

MS 8581a

The history of the Jews in  
Roumania.

Herbert, Edward, 1865-

[19--]

System no. 0077197

These images are from the collection of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS). JTS holds the copyrights to these images. The images may be downloaded or printed by individuals for personal use only, but may not be quoted or reproduced in any publication without the prior permission of JTS.

הועתק והוכנס לאינטרנט  
[www.hebrewbooks.org](http://www.hebrewbooks.org)  
ע"י חיים תש"ע

HISTORY  
of  
THE JEWS IN ROUMANIA  
by  
EDWARD HERBERT



# Hebrew Printing in Roumania

By

**EDWARD HERBERT**

הועתק והוכנס לאינטרנט  
[www.hebrewbooks.org](http://www.hebrewbooks.org)  
ע"י חיים תש"ע

These images are from the collection of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS). JTS holds the copyrights to these images. The images may be downloaded or printed by individuals for personal use only, but may not be quoted or reproduced in any publication without the prior permission of JTS.

Reprinted from *Journal of Jewish Bibliography*, Vol. II., No. 4, October, 1940.

New York

1941

Apparently the son succeeded his father as the sole owner of the press. Publishers of Hebrew books who were served by the Eckhardt press were: Meshulam Heller b. Simeon Aryeh; Moses Leib Horowitz and his brother-in-law Isaiah Asher Horowitz Meisls; Joseph Zeeb ha-Levi and Gershon Reines; Zebi Hirsch Wohl.

The output of Hebrew books from the press of Johann Eckhardt and Son, or for that matter of the other printers of Czernowitz, was intended to meet the needs not only of the Jewish population of Bukovina, but also those of Moldavia and Wallachia. There were no Hebrew presses in those provinces, although there was always a large demand for Hebrew books among their Jewish inhabitants. Apparently the output was not large enough to meet this demand and many books had to be brought from elsewhere. Thus the Censor's Record (*Dosarul Cenzurei*) of that time, now in the library of the Roumanian Academy, records that a single bookseller in Jassy, one Aron Goldenberg, brought on June 14, 1834, as many as 3,511 bound volumes besides other unbound ones and "all kinds of stories." From this, one concludes that there must have been a considerably large reading public within the large Jewish population in Moldavia.

Without waiting for the permission from the censorship authorities for which they had applied, three Jews—Moses Zelig Zimand, Zalman Feigelis and Judah Leib Wechsler—brought in 1833 Hebrew types to Jassy and undertook the publication of many small Hebrew books, among them a calendar for the year 5594 (1833-1834). The permit not having come, Procopie Florescu, the censor, confiscated the presses and the type, as well as their output. This act of the censor was performed in spite of the government having previously declared that "the privileges, accorded the Christian printers, cannot prevent the Jews from having their own printing-shops." It is perhaps due to that act that no Hebrew book printed in Jassy before 1842 could be found. However, some of the books printed during the years 1842-1846 are known. Among them are: The Hebrew text of the *Book of Psalms* with Yiddish translation and *Maamadot*; the *Song of Songs* with Yiddish translation, and *Siah Sefunim*, a commentary by Rabbi Eliezer b. Reuben Kahana; *Selihot* with Yiddish translation and two editions, one with Yiddish translation, of *Shaare Zion*, a compilation of interesting cabbalistic prayers, by Nathan Nata Hanover who had served as Rabbi of Jassy during the year 1657-1670. *Seyag La-Torah*, a legal decision by Rabbi Joseph b. Menahem Mendel Landau appeared there in 1846.

These books were virtually all issued "with the permission of the censor" at the Albina Institute of Gheorghe Asachi, a famous teacher, literateur, historian and well-known printer. The publishers of these works were: Moses Zelig Zimand, Judah Leib Wechsler, Zalman Feigelis, Nathan Wassermann and Israel Abraham Segal. With some interruptions due to political or economic conditions, Hebrew printing continued in Jassy in later years. For in 1855 there appeared the periodical *Korot ha-Itim* and in 1857 Zebi Hirsch Goldner printed there a work entitled *Darke ha-Emunah* by Joseph David ha-Kohen and later in 1859 the *Derek Hayyim* by Dob Baer b. Shneur Zalman. In the same year Mordecai Zilberman published his *Gazeta Romana-Evreiaska*, a newspaper issued twice weekly on Mondays and Thursdays, and devoted to literary, commercial and industrial subjects. In 1872 M. S. Rabener published there his Hebrew quarterly *Zimrat ha-Aretz*, of which only

## Hebrew Printing in Roumania

By EDWARD HERBERT

PRINTING was introduced in Roumania early in the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup> The earliest texts printed there were, as in other lands, the Holy Scriptures; they were in Slavic characters. Hebrew types were introduced in Roumanian printing not earlier than the beginning of the nineteenth century and apparently were used by Jewish printers only. In fact very little is known of early Hebrew printing in Roumania. It is not known when the first publication in Hebrew characters appeared in that country, what it was and where it was first printed. It is assumed that the earliest known Hebrew printing establishment in Roumania was at Czernowitz, the capital of Bukovina. The first Hebrew book printed there, which appeared in 1819, was the *Beer Mayyim Hayyim*, a commentary on the Pentateuch by the celebrated Rabbi Hayyim ben Solomon, called the Czernowitzer, who, at the close of the eighteenth century, functioned as rabbi in Botosani, Moldavia, where, by the way, a Hebrew press functioned in 1902.<sup>2</sup> Due to the then prevailing restrictions imposed by the Austrian governmental authorities, under whose jurisdiction Czernowitz was, upon Jewish publishers and Jewish printers, they were compelled to have their publications issued from non-Jewish presses; the latter having been accorded privileges not granted to Jewish printers. Thus, to meet the needs of a large Jewish clientele, the well known printers, Johann Eckhardt and Son, had established in Czernowitz a well-equipped Hebrew printing shop, engaged competent Hebrew type-setters and proof readers, among them the learned Issachar b. Abraham Back, and began to print and to publish Hebrew books. Eckhardt's Hebrew press issued numerous works consisting largely of liturgical texts and a goodly number of publications in hasidic literature, homiletics, rabbinical and talmudical exegetics. Editions of the *Mishnayot* in six volumes and of the *En Yaakov* by Jacob ibn Habib in three volumes, came from that press in 1852. But its greatest undertaking was the printing of a folio edition, in eighteen volumes, of the Babylonian Talmud with its standard commentaries. It was published in 1839. Among the works of lesser importance printed by Eckhardt's press were *Negid u-Metzaweh* by Jacob Hayyim Zemach, 1849; *Yesod ha-Emunah* by Baruch b. Abraham Kossover, 1854; *Tishbi* by Elijah Levita, 1855; *Psalms* with commentary by David Kimhi and supplementary material, 1856; *Ner Mitzwah we-Torah Or* by Dob Baer b. Shneur Zalman, 1858; *Likkute Torah* by Mordecai of Czernobil, 1859; *Halakot we-Takkanot* . . . compiled by Zebi Elimelek Shapira, 1864; *Sheref Peri Etz* by Moses Schoham, 1866; *Tzel ha-Olam* by Mathatia Delakrot, 1867; *Luah Erez* by Isaac b. Lipman Kunstadt, 1887, and others. Virtually all the imprints on the publications which came from that press prior to 1864 indicate that the printing shop was that of Johann Eckhardt and Son while those published in later years gave the name of Rudolf Eckhardt.

<sup>1</sup> On early printing in Roumania see Moses Gaster, "Die Buchdruckerei in Rumänien" in *Bukarester Salon*, Bucharest, 1883, v. 1, pp. 374-378; Emile Picot, "Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire de la typographie dans les pays Roumains en XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle" in *Centenaire de l'école des langues orientales vivantes 1795-1895* Recueil de mémoires . . . Paris, 1895, pp. 183-221.

<sup>2</sup> L. Kahn's *Yom Le-Shanah*, a list of anniversaries of the death of 250 rabbis appeared there in that year. See E. N. Adler, *A Gazetteer of Hebrew Printing*, London, 1917, p. 8.

ספרא דברי

דוא ספר

תורת כהנים

עם פירוש

# התורה והמצוה

הפירוש הזה נחזה צפונות רגלה סליאות ופסוקי חרות. ויברר כי כל דברי תורה שבעים הלא הם כתובים באצבע אלקים בתורת הכתב. וכל דברי חז"ל מוכרחים ומוטבעים בעומק הלשון עפי חוקים וכללים מיוחדים שהם לחז"ל בשפת לשון הקודש. ובכתב חז"ל דברי אמת יגיד את הרשום בכתב אמת ויתן אות ומופת על אמתת תורה שבעים. ועל גדל חכמתה וקדושתה. ואת דברי הספרא ואת חרותו פורה ומפרש בדרך חדש לא שעררה המפרשים ולא דרכו בו. יפלא נתיב ושביל מיוחד וישם ארץ ציה למצואי פים:

חברתי אני

מאיר ליבוש מלבים

זמן בבאקארעשט מדינת סלונקי

בעהמ"ה

על ארצות החיים וכו' ארצות השלום וכו' שירי הנפש וכו' על ישיע. וכו' מגלת אסתר:

בשנת כתר לפק

באקארעשט

**HATORA VEHAMITVA.**

Compusă de Rabinul M. L. MALBIM

BUCURESCI. TYPOGRAPHIA JURNALULUI NAȚIONALULU,  
1860.

Facsimile of title-page of *Sifra* with commentary by M. L. Malbim  
Bearing name of press as well as place and date of publication.

ספרא דבי רב

הוא ספר

תורת כהנים

עם פירוש

# התורה והמצוה

הפיו' הזה יחזה צפונות ונלה פלאות ויפתור חידות, ויברר כי כל דברי תורה שבעים הלא הם כתובים באצבע אלקים בתורת הכתב, וכל דברי חז"ל מוכרחים ומומבעים בעומק הלשון עפי חוקים וכללים מיוחדים שהי' לחז"ל בשפת לשון הקדש, ובכתב ישר דברי אמת יצא את הרשום בכתב אמת. ויתן אות ומופת על אמתת תורה שבעים, ועל גדל חכמתה וקדושתה. ואת דברי הספרא ואת חידו מורה ומפרש בדרך חדש לא שעררה המפרשים ולא דרכו בו. יפלא נתיב ושכיל מיוחד וישם ארץ ציה למצואימים:

חברתו אני

מאיר ליבוש מלבים

סוק בבאקארעשם מדינת סלונקי

בעהמ"ה

ספר ארצות הרד"מ וספר ארצות השלום וספר שירי הגשש ופיו' על ישעיה, ופיו' מנחת אסתר:



Facsimile of title-page of the *Sifra* with commentary by M. L. Malbim lacking name of printer or place and date of publication.

the "censorship authorities" assume that the work represents a native product and therefore not subject to the restrictions imposed upon "foreign" books.

The rivalries in the Bucharest Jewish community, which incidentally brought about the Malbim's parting with his flock in that city and the increasing restrictions imposed upon Jewish life by governmental regulations did not tend to make Hebrew printing a successful venture in the capital of Wallachia. The effort to extend the use of Hebrew types in other presses in that city proved futile. Naftali Popper was instrumental in bringing about the acquisition of Hebrew types by the Cathedral press in Bucharest. But since there was no great demand for the use of those types they were removed; some say they were destroyed. In fact, for a number of years no Hebrew types were to be found in any of the Bucharest presses.

When in 1874 Michael Azriel was about to undertake the issuance of his Yiddish periodical *Hayoetz* he met with difficulties in launching its publication due to the absence of Hebrew types in the presses then functioning at the capital. It was soon discovered that Naftali Popper, whose attempt to carry on Hebrew printing in the Cathedral press at Bucharest was abortive, had in his possession a case of Hebrew types containing five different fonts. It is not unlikely that these were the very types which had been eliminated from the Cathedral press. The availability of these types finally made possible the launching of Azriel's *Hayoetz*. It was published from 1876 to 1881. Among the other periodicals printed in Hebrew characters and published in Roumania during the period of pioneering in Hebrew printing in that land were the *Korot Ha-Itim* (Jassy, 1855), *Gazeta romana-evreiasca* (Jassy, 1859) and *Et ledaber* (Bucharest, 1859).

When Benjamin Franklin Peixotto served as United States Consul in Roumania he took a keen interest in the welfare of his coreligionists in that land. He was concerned with improving not only their economic, political and social conditions but also sought the improvement of their cultural life. In his desire to provide Roumanian Jewry with a Hebrew periodical he acquired the types belonging to Popper and turned them over to Mibashan, the well-known Roumanian Hebrew writer. To these more types, imported from other countries, were added and before long Hebrew books were again printed in Bucharest. These books were of a character not formerly printed in Roumania. Whereas most of the Hebrew publications which were issued in previous years from Roumanian Hebrew presses were religious texts largely liturgical, Hasidic and rabbinic works, the Hebrew books printed now were secular in character and tended to spread Haskalah tendencies among the Roumanian Jews. Thus among the publications which came from the Hebrew press financed by Peixotto and directed by Mibashan were such works as *Ruah Eliyahu ha-Tishbi* by Leib Silberman (1879); *Gellilat ha-Aretz* by Hillel Kahane (1880), and others. In 1883 L. Steinberg issued the text of the Hebrew prayer book with a translation in Roumanian by Moses Gaster.

Some of the Hebrew presses in Roumania, like the early Hebrew presses in Russia, must have made frequent changes in their locations. This very likely was due to governmental regulations or economic and social factors not always within the control of the owners and operators of these presses. In 1891 Wolf Haber carried on Hebrew printing in Roman and it was from his press that the *Dibre Hayyim* by Hayyim

two numbers appeared. Another Hebrew periodical, *Yizra'el*, originally launched in Jassy in 1881 was later transferred to Galatz and some numbers were printed at Piatra but finally issued in Czernowitz. Apparently Hebrew presses functioned in all these communities while the publication was moving from one place to another.

In Wallachia there was no Hebrew printing before the end of the fifties in the nineteenth century. It was in 1859, at the beginning of the reign of Prince Alexander Joan Cusa that a Hebrew press was established at Bucharest. The Jewish community of that city was then made up of many Jews who were registered as subjects of other states in addition to a goodly number of their native Roumanian coreligionists. The two groups maintained sharp differences in their communal affairs. The native Jews enjoyed full governmental recognition of their religious and communal organizations and institutions. They had a legal status not shared by their "foreign" coreligionists. In the circumstances strife and struggle prevailed and one is therefore not surprised at the failure of the two factions to cooperate in enterprises of common interest. Leading members of the community concluded that under the leadership of a great rabbi the prevailing difficulties would gradually disappear. In 1860 they called to the chief rabbinate of Bucharest, the eminent Rabbi Meir Loeb Malbim. Unable to agree with those in the community who desired to introduce reforms into their religious rites and who even employed violence in pursuit of their aims, the Rabbi wanted to resign but friends and followers prevailed upon him not to do it.

While in Kempen, Prussia, prior to his coming to Bucharest, Rabbi Malbim completed the manuscript of his famous work, *Ha-Torah we ha-Mitzwah*, a commentary on the *Sifra*. He was anxious to have the work published. Among the inducements to have him remain in Bucharest the followers of the Malbim undertook the publication of the book at the expense of the Jewish community in Bucharest. But there was no Hebrew press then in Wallachia and the author was not willing to let the manuscript go out of his hands. The owner of the press in which the journal *Nationalul*, a Roumanian newspaper, was published agreed to acquire Hebrew types and the Bucharest Jewish community imported two Hebrew type setters in order to make possible the printing of the Malbim's *Ha-Torah we ha-Mitzwah*. Before long the book made its appearance (1860) and thus through the cooperation of Boeresco, at one time Minister of Foreign Affairs in Roumania, the owner of the above-named newspaper and the Jewish community in Bucharest, Hebrew printing was introduced in Wallachia. Two other works by the Malbim—*Shire ha-Nefesh* and his commentary on the Book of Esther—were printed in that press during the same year. Other Hebrew books were issued from the same press, among them the second edition of the *Peleh Yoetz* by Rabbi Eliezer Pappo of Silistria and two pamphlets by Moses Israel Almoly, religious leader of the Sefardic Jews in Bucharest.

It seems that of the *Sifra* edited by Malbim, two editions were issued; one bearing no imprint and the other giving on the title-page information as to place, date of publication and name of the press. Apparently the edition lacking the latter information must have been intended for distribution among clients outside of Roumania. It must be borne in mind that in some of Roumania's neighboring lands, certain restrictions were imposed upon books imported. A title page which gave no clue as to place and date of publication was often sufficient to make

Judah, the son of Aaron Simhah Lebel, the rabbi of Bacau, was published. Five years later a Hebrew press functioned in Bacau<sup>3</sup> and was responsible for the printing of several Hebrew publications.

In connection with the publication of A. S. Gold's Roumanian translation of the Pentateuch, made at the beginning of the twentieth century, it was planned that the Hebrew text be printed together with the new version in the vernacular. When the actual printing of the work was undertaken a press equipped with Hebrew types was set up in Craiova where the first two volumes appeared in 1902.

The various improvements in the political and social conditions of the Jews in Roumania during the early years of the present century were in a large measure also responsible for the corresponding rise in their intellectual interests and cultural attainment. Obviously circumstances were now more favorable for the spread of Hebrew printing in all the large centers of Jewish life in that country. The number of Roumanian Hebrew presses increased from year to year and their output likewise rose in volume. When the World War was over and the boundaries of Roumania enlarged a number of Hebrew presses formerly credited to Austria, Hungary and Russia fell under the domain of Roumania. Their activities enhanced the share Roumanian Hebrew printing contributed to the advancement of the printed word in Hebrew characters. The time is not yet ripe to properly evaluate the role it played in Jewish life.

<sup>3</sup> *Hesped Mar*, a funeral sermon over Israel Friedmann, Bacau, 1896. See A. Marx, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n. s., v. 11, p. 273.



THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN ROUMANIA

\*\*\*\*\*

By

EDWARD HERBERT, Ph.D., Lit.D.

PART - 1.

## Part One

### THE BACKGROUND

#### Introduction

#### The Nature of the Problem

In the southeastern part, at the northern border of the Balkan peninsula, there is located a country which looks on the older maps like a sock, its toe pointing westward and its heel strongly entrenched in the east. In appearance and in size it has been changed many times throughout its history and no longer resembles a sock. It has always been surrounded by unfriendly neighbors; and due to these neighbors -- Hungary in the northwest, Yugoslavia in the west, Bulgaria in the south, Russia in the east, and Austria in the north -- that country <sup>has</sup> shrunk and expanded and shrunk again. Its name is Roumania. A beautiful country, endowed with all the richness which a peaceful country ~~could desire~~ could desire: grain, cattle, fauna, forests and fisheries, not to mention the subsoil wealth of oil, iron, gold, salt, and other minerals.

Before 1859 that country was known under the names of its two provinces -- Moldavia and Wallachia. In that year they were united under the name of United Principalities, under the rule of Prince John Alexander Cuza.

Roumania is situated on the dividing line between the east and the west. This commanding position occasioned the envy of its neighbors, who looked upon it with a covetous eye, and did not permit its unfortunate people to live in peace. Russia and Turkey, always in a state of friction, invaded the country by turns, while, at convenient times, its Austrian neighbor also took a hand by occupying one of the provinces.

The principalities assumed political shape under their ruling princes in the 13th and 14th centuries respectively. Throughout their rich history, the two provinces managed to retain their political integrity despite their disunity, because their neighbors were constantly at each other's throat. In size and in power they were puppet states, but their political sense was extremely keen, and their leaders were as perfect in politics as the most astute and ultramodern politicians in Europe.

Roumania has been nominally a democratic country, without titles of nobility; an aristocratic caste, known there as "boyars," was, however, flourishing down to the close of World War II.; the peasantry, on the other hand, as in all Slavic countries, had no voice in shaping its destinies.

The status of Roumania prior to 1878 may be defined thus:

A "Latin" people worshipping in a Slavic church which was converted to Greek Orthodoxy; held under Turkish suzerainty; covered by Russian protection with European supervision; coveted by Austria and safeguarded by England; under French influence,

with a German on the throne. A play presented in concert of the great powers in 1878 in which Great Britain played the Cornet and the Baritone, France the Waldhorn, Russia the Basso, and Italy the Cymbals and the Drum; Bismark wielded the Baton, and Turkey did the dancing, the small powers making up the unwilling audience.

To the historian, Roumania presents a rather tempting task, and not a very easy one, due to the paucity of reliable historical material. Roumanian historians do not agree on their history, much less on the origin of the Roumanian people. Hardly any other country in Europe is so rich in natural resources, and so poor in historical data. Our concern is not a history of Roumania, however, but the history of the Jews in Roumania. Any fragment of Roumanian history on our stage will be there as the background and indispensable prop for the tense drama of the Jewish struggle for emancipation and citizenship.

The history of the Jews in Roumania is a sad one. They have shed their blood on the battlefield; they have fought for their country all through its history, but they have been unrecognized by their own country. considered stepchildren/~~whose country refused to recognise them~~ have ~~xxxxxx~~. They appeared in its annals only as an oppressed and persecuted people. Yet, under the frightful conditions <sup>in</sup> under which they were forced to live, under every disadvantage imaginable, patiently and indefatigably they have pursued a steadily productive course. Whether or not they were allowed to swell unmolested, they have kept ~~on~~ adding to the national

wealth. While they were often barely tolerated, while they were considered base outcasts, the refuse of mankind, and were treated as such, they went on undismayed, and tenaciously helped to develop the country in which they lived.

5

## CHAPTER ONE

### The Early Settlement of Jews in Roumania

As early as the end of the first century, the great enemy of Rome, the Dacian King, Decebalus, planted Jewish colonies in the town of Talmus, or Talmaci, in the region known today as Transylvania.

Jews lived in Dacia at the time of Alexander the Great of Macedonia (336-323 B.C.E.), welcomed by the Dacians, Rome's enemies, and also by the Persians. In the Ciscarpathians and in the Transcarpathians, Jews were established in many villages, one of which was ~~Talmus~~ Talmus. They participated in the struggle of the Dacians against the Romans in the time of Trajan (53-117 C.E.; Emperor from 98 to 117 C.E.). They entered the country in the train of the Dacians, who had returned after a brief period of expulsion. Soon after, they came in numbers and were blended with the conquerors. Whether they came from Rome or other parts, these Jews established themselves in Roumania at that early period and remained there.

Many Jewish traders came to Panonia with the legions of Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.E.). These Jews fared well in those provinces, also in Panonia, now a part of Albania, Montenegro and Dalmatia, which became a Roman province in 35 B.C.E. under Augustus, and was placed under the jurisdiction of a Roman governor. According

to a contemporary writer, such a governor would hardly dare offend a local Jew in his province for fear that on his return home his people would shower him with missiles.

Of the Jews taken into exile by Titus, in 70 C.E., after he destroyed the Second Temple and the city of Jerusalem, many managed to escape and settled in what is known today as Roumania.

Those Jews who settled there immediately after the fall of the First Temple (586 B.C.E.) must have thrived and lived in comfort. For when, in 350 B.C.E., Ezra issued a call for the exiled Jews to return to Palestine, those living in Roman territory preferred to remain there. Four hundred and twenty years later (70 C.E.), with the fall of the Second Temple and the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans, many of the Jews fled for safety to places beyond the Roman dominion, such as Dacia, Podolia, the Dniester regions, the Black Sea, and the Danube, to Moesia, Illyria, Bessarabia, and the Crimea, and thus came also to Roumania, which was then a part of Dacia. Proof that they must have been living there is furnished by a Jewish monument found in the Crimea, bearing a date equivalent to 696 B.C.E., and by the numerous Jewish place-names. We also know of the order given by Decebalus directing many of the exiled Jews to settle in Talmus.

During the successive Roman wars against the Persians, the Goths, and the Greeks, the number of Jews kept on growing, and they ultimately spread into Bulgaria and Hungary. Since they

were attacked and pursued by barbarian invaders, the Jews, like the Vlachs, retreated to the Thracian and Carpathian mountains. While history does not follow these refugees closely, we do find them at brief intervals here and there. In the 8th century a large tribe of Finns, Bulgars, Avars, and Hungarians, embraced Judaism and established themselves between the Vistula and the Dniester rivers. Obviously, Jews must have been living there in numbers sufficiently great to exercise such influence over an alien people that they entered the Jewish fold. The district of Cuvurlui, in Moldavia, derives its name from the Kozars (Khazars), known to some historians as "Covars."

History is silent as to the whereabouts of the Jews in Roumania between the period of Trajan (Emperor of Rome from 98 to 117 C.E.) and the time of the Khazars in the 8th century; and from that time until the episode concerning Benjamin of Tudela in the 12th century. What became of them and where they lived in the intervals between those centuries is a question veiled in darkness. Only here and there do we find traces of the presence of Jews in those regions.

That Jews were living in Roumania before the 12th century is adequately proven by the following facts.

(1) The grave-stone found in the Jewish cemetery in the Crimea bore a date corresponding to the year 696 B.C.E., just mentioned.

(2) Whether Jews were living in Dacia before the Roman



conquest, which, as we have shown, is highly probable, or whether they came thither as tradesmen following the legions of Trajan, the fact still remains that they were there when the Romans came.

(3) When Trajan invaded Dacia in the year 106 C.E., the Jews whom he found there were well-established.

(4) What was known in history as Dacia covered the following territories: Bessarabia, extending to the river Dniester, the Crimea, down to the Black Sea; Rumelia and Illyria. In these territories, especially in Bessarabia, documents have been found showing that Jews were living there before the Christian Era.

Near the town of Hotin, Bessarabia, a coin was discovered bearing the image of Judah Macabee and dating from the Hasmonean period. Obviously, Jews had been living in Dacia Trajana at least four hundred years before the Christian Era; therefore, at the time of their conquest, the Romans found Jews there.

The so-called Cetatea Jidovei (Jewish tower), a place near Campulung, in Wallachia, was given that name on account of its Jewish origin.

(5) Many inscriptions were found in Dacia Trajana, showing traces of the presence of Jews there.

(6) Many localities, such as Jidova and Jidoviscia, in Roumania, by their very Jewish names, indicate that there were Jewish colonies in Dacia.

(7) The city of Adjud, the abbreviation of the Latin words ad Judeo, an ancient Jewish colony.

(8) Barbarian invasions of Dacia, found the Romans retreating to the mountains, or beyond the Danube. Whether the Jews followed the retreating Romans or stayed with the invaders is uncertain. It is a fact that after the retreat of the Barbarians, Jews were found in the principalities.

(9) Among the Latin multitude brought into the new province (Wallachia) to work the gold and silver mines were former autochthonous Jews.

(10) Emperor Theodosius <sup>I</sup>~~the first~~ (397 C.E.) ordered the prefects in the districts to stop the anti-Jewish movement and to protect the synagogues and the homes of the Jews.

(11) The Khazars, a barbarian people from the Caspian region whose empire extended to Panonia, which comprised a part of the present Roumania, embraced Judaism; they must surely have left some traces, even if they had to leave the Roman territory after they had embraced Judaism.

(12) Benjamin of Tudela, (12th century), whose travels covered many parts of Europe, Asia and Egypt, tells of a Jewish community which he found in the Carpathian mountains. He narrates that Jews lived there peaceably with their neighbors, and that the Vlachs addressed the Jews as "Brothers".

(13) In the Banat there was a section called "Districtul Jidovei" (Jewish district) where in 1454 Stefan and Mihai Sugaru, Roumanian Boyars, were appointed administrators of the forests.

But there is other uncontrovertable proof of the presence of Jews in these regions at an early period. The great

Alexandrian Jewish philosopher Philo, upon returning from his embassy to Emperor Caligula at Rome, related that there was hardly a town in the world in which Jews were not to be found, "even in the most inaccessible corners of the Pontus (Black Sea)." Later this was confirmed by Josephus Flavius.

Thus, there is not only an endless chain of epigraphic and clear historical texts revolving around Roumania, but the littoral regions in the north of the Black Sea must also have been in close touch with maritime towns of major and minor Scythia, the Bessarabia and the Dobruja of today, namely: Tyras, in which Jewish life continued uninterruptedly throughout the medieval period of Cetates Alba of today; Istrus (Istrya), at the mouth of the Danube, as well as Tomis, Gallatis and other places; in lower Moesia (of which Roumania was formerly a part) and on both the Danubian shores, which include also a part of the later Auralian Dacia; Muntenia and a part of Moldavia; and in the upper Moesia, which embraces modern Serbia (now Jugoslavia) and the Roumania Banat.

