Christians and Non-Christians in the Marketplace of American Religion

On September 9, 1844, South Carolina governor James H. Hammond issued the following Thanksgiving Day Proclamation to the citizens of his state:

> Whereas, it becomes all Christian nations to acknowledge at stated periods, their dependence on Almighty God, to express their gratitude for His past mercies, and humbly and devoutly to implore His blessing for the future:
>
> Now, therefore, I, James H. Hammond, Governor of the State of South Carolina, do, in conformity with the established usage of this State, appoint the first Thursday in October next, to be observed as a day of Thanksgiving, Humiliation and Prayer, and invite and exhort our citizens of all denominations to assemble at their respective places of worship, to offer up their devotions to God their Creator, and his Son Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world.[1]

Most South Carolinians paid no attention to Hammond's proclamation. They were Christian, he was Christian, and the proclamation, which claimed to be "in conformity with the established usage of this State," expressed sentiments that, as Christians, they found unremarkable. But the proclamation did catch the attention of non-Christians, who noted that the document identified the state, indeed the nation as a whole, as a Christian one, relegating them to outsider status. The document also assumed that "citizens of *all* denominations" would offer up devotions to "Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world." This left them to wonder what their status was in the State of South Carolina, and whether, in the governor's eyes, they remained full citizens or not.[2]

Governor Hammond's proclamation highlights a key aspect of the relationship of Christians to non-Christians in the United States, that is, the use of state power to advance Christianity in the marketplace of American religion, to the disadvantage of non-Christians. Government proclamations at Thanksgiving and especially at Christmastime were for many decades

tinged with Christianity. As recently as 1962, President John F. Kennedy proclaimed, triumphantly, that "Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, as well as Christians pause from their labors on the 25th day of December to celebrate the birthday of the Prince of Peace. There could be no more striking proof that Christmas is truly the universal holiday of all men."[3] Wherever the state has publicly exercised and displayed its authority, from the public square to the public school and from the armed forces to correctional institutions, the faith of the majority has tended to win a recognition that minority faiths are denied. In realms where the state has not intruded, by contrast, competition operates more freely. There, amid the thrusts and counterthrusts of majority and minority faiths, both are transformed.

In the case of Governor Hammond's 1844 proclamation, Jews, then the largest and most visible of America's non-Christian faiths, felt particularly aggrieved. South Carolina was home to approximately 1,000 Jews, among them cultural and political figures of renown and individuals of substantial wealth and influence. Jews had resided in South Carolina since colonial days and gloried in being what the dramatist, editor, and educator Isaac Harby had called "a portion of the people." In Charleston, where the bulk of the state's Jews lived and where the majority of inhabitants were black slaves, Jews' skin color and multilayered ties to the community's elite had, for some time, rendered them political insiders. Now Governor Hammond's proclamation called this vaunted status into question.[4]

Some Jews wrote to the governor to complain. His own political advisers urged the governor to apologize for an "oversight" and make amends. But the proud governor, who did not much like Jews and considered their complaints "insolent" and "impertinent," obdurately refused. In response, Jews kept their synagogues closed on Thanksgiving Day of 1844; they felt that they had no other choice.[5]

A memorial, signed by 110 members of the Charleston Jewish community, set forth what would become a standard response from non-Christians to the claims of those who excluded them. Quoting from the constitutions of the state and the federal governments, the Jewish petitioners demanded their rights as citizens: "We propose to test the position you have assumed, by that constitution, which you have sworn to support. From that alone do you derive your present authority. Thank God, sir, that noble instrument, together with the Constitution of the United States, presents a glorious panoply of defence against the encroachments of power, whether its designs be bold or insidious. Under its universal and protecting spirit, we do not sue for *toleration*, but we *demand our rights*."[6] In addition, Jews warned, as they

would on most such occasions, that to exclude them would be to create a dangerous precedent: "The *Catholic*, the *Unitarian* . . . and numerous other sects may find their privileges *discriminated* away, and their most cherished opinions crushed or slighted by a gubernatorial preference." The issue, as they saw it, came down to minority rights. "The constitution," they declared in a later "report" published in the press, "has nothing to do with the relative numbers of the citizens—with popular or unpopular modes of faith." What affected them now "might at another time be fatal to the rights of other minorities."[7]

