desire to publish all the news fairly” and on a “strictly non-partisan basis,” and that the paper would be “a fine force in the reconciliation of the various Jewish elements of the city
and will lead to the mutual understanding of these elements.” Other letters that were reproduced on full pages in the first section came from Arthur Vandenberg, who asserted that the paper would not only inform the people, but also “give them the inspiration and the leadership which will win unity at home and victory abroad.” Slomovitz published other full-page letters from Detroit area Congressman John Dingell, Stephen Wise, and the national presidents of B’nai B’rith and the Jewish National Fund. The scope of the reproduced letters showed the breadth and depth of the support that Slomovitz had locally and nationally.175

The second part of the first edition contained a “real” issue, although at twenty-four pages it was fifty percent larger than subsequent editions of the paper. The section was also filled with endorsements and reproduced letters (although the reproductions were only a quarter page) including letters from Eleanor Roosevelt, Supreme Court Justice (and former Michigan governor and Detroit mayor) Frank Murphy, The Detroit Free Press, The Detroit News, and Senator Prentiss Brown. The letters and endorsements seemed to include a broad and diverse swath of support, from the fervent Zionist leader Abba Silver to the ardent non-Zionist Dr. Leo Franklin, and from the established German-Jewish Reform leadership to Eastern European Orthodox rabbis. One group that did not seem to join in the general outpouring of support were organizations with socialist or more leftist ties, such as Workman’s Circle and the Labor Zionists. The headline in this section announced that Detroit Jews were being asked to give over a million dollars to provide for allied communal obligations through the Allied Jewish Campaign (Campaign) which was Detroit Federation’s fundraising effort carried out yearly to fund all of the
organizations under its umbrella as well as Detroit Federation’s share of the United Jewish Appeal.

News in the first edition was a mix of local stories and national and international news, much as would follow in succeeding issues. Topics did not vary much from what had been in the January 1942 issues of the Chronicle and included articles about the creation of a Jewish army, Detroit Jews serving in the war, anti-Semitic activities, including Father Charles Coughlin, a number of community events and a page devoted to items of “women’s interests.” Interestingly, there were two news areas that received little attention in the first edition but would come to be major areas of interest in the coming months—the crisis facing Jews in Europe, and Zionism and Palestine generally. In most issues Slomovitz would include a sermonette from one of the local rabbis, and in the first issue he gave the honor to Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer of Temple Beth El.

Among the various columns in the paper was a column created by Slomovitz when he was at the Chronicle, called Commentary in the first issue but soon to be known as Purely Commentary. Purely Commentary was an expanded version of an editorial, allowing Slomovitz the freedom to write as much as he wanted on a given topic or group of topics. Slomovitz had actually syndicated the column for a couple of years while he was at the Chronicle, and he would continue to write it weekly for the rest of his life, with the last column being published two weeks after his death in 1993. In the Jewish News debut issue, his Commentary topics included the sinking of a ship carrying refugees to Palestine and treating Russia as an ally during the war.
The issue also contained several editorials, including one advocating the suppression of the anti-Semitic newsletter published by Father Coughlin called “Social Justice.” Slomovitz had been fighting Social Justice in the Chronicle for close to a decade as part of his overall campaign against anti-Semitism and continued his advocacy in the Jewish News. The other editorial set forth the platform of the Jewish News, which he called “an organ for the molding of Jewish public opinion, as an instrument to strengthen the Jewish community, and for the advancement of the morale and courage of American Jews in this hour of crisis.” The column went on to set forth the paper’s “credo” and then stated that the paper would inform and be a “clearing house” for all “shades” of opinions within the Jewish community and to “approach Jewish issues without partisan coloration.” (Italics in original).

While the format of the Jewish News would evolve over time, the structure was basically in place by the second issue. The paper was typically five columns wide and sixteen pages long. The front page would have one or two major headlines and a number of smaller headlines underneath, occasionally with a quick sentence summarizing the story and a page reference as to where the headline story could be found. A guest editorial would be located in the left bottom quarter of the front page, typically written by a leading member of the established Jewish community, more often than not someone with close ties to Detroit Federation. The other bottom quarter of the front page would be a photograph, usually showing the good work being done by one or another communal organization supported by Detroit Federation. Important news would take up the next few pages, although as the situation in Europe worsened, Slomovitz devoted more and more of the second page
to a feature entitled “World Wide News at a Glance,” a compendium of bulletins taken from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA) wires.

In general, articles were short. A front-page headline could lead to a one-paragraph article of three lines. Most articles were less than a column. A separate page would be devoted to editorials, with usually a sermonette from a local rabbi taking a column of that page. Purely Commentary would also be a weekly feature, as would other local events or “social” columns, a women’s page, a page devoted to social activities, a calendar of religious and synagogue events, smaller articles and community announcements, and a portion of a page devoted to activities of Jewish Detroiter who were serving in the military. Although Slomovitz invited letters to the editor in his first edition, he rarely published letters, and, at least during the first year, he only included letters complimentary to the paper. 177

Even with his investors solidly behind him, Slomovitz found that early 1942 was a challenging time to start a new English-Jewish newspaper. Hundreds of Jewish Detroiter had already departed for war, and hundreds more were getting ready to go. Personal budgets were tight, and most people saw no need for another Jewish weekly. 178 Slomovitz, however, had entered into two different business arrangements that would ensure him an advantage over the Chronicle. First, through his relationships and past employment, he secured the exclusive right in Detroit to use stories and reports from the JTA news service. Various news services existing at the turn of the twentieth century, like Associated Press, Reuters, and so forth, ignored Jewish news per se, but dealt with Jewish news as corollary events to other stories. The JTA was created in 1917 to report newsworthy Jewish events. 179
In 1940 the JTA started an “Overseas News Agency” to place non-Jewish correspondents in Nazi-held territory where Jews could not enter. These correspondents gave the JTA access to much more information and a far greater breadth of stories during the war than other Jewish-oriented news services. The JTA provided reliable news, but with a uniformity of perspective. Furthermore, items about Israel and Zionism tended to receive more prominence than items about the destruction of European Jewry, partly because JTA received a part of its funding from an umbrella organization of local Federations interested in Zionism. JTA was not written for the public, but for the press—it employed no headlines for its stories and did not place stories in any particular order, although at least one author has suggested that JTA “buried” atrocity stories and did not want to emphasize individual suffering. Since JTA material appeared exclusively in the Jewish News in the Michigan area, the Jewish News provided much greater coverage of events in Europe, and worldwide, than the Chronicle. The first issue of the Jewish News also claimed that the Jewish News was the only Jewish newspaper in Michigan with features from The Seven Arts Feature Syndicate, the Independent Jewish Press Service (JPS), the Religious News Service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and Palcor Agency. The claim about Palcor, at least, was inaccurate as several Palcor articles appeared in the Chronicle over the next year. Each newspaper also published stories from the WNS news agency.

The principals at the Chronicle were caught by surprise when their relationships with the news agencies were terminated, and they accused Slomovitz of engaging in unfair business practices. In many instances a blunt letter or
telegram notified them that the service had been stopped—JTA sent a telegram stating, in its entirety, “Sorry Service Not Available.”\textsuperscript{186} \textit{Chronicle} management admitted that their inability to use these services deeply hurt their ability to compete. In at least one instance, they used the influence of a rabbi in the community to cause one news agency, Seven Arts Feature Syndicate, to reverse their decision and send their materials to both newspapers.

\textbf{CHAPTER 5}

\textbf{GENESIS OF DETROIT FEDERATION/\textit{JEWISH NEWS} RELATIONSHIP AND CRITICISM OF THAT RELATIONSHIP}

The second, and probably most critical, business arrangement that gave the \textit{Jewish News} an advantage over the \textit{Chronicle} was the relationship between the \textit{Jewish News} and Detroit Federation. That relationship stemmed from Detroit Federation leaders’ desire to ensure that Detroit Jews received accurate information about not only Detroit Federation, but also matters relevant to Jews generally. Federations across the country disseminated relevant information to their local Jewish population as a part of their charge. Leaders felt that informing their local population about Federation activities was critical to their fundraising efforts. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, an umbrella organization of the various Federation and Federation-type organizations across the country, published a General Bulletin in November 1942 surveying how various Federations informed their local population and listing the perceived benefits of disseminating that information. The General Bulletin noted that educating the public about programming in “simple, non-technical terms” was a key to community planning
and an important fundraising tool, as donors wanted to know what Federation was doing with their donations.  

A survey of Federations conducted by the authors of the General Bulletin found that various Federations informed the public by special meetings, reports, year books, the local English-Jewish press, news letters and, in some cases, Federation funded newspapers. Of the thirty-seven Federations that responded to a questionnaire sent by the Council on the topic of methods used to inform the public, twelve Federations were publishing their own newspaper and two more were considering doing so. Some Federations only published a newspaper during the time period of their annual campaign and limited the contents to campaign related information, but those Federations that published a regular, year-round paper would typically also include national and international news relevant to Jews, as well as information relating to the annual campaign and the local Federation. In almost all cases the newspapers were distributed free of charge, although the intended readership varied from Federation to Federation—in some cases the paper was only sent to officers and workers on the campaign; in others, the paper was sent to all donors. In a few cases, the paper was circulated to the entire local Jewish community. The General Bulletin offered no hard evidence of the value of a newspaper to a campaign, but the anecdotal evidence, by means of comments from leaders of various participating Federations, strongly suggested that the newspaper was a positive influence on both morale and fundraising.

In some instances the local Federation elected to publish a newsletter in a community that was already served by an English-Jewish newspaper. This may
have been because of the local newspaper’s poor circulation, or because the Federation felt that the local newspaper inadequately covered Federation events and constituent organizations. On the other hand, the General Bulletin reported many instances in which the local English-Jewish newspaper was extremely cooperative with the local Federation. In Minneapolis, for example, the local newspaper gave preferential treatment to Federation news releases and paid the cost of linotype for campaign matters set forth in their annual campaign issue, which was devoted almost entirely to the local Federation’s annual campaign.\textsuperscript{192} Other communities reported similar beneficial relationships with the local English-Jewish newspaper.

Leaders in Detroit Federation in 1942 saw the nascent \textit{Jewish News} as a potential conduit to more efficiently and effectively promulgate the information ideally provided by a local Federation. Detroit Federation had published its own monthly publication in the 1930s. That publication had the look and characteristics of an actual newspaper and focused mostly on the Campaign and Detroit Federation agencies without much additional news. Detroit Federation leaders at that time recognized the importance of educating the public as to the services provided by various Federation Agencies. An editorial in the Detroit Federation newspaper from July 1933 entitled “Wanted- An Informed Community” admonished that since only 3,300 Jews participated in the last campaign when there was a projected donor population of over 10,000, Detroit Federation had to do a better job of educating the public as to why it was important to support the Campaign. Slomovitz, who served on the editorial committee of the publication, wrote the editorial.\textsuperscript{193}
By 1942, Detroit Federation was no longer publishing a newspaper, but its board of directors had been discussing restarting the paper as part of an educational and promotional program to better inform Jewish Detroiter about the activities of Detroit Federation and its agencies and to promote those activities. In fact, the 1942 Detroit Federation budget included a line item for such a program and the pledge cards for the 1942 campaign, sent out in December 1941, specifically stated that fifty cents of each pledge would be used as a subscription fee for a new publication, the *Federation News*.\(^{194}\) The Detroit Federation executive committee believed that such a newspaper would “prove more effective in developing a better public understanding of Jewish problems; intensify interest in the programs of our beneficiary agencies and services; encourage more adequate giving and, at the same time, effect economies in overhead for publicity, mailing, and postage, etc.”\(^{195}\) Shortly after the *Jewish News* began publishing, however, some Detroit Federation leaders (some of whom were presumably also investors in the *Jewish News*) proposed that Federation enter into an arrangement with the *Jewish News* to allow the *Jewish News* to serve as the official news organ of Detroit Federation. Perhaps conscious of the inherent conflicts of interest, Detroit Federation leaders made sure that minutes of different committees reflected that the founding of the *Detroit Jewish News* and the funding of that venture by Detroit Federation leaders was entirely independent and separate from the discussions about starting a Federation organ that were occurring at the same time.\(^{196}\)

The executive committee minutes describing the reasons for restarting an internal Federation house organ also provided that the *Jewish News* was created for
the purpose of expanding Jewish readership while engaging in acceptable business practices and being “responsive to communal needs.” This language suggests that animosity existed between Detroit Federation and the Chronicle. The concept of the Chronicle engaging in illegitimate business practices peppers the Detroit Federation archival records in this area. In fact, a draft of the resolution approving the Detroit Federation/Jewish News relationship originally included a phrase stating that the newspaper with which Detroit Federation should associate should be “devoid of unethical practices which have previously been distasteful to Jews and non-Jews alike…” (Italics added) but the italicized language was deleted in the final resolution approving the Jewish News as the Detroit Federation newspaper, suggesting that Detroit Federation did not want to publicly charge the Chronicle with engaging in unethical business practices. Business ethics were apparently a challenge for most English-Jewish weeklies. Fred Butzel asserted that it was impossible for a Jewish weekly to be absolutely ethical in its business practices and still realize a profit unless it received a subsidy.

The Detroit Federation executive committee reviewed and approved the proposed Detroit Federation/Jewish News relationship on June 26, 1942. After listing the reasons that the committee desired a house organ and stating that the creation of the Jewish News occurred independently of such desire, the minutes stated that members of the executive committee met with representatives of both English-Jewish newspapers and concluded that there should only be one such newspaper. The executive committee members agreed that for the “general good and for the specific benefits that would accrue to the Allied Jewish Campaign,”
Detroit Federation should support and encourage that publication and merge its internal newspaper into the chosen English-Jewish newspaper, which was the *Jewish News*. As the official newspaper of Detroit Federation, the *Jewish News* would include all articles and advertising submitted by leaders of Detroit Federation to Slomovitz and would serve as the vehicle by which Detroit Federation's donors would stay informed about all activities of Detroit Federation and its agencies, as well as such areas of Jewish life and current events in general that members of the executive committee thought were important to disseminate.

The terms of the merger included an agreement that the *Jewish News* would provide every Detroit Federation donor who did not separately subscribe to the *Jewish News* with an issue of the *Jewish News* at least once a month, and the *Jewish News* would receive in return fifty cents annually for each such donor; that the *Jewish News* would publish such news or ads as Detroit Federation might request without charge; and that to the extent that the *Jewish News* made a net profit, such amount would be offset against the fifty cent fee paid by Detroit Federation for each of its donors. Additionally, the merger agreement required that the preferred stockholders of the *Jewish News* (whom the minutes state rather self-servingly, invested in the *Jewish News* on the basis of communal interest) agree to a voting trust controlled by the Detroit Federation executive committee for a ten-year period, and that the bylaws of the *Jewish News* would be revised so that the executive committee-controlled voting trust would have a majority voting interest in the paper's affairs.\textsuperscript{200}
The requirement of a voting trust and change in bylaws indicates that the executive committee intended to exercise control, or at least final say, over *Jewish News* policies. In presenting the proposed arrangement to the Detroit Service Group (the Federation committee that actually ran the annual Campaign), executive committee members advised that the voting rights gave the executive committee the right to “direct the general policies of the Jewish News.” Furthermore, the arrangement contemplated that an editorial board, comprised of Slomovitz and members of Detroit Federation or their designee, would set the editorial policies for the *Jewish News*. Isidore Sobeloff claimed that the arrangement would allow Detroit Federation and the community in general to “improve the level of Anglo-Jewish journalism, a field which is coming more and more to be regarded as of a quasi-public nature.” Sobeloff believed that the quality of education being afforded a community was directly tied to the quality of the local English-Jewish newspaper. Indeed, Sobeloff began soliciting articles to be printed in the *Jewish News*. For example, in September 1942 he asked the Executive Director of the Los Angeles Federation to submit an article for the “Detroit paper” about some timely development in Los Angeles suggesting to Detroiters that events happening in other community organizations had a bearing on Detroit agency events.