In addition, there were also the Judaized and true proselytes who, in conjunction with numerous Jews, always made up the compact mass of Christians. If an apostate, Andrew by name, could come to those Pontic regions to preach the Gospel, or if such a thing could even be attributed to him, it is still proof of the presence of Jews there at that time. For only where Jews or Jewish sympathizers were sufficient in numbers was the new religion brought in. Christianity was first preached in the

11

synagogues.

When, through a political move of Constantine the Great (324-37 C.E.), the new doctrine became the religion of the state while the Mosaic faith was merely tolerated, the masses no longer cared to know of the past, and, at the instigation of their superiors, would often attack the synagogues and destroy them. The authorities then came to the rescue of the Jews. With regard to this episode, there are two edicts in the Theodosian codes affecting Illyria and Dacia, one issued in 397, (previously mentioned), and the other in 412; in each of these edicts the prefects were ordered to take strict measures to protect the Jews.

If there were still the slightest doubt as to Jewish communal life in the Balkan peninsula, which formed a part of the Roman-Byzantine empire, recent discoveries have removed it. Excavations at the ancient Stoboi site, in Aurlian Dacia (the Servian Macedonia of today), have uncovered a mass of buildings dating back to the 5th century, in classical basilic, with many spacious rooms and colonnades, forming a peristyle with public thermas. There were also a synagogue, with Mosaic decorations like those in contemporary Palestine, baths for ritual usage (Mikwah), reception rooms, and dormitories for transient guests. In one of the rooms was found an alms box containing 170 brass coins. This group of buildings was a fort which had been destroyed in or about the year 479, in <sup>an</sup> invasion of the Ostrogoths. On one of the columns was found an

7

inscription in Greek which read as follows:

"Tiberius Polychramos, called Archyrios, father of the Synagogue (archisynagogus) of Stoboi, who lived in strict observance of all Jewish customs, following a given promise erected the building of the sacred place, the triclin and the quadrilateral colonnade, from his own pocket without touching the sacred funds. Therefore, I Claudios Polychramos, reserve for myself and my posterity the right to occupy the upper floor. Should anyone desire to alter the building, he will have to pay to the Patriarch the sum of 250,000 dinars, as agreed. I and my successors will have to furnish the building materials in order to maintain the upper story in good condition."

Some historians have raised the question as to why certain documents, rather abundant in the first centuries of the Christian Era, eventually became so rare that by the 12th century they had disappeared entirely. The answer is: acts of vandalism, invasions, various wars, and <sup>the</sup> consequent destruction of property. A second question raised is whether there is any record of the autochthons after the evacuation of Dacia by Aurelian in 271; and whether it is not true that the moment in which they reappeared, curiously enough, coincided with the era between the Vlachs and the Jews, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela. The answer is that the same fate befell the autochthons and the Jews. In their migrations, covering the continent of Europe, the Jews found in that corner an asylum which was inviting. After a lapse of five centuries we find the Jews having relations with the Vlachs,

and that about one day's journey from the river Spechio, a Jewish colony existed under the leadership of two men named Solomon and Jacob.

Where these Jews were in that interval of five centuries, between the 8th and the 13th centuries, is not recorded anymore than is the whereabouts of the Roumanians during the same interval. It is probable that instead of resisting the barbarian invasions the Jews fraternized with the barbarians, and that for this reason they did not have to wander aimlessly, especially since there was nothing better in prospect for them at that time. Some of those Jewish colonists, however, must have followed the Vlachs into mountain retreats.

Jewish colonies were also established on the shores of the Black Sea. Some Jews came from across the Danube, while others came from other parts of Europe, after the conversion of the Khazars to Judaism. Later, under Galician princes, Jews settled in Berlad and Galatz. But the larger Jewish settlements in Moldavia came in the 13th century, under Radu Negru, and still more in the 14th century, under Vladislav Basarab, when the Jews were expelled by Louis I (the Great) of Hungary in 1376, and found refuge in Poland and Wallachia. Many Jewish refugees who had settled in Wallachia, later went across the Danube and settled in Nicopolis. Also, Jews from Moldavia who had come thither from Hungary, in 1336, migrated to Nicopolis. But these Jews were able to live in peace in Nicopolis for only

about a hundred years. The tyrant Dan V drove them out, and they followed the route which their earlier fellow countrymen had taken, i.e., to the Balkans. Soon they joined their Spanish correligionists, and little trace ~~was~~ left of their former Moldavian and Wallachian life.

## CHAPTER ~~THREE~~ II

### THE JEWS IN MOLDAVIA AND WALLACHIA

The two principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, out of whose union modern Roumania was born, were not in existence before the 13th century. Wallachia was formed by Radu Negru in 1247, and Moldavia was established in 1352 by Bogdan Voda. Inasmuch as Jews had lived in these territories long before the principalities were formed, it is not at all surprising that accounts of Jewish activities should appear in the earliest historical records.

The development of the territory began through colonization. Villages were formed for the tillers of the soil and for the raisers of cattle and sheep. These products created a demand for markets where they could be sold, and where farmers and herdsmen could procure whatever they needed for the cultivation of the soil; the clearing of the forests; and the distribution of their cattle, sheep and other products. To fill the gap between the peasant seller and the city purchaser, the Jews, <sup>settled</sup> ~~filled that gap by settling~~ in the principalities, and helped to develop their commerce and their export and import trade.

Under Vladimir Basarab (1330-40), a group of Jews settled in the town of Turnu Severin, and their activity made the town an important commercial center. The city of Roman was settled by



Jews at about the same time.

The Hungarian Jews, in particular, who were expelled by Louis I of Hungary (1352-64), found Wallachia the nearest and most attractive place of refuge. Under his decree of expulsion, this monarch was kind enough not to despoil his Jewish victims; he allowed them to convert all their possessions into cash which they were permitted to take with them. Many of them settled in Wallachia which was then a vassal state under Hungarian suzerainty. Relations between the two lands were somewhat strained for the obvious reason that the Wallachian princes wished to free themselves from that vassalage, while the Hungarian monarch sought to convert both princes and people to Roman Catholicism, and held them in both religious and political restraint. No wonder, that the Hungarian Jewish refugees were well received by the then reigning Prince of Wallachia, Dan I, (1382), who granted them certain concessions and privileges by means of which they were able to develop the commerce of the principalities. They were treated equally well by his successor, Radu II, (1432).

The effect of the Hungarian decree did not last long, because Louis' successor, Sigismund, recalled the expelled Jews and renewed their privileges. Yet this invitation to return could not have tempted those who had already made a successful start in their new places of residence, with good prospects for the future. Certainly most of those who established themselves in the Roumanian principalities could not have been induced to

return. After the pangs of expulsion and the hardships of the long wandering, they had at last found a place of rest with the prospect of a happy future. It must be assumed that all of them remained in their newly-adopted country. There must have been some who, seized by a longing for their former home, relatives, and friends, went back. For the Spanish (Sefardic) Jews, too, Wallachia was a major haven. Here, whether with or against their will, they were compelled to stay, because they could not go further northward, knowing the gruesome life awaiting them in Hungary.

The best proof that the majority of the expelled Jews did not leave Wallachia to return to Hungary is the fact that shortly thereafter we find them in Bulgaria, especially in Nicopoli, a city not far from Turnu Magurele (formerly known as Turn). It has been claimed by many historians that this city was built by the Hungarian Jews, which they developed as an important commercial center. A number of these Jews thus left Wallachia and crossed to Bulgaria where they were well treated under Emperor John Shishman and his Jewish mother. Many Jews who were driven out of Wallachia by the tyranny of Vlad Zepesh, (1476), were attracted by the privileged condition of their Bulgarian correligionists and went there.

When Mihai the Brave (1148-20) besieged Nicopoli, the Jews in that city sought refuge in the villages. As soon as peace was restored, they returned and rebuilt the demolished city. In order to raise the necessary funds to rebuild their Synagogue, they dispatched members of their community to call on

Jews in other cities which had not suffered. Other Jews, especially from Germany, came to Roumania and other East European regions, after the beginning of the Turkish invasion of these parts.

Privileges granted by Alexander Voivod of Moldavia and his son, Prince Peter, to "all the people of Brashov," then part of Moldavia, must have included the Jews, since there is no specific limitation mentioned. There were Jews living in Brashov, as in other parts of Moldavia; during the wars in which Moldavia was engaged in the 15th century, many Polish Jews migrated to Moldavia where they were welcome, and where they were granted permission to engage in commercial enterprises, even in the ransoming of prisoners of war.

With the Turkish conquest of the Byzantine empire in 1453, the persecuted Christians, under the Turkish ruler Mohamed II, migrated to other parts of Europe. The Jews filled their places in Bulgaria and in other Balkan regions under Mussulman rule, where they were gladly received; many of them settled in Roumania. Thus, in 1503, we find three Jews, David, Solomon and Jessaiah (Isaiah), carrying on an extensive business between Berlad and Suceava, selling goods to Brashov; and in 1514 we find Solomon Schneyder, of Suceava, suing on a promissory note which he held and tried to collect.

In the 15th century, Polish Jews were doing considerable business with Moldavia. Their commercial interests brought them thither frequently, and many of them, seeing the commercial advantages in Moldavia, moved there. This immigration became

heavier in the 16th century. Commercial treaties between the Moldavian princes and the Kings of Poland and of Hungary, and the Sultan of Turkey, favoring immigration of Jews, increased Jewish influence in Moldavia.

Under Vlad the Chairmender, in Wallachia (1456-62), the Jews did not feel that they were living in a paradise. We learn something of the mental state of this Prince from a document discovered on the island of Crete in 1525 by Elijah Caspali. This document tells of his extortion of <sup>a thousand</sup> ~~1,000~~ pieces of silver from each of a group of Jews engaged in commercial pursuits, who were passing through Wallachia after they had been held prisoners for three days. The Prince treated them with the utmost barbarity for asserting their Turkish citizenship. He took all their goods away so that they might buy them back, and if any of them had no money or goods, he tore out their eyes, cut off their hands, and reduced them to a most pitiable state.

We have already seen that some of the Jewish refugees from various countries found a haven in Moldavia. ~~A good~~ Many others went to Wallachia, where they found old Jewish inhabitants who in all probability encouraged them to make their homes with them. After they were once settled in one part of Wallachia, there was nothing to prevent them or their kin from seeking a haven in Moldavia. The very presence of Jews in some of the villages is proof of the existence of large Jewish communities in the cities. This is the usual process of migration; first, the immigrants settle in some center, and then they spread out in different directions around the cities.

An old document dealing with matters of the Episcopia (Bishopric) of Rimnic shows that the inhabitants had considerable dealings with Jews. Another document, dated 1491, throws considerable light upon the antiquity of the Jews in Moldavia.

In Polish commerce with Turkey, Jews played an important part, and in this manner extended their commercial activities to Moldavia. There they experienced some difficulties under Peter Rareș (1527-46), who made a practice of depriving Turkish Armenian and Jewish exporters of their horses. His actions led Jewish and Polish merchants to complain to their King in Poland that they were being harassed by the Moldavian government in their export of Turkish horses to Poland. At that time Jews were equally active at Cernăuți and in Chilia. This was at a time when Lutherans were being burned alive in Hungary and "aliens who bring foreign money into the country" met a similar fate. It is not surprising to learn that shortly after 1526, at Alba Regala, the Hungarian Diet voted for the expulsion of Jews from all districts. This was, in general, a period when dissenting opinions were punishable by expulsion or death everywhere in Europe, except in the Turkish dominions.

At Vaslui, in 1525, Christian merchants complained to Ștefan IV that the Jews in that city were strongly competing with them. Following this complaint, on September 20, 1525, Ștefan decreed that Jews could enjoy only such rights that had been granted to them by Alexander the Good, but were not to be allowed to conduct butcher shops, bakeries, or taverns.

Another document, emanating from Peter the Lame, dated 1579, speaks of a Council of Boyars and merchants (held on January 8, 1579) which had discussed matters in relation to Polish merchants, for the purpose of expelling Jewish merchants from Moldavia. The decree of expulsion, strangely, reserved to the Jewish merchants of Poland the right to buy cattle from the interior when frontier supplies were inadequate.

Although the Prince presided at this meeting, which was evidently of considerable importance, the decision of the Council did not alter the existing relations between the Prince and the Jews.

The decree was not long enforced. Soon after, commercial relations were re-established, and Jewish merchants again became as active in Moldavia as they had been before complaints were filed against them. We thus find many Polish Jews among the creditors of Iancu the Saxon, successor to Peter.

A decree issued by Moise Movila, on March 23, 1631, was apparently the first to exempt merchants, Jews included, from nearly all levies, which, up to that time, had been rather heavy. Under the reign of this Prince, business was entirely in the hands of aliens.

The early settlement of Jews in Wallachia in the 16th century is attested by the following evidence: (1) An order by the Sublime Porte, addressed to the Jews at Cernavoda, regarding the dethroned prince, Peter Voda, who had returned to Nicopoli without permission. (2) A communication from the Sublime Porte, addressed to the governor of Salonika, concerning

a Jew who had stolen some article belonging to Prince Peter Voda.

(3) A small document, on parchment, consisting of only eight lines, in the nature of an obligation, dated the fourth of Kislev, 5132 (1571).

In the second half of the 16th century, Spanish-Portuguese Jews and Maranos penetrated into Turkey and played an important role there. They brought large capital with them from Spain and the Netherlands, and from the very outset acted as mediators for the Roumanian rulers and other high officials. Eventually they increased in importance, making loans and charging high rates of interest. As a result, the Roumanian princes became closely connected with these Jewish financiers at Constantinople.

Peter Rareș (1525-46), and Mircea Ciubanu (1545-9) were aided by these Jews. In a similar manner, Alexander Lapushneanu was aided by Don Joseph Hanasi, Duke of Naxos, who dreamed of becoming the King of Cyprus. When Joseph complained of the damage done to him by the Venetian hordes, the Sultan offered him Roumania by way of reimbursement.

Peter the Lamé (1575-80, 1584-90) obtained a loan from Moses, the son of Eliezer, which was paid by the city of Galatz. Another loan was made to him by Rabbi Abraham, and it was secured by the country's revenues. For making a similar loan, Doctor Solomon Ashkenazi, a native of Poland, was rewarded with an appointment to high office. Later, Ashkenazi met with great success in Turkey, became the favorite of the Vizier, and held in his hands the diplomatic threads between Turkey and Europe for over a quarter of a century.

Under Peter the Lame (1579), Polish Jews had penetrated into Moldavia and Wallachia to purchase the renowned white oxen which they exported to Danzig and England. They then imported woolens from Poland. Since this resulted to the detriment of the annual fairs held in the country and caused the great Moldavian business houses large losses, the Prince stopped this business of the Jews and did not permit them to enter his domain. Yet foreign Jews came later, in 1590, by way of Jassy, before the Armenians, the Saxons, Hungarians, and Ragusans. The Duke of Maxos then ended the monopoly he held on importing Cretan wine into Moldavia.

The Jews living in Byzantine also had commercial relations with Roumania. Their business brought them thither quite often, and eventually many of them settled in Moldavia and in Bucovina. As a result of their sagacity and commercial ability, they soon gained prominence in the commercial world of Bucovina, and Moldavia.

The settlement and presence of Jews in Roumania in 1588 are established by many contemporaneous documents. In one of these documents, dated July 28, 1588, we read of a declaration of indebtedness given by John Banul and Nicolai Stolnicul to Celebi the Jew, for woolens purchased by them as agents for Peter Voivod. Payment was made in December of that year.

That there were Jews in Roumania who negotiated state loans, may be learned from a letter by Peter Raresch in 1593, in which he tells of a loan he negotiated through Jewish agents.



The Massacres of Jews Under Mihai the Brave and Aron Voda (1593-94).

The Turkish rulers and minor officials treated the Jews with kindness, consideration, and with a tolerance found nowhere else in the 16th century. The Jews repaid this kindness by being devoted and loyal servants of the Turkish overlords. Unfortunately, in forging these links of loyalty to Turkish interests, the Jews not infrequently acted against the interests of their Roumanian neighbors. As in so many other parts of the world where Moslem influence was for a time predominant, in Roumania, too, persecution of the Jews began as Turkish power decreased. Thus, from the end of the 16th century, there is an increasing tale of calumnies and persecutions directed against the Jews of Roumania.

Such cases occurred under Mihai the Brave in Muntenia, (Wallachia) in 1593, and under his contemporary, Prince Aron Voda, in Moldavia, in 1594.

As soon as Mihai ascended the throne in Muntenia, he formed an alliance with Aron Voda of Moldavia and with Sigmund of Transylvania to declare war against Turkey, and thus become independent of the Turkish empire. The first step taken in this direction was a massacre of Turks which took place in Bucharest and Jassy. This served as a declaration of war and led to many fierce battles, which resulted in victory for Mihai.

On November 13, 1593, Voda killed all the Janizaries and took possession of the country. He also killed the Turks who were

in Bucharest illegally, and slaughtered all the Jews who "as is always their habit, acted as traitors to the country."

The historian Elias Schwarzfeld gives the following historical summary of this dark chapter in the history of the Jews in Roumania.

"Ascending the throne of Muntenia, Mihai found the treasury empty. Turkish officials and Janizaries were oppressing the people, and had reduced them to a low state of misery. Probably at first he was not inclined to tyrannize them, but in order to free the country and the people of the debts of the Turks, Jews, and Greeks, and fearing that they might get wind of his plan and run away, or that they might take precautionary measure, he informed them that he wanted to straighten out the accounts and pay them something on account. November 18, 1593, was the day fixed, and they all came to the Treasury Building to meet the treasurer, Dan, where, they had deposited their notes, papers, etc. After the gate had been closed the creditors were surrounded by a number of soldiers and civilians, at the head of whom stood the Prince and a number of Boyars. The cannons were then let loose on the unarmed creditors. The court was set afire from the four corners, and those who tried to escape were met with the sword. About two thousand of them fell victims. Mihai then assembled the people, ordered the burning of the notes and books in the public market, thereby showing that not only did he know how to free the country from debt, but also all others whose debts he had wiped out."

Besides that massacre, Mihai performed other acts of "bravery". A few months later (January, 1594), ~~in~~ crossing the

Danube and defeating the Turks at Rusciuc, he did not forget the Jews. On his return from that spectacular campaign, his army perpetrated another sensational massacre of Jews along their line of march to Bucharest.

Notwithstanding the many cruelties which he had inflicted upon Jews, when it came to negotiating the peace with Turkey in 1599, Mihai had to avail himself of the services of an influential Jew, Gabriel Bonaventure of Constantinople, to conduct the negotiations.

Aron Voda ascended the throne of Moldavia in 1594, about the time when Mihai became ruler of Wallachia. Aron, too, began his reign with a massacre of Turks and Jews, against whom he seems to have been incensed. The massacre of the latter must have been "in gratitude" for the aid which he had received from an influential Jewish physician from Constantinople who, although there were a number of other aspirants, helped him to obtain the throne.

Aron's obtaining of the throne <sup>through</sup> ~~which~~ the influence of the Jews in Turkey in the 16th century <sup>to be</sup> ~~is shown~~ ~~is~~ not an exception. There were many other cases in which Jewish influence accomplished great deeds, especially in behalf of their kin living in other parts of the Turkish dominion. More than one prince in the two principalities owed his throne to the influence of Turkish Jews. This explains why some of the Roumanian princes used Jews as counsellors. Such was later the case with Celebi Mentesh Bally of Constantinople, the Vizier's banker, a man who was very influential in other ways too. Vida Neculai

Mavrocordat invoked his moral and material aid in order to secure the Moldavian throne. In gratitude, Mavrocordat invited him to go with him to Wallachia, and Celebi settled in Bucharest, where he was soon raised to the rank of Grand Councillor (Mare Sfetnic). He was granted many privileges including exemption from taxation for himself and his descendants.

Bally's son and his grandsons were councillors to the Fanariot prince. Similarly, Bally was in great favor with Voda Mavrogheni, to whom he was of great assistance in securing the throne of Wallachia. Mavrogheni renewed to Isaac Bally the privileges granted by Mavrocordat. Abraham Bally, a son of Isaac, was the father of Davicion Bally, who was later very prominent in Roumanian life.

The two principalities were at no time sufficiently populated, and the need for people was felt keenly. Throughout the history of the principalities, from its very beginning to the middle of the 19th century, the landowners were eager to attract settlers from foreign lands to increase the population of the country. That Jews came to the principalities in the 18th and 19th centuries at the special invitation of the Boyar landowners and of the reigning princes, who offered them numerous inducements, is proved in a contract between a Boyar, Constantin Maresh, and a number of Jews regarding the settlement of the latter at Vladeni. This contract involved a tract of land for Jewish merchants who came as a result of advertisements of this sort.

When Prince Etienne Tomsha (1612-16 and 1620-23) desired

to repopulate his desolate country in which villages and towns <sup>had been laid</sup> ~~were laid~~ waste, <sup>the</sup> land bare and uncultivated, and commerce dead, he sent out a circular letter to Polish merchants of whatever nationality, religion or language, inviting them to come and settle in Moldavia and stimulate commerce and trade there. The same reason prompted Grigory J. Calimach to take similar steps with regard to the town of Targul Frumos. He, too, invited foreigners in 1763 to come and settle there, and promised them a six-month exemption from taxation.

In a hrisov (princely decree) of 1768, Calimach speaks of attracting new colonists from abroad, from near and far, "which we hope, with the Help of God to see the fruit of our endeavors, promising signs of which we already see in the coming of several foreign families to settle and live with us in all comfort in this our country."

A decree issued by Alexander Constantin Mavrocordat in September, 1783, emphasized the needs of commerce. The outstanding figures in that field being few when compared with the necessities of the country, the Jews held a place of honor; they were recognized as leaders, and various concessions were granted to them. During the reign of Mihai the Brave, Peter Cercel, and other later princes, commerce was completely in the hands of Greeks, Armenians, and Jews.

A hrisov issued on January 16, 1784, by Alexander Constantin Moruzi was favorable to the Jews under him. Alexander Ghica, on the other hand, did not permit Jews to enter Moldavia, because the Jews of Galicia <sup>had</sup> settled there and competed with the

Moldavians: Jewish artisans worked more cheaply, so they were employed by the Wallachian government as mechanics to work in the monasteries.

In Muntenia Jews were tolerated as a useful commercial element. In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries nearly all the commerce in the two principalities was in their hands, and they extended their commercial activities as far as Germany. Trade in grain and cattle as well as in prunes and nuts in Moldavia was the principal and most productive business of the Jews in the principalities. Long caravans of wagons loaded with these products could be seen moving along the highways toward Poland and Russia. This immense trade was exclusively in the hands of Jews.

Grain export was forbidden while the principalities were under Turkish dominion. As a result, the alcoholic beverage business developed. The grain surplus had to be converted into an export commodity; so the distillers consumed the grain surplus in the production of exportable alcohol and, incidentally, furnished fodder for the cattle. The Roumanian Jews in this trade were the first to establish commercial relations between Roumania and Germany, and other countries in Europe. Thus, they were the first to organize an export system of cereals in Roumania.

Other factors which led to the Jews' being invited to settle in the principalities, besides the sparsity of the population, were the invasions of the Tartars, Poles, Hungarians, Turks, and Cossacks, who devastated the country and depopulated it. When the invasions of

these human marauders had abated, nature's unfriendly elements, locusts, famine, plague, and pestilence, decimated the thinly distributed population. As soon as these physical plagues had subsided moral pestilences came upon the land, such as the Vodas (princes) with their satellites, the boyars and their henchmen, and the local officials, who drained the last drop of blood out of the inhabitants.

The depopulation increased the bareness of the land all the more, because of the lack of laborers. The land lost its value, and the revenue from it was reduced. The monasteries and the boyars constantly faced the problem of bringing back their lost toilers or bringing other workers into the land to take their places. To aid the solution of their problems, they obtained princely decrees which permitted them to import help from abroad; the newcomers were to be exempt from taxation.

Such decrees were issued as early as the 15th century, and their numbers increased in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. These decrees were issued for the benefit of the boyars, of the monasteries, of the patriarchs, and of the episcopacies. Much stress was laid on the fact that the settlers were to come from abroad, no matter of what faith they might be.

Since there were no inducements or attractive prospects for them to settle in the rural districts, Jews were few in number in the villages. Agriculture was not their occupation; hence, they opened inns, held mills, bridges, and distilleries on lease, and engaged in other similar enterprises which were much in demand at

that time, such as roadhouses and landleasing. Many of the Jews were skilled workers, and were greatly in demand by the boyars. Fisheries were taken over by Jews and brought much revenue to the landowners.

Since they were invited by the boyar landowners, and as a result of the favorable inducements offered to them, also encouraged by the government, many Jews were attracted to Moldavia. During the 18th century the number of immigrants grew. They were met in a spirit of hospitality and tolerance with good prospects for the future. No sooner had they arrived, than they engaged in all branches of commerce and industry and various trades. Eventually seeing the progress which the Jews had made, the government made a change in the exemptions which they were enjoying and imposed a tax on them.

As a result of an intense propaganda carried on by the landowners and by the proprietors of the towns, a continuous influx of immigrants was added to the population. Among these newcomers whose diligence increased the value of the products of the soil, were Jews. Agriculture took an unprecedented upswing as the population grew. Fields which had been idle for centuries and had served only for pasture were now plowed. The income of the estates increased rapidly, and everything gained in value. Life was thus instilled into the cities and towns which had, heretofore, been dormant. Barter and trade were carried on with unheard of activity and bustle. Exports increased in volume, and the total of commerce reached a height unknown before. With this progress, the budget of the two principalities also increased beyond their fondest hopes.



Through the intelligent labor and diligence of these ambitious Jewish settlers, all the trades which they had found in a primitive state were now transformed, to the benefit of those towns and cities and the entire country. All the industries established in the two principalities were either directly or indirectly due to the enterprising spirit and capital of the Jewish pioneers. With the stream of invited immigrants there were undoubtedly some uninvited guests who, quite naturally, helped increase the population of the larger cities and small towns. As the two principalities began to develop, a new field opened for commercial activity. This was possible because outside of the farming element, the average Roumanian had no other ambition than to enter government service which was considered a sinecure. In this manner the opportunities were much greater for the newcomers, who readily pursued every avenue of commercial activity; with these considerations, and the assurance that they would be well treated by the landowners and the government, the rush of immigrants to the principalities is not surprising.

As soon as the newcomers had established themselves, their kin abroad felt the urge to follow them to the principalities where they knew they had friends and relatives who would protect and help them, and enable them to escape from their misery at home.

It is highly improbable that in the course of the early centuries great numbers of Jews had come from Turkey to the principalities.

In the former centuries the principalities undoubtedly received a number of Turkish Jews, but these early settlers were the real oriental and so-called "German" Jews who had been in Turkey for

a long time. What is more, their coming to the principalities must have assumed considerable proportions after the arrival of the Spanish Jews who began to establish themselves in Wallachia in the middle of the 18th century.

In 1832, however, Spanish Jews were already sufficiently great in number to entitle them to representation. An ordinance was passed dealing with the Jews in Bucharest. This ordinance provided that every two years "four honest men shall be elected, and they shall attend to the collection of moneys," that "two of them shall be Spanish Jews and two of other backgrounds, each of them to be responsible to the party which he represents." By the middle of the 19th century, however, the Spanish Jews had already organized themselves as a separate community.

That the Jews were quite numerous in Moldavia in the 18th century may be gathered from the action of the Divan of that principality, in 1802, forbidding them to enter the country. After a lapse of twenty-eight years, the government decided to mitigate its restriction to some extent, although the immigration of Jews in that interval had been little affected by the restriction. A little later in 1834, an anti-Jewish current developed. Several complaints were filed with the reigning prince in 1841 and again in 1845. As for the capital, Jassy, the complaint stated that "all the wards and all the streets are full of them."

The most important commercial enterprises were conducted by Greeks, Armenians, Bulgarians, and Jews. The first two did business with traders of their own nationalities in Constantinople. The Jews established credit in banks in Lemberg, Cracow, and Leipzig.

With their coming to Moldavia, and partly because of the development of their commercial activities, Moldavian exports, which prior to 1828 had been zero, reached the sum of 58,536,000 lei in 1839, and 210,000,000 lei in 1855.

Roumanian commerce grew in proportion to the number of towns established by Jews. In 1828, we find twenty-one thriving communities in Moldavia which were founded by Jews; in 1838, forty-two; and in 1859, sixty-three. The same methods were pursued by the boyars in Muntenia (Wallachia), but with this difference: While the latter colonized their lands with Bulgars and Serbs, the former appealed to the Jews in Poland, Bessarabia, and Bucovina, to come and establish themselves and develop the commerce and industry of the country.