Governor Hammond, whose term in office was ending, viewed the Jewish complaint as an affront to his authority. "I answered it pretty sharply, refused to make an apology, and defended my Proclamation," he reported to his diary.[8] That defense, notwithstanding its sarcastic language and intemperate tone, offered a significant Christian counterthrust to the arguments put forth by the Jews. It won him "a good many compliments" at the time and set forth arguments that, worded differently, would continue to echo down to the present day.[9]

First, Hammond insisted that America was culturally and self-consciously Christian. Even an avowedly poor Christian like himself—"I am not a professor of religion; nor am I specially attached by education or habit to any particular denomination"—still "always thought it a settled matter that I lived in a Christian land!"[10]

Second, he questioned whether religiously neutral prayers were either possible or desirable. "A Proclamation for Thanksgiving which omits to unite the name of the Redeemer with that of the Creator is not a Christian Proclamation," he explained, "and might justly give offense to the Christian People."[11]

Third, he countered Jewish claims concerning threats to minority rights by warning against minority group imposition: "If in complaisance to the Israelites and Deists, his [Jesus'] name must be excluded, the Atheists might as justly require that of the Creator to be omitted also; and the Mahometan or Mormon that others should be inserted."[12]

Finally, he pointed to other laws and institutions of the state that were "derived from Christianity," notably legislation forbidding labor on Sunday, the Christian Sabbath. Would these too, he wondered, now be called into question? Where Jews had pleaded for minority rights, he now made a forceful case for the Christian majority, "ninety-nine hundredths of my fellow citizens."[13]

The Jewish community was taken aback by Hammond's response. At a

well-attended meeting, Jews made clear that what they actually sought was inclusive language, a proclamation addressed, as many earlier ones had been, to "our Christian fellow-citizens" as well as to members of "all other denominations." Rather than continuing an intemperate debate, they resolved to publish all of the correspondence in the press, allowing "public opinion of the country" to decide the issue.[14]

The issue, of course, was never decided. Instead, Hammond's clash with the South Carolina Jewish community reflected *ongoing* themes in the confrontation between the Christian majority and the non-Christian minority in the United States. It posed the same intractable and explosive questions that would forever after characterize these confrontations: questions concerning the role of Christianity in American life, the relationship of the state to Christianity, the prerogatives of the Christian majority versus the rights of the non-Christian minority, and linkages between the rights of particular groups of non-Christians and the rights of every American. In later years, Mormons, Muslims, Buddhists, members of new religions, and atheists would, when confronting the Christian majority, face questions of a parallel kind. All would have occasion to wonder whether the marketplace of American religion is truly free, open, and competitive or whether, in reality, Christianity enjoys state protection and support that non-Christian faiths are denied.

Confrontations in the Public Square

Confrontations resulting from questions like these generally played out in one of four tension-filled arenas where state power is exercised and displayed: the public square, the public school, the armed forces, and correctional institutions. These spaces, where citizens of different faiths (and no faith) meet and engage one another, individuals are formed and reformed, and civic culture is exhibited, are perennial scenes of conflict. Disputes over the character of these spaces reflect, at the deepest level, contending visions of American society as a whole.

The first of these arenas, the public square, was once self-evidently Christian. The Christian calendar, with its Sunday-Sabbath and major winter and spring holidays, prescribed its settled rhythms. Church spires in close proximity to city hall shaped its sacred landscape. Government laws and proclamations articulated its highest values. Even where no particular form of Christianity was "established," the public square marked time, regulated

space, and bolstered values in accordance with Christian religious norms. Non-Christians, who observed different days of rest, celebrated unfamiliar religious holidays, upheld alternative values and lifestyles, and worshiped in places other than Christian churches, threatened those norms.[15]

Jews, as members of perhaps the largest and most visible non-Christian faith in the United States, were parties to many of these disputes. They took the lead, for example, in battling against "Sunday laws," regulations ("blue laws") designed to protect the sanctity of the Christian Sabbath and to guarantee all workers a day of rest and the freedom to attend church. Since Jews observed the seventh rather than the first day of the week as Sabbath, they found such laws oppressive and sought either to repeal them or to gain exemption from them.[16]