The fact that Detroit Federation had such a degree of control over a theoretically independent and community based newspaper raised some eyebrows and brought forth some criticism, but receiving financial support from a local Federation was not a new concept. In many local communities where the English-Jewish press had failed or was financially insolvent, the local Federation would
either take over the paper or provide significant financial support. Some criticize such arrangements, arguing that newspapers relying on Federation dollars are nothing more than an arm of the Federation since the paper would not be critical of Federation or any other issue or organization supported by Federation. On the other hand, as Jonathan Sarna has written: “Between a bland paper and none at all the former was preferable.”

The voting trust arrangement clearly gave Detroit Federation great influence over policies at the *Jewish News*, but even without the voting trust agreement, Slomovitz and the *Jewish News* faced the same tensions because of the large Federation circulation and the relationships between the *Jewish News* board members, many of the community advisory members, and Detroit Federation. Indeed in 1943 Abe Srere wrote to Slomovitz:

> it would be very helpful if the committee appointed by Federation reviewed the editorial and advertising policy of your paper from time to time and make reports on their findings which could be published in your paper. This I believe would be very helpful as it would indicate to the community that the Federation is vitally interested in the affairs of the Jewish News.

The *Jewish Press Services Committee of Detroit Federation even created a sub-committee on editorial policy and business practices to monitor the *Jewish News* relationship.

Despite the formal governance structure put into place and the assertions by various Detroit Federation leaders that Detroit Federation had the right to control the newspaper, Slomovitz claimed that he never felt constrained and that he was never restricted. This assertion would seem inapposite to the facts but in reality, even without the voting trust arrangement, it was unlikely that Slomovitz would
print an article critical of Detroit Federation or its associated agencies because Slomovitz did not believe in airing the “dirty laundry” of community organizations, and by nature he avidly supported Detroit Federation and its constituent agencies. One reason he received the widespread support of the mainstream Jewish leadership was his record of support for that leadership and for the mainstream institutional infrastructure in the city. In fact, Slomovitz actually welcomed the input of Detroit Federation leaders. Slomovitz, for example, solicited Sobeloff’s counsel on various aspects of the Jewish News, including front-page layout, the substance of various articles, and how to best respond to criticism. He solicited Fred Butzel’s opinion as to layout and other changes and told Butzel that Sobeloff was very helpful and the paper was making progress. He was also sure to share with Sobeloff letters that were complimentary about the Jewish News.210

Slomovitz should have been delighted with the arrangement with Detroit Federation regardless of any governance requirements. The Detroit Federation subscription list included twenty-three thousand donors from sixteen thousand discrete families and the agreement with Detroit Federation was a singular opportunity for Slomovitz to get his new publication into a good portion of Jewish Detroiters’ homes at least once a month. Under the merger arrangement, each donor household received at least one issue of the Jewish News monthly and in some instances, two issues, since the original arrangement contemplated fourteen special Federation issues of the Jewish News each year.211 At a subscription rate of fifty cents per donor, the Jewish News would receive the type of subsidy that Fred Butzel believed was necessary to allow a Jewish weekly to maintain ethical business
practices. Between the donor circulation and those who actually subscribed to the Jewish News on a weekly basis, the Jewish News would be distributed to over 19,000 homes in Detroit at least once a month, compared to the approximately 1,500 homes receiving the Chronicle. Indeed, the first Federation edition of the Jewish News had a run of 19,500 copies. This created a clear advantage for the Jewish News in terms of readership, influence, and advertising revenue.

Both the owners of the Chronicle and Jacob Bernstein, the manager of the Detroit edition of the Forward, a daily Yiddish newspaper popular among first generation Jewish Detroiter, quickly challenged that advantage. Bernstein, a respected figure in the community, especially among first generation Eastern European Jews, was a board member of Detroit Federation and was incensed at the arrangements made with the Jewish News, particularly since he claimed they were made without appropriate consideration or discussion, but rather “rammed through” in one meeting. In September 1942 he sent a memorandum of his grievances to Sobeloff who in turn distributed it to all Detroit Federation board members. Bernstein claimed that he had not been notified of the meeting where the arrangement was approved and that he had spent the summer trying to coordinate a meeting with Sobeloff to discuss the matter. He asserted that the actions of Detroit Federation in this matter were “unique and revolutionary” and, by endorsing the Jewish News, Detroit Federation was entering into direct competition with papers such as the Forward and the Chronicle. He objected both procedurally, stating that the board members had not been given a chance to absorb the ramifications of the transaction, and substantively, claiming that the arrangement would make Detroit
Federation a participant in a fraud. He postulated that advertising salesmen for the *Jewish News* would tell potential advertisers that the *Jewish News* boasted a circulation of over sixteen thousand, which was only true when the Detroit Federation issues were circulated, but not the rest of the year. He also pointed out that any other Yiddish or Anglo-Jewish newspaper in the Detroit community that supported Federation would now find itself in the odd position of supporting its competitor. He noted the tangled financial arrangements between certain Detroit Federation board members and the *Jewish News* and suggested that those members should have been disqualified from voting on the proposal, although he also acknowledged that the parties tangled in the ethical conflict were not motivated by profit in their decision to invest in the *Jewish News*. Finally, he asserted that the policies and content of the *Jewish News* would be associated with Detroit Federation, making Detroit Federation “the mouthpiece of the many-hued Jewish community of Detroit.... A mission that has not as yet been entrusted into the hands of the Jewish Welfare Federation.”\(^{213}\) Sobeloff’s cover note distributing the memo to all board members pointedly noted that forty-one board members were at the June meeting and all but one voted for the proposal.\(^{214}\)

Detroit Federation’s leadership took Bernstein’s complaints seriously, although Sobeloff noted that some of Bernstein’s statements in the memo were factually incorrect. Abe Srere wrote that he believed that those heading Detroit Federation should not be on the Board of Directors of the *Jewish News* even though both he and others continued to do so.\(^{215}\) The Detroit Federation executive committee voted to discuss Bernstein’s criticisms at the next board meeting if
Bernstein were to request such consideration, although there is no record of whether the matter was actually discussed at the next board meeting. Bernstein’s assertion about ad salesmen at the *Jewish News* misrepresenting circulation numbers was treated very seriously and the executive committee warned Slomovitz against over stating circulation numbers. Detroit Federation monitored Slomovitz’s practices in this respect for the next several years. In response to an inquiry from the advertising manager of the J. L. Hudson Company (a large advertiser in the various Detroit Jewish newspapers), Fred Butzel clarified that the usual circulation of the *Jewish News* was three thousand, but that at least once a month, as an organ of Detroit Federation, the newspaper would be distributed to over sixteen thousand households comprising, in Butzel’s words, “a very interested segment of our population” and assured the advertising manager that the paper would be read. Mindful of Bernstein’s warnings about favoritism, Butzel also took the opportunity to endorse the *Forward* as a quality paper with an excellent following, noting that the intellectual and literary standards of the *Forward* were “way above the average of American Journalism.” It is notable that the *Chronicle* is not mentioned in the letter.

Bernstein may have been upset about the Detroit Federation/*Jewish News* arrangement, but Jacob Margolis and Jacob Schakne, respectively the president/general manager and the editor of the *Chronicle*, were livid. They complained to Federation about Slomovitz’s letter to the Jewish community announcing the coming of the *Jewish News*, which they claimed disparaged the *Chronicle* unfairly in many respects. They pointed out that Slomovitz, after
resigning from the *Chronicle*, flew to New York and convinced the various news agencies supplying news to Jewish publications to make exclusive deals with the *Jewish News*, thereby inhibiting the *Chronicle’s* ability to obtain and print national and international news stories or any number of features typically found in local English-Jewish newspapers. They noted that they had met with a Detroit Federation committee in Fred Butzel’s office in June 1942 to discuss better Detroit Federation coverage in the *Chronicle*, and that they had offered to print whatever number of copies of the *Chronicle* that Federation might want at cost, but that they had heard nothing further from anyone at Detroit Federation until Federation announced its relationship with the *Jewish News*. They claimed that Detroit Federation treated them unfairly and echoed Bernstein’s claim about *Jewish News* ad salesmen falsely inflating circulation numbers.\(^{219}\) They also used their paper to advocate their position. The November 13, 1942 edition of the *Chronicle* includes a front-page article in which the Jewish War Veterans of the United States endorsed the *Chronicle* as a “Truly Communal Jewish Newspaper.” One week later the *Chronicle* reprinted a letter from Elmer Berger, the fiercely non-Zionist rabbi at a temple in Flint, Michigan (who would later become executive director of the non-Zionist rabbinical organization American Council for Judaism) endorsing the *Chronicle* as a “Fair Minded, Non-Partisan Jewish Newspaper.” The following week the *Chronicle*’s front page included a reproduced letter from the USO stating that the *Chronicle* builds up camp morale.\(^{220}\)

Others in the community were also disturbed at the notion of Detroit Federation subsidizing a private enterprise. Fred Butzel received a letter from “A
Contributor” strongly objecting to the arrangement, and enclosing a clipping from another “local Jewish publication” highly critical of Slomovitz’s grammar. Another contributor sent a letter objecting to the additional costs to be incurred in the venture.221 Abe Srere advised Sobeloff that “Mr. Prentis” (perhaps Meyer Prentis, General Motors’ Treasurer and a major philanthropist in the community) had been discussing the matter with other Detroit contributors and was “making much” of Bernstein’s memo.222 Others in the community objected to additional costs incurred.

The discord created by the relationship between the Jewish News and Detroit Federation was based not only on unfair competition. Others complained to Detroit Federation board members about the weak quality of the newspaper. Fred Butzel wrote in September that he was not satisfied with the “literary and news character of the paper” but acknowledged that it was improving.223 Concerns about quality appear in Detroit Federation minutes early in the relationship, but within two years these concerns would disappear—minutes of a Detroit Federation special committee dealing with the Jewish News include the statement that “The general content of the Jewish News is clearly superior to that of the Chronicle,” while the committee noted in subsequent meetings that, except for some imbalance in news coverage, the quality of the Jewish News was “unsurpassed in the Anglo-Jewish field.”224

Tensions over the Detroit Federation/Jewish News relationship caused some leading members of Detroit Federation to try and bring peace by brokering a merger between the Jewish News and the Chronicle. The merger notion also stemmed from a feeling among executive committee members that Detroit was big enough for only
one English-Jewish weekly paper. Within a few months after the Detroit Federation approved the Jewish News arrangement, and shortly after publication of the first Detroit Federation edition, Abe Srere, who was both president of Detroit Federation and a Jewish News board member, suggested the idea of a merger. Srere, who claimed he was brokering the discussions as an individual without the authority of anyone else, suggested to Margolis and Schakne that both newspapers and the Detroit Jewish community would greatly benefit by the elimination of one of the papers. He proposed that the Chronicle combine with the Jewish News and that Margolis and Slomovitz would jointly manage the new paper, but that ownership would be split 65% to the shareholders of the Chronicle, and the balance to Slomovitz (Slomovitz’s preferred shareholders would be reimbursed out of the first profits realized by the paper). He also proposed that the Chronicle shareholders should distribute a portion of the profit they received to Detroit Federation to be used by Detroit Federation to pay advertising and other obligations it would incur to the new paper. Srere also insisted that Detroit Federation would have representation on the paper by means of an advisor “with regard to the ethical, cultural, and news policy” of the paper. He cryptically continued by stating that the Federation participation part of the proposal may have sounded “harsh,” “but both of you gentlemen know exactly what is referred to.”

Members of Detroit Federation continued to be concerned about the Chronicle’s business practices.

Slomovitz was not only amenable to Srere’s proposal, but he had helped craft the terms. A day before Srere made the proposal to Schakne and Margolis Slomovitz sent Sobeloff a letter about the proposed merger, which Sobeloff then forwarded to
Srere. This chain of events suggests that despite Srere’s statements to the contrary, he was not acting independently in trying to bring about a merger. Slomovitz’s letter set forth certain financial information and stressed that Slomovitz’s main concern was that the “community assume and remain permanently in control” of the merged paper, which had to continue as a community paper. He expressed his gratefulness that Srere was advocating for Slomovitz to receive a 35% share of the paper, but Slomovitz advised Sobeloff that Slomovitz was much more concerned that governance of the merged paper include “a firm and more lasting balance of power for Federation.” Slomovitz’s letter also sheds light on his unhappiness when he was at the Chronicle: “I can not go back to an unwholesome atmosphere which either involves one partner who curses the entire community and those around him and creates an outrageous environment; or another who loafs all day and may expect to draw a high salary.” He further wrote: “a Jewish newspaper is not a house of prostitution but a much-needed community service to be rendered honestly and with devotion.” He then listed some business points that he would insist upon in any merger, including complete control over the editorial department, selection of staff, that the office of the paper be closed on the Sabbath, and that he have a clean office, not a “firetrap and a dump.”

Margolis and Schakne responded to Srere nine days later rejecting the proposal and counter-proposing that the Chronicle absorb the Jewish News, but critically stating that they had no room for Slomovitz, claiming that their current staff was sufficient to operate the paper. They went on to say that they were amenable to consulting with Detroit Federation as to news and editorial policy and
that they were “just as desirous as the Jewish Welfare Federation that only non-
partisan fair minded news be printed that would be of real interest to the entire
Jewish community.” That letter, as well as another letter to Detroit Federation
written by Schakne and Margolis a few weeks later bitterly complaining about
Slomovitz, reveal the animosity between Slomovitz and the management of the
Chronicle, with accusations of unethical practices flying both ways. The later
letter also reveals the level of anger and frustration that Chronicle management felt
over the Detroit Federation/Jewish News relationship.

Following the failed merger talks, Schakne and Margolis tried, at various
times, to convince Detroit Federation to terminate their relationship with the Jewish
News. In October 1944 they appeared before a special Detroit Federation committee
dealing with the Jewish News to state their objections to the arrangement. The
subcommittee eventually recommended that Detroit Federation continue its
relationship with the Jewish News. By the end of June 1945, both Schakne and
Margolis had left the Chronicle and Joseph Cummins, who had owned the paper for
over a quarter century, began to actively run the paper. When all of Cummins’
efforts to break the Detroit Federation/Jewish News bond failed, he decided to air his
grievances in public, and beginning in late June 1945, the Chronicle ran weekly
front-page headlines and articles blasting the arrangement for eight weeks in a row,
claiming that the community had been misled and the community’s dollars
misspent, and bragging that the Chronicle was the only “independent” paper in
town. Cummins’ intense bitterness is clear from some of the headlines in those
weeks: “Charity Funds Pervered To Build the Jewish News”; “Undemocratic Tieup
May Prove Danger To Detroit Jewry”; and “A Unique Code of Ethics Is Expounded by Jewish News.”