Thus, in the populating and even in the founding of many of the cities and towns of Roumania, the Jews played a great part. The princes issued decrees offering every kind of inducement to those who would settle in cities, in towns and in villages and establish new commercial centers. New settlers were given land free in order that they might improve it, cultivate the soil, and build houses in the towns and villages. They were given the right to pasture and haycutting in the prairies surrounding their villages and towns, and of cutting wood in the adjacent forests.

CHAPTER THREERights and Privileges of the Jews

The oldest known document in Moldavia by which Jews were invited to settle there is dated 1612. A proclamation issued by Stephan Tomsha appeals to all the merchants of Lemberg without distinction -- Poles, Ruthemians, Armenians, Jews -- to come and settle in Moldavia and do business there unmolested. He endeavored to encourage the Jews to come by explaining that the anti-Jewish policy of his predecessor, Peter the lame, had been adopted solely for political reasons.

A similar invitation was issued to the merchants of Poland by George Ghica at Jassy, on April 15, 1656.

The Lemberg Jews seem to have been unable to take advantage of this offer. In 1664, they had renewed an agreement with their city authorities by which they bound themselves not to go to Moldavia or to send their representatives there. However, in view of their late experience with the Cossacks (under Bogdan Chmielnicki from 1648 on) it is certain that Jews from other localities in Poland did avail themselves of this offer, and emigrated to Moldavia.

A hrisov which had as its purpose the population of Suceava must have been proclaimed either at the end of the 17th century, or at the beginning of the 18th century. This old town, former capital of Moldavia, was again occupied in 1691 by Jan Sobieski, and about that time it was totally destroyed, ~~and devastated~~. Since Antioch

Cantemir (1705) issued permits to enter, it is probable also that he issued a decree to repopulate Suceava. In fact, there is a later hrisov of 1761, in which mention is made of the new settlers who "With God's Mercy, have succeeded in opening stores and doing business in that manner so that Suceava stands high."

An earlier decree issued by Constantin Mavrocordat in 1742 granted tax exemption to a Polish merchant named Aurana. to encourage him to remain, in order that other traders might follow his example to settle in Roumania. Another decree of July 29th of the same year (1742) directed Radu Val Spatar to permit the Jews, Avram and Boruch, from Hotin District, who had asked for permission to visit the fair at Bacau, "to erect a building on state land, wherever they may choose." Prince Constantin Mavrocordat granted these two Jews many privileges and issued <sup>to</sup> <sup>a</sup> them <sup>a</sup> "carte blanche" exempting them from many obligations.

The first known hrisov designed to encourage settlers is dated July 3, 1763, and was issued by Prince Gregory John Calimach for "Targul Frumos," one of the oldest towns, where once stood the throne of the Prince. Due to some dispute with the monks, which was later decided against them, the town gradually dwindled in population so that "it was considerably reduced." In an attempt to restore the importance of the town, Calimach issued this decree:

"To those who desire to come here from abroad and settle in Targul Frumos, we promise to give ten months from the very first day of their arrival, in which they have to make no payment so that they may be able to arrange for their necessities. At the end of that time, the taxes will be suitably arranged by the local

authorities. But the taxpayers shall not go under the name of strangers."

Similar exemptions were granted to other Jews, including these who established useful industries and men of great enterprise. All these exemptions were designed to attract competition. Thus, a hrisov of 1741 provided "for the leasing in the city of Suceava of properties belonging to the holy Metropolis which the patriarch had leased to the two Jews." In this decree Mavrocordat assured these Jewish leaseholders that they would be protected from annoyance, and exempted from "those five lei of pivnitze (market charges) ... for the supply of oil to the Metropolis (Cathedral)." On February 20, 1759, John Calimach issued a hrisov for the benefit of two Jews who leased the manor of the monastery of Putna, at Seret exempting them from every kind of tax: "nor shall ye citizenry impose (on them) anything in connection with the city."

When, during his second term in office, on March 30, 1768, Grigory Calimach issued a hrisov to Marcu Jidov, of Harlau, to open a glass and a paper factory, he provided, among other things, tax exemption for three Jewish supervisors. Similarly, Alexander Mavrocordat, on May 15, 1786, exempted from tax levies a Jew named Boroh, of the district of Harlau; one Saber, who later bought the glass factory and needed Boroh's help to bring the material and other accessories for the factory from Poland.

Jews in the cities were generally classed as bourgeoisie, a title which they enjoyed in no other country in Europe. Because of this title they were placed on an equal basis with the rest of the population, enjoying the same rights and privileges, and discharging

the same duties. This equality is manifested in a hrisov issued by John Nicolai Mavrocordat on June 22, 1745, and in a decree of Matei Ghica, dated March 12, 1754.

The part played by the Jews in the establishment of the town of Falticeni, formerly known as Sholdanesti, is revealed in a hrisov of 1780. After the return of Bucovina to Moldavia, the successor to Gregory Ghica, who was decapitated, Constantin Moruzi fixed the boundaries between Austria and Moldavia in accordance with the convention of February 13 ~~to~~ 24, 1777. He also fixed the district boundaries in the vicinity of Bucovina, making up the Suceava district by taking patches from the adjacent districts. He made Sholdanesti his capital, and in 1779 granted a charter for the founding of that city.

On July 1, 1780, the owner signed a contract with a group of newcomers in which he agreed that bourgeois who came at that time, as well as those who would come later, should have the right to build houses, stores, inns, distilleries, and the like, provided that they pay to the owner the rent fixed in the contract. The Jews, as bourgeois and as established principals, enjoyed the same right to "maintain separately a house of worship, but not among the Christians; that houses of worship are to be built in no other style than other houses; also that a place be assigned outside the city by the local ispravnic (prefect) and be established as a Jewish cemetery. On establishing a distillery, the land shall remain theirs and their children's forever."

Constantin Moruzi was so enthusiastic over the influx of

Jews into Moldavia that he granted them many privileges. He exempted them from the payment of taxes, and expressed his faith that they would contribute to the commercial development of the country. He also provided that the Jews were not to pay taxes on their realty.

In 1723 mention is made of Jews living in Botoshani. They held houses on lease which were owned by the monks of Monasteri Doamnei. Other Jews were leasees at Suceava (in the 18th century), holding property owned by the Patriach. Still others were engaged in business at Ocna, Harlau, Siret, Galatz, Berlad, and Roman. Turkish Jews were quite active in commerce at Chilia. Jews settled at Neamtz in the 18th century on land owned by the ~~Monastery~~ and conveyed to them to hold in perpetuity. The grantee agreed that "I will never sell the land and will occupy it with my family and my children after me." In 1794 we find a Jewish landlord, named Calman, who owned several houses. Eight years later, in 1802, two Jews concluded a lease which was to run for fifteen years, covering several houses owned by David Goilov, who paid 380 lei in advance. In the same year, 1794, a number of Polish Jews settled in Bucharest,

From the re-annexation of Bucovina, in 1774 down to the end of the reign of Scarlat Calimach, many towns in Moldavia were founded by Jews, such as Mamornitza (in the Dorohoi district) and Moenesti (1781, district of Bacau). The towns of Balti (Balz) and Panzereni, in Bessarabia, were established in the third quarter of the 18th century, under Constantin Moruzi, prior to the annexation of the province of Russia. A decree dated January 12, 1782, issued



by that Prince, authenticates the contract made between the owner of that land and "a number of Jews from abroad" to establish themselves on his land and found a town. This decree was confirmed by Alexander Constantin Mavrocordat; on December 20, 1782; by Alexander John Mavrocordat in 1786; and finally by Alexander Constantin Moruzi on July 24, 1792. Vladeni was established by Jews in 1792. The name was later changed to Targu Nou, and then to Mihaileni. The city of Burdujeni was founded in 1792, under a hrisov issued by Alexander Constantin Moruzi, prince of Moldavia.

A decree dated July 25, 1823, authenticated a contract made by the proprietor of Totosheni, in Carligatura Plasa (county), with regard to Podul Iloaei; it provided that the Jews were to have "two synagogues, two houses for Shochetim (Jewish ritual slaughterers of cattle) near the synagogue, a bath house, and a cemetery outside the city, and not to be harassed <sup>regarding</sup> ~~for~~ the payment of taxes."

The town of Radauti was founded in the early part of the 19th century. Seeing that the newly-founded small towns had increased the revenues of the estates surrounding them, the proprietor of the land, Costache Sandu Sturza, Grand Logofat and Cavalier, obtained a hrisov from Prince Mihai Sturze to recognize the town as a corporation. A number of Jews then developed it. With the increase in business activities, the proprietor entered into a contract with the settlers on May 14, 1845.

In 1818 Mamaloasa (in the district of Pŭtina) was founded. Under John Sandu Sturza many towns and villages were founded by Jews. Some were established under Calimach. One of these was the

town of Sulitza, pursuant to a hrisov issued in 1817. In a similar manner, by decrees issued by Prince Alexander Sturza in 1823, the town of Bucecea was established; and a decree issued by Sherban Negel provided for the establishment of the town of Scobateni. Basing his decision on this hrisov, Negel Vornic, on June 17, 1824, closed a contract with ninety merchants giving them ground to build stores and other structures.

The hrisov for the founding of the town of Bucecea, issued by John Sturza on January 16, 1828, provided: "The settlers, of whatever nationality they may be, shall peaceably enjoy the grant without any annoyance of taxes or the payment thereof for five years." Yet on May 14, 1835, the department of the interior, under the Organic Law, issued an order that no deeds conveying property to Jews were to be confirmed.

The contract entered into between the proprietor of the land and a group of Jews for the establishment of the little town of Frumoshica, provided that they (the Jews) "undertake without fail to establish the town as fast as possible by next spring: open shops by April 1, 1845, according to their means; and do their utmost not to delay the work. On failure to carry out the conditions of the contract, they shall answer to the landowner. The proprietor also agrees that as soon as eighty families will have settled there, he will cause a princely decree to be issued, confirming the conditions of the contract in perpetuity." Similarly, Prince Alexander Mavrocordat granted them land for a synagogue, bath house, and cemetery, tax exempt. He also promised to give them all the timber which they might

need.

Under Mihai Sturza (1834), sixty-two new towns were founded by Jews in Moldavia. So, for instance, the town of Poeni was founded under him in 1837; it was granted the right to hold twelve fairs annually, and weekly markets on Sundays. Provision was made for the payment of taxes to the owner, Alexander Balshunder; but the synagogue, the bath house, and the cemetery were exempted from taxation.

The activities of Prince Sturza were certainly paradoxical. While he saw to it that the vagabond law (to be discussed in a later chapter) was enacted at Jassy to force the return of the many promissory notes kept by Jewish bankers, he founded the town of Vladeni, and in 1835 gave it his name, "Mihaileni." The hrisov which he issued for its founding granted all alien artisans tax exemption for five years.

In 1837 we find Sturza conferring with a delegation representing the town, seven of whose members were Jews appointed by the Jewish community. They discussed with him conditions affecting the owner of the land and the townspeople. A new contract was then entered into in which it was provided that "in the exemption from land taxes is included the great Jewish Hebrah together with the small ones, and the bath house of the Jewish national of Milhaileni." It provided also for supplying the Jews with bread and meat, as well as for their enjoyment of such other rights as they had in common with the rest of the inhabitants of the town.

It is also interesting to note with what eagerness the landowners welcomed the Jewish settlers, and how the towns were built.

To Mamaloasa, for instance, Costache Conaki, the landowner, brought Jews from various parts of Europe. He built for them a synagogue and a bath house, and gave them title to the ground in fee simple. He also gave them, free of charge, land for a cemetery and ground on which to build houses and stores. To some of them he even lent money without interest. The synagogue which he built was quite spacious.

The foregoing proof of encouragement to the Jewish settlers by those in high places does not agree with the theory that "the Jews came to Roumania clandestinely; that they are recent comers who forced themselves illegally upon the Roumanian people." They were certainly no "vagabonds". Furthermore, the vagabond laws were not enacted for the purpose of being applied to Jews who had come there illegally, nor were those laws intended to prevent foreigners from settling in Roumania. The proof is that while the vagabond law was moldering in the statute books, contracts between landowners and prospective Jewish settlers were confirmed by the prince, and hrisoys were issued to that effect. The only purpose for which the vagabond law was enacted was to extort money from the helpless Jews, who were always at the mercy of that government and of local officials. For, had the vagabond law been enacted for its supposed purpose, most certainly Prince Sturza would not have entered into such a transaction, nor would he have granted them new privileges and more concessions.

Sturza was also the owner of the town of Sulitza, and did his utmost to have it populated by Jews. And this, too, at a time when he was continually signing decrees against the influx of Jews from abroad. A fire had destroyed Sulitza, and the inhabitants began

to leave it. Under the laws existing at that time, Sturza should have welcomed this exodus, but, on the contrary, he stopped them from leaving, encouraged them to rebuild their homes, entered into a new contract with them, to run for a period of thirty-five years, and wrote into it conditions still more favorable to them.

Emulating the patriotism of their prince, the boyars forgot that they had voted for the closing of the country's gates to the "Jewish invasion" and vied with one another in attracting Jews to settle in their towns and on their estates, and to increase the population thereon.

In dealing with the ambivalent attitude of Prince Sturza, it should be remembered that the Roumanian nobility had always had a "warm affection" for their peasants and kept them in virtual slavery. Prompted by that "love", they saw the Jews as the greatest enemy of the peasants and recognized the great danger to the country accruing from them.

Thus, we find that in 1844 a bill was introduced prohibiting Jews from doing business in villages, selling liquor or food there, or leasing roadhouses or towns. Prince Sturza, however, was opposed to the enactment of that law and gave reasons which were quite characteristic of the man and his motives. He pointed out the consequences of such a law: (1) most of the towns were inhabited by Jews because the Moldavians found more profit in the plow; (2) if the intended restrictions were enacted, and the Jews were to find themselves deprived of their livelihood, they would move away and the towns would become desolate; (3) this would cause property values to suffer immensely, especially since those towns could not be filled with country people when most of the land was in need of toilers;

(4) the Jews in the towns had contracts with the proprietors for the purchase of liquors, grain, and other products. If they were prohibited from dealing in these products, they would be justified in demanding the annulment of those contracts; (5) the new law would entail many implications affecting cities and towns, would impair commerce, and reduce the government's revenues. He concluded that the proposed law would remain a dead letter, since it would be unenforceable.

The legislators agreed with the prince. Not only did they fail to enact the law or drive the Jews out of the villages, but shortly thereafter about twenty additional towns were established by Jews. In authorizing the establishment of a new town, the prince explained in a hrisov that "the increase of these small towns is unquestionably a means of developing commerce." The last town founded by Cogalniceanu on his manor in Moldavia was Drancenî, known also as Granza. This was done under a decree issued by Alexander John Cuza in 1862.

Since they were so disposed, the boyars of Moldavia could not have found a more desirable element to benefit their land than the experienced Jews engaged in the operation of distilleries and taverns and in many other commercial vocations. With this object in view they were brought to Moldavia at the beginning of the Fanariot regime. As soon as the new settlers began to arrive, the boyars demanded authorization from the prince to found towns and establish commercial and industrial centers. One of the conditions was that the town must be composed of "strangers who must not be from among the inhabitants of other towns or villages, and who are not connected

with any other grant here." In order to lighten the burden of the landowners and assist them in conducting this propaganda in behalf of new settlers to assure their success with the immigrant aliens from abroad, the decree for the founding of towns granted settlers certain privileges. Among these privileges were exemption from taxes and the establishment of fixed market days.

In addition to those Jews who came to the principalities at the solicitation of the government and of the landowners, the opening of the ports on the Black Sea and on the lower Danube to international commerce brought Jewish merchants and traders with capital from abroad. This was in 1829, under the treaty of Andrianopole. Sephardim (Spanish and Portuguese Jews) came from the south, and German-speaking Jews from the north. Russian Jewish refugees came to Moldavia in 1827 in order to escape from military conscription. Finally, the influx of Jews began to be felt in Wallachia, and the government put a stop to it. A number of Jews from Austria began to come to Wallachia from Moldavia, but the Austrian representative, Krenchly, was informed that Jews from Jassy would not be permitted to settle in Bucharest.

Despite the large immigration, no restrictions were enacted exclusively against Jews. When some restrictions were imposed, they affected all Roumanians. Even the building restrictions affecting construction of the synagogues were only echoes of the ancient canonical law. Ghettoes, Jew Badges, and other tokens of discrimination were unknown in the principalities.

After the peace of Adrianople (1829), Jews from Russia settled in the northern part of Moldavia -- in Jassy, Botoshani, and



other cities and towns of the principality. Moldavia at that time, like the other principality of Wallachia, was under Turkish suzerainty. While the two principalities preserved their autonomous life, their close relations with Turkey had great influence over them. The Moldavian Jews, in their dress, were more Oriental than Occidental, and they also preserved their Oriental home life. The study of Hebrew and, to a lesser degree, of the Talmud, engaged their attention, but did not inspire them. What the Moldavian Jew wanted was a quiet, undisturbed life. This caused the Polish Jews to look upon their Moldavian coreligionists as their inferiors; this attitude was so strong that intermarriage between Moldavian and Polish Jewish families was regarded by the latter as undesirable.

In Wallachia, the Jews were divided into two categories, differing in manners, customs, and habits; Polish Jews and Spanish Jews. The latter were also called "Franks", Spaniols, or Spanioli. The term, "Polish Jews" was applied to the Jews who represented the majority and originated from Russia, Poland, Hungary and Germany, and who spoke Yiddish. The Spanish Jews, known also as Turkish Jews, spoke Spanish and Roumanian. Polish Jews in Wallachia also spoke Roumanian well, but not those in Moldavia. The Spanish Jews were, economically, better off than their Polish coreligionists.

In 1822, under Nicolai Mavrocordat I, a constitution was adopted in Moldavia which contained many innovations, some broad in scope, many others rather restricted. Jews were forbidden to hold land, and to conduct taverns on lease in the villages. There were also restrictions with regard to the building of synagogues.



As regards taxes, the Jews paid more than did the rest of the population of the two principalities. However, thanks to Turkish intervention, this Judensteuer (Jewish tax) was abolished toward the end of the Fanariot regime. In 1814, in Wallachia, a hrisov issued by George Caregea provided that "Armenians and Jews are bound by the visteria (treasury) and (their tax assessments) shall be regulated according to station and ability."

In Moldavia, as soon as the Fanariots came to power in the 18th century, taxes were collected even before they were levied. At that time the Jews paid their taxes collectively. The Jews, through their organizations, had to collect the taxes and deposit them in the visteria.

After the peace of Adrianople came the Russian occupation of the principalities (1828-34), with the enactment of the Organic law and its restrictions. Even after the withdrawal of the Russian army (in 1836), Jewish dealers in exchange at Jassy were reduced to ten per cent of their number. Only wealthy men with satisfactory records, and subjects of foreign powers could deal in exchange. The discount rate was also fixed, and severe punishments were provided for any violation thereof.

Under a law passed in 1830, Jews were not allowed to hold vineyards, but it was never enforced. It was renewed in 1843 and Jewish owners of vineyards were ordered to sell them.

A proposed law to tax Jewish guilds on the same basis as other guilds was opposed by Sturza Voda "because, besides government taxes, Jews contribute to their own community needs, to maintain

42

hospitals and aid the poor; they can, therefore, not be compelled to contribute also to guilds to which they do not belong."

In 1833, strict instructions were issued to the police with regard to Jewish "vagabonds". Rigorous means were adopted for the control of passports and identification cards, without which no one could leave his abode or be received as lodger anywhere. Jewish leaders and the Kahal (community) were held responsible for any statement concerning Jews. Every Jew had to show an identification card, which was renewable every year, "because Jews in the principality have no civil rights, except to speculate and pay the taxes imposed."

By a decree of July 24, 1836, Jews were prohibited to do business or work on Sundays and other holidays.

Three years later (1839) the Grand Treasurer of Moldavia became alarmed because of the influx of Jews. He addressed a communication to the Assembly, to the effect that a resolution had been adopted forbidding the entrance of "undesirable" Jews into the country. On March 2, 1843, the Secretary of State directed the department of the interior not to permit Jews to buy vineyards.

With the return of the native princes, the situation of the Jews improved. It was not due to the regime under the Russian protectorate, but perhaps to the campaign for the union of the two principalities, that the Jews found some relief. In 1848 some measures were taken against them, but they found solace when the revolutionary committee included in its program the emancipation of the Jews and political equality for all citizens of all religions. With the exception of the ritual murder accusation at Galatz in 1859,

15

the Jews lived in peace. But after the two principalities united  
and <sup>with</sup> the coming of Carol I to the throne in 1866, the persecution  
of the Jews began. A Jewish question was born; it came up from  
nowhere, as a social and political question. If, now and then,  
religion was injected into it it was done to a very small degree.

CHAPTER IVLater Records of the Jews in Roumania

On November 29, 1594, Marco Venier reported to the Doge the massacre of Turks, Greeks and Jews in Muntenia. Obviously this has reference to the "good work" of Mihai the Brave. For two weeks earlier, on November 13, 1594, we find another version, substantially to the same effect:

" " But the Voivod understood Sinai's and the Tatar's intention, and he obtained the consent of the Wallachians to enter into such a so-called great alliance; and in a certain day he ordered two thousand Janizaries to gather the Turks and the Jews within the border lines of Wallachia to be killed."

Another version of this incident is a little more detailed. Says the writer: "... which Prince Basta took advantage of, to rally his army, also those who found themselves at the Hungarian border, with which force he arrived at Cluj on September 13 th. There he was met by representatives of all classes, from Transylvania, and was received with great honor. On September 16 th he marched with his army against Mihai Voda who, with a force of 18 000, was stationed at a pass, two leagues from Alba Julia, with the intention of cutting to pieces all Vlachs, Serbs and Jews, who had joined the Voivod."

In 1600 we meet the Jews in Cluj, where the Diet invited the new governor, Basta, urging him to come at once. Basta accepted the invitation, and took possession of the city of Cluj and

57

began his regime by ordering all Wallachians, Serbians, and Jews to be beaten.

Again, in Moldavia, the presence of Jews is evidenced in the investigation of the death of a Jew, by the testimony of Joseph, son of Samuel, and Hayim, son-in-law of Isaac ben Solomon, who, on his way to Botoshani, went to Stefanesti on February 26, 1605, where he found the dead body of Hayim lying in a puddle of blood, with a stab wound in his rectum. The dead man was dressed in a coat which the peasants wanted to remove, but they were scared away. They were told that the deceased was a Jew, and that they were not to touch the corpse, because they would have trouble if they did.

At the wedding of Chmielnicki's son, Timoszek, in 1652, we find: "The Kozaks (Cossacks) camped under ... and caused considerable damage to the inhabitants of Jassy, with whom the Jews had hidden themselves. For if they caught one, he had to pay a heavy ransom before he would be set at liberty."

In an account of his travels by Paul D'Aleppo, who travelled from 1650 to 1660 as companion of the Patriarch, Antioch Maccarie, there are the following items in regard to the Jews of those regions which deserve to be quoted. "As for the Jews, the Kozaks enclosed them in towers and tortured them all night to compel them to tell where they held their money. Our heart is filled with bitterness at the sight of so many women and children."

✱ D'Aleppo told also of a Jewish community which he found at Craiova and at Targoviste, also of a converted Jew named Athanasius who boasted of having converted numerous Jews to Christianity.

2

However, when Athanasius was on his deathbed, a certain woman named Fraisa went and fetched the chief of the Jewish community to care for the dying man, a sure sign that there were both a "chief of the Jewish community" and a Jewish community which needed a "chief".

We shall also cite a few instances recorded in the rabbinical responsa, the various volumes of which speak of the presence of Jews in the principalities. There is, for example, the testimony of Joshua ben Jacob regarding his brother, Judah ben Jacob:

"About a year ago, I was in Wallachia with Moses Plasker to buy cattle, and there I met a Jew whom I recognized as being from Cetatea Alba whom I had not seen for fifteen years. I inquired of him about my brother Judah, whether he knew him, etc."

The testimony of Simon bar Jacob indicates the presence of Jews in the city of Soroki. That of Israel ben Solomon reads as follows:

"I went to Orhei, where I made inquiry regarding those assassinations. Several Christians told me that they had been drowned. Others told me that they had been murdered in the woods. Other Christians told us later that without doubt they had been killed. On the head of one of these well-to-do Christians I recognized a kerchief that belonged to Nissen."

The testimony of Isaac ben Mordecai: "I was in the city of Stefanesti, Wallachia (Moldavia), where I met a Jew from Bar, who told me of the murder, and he pointed out to me the murderer who had drowned the two Jews from Priluk. And the said Jew, while he was writing a letter, said: 'If I were the leader of the

Priluk community, I would avenge myself on the murderer!"

The testimony of Mordecai ben Solomon: "I, together with a Welsh (foreign) Jew, was stopping at Jassy, Wallachia (Moldavia), and a Jew named Isaac Glazer came to us. He was a dairyman, making butter and cheese, and he began to tell us that he did not want to stay any longer, that he wanted to go to Haliz (Galatz) to buy licorice, hoping to meet with success. We tried to dissuade him, but he did not want to remain. He took along with him a .... and bandages, and the Welsh Jew gave him a jug of brandy, to start him in the licorice business.

"Shortly after he left, came a rumor that war had broken out in Haliz and he had been drowned. After this, while we were still in Jassy, on a market day, a priest came to the Welsh Jew and spoke of the aforementioned war and about the Lemberg Jew said to have been killed. In this manner I, too, have learned about it. So I asked him to tell it to me in the Wallachian language, and he did.

"The rule in Haliz is that in case of war, this being a great river (port) and there being many ships, they jump into the vessels and move them across to the other side. The Jew also wanted to jump into the ship and held on to the side when a man came and gave him a push so that he fell into the water. But the Jews did not give him his name. They merely said what they heard, how a Jew was lost in that manner." He, therefore, demanded payment either in cash or in goods.

53

T. V. Stefanelli, the Roumanian writer, tells of a deed, executed in 1684 by Michael Dodul and his wife Sofranie, conveying part of a manor and a house at Campulung to their son Miron. The title passed in the house of Mer (Meyer) the Jew, an inn-keeper. The deed was witnessed by nine persons, one of them being Mer.

On May 10, 1768, Jacob Lazar bought a parcel of land from Ion (John) Bedrule, which land had been donated to the Church by one Cliga. The contract was witnessed by Eliezer ben (bemerer) Ichiel Mechel Zelo. The matter was later litigated, and Vornic Nicolai Petrash decided against Lazar the Jew, and the judgment provided that Lazar had to deliver to the Church one oca (a weight or measure of about four pounds) of wax annually.

On marrying off his daughter Catinca to Ianutsa, the painter's son, Theodore Suiul and his wife Varvara gave her the house, orchard, and trees at Campulung, adjacent to the house of David the Jew and Isaac the Jew. The deed is dated October 2, 1769.

On December 24, 1785, Eliezer ben Ichiel Mechel, of Campulung, was sued by his son Mechel, who had embraced Christianity, for his share in his mother's dowry. The action was settled by the father's paying to his son Mechel (now called Gheorghe) the sum of eighty lei, conveying to him a house in Campulung, delivering to him a pair of silver clasps weighing forty-five drams, a gold ring, a fur coat and a jacket. The settlement agreement is dated December 24, 1785, and is signed in Yiddish "Eliezer ben Mearer Ichiel Mechel and Esther bath (daughter of) Joseph." Witness Anton Diac Popovici. Judicial seal of the Suceava District,

5



586

March 14, 1786; Kihler, Captain and Auditor."

Among the taxpayers listed there for the year ending December 29, 1770, we find Avram sin Miva, a Jew, 11 lei; Jacob Perez, 5 lei; Jacob Meral, 20 lei; Jacob the Jew, 12 lei; Jacob Ehram, 8 lei. Among the owners of cattle we find listed Avram sin Mihai, 3 cattle; Jacob Bertzu, 5 cattle; J. Jacob, 2. Additional names of Jews are listed as owners of horses, sheep, and other kinds of animals.