Jews likewise waged war against Christian missionaries who sought to convert them. As a beleaguered minority, they viewed missionizing as a violation of their religious liberty, recalling that the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had promised that "no person, demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner, shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments." They strove not only to rebut the missionaries but also to strengthen communal defenses and to shore up communal weak spots that missionaries sought to exploit.[17] Later, Jews battled to keep the public square free of sectarian Christmas decorations, such as nativity scenes. The state, they insisted, had no business employing its power to promote Christian holidays that non-Christian Americans neither recognize nor celebrate.[18]

Jews, of course, were not alone in challenging Christian control of the public square. Bans on the religious use of peyote, efforts to prevent *santeria* ritual slaughter, and restrictive zoning regulations that function to exclude non-Christian houses of worship from religiously mixed neighborhoods reflect similar, albeit more recent, disputes over the control and character of publicly shared spaces. What the character of the public square should be—avowedly Christian, entirely stripped of religious symbols, or opened up to the widest array of religious symbols and practices—remains an unresolved American dilemma.

The Public Schools—Temples of Liberty?

The character of America's public schools has long posed a similar dilemma, and schools have therefore served as another arena of conflict between

Christians and non-Christians. In the late nineteenth century, Jews imagined that the public schools were to be, in the words of the Cincinnati Jewish merchant and communal leader Julius Freiberg, "temples of liberty," where "the children of the high and low, rich and poor, Protestants, Catholics and Jews, mingle together, play together, and are taught that we are a free people, striving to elevate mankind, and to respect one another. In them we plant and foster the tree of civil and religious liberty."[19] In real life, though, schools often fell far short of that ideal. William Holmes McGuffey's *Third Eclectic Reader* (1836–37) taught a generation of public schoolchildren that "the Scriptures are especially designed to make us wise unto salvation through Faith in Christ Jesus." The "Old Testament," according to that reader, was the Jews' "own sacred volume" and contained "the most extraordinary predictions concerning the infidelity of their nation, and the rise, progress, and extensive prevalence of Christianity."[20] Many a public schoolteacher read out uncomfortable passages from the New Testament to her charges. "On Good Friday," the Jewish lawyer Louis Marshall recalled, "the reading always related to the crucifixion and the . . . word 'Jew' was mentioned in such a manner as to convey the idea not only of contempt, but also of hatred. This was always followed during the recess and for several days after by the most hostile demeanor on the part of the Christian boys and girls of the school, some of whom resorted to physical violence."[21] No wonder Rabbi B. H. Gotthelf of Louisville detected a "sectarian and missionary spirit, that governed the teachers and was manifested in the schoolbooks" of the public schools.[22]

The twentieth century brought with it no resolution to this problem. Fueled in part by mainstream Protestants who saw public schools as a vehicle for Americanizing the immigrants and beating back competing faiths, pressure to strengthen the religious component of state-sponsored education heightened. Jewish and Catholic pupils suffered particularly acutely, for both prayers and Bible readings tended to be cast in a Protestant mold. Nor did released-time programs, which took youngsters out of school for religious training, solve the problem. "Practices employed by over-enthusiastic religious groups in many communities," the *American Jewish Year Book* reported in 1947, "not only involve the public schools as a co-partner in the enforcement of their own sectarian instruction, but employ public school facilities." Teachers in some communities pressured students to attend Protestant religious classes; in others, Jewish students were taunted for studying apart from everybody else. In one unhappy incident, all children were asked to pledge allegiance to a "Christian flag" as a mark of their "respect for the Christian religion."[23] The dilemma for Jews and other religious minorities

was whether, given these abuses, *all* released-time programs should be opposed, even at the risk of angering the Christian majority and being charged with "godlessness," or whether in the interests of goodwill and interfaith harmony, only the abuses themselves should be attacked, not the program as a whole. The Supreme Court, in a series of decisions, resolved that dilemma. Not only did it declare released-time programs unconstitutional in the public schools, but it went on to outlaw school prayer and devotional readings of the Bible as well. This, however, by no means resolved all issues concerning the place of Christianity in the public schools. In short order, debates arose over curricular issues, holiday celebrations, team prayers, and religious invocations at graduation exercises. In the public school, as in the public square, majority rule and minority rights seemed perennially in conflict.[24]