When these headlines failed to attract much attention, Cummins offered to provide the same service to Detroit Federation that the Jewish News had been providing, but without charge, a rather disingenuous offer since the value in the arrangement was in the circulation numbers and increased advertising revenue. The offer also greatly undercut the Chronicle’s many editorials arguing that any such arrangement would restrict the paper’s independence. Cummins urged Chronicle readers to voice their displeasure at the arrangement at the next Detroit Federation meeting where the Jewish News arrangement was up for renewal.

Despite the campaign waged by Cummins, the Detroit Federation executive committee voted to renew the Jewish News arrangement, which speaks loudly to the relative quality of the two newspapers. In reaching their decision, the executive committee noted that the cost of the service provided by the Jewish News had decreased each year and was now “considerably less than the actual cost to Federation for maintaining a publicity department” and that the business practices of the Chronicle were “no more desirable than when Federation approached the whole matter of press service in 1942.” Cummins’ actions, coming more than three years after the arrangement was first put into place, seems like a last-ditch effort and indicates the dire straits in which Cummins must have found the financial condition of the Chronicle. Indeed, within months after the failed campaign, Cummins sold the Chronicle to an outside party.
The substance of the Federation issues confirmed that using the *Jewish News* as a communicative tool for the Detroit Federation agenda was a smart choice. The first two Detroit Federation issues focused on a second major fundraising drive faced by Detroit Jews in 1942, the War Chest, and the *Jewish News* proved invaluable in educating readers (over 19,000 households between regular subscribers and Detroit Federation non-subscribing donor households) as to why the war chest drive was critical and how it worked with the Campaign. The third issue, following the war chest campaign, gave Detroit Federation a chance to educate readers about all of the services and activities that Detroit Federation and its agencies provided, starting with a full page, front-page article written by Abe Srere explaining that Federation agencies were ready to deal with war needs and ending with a full page back page “advertisement” listing the various agencies and quickly summarizing the services provided. The pages in the issue featured numerous articles about the various Federation agencies.\(^{235}\)

The first Detroit Federation issue of the *Jewish News* was not published until September 25, 1942, but it is clear that from the beginning of publication Detroit Federation had found an ally in Slomovitz and the *Jewish News*. A comparison of various issues of the *Jewish News* and the *Chronicle* during 1942 reveals that the *Jewish News* was the better vehicle for the goals desired by Detroit Federation leadership—comprehensive information about local, national and international events affecting the Jewish community, a mainstream editorial policy favoring Zionism and emphasizing the need to be both a good American and a good Jew during the war, and a large amount of publicity and information about various
programs and fundraising efforts effectuated by Detroit Federation and its constituent agencies. The Chronicle was handicapped by its inability to access national and international news reporting agencies, but in any event, some of its editorial policies and choices as to what to emphasize as most important news would have created discomfort among some of the mainstream Jewish leadership in Detroit.

CHAPTER 6

PROMOTING, INFORMING AND EDUCATING;

COMPARING REPORTING AND EDITORIAL POLICIES

From its inception, the Jewish News reported and editorialized about national and international topics of Jewish interest such as anti-Semitism, Zionism, the creation of a Jewish army, and the tragedy unfolding in Europe, as well as local topics such as local anti-Semites Charles Coughlin and Gerald L. K. Smith, Detroiters serving in the war and on the home front, and, most of all, Detroit Federation, the Campaign, and other fundraising efforts. The paper only included articles that had a Jewish connection of some sort. The paper did not carry general war or political news.

A. Local Fundraising

Leaders of both Detroit Federation and other American Federations recognized that their 1942 fundraising campaigns would be very different because of America’s entry into the war. Campaign literature promised that every dollar spent would be “aimed to promote the well-being of our country” either directly for the war effort or to support essential civilian services. Internal Federation
discussions recognized that as Jews, they had an obligation to “hold down our special sector in this world struggle, at home and abroad.” Discussions about campaign strategy focused on tying the Campaign to patriotism, emphasizing to the donor base that giving to the Campaign was both a Jewish obligation and an American duty, and that a “total war calls for a total effort.” Strategists, fearing that donors would be tempted to merely move their normal Campaign contributions to other, secular, war-related causes, stressed that a truly patriotic American Jew would not meet its tax obligation and its obligation to meet other patriotic demands by taking from their charitable giving.  

Additionally, Campaign leaders wanted to encourage Jewish families with men and women in service to display service flags to demonstrate their American patriotism, and to also encourage all Jewish homes to fly American flags whenever the occasion called for the flying of an American flag. Leadership hoped that these types of activities would have dual benefit— in addition to showing all Americans that Jews were patriots, the service flags would combat the well established canard that Jews looked to avoid service at all costs while being the first to economically benefit from the war. 

The 1942 Campaign received front-page coverage in the Jewish News, and much inside coverage, every week during the Campaign season, even though the Campaign occurred well before the Detroit Federation/Jewish News relationship was formalized. The April 10, 1942 issue covered the official Campaign opening and included, among other coverage, a front-page story and large picture of Henry Wineman, the 1942 Campaign executive committee chairman, several articles about
the Campaign including notices of two rallies being held around Detroit, an editorial about Abba Hillel Silver being the first major speaker for the 1942 Campaign ("the first major expression of community solidarity for our great fund-raising effort") and a half page devoted to how the funds collected would be allocated.\textsuperscript{238}

Each issue of the paper followed the progress of the Campaign, starting with setting a goal of $985,000, to listing the names of all division heads and acknowledging all 3,500 volunteer solicitors, to tracking progress of pledges, to the final results of the Campaign. Most back covers featured photographs relating to agencies funded by Campaign dollars or missives written by Detroit Federation affiliates. Slomovitz would run at least one editorial in each edition urging readers to give generously. Many of the newspaper articles reminded readers of the close tie between funds raised by the Campaign and the war or the ongoing European tragedy, such as “Record Allied Jewish Drive to Maintain Life, Hope, Here and Abroad Will Open Sunday.”\textsuperscript{239}

A number of the articles and editorials were written with Detroit Federation strategies specifically in mind. “Never before has the need been as great,” wrote Slomovitz in an April 17 editorial. Guest editorials and guest articles connected the Campaign, the war, and patriotism as the strategists desired. In a full-page article entitled “A Message from Yourself to Yourself” that ran twice on the back cover of the paper during Campaign season, Fred Butzel told readers that they had to be both an American and a Jew.\textsuperscript{240} Abe Srere, in his role as the 1942 president of Detroit Federation, reminded readers that the Campaign was a weapon in the fight for freedom. Citing a letter written by President Roosevelt that was reprinted in the
Jewish News, Srere noted that Roosevelt declared that in the time of war, the community's activities for overseas and domestic causes could not be reduced, which Srere interpreted to mean that Jewish causes should not be abandoned for the war effort. Isidore Sobeloff, in another guest editorial, warned readers to guard against becoming so absorbed in the “grim task of destroying our enemies that we forget to keep our own house in order.” He went on to admonish readers that the Campaign was not just a Jewish cause, but also an American cause, a democratic cause, and humanity’s cause. Even guest editorials not directly related to the Campaign were tied into the cause. At the end of a guest editorial about a European Jewish leader who had died in prison, Fred Butzel added the tag line, “Is there any limit to our obligation to help in this emergency?”

The hard work of the Campaign volunteers, combined with the urgent needs of various agencies, resulted in the most successful Campaign ever held in Detroit to that date. Twenty-two thousand Detroiters contributed over $885,000, breaking not only local records, but also topping all other campaigns in the country that year. The Jewish News had played an important part in that success by publicizing events, urging readers to contribute, echoing the strategic views of the Campaign, and providing Federation leadership a forum to express their views and reach a large audience. The Chronicle also covered the Campaign, but its coverage was not nearly as broad or as sustained. Where the Jewish News devoted an attractive full page to listing all of the division heads and other officers of the campaign, the Chronicle merely ran the names in an article, one after the other. The Chronicle did not publish (or possibly have) any of the guest editorials or articles written by Detroit
Federation leadership, nor did it devote full pages to the Campaign, with the exception of reprinting the Roosevelt letter on its back page without comment. In general, *Chronicle* coverage was skimpier and lacked the grandeur of the *Jewish News* coverage.

The *Jewish News* continued to feature the Campaign even after the Campaign was over for the year. The back pages of the June 26 and July 31 issues urged contributors to pay their pledges. The December 25, 1942 issue included a prominent article urging readers to donate to Detroit Federation to commemorate happy occasions, as well as for sadder events, and also contained advertisements urging readers to donate before the end of the year for tax purposes, but the *Chronicle* contained no such article and made no mention of Detroit Federation at all. Many *Jewish News* issues had stories or guest editorials about various agencies benefitted by the Campaign, both local agencies like the Jewish Children’s Bureau of Detroit and overseas agencies like the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Many issues also had the equivalent of “advertisements” featuring pictures of the work that affiliated service organizations were doing. The pictures, articles and editorials presented a powerful message of the importance of contributing to the Campaign, and would have given Campaign contributors a sense of participation in not only the Campaign, but also in the work of affiliated agencies.

Many members of Detroit Federation unexpectedly became involved in a second major campaign in 1942 when Federation leadership agreed to merge the Campaign into the War Chest of Metropolitan Detroit (War Chest) for the duration of the war. Detroit Federation was one of the first Federations in the country to join
the local War Chest. Many communities across the United States had created war chests or similar umbrella organizations to amalgamate the many foreign and local relief appeals for money into one large campaign each fall, with the proceeds raised then allocated among the various participating agencies, in much the same manner as Detroit Federation allocated contributions raised by the Campaign. Federations across the country were considering whether to join their local war chest or continue as an independent charity, and many were discussing not only budget allocation issues but whether joining the war chest would have a negative impact upon maintaining Jewish solidarity in the local community after the war. In Detroit, War Chest member agencies included the British War Relief Society, the Greek War Relief Association, the Detroit Community Fund, and seven other similar organizations. Fred Butzel served as one of the vice-presidents of the War Chest, and Henry Wineman was named a member of the executive committee.

One of the main challenges facing war chest participants was educating their donors about the new arrangement. In St. Louis, for example, the leaders of the local Federation prevailed upon all local rabbis or synagogue presidents to deliver sermons about the structure of the War Chest and to encourage their congregants to participate, and to deliver those sermons at the evening service that began Yom Kippur, traditionally one of the most heavily attended nights of the year. They also sent out letters to all of the Federation donors explaining the mechanism and the benefits of joining and asking for support.

In Detroit, Wineman, Butzel and others relied upon the Jewish News to inform Detroit Jews about the War Chest, how it would coordinate with the recently
completed 1942 Campaign, and why donors now had to once again dig deeply into their pockets, as the needs were greater than ever. Leaders in Detroit Federation elected to make the War Chest the focal point of the first Federation issue of the Jewish News, published on September 25, 1942. That issue included comprehensive coverage of the War Chest drive, scheduled to start a month later. The entire front page of the issue was an article educating readers about how the Campaign would fit into the War Chest and how the allocation of funds would work. The article itself spanned the entire front page in two columns, adding great gravitas to the story. The Detroit Federation seal and a box listing the officers of Detroit Federation and Detroit Service Group were set prominently at the bottom of the front page, serving as their imprimatur on the concept of the War Chest, and also legitimizing the Jewish News as the voice of Detroit Federation.  The same issue also contained a number of stories related to the War Chest (including several statements clarifying that the War Chest would cover all organizations that the Campaign would normally cover) and also advising readers that, since the 1942 Campaign had ended only a few months earlier, donors to the Campaign would not be expected to pay their War Chest pledge until 1943. The Chronicle also carried the War Chest story as a front-page story the same week, and actually used the same language (the story must have been in the form of a press release available to all press), but the Chronicle article was laid out in typical fashion without boldness or grandeur, and did not include the type of extensive coverage found in the Jewish News either the week of September 25 or in the weeks that followed.
The Jewish News included weekly stories about the War Chest from September 25 until the end of the drive in much the same fashion as Slomovitz had covered the Campaign. Many of the stories included prominent front-page headlines, such as “War Chest to Meet Democracy’s Needs”; “Jewish Manpower Bolsters War Chest”; and “War Chest Tests Our Honor and Patriotism.” As was the case with the Campaign, there were guest editorials by various Detroit Federation leaders, including a front-page, full-page article by Abe Srere, explaining how the War Chest would work. Many of the stories were set up in the same fashion as similar stories about the Campaign a few months earlier, including information about staffing and allocation of funds, and weekly editorials urging participation. The October 23 edition of the Jewish News, being the second Federation issue, devoted the entire front page, half of page two, all of pages three, eight, nine, ten and eleven, the back cover, and other space within the issue to the War Chest, including an expanded Purely Commentary by Slomovitz on the importance of the drive. The paper was actually twenty pages rather than the normal sixteen. Since there was really no additional advertising and the issue was priced the same as all other issues, it would appear as if Slomovitz had donated the cost of the four extra pages, but in reality, Slomovitz, always the businessman, sent a letter to Sobeloff detailing all additional costs incurred in the Federation issue, from mailing to change-of-address notices to the costs of setting the additional pages, but it is not clear if he was demanding payment or only showing Sobeloff the incremental cost of the issues. That same week, the Chronicle had one small article about the War Chest. Even when the two newspapers ran identical stories, the Chronicle would lay out the
story in a typical manner, while in many cases the *Jewish News* would set the story in a different fashion from the rest of the paper to draw additional attention to the article and implicitly suggest the great importance of the War Chest.