An account rendered on May 25, 1795, by Grigory Gramada, a priest, of expenses which he incurred at the funeral of his uncle, Gramada, shows "one lei paid to David the Jew." This same David was in the service of the Prussian royal consul who, in 1784, complained to Prince Alexander Mavrocordat of Moldavia that his mail, sent through the agency of a Jew, David, was stopped by the Austrian Aga; he demanded that the matter be reported to Constantinople and that the Austrian officials, who denied having received the mail or having seen the Jew, be exposed. In his complaint the consul speaks of the immense export trade carried on by Jews in Wallachia, and asks; "Why can not our fellow citizens do likewise?"

A contract for the sale of land, dated June 5, 1802, and made by Istrate Floce and Itzig Hiligman, was witnessed by seven villagers, among whom was Jacob Zet, a Jew.

On February 16, 1806, Nicolai Zugranu, of Campulung, executed a mortgage to the Jew, Joseph Zet, in the sum of fifteen lei, covering a parcel of land "for the help which he gave me in lending me the money". The mortgage was due and payable at the end of the summer.

571

On January 20, 1820, Stefan Titienii executed an instrument in writing to the Jew, Smil, of Campulung, in the sum of 120 lei, to be paid at Ispas; otherwise, in lieu thereof, Smil was to have the right to take sheep with lambs at five lei per sheep with wool and lamb.

On February 14, 1827, Vasile Drina, Vornic of Campulung, delivered to Smil a promissory note in the sum of thirty lei, payable at Ispas.

In the inventory of the estate of one Dincolo, under Moruzi (1793-96), there was found an act of indebtedness by one Shloim (Solomon) the Jew. It showed that an action had been brought by Dincolo against Shloim. The case was tried and was decided against Shloim, who was directed to pay the amount sued for within sixty days, or go to jail.

An act of 1771 shows an indebtedness by Leib Barnii and Joseph David, sons of Hersheu Isacovici, of Juravna, to Toma Ismandi.

Incidentally, it is to be noted that in every document where a Jewish name appears the designation "Jew" invariably follows. We thus find, on December 5, 1799, a contract made for the loan of 2,400 lei by one Ghinea which "I, Moishe, together with my son Joseph, Jews, from Silistra, have received to be used in our 'Kasch' (sheep cheese) business." The contract was witnessed by Stefan, the priest, and Radu Prizeanu.

In that same month and year Moishe, his son Joseph, and "my son-in-law, Bohor (Boroh), have received 350 lei through Peter

58

Zigamush as surety, to be used in our Kasch business." Only Bohor signed. This latter transaction was later brought to Court. Ghinea claimed two dairies, since the herds were his, and since in the previous year he had given a binder on them in wool, money, cauldrons and watchmen, amounting to 705 lei, stating that "the Kasch is being made with my money." He also stated that notwithstanding the foregoing, the dairy "is now held on lease by Avram the Jew." He therefore demanded payment either in cash or in goods.

A contract, bearing the date of 1727, for the sale of a parcel of real estate at Ploesti, by a Jewish family named Weinberg, showed that it had been in their possession for six generations.

The account of the traveller, Antonio Bortoli, of early 18th century, among other things, says:

"As regards other peoples, of a faith other than the Vlachs and the Latins, there are also many Jewish foreigners. They live in a very favorable state, dealing in spirituous beverages and other goods, by which they earn their daily bread. Besides the Vlach language, they use also the German and the Polish languages. They are not allowed to wear clothes of any other color than black or violet; nor are they allowed to wear yellow or red shoes -- only black."

"... Besides this, he, the Prince, (in 1818) ordered the demolition of the Jewish synagogue, although it stood in an

597

isolated place, giving strict orders not to assemble to hold services anymore."

Describing his voyage, the author tells: "I arrived at Chilia (in 1727), which is situated twenty leagues from Binder, where it falls into the Black Sea. The town is considerably populated by Turks, Jews and Greeks and a few Armenians.

"There, in Silistra (Bulgaria), I embarked on a vessel. This town is much smaller than Rusciuc, but is at least just as much populated, to the same degree as the Turks, Greeks and Jews."

In a letter dated Binder, February, 1713, the author writes: "There, at Caushani, they prepared a place for His Majesty; quarters good and bad for us in the homes of Tartars, Moldavians, and Jews who inhabit the town."

"After this," continues the author, "there was only one thing left for me to do: to provide clothing for the Swedes, who were nearly all naked, except General Spave, who had had the foresight to ship all his belongings to me. In order to help him as well as I could, I sent out word all over the city, especially in the Jewish quarter, to have all those who bought things taken from the prisoners brought to me so that I might buy them back from them."

De Bauer, a historian, wrote in 1778; "True, you find people there (Wallachia) in every trade, but they are of an unhandy kind, and the most ignorant I ever met. The best of them are Armenians or Jews. And for the baser trades, Gypsies are available, because

the Wallachians do not show the slightest inclination to learn something that requires thinking and earnest effort."

Describing conditions prevailing between 1768 and 1774, when the war between Turkey and Russia was ended by the peace at Cuciuc Cainargi, Baron Tot says in his Memoirs:

"The most frightful picture of devastation which the war produced was in northern Moldavia, and the panic of the inhabitants caused by the invasion of only a few detachments, brought about that disaster. Now the Jews, more than any others, had a strong reason for leaving their abodes .... Being near the scene of rebellion, the Jews at Barcov were all the more in haste to leave their dwellings and seek peace wherever they could find it ...

In his memoirs, Count De Hauterive wrote in 1787: "We have to do justice to the Jews; they are moderate; they pay taxes without a murmur; they become rich without haste, and they do not send their savings abroad. They have enhanced the value of several national products. Before they came (to Roumania) rabbit skins were thrown away, but they found them to be the nicest in Europe, and they are now selling in Germany alone over 100,000 skins annually."

In his book describing his journey to Germany in the early 19th Century, Dr. Neale Adam gives the following interesting account: "Cernauti ... The Polish homes are just as unclean, and generally are much smaller than those of the Jews, and they are also as unclean in everything they do. The most important city through which I passed is Dorohoi, like other towns situated on the shores

61"

of a lake. The second is Botoshani, which seemed bigger to us and where we saw a few stores arranged in oriental style. The storekeeper is dressed in Greek fashion, sitting on the window sill, his feet under him, Turkish style, smoking a pipe; and the shouting, or, better said, the yelling of the guests prevented us from closing an eye all night until the dawn of the day, when the drivers arrived to tell us that it was time to leave.

"Nor did we fare any better on the following day. It was on a Friday, at 6 P. M., that our Jewish postillion stopped in a small town, called Malla Gast, and neither our pleading nor threats nor promises could make him continue the journey. All we could secure was to have them try to get us a few Moldavian peasants to take us to Jassy. But every effort remained useless, and we had to decide on patience. The tavern where we stopped was, as usual, kept by a Jew, and the sons of the circumcised had to put out the lights, propped up a candelabrum with seven lights, and chanted : 'On the shores of Babylon....' in the tongue in which the King Prophet had written the song."

"There (in Moldavia) are many Jews. They dress in the Turkish style, and are engaged in business."

"Only boyars have the right to wear berats (a headgear), and only those of the first class have the right, of which they are very jealous. But the clergy and Jews are permitted to enjoy this privilege."

"After Galatz and Roman, Botoshani is the foremost city in Moldavia. It has over 1,000 buildings (in 1818). It is situated on an elevation --- therefore it is healthful."

11

"Commerce is carried on mostly by Armenians and Jews, who extend it as far as Leipzig and Brody. They deal mostly in canned goods, Saxon manufactured products, Russian furs, wax and tobacco, and do an extensive business."

In his book describing the journey of the Russian Imperial Embassy (1803), Heinrich von Reimers states; "Kishinau (Kishinev) is a small, insignificant place, situated on the river Buc.

Moldavians, Jews, and Greeks are the inhabitants of the towns.

While in Moldavia and in Wallachia Turks are not allowed to live; this is the reason why Mosques are not to be seen in these provinces."

"All commerce," says La Jeune, "and the small industries of utmost necessity (in Moldavia and in Wallachia) are in the hands of aliens. Foremost among them are Greeks, from Albania or Macedonia; after them come a few Vlachs, from Transylvania; then Armenians and Jews from Galicia."

"... Greeks established at Jassy or at Vienna buy as much as 50,000 oca of wax, while the Jews of Brody buy 200,000 rabbit skins which, for the last few years, have been sold at fifty piasters per 100."

"In Wallachia, there are a few monasteries of Franciscan monks who are attached to the Bishopric of Nicopoli, Bulgaria. There are also Lutheran Churches and Synagogues.

"The Jews, being in great numbers, must have obtained permission to erect Synagogues in many parts."

That Jews are quite numerous in Wallachia in the 18th century may be learned from Thomas Thornton, who states in his work:

" ... All other sects and religions are equally tolerated. The



Lutherans in Bucharest have a church, and the Jews have a great number of synagogues in both provinces."

That Jews lived in Bucharest and had their communal institutions is also evidenced by the Hebrew inscription discovered on a stone during the alteration of the church known as "Biserica Doamnei," in Strada Doamnei, known also as "Strada Maurice Blank," in Bucharest. This stone bearing the date of 1721, reads as follows:

"Here rests Mar Joseph, son of Mosheh; died on the fourth day of the month of Iyar, in the year 481, (1721 C.E.) according to the minor cycle. May his soul be bound up in the bond of life."

"The presence of Jews in Moldavia," says Alfred Melon, French Consul in Germany, "goes back to a very early date. The oldest available document makes mention of Jews in Jassy as already constituting a considerable-sized community in 1763."

They began to increase in Moldavia in the 18th century. The partition of Poland contributed considerably to that increase. The former privileges of the nobility having been withdrawn, it was only natural that those Jews should seek other parts outside of Poland to better themselves. Moldavia was the nearest and most attractive at that time, especially since the Moldavian landowners held out tempting inducements to them to settle on their lands.

Describing the town of Kilia, in Bessarabia, Dimitre Cantemir tells of Jews living there, and wonders how so narrow a country



could harbor so many nationalities --- Greeks, Albanians, Serbs, Bulgars, Poles, Kozaks, Russians, Hungarians, Germans, Armenians, Jews, and fecund Gypsies. "Jews," says Cantemir, "are considered subjects of the country, and are obliged to pay higher taxes than the rest. The only occupation they have is commerce and they keep taverns mostly. They may erect synagogues, but they must be frame - not stone..... Those engaged in business are ..... Turks, Jews, Armenians, and Greeks." Also, in describing the hospitality of the monasteries and hospitals, he speaks of Jews and Turks as being accommodated there.

Jassy in the eighteen forties had a Jewish population of 30,000, many of whom were refugees who had been legally admitted into the country. They were poor, and struggled for their existence. Of Jassy Neigebaur relates: "Statistical figures of the Jassy population are as uncertain as those of Bucharest. And if we speak of 70,000 inhabitants, there is a difference of about 10,000. If we accept the figure of 30,000 Jews in the midst of that population, we come nearer to the truth. For we find in the streets at least one Christian to five Jews, because the most of the not very poor do not walk, and use carriages. Then there are many, but small synagogues."

In the old cemetery at Jassy there are tombstones bearing inscriptions dated 227 (1467), 297 (1537) and 344 (1584). Twelve mausoleums have inscriptions of names of rabbis.

Neigebaur describes Botoshani as follows:

"Botoshani is located in upper Moldavia, and does considerable business. It is built without order, and among the 25,000

65

inhabitants there are many Jews and Armenians; the latter have a church and a school of their own."

Jews have lived in Botoshani for nearly <sup>four hundred</sup> 400 years. That the Jews suffered there during the turbulent periods of wars between the Turks, Tatars and Moldavians may be gathered from an inscription on one of the graves in the old Jewish cemetery, which tells of the killing of the martyr Aziel ben Joseph and of Rabbi Joseph ben Samuel and Rabbi Jehudah ben Mordecai on the 7th of Eulul, 479 (1719).

The Kahal (Jewish community) of Neamtz is in possession of two Pinkeses (communal record books). One of them is that of the Society Gemiluth Hasadim. Its title page, written in Hebrew, reads in translation thus: "Pinkes of the Brotherhood of Benevolence of the city of Neamtz." On the same page, under the title, there is the following in type letters: "This sacred and pure book is the property of the Society Gemiluth Hasadim of the City of Neamtz."

The book consists of two parts: one for the living, containing the rules and the by-laws of the society; the other, called the "Book of the Dead," is a record of those who had passed away in the community. The first entry was made in the year 1776. The second Pinkes, dated 1753, is similar to the first in its make up.

In his two histories of the Jews in Roumania, the Roumanian Jewish historian Jacob Psanter gives additional evidence of Jewish antiquity in Roumania. In the Jewish cemetery at Rimnic Sarat there is a stone bearing the date 1662. At Foschani there is an old cemetery which has not been used since 1689. There was

66

a monument which remained standing up to 1858, but now has been removed; on that spot stands the building of the Court of Appeals. A grave-stone in the Jewish cemetery at Bacau dates back to 1703. In the Jewish cemetery at Piatra are grave-stones bearing the dates of 1677 and 1689, respectively.

The march of time on the one hand, and unchecked vandalism on the other, have removed more than one Jewish cemetery, so that no trace can be found of them. Most of the existing cemeteries have been despoiled of many of their grave-stones; many other grave-stones have sunk underneath the surface of the ground, and their dates cannot be deciphered. In the Sephardic cemetery of Strada Sevastopole in Bucharest the author found many such monuments with inscriptions which are indecipherable except for the dates on some of them. In Jassy some of these stones bear the dates of 1467, 1548, and similar early dates; some in Botoshani bear the date of 1560, and in Neamtz those of 1677, 1699, and the like.

Chapter ~~IX~~ V

Early Occupations of Roumanian Jews

There were no restrictions against the Jews in the principalities until the <sup>19th</sup> ~~nineteenth~~ century. Commerce was free. Strangers who sought to establish themselves there were welcome. It did not matter whether they remained foreign subjects, or abjured their allegiance to the foreign governments in order to become Roumanian subjects.

The Jews occupied an exceptionally favorable position in Turkey in the 15th and 16th centuries, and they had great influence in Constantinople. This influence extended everywhere, and apparently continued down to the middle of the 19th century. The Zultans, as we know, were the masters of the destinies of the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia throughout these centuries, and the princes as well as the boyars were in need of court influence. This they would always find in the Jews, who were attached to the Zultan's palace. Princes who used such influence included Alexander Constantin Mavrocordat and Caragea in Wallachia.

If money was the key to open every door to influence, then the hardest task of the princes and the boyars was to get that key. They found it in the possession of the Jews. The Jews of the principalities had business connections with Turkish Jews; their relatives, friends, and commercial houses in Turkey were in a position to provide the princely candidate with financial means, and they procured the loans wanted. To show his

recognition and appreciation, the successful prince would open every door to his Jewish benefactor at home. Among these benefactors were many Jewish bankers. One of them was Celebi Mentesh Bally, the banker of the Turkish vizier, by whom he was held in high favor. With the aid of Bally, Constantin Mavrocordat ascended the throne in Wallachia. As soon as he secured the appointment to the throne, the prince took Bally along with him to Bucharest, where he accorded him many favors, privileges, and exemptions; later, he raised him to the rank of "Sfetnic" (counsellor). Bally's son and his nephew Isaac Bally continued to enjoy these privileges through the renewal of hrisovs; they also continued in the high rank of "confidential Sfetnic" to the succeeding Fanariot princes (a group of Greeks originating in a certain section of Stamboul, or Constantinople, known as Fanar). Isaac Bally also enjoyed the special favor of Prince Nicolai Mavrocordat, because it was through Isaac's intervention that he succeeded to the throne.

From 1839 to 1848 Davicion Bally held the office of treasurer of the Agie (prefecture) of Bucharest.

Grigory Ghica of Wallachia, in a hrisov issued in 1827, accorded privileges to the brothers Hillel and Isaac Manoah, of Bucharest, "because it was found that they served the principalities with devotion, showing themselves assiduous in every case entrusted to them."

Jews were eligible for public office, and sometimes successful in elections. Thus, in 1848, Hillel Manoah was elected alderman in Bucharest. In Moldavia, Solomon Pascal was president

of the Ephory (magistracy) and fire chief at Vaslui for eleven years (1839-1851). Michael Daniel and Wexler, of Jassy, were raised to the rank of Boeri (nobles).

The Jews in Moldavia were treated as a useful and commercial element. They were engaged in commerce as early as the 15th and 16th centuries when they extended their commercial relations as far as Germany, and imported woolens, silks, and other goods. Some of them were engaged in banking, finance, the operation of distilleries, and in other occupations; others followed the liquor trade. They were able to speak several languages and dealt with various nationalities. The trades were exclusively in Jewish hands because, according to contemporary writers, the Roumanians were unfit to engage in any vocation requiring skill, care, and diligence.

As cattle-dealers, they developed their activities on a large scale as early as the 16th century, and extended their exports to Constantinople and Poland.

Numerous official documents in existence show that Jews were among the foremost merchants in Moldavia, and that their number was rather large.

Compared with the Jews in other countries, those in Moldavia engaged in every trade. According to statistics, there were among the Jews: watchmakers, kettle-makers, furriers, tobacco spinners, operators of coffee houses, bootmakers, hawkers, glaziers, butchers, painters, and bricklayers.

The Roumanian boyars, like the nobles of Poland, had the sole right to deal in wine, so they had to call on Jews to open

taverns and inns to sell their wines.

After the Russo-Turkish War of 1769-74, when Bucovina was annexed to Austria, the number of Jewish inhabitants in Moldavia was small. In Seret they numbered 4,000. They were engaged in the conduct of taverns and distilleries, and in the leasing of estates. In 1783, about 100 of them were artisans.

In agriculture, there were 170 Jews engaged as lessees of manors; sixty-five of these held one-tenth of the manors on lease. A law enacted by Grigory Ghica in 1747, prohibiting Jews to hold land on lease, remained a dead letter during his rule. It was against the interest of the nobility, who used to spend their time and money abroad, and left their estates to be managed by others. Finding the Jews better administrators of their estates, the nobility ignored the princely restrictions.

Jews were almost the sole buyers of peasant agricultural products. In their eagerness to buy, the Jews would go to the villages, meet the peasants in their homes, and, as there were no railroad facilities, spared the peasants the trouble of having to carry their products to town. In this manner, the peasants earned money by transporting the products sold to the Jews. In addition, the peasants benefited by purchasing goods in the Jewish-owned stores.

Unlike the modern method of taxation, taxes at that time were assessed in accordance with one's confession of religion. There were three kinds of taxes: (1) those paid to the Sublime Porte of Turkey; (2) those paid to the vizier; (3) those paid

to the Han (Tartar prince). The Jews, of course, paid these taxes the same as the rest of the population. Since only autochthons were subject to taxation, it is obvious that the Jewish taxpayers were classed as autochthons.

In 1798, the Jews in Moldavia were keen competitors in every sphere of human endeavor. They imported woolens and other goods, and furnished carpets to the prince and other members of the nobility. Jewish dressmakers furnished outfits for boyar-brides. Jewish merchants imported jewelry from Vienna; glass from Bohemia and Bucovina; pottery, silks, yarns, and lace from Silesia; refined sugar, mirrors, furniture, and woolens from Fiume; woolens and cotton goods from Germany; canned goods from Hamburg; fine stuffs, mercury, lead, tinware, steel, and hardware from Danzig; watches and clocks from Nuremberg; goldware, jewelry, and muslin from England; furs and alcohol from Russia; skins, braids, furs, and alcohol from Poland; Oriental goods, crystal, and paper from Venice.

Roumanian commerce at that time was limited to vegetables, fruit, fish, salt, coarse cloaks (Sumani), linen, iron, tin, clay, pottery, wooden vessels, wax, honey, cattle, and (later) fox skins and rabbit skins -- a branch of commerce developed by Jews. At the beginning of the 19th century, the entire commerce of Bucharest was in the hands of Greek and Jewish merchants. The Germans (Austrians) were engaged in manufacturing. In Moldavia, there was hardly a village which did not produce some kind of German (Austrian) industrial products.

Grain and cattle, in the course of the centuries, came to be the principal productive businesses in which Jews were



engaged. They exported cattle and imported all kinds of goods, especially dry goods. The prune and nut business in Moldavia was carried on by them for hundreds of years. Even as late as 1832, long caravans loaded with these products were seen on the highways moving in an unbroken chain toward Poland and Russia. This immense business was exclusively in Jewish hands, and it was there that most of the Jewish capitalists of today got their start.

The entire first half of the 19th century found the principal business of Moldavia in the hands of Jews. They were numerous in the Moldavian markets. The Christian merchants, in a petition to the prince in 1843, complained that the "Jews control everything." "In Jassy<sup>n</sup>, the petition stated, "they speculate in large stocks of goods, and it can be easily seen that in all the stores of the city, numbering more than 1,000, there are hardly seen fifteen Christians. As to the side streets, out in the wards which are densely populated by the poorer classes, one sees only Jews. They deal in everything, and on the Sabbath day, when the stores are closed, no forewood can be had." This state of affairs, which prevailed in Moldavia at that time, existed in all the cities of the principalities. At Roman, says the Roumanian author Negruzi, the stores and all the goods for sale were in the hands of Jews. Many Jews made their living by peddling from village to village; these peddlers were indigenous Jews and foreign peddlers.

Despite all the occupations in which Jews were engaged

prior to the 19th century, money lending would appear to have been foreign to them at that period. In foreclosures of mortgages, under which properties were sold, we rarely find Jews figuring as plaintiffs, although they did as borrowers.

Gradually, Jews, too, began to lend money. In 1832, there were more than fifteen Jewish money lenders in Moldavia, foremost among whom was Srul Focschaneanu. In the course of time, this business of lending money came to be exclusively in the hands of Jews.

This business of money lending merits a more detailed treatment in view of its importance. It was never a monopoly exclusively of <sup>the</sup> Jews, in the principalities. Up to the middle of the 19th century, Greeks and Turks were the principal money lenders. While it is true that there were some Jewish money lenders in the principalities, it is also evident that they were not the leaders in that field.

Thus money lending was a business rather alien to the Jews in Roumania. There were other and more profitable affairs in which they were interested. Furthermore, due to the very simple life of the Roumanian people, money was not so much in demand. As a matter of fact, nowhere else in Europe did the Jews engage in usury (the lending of money at illegal rates of interest), until they were driven to it by force of circumstances, in medieval times, after they had begun to feel that their lives and property were unsafe. Since these conditions did not exist in the principalities, they invested their money in legitimate business enterprises.

Only after Russian influence began to be felt, after the nobility and the bourgeoisie had learned to emulate Russian habits of idling and gambling, did money lending become profitable to Jews in the principalities. Card-playing became a passion which attracted many. The nobles, their ladies, and large numbers of businessmen would gamble away all their wealth on the wheel of chance. When they found themselves pinched for funds, they fell back on their Jewish broker or businessman and borrowed money and paid liberally for the accommodation. Finding this new venture profitable, Jewish businessmen gradually withdrew their capital from their businesses and by degrees developed what eventually became banking. Their established credit attracted capital which was lying idle and caused it to circulate in the country. Thus an army of brokers and intermediaries sprang up, and with the growth of agriculture and the development of commerce, their number grew in proportion.

In the 18th century, a heavy stream of immigration poured into Moldavia from Poland, Galicia, Russia, Turkey, and other countries. They were driven to migrate to Roumania by adverse conditions in their own countries, and by the economic advantages which Roumania offered. The government was eager to increase the population of the land through immigration and attracted strangers from many lands. The desire of the monasteries and great landowners to increase the value of their land holdings and their revenue led to the founding of villages and small towns. They granted special privileges and exemptions to immigrants who were willing to settle there. In a period of

about one hundred years, up to 1859, the number of immigrant Jews did not exceed 50,000, or about 30 per cent of the entire Jewish population in Moldavia.

The permanent increase of the Jewish population in Moldavia may be learned from the fact that in 1812 the Jewish tax was increased from 16,000 to 28,000 lei.

Similarly, an official document of the year 1838 speaks of the Jews as being active in all trades and businesses. There were no skilled artisans among <sup>the</sup> Roumanians. As a result, Jews found an opportunity to fill many of the vacant positions.

Toward the end of the 18th century, the Jewish element gained the upper hand in the commerce of the country. By that time the non-Jewish merchants whose businesses had passed from generation to generation were considered indigenious, and had succeeded in being elevated to the status of a privileged class. Recognized as boyars, they became active in political life and obtained governmental offices which they found more profitable than business.

Greeks, Jews, and Italians were engaged in the leech business. Before long, the Moldavian Jews learned to raise marshy leeches themselves, and, with little capital, succeeded in developing an expert business. The new immigration had increased the Jewish village population of Roumania. Jews could hold land on lease in Moldavia. After 1804 they were forbidden to hold land under lease because the law would not tolerate Christians as servants to Jews. Later this law was abolished. In 1817, a princely decree forbade Jews to buy land in rural districts,

although they were permitted to own land in the towns. Under the Organic Law, no Jew could hold monastery lands under lease. However, by a princely decree issued in 1864, the restriction was removed.

The leasing of estates as a business, especially in Moldavia, had been going on for a long time, and was never denied to Jews. The boyars, as we know, did not manage their estates themselves, but lived on the income. Under the Fanariots, the Jews saw the inviting opportunities in land-leasing held exclusively by Greeks. The boyars welcomed the new competitors, particularly because they offered to pay higher rentals.

In 1804, Jews were forbidden to hold manors on lease; this prohibition came as a result of Greek instigation. The Jews resented it because they did not want to lose a good business, and the boyar landowners ignored it because it caused a loss of value to their property. In 1830, under the Russian occupation, General Kisseleff renewed this prohibition, but it was ignored, and had to be renewed again in 1835.

Jews could own vineyards in perpetuity. In 1843, they were deprived of these rights, but the prohibition was not enforced.

In 1806, Jewish lessees were officially recognized; they were designated as "Jidovii Orindari de Prin Sate" (Jewish village lessees), and had to pay their taxes together with the urban taxpayers. At Odobesti, the famous wine-producing region of Roumania, Jews owned many vineyards.

For a long period Jews were forbidden to live in villages. Expulsion of Jews from villages took place in 1764, 1774, 1778, and 1782.

Under Turkish dominion, grain export was stopped, and consequently the business in alcoholic beverages developed extensively. The grain had to be converted into exportable commodities, principally cattle. The distilleries then consumed the grain surplus and furnished fodder for the cattle. The greater production of alcoholic beverages resulted in an increase of taverns. Jews entered the flourishing new business, and the landowners compelled their underlings to consume a certain amount of alcohol annually. The boyars always had a monopoly on the taverns; they built distilleries, joined them with the taverns, and placed them in the hands of Galician Jews brought in especially for that purpose. Gradually this business became the largest source of revenue in the country. As distilling was a good business, many Jews were attracted to it. More than half of the land in the city of Neamtz, which was owned by the local monastery, had distilleries managed by Jews.

Besides those engaged in commerce, many Jews were skilled artisans. Jewish artisans, like the Armenians, were not permitted to join Roumanian guilds. The members of these guilds were forbidden even to sell products made by Jewish and Armenian workers. The by-laws of the shoemakers' guild at Jassy (1767) contained this provision: "No artisan shall have the right to sell Jewish or Armenian-made footwear. If one should be discovered, he will be reprimanded and punished." It became necessary, therefore, for the Jews to organize their own guilds for self-preservation. The earliest record of such an organization dates from the year 1776 in Jassy. In 1794, there was a Jewish Workingmen's guild at Roman, known as Poale Zedek.

The Pinkas of the Tailors' Synagogue of Jassy, in the year 1800, tells of the existence of a joint guild of Jewish carpenters and tailors, prior to that date.

Every guild or society had to pay a tax to the Aga (prefect). Nevertheless, these societies, both Christian and Jewish, increased in number. Under the terms of a decree of Grigory Ghica, issued in 1776, all the societies, with the exception of those of Chricibasha, Taraibasha, and Buingi Basha, had Jews and Armenians as provosts. The Aga, under that decree, could name all other provosts, and exempt them from taxes. This decree permitted Jewish artisans' guilds in Moldavia to continue undisturbed.

In Wallachia, the situation was similar to that prevailing in Moldavia. Jews were very numerous in the clothing trade. In 1800, they organized a guild of their own. Jews were also engaged in other trades. The Pinkas of the tailors' society of Jassy, dating from the year 1800, shows that in the middle of the 18th century, the capmakers' guild had united with them. The capmakers were quite prosperous, and were well-regarded in the community.

The Jewish businessmen were members of commercial guilds. However, there was one line of demarcation between indigenous and alien merchants. Beginning with the 18th century, some changes were made in their privileges. The Jews were required to register, and had to pay a small tax.