Religious Liberty versus Military Discipline

The military represents a third arena where Christians and non-Christians have repeatedly clashed. Military tradition inevitably privileges conformity and discipline: as a result, non-Christians, even in early America, frequently faced discrimination. Uriah Phillips Levy, who entered the U.S. Navy in 1812 and fought his way up through the ranks, was court-martialed half a dozen times by those who opposed him as a Jew. In a celebrated 1857 appeal against efforts to strike him from the navy's roll, officers admitted that many of Levy's problems stemmed from prejudice and hostility toward his religion. "What is my case today, if you yield to this injustice, may tomorrow be that of the Roman Catholic or the Unitarian, the Presbyterian or the Methodist, the Episcopalian or the Baptist," Levy warned the court, echoing the Jewish response to Governor Hammond. A panel of inquiry restored him to service.[25]

Three years later, however, the government's military chaplaincy law kept alive the tradition of discrimination against non-Christians. It stipulated that a regimental chaplain be a "regularly ordained minister of some Christian denomination." In the face of Jewish protests, one evangelical paper warned that "Mormon debauchees, Chinese priests, and Indian conjurors" would stand next in line for government recognition, tacit admission that the central issue under debate concerned non-Christians' religious rights. Those rights were only restored indirectly by construing the words "some Christian denomination" in the original law to mean "some religious denomination."[26] Today, over 130 different faiths and denominations, in-

cluding Jews and Buddhists, have military chaplains of their own, but Don Larsen, a chaplain who applied to become the first Wiccan chaplain in the armed forces, was denied, reputedly out of a concern for "good order and discipline."[27] Arguments based on military discipline similarly underlay the U.S. Air Force's concerted and ultimately unsuccessful effort (1981–86) to prevent an Orthodox Jewish officer from covering his head with a skullcap (yarmulke) in keeping with his religious beliefs.[28] Reconciling the military's interest in discipline and uniformity with minority-group religious practices that are (by definition) nonconforming has never been easy.

Reconciling Majority Rule and Minority Rights

For similar reasons, correctional institutions have witnessed complex confrontations between Christians and non-Christians. Nonconforming foodways, such as kosher food and halal food; nonconforming calendars with different rest days and holy days; and nonconforming prayer requirements of Orthodox Jews and Muslims scarcely jibe with prison regimens designed around Christian norms. "Faith-based" Christian programs to fight substance abuse and transition prisoners back into society raise, for members of minority faiths, the same kinds of questions posed, as we have seen, since pre–Civil War days: Is it appropriate for the state to use its power to recognize and advance the majority's faith? What should be the appropriate role of Christianity in American life? Where do the prerogatives of the Christian majority end and the rights of the non-Christian minority begin? What is the domino effect of injustices against non-Christian minorities? How do they ultimately affect the rights of other minorities, and of Americans generally?

Whatever issue occasions a confrontation between the Christian majority and non-Christian minorities—a governor's proclamation, a school textbook, a Christmas crèche, a menorah in the public square, a faith-based program for incarcerated prisoners, or something else—the question lurking behind the scenes inevitably concerns the character of the country as a whole. Strident debates over church-state separation and the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution evoke so much passion because they hit upon fundamental questions of power and social position. Much is at stake in how these volatile issues are resolved. In effect, they determine who is a "protected" insider, who is a "suppressed" outsider, and how majority rule and minority rights are to be reconciled.

The Competitive Religious Marketplace

Many public encounters between Christians and non-Christians do not, of course, involve the government. They reflect the ordinary workings of the competitive religious marketplace, free of state interference. A year after Governor Hammond's confrontation with the Jews of his state, for example, Isaac Leeser, the "minister" (hazan) of Congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia and editor of the monthly *Occident*, America's first successful Jewish periodical, called upon American Jews to unite in forming "a Jewish Publication Society." "No effort is spared," he complained, "to diffuse false views concerning our faith among the Gentiles." In response, he urged Jews to emulate Christian publishers in preparing "suitable publications to be circulated among all classes of our people." "This is, in fact, the plan adopted by our opponents," he declared, "and shall we not profit by them?"[29]