Slomovitz called the War Chest the greatest mercy campaign on record in his editorials, and observed that the Jewish community owed a responsibility to “the millions of Hitler's victims.” He asserted that American communities could not be divided into different groups providing relief to the war victims, and that undivided loyalty was needed, admonishing that it was expected that all organizations should avoid conducting appeals for funds until the end of the War Chest drive. Some Federation members, both locally and in other communities, worried that participation in the War Chest might have a negative impact upon relations between Jews and non-Jews, but Slomovitz saw an opportunity in the War Chest to improve those relations. He felt the drive was “certain to bring us closer to our neighbors”—that is, the non-Jewish community in Detroit. When the drive fell behind the goals set by War Chest leaders, Slomovitz wrote an editorial urging workers to increase their efforts, warning that because the Campaign was included in the War Chest, Jews had an increased responsibility to ensure its success. In the end, the efforts of all of those who participated in the War Chest were successful. Percival Dodge, chairman of the Detroit War Chest, sent a telegram announcing that Detroiters had passed the War Chest goal of Five Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars, which he characterized as “an unprecedented amount for Detroit and the largest war chest total to date for any city in the country.” Meeting the goal was even more impressive since Slomovitz had pointed out that to meet the goal, every
donor would have to increase their donation to Detroit Community Chest by 125%,
taking into account donations made to other charities covered by the War Chest, like
the Campaign.\textsuperscript{257} Slomovitz enthused in an editorial that the success of the War
Chest was “one of the most thrilling experiences in the present crisis” and that the
success duplicated military victories and warned the enemy of American
determination.\textsuperscript{258} When it was apparent that the war chest drive would be
successful (campaign leaders projected that the War Chest would raise more than a
million dollars over its stated goal), Slomovitz included a page 2 story about the
success of the drive and how the success meant that “as Jews, the campaign has
served as the greatest, the most favorable instrument for better community
relationship in the history of Detroit.”\textsuperscript{259}

Detroit Jews participated in one other major civic monetary drive that year—the
drive to sell war bonds. As was the case with the War Chest, many of the same
people who were leaders in Detroit Federation and also leaders in the War Chest
took leadership positions in the war bond drive. The\textit{Jewish News} carried numerous
editorials and cartoons urging readers to buy war bonds, like a cartoon of an open
Bible in the August 14, 1942 issue that was captioned “To Keep an Open Bible—The
War against Paganism—Nazism and Fascism—Buy War Bonds.”\textsuperscript{260} Even in the
middle of the Campaign drive, Slomovitz published an editorial urging readers to
buy war bonds.\textsuperscript{261} In a guest editorial, Leonard Simons, in his capacity as chairman
of the advertising committee of the Treasury Department Michigan war bond staff,
urged readers to buy war bonds and then challenged them: “What kind of Jew are
you?”\textsuperscript{262} In a similar vein, Nate Shapero, Wayne County chairman of the Michigan
retailers war savings committee, admonished readers that it must never be said that the Detroit Jewish community was not doing its part to win the war. Slomovitz also actively supported the war bond drive by including a depiction of a stamp urging readers to buy war bonds and stamps on the Jewish News masthead from the very first issue published, and on both sides of the masthead from the second issue published through at least June 1945. The Chronicle did not include a war bond stamp in its masthead until June 1942 and did not include a double stamp until January 1943.

In July, Franklin Hills Country Club, the oldest Jewish country club in Detroit, started a unique bond drive—the members undertook a “Beat the Axis” dinner party and each attendee had to buy at least a thousand dollar war bond. The club raised three hundred sixty-five thousand dollars at the affair, which the club president claimed was the “only event of its kind in the country.” A month later, Knollwood Country Club, another local Jewish country club (of which Nate Shapero was president), increased the stakes by holding an affair with the goal of raising a million dollars for war bonds. The club enlisted the Jewish News to lend its support and publicize the event. Slomovitz wrote in an editorial that “the eyes of the Axis are upon us—we dare not fail.” The affair raised a million and a half dollars. In a guest editorial Fred Butzel wrote that synagogues competing against each other had raised a million dollars and Knollwood was going to reach its goal—friendly competition in some things was good.
B. Anti-Semitism

A portion of the funds raised by the Campaign was earmarked to fight domestic anti-Semitism through organizations like the American Jewish Congress, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League and, on a local Detroit level, the Jewish Community Council. American Jews experienced a drastic growth in anti-Semitism from the 1920s to the 1940s. The timing of the rise was particularly sensitive for Jewish Americans because they were constantly afraid that if the violent anti-Semitism occurring in Germany could happen in that highly cultured country, then the same thing could happen in America. Fears of spurring anti-Semitism often drove the way that Jews viewed other issues of importance to the Jewish community. For example, despite the fact that European Jews desperately needed to emigrate, even such a progressive Jewish leader as Rabbi Leo Franklin believed in immigration restrictions, because to increase the number of Jewish immigrants could lead to conflicts and misunderstandings. He asserted that new Jewish immigrants should not adversely affect the status of established American Jews, and that if America could not absorb them, then efforts should be made to find other places for them to settle.

Detroit had become a focal point for anti-Semites, starting with Henry Ford purchasing the Dearborn Independent and using it as a vehicle for anti-Semitic rants in the 1920s, followed by Father Coughlin’s radio broadcasts and his publication, Social Justice, in the 1930s. In 1924 a Ku Klux Klan candidate had run for mayor of Detroit and was narrowly defeated, not a surprising outcome given that Michigan had among the largest state Ku Klux Klan groups in America. By 1940 Detroit was
a stronghold of Fascist and anti-Semitic activity and Franklin Roosevelt had advised his envoy in the Vatican that there was a great deal of anti-Semitism in three dioceses in America, including Detroit. The anti-Semitic wave would not abate until the United States entered the war, though by the end of the war, only extremists would think to express anti-Semitic views.

Slomovitz was deeply invested in the war against anti-Semitism. He wrote numerous editorials and articles while at the Chronicle identifying sources of anti-Semitism and advocating aggressive action to combat it, wherever found. He continued his battle at the Jewish News and it became a repeated theme in the paper. Detroit Federation leaders, believing that educating readers about anti-Semitic activities was part of their core mission, fully supported Slomovitz’s efforts. He would run short articles with large headlines and identify specific people or groups engaged in what he believed were anti-Semitic activities in America and around the globe: “Ohio Catholic Paper Running Anti-Semitic Charges”; “Anti-Semitic Publication Banned from US Mails”; “Varian Fry Charges Lisbon Consul Anti-Semitic”. Often he would run two- or three-sentence articles from various news agencies adjacent to each other to create the sense of a larger problem than a single short article would suggest. Additionally, after America’s entry into the war, he would tie anti-Semitic activity to an anti-American alliance with the Axis powers. Headlines such as “US Senators and Others Expose Anti-Semitism as a Cloak for Pro-Axis Cults” were common. In one editorial he bluntly stated that pro-Axis meant anti-Semitic.
Both the *Jewish News* and the *Chronicle* would run articles about anti-Semitism, and an incident involving the *Saturday Evening Post* reveals the philosophical differences between the two newspapers on the appropriate way of addressing the issue. The *Saturday Evening Post* ran an article by a Reform Jew, Milton Mayer, titled “The Case Against the Jews.” The article was highly critical of American Jews, particularly those who attempted to assimilate completely. In the article, Mayer asserted, among other things, that tremendous anti-Semitism in tenement areas had arisen because of “the Jew’s tenement profiteering,” and that “there are few employers as conscienceless as the Jewish sweatshop operator . . . .” He concluded that the inevitable collapse of America after the war “will remind a bitter and bewildered nation that ‘the Jews got us into the war.’”276 The article created a sensation and many periodicals and writers responded to it, including Irving Howe, who quipped that at best, Mayer should have called his article “The Case Against Some Jewish Members of the Capitalist Class.”277

Both newspapers carried a good deal of coverage about the story, including front-page articles on April 3, 1942. In a short editorial the same day, Slomovitz wrote:

But the final upshot, in the article by Milton Mayer, is of a nature to arouse the indignation of all fair-minded Americans. The young Chicagoan, presented as a “modern Jeremiah,” assumes to display the cloak of a Prophet in a spirit which gives the impression that there are no decent people, and as if Jews and non-Jews alike are bad.

A person who generalizes has not the right to judge. Milton Mayer generalized in his article. He did not differentiate between the good and the bad, the creative and the speculative—either among Christians or Jews. To him, it is a case of bad Jews learning bad examples from Christians who are equally bad. We consider it poor
judgment. We look upon his article as an unfair attempt to wash dirty linen in public and to drag out the dirt that is non-existent.

In the main, people are not evil-minded or foul in their practices. It is the exception to the rule that makes for the undesirable in life. But when the Saturday Evening Post provides a platform for one who generalizes as if there were little good left in American life, this important magazine renders a disservice to all Americans. . . . Simply because a trio of Jewish writers were called upon to produce the sensational Post series does not exonerate its editors from having committed a blunder which is highly insulting in its very nature."

The *Chronicle* editorial the same day is two full columns and refuted Mayer's charges line by line in an articulate, measured fashion. While Slomovitz viewed the issue as a black-and-white case of blatant anti-Semitism, the *Chronicle* editors took a more nuanced view, and called Mayer a gifted writer in a later editorial.

When the firestorm continued for over six weeks, the *Chronicle* defended Mayer in yet another editorial, saying that there was no reason that his article should have been met with such “vituperation and billingsgate.” The editorial noted that Mayer was not a traitor and argued that Mayer was not an anti-Semite, but a “high-minded, perfectionist, critical” Jew. Unlike Slomovitz, who found no worth in the Mayer article, the *Chronicle* called the article a “constructive, helpful, upbuilding criticism.” Finally, the *Chronicle* editorial almost directly attacked Slomovitz and others who found the article anti-Semitic: “Do we in our zeal to destroy anti-Semitism want to deny the freedom of speech and press to all those who do not see eye to eye with us but who are just as honest, sincere, and humane as we are.”

The debate between Slomovitz and the *Chronicle* editor reveals a basic philosophical difference in their respective positions. Slomovitz was prone to attack anything with even the whiff of anti-Semitism attached to it, while the editor of the
Chronicle, even if he found the subject matter disagreeable, was more interested in preserving civil rights and free speech.²⁸³

The Saturday Evening Post incident also confirmed Slomovitz’s preference for aggressive action over quieter methods. On April 17, 1942 the Jewish News ran countervailing views about the best way of responding to the charges made in the Post article by reprinting editorials appearing in the liberal magazine, The Nation, and in the liberal New York newspaper, PM. The Nation editorial criticized PM for an earlier editorial taking the Post to task for printing the Mayer article and declared that the “sha-sha” approach was the best way to respond, fearing that the article would give the Nazis propaganda opportunities if the debate over the article raised too high of a profile. The PM response disagreed with that approach and maintained that silence would be “unpatriotic.” To remain silent, the PM response contended, would be the equivalent of appeasement. In his conclusory remarks after the two editorial reprints, Slomovitz maintained that PM “has the edge on the Nation” and that after examining the facts, readers of the Jewish News would endorse his position that “action is more often correct than a policy of ‘hush-hush.’”²⁸⁴

Slomovitz continued to pursue aggressive action when it came to Charles Coughlin. Both the American Jewish Committee and the Interfaith Council of Jews and Christians had criticized Slomovitz’s aggressive approach while Slomovitz was at the Chronicle and argued that to debate the content of anti-Semitic statements might lead the public to believe that there were two sides to the statements being debated.²⁸⁵ Those organizations believed that non-Jews should handle any such debate, so that the battle would be seen as more universal.²⁸⁶ Slomovitz was
undeterred by the criticism and continued his crusade against Coughlin at the *Jewish News*, printing articles tracing Coughlin’s denunciation by various Catholic organizations, advocating for the United States Postal Service to ban *Social Justice* from the mail, and reprinting editorials and other articles from other publications demanding an end to *Social Justice* and Coughlin’s radio diatribes. Even after the Postal Service banned *Social Justice* from the mail, Slomovitz continued his campaign and wrote articles and editorials detailing Coughlin’s attempt to overturn the decision and revealing Coughlin’s retention of the *Social Justice* mailing list.287

Much as was the case with the *Saturday Evening Post* incident, *Chronicle* management took a more nuanced position on Coughlin and *Social Justice* than Slomovitz. The *Chronicle* also ran a number of articles about the end of *Social Justice*, some of which were much more detailed and provided a better picture of the facts, but in its editorials, the *Chronicle* stressed Coughlin’s right to have his day in court and have a “fair and impartial trial.”288 Furthermore, while complimenting the justice system and opining that justice had been served when *Social Justice* was found guilty of violating the Espionage Act, the *Chronicle* noted that the followers of *Social Justice*, while “botched and bungled human beings,” could now channel those feelings usefully once the “vitriol” of *Social Justice* was out of their systems.289 Given his black-and-white view of the issue, Slomovitz would not have printed anything close to those types of sentiments, or that, given the insecurities of the Jewish community on the issue of anti-Semitism at the time, such comments would have found much approval among Detroit Jews.
Slomovitz also targeted Gerald L.K. Smith during the 1940s. Smith was a demagogue who moved to Michigan to run for the senate seat held by liberal democrat Prentiss Brown. He was less explicit in his anti-Semitism than Coughlin and had actually attracted some early Jewish support in a questionable manner. Slomovitz attacked Smith both through the Jewish News and privately. He wrote letters to various figures, including Prentis Brown and the watchdog organization Friends of Democracy advising them of Smith’s activities and proclivities. He also wrote to his friend Arthur Vandenberg, who advised Slomovitz that there was nothing he could do about Smith. Slomovitz ran a series of articles and editorials in the Jewish News, including an editorial stating that Smith was following a dangerous line in opposing the present administration during the war and that Smith associated with Huey Long and Father Coughlin. Slomovitz did not usually endorse political candidates, but he ended one of his Purely Commentaries by noting that while Smith’s opponent in the upcoming Republican primary was a decent man and a good campaigner, no one should assume that Smith would be defeated, especially since Smith had supporters, including the Coughlin supporters. He urged his readers to vote against Smith and repeated the message three weeks later. Smith was defeated in the Republican primary and eventually moved out of Michigan.

While his Jewish News editorials may have been aggressive, Slomovitz took a different approach with Smith than he had with Coughlin and heeded the advice of those who believed in “dynamic silence,” making few public pronouncements and reducing militant protests. In a letter to Rabbi Leon Fram, president of the Jewish
Community Council, Slomovitz wrote that while he could not make the Council meeting scheduled for the next day, his opinion on the question of distributing anti-Smith literature was that “WE should do nothing about it. Distribution should be left entirely in the hands of non-Jews.” 294 Under the right set of circumstances, even Slomovitz could see the good in taking a back seat position if it would “help the cause.”

Slomovitz was more likely to find anti-Semitism in any remarks that were detrimental to or critical about Jews. He noted that a United Press story reporting that certain Congressional circles believed that Henry Morgenthau Jr. was going to resign his Treasury Secretary's position to become head of the Zionist Organization of America “had all the earmarks of an anti-Semitic libel.” His reasoning was that since Morgenthau had no affiliation with the Zionist movement, the only reason for the story was to stir anti-Semitic feelings that Roosevelt’s cabinet was more interested in the Jewish interest than the war, and that line of thinking was “so fantastic” that printing it could only be malicious. 295 His remarks do not consider other possibilities, or point out the obvious fact that the United Press story was reporting on what others were saying, not what United Press management believed itself.

C. Zionism

One area where Slomovitz refused to take a back seat was Zionism. The American Zionist movement was fragmented and deeply inefficient. Until the Second World War, a majority of American Jews did not support Zionism. 296 Louis Marshall, possibly the most influential Jewish American in the early part of the
twentieth century, preached that America was the new Jewish homeland and no other was needed. Both the American Jewish Committee and the Reform Judaism movements rejected the notion of a Jewish state, partially on philosophical grounds, since both organizations viewed Judaism as a religion only and not a culture or nation, and partially because they feared that anti-Semites would accuse Zionist Jews of having dual loyalty, or even worse, disloyalty. Within the Zionist movement, there were all types of different groups, including cultural Zionists, who believed in Palestine as the home for Jewish culture but not as a political Jewish state; socialist Zionists, who believed that a Jewish homeland could transform a defective Jewish class structure; religious Zionists, who saw Palestine as the base for dissemination of the Torah; and revisionist Zionists, who advocated a militant and strident nationalism.