Controversies between merchants were, in general, heard by the Staroste, but Jewish litigants submitted their complaints to the rabbi or to the Hahambasha. When cases involved disputes

between Jews and Christians, the matter had to be submitted to the Staroste or the Board of the commercial guild. Appeals could be taken to the Vel Camarash. Alien merchants residing in Roumania constituted a separate guild. In Moldavia, cases would originate with the Hahambasha, the rabbi, or at the Beth Din (Jewish tribunal), as well as with the Staroste of the guild. The same system prevailed among Christians in Moldavia, who brought their actions to the Staroste, to the Protopop (archpriest), or to the Vladica (bishop).

When, in the second half of the 17th century, the merchants in Moldavia organized themselves into guilds, they obtained many privileges for themselves, and also many restrictions against strangers. Under a decree of Prince Mavocordat, issued in September, 1783, a stranger was required to obtain permission from the commercial provost to open a store. He could sell no goods but those authorized. But such limitations could not be enforced at Jassy. In November, 1783, a princely decree provided that it "cannot be enforced because numerous strange merchants have intermingled with the indigenous merchants."

The guilds of alien merchants, Armenian and Jewish, created in 1776 by Grigory Ghica, prince of Moldavia, were under the jurisdiction of the Vel Camarash. These guilds were religious organizations and controlled the spiritual heads of Christians and Jews.

Rabbi Joshua Heshel of Opta (Opatov), Jassy, in certifying the Tailors' guild in 1800, writes as follows:

"Seeing the constitution and by-laws adopted by the tailors' guild of Jassy, built on truth and justice, I, therefore,



come to certify to them, thus granting them authority and power to enable them to function. No member of this guild shall, therefore, dare to change anything written in this Pinkas (record). The honorable heads, the elite, and leaders of the thousands of Jews, and the honorable rabbis sitting in judgment -- the local rabbinate as well -- are in duty bound to lend strength and vigor to the above-mentioned by-laws."

The ~~ub~~ubiquitous consulate was a great detriment to the life and activities of the guilds. In order to escape the arbitrary power of the Staroste, or even that of the government or the rabbi, the Jewish artisan would place himself under the protection of the consulate, not wishing to recognize any other authority. Christian artisans resorted to similar means. However, their guilds eventually disappeared, the Jewish guilds lost their basic characteristics, and continued to exist primarily as fraternal organizations.

Jews supplied the churches with wax candles. However, their Christian competitors in time saw to it that they lost their trade. The latter denounced the Jews to the Patriarch Venjamin, in 1826, declaring that they were adulterating the wax with unclean matter, as a result of which the holy church was desecrated. John Sturza then forbade Jews: (a) to manufacture yellow wax candles in Jassy, possibly also in the province. The pretext was a religious one, raised by the Patriarch on the complaint of the Christian merchants; (b) to bake bread, and to engage in pharmacy. In 1862, however, the latter restriction was removed.

In 1818, the clergy in Muntenia complained to the Patriarch and asked that measures be taken against the Jews

similar to those taken in Moldavia in 1804, forbidding to them the employment of Christian servants. In 1813, the clergy had made a similar complaint, but it appears that no action was taken.

Similarly, on complaint of Christian merchants, Sturza, in 1828, asked the Sublime Porte to forbid Sulits (foreign subjects), mostly Jews, to own or hold shops and dwellings on lease. Armenians, Greeks, and Jews, at that time, had considerable capital invested in Moldavia, since they were the most active in the commercial field. One of these Jews, a man named Israel, held a large manor on lease from an Armenian widow.

It has been proven that commerce and the trades were in the hands of foreigners. After the enactment of the Organic Law, with the awakening of national sentiment, Roumanian patriots attempted to induce their fellow citizens to learn trades. Trade schools were established at Jassy for Roumanians only.

Although the Organic Law restricted Jews in many endeavors of economic life, they managed to evade or slip through these restrictions. In 1843, out of a thousand shops in Jassy, only three were owned by Jews. In Botoshani, the Jews penetrated every trade and business. In Berlad, in 1820, there were only about ten Jewish houses against thousands owned by Christians; However, by 1840, Jews consisted of the majority of people engaged in business.

The law of August 31, 1864, forbade "non-Christian aliens" to hold land. Jews were also excluded from bidding at auctions. In 1872, they were forbidden to deal with tobacco products.

Jews were forbidden to lease distilleries. However, they were compelled to start pioneering work in new industrial enterprises. A glass factory was established by Jews as early as the 18th century. At the end of that century, David Leib of Botoshani had a large glass factory at Comanesti, which existed until 1829. A Jewish fur cap factory was opened in Jassy in 1797, and a shoe factory in 1809. The government facilitated Jewish enterprises in every way. A decree of 1768, issued by Prince Grigory John Calimach, authorized Hershel Marcovici of Harlau to open two factories in the vicinity of that city.

The first match factories in Roumania were established by Samuel Goldenthal at Jassy and by Adolph Stern and Gerkez in Bucharest.

The first woolen factory was opened and operated by Abraham Lippe Juster, at Piatra-Neamtz.

The sugar factories at Suceava and Soscut were founded by the Roumanian Jewish philanthropist, Elias.

The export of saltpeter from the land was also originated by Roumanian Jews. Srul Veniminovici had a large saltpeter plant, and the Council encouraged him by granting him 150 stinjin of firewood.

The Roumanian merchant marine was developed by Mendel Brothers of Galatz and Braila, the largest shipowners in Roumania.

L. Mendel and Company of Galatz developed a large export and marine business.

Petroleum was discovered at Bacau and Moinesti in 1780.

In 1854, a Jewish workingman from Galatz discovered a process for distilling petroleum and founded this industry. In

1857, two Jews bought a tract of land at Tetscani, and after discovering petroleum on it, established a small refinery, and gradually developed the petroleum industry in the country.

Another Jewish pioneer in that field exported petroleum from Roumania to Russia, and introduced the first gas lamps. Petroleum exports were increasing and the Roumanian Jews extended the export to Vienna. In 1859, Wolf Lazarovici, of Moenesti, established a petroleum refinery, which greatly increased the export of that natural product of Roumania.

The first exporter of Roumanian petroleum on a large scale was Joseph Teiler. He introduced the American sounding system at Moenesti, Solontsi, and Tetscani, and extracted paraffin from petroleum. Later, he established a large paraffin factory at Valea Ariuitor. When Austria attempted to cut off Roumanian export by imposing a heavy tax on petroleum in 1873, Teiler succeeded in defeating the attempt. He opened refineries at the Austrian boundary line, whither he brought the raw material, from where it was easily transported and sold in Vienna. He was also the first to introduce the pipeline system for the transportation of oil directly to Constanza.

Prior to 1828, there was no oil industry in Roumania; in that year, Hayim Cozak became the owner of 250 gallons of tar. By 1832, the Jewish petroleum export from Roumania amounted to 69,813 lei. In 1846, Nuchem Chors constructed a refinery at Lucacesti, in the Bacau district. Ten years later (1856), the export of petroleum by Jews had been considerably developed. In the following year, Avram Meyer built an extremely large refinery. In 1860, Hayim Mogirescu built another one; in 1862,

84

S. Nadler, and in 1865, Avram Hayimson, established new refineries. New machinery was installed for driving wells. In this way, the petroleum industry and the export of its products were greatly developed. The oil production in Roumania amounted to over 2,000 carloads a day, with over 35,000 persons engaged in it.

The founder of the largest petroleum industry in Roumania, the Steaua Romana, was one Kirshenbaum. Jacques Elias was the founder of the Columbia Company. Another large petroleum company, Aurora, was founded by Zentler, a Jew.

18

CHAPTER VI

THE ROUMANIAN CODES AND THEIR RELATIONS TO THE JEWS

Codified laws were unknown in Roumania until the 19th century. There was a " common law " system which was recognized by the courts.

Nevertheless, there were some codes which were more or less in force. The people were often confronted with two kinds of laws: ( 1 ) the common law: and ( 2 ) the code of Alexander the Good. However, since many historians hold that Alexander the Good never created a code, we shall assume that the first real codes adopted in Wallachia and Moldavia were those of Matei Bararab and Vasile Lupu, respectively. These were written in the spirit of the Church. The code of Vasile Lupu had similar assertions; it exempted Jewish physicians whose testimony was acceptable without an oath.

In the 17th century, the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were furnished with two codes. The first was the Codex Basarabien, promulgated by Matei Basarab in 1652, which bore the title of Indreptarea Legel ( Rectification of the Law ). The codex consisted of two volumes. The first volume was called Pravila Bisericesca ( Church Code ); this was also called " Govora Code," after the name of the monastery where it was printed in 1640. The title of the second volume was Indreptarea Legel or Pravila lui Matei Basarab, V.V. (Code of Matei Basarab) printed

at Tirgoviste in 1652.

The second code was promulgated in Moldavia by Vasile Lupu, in 1646, and was printed at Jassy. It bore the title of "Cartea Romaneasca de Invetatura de la Pravilele Imparatesti, si de la alte Județe" (Romanian Book of Learning, of Imperial Laws, and of Other Districts); its shorter name was "Pravila lui Vasile Lupu" (Code of Vasile Lupu). It was substantially the same as that of Matei Basarab.

Under the code of Matei Basarab, Jews were forbidden to hold real property in perpetuity, but could hold land on lease, and also own stores in the cities. Armenians were permitted to own vineyards, the Jews were not. The restrictions against the Jews were the result of the superstition existing at the time, that they were poisoning the beverages used by the peasants. Marriages between Jews and Christians were also prohibited. Heretics, Turks, Tartars, and Jews could not testify against Christians. No Christian might visit a synagogue, celebrate the Sabbath. The code also forbade <sup>under</sup> anathema, bathing with Jews, employing the services of Jewish physicians. However the regulations of the code of Vasile Lupu were less severe in many of these provisions.

The first volume of the code of Matei Basarab was exclusively canonical. All its provisions were framed on the pattern and in the spirit of the church; the penalties provided for violations, and other features and contents, were purely religious. The second volume, "Indreptarea Legii", being both canonical and laic, was somewhat broader. The former concerned the church and the latter the administration which enforced the law.

With reference to the Jews, the codes were not always

explicit. They rarely spoke clearly about Jews. The only way in which one could learn at what the law was aimed was by reading the different provisions, finding the spirit in which they were framed, and how they were enforced. We thus find that the law recognized three classes: infidels, heretics, and Jews. Yet all these three stood on the same footing; what affected the one class affected the other two as well.

With some exceptions, equal justice was meted out to all inhabitants of the same class. In this respect the Jews were nearly always classed with city merchants, and always considered heretics and pagans. The Armenians, although also so classed, were always treated more favorably than the Jews. Later, under the Fanariots in the 18th century, they began to consider the Jews as indigenous; and the latter thus gained legal status. However, no Jew could testify against a Christian. When Jews were engaged in litigation with Christians they had no right to take an oath. ~~The Code of Muntenia (Wallachia) abolished these restrictions, but in Moldavia the restrictions continued until the enactment of the Organic Law.~~ <sup>vwv</sup> ~~Caragea of~~ <sup>vwv</sup>

If usury is looked upon unfavorably today, it was all the more objectionable three centuries ago. However, Christians were extensively engaged in the practice of usury, but the Jews were always charged with having a monopoly of it. <sup>But</sup> ~~However,~~ no reference is made of usury by Jews in the canonical laws. Every provision in these canonical laws concerning usury refers to Christians only, and still more to the clergy, who seem to have been quite active in that field.

The early statutes covering commerce contained no reference to Jews. The reason is obvious: since the Jews enjoyed full liberty



in trading, no special mention was necessary. They merely came under the category of merchants and traders, especially since the greater part of commerce was in Jewish hands under the Code of Matei Barasab the Jews in <sup>C</sup>ommerce were placed on a level with the nobility. The relevant section reads: (a) "Theft committed in stores in the course of business is considered grand larceny if committed against a nobleman, or against any other great and honorable man." (b) "If money was deposited with a merchant who could not use it in his business, he is not liable for the loss of the money in case of burglary." (c) "Even the Prince himself can enforce no higher duties on strangers than on indigens." Thus, it is clear that foreign merchants (obviously also Jews) importing goods could not be treated differently from indigenous merchants in matters of duty.

Over and against the foregoing provisions which gave the Jews no cause for complaint in commerce, there were, in the same code, canonical laws which prohibited any intercourse with Jews. No Christian could taste wine from the hand of a Jew unless it had first been blessed by a priest. Since contact with the "unclean Jews" was so dangerous to a Christian, the transgressor ~~was ostracized~~ was ostracized by the Church, and could not return impenitent. Under the canonical law, any contact with Jews was more severely punished than contact with Armenians or other persons.

A special section of prescriptions affirmed these punishments, particularly with respect to Christians who celebrated the festival of the Passover with Jews. These prescriptions also included the requirement that the dough used in making unleavened bread

(Matzoth) for use during the festival should be spat upon. Finally, associated with the Passover regulations, possibly because of the ritual murder suspicion, was a prohibition to Christians not to consult Jewish physicians or bathe with Jews.

When Vasile Lupu, in Moldavia, and Matei Basarab, in Wallachia (1634-54), each in his own dominion, sought to improve conditions, they enacted certain laws and formulated codes. These followed the pattern of the Slavonic texts. Since the compilation of these codes was done by churches, they assumed the character of canonical codes - by no means sympathetic toward the Jews. In the "Code de Savoia" of Matei Basarab, collected from the Justinian Statutes, one finds the following provisions:

"If a man joins the Jewish camp, to practice their religion, and then returns to Christianity, he must practice penance for nine years ... after which he will be permitted to enter the church to receive the blessed bread; after that he will do another year of penance, and at the end of the tenth year he will be able to receive Holy Communion."

"He who is soiled by receiving from the hand of a Jew, wine or butter, which is improper for a Christian to taste, must take it to the priest to have it blessed, after which he may touch it."  
 "No Christian shall observe the Sabbath except on Sunday. He who observes the Sabbath otherwise becomes Judaized. He shall, therefore, work on Saturday and rest on Sunday."

"It is unbecoming (to Christians) to feast with Jews and

heretics, or to accept the remnants of their feasts. No more <sup>can</sup> light and darkness ~~can~~ be united than ~~to~~ have Christians, heretics, and Jews seated at the same table or share the remainder of the table, unleavened or otherwise."

"He who worships with Jews shall be excommunicated."

"He who joins any reunion, or worships in the Jewish Temple or in that of heretics, if he be a layman, shall be excommunicated; but if he be a priest, he shall be forbidden (to officiate) and shall be considered as one who is charged with the care of Jewish affairs."

This code was very clear as to safeguarding women's virtue, marriage, illegitimate unions, and separations. Intermarriage was forbidden. Closely bound up with this was forcible seduction for which the following provision was made:

"If an infidel seduces a Christian maiden, he must receive baptism and marry her by receiving nuptial benediction. And if he refuses (baptism), his goods shall be confiscated for the benefit of the one whom he has seduced, because the union is broken. Being the abettor, he shall be driven away from her like a cursed destroyer of the Christian race. As far as that Christian girl is concerned, she shall take the possessions of that infidel dog and marry another man, a Christian."

"Whoever will take a slave, or one free, and will force her against her will, or by some devilish scheme will deceive her, and will try to entice her away from Christianity to some heresy, such shall be sentenced to death, as enemies of God and of Christianity." (151)

In cases of voluntary ~~seduction~~ (by consent), the code provided: ~~(PSE)~~

"The wench who dishonors herself ... and still more, if the girl will go to bed with some one, or if she is ~~take~~ taken by force, he shall be punished according to law, and his punishment shall be as prescribed in the 20th book, 17th title, which says: His nose shall be cut off, and one-third of his goods shall be given to the one he has wronged, except where it was with her consent -- in such case her hair shall be cut off and made to shame and pay a fine ..."

As regards marriage and illegitimate unions, the code provided:

"Whoever will marry in another faith, either the boy or the girl shall do five years' penance. Likewise the priest who officiates at such a marriage shall do three years' penance outside of the church.✓

"In case of free love between a Christian man and a non-Christian heretic, infidel, or Jewish woman, he shall have no communion for five years: he shall fast, give charity, and pray.✓

"Any Christian who will commit adultery with a pagan woman, such a one desecrates his baptism. And worse yet, if he should eat and drink with her, which is very profane, such a one should be ostracized from the Church for three years, after which time he shall reenter the church and stay two more years. In all those five years he shall repent, and in the sixth year he shall partake of the holy communion with loyal Christians.✓ ~~(PSE)~~

"Any illegal union can be broken and either of the parties may remarry." ~~(21)~~

"If an orthodox man marry a woman heretic, or vice versa, they shall separate." ~~(22)~~ On the other hand, "Where husband and wife are both heretics, and one of them turns back to the church, while the other remains a heretic, in such case the Christians may unite with another Christian, and the first bond is dissolved. And if one turns back to the faith and the other spouse should shortly thereafter follow, their marriage will not be dissolved."

"An engagement to marry becomes void when one of the parties discovers that the other is of a different faith:

"For the heresy of the man, the woman can separate from him not only through the church but of her own free will; and so much the more if he should have attempted or forced her to break away from her orthodox faith and have her embrace his heresy."

Baptism was obviously made attractive, as it held out many advantages for the prospective convert to Christianity. In such cases, the code provided as follows:

"The Jew who commits a wrong and then embraces Christianity will be subject to no penance. Or if, under the code, he should be subject to penance, it will rest with the discretion of the judge to give him a light or severe sentence. No baptized Jew can be punished, no matter how serious his acts committed before his baptism."

"If the Jew receives baptism after he has committed serious

offenses, all his crimes shall be wiped out by his baptism, and he shall be considered as ~~reborn~~ reborn, and be eligible to the priesthood without difficulty."

Under this code, the testimony of any Jew except a physician was inadmissible. The concession to physicians was due to the influence of the renowned Dr. Cohen. However, in the eyes of the law, when a crime had been committed, or when there was a controversy between Jew and Christian, the Jew was treated impartially.

We have already pointed out that, in connection with the foregoing provisions, it should be noted that in Roumanian legislation -- always canonical in spirit -- besides the faithful of the Orthodox church, three classes were recognized: infidels, heretics, and Jews. As a result of this distinction, a law or a princely decree affecting any one of these classes would invariably react against the other two as well. Another peculiarity to be noted in official documents, legislative or otherwise, is that, unlike Occidental governments, which use the name Hebrew or Israelite, an ugly name for Jews, such as "Jidan," is used in the land of Trajan's descendants. Thus, too, Russia and Poland used the word "Jid" when they mentioned the Jew. In Roumania, again the unpleasant name was used exclusively in Moldavia for a time, but eventually Wallachia adopted it together with many other ugly terms which were originally Moldavian.

It has been pointed out that the courts recognized three

classes: infidels, heretics, and Jews. As a result of this distinction, a law or a princely decree affecting anyone of these classes would invariably apply to the other two as well.

The number of Jews in the principalities at that time was evidently great enough to cause the lawmakers to take notice of their existence. They were numerous enough to be organized as a community of indigenous Jews and pay state taxes. Proof of this is found in various registers of receipts and disbursements in the years 1694-1704.

Formerly Jews could employ Christian servants, but as late as 1741, ~~the~~ Prince Mavrocordat prescribed that "children or female servants up to the age of 30 shall no more be in the service of Jews."

Jews could live undisturbed in cities, towns, and villages. But in the second half of the 18th century, the authorities in Moldavia began to forbid the Jews to live or do business in the villages, or to keep manors on lease. These prohibitions remained dead letters; since they were at variance with the interests of the boyars.

With the beginning of the 19th century, attempts were made to provide a Roumanian code <sup>of</sup> ~~to~~ law. In 1804, Prince Moruzi commissioned Theodor Carra to translate into modern Greek the six volumes of the code of C. Harmenopol, known in Roumania as Carra Code. However, Carra died in 1806 without finishing his work, and Andronski (Andronache) Donici, then ~~Minister~~ Minister of Justice, undertook to complete it. It was published at Jassy in 1814, and remained in force until 1817. This so-called code of Donici, which had two provisions regarding

strangers, but not specifically in regard to Jews, was adopted in both the principalities. The two references to Jews in that code concerned testimony:

"Heretics and Jews are not accepted as witnesses, but they may testify against each other" (Chapter 12, Part 2); and

"Armenians and Jews, in particular, cannot acquire rural property, but they may own stores in the business streets. Armenians may even acquire vineyards." (Chapter 25, paragraph 5).

The rights of the Jews were limited to the carrying on of business, wholesale, and retail, like any other indigens or aliens established in the country.

Only aliens in transit who stopped for a short time with the intention of leaving as soon as they should have disposed of their goods seem to have been able to sell at wholesale only. Industries, large and small, were free, as was also every trade. Jewish artisans could not employ a Christian foreman.

In 1817 the Code Caragea and the Code Calimach were adopted in the two principalities. The Code Caragea was adopted in Wallachia, and that of Scarlat Calimach became the law of Moldavia. This latter code was framed within the narrow walls of the church, and therefore, fell far below the Code Caragea, as far as the Jews were concerned.

The Code Calimach was compiled on July 1, 1817, in Greek. Later, under the Russian occupation, in 1833, it was translated into Roumanian by Assaki Bojinka and Fletermacher. This code was in force



up to 1831, when the Organic Law was substituted for it. The Code Calimach was considered the most complete Roumanian code of interest to the Jews. Paragraph 29 of the Code ~~Calimach~~ reads: "Every man is worthy of acquiring rights according to law." This is supplemented by Paragraph 45, which reads: "Strangers in general share civil rights with indigens, except such rights for which they must be of the same rank as indigens."

The Code Caragea embraces former Roman imperial and Byzantine decrees, but has no special reference to Jews except a provision regarding naturalization of aliens and their civil rights. And wherever it was found necessary to insert some restriction, it was done without offense to the Jews. It was provided that "Christians cannot contract marriage with persons of other faiths."

The Code ~~Calimach~~ was compiled in Greek, and is considered inferior as a legal document to that of Calimach. Archaic in spirit, it dealt with commercial, civil, and criminal matters. Its commercial code was replaced, in 1840, by the French "Code Commercial" of 1807. The criminal code was superseded by that of B. Stirbey in 1852, who also on October 30, 1864, compiled the penal code.

With regard to civil rights, only one change was made in the latter (Caragea) code: the prohibition of acquiring land by Jews and Armenians, and the eligibility of aliens to testify or to witness wills and the like, provided ~~in~~ in the codes of ~~the~~ Basarab and Calimach, are eliminated. Otherwise the other provisions affecting aliens in the Code Calimach were included in the Code Caragea.

Thus, up to the time of the adoption of the Organic Law (1831), Jews enjoyed full liberty in the principalities. The only restriction against them was contained in a princely decree issued by Prince Mavrocordat, in 1741, which reads: "Boy and girl servants who have not attained the age of thirty must not engage in serving Jews." ~~and~~.

Usury was always unlawful in Roumania, as we have already briefly observed. The church forbade, under anathema, any "Christian to charge usury from his brother Christian". Obviously, this prohibition did not apply to Jews, heretics, and infidels. In the case of the clergy, the canonical law was even more stringent. Nevertheless, and in spite of a double prohibition -- canonical and legislative -- Christians engaged in it to a great extent. But this traffic was always charged to the Jews. In the countries of Western Europe, Jews did engage in this business, but there they were driven to it as the only means of existence, because they were excluded from other vocations, from the guilds, and from agriculture. This was not the case in the two principalities, where they formerly enjoyed full liberty in commercial enterprises. We thus find the canonical law preoccupied with laws regarding usury. But, strict as the law was under Matei Basarab, and numerous as were the cases of usury which came ~~up~~ under his regime, there is not one case on record involving a single Jew in the remotest degree. Obviously, the Jews were not engaged in this business. What is more, all the provisions regarding usury had reference to Christian laymen ~~and~~, as well as to the clergy, as is shown by the quotation from the code ~~in~~ a preceding page. This latter

class seems to have conducted the business of usury on a large scale, without the Jews having any part in it. Otherwise, the Jews would certainly not have been spared, but would have been mentioned in the provisions of the code. But since all avenues of commerce were open to them, the Jews in the two principalities preferred legitimate commerce to a vocation which would have been likely to bring them vexation, pain, and persecution. ~~(333)~~

Commerce was looked upon askance by the Roumanians. While it was not entirely forbidden, ~~but much disliked~~, there was prejudice against it. Yet even in this branch of human endeavor no legislation was enacted to that effect, and no mention was made of the Jews. But this does not mean that they were beyond the law; they were subject to it, like all other businessmen. However, there were some provisions, medieval in character, which branded them as "lepers", anathema, cursed by God -- to be shunned. Any contact with them was unclean, and caused one to lose some of one's holiness, and brought one filth, anathema, and execration; to have intercourse or dealings with Jews was a mortal sin. ~~(334)~~

Jews were designated in the principalities either as indigenous or as aliens. This was so intensively the case that even in matters strictly Jewish and of which the government took no official recognition, they were still designated as such. Still more - the alien Jews were directed to submit to the jurisdiction of the Hahambasha (chief rabbi) of the indigenous Jews. We thus find the following provision in the charter of 1823 given by Prince John Sandu Sturza to the Jewish community in Jassy of some interest:

"By this decree I order you, Jews in Jassy, to obey the injunctions of the Hahambasha and other notables of the indigenous Jews in all that concerns the provisions of your religion: your taxes, assessments levied among yourselves, as well as the payments which you call taxes on meat which you consume. Whoever fails to obey the decision of your community will be punished.

"Under no circumstances can foreign Jewish subjects maintain butcher stores to sell meat. They shall buy meat and fowl for their consumption from indigenous Jews at the price paid by other Jews in the city. The slaughter house will be visited by the Haham (Shochet) of the indigenous Jews. Under no pretext will alien Jews have their own Haham.

"No Jewish butcher shall sell meat to his coreligionists without paying the tax fixed by the Hahambasha and the leaders of the community.

"Whoever violates this order will be punished."

The term "alien" was applied not to the Jews alone, but to Christians as well. Under <sup>the</sup> Code Calimach, Jews who were established in Roumania and were not subjects of foreign powers were considered indigenous. But intermarriage between Christians and members of other faiths was forbidden (Article 91), as also engagements to marry were void under Article 120.

Otherwise, Jews enjoyed full civil rights, except to hold rural property. This restriction was explained by ecclesiastical as well as political reasons. The church and the boyars (~~nobles~~) owned the soil. To have let Jews own land would have meant to form an inconceivable triangle, an inadmissible triple partnership. With this exception, under the two codes, <sup>the</sup> Code Caragea and the Code Calimach -- there were no provisions affecting the Jews. Indigenous Jews were considered a part of the population, and therefore enjoyed civil rights. Foreign subjects, whether Jews or

Christians, were treated alike. The indigenous Jews of that period also enjoyed full rights, except that they could not attain to the dignity of boyars. However, this was not on religious grounds but political. Jews could hold civil office, as is evidenced by a princely edict issued by Mihai Sturza (1783-86), which reads:

"My Lordship has granted this decree to Joseph Simon, whom My Lordship has appointed provost of Jews, after consulting the princely charters which give evidence of the existence of such custom." ~~and~~

Minor cases in which Jews were involved were tried by the provost. However, more important cases and appeals from his decision were brought before the grand treasurer. The provost and his family were exempt from ~~the payment of~~ feudal taxes, and he paid no tithes on his legitimate crops or on his beehives. He could impose a tax of thirty bani (a Roumanian ban was equivalent to the French centime, i.e., one-fifth of a cent) per capita on the Jewish community for his own use. Furthermore, since he was the representative of the Hahambasha, he could levy a tax (equivalent to the French franc, or about 19 cents) as well as other revenues of the Hahambasha, annually, on each individual of the Jewish community. He could also register (for purposes of taxation) the distilleries constructed by Jews on land granted to them by the Prince.

It is reasonable to assume that the office of provost had considerable weight. It entailed, as we have seen, judicial and fiscal powers. Since the appointment came from the Prince, it carried authority which could enforce orders. Since the provost was recognized as a public official with the authority granted by the reigning Prince, there could be no question of "Jewry."

CHAPTER VIITHE ROUMANIAN CODES AND THE LEGAL STATUS OF  
THE JEWS IN THE PRINCIPALITIES

It is not an easy task to define the earlier legal status of the Jews in the two principalities. The main reason is that legislative enactments were never codified. The few known codes mentioned above, from the earliest date down to the 19 th century, contain very little about legislative enactments affecting Jews. Only by wading through thousands of documents, hrisovs, and volumes can one discover some trace of laws and customs concerning <sup>the</sup> Jews.