The Jewish Publication Society that Isaac Leeser and his supporters soon established did closely emulate its Christian counterparts. Among Christians, the press had become, in Nathan Hatch's words, "the grand engine of a burgeoning religious culture, the primary means of promotion for, and bond of union within, competing religious groups,"[30] and Leeser felt that the same could happen among Jews. He had already demonstrated the power of the press through his books and journal, but now he set about publishing Jewish religious tracts, each about 125 pages long. Some contained stories based on the Bible and Jewish legends; others presented "affecting tales," heavily Victorian in tone, designed to combat missionaries, prevent intermarriage, and foster observance of the Sabbath; still others, like Leeser's own *The Jews and Their Religion*, treated more academic subjects. All were cheaply produced and printed as part of a series entitled *The Jewish Miscellany*, the very title recalling the *Tract Magazine and Christian Miscellany*, which the Jewish series aimed to counter. Some fourteen different booklets appeared over the next five years, but the series never achieved commercial success. On the night of December 27, 1851, fire swept through the building where most of the stock was stored, and the whole enterprise went up in smoke.[31]

While it lasted, Leeser's Jewish Publication Society competed with its Christian counterparts by borrowing tactics and employing them to Jewish ends. In the free marketplace of religion, where non-Christians did not have to contend with state power arrayed against them, ordinary competition determined success. Nothing prevented Jews and others from studying the methods of the majority and employing them to buttress their own minority positions. Indeed, by selectively emulating the Christian majority, non-

Christian faiths became stronger—better able to preserve their religious integrity.[32]

The Jewish Sunday school, begun by Rebecca Gratz in Philadelphia in 1838, illustrates this phenomenon. Founded to "follow the example of other religious communities" and in the very city where the Christian Sunday school movement was centered, it openly sought to adapt the Protestant model of American education to Judaism.[33] The Sunday school provided Jewish boys and girls with knowledge of the Bible, as Jews understood it, and with catechistic answers to basic questions of faith from a Jewish perspective. The goal was to ensure that "there shall not be a Jewish child ignorant [of] *why* he is a Jew."[34] Children who might not otherwise have known how to respond to challenges from their Christian peers were fortified by their Sunday school lessons. One popular textbook, for example, taught that "God is but one . . . we do not worship any being besides him." It also warned children that "should any designing persons . . . attempt to seduce us from our religion, we must resist such temptation with the firm resolution to live and die in the religion of our forefathers."[35] For all that it emulated its Protestant namesake, the Jewish Sunday school thus basically aimed to compete with Protestant teachings. Its goal was to keep Jews Jewish.

When Protestants, beginning in 1864, established free "mission schools" in Jewish immigrant areas, ostensibly to offer instruction in the Hebrew language but with the clear aim of converting their charges, Jews similarly countered by establishing "free schools" of their own, with great success. "If there had been no 'Jewish missions' in New York, we should have had no Hebrew Free Schools with nearly 3,000 children as pupils," the *Jewish Messenger* admitted in 1888; "the conversionists are our benefactors."[36] Whenever public schools preached Christianity, Jews expressed anger, for that pitted them against the forces of the state and called into question their status as equal citizens. Mission schools, by contrast, received no government support. Jews, as a result, competed with them on a level playing field where they felt much more confident.

Many similar examples could be adduced. Jewish hospitals, Jewish philanthropy, and Jewish orphanages all were stimulated and shaped, at least in part, by competitive pressures from the Christian majority.[37] More broadly, Judaism, like many other non-Christian faiths, democratized and opened up new roles for women in response to Protestant pressures.[38] Where once, for example, synagogue seating was stratified by class and separated by gender, most synagogues over time adopted the patterns of free seating and mixed (family) seating common in American churches. Even in Orthodox syna-

gogues, where men and women continued to be separated by a partition, their seating areas came more and more to be equalized.[39]

Toward a Religious Free Market

Harvey Cox has observed that "few faiths ever escape modification when they collide or interact with others. Most profit from such encounters."[40] This, of course, holds true for American Christianity no less than for its minority counterparts. Indeed, just as Christian religious outsiders like Christian Scientists and Pentecostals "have been an indispensably dynamic force in American religious history," so too non-Christian outsiders.[41] The music and dance of African religions, the meditations and mysticism of Asian religions, the culture and philanthropy of Judaism—all have enriched American Christianity. American Christianity, for its part, has likewise enriched the religions that it has touched.