Mainstream Zionists wanted a liberal democratic state and haven for Jewish refugees, but not a place where most American Jews would emigrate. Despite their differences, the major Zionist movements joined forces and formed an umbrella agency called the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), originally led by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis. The ZOA experienced numerous internal battles, and by the Second World War, was jointly led by Stephen Wise and Abba Hillel Silver. While Wise favored a quiet diplomacy and believed that getting Jews out of Europe into Palestine took precedence over the creation of a national state, Silver believed that only with “sovereignty would rescue be possible” and advocated aggressive public action and nationalism as a first priority. The two leaders and
their separate beliefs would eventually come to a head in 1945 and nearly destroy the Zionist movement at a critical time.

Dissension was the last thing that the movement needed, since there was much opposition to the movement’s goals. In addition to Jewish dissension, neither the United States nor Great Britain, which held the mandate from the League of Nations to govern Palestine, was in favor of a Jewish state or even much Jewish immigration into Palestine. The State Department favored oil and good relations with the Palestinian Arab population over Zionist goals, and did not want to cause a rift with the British during the war. The British wanted to stabilize their empire and pacify the Arab population. Even though some Zionists like Judah Magnes, the head of Hebrew University, wanted to see equitable treatment for the Arabs living in Palestine, historian Henry Feingold notes that a “founding myth” of most Zionist ideology was that “Palestine was a land without people for a people without land.”

Slomovitz was a passionate Zionist even during his college years. He believed in aggressive action, and served as the connection between the ZOA and Arthur Vandenberg, a connection that became very important when Vandenberg became the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The two engaged in voluminous correspondence discussing Zionist issues and pushing for a Senate resolution endorsing the Jewish homeland. In keeping with his general aggressive philosophy, Slomovitz favored Silver’s approach to Zionist strategy over Wise’s quieter approach. In the fight between Silver and Wise over control of the ZOA in 1945, Slomovitz actively favored Silver and convinced the Detroit branch of the ZOA
to cast their vote for Silver. Slomovitz was recognized, in fact, as one of the parties responsible for Silver regaining control of the ZOA.\textsuperscript{303}

Slomovitz used the *Jewish News* as a platform to disseminate his Zionist views and Zionism was a repeated theme on the editorial page and in the Purely Commentary columns. Even when a member of his board of directors, in order to avoid controversy, asked him to change the words “Jewish national home” to “Jewish homeland” in a draft editorial that the board member reviewed, Slomovitz still used “Jewish national home” in the editorial.\textsuperscript{304} He urged readers to not only donate to the Zionist cause, but to join a Zionist organization since the vitality of the movement could not be taken for granted.\textsuperscript{305} He pleaded for unity among the Zionist ranks, observing that only unity in the movement would result in the movement gaining advantage for the European Jewish victims when the war ended.\textsuperscript{306} Noting that Jews had given “a good account of themselves” in Palestine, but that anti-Semites were inciting the Arabs and undermining “the efforts for amity,” Slomovitz concluded that the Jews had to meld the ideological divisions in the movement and present a unified front in order to establish better relationships with both the Arabs and the British.\textsuperscript{307} He printed numerous stories about British Labor Party support for Zionism and urged the British to reconsider their reticence to allow more Jews into Palestine and to allow creation of a national homeland. In his view the Jews had contributed much to Britain and British life and now it was time for Britain to honor Jews by supporting their Zionist goals.\textsuperscript{308}

The *Chronicle* also featured Zionist stories, to the extent available from the news service WNS, local reporting, or reprints. The *Chronicle* editorials were not as
fervent in advocating the Zionist agenda, and even suggested that there could be other acceptable viewpoints. The refugee problem, stated one such editorial, is a European problem because the refugees “live on that unhappy continent and it is there that the solution for the vast majority must be found.” The solution proposed by the Chronicle, not surprisingly, was in the idea of “Federation and European citizenship.”309 The editorial did not suggest that a solution for Jewish refugees could be found in the idea of Zionism. A week later, the Chronicle rejected an American Jewish Congress demand that the Jews be given a seat at the peace table by arguing that there was no one for the Jewish representatives to represent. The editorial pointed out that American, British, and Russian Jews were adequately represented by their respective nations, that Jews in Axis countries had “no political sovereignty” and that “only sovereign states will sit” at the conference.310 The editorial concluded that if Palestine were a sovereign state then the representatives of that state could speak for the Palestinian people, but that “will hardly be in the near future despite the demand” for an immediate Palestinian state.

The Jewish News and Chronicle also differed over an embryonic political movement named Ichud that wanted to create a bi-national state with both Arabs and Jews having equal representation, rather than two separate states. The Ichud movement wanted to, among other things, change a clause in the charter of the Jewish National Fund that required all land bought by the Jewish National Fund to be used by Jews only.311 Ichud’s platform was an anathema to most mainstream Zionists, and the ZOA and related groups called for Judah Magnes, the head of Ichud, to resign from his Hebrew University post. Slomovitz blasted Ichud, called the
members of the group appeasers and escapists, and labeled Magnes’s proposals as “defeatist.” The *Chronicle*, however, noted that relations between Arabs and Jews would require careful handling and that the Ichud proposals should be fully and freely discussed so decisions were made deliberately and soundly. As with his critical columns dealing with anti-Semites, Slomovitz represented more of the mainstream in this debate, while the *Chronicle* championed freedoms of speech and minority rights.

Advocating for a bi-national state may have been disagreeable to many mainstream Zionists, but advocating against any state was even worse. As the situation worsened for European Jews, many American Jews who were formerly opposed to a Zionist state began to see the desperate need for such a state as a haven for refugees. By 1937, the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Central Conference), the main organization of Rabbis in the American Reform Judaism movement, had reversed its former position and embraced Zionism, although many of its members disagreed with that embrace. In 1942, when the Central Conference endorsed the notion of having a separate Jewish army to join the Allied Forces, a group of dissident Reform rabbis broke away from the Central Conference and formed the American Council for Judaism (ACJ). Their platform was “non-Zionist,” a position embracing support for Jewish emigration to Palestine as a haven for refugees, but not advocating a sovereign Jewish state, or endorsement of a separate Jewish army. Eighty-five rabbis agreed to be founding members of the organization, including Dr. Leo Franklin, by then the Rabbi Emeritus at Temple Beth El. Franklin had a long record of supporting liberal causes and civil rights, and was probably the
most respected rabbi in Detroit, but he had been consistently non-Zionist during his decades on the Beth El pulpit.

The ACJ generated great controversy in the American Jewish community, including in Detroit. In an editorial, Slomovitz wrote:

A group of rabbis have decided to convene a conference of dissenters from the majority opinion of the Central Conference of American Rabbis on the subject of a Jewish Army in Palestine. In effect such a conference is proof of the deplorable disunity which continues to split the ranks of American Jewry. It is a regrettable example of failure on the part of our people to get together in time of crisis.

The question of a Jewish army in Palestine has been debated in many quarters. The need for such a force has been recognized as a precautionary measure in the defense of the Middle East by British and American statesmen. Outstanding American leaders have pleaded for such a military force. The large majority of the members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, as well as the Conservative and Orthodox groups, have approved of the proposal. To create dissension at this time by calling a protest conference against the action of the majority is hardly consonant with the dire needs of the hour on the world democratic front.314

Despite his harsh words about the Council, the Sermonette of the Week immediately adjacent to the editorial blasting the ACJ was written by Leo Franklin. Perhaps this was mere coincidence, or perhaps this was Slomovitz’s subtle way of showing that disagreements in the community could be handled in a civil manner without malice. Later, Slomovitz would assert that the ACJ was taking an isolationist position in a world where the refugees had no place else to go and that while the actions of the ACJ might temporarily impede negotiations for unity among Jews and Jewish organizations, “sound judgment will prevail.”315 While he was politically opposed to the ACJ, the Jewish News would carry news agency reports about the Council’s activities, like a JPS article about Judah Magnes encouraging the ACJ to continue to advocate its position to prevent a civil war from breaking out in
Palestine, but the following week Slomovitz ran an editorial heavily criticizing the formation of the ACJ.\textsuperscript{316}

As was the case with anti-Semites and the Ichud movement, the \textit{Chronicle} took a more nuanced view, emphasizing freedom of expression. The editors observed that the non-Zionist and anti-Zionist rabbis should realize that a majority of Jews who were interested in Jewish problems supported one form of Zionism or another, and that it was unrealistic to consider America the “promised land” for all Jews, given restrictive immigration laws. The editorial went on to reason that regardless of whether the reader believed that the Jewish mission was to “spread tolerance, social justice and righteousness” among all people or that the Jewish mission was to create a national homeland, “the grim fact still remains that mission or no mission, millions face the pressing problem of survival.” Having stated its disagreement with the position taken by the non-Zionists, the editorial concluded that many “honest, loyal Jews” agreed with the dissidents and that the rabbis in the minority were not “traitors.” The fact that the rabbis in the majority did not mount a spirited defense of their fellow rabbis against the worst charges made against them was “depressing.”\textsuperscript{317} The difference between non-Zionists and Zionists “is a reasonable difference,” stated a \textit{Chronicle} editorial a month later. “It is our hope that future discussions of these vexing problems will be on a tolerant and friendly plane.”\textsuperscript{318} Vexing problems or not, the \textit{Chronicle} had hit at least one truth directly on the head—while the American Jewish community argued among itself as to the relative merits of anti-Zionism, non-Zionism, and the many varieties of Zionism,
Hitler’s “final solution” was destroying the European Jewish community and the surviving refugees would need some place to go.

**D. European Jewry**

Historians generally have agreed that the American press reported Hitler’s plan for the “final solution” by December 1942. There is debate as to how much Americans knew about the fate of European Jews before that date but it is clear from the first few months of the *Jewish News* that readers would have known that the atrocities in Europe were devastating. Despite certain faults and lack of complete information, the *Jewish News* provided Detroit Jews with the best coverage of the scope of the tragedy befalling European Jews during 1942 and served Detroit Federation’s goals of educating the population and increasing contributions to various agencies assisting European Jewry.

There was little coverage of the European crisis in the first two issues of the *Jewish News*, and the first real coverage was in the April 10, 1942 issue. In that issue, the top headline was about *Social Justice*, but the smaller headline underneath stated that hundreds of Dutch Jews had died in slave labor camps. That headline was surrounded by headlines about the Campaign and about anti-Semitism. The actual article about Dutch Jews was on page three of the issue, and was surrounded by stories about the history of United Hebrew Schools, articles on Abba Hillel Silver and the Jewish Community Council, and very small articles from JTA and JPS about Jews being removed from trains in Bulgaria. There were also a few small articles scattered throughout the paper about various anti-Semitic acts throughout Europe.
Almost all articles relating to the European tragedy in the first few months of the Jewish News were one or two paragraphs of two or three sentences, scattered through the newspaper with small headlines like “Slovak Hospital Ousts Jews and Deports Them” or “Bratslava Jews Hide to Escape Deportation.” The articles were of the size and placement that one might expect of an article entitled “Local Mom Wins First Prize in Pie Contest at State Fair”—the size and placement of the articles, without a larger context, would not sound serious bells of alarm. The European crisis made the top headline in the April 24, 1942 issue of the Jewish News in connection with a story about Polish Jews sending a frantic appeal for food and the Red Cross being prepared to help. The actual story was several paragraphs long and spoke to the gravitas of the situation. By May, many of the front-page headlines were about the European crisis but there were few substantive stories and the story length could be two or three sentences, even when the headline screamed that “Nazis Slaughter 13,000 Jews in Lwow; Report 1,500 More Die in Radom of Starvation.” The actual story on Lwow was extremely brief and read in its entirety as follows:

KUIBYSHEV (JTA)—Approximately 13,000 Jews have been executed by the Nazis in Lwow since the capital of Eastern Galicia was occupied by the German army, it is reported in advises from Lwow published this week in Pravda, official organ of the Communist Party. Pravda also discloses that the prize of 200,000 rubles, highest Soviet award, given last week to the Jewish professor Jacob Parnas of the Lwow University, was given to him for his discovery of a blood substitute which was successfully used on wounded Russian soldiers in place of blood transfusions.321
The following article, on starvation in Radom, was one paragraph. The brevity of both stories may have been because JTA was unable to provide more information, or because JTA sent only condensed bulletin-style reports.

For several months, Slomovitz aggregated various JTA bulletins about the situation in Europe in a feature entitled “World-Wide News at a Glance,” although other stories relating to the crisis would still be scattered throughout the paper. The feature ran on page two of each edition, and started as a two column wide feature covering about three-quarters of a page. Initially Slomovitz used a smaller font for the feature to squeeze in more news and separated the various bulletins by country, rather than headline. Even in this hard-to-read format, a subscriber who read the feature thoroughly and regularly would know that the situation in Europe was no ordinary pogrom or temporary period of anti-Semitism. A sample of the substance of the bulletins, never more than a few sentences each, demonstrate the horror facing Europe’s Jews: 800,000 to 1.25 million Jews faced mass expulsion from Hungary; Polish Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto were hiding the dead to retain ration cards; Hungarian troops in Yugoslavia tortured and killed one hundred thousand Serbians and Jews; more than ten thousand Jews were killed in a mass execution; more than thirty thousand transported Rumanian Jews have died; hundreds of Jews die as a result of being used as guinea pigs for poison gas experiments; and on and on.\textsuperscript{322} By July the feature had expanded to all five columns and two-thirds of page 2 and Slomovitz eventually added headlines and made the feature easier to read, although he discontinued the feature in October 1942.
Slomovitz continued to scatter stories about the European crisis throughout the paper and gave more headlines to the crisis in ensuing weeks. The top headline on June 19, spread across the front page in two large lines, reported the biggest tragedy yet: “60,000 Vilna Jews Massacred by Nazis.” The story came from the New York Times, and the Times was careful to state that the story was based on eyewitness testimony so it was impossible to confirm. The Jewish News article included the graphic information that the Jews had been taken by truck and machine-gunned from dusk until dawn. This story was followed by a story about the Nazis engaging in a “murder orgy” against Jews in retribution for an attempted bombing at an anti-Bolshevist exhibit, even though Jews were not allowed on the streets or in public spaces so they could not have been involved. The issue contained a number of other reports about the events in Europe throughout the paper.

The following week, the Jewish News carried an article reporting that sixty thousand Jews had been massacred in the vicinity of Kishinev. Although the Vilna story from the previous week had been given significant treatment and top front-page headlines, the Kishinev story, equally horrific, was treated as any other news story, and placed next to a larger article about students’ outstanding achievements in United Hebrew Schools. This pattern of giving some articles about the European crisis prominence and others no special treatment would continue throughout most of 1942. Several articles, however, stood out by the sheer magnitude of the events and by the descriptions of the atrocities involved.
The most significant articles of this period were published in the July 3 edition of the *Jewish News*. The top headline, two rows long, was “Jewish Heroism Vital Aid on Russian Front.” Beneath that headline, in smaller type, was a somewhat innocuous headline—“Reprisals Planned Against Nazis by United States for Massacres of Jews.” When the reader turned to the story about reprisals on page two of the edition, the reader would find another headline: “Nazis Massacre 700,000 Jews in Poland.” The story relayed that the dead equaled one-third of the total Jewish population in Poland and that trucks containing poison gas were used. An article directly beneath that story reported that three hundred thousand more had been killed in Lithuania.\(^3\) The two stories combined were two paragraphs long and provided little detail.