Not until the beginning of the 18th century was an attempt made to codify the statutes in force at that time. The few codes which could be found contained only religious, civil, and criminal provisions of a general character but no rules defining the status of the Jews, their rights, limitations, or the restrictions imposed upon them.

~~of law.~~

The first known code was that of Alexander the Good of Moldavia (1401-32). But even this code no longer exists. Instead we have, also credited to him, a collection or an agglomeration of rules taken from the Basilic civil laws (the Byzantine Code of Basil I, in the 9th century). To these, in the course of the centuries, the Moldavians added by borrowing from neighboring lands, or by passing new laws necessitated by new circumstances. These additions were adopted and recognized as law. It is more than probable that under Alexander the Good there were provisions affecting Jews, since there was some Jewish immigration under his regime and some decrees or orders must have been issued affecting the immigrants.

The custom or law under Alexander the Good, although frequently changed in detail, remained in force in Moldavia for nearly two centuries before being emulated in Muntenia. Not until the middle of the 17th century was the code of Matei Basarab compiled at about the same time that the code of Vasile Lupu in Moldavia was in effect.

As has already been stated, the code of Matei Basarab was patterned along the lines of the canonical law. It preserved many provisions and decrees with respect to Jews which were enacted by the synod and the Catholic ~~kings~~ of the medieval era. Under this code, every iniquity and every crime which a Jew could commit would be remitted if he embraced Christianity. Christians were forbidden under severe penalty to associate with Jews or to sit at table and break bread with them. A Christian was not

allowed to touch food which had been prepared by the hand of a Jew. Any food touched by a Jew became "unclean" and could become clean only through a priest's sprinkling it. The eating of matzoth was strictly forbidden to Christians--they had to spit upon such unleavened bread of the Jews. The testimony of a Jew, no matter what his status might be, even as a physician, was not accepted, especially when it was against the synod of the church. No Christian might observe the Jewish sabbath.

Under Matei Basarab, the law recognized three classes of non-Christians; infidels, heretics, and Jews. However, in the eyes of the law they stood on an equal basis, since what was enacted against or concerned one class affected the others, except such provisions as were of purely religious nature and affected the faithful only.

The Code of Vasile Lupu, was almost exclusively penal. Here too, baptism was a cure-all remedy.

The Code Ypsilanti, adopted at the end of the 18th century, did not remain in force very long. This, too, contained nothing affecting the Jews.

The Code Caragea in Muntenia differed from that of Calimach (both adopted in 1817) in that it contained only one important provision: the granting of equal rights to foreigners without distinction, which included Jews, especially indigenous Jews. But it did not grant political rights, and forbade inter-marriage between adherents of different faiths. It permitted any individual, without distinction, to act as arbitrator. In civil matters one could take the oath in his own faith. Infidels could



take no oath.

The Code Calimach was in many respects more liberal. It followed the Code Napoleon very closely. True, it had a great deal of basilic material in it but in spirit it was widely different from that of Caragea. That basilic spirit which, obviously, could not be eliminated, enabled those in authority to abuse their power and make the liberal provision a dead letter.

Before the enactment of the Code Calimach, Jewish civil and criminal cases were decided according to the rabbinic law. Every controversy between Jews was brought before the Rabbi, with leave to appeal to the Hahambasha at Jassy. More important matters were appealed to the Grand Camarash <sup>(Chamberlain)</sup> or to the minister of finance. Contrary to law and custom, Jews were under the jurisdiction of the minister of finance and not, like the other inhabitants, under the Logofat (chancellor) of Justice or the Divan (council). But this jurisdiction extended only to matters between Jews. Those in which Christian and Jew were involved followed the ordinary course in the courts of the land. The Jews in each locality constituted a separate community with the synagogue as their center. Their status was fixed by a hrisov issued by the Prince. Every Jewish community constituted a body, guild, or obstie (community) patterned on the Christian communities, each enjoying its own autonomy. Officers and members of the administration were elected from among themselves. These communities were not distinguished from the rest except by some higher dajdie (a kind of Jewish tax). But due to the fact that they constituted a group possessing certain rights, they could move more freely within their respective communities. Even when they

were made to feel the whip of arrogant authority, they were better off than those in other lands. Generally, they suffered no more and no less than did the rest of the inhabitants.

Officially, the Jews in Moldavia were always considered Pamanteni (indigens) who had inhabited the land for centuries. Only those were considered alien who wished to remain so and did not care ~~to~~ become Moldavian subjects. Even foreign Jews could abjure their former allegiance and become citizens of the country in which they lived, and while they could not obtain the higher citizenship inherent in the boyar and the Christian, they could enjoy petty citizenship, which gave them all civil rights. Those to whom Moldavian citizenship held no attraction, remained under the jurisdiction of their respective consuls and enjoyed protection under the treaties concluded with Turkey, the suzerain of the principalities.

We thus see that there were two classes of citizenship: (1) the higher citizenship inherent in the Christians and in the boyars which the Jews could never attain; and (2) the petty citizenship which embraced all civil rights and was easily attainable. All that the would-be-citizen was expected to do, according to the Organic Law, was; enroll in the local comuna and assume the same local duties as the rest of the population. He would then be "counted among the indigens of the land, and would enjoy the same rights as the indigenous merchants and industrialists."

Thus there can be no doubt as to the status of the Jews at that time. In a petition addressed by the Jews of Jassy to the administration, they asked for the abolition of the office of Hahambasha, and declared themselves ready to enroll as indigens as

soon as their petition was granted.

The fact that the government laid so much stress on granting their petition and in framing the law accordingly, is ample proof that such was the practice and that Jews were actually indigens. It must also be borne in mind that citizenship in the two principalities at that time did not mean what Roumanian citizenship means today. For the principalities themselves were under the Turkish yoke. What is more, under those conditions it was to the interest of the prince to increase the number of indigens and thus diminish the influence of the aliens. The principalities, therefore, officially recognized indigenous Jews under the law and alien Jews under the jurisdiction of the consuls, in conformity with existing treaties. Even the Code Calimach drew a distinction between indigenous and alien Jews. The language of the code very clearly defined their rights -- the same as those of other inhabitants -- with a few exceptions mentioned therein. This status of indigenous Jews stands out in bold relief when we compare it with the deplorable status of the Jews in other countries.

Article 44 of the code provided: "He who has the rights of an indigen is absolutely entitled to all the urban rights." The alien, on the other hand -- Jew or otherwise -- might enjoy such rights by engaging in great commercial or industrial enterprises and demanding such rights through the constitution. There was, however, one exception; in order to attain such rights and be eligible for enrollment as an indigen, the alien had to be a Christian and the owner of a manor or attain nobility. Thus,

except where a Christian had precedence, Jews enjoyed full rights and could engage in commerce and industry.

In the case of aliens -- Jewish as well as those of other denominations -- the situation was entirely different. Those who enjoyed certain rights had to comply with Article 46, which had a different provision with regard to aliens. As a further precaution against any limitation of rights, the code added: "Distinction of faith shall have no role in the obtaining of rights; for in the eyes of the law there exists no distinction." Article 47 provided: "The difference of religious faith has no influence on these rights if for certain reasons the law will not have established any distinctions."

In regard to the holding of real property, the code provided that they were to be governed by the law of the place where the property was located. Personal property, on the other hand, was subject to the law under which the owner lived. In this respect, too, we find that the alien Jew was on a different footing from the indigenous Jew. Under John Stefan (1764), marriage and the ownership of realty were restricted to Greeks and other strangers; Jews were not mentioned, because they were not subject to this rule.

Jewish communities, both before and under the Code Calimach, were recognized by the government. Furthermore, their representatives, such as the rabbi, Staroste, and others were as we have already seen, recognized by the government and endowed with certain degrees of authority. This recognition gave the community the right to hold real and personal property. In addition, every charitable or religious institution and all property belonging to the synagogue, such as the

hospital, cemetery, etc., were recognized as institutions of public interest and came under special provisions with certain privileges.

Generally, the Code Calimach is considered broad and liberal in character, containing few restrictions in respect to Jews. "One of the restrictions prevalent in other European lands at that time, such as those dealing with the marriage of Jews is contained in the Code Calimach. In some countries only native Jews could marry, while other lands did not permit Jews to marry women from another country or city. "Every man", said the code, "may contract a marriage, provided he is not stopped by some legal impediment". Those who were prevented from marrying by these legal impediments were: imbeciles, the demented, and minors. An alien, however, had first to produce sufficient and reliable proof that he was free of any impediments and furnish security before he could contract a marriage. Marriage was considered a matter of religion.

As to intermarriage, the Moldavians were forbidden to marry, not only Jews, but persons of other faiths, as well. If an engagement had already been made, it had to be broken. But there were cases in which, as a result of desertion of one of the spouses, especially the husband, many tragedies were caused through the severity with which the law was applied in many lands. The Catholic Church, especially, was very strict in such cases. The conversion of a spouse from one religion to another caused many a tragedy among the Jews. In some

cases baptism itself caused many dissolutions of marriage; in others, the Christian doctrine; "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" was applied. Every effort was made, especially by the priests, to capture "Jewish souls". By preventing the dissolution of the marriage, there was some prospect of getting hold of at least one of the two spouses and of bringing him or her into the Christian faith; where there were children born of the marriage, so much the better. In every case, special inducements were held out to attract Jews to the Christian faith. For example, many privileges which others did not enjoy were available to converts. The same methods were employed in the principalities. In fact, there were some statutory provisions similar to those prevailing in other countries, and under Matei Basarab it was the rule that baptism would forgive all iniquities or wrongs committed against the state and society. The provision read: "By the gift of baptism, everything is cleared and the Jew<sup>s</sup> so baptized turns as clean as when he was born, and may then even become a priest."

After the convert had once been so cleansed, all his former liabilities were null and void. Since the state and the church worked hand in hand, the convert would even be exempt from the payment of taxes. But, contrary to the law and ~~the~~ custom of other lands, the convert from Judaism could not harass or vex his Jewish wife by enforcing his legal rights against her. Under the Moldavian law, the marriage became dissolved the moment either partner embraced Christianity, but on an equitable basis, without injury to the Jewish spouse.

Dowry, under the Code Calimach, was obligatory on parents, who had to endow their daughters according to their station in life. However, most of the provisions with regard to dowry were not applied to Jews, who were permitted to conform to the Talmudic provisions. But in case of a lawsuit between the parties to a marriage or an engagement, the law of the land prevailed.

However, there were some provisions in that code which were not equitable toward the Jews, or even toward the non-orthodox Christians. One of these provisions, Article 1623, made it obligatory upon the father and grandfather (on the father's side) to provide a dowry for the daughter or granddaughter. "If the father is poor or is of another faith, and the daughter is orthodox, the mother must provide a dowry." Similarly, if the daughter embraced Christianity, the father and grandfather were required to furnish the dowry. In cases in which the father or grandfather embraced Christianity while their children remained Jewish, the law worked inversely. Article 1625 provided that neither father, grandfather, nor mother was obliged to endow the unworthy daughter or granddaughter who did not belong to the Christian Church.

The same law governed the kind of dowry which was called "Counter dowry of sons". By the operation of law, Jewish parents had to endow their apostate sons, while the sons could not invoke the law against their baptized parents.

Jews could adopt no children as the adoption had to be made according to law. The holy prayer had to be read and only

in this manner could the foster parent step into the place of the natural parent. Thus adoption was not a civil but a religious act in principle and therefore no Jew could comply with it. However, the Jews found a legal way under Article 233 which permitted them "to feed and bring up poor children". Such an act had to be approved by the Epitropia (the administration in a social sense).

There was no statutory provision for the schooling of Jewish children. Jewish parents could educate their children, those of their relatives and others, in whatever manner they chose. But they could not take alien children.

The question of succession, inheritance, and testamentary rights opened avenues which lead to many disabilities. In principle, Jews were subject to the law of the land, like the rest of the inhabitants. A Jew could dispose of his property at will and bequeath it to his ascendants or descendants. The Code Calimach made ample provision for the manner in which one might dispose or come into possession of property. A testament was considered both civil and religious; therefore, where the Jewish testator felt that he could rely on his legatees, he would follow the rabbinical law, instead of the official code. However, if the will was contested, the law of the land prevailed.

There were no limitations as to the provisions which a testator could make in his will. The only formality required was that it be properly witnessed. Nevertheless, under Section 752, among the many disabilities or restrictions, there was one which provided "the law forbids to act as witness to a will one



who has sold out his holy baptism, and one who pretends to be Christian while under cover he follows another faith". Similarly, those of another faith were forbidden to witness a Christian will. Therefore, no Jews could testify in a case involving the will of a Christian, while in the case of a testament by a Jew, a Christian was eligible to testify.

One could dispose of his property by will or by codicil. In case a person died intestate, the succession was regulated by the code. All ascendants and descendants, sanguinary, lateral and other beneficiaries, could share in the estate under the code. Religion was not a bar to inheritance. Christian and Jew of the same degree were on an equal basis.

Where there was a will, there was a different rule. Article 979 provided: "Parents may disinherit their sons as well as their descendants if they be not in the faith; sons, daughters, and grandchildren of sons and daughters may disinherit their father, mother, grandfather and grandmother, if they are in the same condition as above. But in many cases of disinheritance the testator had to give his reason for so doing. A Jewish testator could not disinherit his legal beneficiaries. To deprive the legitimate heir of his right to inherit required a strict interpretation or investigation by the community and this the code did not permit.

With the exception of the foregoing restrictions, Jews could figure as legatees in wills made by Christians. Cases in which the boyar made his confidential Jew one of the legatees were numerous. Such legacies were legal and could not be attacked

on religious grounds. Similarly, Christians could be legatees in wills made by Jews and such cases were not at all rare.

In case a person died intestate, leaving no heirs, it was generally the rule that the whole estate passed to the state. But the code Calimach took a different, rather broad, view. It provided that: "In the absence of all the different degrees of heirs mentioned, the estate is declared vacant (without heirs) and belongs to public institutions, such as schools, hospitals, poorhouses, orphan houses, poor boxes, and to all other institutions of public interest<sup>n</sup>. Therefore, in case a Jew died intestate, and left no heirs, his estate passed to the benevolent Jewish institutions of the community and probably, according to the last phrase in Article 962: to the synagogue, and for Yahrzeit (observing the commemoration of the anniversaries of death). This phrase reads: "Except the third part which, with the knowledge of the archiereu (bishop) shall be spent for commemorating the soul of the deceased."

Under the code, Jews could acquire, hold and dispose of all kinds of property. It recognized no distinction, except in cases of legal incapacity such as minors, mental defectives, convicts, and the like. Nevertheless, there was one exceptional provision common to all the statutes of that period which remained unchanged. It read: "Armenians and Jews are forbidden to acquire manors and to hold them in perpetuity<sup>n</sup>. Yet even this was not a new provision. It was put there in order to follow and reaffirm an old custom of the country. Furthermore, the Jews were not the only ones to whom this right was denied, since it belonged more to the boyars and to the church.

At the same time, the code also restricted Jews in the acquisition of vineyards, a restriction which up to that time had not existed. However, personal and business interests were strong enough to overcome this restriction. That Jews continued to hold vineyards is evident from the many complaints made to the administration by boyars and merchants who claimed that Jews did not respect the law in this regard. The government was, therefore, forced to send out a circular order advising them on the one hand to dispose of such property as they held, and on the other, requesting the courts not to sanction such transactions when made by Jews.

The code also confirmed an old custom of the country relating to real property. Under Prince Cantemir, at the beginning of the 18th century, Jews could own real property in perpetuity. Later, however, they were forbidden to do so. But this restriction, it appears, did not last very long, for at the time when the Code Calimach was compiled, the right of Jews to hold real property in cities had already been hallowed by custom. The code reads: "Jews may acquire houses and stores in cities; and Armenians may also acquire vineyards." This right was later attacked, unsuccessfully. A complaint by the boyars in 1827 was to the effect that their rights were being usurped by abuse of the law.

Inasmuch as Jews could hold real property and stores on lease it is apparent that they could hold property in perpetuity. Whether they could also hold manors on lease, or as tenants in common, is a question which has never been settled.

We know that Jews <sup>were</sup> ~~are~~ invited from Poland to settle in the principalities and administer the boyar estates which they eventually held on lease. In the course of the 18th century, notwithstanding several attempts made to hinder them, Jews came to hold such estates on lease uninterruptedly. The first attempt to prevent them from leasing estates is found in a hrisov of 1804, issued by Prince Moruzi; the language of this document indicates that the Jews were never forbidden to hold land on lease, because it does not say that it is against the law, but that it is against "the spirit of religion and Christianity that Jews should be masters, even temporary, over Christian peasants".

However, this order was not strictly enforced, because it was against the interests of the boyars and other property owners whose incomes would have been considerably affected. Without these Jewish lessees and the demand which they created, the value of the land would have been reduced.

When Calimach came to power, Jews were again in possession of manors and he was, therefore, forced to renew the prohibition of his predecessors. But he too, met with strong opposition on the part of the boyars and was compelled to let matters remain in status quo without repealing the law. This explains why his code not only omitted the prohibitive clause, but, on the contrary, was made to read: "The renting and leasing of property can be done in the same manner as selling". However, some time later, such a case came before a court and it was decided against the Jews.

The Organic Law permitted Jews to hold estates on lease

when they were unoccupied by the owners; but circular orders issued before and after the Organic Law became effective were emphatic in their prohibition of Jews' holding estates on lease.

Since the old codes were more canonical in nature and while no record of any such prohibition is available, it is reasonable to assume that Jews were forbidden to employ Christian servants. However, like many other restrictions, this law, too, was not observed. That there must have been complaints against the infringement of this statute, under the pretext that Jews were likely to seduce Christian servants and convert them to Judaism, is evidenced by a provision issued in 1741 under Mavrocordat which stated: "As regards child servants or girl servants, up to the age of thirty years, it has been decided that they can serve no more." This provision remained dormant except for occasional periods of enforcement. The Code Calimach was silent on this point. All that it said was that matters concerning master and servant were subject to police regulations, a provision which opened the way for the police to harass Jews at will, since its enforcement or non-enforcement depended on the mood of the police. Later, the mayors were either indifferent or proceeded in an extremely arbitrary manner. Such was the case in the period between 1869 and 1870 when a campaign was launched against the Jews because they employed Christian servants. The police, of course, benefitted handsomely by their extortions.

Taken as a whole, the Code Calimach was the most liberal document with reference to the Jews which Roumania ever had. Every chapter, every paragraph of it, was written in a liberal spirit, favorable to the Jews in many respects.

56

CHAPTER VIIILEGAL AND ILLEGAL DISABILITIES

In Moldavia the code of Vasile Lupu was in force, while in Wallachia that of Matei Basarab was followed. These two codes, together with the common law, served for the dispensation of justice in their daily life. The jury system was found so cumbersome that under Alexander Ypsilanti a new code was promulgated in Greek amending the jury law. Since this code did not touch the commercial law, the provisions affecting Jews and strangers remained unchanged. In Wallachia, this code was applied up to the year 1816, when the Code Caragea was adopted in its place.

At that time the two principalities had not as yet been united, so that each of them followed its own code and its own laws. In Moldavia, Prince Grigory Ghica established, in 1776, three categories -- Christian merchants, Jews and Armenians -- which were to pay a tax of 10 per cent of the amount involved in every case litigated through the courts before the Vel Camarash ( court chamberlain ). Payment had to be made after the decision had been rendered. The aggrieved party could appeal to the Grand Council. If the judgment of the court chamberlain was reserved, the sub-prefect would collect another 10 per cent.

Being under the jurisdiction of the chamberlain, the Jews,

through their rabbi, had to pay a tax of sixty lei annually.

Furthermore, the Jewish provost (Gabbai) also had to pay a similar sum to the Chamberlain.

As soon as he assumed office, the Chamberlain collected from every storekeeper selling goods by length measure, thirty paras (a para was a coin worth two-twenty fifths of a cent; thus thirty paras were equivalent to two and two-fifths cents) per cot (the cot was a measure of yardage equal to one foot in length). The Vel Hatman (army chief) had the power to try soldiers, Gypsies, and strangers; the Vel Spater (cavalry chief) had jurisdiction only over the trial of strangers, while the Aga (prefect) could try the bourgeoisie. ~~THE~~

A case was tried in a court of law wherein the plaintiff was a Jew and had proved his case against a Christian defendant. In rendering judgment, the trial justice said to the plaintiff: "I could give you judgment if you were not a Jew." ~~THE~~ A similar decision was rendered in the court of Dorohoi by an overzealous judge, but the higher court reversed it. ~~THE~~

On the other hand, when another judge was approached by the notorious anti-Semite, Holban, at Jassy, to have him convict a group of Jews on a false accusation, he indignantly remonstrated with Holban, and said: "I shall not stoop so low. I shall do my utmost to wipe out this shameful accusation against the Jews. Furthermore, if it were possible for me, I would leave this city at once, so that I should not live in such an infested atmosphere of hatred." ~~THE~~

A decision was rendered by a high court at Jassy which held that contracts between Christian and Jew, or between Jew and Jew, for the sale of real property were illegal. Following this decision, a ministerial circular forbade the authentication of such contracts and other similar transactions. ~~and~~ Similarly, the right to vote in communal elections was denied to Jews by a decision of the court of cassation. ~~and~~

When a bereaved father tried to rescue his daughter, who was being forcibly baptized, he was fined 100 lei, while six of his friends were each sentenced to three months in prison for having participated in that "crime." ~~and~~

Against this pattern of "justice" toward the Jews, we find one case wherein justice was actually done. The mayor of Adjud was on trial on an indictment of malfeasance and abuse in office, on complaint of a Jewish merchant. Pleading for his client, the defendant, the lawyer resorted to the following rhetoric and "sound logic": "(1) I am defending a public official; (2) a representative of a high government; (3) a Christian citizen against a Jew whose race is known as a revolting element. I am, therefore, in a position to hope that it will be easy for me to prove the innocence of my client." Despite this "logical plea," the mayor was convicted.

A law enacted in 1874 recognizing the right of Jewish graduates of universities to qualify as electors in municipal elections was voided by a higher court. ~~and~~



The appellate court at Focshani went one step further: it held that no Jewish apostate was eligible to vote at communal elections. ~~and~~

It was not unusual for the presiding justice to insult a Jew in open court in Moldavia. Such was the case when the rabbi of Campulung began to testify in a case before that court, on January 24, 1884; the presiding justice held his handkerchief to his nose, and said: "The Jew stinks." When the rabbi said that he was unable to make himself understood in Roumanian, the justice said to the trial lawyer: "Give him twenty-five lashes ~~on his~~ ... and he will talk." Addressing himself to the audience, he said: "Will we be able to find an honest man among these (Jews) who will be able to interpret?"

A decision of the court of cassation, at Bucharest, in 1887, held that native Jews in Roumania were aliens. ~~and~~

After insulting Rabbi Feivish Taubes, of Jassy, in the street, an army captain brought an action against the rabbi, charging him with having provoked a mob to assault him. Notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the rabbi was fined 200 lei, and damages of 2,000 lei were awarded to the officer.

At Saveni, "justice" was meted out on a grand scale. After one Mandelbaum had been beaten by his debtor, a Dr. Christea, for suing him to recover a debt, the "impudent Jew", was given ten days' incarceration, and was fined twenty-five lei, and 100 lei damages were awarded to Dr. Christea.

At Darabani, Radauti, and Herza, the Jews were subjected to continuous abuse by the local authorities. In order to harass them the latter would always find some violation as a pretext and bring them to court. The judge would never fail to see the point. Whether it was that the porch had not been calcimined, or for any other imaginary violation of some "law" or "ordinance," or whether the reason was that the axles of their carts had not been greased, hundreds of Jews were brought into the courts, fined twenty-five lei, and suffered three days' arrest.

Actions for libel were unknown in Roumania, and there was no check on the press. No matter how savagely a newspaper might attack a person, it need fear no action. If it happened that a libelled Jew thought that the law would give him some redress, he soon found out, from the verdict of the jury, that he was mistaken. The case was different whenever a Roumanian sought redress from a Jew. Such a case was tried in Bucharest on October 2, 1886; the defendant, Dr. M. Beck, was fined 200 lei and was ordered to pay 700 lei in damages. ~~200~~

Two police officers who had cruelly tormented several Jews in such manner that two of them died, while the others were crippled for life, were indicted, tried, convicted, and -- fined 100 lei. ~~200~~

In an application to release a Jewish bankrupt on bail, the court held that "vagabonds" could not be freed on bail (January 27, 1911). Similarly, the court refused to incorporate a Jewish

firm to farm liquor taxes, on the ground that " Jews have no right to engage in the sale of spirituous liquors."

Having been convicted of the murder of a Jew, four Christian assassins were fined 7 000 lei. At Falticeni, however a jury of twelve good men and true was more charitable in rendering a verdict of not guilty and thus acquitting a Greek who had murdered a Jew and against whom the evidence of guilt overwhelming.

#### The Oath More Judaico

The Oath More Judaico, " made in Russia " , was in practice in the principalities as early as the 18th century and eventually the courts condemned it. Notwithstanding these decisions, several rabbis were prosecuted for refusing to administer this barbarous oath.

This oath had been abolished in France in 1828, but forty years later it was still administered in Roumania. In a case in which the plaintiff, one Goldenthal, had to take it, the procedure was as follows:

Twenty-four hours prior to his taking of the oath, the

affiant, before whose house a military watch was posted, had to be under the supervision of a priest, and abstain from food and drink. His nails were then cut close to the flesh, after which he had to take an ice-cold plunge. Accompanied by the same priest and escorted by a soldier, he was brought to the synagogue, where the oath was to be administered on the Holy Scroll. Claiming that he alone was empowered to hold the Holy Scroll during the holy performance, the priest insisted on that right, but the Jews protested. The situation assumed a serious aspect, and the plaintiff decided to discontinue his action. ~~He~~

In 1889 the oath was declared unlawful by the high court at Jassy, but in 1904 it was again in force against ~~the~~ Jews who had the misfortune to appear in a court of justice. The rabbis and the Jewish communities fought sturdily against the reinstitution of this hateful and humiliating oath. Some of the Jewish communities refused to open the synagogues for its administering, and in some of the cities the rabbis refused to administer it. Then, too, the various courts throughout Roumania were not of one accord with regard to it. Also, at Botoshani, for example, the court held that the general formula of an oath might be administered to Jews, while a justice of the peace insisted upon the Oath More Judaico. The high court finally decided that the taking of an oath formed a matter which was to be left to the discretion of the judge presiding at a trial.

In a case which came up for trial at Jassy, the court

directed Rabbi Faivil Taubes, of that city, to administer the Oath More Judaico to one M. Feltz. He refused to do so, on the ground that the Jewish law did not prescribe such an oath. The court imposed a fine of 300 lei on the rabbi. An assistant of the judge, Longinescu by name, then went to the synagogue, forced open its doors, broke in the doors of the holy ark, took out the scrolls, and administered the oath according to the formula which he had obtained from a priest. On appeal, the lower court was sustained. ~~and~~

The procedure was so gruesome and barbaric that it is inconceivable to the modern mind. For this very reason it deserves a place in this history: This was more severe than the Goldenthal case:

The oath had to be taken in the synagogue, before the Beth Din (rabbinical board or court of three members) consisting of a rabbi and of three outstanding Jews, in the presence of the judge or judges before whom the case was to be tried. The whole procedure of the oath was public.

The oath was administered over the Scrolls of the Law on any day, except the Sabbath or other holy days. The witness was taken to the public bath, where he was prepared. At the synagogue he took off his shoes, put on a shroud, and took his stand before the open ark. Two burning candles were placed before the witness, and the Scrolls of the Law over which he took his oath were placed before him.

The candles were then put out, and the rabbi read the frightful formula to the witness, as follows:

"Beware! Just as the light of these two candles was snuffed

out, so will thy soul be snuffed out if thou wilt swear falsely before us on this day".

To which the witness said, "Amen"

The Scroll was then placed in the right arm of the witness who read the oath and signed it. The rabbi and his two assistants signed as witnesses that the proceeding was according to law.

The oath read as follows: "I, the undersigned ....with a pure heart, without any hidden thought, but with my full knowledge and that of those who lead me to take the oath, do promise and swear by God, the God of Israel, that in the matter in which I was called as witness, I will tell the actual truth in everything I shall be asked by the court. Outside of that I will not deny, and will tell all I know about the matter. Under no circumstances will I testify falsely, prompted neither by friendship nor by enmity, nor through blood relation, friendship or fear. And since I am always to answer to God in this matter, may God help me so in my soul and in my body. Amen."