The relationship between Christianity and non-Christian religions in America has thus been a reciprocal one. In the face of a state power that distorts the functioning of the religious marketplace, competition serves as a restorative. Where the Christian majority and non-Christian minorities in the United States compete freely, they learn from one another, borrow from one another, and strengthen one another.

NOTES

1. *Occident* 2 (1845): 500–10; reprinted in Jonathan D. Sarna and David G. Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 113.

2. Ibid., 112–21, reprints Hammond's exchange with the Jewish community. For background, see Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 249.

3. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, 1962* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), 888. For other examples of such Christological Christmas messages, see Jonathan D. Sarna, "Is Judaism Compatible with American Civil Religion? The Problem of Christmas and the 'National Faith,'" in *Religion and the Life of the Nation: American Recoveries*, ed. Rowland A. Sherrill (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 155–56. For an 1812 Thanksgiving Proclamation that met with Jewish protests, see *Occident* 1 (1844): 435; and for other examples, see *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 13 (1905): 19–36; and 20 (1911): 133–35.

4. For South Carolina Jewish history, see Barnett A. Elzas, *The Jews of South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1905); Charles Reznikoff and Uriah Z.

Engelman, *The Jews of Charleston* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1950); James W. Hagy, *This Happy Land: The Jews of Colonial and Antebellum Charleston* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1993); and Theodore Rosengarten and Dale Rosengarten, eds., *A Portion of the People: Three Hundred Years of Southern Jewish Life* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002). The Harby quote is found in ibid., xv, 75.

5. See Carol Bleser, ed., *Secret and Sacred: The Diaries of James Henry Hammond, a Southern Slaveholder* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 94, where Hammond refers to the brother of Moses Cohen Mordecai as a "miserable Jew." For other quotes, see ibid., 125–26; and Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 249.

6. Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 114.

7. Ibid., 115, 119–20.

8. Bleser, *Secret and Sacred: The Diaries of James Henry Hammond*, 126.

9. Ibid., 138.

10. Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 116.

11. Ibid. Privately he recorded in his diary that "whatever may be my religious doubts, I could not conscientiously omit the name of Jesus Christ in my public worship." Bleser, *Secret and Sacred: The Diaries of James Henry Hammond*, 138.

12. Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 116.

13. Ibid., 116–17.

14. Ibid., 118–21. "This will be a three days talk for the public," Hammond predicted in his diary after reading the Jews' report. "It has drawn on me the everlasting and malignant hostility of the whole tribe of Jews, which is very unpleasant in many ways." Bleser, *Secret and Sacred: The Diaries of James Henry Hammond*, 126. Hammond's successor, Governor William Aiken, made a point just one day after his inauguration of issuing a new Thanksgiving Proclamation, which disavowed Hammond's principles and (much to the latter's disgust) carefully employed language inclusive of the Jewish community. Ibid., 137–38.

15. Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1984), depicts the changing public square and what he sees as the consequences of those changes.

16. Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 139–65; Naomi W. Cohen, *Jews in Christian America: The Pursuit of Religious Equality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 58–64, 72–79, 214–39; Morton Borden, *Jews, Turks, and Infidels* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 103–29.

17. Jonathan D. Sarna, "The American Jewish Response to Nineteenth-Century Christian Missions," *Journal of American History* 68 (June 1981): 35–51; Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Impact of Nineteenth-Century Christian Missions on American Jews," in *Jewish Apostacy in the Modern World*, ed. Todd M. Endelman (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1987), 232–54; Yaakov Ariel, *Evangelizing the Chosen People: Missions to the Jews in America, 1880–2000* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

18. Sarna, "Is Judaism Compatible with American Civil Religion," 152–73.

19. Lloyd P. Gartner, "Temples of Liberty Unpolluted: American Jews and Public Schools, 1840–1875," in *A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus*, ed. Bertram W. Korn (New York: Ktav, 1976), 157–89 (quote is from p. 180); Cohen, *Jews in Christian America*, 79–87.

20. John H. Westerhoff, *McGuffey and His Readers: Piety, Morality, and Education in Nineteenth-Century America* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), 138–39. See Neil Baldwin, *Henry Ford and the Jews: The Mass Production of Hate* (New York: Public Affairs, 2001), 1–7, for McGuffey's influence on Henry Ford.