Although these two paragraphs reported the death of over a million Jews, there was no other mention of these atrocities in the paper—no editorial, or commentary, or any type of special feature although there was a short editorial the following week urging Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill to condemn the atrocities. The issue contained many other news stories: the Detroit ZOA elected a new president (a three-column story), the USO program in Detroit was expanding, and summer programs began at the Jewish Community Center. While Slomovitz possibly received the news too late in the process to make a special edition, the next week’s edition was no different. It is hard to imagine that the murder of over a million Jews (or for that matter any human beings) would not have warranted more than two paragraphs, or at the very least, the top headline on the front page. The *Chronicle’s* report of the massacre was more thorough and seven paragraphs, but
was also a page three story. The headline, “Nazis Murder 700,000 Jews, Polish Government Charges,” suggests that the editors of the Chronicle might not have found the report to be credible although the story contains a great many details. By comparison, The New York Times had first carried a United Press report on June 30 (based on a press release from the World Jewish Congress) stating that a million Jews had been slain by the Nazis. That article was five paragraphs long, appeared on page 7 of the Times, and was fairly comprehensive. A second article in the Times a few days later reported that the Allies were being urged to execute Nazis in retribution for the massacre of Jews.

The amount of coverage given the crisis in Europe, and the significance afforded that coverage, varied from week to week, but in general took up more of the paper as weeks went on. In October, Slomovitz reprinted a long article furnished by JPS titled “And Millions Shall Die,” written by a man identified as the “foremost Jewish Journalist in Europe today.” The author admonished American Jewry to keep the atrocities in mind and claimed that European Jews were trapped like mice. Additionally, Slomovitz wrote a number of editorials and Purely Commentaries that touched on the European tragedy in one fashion or another. After reviewing burial figures in Warsaw, Slomovitz concluded in May that the worst was happening: “for a time we thought Polish Jews were somehow carrying on, even as slave laborers, but that is not so.” In a later editorial he seemed to recognize the uniqueness of the event: “There is nothing in all human records to compare to such tragedy.” Talking about the Warsaw Ghetto, he contended that the tragedy befalling the Jews required an effort “exceeding by far any relief
campaign that has been sponsored in the past.” While Slomovitz seemed to recognize the singular nature of the unfolding events, he offered no plan of action except to give money to the Campaign or other causes. Another editorial suggested that he subscribed to the theory that the best way to stop the atrocities was to win the war quickly as he wrote that only complete defeat would stop the “Nazi Beasts.”331

Information about the European crisis was sparse and not always reliable, and the editors were often drawing conclusions based on little fact or relying on past history. The Chronicle ran an editorial the same week that Slomovitz wrote about Warsaw burial figures countering Slomovitz’s pessimism with the optimistic declaration that the determination of the Polish Jews would enable them to survive.332 Despite Slomovitz’s early prescience about the singular nature of the massacres, later editorials suggest that Slomovitz did not fully comprehend the gravity of the events. In June he called the Warsaw Ghetto the worst ghetto of all times but observed that the Jews in the Ghetto were building gardens and not allowing the Nazis to stop them from elevating themselves. He went on to note that social scientists had found that the Ghetto had equalized classes and democratized Jewish life, and that Jews were holding up under the strain.333 In August he wrote that while it was true that the lot of Polish Jewry was intolerable and it took a great deal of courage to go on living, the Polish Jews would carry on in “order that they may live to celebrate the victory of decency over brutality.”334 Even after Slomovitz had reported that one-third of Polish Jews had already been murdered, the true meaning of the events was not comprehensible. In November he wrote that he was
confident that the “tragedy of the Jewish people will be mitigated in the course of time,” and one week later opined that although it was becoming apparent that the Nazis were effectively carrying out their threat to reduce the Jewish population, after the war European Jewish communities would be rebuilt and “there is certain to be recompense for the suffering now suffered by millions of our kinsmen.”

The *Chronicle* coverage of European events was not as comprehensive, most likely because of its lack of resources. *Chronicle* articles tended to be more detailed and extensive when *Chronicle* management was able to use the Palcor or WNS news services, but there were many more stories and articles about Europe in the *Jewish News*. *Chronicle* editorials dealing with Europe tended to advocate the creation of a European federation or urge that the German population not be subject to collective punishment.

The *Jewish News* also carried a number of stories about European efforts to save some of the Jews. Slomovitz wrote an editorial complimenting the Danes for standing up to the Nazis and another saying the same about the Dutch. He also was complimentary of the Pope’s efforts to protect the Jews. In August he reprinted an editorial from the *Detroit Free Press* about the Pope’s declaration opposing Vichy treatment of the Jews, and in September he related how reliable sources were saying that the Pope was going to recall his nuncio from Berlin unless there was an end to the mass murder of Jews. He concluded the editorial by stating that the Church stance was a “significant factor” in fighting the Nazis.

While Slomovitz aggressively used his editorial power to raise funds, to combat anti-Semitism, and to advocate his Zionist agenda, he seemed more passive
when it came to action that could help save European Jews. Certainly the funds he helped raise were critical, and his columns publicizing the war effort supported his belief that the fastest way to end the European tragedy was to defeat the Axis, but there was little written advocating protest or urging a change in United States policy, or otherwise trying to “stir the masses” to some form of action. The Jewish News did report on the Jewish Community Council’s plans to hold a mass meeting protesting Nazi atrocities, but his editorials that week did not include anything urging people to attend.337 His editorials in this area tended to be more in the form of lamentations or expressions of hope, rather than calls to action. He seemed satisfied with governmental and religious institutional expressions of shock and horror, and with governmental promises of retribution to be taken after the war.338 Despite his close relationship with Arthur Vandenberg and his willingness to leverage that friendship when it came to Zionism or anti-Semitism, archival records do not suggest that the two men corresponded in any meaningful way about European Jewry.

The Jewish News did report on the few protests that were occurring, but not with great vigor. When the Rabbinical Council of America and American Jewish Congress issued a joint call to all rabbis to memorialize the Jewish victims on the traditional day of mourning called Tisha b’Av, Slomovitz placed the announcement of the coming event in the middle of World-Wide News.339 He did, however, also include an editorial publicizing the event and noted that since it was reasonable to assume that the United States government disapproved of the murders, “to protest
against the atrocities is in the main an expression of our people’s sorrow and resentment” over the Nazi atrocities.340

The notion of protest only serving as a salve for the protesters carried into the Jewish News reporting of the largest protest rally held in America that year—a rally in Madison Square Garden that was sponsored or endorsed by all major Jewish agencies and attended by tens of thousands. The Jewish News carried a small article about the upcoming rally on page thirteen without editorial comment, but the Chronicle afforded the event much greater prominence, featuring the upcoming rally as a headline story on the front page and listing the speakers.341 Following the event, both papers carried large stories describing speeches and crowds, but the Chronicle coverage was more comprehensive, as was usually the case when the Chronicle ran a story using WNS. A sentence in the Chronicle coverage suggested that at least some were aware of the true extent of the fate of Europe’s Jews: the story stated that the speakers reported the facts about the murder of a million Jews by the Nazis “and the planned extermination of seven million other Jews enslaved by the Nazis.”342 In an editorial discussing the rally and asking whether protests really helped, Slomovitz suggested that vows of vengeance after the war were not enough and that the Allies should insist that the Nazis stop the mass murders now or face immediate reprisals, but he gave no indication of what those reprisals could possibly be. He ended the editorial by stating that if protests did not help immediately, they eased the protestor’s conscience “that we were not silent.”343 The Chronicle agreed that the purpose of the protest was to build morale.344 Neither paper suggested that mass protests could help reshape policy.
Although both newspapers covered a few other, much smaller protests, neither paper urged its readership to either publicly protest or to protest by communicating with elected officials. Many historians have considered the lack of protests and the reasons for it. One view was that Jewish organizations wanted to be viewed as “serious sober” American citizens to avoid disloyalty charges by anti-Semites, and having noisy rallies and public protests would work against that. Some blame the divided national leadership for lack of a coordinated effort. The singularity of the event also played a large part. One author wrote, “The Holocaust was a novum, unassimilable by the mind, unexpressable in any vocabulary.” Another addressed why the impending Holocaust did not take precedence over all else in the press after the stories about the one million dead came out, and suggested that, among other reasons, the crime was too big. The press could not digest the enormity of what was being told to them, and even the Jewish press could not “absorb and disseminate the true horror of the crime.” This seems true in the Detroit English-Jewish press, at least during 1942. With our historical perspective, it is hard to imagine Slomovitz, truly a man dedicated to his profession and his people, optimistically writing about growing gardens in the Warsaw Ghetto or relegating news of mass murders, including a three-sentence story on page 13 with the headline “2,000,000 Jews Destroyed By Nazis, British Paper Says” to small backpage articles, but in the period immediately after America’s entry into the war, the truth of the Holocaust would have seemed impossible.

Another common explanation for the failure of Jewish leadership to respond more aggressively to the European tragedy was that the leadership, and the
community at large, was preoccupied with American participation in the war following Pearl Harbor. This preoccupation is certainly understandable, especially since, at least at this early moment in the war, many American Jews viewed their European counterparts as no more than co-religionists, and not as a unified nation or people. Most Detroit Jews confronted the war as Americans first. Additionally, given the spread of anti-Semitic accusations that the war was being fought for the Jews, and that Jews were the first to opt out of fighting in the war, it was important for the Jewish community not only to actively participate in the war effort on all fronts but to publicize that fact so that such accusations could be refuted. The Jewish commitment to the war effort was not purely out of self-interest and self-preservation, and patriotism and loyalty certainly played a large role. Publishing instances of heroism or service to country, however, not only instilled ethnic pride but also were pragmatic responses to the anti-Semitic accusations.

E. War Effort

Both the Jewish News and the Chronicle published stories of Jewish heroism in the war but the stories appeared more regularly in the Jewish News. Jews comprised approximately eight percent of those in the United States military during the war, about twice their proportion in the general United States population. Between 9,000 and 10,000 Jewish Detroiter served during the war. Stories about Jewish heroism served several strategic Federation goals—they bolstered morale, built a sense of community and pride, demonstrated patriotism and loyalty, and fought anti-Semitic accusations and stereotypes. Headlines such as “Jewish Ace Bags Five Jap Planes”; “Blitzkrieg Broken by Soviet Jewish General”; and “Jewish
Heroes Speed Axis Rout in Africa” appeared frequently. Articles like this were not limited to overseas efforts: “Albert Kahn Cited by AIA as Number One War Plant Designer” and “Irving Berlin Donates $500,000 to Army Emergency Relief Fund— a Record in Philanthropy” showed patriotic civic action by Jews domestically as well.353

Slomovitz did not limit his articles to heroic acts. He also included, as a weekly feature, the names of Detroit Jews who had entered military service and also news about those in service as it became available. Besides reporting on war bonds, Slomovitz also included articles about local Jews or Jewish organizations helping the war effort. Numerous articles reported such varied activities as the Detroit Jewish War Veterans raising money to buy army planes, the Jewish Community Center holding air raid warden classes, and the Twelfth Street neighborhood organizing a scrap metal drive.354 Many workers came to Detroit to work in the war industry, and as Detroit was the “arsenal of Democracy,” there was a housing shortage.355 Slomovitz included stories about Jews in Detroit organizing efforts to help transient Jews find housing.

Slomovitz also made sure to tie the War Chest drive to patriotism, and to promote Detroit Jews’ generous giving and service to the War Chest. Large headlines declaring that “Jewish Community Plays Important Role in War Chest; Men, Women and Organizations Make Liberal Gifts”; “Tribute Paid to Jews as Vital Ally of Democracies at War Chest Rally”; and “Jewish Organizations Lead in War Chest Treasury Gifts” would both increase Jewish solidarity and pride and also help combat anti-Semitism.356
The *Jewish News* also contained stories, editorials, and announcements supporting the United Service Organization (USO), a national non-denominational agency devoted to helping military personnel. A close tie existed between the USO and the Detroit Jewish community, and the Jewish Community Center served as the main service facility for the USO in Detroit. Detroit Federation was one of five organizations invited to work with the USO, and Slomovitz publicized the USO in many ways, including several guest editorials promoting the USO and an editorial by Slomovitz urging readers to give to the Campaign but also to remember other charities like the USO. The paper often contained announcements about various USO activities in the Detroit area. Many of the leaders in Detroit Federation and other Jewish communal organizations took leadership roles in the USO, and the larger synagogues in Detroit had both USO and Red Cross auxiliary service groups. The *Jewish News* carried weekly announcements of these groups’ activities.

American Jews also struggled with the tension between religious observance and service to the war effort. As the Jewish High Holidays approached, a question arose as to whether it was appropriate to take time off from the war plants to attend services. This was an especially important question in Detroit, a major industrial base for the war effort. Slomovitz recognized the difficulty of the issue and suggested that the Synagogue Council of America, an umbrella organization that included synagogues from the three main Jewish denominations, should issue an opinion. Although no decision was made by that organization, in Detroit a group of rabbis from all three denominations did recommend attending services but making up the time on Christian holidays. Slomovitz pointed to this incident as the result
that could be reached when Jews united to resolve issues rather than wallow in
dissension.\textsuperscript{357}

\textit{F. Factionalism}

Slomovitz’s editorial about the power of unity over dissension reflected his
desire for unity in community. He generally would not print articles about
dissension within the community and kept internal dissent out of the paper,
avvocating resolution of dissension privately.\textsuperscript{358} This was a prevailing attitude
among publishers of English-Jewish newspapers and, in part, was meant to preclude
passionate controversy from playing into the hands of anti-Semites.\textsuperscript{359} Even when
there was division, the parties would sometimes “circumvent” the controversy in
public forums. For example, even though it was well known that the Beth
El/Temple Israel split occurred over the failure to promote Leon Fram and that
Zionism had been a major factor, the biography given by Fram to Slomovitz for an
article in the \textit{Jewish News} stated that he went to Temple Israel “to answer the call of
a group of friends who had founded Temple Israel.”\textsuperscript{360} In some cases, personal
feelings were suppressed for the good of the community. Slomovitz privately
referred to animosity between Rabbi Morris Adler, the Shaarey Zedek rabbi, and
Isidore Sobeloff, yet Adler remained a strong supporter of Detroit Federation.\textsuperscript{361}

The Jewish community in Detroit in the 1940s could not realistically be
homogenized into one uniform group of people. Outside of being Jewish, various
groups within the community had little in common with each other. The different
ways of life of different parts of the community would naturally create some
suspicions and divisions. Compare, for example, a member of Temple Beth El and a
member of an Orthodox synagogue. A typical member of Temple Beth El, clean shaven, wearing the latest fashions and forsaking ritual articles such as yarmulkes or prayer shawls, would attend relatively short services, mostly in English and with instrumental musical accompaniment. The Beth El member would most likely not follow kosher dietary laws, would not read Yiddish newspapers or attend Yiddish theater or even understand much Yiddish, and would embrace modernity. A member of one of the many Orthodox synagogues in the city would be dressed in all black, with all ritualistic garb, bearded, including ear curls, and attend relatively lengthy services in Hebrew, with sermons in Yiddish, and with no instrumental music. The Orthodox member would strictly follow kosher dietary laws, perhaps speak Yiddish as his primary language, but in any event likely read Yiddish papers and attend Yiddish theater, and would reject many aspects of modernity and acculturation. When combined with all of the other groups of Jews in Detroit, including Conservative Jews with beliefs and practices in between the Reform and Orthodox movements, political radicals with no religious bent, those who only attended services on the High Holidays and had little other use for their religion, and those who had no religious or political beliefs at all, the notion that the “Detroit Jewish community” embraced any type of a unified message or agenda is improbable.