Before administering the oath, the rabbi read a warning, which read as follows:

"We, the Beth Din, inform you that we are taught by our sages to observe the laws of the country in which we live, as we do the rules of our Torah. And not to hide from the judges of the law the slightest evil thought, but to testify openly according to law, so that the innocent may not suffer thereby, and for that purpose we conduct you to take the oath, to testify to the

truth and the truth only, in all matters asked by the court, and in all you know in the matter outside of what you will be asked.

"Before you take the oath we must warn you, under the law, to bear in mind the sacred oath administered to you, so that God, blessed be He, may not punish you for violating your oath.

Whoever has heard or knows something unlawful and does not report it, is a transgressor, as it is written: 'Any witness who knows something in the case and does not bring it out is a transgressor.'

"You must also know that any witness, even those of another creed, who does not do his duty truthfully, is guilty of sacrilege. Also any witness who conceals the truth and testifies falsely is an abomination to God, here and in the world to come. Remember that the whole world trembled when God said: 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' It is written: 'All the transgressors against the Torah of Moses may be purified, but he who ~~violates~~ <sup>violates</sup> the oath cannot be purified.' If you will break the oath which you take before God and His holy Torah, you thereby become an atheist, against God, and against our faith, and you are thereby considered a Jew no more. And the punishment which you will receive from the court for false swearing will be God's punishment, and the punishment will be one sent from above for having desecrated the Holy Name. Remember also that it is written that the suffering by Zedekiah was for his breaking of an oath which he had taken before the king of Babylonia, and it was inflicted from above, inflicted on him for having desecrated His Holy Name." ~~END~~

The formula of the oath (in Hebrew) was as follows:

"Shema Yisrael adonoi elohenu adonoi ehad. Barach shem kebed malechutho leolan vaed. Amen. Anochi Adonoi. Adonoi hu elohim hai vekayyam, nora marom vekadosh (the last five words had to be repeated three times). Ani elohecha asher hotzethicha meeretz mitzrayim. La thirtzah. Lo thinaf. Lo thaaneh bereacha ed shaker. Lo thahmod beth reecha, shoro, vahamoro, vechol asher lereecha. Abraham, Yithak, Yaakob, Mosheh, Aharon, David, Shelomoh."

(Translation: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One. Praised be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and ever. Amen. I am the Lord. The Lord is God, living and enduring, exalted on high and holy (from "living and enduring" to "holy" had to be repeated three times). I am thy God Who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is thy neighbor's Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon.")

Having finished administering the oath, the rabbi would add: "Now, if you are not right, you shall become like Korah -- you will sink into the earth together with your wife, children and all your relatives."

This oath was in practice until 1832, when, after the Organic Law had been introduced by Russia, a new form of oath was brought from Bessarabia by the Russians and adopted in Roumania. Of this formula which was in use for only five years there is no record. In 1838, in a case between two Jews and a Christian, the



latter objected to the oath and insisted on a new formula which was accepted by the tribunal at Focshani, and this was then used by other courts, and in 1848 was officially adopted by a decree of Mihai Sturza. It was the most degrading and absurd formula imaginable. ~~It~~ In 1911, through the efforts of Dr. Jacob Niemirower, at that time ~~the~~ rabbi of Jassy, this oath was abolished by a decision of the court of cassation. ~~It~~

### Street Restrictions

Arbitrary measures proposed or taken against the Jews, always emanated from hatred, fanaticism, or a desire for exploitation. The authors of such measures have never acquitted themselves of the contradictions into which they fell. Only in this manner can we explain how, in two different countries, the Jews were persecuted, in one for doing a certain thing, while in the other they were persecuted for not doing it."

Hatred and fanaticism do not harmonize with logic. And when it is a question of exploitation and persecution, the momentary impulse is the stronger argument.

During the medieval period and up to the present, in nearly the whole of Christendom, the Jews were forced to live crowded together, and form a ghetto of their own in many cities so that they might not contaminate the Christians. It was a canonical principle put into practice not to permit Jews to mingle with Christians. It served also to facilitate for Christians the pillaging and slaughtering of Jews whenever the inspiration to do so came to them. Nor did the Christians always look for a pretext. Woe

to the Jew who dared to live outside of the ghetto. But whether he lived within or without the ghetto, he was never safe.

The two principalities were an exception to this ghetto rule. For the ghetto was unknown there: and even in those cities where the Jews had chosen certain streets for their residence, they had done this inconspicuously, and of their own free will, with no one driving them to it. Whether it was with the idea of being close to one another in case of an attack, or whether because of a desire to be near to the synagogue, which was also the center of their spiritual life, they always managed to live together in the section which they chose. There were streets and wards in some of the cities of the principalities where they formed a majority of the population, but they were never compelled to be confined to a ghetto, whether the principalities were under Turkish, Polish or Hungarian rule.

While those governments may have shown themselves to be tolerant, ~~however~~, the sentiments prevailing in the wards often proved to be different. Those Christians who were born in hatred, nurtured on hatred, and often instigated by some fanatic against the Jews made their life bitter. Very often the Jews had to endure being harassed, denounced, insulted, and expelled. Just so often did they have to appeal to the authorities for protection.

Even in those streets in which they had settled they were annoyed by their Christian neighbors. The synagogue was like a thorn to Christian eyes, and if the Jews dared build a synagogue

in addition to the one in existence, those good Christians demolished it. Such was the case in 1714, when, under Prince Sherban Cantcuzino, the synagogue in Bucharest was demolished, although another one had been erected next to the Hotel St. George, during the reign of Alexander Ghica (1706-68). ~~20~~

In 1795, under Prince Alexander Constantin Moruzi, in the Raznovanu ward, where the Jews had always lived, the Christians, at the instigation of their priest, provoked fights with their Jewish neighbors every day, and the Jews had to meet them in the same spirit; in one engagement they did not spare even the holy man who had instigated the disorder. Using this incident as a pretext, the Christians filed a complaint with the Prince to the effect that "this ward is full of Jews who may cause the rent to double, and they are taking possession of everything; even the hotel known there as 'Hanul Niculescului' the Jews have leased at a double rent. All the ward is full of Jews, most of whom are Sudits. And they have made a synagogue in the hotel to worship there." The complainants then asked that the synagogue be broken up and that the Jews be removed from that section, that they be dispersed in other wards forever, because they had increased too greatly in number. The Christians declared that they would undertake to pay the owners ~~the~~ the rent of the houses occupied by the Jews, and for the lease of the hotel. ~~21~~

Prince Moruzi appointed a commission to investigate the complaint; on November 10, 1795, it filed its report, which was

unfavorable to the Jews. While Moruzi himself was not too friendly toward the Jews, he nevertheless failed to yield to the passions of the complainants, and refused to prohibit Jews from settling in that ward.

It must be borne in mind that at that time the princes in the principalities were appointed by the Sultan, and that the suzerain was in Constantinople, where the Jews had great influence. Whenever the Jews in the principalities were harmed, they appealed to Constantinople or to their influential coreligionists in the Turkish capital. The reigning prince would, therefore, hesitate before issuing a decree hostile to the Jews.

Up to the first third of the 19th century (1830) many of the streets in Bucharest were closed to Jews. In Calea, Vacaresti, in Tabaci, in Dudesti, and the like, sections which are now densely populated by Jews, they were formerly not permitted to live. More than that, in order to go safely through these sections, a Jew had to dress like a Turk and cover his head and his earlocks in order to prevent himself from being recognized as a Jew. Beyond a certain point, where the Church of S<sup>t</sup>. Nicolei Popescu is located, no Jew dared to go, for his life was in danger.

What a Fanariot prince refused to do, a native prince, Mihai Sturza, did later in Moldavia under a different form. In 1843, he forbade Jews to live in certain streets in Jassy, and Galatz. However, this decree was not rigorously enforced.

On February 15, 1845, a decree provided "the settlement of

inhabitants in the ward Munteni~~ca~~, in the part of the Carligul Manor, comprised within the boundary of Jassy." This manor was the property of the Patriarch. The land occupied in the words of that manor was leasehold ground, the rent of which was paid to him. The council and the prince both approved of the elimination of Jews and the prohibition against their settling in that part of the city. In fact, Jews did not live in that ward until very late. Eventually, they settled also in the residential section known as Capau, and in the Sararia, between the Pacuraru and Tetarash.

These restrictions emanated not from the Church but from the government. The monasteries did not exclude Jews from their estates - they even allowed them ground to build synagogues close to churches and monasteries. Thus laws passed on March 1, 1841, regarding leaseholds of the Greek monasteries at Jassy show quite a number of buildings erected by Jews on leasehold ground owned by the monasteries.

The prohibition against Jews' living in some streets of Jassy was not the only one which emanated from Mihai Sturza. In 1836 he had already issued a similar decree at Galatz. Upon his arrival in that city, the citizenry had petitioned him to make it "a city with improvements to enhance commerce, consistent with the splendid possibilities of the city." On August 23, 1834, he addressed a letter to the ~~Mayory~~<sup>M</sup>ayory of Galatz, embodying the projected improvements "to be made in the port in accordance with the wishes of the community .. and to permit all those who wish to benefit from the business in the city to erect stores and to erect buildings, durable, not frame, built in line, etc. ~~(25)~~

Following a petition by boyars, and businessmen, the prince issued a decree, on October 1, 1836, which restricted Jews to live in certain streets.

There is no record as to how fast the Polish-Jewish bankers flocked thither, and how eager they were to discard their Polish dress and put on "European style" clothes in order to be able to do business at Galatz, the city to which the above decree applied. But it is a fact that this decree was the forerunner of subsequent restrictions against the Jews at Jassy. Only bankers were privileged, but even they had to dress in "European" style. The other Jewish merchants, artisans, and the like, could not live in the new wards.

While there were no ghettos in Moldavia at any time, the Jews in Moldavia must have formed such ghettos unconsciously by grouping themselves densely in certain streets. As a matter of fact, in Jassy they ~~are~~ occupy<sup>ied</sup> the principal streets suitable for both residence and business. The complaint to which reference has been made, which was filed with Prince Sturza, in 1843, is rather emphatic and bitter against the Jews who "occupy all the stores and the best houses in the principal streets, so that there are very few Christians left." [28]

This complaint caused some legislation containing restrictions against the Jews. However, that measure was not enforced, for the very reason that it was against the interests of the property owners -- the boyars. They did not want to lose the Jewish tenants,

who paid the highest rents, and whose commercial enterprise increased the value of their property. These very landlords did their utmost to protect their Jewish tenants against any abuse or injury on the part of the government. In this manner, the law became a dead letter, and the Jews were able to live undisturbed.

The old canonical law forbidding the employment of Christian servants by Jews was renewed. Under Mavrocordat a decree previously mentioned was issued in 1841 forbidding Jews to employ Christian servants under thirty years of age.

The complaint of 1843 also mentions the fact that the Jews were "served by Moldavians who are being profaned by food and habits -- things unforgiveable by the holy law."

Mihai Sturza went still further. He forbade Jewish artisans to employ Christian workingmen and vice versa. Christian furriers were forbidden to work for Jews. The Jassy furriers petitioned the government to remove these restrictions. The government decided in favor of the furriers.

Jews were also <sup>restricted</sup> ~~forbidden~~ in their freedom of movement and occupation. They were forbidden to go from village to village and in the buying of foodstuffs. However, this prohibition was intended only for dealers.

In 1852, the Divan decided that a Jew had to produce a certificate of good character.

In 1867, a resolution of the city council forbade Jews from bidding on any official contracts ~~and~~

Down to the second World War, an unbroken chain of restrictive laws, ordinances and ministerial decrees was enacted against the Jews.

Hardly a parliamentary session closed without the enactment of some restriction.

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to enumerate all these restrictions. It is to be regretted that we are also unable to bring the list of restrictive laws down to date. The outbreak of the second World War hindered the author in his research, for which he had gone to Roumania in 1939, but had to leave Bucharest when the war broke out. However, even this incomplete record shows a total of 225 laws, including eight amended laws, which were enacted against the Jews in Roumania beginning with the year 1864 and extending down to August 17, 1913. ~~SA~~

There were many more disabilities, too numerous to list. Thus the government gradually eliminated the Jews from the professional and vocational ranks, and forced them into the artisan class. After restricting them in every manner possible, and driving them from every field of activity, the government forbade them to work. Fortunately, or unfortunately, most of these laws ~~never were~~ enforced.



IX  
CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

THE SUDITS IN ROUMANIA

The Roumanian codes, as we have seen, did not discriminate sharply against the Jews. In practice, however, various officials, either under cover of existing law, or when necessary for their purposes, without any legal justification whatever, abused the Jews and other minority groups within the principalities. Out of this situation there developed a class of inhabitants known as "Sudits", native-born Roumanians who ~~obtained~~ <sup>obtained</sup> foreign citizenship in order to have the protection of a foreign power against the officials of their own country.

Thus, under Mihai Racovitza of Moldavia (1704-05; 1706-10; 1716-27), Jews, like others -- aliens and indigens -- suffered much from arbitrary administration. Racovitza despoiled them of everything on which he could lay his hands. Stefan Cantacuzine, of Wallachia (1714-16), who made his people suffer under his tyranny, forced the Jews in his dominion to endure still more hardship and oppression. He caused the destruction of the synagogue in Bucharest, and did not permit the Jews to assemble for worship. He was a most greedy, avaricious man, bent on doing wrong and injustice, so that there was no priest, boyar, or merchant, great or small, who was not robbed by him.

Besides the "blessings" the Jews enjoyed under the domination of these not so kind or humane rulers, they also suffered from invading hordes who bled the inhabitants, and especially the Jews. Establishing residence or commercial enterprises at that time was, therefore, not very attractive to the foreigner. Doing so was fraught with many dangers, risks, and inconveniences. The extreme arbitrariness and avidity of the administration, the numerous bands of brigands with which the country was infested, changed the minds of foreigners about settling in the principalities. In this respect Mikosha properly remarked: "Only those who had to save themselves by running away from another country, or those who were driven by an irresistible business force, had the courage to establish themselves in the principalities."

As stated previously, only two categories of inhabitants were in the principalities: indigens and aliens. Religious designations were yet unknown. Thus, Armenians and Jews were not in these categories. By the word "Strain" ("alien," "stranger," pronounced "Strayin"), Armenians and Jews were meant. And yet, in the various hrisovs (~~decrees~~) issued by the princes, "indigenous Jews" were mentioned. So we find two categories of Jews -- indigens and aliens. The "alien" category had its origin in the practice of seeking protection by becoming "Sudits" (foreign subjects).

Maltreated by a corrupt administration, the Jews and many Christians were compelled to buy foreign protection by becoming Sudits. They would go across to Ardeal (which at that time

was Austrian territory), become Austrian subjects, and as such were exempted from the taxes and other obligations burdening Roumanian subjects.

Some boyars found it more advantageous to be foreign subjects than to remain under the protection of their own Roumanian government. In 1856, the number of Russian Sudits in Moldavia amounted to 35,000.

The main ~~causing~~ factor in the development of the Sudits was Austria's desire for territorial expansion. Her ambition was to broaden the empire southward to the Danube, eastward to the Dniester, and to the Black Sea. Since military conquest was too risky and complicated she preferred the slower but peaceful strategy of economic penetration.

As Jews were considered the most suitable agents for such a penetration, the Austrian government encouraged them to emigrate to Roumania. By 1844, the Austrian Consul at Jassy had an enrollment of over 200,000 Jewish Sudits ~~(subjects)~~ living in Moldavia. This situation led to considerable abuse on the part of the consuls who exercised their functions by virtue of an understanding with Constantinople. To put an end to this <sup>abuse</sup> ~~misconduct~~ ~~part~~, a special commission was created under the Organic Law, to examine the protective documents of every individual domiciled in Roumania. The foreign consuls were opposed to it, and the governments of the two principalities met with such disfavor that they were compelled to renounce the enforcement of that plan.

The development of the intensive practice of creating Sudits brought considerable revenue to the consuls in exchange for the protection given to the holders of "Sudit" certificates. Eventually the Sudits became so obnoxious to the Roumanian government that in every administration contract, a proviso was made that the contractor had to renounce his foreign protection, and, in case of controversy, submit to the jurisdiction of the principalities.

In 1795, Austrian-Jewish subjects living in Moldavia were ill-treated, and they felt compelled to ask for imperial protection. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Prince, he decided that since the complainants had married in Moldavia, they were no longer Austrian subjects.

On May 28, 1826, the monastery at Neamtz complained to the Prince that the Sudit Jews refused to pay the leasehold rent. The Prince ordered the prefect to enforce the terms of the lease. Fifteen such cases were located, and the Sudit Jews were forced to pay.

Sudits were exempt from the payment of taxes, but they had to pay for commercial licenses.

The Sudits in Roumania were under the protection of their respective consuls, and were exempt from local taxes. All they had to do in order to retain their status was to have passports periodically renewed. A Sudit could not be arrested or punished by the Roumanian government. Controversies between Sudits and Roumanian citizens were brought in the Roumanian Courts, but the Consulate had to be represented. Controversies between

foreign subjects were beyond Roumanian jurisdiction. The person and domicile of a foreign subject were inviolate, except in criminal cases, when the consular Staroste had to be notified. The possession of a foreign passport made the bearer absolutely immune to maltreatment, and, whenever necessary, the consul protected his subjects. The number of foreign Jewish subjects thus increased considerably. As the Roumanian government did not look with favor upon the rapidly increasing number of Sudits, the situation had to be brought to an end. On May 17, 1880, Italy renounced the protection of her subjects in Roumania, and on February 14, 1887, Austro-Hungary renounced her foreign subjects; France and Germany followed this example.

The abolition of the Sudit system by the Russo-Turkish War left the Jews of Roumania ~~living~~ in a "no-man's land." Prior to 1878, the principalities, as we know, were under Turkish suzerainty. Since Roumania had become independent, the protection of the respective Powers was unnecessary. When Austria withdrew her protection without troubling herself about the future status of her 16,000 subjects in Roumania, Roumania was not overhasty in granting them citizenship. All the Jews were declared "Straini" (strangers). The paradox of the situation was that the oppressive laws which had been enacted against the Jews over a period of half a century, were left intact under the disquieting term of Straini.

The withdrawal of foreign protection for the Sudits was exceedingly harmful to them. This withdrawal was a gradual process

which took place between the years 1880 and 1887. In 1886, by the terms of an accord reached between Roumania, Austria, Russia and Turkey, the subjects of the last three monarchies who resided in Roumania were proclaimed ~~these~~ Roumanian subjects. For the Jews of Roumania this meant that they could not claim Roumanian protection because they were registered as foreign subjects, nor could they enjoy the former protection granted to them under the consuls of these monarchies. They were handed over to the mercies of the unscrupulous Roumanian police. Roumania was the only country which had a great population legally without a country.

Part TwoTHE PROBLEM DEVELOPSChapter XDuring the Greek Revolution of 1821

The Greeks, known in the principalities as Fanariots (after the district Fanar, in the city of Constantinople), suffered considerably from Turkish oppression. To put an end to this condition they wanted to form a state independent of Turkey; to popularize this idea, they gave it a religious coloration. The impression was thus given to the people that it was not a political question, but one of religion, of Christian versus Muslim.

In order to carry out their plan safely, the Fanariots formed a secret organization in 1815, and succeeded in entangling the Roumanian aristocracy. The Russian consuls in the principalities, who mingled with the Roumanian elite, also became members of this organization. This caused a rumor to be circulated that the Russian Tzar was in back of the movement for independence. The revolutionary idea soon became firmly rooted in the minds of the people, and the leaders sought to enlist Alexander Ypsilanti as the head of their movement, after they had succeeded in convincing him that the Tzar favored the rebellion. By 1820 the movement had spread so widely that it had over 200,000 followers all over Europe, all believing that the Tzar approved and supported it.

Mihai Sutzu (1819) was the last of the Fanariot Princes.

143  
He ascended the throne in Moldavia and at once showed himself in sympathy with the movement.

The Greeks did not confide the actual plans and the more important secrets of the conspiracy to the boyars, who were afraid to reveal against Turkey. The only Roumanians who knew of the intended revolution were Tudor Vladimirescu and the revolutionary leaders of Oltenia (Wallachia).

It is not possible to say what success that movement had. The leaders of the revolution made no effort to win the Roumanian people over for their cause - just the opposite, as soon as the revolution broke out, they perpetrated every possible act of cruelty against the population, especially in Moldavia, and subjected the people to the most barbarous acts.

Jassy was the headquarters of the revolution. From here, revolutionary communications were sent out to the provinces and volunteers were openly recruited from ~~among~~ the dregs of the various nationalities. The main agitator at the head of the movement was a tailor named Duca, who, despite an unenviable reputation, had in some manner succeeded in working his way up in Roumanian society.

Under such leadership, the movement lost its revolutionary aspect and became an instrument of the outlaws, employed for the commission of every act of cruelty and brigandage. While preparations for the revolution were going on, the enrolled volunteers were idling their time away in the grog shops, drinking, cursing and brandishing knives, and boasting that they would soon rid the Christians of the Jews by slaughtering them.



144

Alarmed by this frightful news, the Jews sought protection wherever they could. The Sudits ran to their consuls and the indigenous Jews appealed to the local authorities for protection. They obtained considerable assistance from Iancu Schina, camarash (treasurer) and postelnic (marshal of the Prince's household), a brother-in-law of Prince Sutz, who gave them the assurance that proper measures would be taken to stop the hoodlums.

The Aga (prefect) ordered an investigation and it was found that the threats against the Jews had their origin in Duca's home. Duca learned of this, pretended to be surprised that <sup>the</sup> Aga, a personal friend of his, should let himself be influenced by such slander, which must have been spread by the Jews themselves. However, Duca assured the Aga that nothing would happen to the Jews.

The Consuls, however, were not satisfied with the assurances which had been given by the Aga, and Duca was compelled to take the necessary steps to satisfy the Consuls of the safety of their Jewish subjects. The Prince himself also ordered that strict measures be taken, and many of the brigands of Duca were arrested.

The revolutionary movement proceeded more swiftly, and the Postelnic, who was the right hand of the Prince, now worked openly in conjunction with the revolutionary leaders. His own son enrolled in the movement, as did ~~many~~ many others, from all classes and ~~stata~~ parts of the population. Christians who opposed the revolution were beaten severely and forced to contribute large

sums of money to the cause. Blacksmiths and other skilled workmen were forced to labor for the revolutionary army. Some of the Christian merchants must have been in the movement, because they gave liberally of their woollens to clothe the revolutionaries. The rest of the Christian merchants and the Jewish and Armenian merchants were also forced to contribute.

A spirit of anarchy pervaded the country. All the necessities for the army had been raised and the Jews were forced to supply the major part thereof.

On February 22, 1821, Ypsilanti came to Jassy and issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of the country. His very arrival was taken as the signal for an attack on the Turks. Forty Turks were disarmed and arrested, and a number of Turkish merchants were killed. The volunteers were given three days to pillage the Turks, but not to set the city on fire. The rebels hurled themselves upon the Turks and slaughtered many of them. The whole city of Jassy assumed the aspect of an abattoir. Nor were the Jews spared; many of them were taken from their hiding places and killed, despite Ypsilanti's order not to touch them.

The same scenes were enacted in Piatra. Arnauts (Albanian troops) sent from Jassy caught every Turk they could, bound them and brought them to Roman, where they were murdered.

A naturalized Serbian masquerading as a friend of the Jews offered to protect them by hiding <sup>them</sup> in the cellar. After crowding over a hundred Jews into an underground cache, he called volunteers and had the panic-stricken victims removed and killed.

When the news reached Constantinople, the Turks took revenge by killing the Greek Patriarch there and ordered the Jews to drag his body through the streets of the Turkish capital. Reluctantly they obeyed this order. The act provoked the Greek population, who swore vengeance against the Jews. As soon as the Eterists gave the signal for the revolt and covered the whole of Muntenia, they avenged themselves on the Jews by killing every ~~few~~<sup>one</sup> they met.

A strong detachment of volunteers was organized at Odobesti, under the command of one Captain Spiridon. The Jews of this town became panic-stricken but, due to the courage of a few of them there, the murderous captain spared them and withdrew from the town. Thus, not only the Jews but also <sup>the</sup> Christians of this town were spared. From that place the band marched to Adjud, where the captain and his volunteers used their sabres freely on Jews and Christians alike. After the slaughter, they came to Bacau, and a Spanish Jewish woman, named Bechora, from Turkey, who knew Spiridon, succeeded in saving the lives of the people.

From Bacau the volunteer bands marched to Roman, but a miracle saved the city. One of their vanguard, having sighted a body of peasants with their scythes on their shoulders, on their way to work in the fields, mistook them for Turkish soldiers. The brave Spiridon became frightened and retreated with his command to Herza. Here he was met by a force of Jews and Christians. After a short resistance the volunteers succeeded in breaking into

the town, where they massacred the aged men and helpless women and children; not one Jew escaped alive.

At Focshani a battle between volunteers and Turks resulted in the defeat of the volunteers. Soon the Turks entered the cities and restored order. At Rugincasa the volunteers pillaged the Jewish homes, killed the Jewish inhabitants, and destroyed whatever they could not carry away.

Thus did those outlaws carry on their war against the Turks, waging a great portion of it against the Jews. While Ypsilanti cannot be said to have approved of these barbarities, he was nevertheless an accomplice, especially since he congratulated Cavodis, the leader of the Galatz massacre. Ypsilanti left Jassy in March to attack Bucharest, whither Tudor Vladimirescu went also. In his place he left one Pendelescu, the commandant of the Eterists, in charge of the Moldavian capital.

Unable to win the boyars over to the Eterist cause, Sutzu gave up his throne and left for Russia. The boyars fled to Bucovina and such persons as could do so followed them. Those who had the means packed up as ~~many~~ of their belongings as they could carry, and took them along as they fled to safety.

The Eterists invaded the homes of the people, impudently insulting women and their daughters; the crying and screaming of the women were heard everywhere. The men were helpless to protect or help them. To make things worse, the people were

148

forbidden to leave the city while the volunteers carried on their acts of robbery.

At the same time Ypsilanti was marching from two points, Focshani and Berlad, to attack Bucharest. All along the route the same cruelties were enacted as at Jassy and in upper Moldavia. He ordered the Eterists to cover every city in Moldavia. Soon they invaded every village, despoiled the peasants of their cattle and took what they possessed. Every able-bodied man was forced to join their ranks and compelled to fight against their own kin. The plight of the Jew was not any better.

At Herza the same cruel and gruesome acts were committed by the Eterists.

The city of Botoshani was more fortunate. As soon as they heard of the approach of the Eterists, the Christians, Armenians, and Jews met and appointed a committee, headed by one John George, an aged pharmacist; the committee met with the Eterists, and promised their captain every assistance.

When the news reached Falticeni that the Eterists had entered Neamtz, most of the Jewish population, panic-stricken, crossed the Austrian border to Bucovina. The few Jews left in the city were sent to the monastery at Neamtz. The city itself was set on fire.

Among the Jews sent to the monastery was one Moishe Malineanu, a prominent businessman. When, after suppressing the revolution, the Turks took possession of this monastery, <sup>they</sup> found Moishe Malineanu alive but so disfigured that he was beyond

recognition. They sent him to a hospital at Cernauti, where he recovered his strength sufficiently to tell of his frightful experiences, and of the tortures which he and the other Jews had suffered there at the hands of those monks. Many of the unfortunate Jews died under torture, and their bodies were thrown out into the surrounding woods.

The Roumanian nobility had relied on Russia to help them to free themselves from the Turkish yoke. However, seeing that they could not induce the Tzar to put an end to the rebellion, the boyars sent a delegation to Constantinople, where they were promised that a military force would be sent to Wallachia and Moldavia. At the same time, the refugee boyars in Bucovina decided not to wait for the coming of the Turkish army. They succeeded in driving the volunteers from the Bucovina border toward Jassy, thus forcing them to meet the Turkish force coming up from lower Moldavia.

The Jews in Moldavia gave every assistance to this army, supplying it with provisions and arms, as well as with money. The refugee Jews in Bucovina did likewise. The boyars, on their part, assured the Jews that in due time they would know how to repay them for this help. As a matter of fact, after the rebellion had quieted down and the Turkish army had left, the Jewish situation improved considerably. But the Jews, too, had done a lot of good for the Christian population when the Turks came. For when the

Turks massacred the Eterists, the Jews intervened in their behalf.