21. Louis Marshall to William Fox, December 2, 1927, as quoted in Gartner, "Temples of Liberty Unpolluted," 175–76. Since Marshall was born in 1856, he was presumably describing experiences dating back to the 1860s or the early 1870s.

22. Gartner, "Temples of Liberty Unpolluted," 175.

23. *American Jewish Year Book* 49 (1947–48): 32; *Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook* 53 (1943): 80.

24. Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 16–27, 190–226; Cohen, *Jews in Christian America*, 115–22, 159–213.

25. Melvin I. Urofsky, *The Levy Family and Monticello, 1834–1923* (Monticello: Thomas Jefferson Foundation, 2001), 81; Marc Leepson, *Saving Monticello* (New York: Free Press, 2001); Abram Kanoff, "Uriah P. Levy: The Story of a Pugnacious Commodore," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 39 (1949): 1–66. See, for more broadly on anti-Semitism in the military, Joseph W. Bendersky, *The Jewish Threat: Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army* (New York: Basic, 2000).

26. Bertram W. Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 56–97, esp. 64; Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Judaism: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 119–20.

27. Alan Cooperman, "For Gods and Country: The Army Chaplain Who Wanted to Switch to Wicca? Transfer Denied," *Washington Post*, February 19, 2007, C01, at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/02/18/AR2007021801396_pf.html (accessed September 28, 2008).

28. On the 1986 case of *Goldman v. Weinberger*, see Sarna and Dalin, *Religion and State in the American Jewish Experience*, 278–81. An act of Congress, in 1987, overturned the Supreme Court decision in the military's favor and granted members of the armed forces the right to wear religious apparel, such as a skullcap, so long as it was "neat and conservative."

29. [Isaac Leeser], "Address of the Jewish Publication Committee to the Israelites of America," preface to *Caleb Asher*, no. 1 of *The Jewish Miscellany* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1845), 1–4; reprinted in Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, *The Jew in the Modern World*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 461–62. Leeser was particularly incensed by the publication in 1845 of *The Jew at Home and Abroad* (Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union, 1845).

30. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 126.

31. Jonathan D. Sarna, *JPS: The Americanization of Jewish Culture, 1888–1988* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 1–4; Lance J. Sussman, *Isaac Leeser and the Making of American Judaism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1995), 152–54.

32. See Lance J. Sussman, "Isaac Leeser and the Protestantization of American Judaism," *American Jewish Archives* 38 (1986): 1–21; and for a broader evocation of this theme, see Gerson D. Cohen, "The Blessing of Assimilation in Jewish History," in *Jewish History and Jewish Destiny*, ed. Gerson D. Cohen (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1997), 145–56.

33. Joseph R. Rosenbloom, "Rebecca Gratz and the Jewish Sunday School Movement in Philadelphia," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 48 (1958): 71–78 (quote is from p. 71); on Gratz and the Sunday school, see Dianne Ashton, *Rebecca Gratz: Women and Judaism in Antebellum America* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997), esp. 121–69.

34. Isaac Leeser, *The Claims of the Jews to an Equality of Rights* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1841), 86.

35. Salomon Herxheimer, *Doctrines of Faith and Morals for Jewish Schools and Families*, 2nd ed. (Louisville: Terrell, Dietz, 1874), 17–18, 54.

36. *Jewish Messenger*, May 18, 1888, p. 4; for sources that echo this theme, see Sarna, "The Impact of Nineteenth-Century Christian Missions," 252n43.

37. Sarna, "The Impact of Nineteenth-Century Christian Missions," discusses this theme.

38. Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Democratization of American Judaism," in *New Essays in American Jewish History*, ed. Pamela S. Nadell, Jonathan D. Sarna, and Lance Sussman (forthcoming, American Jewish Archives).

39. Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Debate over Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue," in *The American Synagogue: A Sanctuary Transformed*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 363–94.

40. Harvey G. Cox, *The Seduction of the Spirit: The Use and Misuse of the People's Religion* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), 121.

41. R. Laurence Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 21. Moore considers Jews in his volume but focuses mostly on Christian "religious outsiders."

American Christianities

A History of Dominance and Diversity

Edited by

CATHERINE A. BREKUS

and

W. CLARK GILPIN

THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
Chapel Hill