Given the broad differences in lifestyles, ritual practices, and political views held by various groups of Jewish Detroiters, Sidney Bolkosky’s assertion that the community was not unified but was estranged is not surprising. He also claims that Detroit Federation would underfund or not fund Zionist and leftist groups although
he cites no specific evidence to support this claim.\textsuperscript{362} It is certainly reasonable to believe that Detroit Federation, led by mainstream, established, economically successful members of the community, would tend to favor apolitical organizations providing needed communal services over more politically radical and leftist organizations with agendas that did not reflect the mainstream attitudes of a majority of Detroit Jews.

Slomovitz alluded to the division between German Jews and Eastern European Jews in Detroit in a Purely Commentary honoring Fred Butzel. In the column, Slomovitz reminisced about great Jewish American leader Louis Marshall who had passed away in the 1920s and, in Slomovitz’s mind, had not been replaced. Marshall had great influence among the Jewish masses, wrote Slomovitz, because he “loved the masses and did not hesitate to mingle with them.” Slomovitz recalled that to understand the masses, Marshall studied Yiddish and read Yiddish newspapers regularly. Fred Butzel, claimed Slomovitz, was Marshall’s counterpart in Detroit. Butzel had recently attended a Yiddish theater performance, and Slomovitz noted that “so few among our outstanding leaders “ would be seen in a Yiddish theater or are close to the Yiddish masses that Butzel’s deep concern for the masses stands out.\textsuperscript{363} In another Purely Commentary, about a marriage between a child of German-Jewish descent and a recently arrived Eastern European Jew, Slomovitz observed that

This is to record an intermarriage. It was not a merger of Christian and Jew, but of two Jews of different strata in life. One came from a family of German Jews whose ancestors arrived in America in 1848. The other hails from a Russian group who came here but a few years before the bride was born. . . . East meets West under very pleasant circumstances. But one felt, nevertheless, that this was a kind
of intermarriage. Unlike the mixing of different faiths, it was devoid of heartache and was thrilling in many respects. After all, it was a step in the direction of linking the past with the present, of cementing internal Jewish relationships, of making the American Jewish community count for something through the merger of extremes. Such evolutionary processes, however, are inevitably marked by tense feelings. A new generation is rising and its development is marked by the pains resulting from readjustments, the assimilation of the best traits of the partners in the deal, the elimination of the less desirable traits.

Slomovitz went on in the column to observe that when different cultures meet both children and parents must make things work for the good of the community. To survive there must be internal assimilation to fit into “the American scheme of things” but yet the parties must also retain the “most sacred of Jewish traditions.”

In Detroit, the German-Jewish/Eastern European tensions may have spawned the creation of the Jewish Community Council (JCC), although there are differing views as to why the JCC was created. Detroit Federation had been created and operated by the established German-Jewish elite, most of whom were members of Temple Beth El. The agency focused on fundraising and social service, and did not offer unifying political leadership. Many parts of the Jewish community were unhappy with Detroit Federation for its perceived elitism and exclusivity. One view is that the JCC was organized by a group anxious to democratize Detroit Federation and to give an organized voice to some Jewish groups that felt ignored by Detroit Federation. Those close to Federation, however, say that leaders of Detroit Federation created the JCC to “broaden its base of representation.” In any event, Slomovitz believed that the purpose of the agency was to coordinate Jewish community efforts, promote cultural work, and defend the Jewish position, all goals
that aligned with his worldview of Judaism.\textsuperscript{368} The JCC served as the umbrella coordinating agency for over one hundred sixty community organizations of every kind.\textsuperscript{369} Some perceived the JCC to be the “rebel” organization as opposed to the established Detroit Federation.\textsuperscript{370} Despite this perception and mythology as to its creation, the JCC executive committee included much of the Federation leadership including Henry Wineman, Isidore Sobeloff, Abe Srere, and Phil Slomovitz. Fred Butzel, who had the reputation of reaching out to all parts of the Jewish community, was named president for life. While Eastern European Jewish organizations may have also been represented in the JCC, the established Jewish leadership in Detroit also clearly had a place at the table, if not the head chair.

The fifth anniversary meeting of the JCC, held in April 1942, evidenced community leadership’s commitment to inclusion and unity. The meeting was held at Temple Beth El, the base for established Reform German-Jewish leadership, and Rabbi Morris Adler, the leader of Congregation Shaarey Zedek, a Conservative Synagogue comprised mostly of prominent Eastern European Jews, delivered the keynote address. Detroit Federation representatives praised the JCC, and declared that the JCC would not have been created if the community had not felt the need for it. As Slomovitz wrote in his story about the meeting, “what was expected to be a period of criticism turned out to be an outpouring of encomia lauding the work” of the JCC.\textsuperscript{371} While there may have been dissension in the community, the fifth anniversary meeting of the JCC was a celebration of unity. By October, however, the JCC had turned to serious work at hand—the agenda for its meeting that month
including discussion of the War Chest and the need for the JCC to do more work in the “field of internal Jewish community problems.”

While Slomovitz may have been aggressive and willing to advocate vociferously for his beliefs, he also deeply believed that the community should put dissent aside, find common ground, and act as a unified force. In a Purely Commentary entitled “Like Fathers Like Sons,” Slomovitz wrote about B’nai B’rith trying to force a socialist youth organization to consolidate into a mainstream youth organization to “silence” the views of the socialist organization. “Has it occurred to anyone,” Slomovitz asked, “to ask why the major conflicts in Jewish life are based on differences of opinion over authority and autonomy?” Slomovitz opined that this flaw was what ailed the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and B’nai B’rith. Noticeably missing from this list was the infamously unstable ZOA, an organization with which Slomovitz was deeply personally involved. He went on to say there was no need to suppress opinion, and the collaboration of differing opinions would lead to a greater result. He concluded with the hope that such collaborative efforts would reach into the “parent” movements in American Jewish life. Furthermore, in a different editorial in which he reflected on the Madison Square rally, he found the rally significant because it succeeded in “attaining a semblance of unity” in American Jewry. He declared that conditions were “too tragic” to allow dissension to “destroy our inner amity.” He concluded by warning that “the disunity we can afford in time of peace becomes destructive in time of war.”
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

By December 1942, the *New York Times* and other publications reported that rumors of Hitler’s “final solution,” the extermination of all Jews in Europe, were true, and the tenor of English-Jewish reporting about the war and the destruction of European Jewry changed. In Detroit, the period from the founding of the *Jewish News* in March 1942 until that date in December was a transitional period in many ways—two major fundraising campaigns and a push to buy war bonds, increases in anti-Semitism, a deepening horror about the fate of European Jews, adapting to a new lifestyle in light of America’s entry into the war and dealing with ongoing internal dissension and conflict.

The founding of the *Jewish News* at this transitional time was a fortuitous event for Philip Slomovitz, Detroit Federation, and ultimately, the Detroit Jewish community. The newspaper added cohesion and a strong communal voice, supported by the established leadership of the community. It was that established leadership that kept the community moving forward in this transitional time by raising more money for the Campaign than anywhere else in the nation, helping the War Chest also reach record numbers, fighting anti-Semitism, promoting Zionism as a solution for European refugees, supporting the war effort monetarily, patriotically, and with service to country, and creating and staffing organizations that protected the community and created, to the extent possible, a sense of solidarity. The *Jewish News* served as the communicative tool that reached, informed, and educated most Jews in Detroit on behalf of those community leaders.
Far from being passive and unresponsive, Detroit Jews were very active and engaged during this transitional period. Detroit Jews may not have participated in a stream of rallies and protests, but there were reasons for that, and they did participate in a number of activities aimed, directly or indirectly, in stopping the destruction of European Jewry. Over twenty-two thousand Detroit Jews participated in the Campaign, and the money allocated to the UJA from the Campaign went directly to help European victims. Jewish Detroiters also held clothing drives to help Polish Jews and engaged in other similar activities. Detroit Jews were fully invested in the war effort, participating in the War Chest, buying war bonds, serving in leadership roles in war related volunteer agencies like the USO, the Red Cross, the War Chest and the sale of war bonds, collecting scrap metal, and serving in the military. One hundred eighty of them would lose their lives in the war. For the majority of Jews who believed that the quickest way to end the murder and victimization of European Jews was to win the war, the war effort took on an extra layer of significance.

Detroit Jewish leadership found a communal voice in Slomovitz and the *Jewish News* and used that voice as a voice of cohesion and unity and to further their agenda, educate readers, and promote communal events. The Jewish community was engaged, participating in over one hundred sixty different communal organizations, and the *Jewish News* served as a type of clearinghouse for many of them, reporting on their activities and scheduled events. While there was not as much advocacy on behalf of European Jews as there might have been, the *Jewish News* became the best source of information for what was happening in Europe.
Even in this transitional period, no reader of the paper could say that they were unaware of the magnitude of the events happening to the European Jewish community. The newspaper also led the fight against anti-Semitism and was a leading advocate for Zionism, a cause that was initially divisive, but as the war dragged on and the murder of European Jews received more press attention, became a cause that most mainstream Jews supported. The *Jewish News* certainly served as a champion of the Campaign, the War Chest, and the sale of war bonds, and Slomovitz devoted a good portion of the newspaper to ensure the success of those drives. He used the paper to garner support for patriotic causes as well as Jewish causes, intending to inspire readers to become active in the community based on his encouragement in his editorials.

In the early months of publication, Slomovitz sometimes failed to abide by the credo and platform published in his first issue. He certainly attempted to mold Jewish public opinion and strengthen the Jewish community. His pledge, however, to serve as a “clearinghouse” for the “various shades of opinion among us” and to “approach Jewish issues without partisan coloration” went unfulfilled when it came to issues for which he had passionate beliefs, most notably Zionism and treatment of alleged anti-Semites. His editorials and articles on Ichud and the American Council for Judaism, and his unequivocal view of those publishing items critical of Jews in general, do not suggest that he was willing to allow the *Jewish News* to fully present two sides of these complicated issues. He did not carry much news or write editorials about the various socialist and leftist Jewish organizations in the community. He did not seem particularly interested in issues that had no Jewish
angle. Furthermore, despite the vituperative tone of the *Chronicle* attacks on the *Jewish News* over the Detroit Federation relationship, there was a grain of truth in the *Chronicle* articles. Slomovitz was beholden to Detroit Federation and its leadership, and between his business and close personal relationships with leaders of Detroit Federation, it is hard to imagine the *Jewish News* reporting anything significantly unfavorable about Detroit Federation or its agencies. On the other hand, the *Chronicle* did not publish any articles critical of Detroit Federation or its agencies during 1942 either, outside of certain articles in November implying that the *Chronicle* was now the only independent English-Jewish publication in Detroit. Additionally, Slomovitz was an active board member of the JCC, so he was comfortable with a broader spectrum of the Detroit Jewish community than just the established leaders of Detroit Federation.

Slomovitz repaid his investors quickly and become sole owner of the *Jewish News*. He would eventually buy the *Chronicle* in 1951 and shut it down. When Abe Srere heard that Slomovitz was buying the *Chronicle* he congratulated Slomovitz and added, somewhat ironically, “one good Anglo-Jewish newspaper was enough.” Immediately after ending the *Chronicle*, Slomovitz changed the masthead of the *Jewish News* to read “Michigan's Only English-Jewish Newspaper.”

Slomovitz and the *Jewish News* would experience a lifetime of accolades and success. The Jewish Information Bureau called him a “leading voice in American Jewish Journalism and one bright light on the American Jewish press scene.” The *Jewish News* became a true unifying force in the Detroit Jewish community—no matter where a Detroit Jew fell on the political, class, education, or religious scale,
they would turn to the *Jewish News* each Friday. In the end, Slomovitz succeeded in what he set out to do in 1942—mold Jewish public opinion, strengthen the Jewish community, and advance the morale and courage of American Jews.
APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ACJ. American Council for Judaism.

Campaign. Allied Jewish Campaign run by Detroit Federation.


Chronicle. Detroit Jewish Chronicle.


JCC. Jewish Community Council of Detroit.


JPS. Independent Jewish Press Service.

JTA. Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

UJA. United Jewish Appeal.

USO. United Service Organizations.

War Chest War Chest of Metropolitan Detroit.

ZOA. Zionist Organization of America.
APPENDIX B

TIME LINE

(Sources- Rockaway, Jews of Detroit; Bolkosky, Harmony & Dissonance; Jewish Virtual Library, http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/detroit-jewish-history-tour)

1762 Chapman Abraham arrives and settles in Detroit. He was a successful trader for two decades.

1798 Isaac Moses appears in records of Zion Lodge, Detroit’s first Masonic lodge, probably making him Detroit’s first Jewish Mason.

1840s German Jews begin to settle in the city in significant numbers.

1850 Twelve German Jewish families form Congregation Beth El in the home of Sarah and Isaac Couzens. Detroit has 51 Jewish residents out of a population of approximately 20,000.

1851 First Jewish Cemetery established on Champlain (later Lafayette) Street.

1857 Pisgah Lodge No. 34 is formed as Detroit’s first chapter of the International Order of B’nai B’rith.

1861 Beth El becomes a Reform Congregation. 17 members withdraw and form Congregation Shaarey Zedek.

1869 Gentlemen’s Hebrew Relief Society (later called the Beth El Hebrew Relief Society) is founded as Detroit's first centralized Jewish philanthropic agency.

1877 Fred M. Butzel is born; devotes his life to public service (both secular and Jewish) and is eventually named “Detroit’s most valuable citizen.”

1880 There are approximately 1,000 Jews in Detroit out of a population of approximately 116,000. The city has one Reform Jewish congregation (Temple Beth El) and four Orthodox congregations.

1881 Great Migration of Jews begins from Eastern Europe. Detroit’s Jewish population will go from 1,000 in 1880 to over 34,000 in 1914.

1899 Rabbi Leo M. Franklin of Temple Beth El unites four charities into the United Jewish Charities of Detroit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>The <em>Jewish Advance</em>, a Jewish newspaper printed in English, begins in Detroit but quickly becomes the house organ of Temple Beth El.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Branch 156 of the Workmen’s Circle, a socialist labor organization, is founded in Detroit. By 1916 Branch 156 would be the largest branch in the United States and Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Detroit has one Reform congregation (Temple Beth El) and 19 Orthodox congregations, reflecting the great increase in the number of Eastern European Jews settling in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td><em>Detroit Jewish Chronicle</em> begins publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>David W. Simons, the first president of United Jewish Charities, is elected to the first nine person Detroit City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early 1920s</strong></td>
<td>Philip Slomovitz is hired by the <em>Detroit Jewish Chronicle</em>; he will leave the newspaper for positions in New York and with a competing short-lived English-Jewish newspaper in Detroit but will otherwise stay with the <em>Chronicle</em> until the beginning of 1942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Henry Ford buys the <em>Dearborn Independent</em> and begins to use the paper to spread his anti-Semitic views. The articles would end in January 1922, and he would renounce <em>The International Jew</em> in 1927, but he would not disavow its European publication until a decade later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>A member of the Ku Klux Klan runs for mayor of Detroit and nearly wins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit is created to better organize the myriad agencies servicing the Jews of Detroit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Jewish Community Council is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Father Charles Coughlin, who came to the Shrine of the Little Flower Church in Royal Oak in 1926, becomes increasingly anti-Roosevelt and anti-Semitic since Roosevelt spurns Coughlin following Roosevelt’s 1932 election, and uses his radio broadcasts and his newspaper, <em>Social Justice</em>, to spread increasingly fanatical and vituperative anti-Semitism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Philip Slomovitz leaves the <em>Jewish Chronicle</em> and begins publication of the <em>Detroit Jewish News</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Table 1-Detroit Historical Population Figures
Taken from the Meyer Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish population</th>
<th>Percent Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>205,876</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>285,704</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>465,766</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>993,683</td>
<td>51,400</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,568,662</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2*1,469,066</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,623,452</td>
<td>81,400</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated by applying the rate of increase of selected Jewish names (see note 9, above) in Detroit city directories to the estimated 1935 Jewish population of Detroit (see p. 112, above).
* Estimate for 1939.

FIGURE 2.—SELECTED JEWISH NAMES IN DETROIT CITY DIRECTORIES AND TOTAL DETROIT POPULATION, 1890-1940

Semi-logarithmic scale:
1: 100,000 for Detroit population
1: 100 for Jewish names
Table 2-Jews in the United States by State in 1937 and Jews in the United States Historically since 1850 by Decade
Taken from the 1941-42 American Jewish Yearbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>131,669,275</td>
<td>4,770,647</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,832,961</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4,992,281</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1,649,587</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6,907,852</td>
<td>157,471</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,123,296</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,769,742</td>
<td>93,060</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>266,508</td>
<td>6,587</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>663,091</td>
<td>18,350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,897,414</td>
<td>21,276</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3,123,723</td>
<td>23,781</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>514,873</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,477,796</td>
<td>28,155</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,836,268</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,801,028</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,845,677</td>
<td>17,894</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,363,880</td>
<td>14,042</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>847,220</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1,821,244</td>
<td>76,124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4,166,721</td>
<td>362,945</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5,256,106</td>
<td>105,201</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,792,300</td>
<td>41,728</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,183,790</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,784,664</td>
<td>86,572</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>559,456</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,315,834</td>
<td>14,579</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>110,247</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>401,574</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4,160,165</td>
<td>267,970</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>531,818</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13,479,142</td>
<td>2,206,328</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3,571,023</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>641,935</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6,907,612</td>
<td>183,570</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,336,434</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,090,488</td>
<td>11,649</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9,000,180</td>
<td>434,016</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>713,346</td>
<td>27,813</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,999,890</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>642,061</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,315,841</td>
<td>25,811</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,414,824</td>
<td>40,196</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>550,719</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>359,231</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2,677,773</td>
<td>25,066</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,386,191</td>
<td>18,422</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,901,974</td>
<td>7,213</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole United States</td>
<td>10,519,930</td>
<td>629,817</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The United States Census Bureau revised its population estimates for 1937, giving a total of 128,823,000 for the United States instead of 129,257,000. Its former estimate, and proportionate differences for the states separately. The percentages for the Jewish population, which differ from those given in the writer’s article “Jewish Communities of the United States” in the last volume of the American Jewish Year Book, pages 227, 228 and other places, are herewith corrected to correspond to the new population figures for 1937.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>P. C. Increase in ten years</th>
<th>Principal Communities</th>
<th>Congregations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>23,191,876</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>43,061,968</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>72,108,120</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>112,756,050</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>12,823,038</td>
<td>7,470,047</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 1900.  
2 1848.
### List of Cities of United States Having 1,000 Jews or More, 1937

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jews 1937</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jews 1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>244,791</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>Flint, Mich.</td>
<td>151,543</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, N. Y.</td>
<td>190,577</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, Ind.</td>
<td>118,410</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, Pa.</td>
<td>66,904</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Fort Worth, Tex.</td>
<td>177,602</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona, Pa.</td>
<td>80,214</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Freeport, N. Y.</td>
<td>20,410</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park, N. J.</td>
<td>14,617</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>Galvaleon, Tex.</td>
<td>50,862</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>302,288</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Gary, Ind.</td>
<td>111,719</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City, N. J.</td>
<td>54,094</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Gloversville, N. Y.</td>
<td>28,949</td>
<td>1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>869,100</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Mich.</td>
<td>108,312</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor, Me.</td>
<td>29,822</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>Great Neck, N. Y.</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayonne, N. J.</td>
<td>79,198</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>Hammond, Ind.</td>
<td>70,184</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont, Tex.</td>
<td>59,061</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>Harrisburg, Pa.</td>
<td>85,266</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere, Calif.</td>
<td>37,192</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>164,547</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem, Pa.</td>
<td>58,490</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>Haverhill, Mass.</td>
<td>46,732</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly, Mass.</td>
<td>25,677</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>Hazleton, Pa.</td>
<td>38,609</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton, N. Y.</td>
<td>78,309</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>Hempstead, N. Y.</td>
<td>20,506</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Ala.</td>
<td>287,593</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Hempstead, Town, N. Y.</td>
<td>298,318</td>
<td>3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, N. J.</td>
<td>41,023</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Highland Park, Mich.</td>
<td>50,919</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>770,818</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>Hillside Township, N. J.</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braddock, Pa.</td>
<td>18,325</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>Hoboken, N. J.</td>
<td>50,115</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>147,121</td>
<td>15,765</td>
<td>Holyoke, Mass.</td>
<td>53,756</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton, Mass.</td>
<td>62,243</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>Houston, Tex.</td>
<td>385,314</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline, Mass.</td>
<td>49,786</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>Huntington Town, N. Y.</td>
<td>31,708</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N. Y.</td>
<td>575,901</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>386,972</td>
<td>10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, Vt.</td>
<td>27,688</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Irvington, N. J.</td>
<td>55,228</td>
<td>6,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Mass.</td>
<td>110,879</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Fla.</td>
<td>170,665</td>
<td>4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, N. J.</td>
<td>117,566</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>Jersey City, N. J.</td>
<td>301,173</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, Ohio</td>
<td>108,401</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>Johnstown, Pa.</td>
<td>66,668</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarhurst, N. Y.</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>Kansas City, Kan.</td>
<td>121,468</td>
<td>2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, S. C.</td>
<td>71,275</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>Kansas City, Mo.</td>
<td>396,178</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, W. Va.</td>
<td>87,914</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Kearny, N. J.</td>
<td>38,467</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, Tenn.</td>
<td>128,163</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>Kingston, N. Y.</td>
<td>28,589</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea, Mass.</td>
<td>41,259</td>
<td>21,260</td>
<td>Knoxville, Tenn.</td>
<td>111,580</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Pa.</td>
<td>59,285</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Lakewood Township, N. J.</td>
<td>38,502</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, III.</td>
<td>3,395,808</td>
<td>363,000</td>
<td>Lancaster, Pa.</td>
<td>61,345</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>455,160</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>Lawrence, Kans.</td>
<td>84,323</td>
<td>4,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>878,336</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>Lawrence, N. Y.</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights, Oh.</td>
<td>54,896</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>Lewiston, Me.</td>
<td>35,988</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>306,067</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>Lincoln, Neb.</td>
<td>81,964</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Tex.</td>
<td>294,734</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>Lindon, N. J.</td>
<td>24,115</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>210,718</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Little Rock, Ark.</td>
<td>88,069</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colo.</td>
<td>322,412</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>Long Beach, Calif.</td>
<td>164,271</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Ia.</td>
<td>198,319</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Long Beach, N. Y.</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1,253,452</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>Long Branch, N. J.</td>
<td>117,669</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, Minn.</td>
<td>101,065</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>1,604,277</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Orange, N. J.</td>
<td>68,945</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>319,977</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton, Pa.</td>
<td>33,589</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Lowell, Mass.</td>
<td>101,399</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis, III.</td>
<td>75,609</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>Lynbrook, N. Y.</td>
<td>14,857</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth, N. J.</td>
<td>109,912</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Lynn, Mass.</td>
<td>94,223</td>
<td>9,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira, N. Y.</td>
<td>45,105</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>McKeesport, Pa.</td>
<td>55,355</td>
<td>8,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Tex.</td>
<td>96,810</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>Madison, Wis.</td>
<td>67,447</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pa.</td>
<td>116,955</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Malden, Mass.</td>
<td>58,010</td>
<td>11,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville, Ind.</td>
<td>97,032</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>Manchester, N. H.</td>
<td>17,648</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett, Mass.</td>
<td>46,784</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>Maywood, Ill.</td>
<td>26,648</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River, Mass.</td>
<td>115,428</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>Memphis, Tenn.</td>
<td>292,942</td>
<td>13,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallsworht Town, N. Y.</td>
<td>5,582</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>Meriden, Conn.</td>
<td>39,494</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 - Number of Jews in U.S. Cities in 1937

Taken from 1941-42 American Jewish Yearbook

Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jews 1937</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jews 1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Fla.</td>
<td>172,172</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Mo.</td>
<td>75,711</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach, Fla.</td>
<td>28,012</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>818,048</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>887,472</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>St. Paul, Minn.</td>
<td>287,726</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td>492,370</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>Salem, Mass.</td>
<td>41,213</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, Ala.</td>
<td>78,720</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>149,534</td>
<td>2,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Ala.</td>
<td>78,084</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>San Antonio, Tex.</td>
<td>233,854</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello, N. Y.</td>
<td>7,375</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>San Diego, Cal.</td>
<td>203,241</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon, N. Y.</td>
<td>67,362</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>San Francisco, Cal.</td>
<td>634,536</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>167,402</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>Santa Monica, Cal.</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford, Mass.</td>
<td>110,341</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>Savannah, Ga.</td>
<td>95,966</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain, Conn.</td>
<td>68,986</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>Schenectady, N. Y.</td>
<td>87,849</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, N. J.</td>
<td>33,130</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>Scranton, Pa.</td>
<td>140,404</td>
<td>8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>160,505</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>Seattle, Wash.</td>
<td>368,302</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London, Conn.</td>
<td>30,456</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>Shreveport, La.</td>
<td>98,187</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orem, Utah.</td>
<td>494,337</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>Sioux City, Ia.</td>
<td>82,364</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rochelle, N. Y.</td>
<td>88,408</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>Somerville, Mass.</td>
<td>102,177</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>7,454,995</td>
<td>2,035,000</td>
<td>South Bend, Ind.</td>
<td>101,268</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, N. J.</td>
<td>429,769</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>South Bend, Ind.</td>
<td>101,268</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh, N. Y.</td>
<td>31,883</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>South Orange, N. J.</td>
<td>13,742</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News, Va.</td>
<td>37,067</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Spokane, Wash.</td>
<td>122,001</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls, N. Y.</td>
<td>78,029</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Springfield, Ill.</td>
<td>75,503</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, Va.</td>
<td>244,332</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>Springfield, Ill.</td>
<td>149,554</td>
<td>12,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bergen Township, N. J.</td>
<td>39,714</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Spring Valley, N. Y.</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich, Conn.</td>
<td>39,084</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Stamford, Conn.</td>
<td>47,938</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich, Conn.</td>
<td>23,652</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Steubenville, Ohio.</td>
<td>37,651</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, Cal.</td>
<td>302,163</td>
<td>7,415</td>
<td>Stockton, Cal.</td>
<td>54,714</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, Okla.</td>
<td>206,424</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Syracuse, N. Y.</td>
<td>205,967</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Neb.</td>
<td>223,844</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>Tampa, Fla.</td>
<td>108,391</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange, N. J.</td>
<td>35,717</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Terre Haute, Ind.</td>
<td>62,963</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic, N. J.</td>
<td>81,894</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>282,349</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic, N. J.</td>
<td>61,394</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>Troy, N. Y.</td>
<td>124,507</td>
<td>9,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, N. J.</td>
<td>159,536</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>Tula, Okla.</td>
<td>70,304</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket, R. I.</td>
<td>75,797</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Union, N. J.</td>
<td>142,157</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody, Mass.</td>
<td>21,711</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Uniontown, Pa.</td>
<td>56,173</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, Ill.</td>
<td>105,907</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>University City, M.</td>
<td>21,819</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Me.</td>
<td>81,042</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Utica, N. Y.</td>
<td>33,023</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>1,031,334</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>Utica, N. Y.</td>
<td>100,518</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Ariz.</td>
<td>65,414</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Waco, Tex.</td>
<td>53,982</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>671,589</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
<td>663,091</td>
<td>18,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield, Mass.</td>
<td>49,684</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>Waterbury, Conn.</td>
<td>99,314</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield, N. J.</td>
<td>37,469</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>Waukegan, Ill.</td>
<td>34,241</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Chester, N. Y.</td>
<td>23,073</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>West Hartford Town, Conn.</td>
<td>33,776</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Me.</td>
<td>73,643</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>West New York, N. J.</td>
<td>39,436</td>
<td>2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>365,394</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>Wheeling, W. Va.</td>
<td>61,099</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth, Va.</td>
<td>50,745</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>White Plains, N. Y.</td>
<td>40,327</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie, N. Y.</td>
<td>40,478</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>Wichita, Kan.</td>
<td>114,956</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, R. I.</td>
<td>252,504</td>
<td>26,800</td>
<td>Wilmington, Del.</td>
<td>35,238</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy, Mass.</td>
<td>75,810</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>Winton, Mass.</td>
<td>112,504</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Pa.</td>
<td>110,566</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Woodbine, N. J.</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverie, Mass.</td>
<td>34,405</td>
<td>9,635</td>
<td>Woonsocket, R. I.</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Va.</td>
<td>70,422</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Woonsocket, R. I.</td>
<td>49,305</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, N. Y.</td>
<td>324,975</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>Worcester, Mass.</td>
<td>193,694</td>
<td>13,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island, Ill.</td>
<td>42,775</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>Youngstown, Ohio.</td>
<td>142,598</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville Center, N. Y.</td>
<td>28,613</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>Youngstown, Ohio.</td>
<td>167,720</td>
<td>8,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|Sacramento, Cal.| 105,568 | 1,255 | | | |
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While many historians writing about Jews in America focus on dissonance and disorganization during the 1940s among national Jewish leadership and national Jewish organizations which accounts (partially) for their inability to effectively advocate for European Jewry, Zionism, and other Jewish causes, this was not necessarily true on a local level. Jews in Detroit were effective in raising funds for these causes, supporting institutional infrastructure, battling anti-Semitism, and participating in the war effort. An important part of that was a unique partnership entered into between the nascent Detroit Jewish News and the established Detroit Jewish Federation, the most important part of the Jewish communal infrastructure in Detroit. The Jewish News became a key communications tool between leadership and Detroit Jews, serving as an advocate and an informative and educational bridge. The arrangement allowed the Jewish News to quickly overtake its competition and become the “newspaper of record” among Detroit Jews.
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