The boyars advanced with their army to Botoshani, where Grigory Rizu was prefect and had 1,000 Eterists at his disposal. But as soon as the people in Botoshani heard of the arrival of Gherghel, the army, all the townspeople -- Christians and Jews - attacked the prefecture, drove Rizu out, and put Varnov in his place. During the following night, the Eterists left Botoshani and fled to Sculeni, where they tried to cross the Pruth River into Russia. Here they were held up and detained by a force which had encamped there to engage the Turks.

The march to Bucharest by the two forces under Ypsilanti and Tudor alarmed the capital the more since the people saw that the boyars and the consuls had gone to Brashov for safety. Beshli Agi had retreated to Russia, and this induced the caimans (court dignataries) to notify the people to take the necessary precautions for the safety of their persons and of their property. Before leaving Bucharest, the ~~consuls~~ gave their nationals the same notice. The result of these notices was frightful. The people ran aimlessly in whichever direction <sup>they</sup> ~~by~~ could. All the stores and the residences of the boyars were closed. The streets were jammed with vehicles carrying women, children, and baggage. A shortage of food was felt immediately and there was no money available. The most valuable things were sacrificed to procure some little amount of cash. The whole town became desolate; only

a few vagabonds were to be seen here and there, looking for an opportunity to commit some crime.

Jews, Armenians, businessmen, and artisans without means crowded into the monasteries, where, under rush-mat tents, they stayed with their families. All the roads had been rendered unsafe; bands of outlaws lurked everywhere in wait for the traveler, ready to despoil him of his possessions.

On March 17, 1821, Tudor and his army marched into Bucharest, and found the capital deserted. Property became worthless, and had no owner to claim or protect it. In order to secure food, Tudor's henchmen sold the most precious articles taken from the refugees along the road from Craiova to Bucharest for 5 percent of their value. The same conditions prevailed all through Muntenia.

The Turkish government finally decided to put an end to the revolution. An army was dispatched from Constantinople, and entered Roumania from three points. At sight of the Turkish army, the people, especially the Jews, breathed more freely. The first engagement with the Eterists resulted in the latter's being put to flight. The Turks repaid them in the same coin those "brave" soldiers had used. A decisive battle between the Turks and the revolutionaries was fought at Souleni, where the Eterists were routed almost to the very last man. The town caught fire, and the people, necessarily, suffered great loss. From Sculani the army marched to Jassy and from there its head directed the pursuit of the Eterists who, in their flight, continued their robberies and their murderous work at Herza and at Meamtz, and set those towns on fire.



150

In its fury and thirst for revenge on the Eterists, the Turkish army pursued them into every city, town, and village, killing them, not sparing either Christian or Jew. A remnant of Eterists who had taken refuge at Slatina and in the monastery of Secului was wiped out by the Turks. This ended the Greek revolt.

At first the Turks were interested only in suppressing the revolution and in restoring order. However, after the last skirmish at Sculeni, they still continued their hunt. In the course of seeking out the Eterists, they killed many a Christian Moldavian and Greek on mere suspicion.

In Tecuci the Jews were not disturbed by the volunteers, but the Moldavians who took to flight when the Turkish army came suffered considerably at their hands. The Jews protected these Moldavians and hid them so that they should not fall into the hands of the Turks. As a further precaution, the Jews of Tecuci sent a delegation to the Pasha, carrying many gifts to him, and this won his confidence so that he ordered a special detachment of 150 men for their protection. Thus when a group of Janizaries (~~Turkish soldiers~~) forced their way into the house of one Mihai Blanaru, his Jewish neighbor, Leon Cohn, notified the Turkish officer in command of the guard, and the Janizaries were immediately removed. When, on the following day, seven Christians were to be hanged, the Jews of Tecuci appealed to the Pasha, and their lives were saved.

Through the wit of two Jews, Meyer Feris and M. Lewits, the city of Botoshani was saved from the volunteers. In Bucharest, Joseph Halfan helped a number of boyars to escape from the hands of the Turks. Here, too, the Christians were in fear of death, and

153

their neighbors, the Jews, protected and sheltered them.

Jodache Prunkul, then prefect at Moenesti, was saved from the hands of the Greeks and later of the Janizaries in 1821 through the intervention of the Jews.

In 1822 there were still some disturbances at Jassy. By July 31st of that year things had quieted down. Many of the Christians who had run away to save their lives came back. But none of the boyars who had run away for their safety to Bucovina and to Bessarabia returned. Nor were there any of the Austrian and Russian consuls in sight.

In the same manner as at Tecuci, the father of Joseph Halfan, of Bucharest, saved the lives of two Christians who had been condemned to death, one of them was Enache Aridu, who as government treasurer refused to render a financial statement to the Pasha. Through his influence with the Pasha, however, Halfan succeeded in having the sentence remitted.

In a similar manner, the Jews of Moenesti saved the life of a prominent boyar named Iordache Pruncu. Pruncu was a great land-owner, and had held more than one office of high rank, such as prefect of police, Parcalab (mayor) of Galatz, Aga (Turkish military chief) of Jassy, and director of the mint. In addition, he had been elected seven times deputy and prefect of the Pŭtina district. He was condemned to death for having served as a volunteer in his country home. A certain Iancu Cocca, deacon of the Church, one of his fellow Roumanians, had denounced him to the Pasha. Pruncu was taken into custody and sent to Jassy. Passing through Moenesti,

14

when he saw some Jews he managed to say to one of them: "Please help me; follow me." Immediately the Jews sent one of their most influential men to the Pasha, and the sentence was remitted. Similarly, Jews saved the lives of seven Roumanian Greeks, near Piatra, who were to be decapitated by the Turks.

The Jews of Ploesti, at this time, were living in harmony with their Christian neighbors. The whole Jewish community consisted of twenty families. On the outbreak of the revolution they began to be harassed by local Greeks and Bulgars, who subjected them to humiliation and insult. These seized twenty Jews, bound them together with ropes, and drove them to Campina, a town some distance from Ploesti. There the Jews were ordered to lie down on the bare field, while their captors sat down to feast and to drink, telling their victims that within an hour they would be slaughtered like sheep. Suddenly they heard the beating of drums, and they took to flight. Soon the Turkish army arrived, and saved the lives of the twenty Jews.

CHAPTER IV XIRUSSIA TAKES A HAND ( 1828 - 1834 )

In 1828 Russia declared war against Turkey, and in time occupied Moldavia. Grigory Ghica, the then ruling Prince who was not in sympathy with Russia, gave up the throne and left the country. Soon after the Turkish army was defeated by Russia, a peace treaty was signed at Adrianople in 1829, by virtue of which Russia assumed the protectorate of the two principalities. Her army remained on Roumanian soil until 1834. The thrones of the two principalities had to be occupied by Russian-chosen princes, acceptable to Turkey.

The boyars, feeling that they had earned the confidence of Russia, submitted to her military commandant a list of prospective appointees to various posts. The Russian general declined to interfere, pretending that his position was non-political. He demanded instead that they take care of the needs of the occupying army. The brother of the former ruler, Prince Alexander Ghica, was chosen by the Russian Consul General to reign over Wallachia. But he was not wealthy enough to pay homage to the Sultan whose approval was necessary and <sup>he</sup> turned to a wealthy man, Hadshi Marco, who hoped that Ghica would marry his daughter. Marco privately advanced the money and enabled Ghica to ascend the

throne. Very soon it became known that the gift for the Sultan was obtained from the Jewish brothers Isrul and Samuel Hendik. Prince Ghica was unable to meet his obligations, and was preparing to leave for Constantinople. Since the two Jews were Russian subjects, the matter was brought to the attention of the Russian Consul, Catoff, who compelled the Prince to put up sufficient security to cover the debt.

Russia, as the "protector" of the two principalities, began to "improve" conditions by enacting the Organic law which planted anti-Semitism in Roumania. Commissions, one in Bucharest, a second in Moldavia, did the preparatory work. None gave a thought to the interests of the two principalities.

The Russian protectorate caused much dissatisfaction. The people resented the Russian pretense of protecting Roumanian interests; and the Sultan was not satisfied with the increased prestige of the Russian protectorate. In 1834, the Russian protectorate came to an end, and the countries were placed under the collective guarantee of the great European powers.

Alexander Ghica became prince in Wallachia and Mihai Sturza in Moldavia. Sturza turned out to be a blind tool of Russian Tzar; his treatment of the Jews was in the best tradition of Russian schools of oppression.

During the earlier reign of Prince Mihai Sturza in Moldavia, from 1819 to 1821, as well as from 1834 to 1849, the government was unfriendly to the Jews in that principality. Numerous rules and decrees were enacted and various ministerial circulars issued against

the Jews. The local authorities vied with the ~~Princely~~ government and abused their powers by issuing administrative regulations. Judiciary corruption and distortion as regards the prefect's orders, prevailed, down to the lowest official.

If the officials relaxed (~~the~~) the enforcement of the vagabond law, the village liquor law was enforced. If this was overlooked, they enacted a restrictive residential law by naming certain streets where Jews were not permitted to dwell. Restrictions were also enacted against merchants, dealers in exchange, tradesmen, and peddlers. These enactments and prohibitions were designed to press money out of the Jews. If the Jews enjoyed a short respite from official oppression, they were victimized by the mob. At the slightest provocation Jews would be seized, beaten, and kept behind bars for months without a trial.

Besides the continuous persecution and oppression to which the Jews were subjected, there were plagues and epidemics which had stricken the people during that regime, like pestilence, cholera, famine, blizzards, and polar frost. Hard winters brought floods in the spring; extreme heat would then follow, together with whirlwinds and heavy rains. Living under these conditions, in the midst of a people smitten by such calamities, the Jews were made to feel them more than the rest of the people, for the very simple reason that some of these plagues were blamed directly <sup>or</sup> ~~on~~ indirectly on them.

A pestilence broke out at Galatz in 1815, and soon spread over the whole of Moldavia. The government, under Prince Scarlat Alexander Calimach, took steps to check it. The boyars agreed to raise the sum of 10,000 lei to build hospitals. The plague did not abate, and the merchants had to contribute toward the maintenance of these lazarettos. Since the Jewish merchants were in the majority their contribution was considerably greater.

With the increase of fatalities from the plague, the burden of taking care of their own poor fell upon the wealthy Jews, who sought to escape responsibility by running away from the dangerous regions. The great mass of the poor found refuge at Jassy, where they were placed in tents outside of the city. Here, in 1818, funds were raised for them. Under such conditions, with the plague raging and decimating the population, commerce was at a standstill and this, too, contributed to greater suffering among the entire population, including the Jews.

The plague of 1824, with the cruel, unspeakable ravaging of the cities, especially Jassy and Galatz, caused a tremendous loss of lives. The streets were deserted and the people at Jassy died from misery, want, and hunger.

The plague relented for a short while -- but in 1829 it reappeared. It began again in May of that year, mildly at first, but assumed frightful proportions by the month of August. In Jassy, hundreds were carried off daily, and in the following month, September, the pestilence reached its climax.

In 1831 the cholera broke out in Bucharest and the Jews

were made responsible for the epidemic. The government shared that opinion and suggested the isolation of the Jews and of the Gypsies. However, after considerable bribery, the Jews were allowed to remain four weeks longer and then move, to be crowded into some barracks outside of the city limits.

The people in Moldavia had hardly recovered from the plague in 1831, when the cholera broke out in Bessarabia, from where it passed to Jassy in May and raged with more fury than it had in 1829. The Russian General, Kisselef, and the boyars could find no other means of "subduing" the plague than by again driving the Jews out into the fields around the Moldavian capital, Jassy.

Finally, the pestilence receded, but during the reign of Mihai Sturza it broke out again. Enlightened by previous experience, the government took preventive measures to check the malady. As soon as it became known that the cholera had broken out throughout the Black Sea basin in the surrounding principalities, in Russia and in Turkey, an extraordinary meeting of the administration was held (October 17, 1847).

Among the measures adopted at that session, those in regard to the Jews are particularly interesting. The sanitary code did not provide against the crowding of Christians in their homes and other places. But it did provide that "all the streets market places, yards, and walls be kept clean so as not to contaminate the air."

"Since the sickness of the cholera nestles mostly and becomes dangerous where people are crowded -- "it stated" --



and where places are kept unclean, the Jewish community shall be informed by the police that they are not permitted to have more than one family live in a house having only two rooms, due to the inability of Jews to procure healing means and their crowding in dwellings; it is their duty to go to villages for treatment, and provide themselves with remedies beforehand; to move as soon as they are notified after the appearance of the sickness in Bessarabia. Otherwise, they will be driven out without regard to the cause."

In addition, Russia had forbidden Jews to live near the boundary line, and insisted that Moldavia should introduce the same law. The Roumanian administration amended her code by adding that "Jews are not permitted to move into villages in the proximity of the river Pruth within a distance of two hours' travel."

Other provisions were made affecting the Jews in health and in sickness, limiting the number to be admitted to hospitals for treatment by providing that "only those shall be admitted to the hospital who are without means -- most preferably, Christians."

In 1848 the cholera reappeared. Sanitary or hygienic measures being unknown in Roumania at that time, the plague soon developed with an unprecedented fury, and its victims fell by the thousands, including parts of the army. The boyars and the wealthy Jews went abroad. It is claimed that in Jassy alone the number of the dead exceeded 10,000 of whom 3,000 were Jews.

Mihai Sturza's ambition to reoccupy the throne of Moldavia could not be realized without Russian consent. He needed money to reach his goal. These funds he obtained through a loan from a Jewish banker, Daniel, of Jassy. However, as soon as he returned successfully from St. Petersburg, he discovered that a conspiracy had been hatched against him. Among the conspirators were George Ghica, Rosetti, and a few other leaders of that time, and a Russian Jew named Dr. Weinberg, a favorite of General Mukowitch.

Sturza decided to dispose of these conspirators in some way, but he was deeply in debt to the Jews. In order to rid himself of these debtors, he adopted a novel plan of strategy; he issued a decree directing that any Jew who could not show a capital of 50,000 piasters and a spotless record of conduct was to be expelled from the country. Over 80% of the population, including bankers, were affected by such a drastic order. In order to save themselves from utter ruin, the latter turned their securities over to Daniel, who obtained an audience with the Prince. After a short interview, the notes were delivered to the Prince, who showed his good grace by rescinding the decree. Daniel then left the princely palace and went directly to the Minister of the Interior, Catargiu, and delivered the princely decree to him.

Although many laws hostile to the Jews were enacted under Sturza's regime, it cannot be said that they were prompted by anti-Semitic motives. But it is true that the Jews suffered

under him, and much more from unchecked abuses by the administration. Yet it was not due to hatred.

Sturza was deeply in debt. The only way of raising funds was to tax Jews, or to enact stringent laws against them that they would be willing to pay in order to secure relief from them. And the Jews did pay.

The local functionaries, seeing the attitude of the Prince toward his Jewish subjects, and the methods which he employed against them, followed a similar course. They either enforced the law, or overlooked it, depending on which course brought them greater profits. And if this method did not work, they had a still more effective and workable scheme. Any kind of disorder, or any fear of disorder, would drive the Jews to seek protection from the local authorities and for such "protections" they had to pay.

If excesses were committed against the Jews, such as those which occurred at Galatz on Christmas, 1846, they were spontaneous outbursts of religious fanaticism, rather than the result of anti-Semitic agitations, which were yet unknown in Roumania. Similar outbreaks occurred in Braila in 1841, 1842, and 1843, but on these occasions they were against the Christian wealthy class, and not against the Jews. However, there was this difference between outbreaks against Christians and those against the Jews: in the case of the former, they were immediately suppressed, while in the latter case, the authorities were rather slow in suppressing them. With respect to Mihai Sturza himself, the historian

can only concur in the opinion of Krenchely, the Austrian representative. He characterized the Prince as not bad, but <sup>as</sup> a weak man ready to submit his will to any advisor who had a plan for raising the money which he and his administration needed so desperately.

## CHAPTER XII

### FORESHADOWINGS OF REVOLUTION

The Organic Law forced upon the principalities brought internal dissension. Gradually the position of the prince became weaker and more insecure. Bitter resentment grew against the boyars, and Russian dictation was followed blindly.

Prince Bibesco (1842-48), a tool in Russian hands at that time, occupied the Wallachian throne in Bucharest. Due to the appearance of a new element in Roumania--intellectual young men who resented Russian interference in Roumanian internal affairs--Prince Bibesco abdicated, and was succeeded by Alexander Ghica.

The revolt of the enlightened intellectuals against Russia became stronger, Russia did everything possible to smother the movement for Roumanian independence.

In many respects the situation in Moldavia was similar to that in Wallachia. While the opposition formulated a list of reforms, the abolition of the Organic Law and the elimination of the Russian "protectorate" was not mentioned, for tactical reasons, Sturza, who was on the throne of Moldavia, was a loyal and obedient subject of Russia and defended the Organic Law

This made Sturza's reign insecure. The boyars were against him. Their leader, Michael (Mihai) Cogalniceanu, demanded equal civil rights for all citizens; the emancipation of the Jews; the secularization of church property; and other liberal reforms. Sturza was forced to abdicate. Then Moldavia and Wallachia found themselves united for the same cause.

But there was only a small difference between the two principalities: in Wallachia the opposition desired a change in the lower strata of the population, and sought only to better their lot. In Moldavia the leaders of the movement were the great landowners who wanted to do away with privileges restraining accumulation of wealth. However, in one essential point, the two principalities were strongly united: in the desire to be free of the Russian protectorate and the Turkish suzerainty.

Thus, the effect of the peace of Adrianople was fourfold: (1) Russia assumed the protectorate over the two principalities, which remained under Turkish suzerainty; (2) the principalities were endowed with the Organic Law framed by Russia, and at the same time began to lean toward the Occident, while Turkish influence weakened; (3) the weakening of Turkish influence led to the alienation of the principalities from her; (4) with the assumption of the Russian protectorate, accentuated by the Organic Law, conceived in the Russian spirit, and eventually culminating in the persecution of the Jews which later assumed great proportions, the seeds of anti-Semitism were planted in

Roumanian soil. True, Roumania leaned partly toward the West, but Russia's influence could not be removed.

Russia did not mind the Turkish suzerainty in Roumania. She had no fear of outside interference. But she did fear Jewish influence; the influence of the Roumanian Jews was like that of the Jews of her own country which she could not control. What is more, due to the treatment which she accorded the Jews in Russia, she knew that the Roumanian Jews would understand what was in store for them if she should become master. To weaken Jewish influence, she framed the Organic Law by inserting various restrictions against the Jews.

If Russia could not introduce all her anti-Jewish laws in the course of the six years of her occupation, she managed, through the Organic Law, to inject enough poison to convert the Roumanian people into bitter enemies of the Jews. The entire political and social structure of the two principalities was infected by the Organic Law.

This law divided the Jews into two classes, indigenous and immigrant Jews. A commission was created to determine the status or unfitness of the Jews, with the power to expel those who were found undesirable. The Jews in Moldavia were classed as immigrants, and, therefore, subject to expulsion without the right to return. The law provided that only Christian newcomers could be naturalized.

To assure a strict adherence to this law, Russia took the necessary precaution of providing that no change could be made except by "special authority" from the Sublime Porte with the consent of Russia."

The high council, under Prince Sturza, later formulated an administrative manual ( Manual Administrative ) containing a collection of ordinances, guided by the spirit of the Organic Law. This manual was later the basis for numerous laws enacted against Jews, as the act passed by the Assembly on July 4, 1839, which empowered the expulsion of vagabonds and the stopping of the Jewish "invasion."

For the purpose of identification, the ordinance required every community to furnish the provost with a list of its members. Every Jew would receive a card bearing his name, personal description, family status, occupation and the amount of his bond.

" Jews born here who failed to file a personal bond as provided by law shall be expelled; but those born abroad must prove that they have a vocation and possess a capital of not less than 5 000 lei." Failure to comply with the foregoing provision causes immediate expulsion.

These laws were usually followed by a manual of instructions formulated by the minister of the interior as to the manner of their applications by the local officials. They called for a census of the Jewish population. Under the provisions of the manual, every Jew -- indigenous or immigre -- who could not prove that he had a vocation or possessed the required capital, was labelled a "vagabond" and became subject to expulsion.

Under the same manual of the year 1840, every Jewish youth, boy or girl, leaving the parents' house ( to be married or otherwise )



had to apply for an identification card, without which he was declared vagabond. The rabbi had to report every actn of marriage. Those declared vagabonds were registered in the office of the minister of the interior, and they had the right to choose the point of their expulsion. If the neighboring government refused to receive them, they would be shipped across the Danube.

No Jew could move about in the country without a card, or change his residence without special permission. The local treasurer had to inform the police, who would endorse the card for exit, together with the assent of the treasurer and the name of the place to which he was bound. The act of classification had to be obtained from the prefecture, as well as the date of departure and a statement as to his destination.

Prior to the Russian occupation of 1828 to 1834, no passport had been required in Roumania. Jewish merchants could come unhindered to Moldavia <sup>from</sup> any country. Thanks to Russian influence the system of passports was introduced.

The police had to control the passports of Jews entering the country and to issue permits for a period not to exceed six months. The frontier guards had to report daily to the police the entry of every Jew, describing his credentials and his destination. If a Jew changed his destination without permission he would be considered a vagabond and would be expelled. To prevent any complications, the consuls were requested to inform their subjects of the importance of possessing passports.

The representatives of foreign powers did not accept this Russian-made restriction in Moldavia. They protested, and their subjects were not molested. But the indigenous Jews had no one to whom to protest and were helpless against their own government. This condition created a new category of Jews in Moldavia who were classed as "aliens, not subject to foreign protection."

The tangible result of the passport restrictions was not a reduction in the number of Jews in the principalities, but an enrichment of functionaries.

The same condition prevailed in Wallachia. A number of formalities were prescribed for the Christian stranger who wanted to obtain rights. He could buy property, engage in business, and after six years if he proved himself a benefit to the country, he could be naturalized and enrolled among the indigenous, with full political and civil rights, and could even hold office.

The same provisions were applicable to the Jews, except naturalization. Thus we find very little difference between the Organic Law in Wallachia and that in Moldavia.

The first steps taken under the Organic Law against the Jews were those by Mihai Sturza (1834-49). He instructed the administrative council "not to admit Jews into the country except those possessing transit passports valid for one month only." He ordered them to keep a register of all Jews. Only those who could prove the ability of sustaining themselves by means of some legitimate occupation, were to be permitted to enter.

Moldavia's sister principality, Wallachia, did not remain behind her neighbor. The same restrictions were introduced in this province. Native Jews, or those who lived there for a long period, had to prove a continuance in their profession or vocation.

The government went still further by not permitting Jews to engage in keeping inns in villages, or holding farms on lease. Those already holding inns or farms had to liquidate within fifteen days. Jews and other merchants were forbidden to deal in cereals. The reason given was that these middlemen caused the peasants to receive less and the consumer to pay more for these products. The Jews were forbidden to deal even in leeches.

Under the Manual Administrative, Jews were forbidden to live in certain streets, to rent shops in the neighborhood of the Metropolis (cathedral), or to fence in their synagogues. Jewish books could be sold by Jews only, because "the government must keep a close watch on Jewish books."

It has already been pointed out that the principalities, especially Moldavia, had been a haven for the Jews in former years. Besides the many Jews who came to Moldavia at the invitation of the landowners, and the government, some other Jews came because the country was attractive to them. This condition prevailed up to the beginning of the 19th century. Up to that time, indigenous Jews and the newcomers lived in peace, unhindered in their movements, and were able to engage in any enterprise without official molestation.

The Organic Law rendered the situation impossible.

Immediately after his ascension to the throne, Sturza issued a decree on September 10, 1834, with reference to the provisions of the Organic Statute. He continued to issue decrees unfavorable to the Jews. Finally, he shaped these decrees and ~~and~~ orders into: "Instructions for the investigation of vagabonds of any nationality, and the prevention of Jewish invasion of the land." Although the law was applicable to vagabonds of "any nationality," it was almost exclusively applied to Jews. And while numerous provisions were made for the prevention of unlawful entry by any foreigner, still more restrictions were enacted in the interest of the country. No inhabitant, especially a Jew, was permitted to receive even a relative or an acquaintance in his house without promptly reporting the fact to the local authorities. Nor could anyone leave his locality without some kind of personal identification.

Sturza was succeeded by a more humane prince, Grigory Ghica (1849-56). A decree of December 12, 1850, abrogated that act of Sturza which forbade the expulsion of Jews, "even if they have no trade or capital as required by law; it is sufficient if the individual be known in his community by his honorable conduct."

This decree came about as the result of a complaint by the Jewish community of Moenesti. Prince Ghica, however, went a little further. He recognized the fact that the vagabond law served only to enrich the officials. Therefore, a decree dated May 8, 1851, abrogated that law entirely. New instructions, tolerant in spirit, were then

~~87~~

issued. The classification of vagabonds was narrowed<sup>w</sup> to apply only to Jews who came from other districts without visible means of support and without passport, and who could furnish no security against becoming a public charge. Thus, a radical change came with the new ruler, and the drastic Russian measure was abolished.

CHAPTER XIIIThe Revolution of 1848 and After

The year 1848 was a period of revolutionary unrest in Europe. A spirit of nationalism swept over the continent -- a nationalism whose goal was political and social. Smaller nations, the vassals of great powers, sought freedom and national emancipation. In multinational states each national minority was striving for autonomy. This trend was especially noticeable in Austria-Hungary, which was populated by many nationalities. The Slavs of Croatia, the Slavonians of Dalmatia, the Poles of Galicia, the Czechs of Bohemia and the Roumanians of Transylvania wanted national self-determination.

In Moldavia and Wallachia, however, other forces came into action. Besides national autonomy, the inhabitants of the two principalities added resentment against Russian interference. Cogalniceanu, an eminent Roumanian liberal statesman, delivered an address in the Parliament on the subject "The Wishes of the National Party in Moldavia," in which he declared that "the Organic Law and the Russian protectorate can do nothing for the benefit of the country. Its last article robs Moldavia of its right to enact its internal laws. And how can it be otherwise when this law is an alien legislation, created according to Russian instruction?"

It is, therefore, not surprising that the revolution broke out in Moldavia. At the head of this movement was the famous Roumanian statesman, Mihai Cogalniceanu, a friend of the Jews. Another member of that revolutionary committee was John C. Brătianu, who returned to Roumania from France and became secretary of the provisional government. On March 27, 1848, a meeting was held at Jassy at which a program of immediate political action was formulated.

The main points of this program were: a free national assembly elected by all classes; freedom of press, political and religious rights; the emancipation of the Jews; unification of the two principalities.

Tzarist Russia could not welcome such a movement and she threatened Moldavia with a reoccupation. Through devious machinations, she succeeded in hampering the revolutionary movement. Gradually Russia became virtual master of the two principalities and was instrumental in having thirteen of the Moldavian revolutionary leaders expelled from their native land.

The leaders of the revolutionary movement wanted Prince Bibescu, the ruler of Wallachia, to lead the revolution, but he declined. Not discouraged they continued their activities and on June 9, 1848, at Galatz at a large meeting, a priest named Shapca, gave his blessing to the liberation of the people."

The draft of the platform, prepared at the convention of March 27, 1848, and adopted prior to the revolution, was signed by 800 Roumanian citizens including the Metropolit, Meletie. Moldavian youth, inspired

98 175

by Cogalniceanu, joined the movement. Their program called for equality of civil and political rights for citizens. A similar program was adopted in Wallachia and announced by the prince.

After a provisional government had been formed, a new but unsuccessful appeal, had been made to Prince Bibescu to lead the movement. This second appeal, signed by the provisional government, stressed Roumanian grievances against Russia, and pleaded with Bibescu to "yield to the voice of the fatherland and place yourself at the head of this great movement."

Thereupon the provisional government issued its own proclamation dated June 11, 1848, which began thus:

"In the name of the people of Roumania, respect; respect for property (rights), and respect for persons! God is the master, and He shows Himself to us; blessed is he who speaks in the name of the Lord."

The proclamation went on to say that, "based on the old customs of the land," it appealed to every Roumanian who valued liberty to unite in brotherly love, to repudiate the Organic Law, and to preserve the political and civil rights of every Roumanian. Roumania was to secure its administrative and legislative independence in accordance with existing treaties. The Jews were to be emancipated, and recognized as equal fellow citizens.

"Citizens, peasants, boyars, soldiers, merchants, artisans of every nationality, of every religion in the capital and in other cities;" the manifesto reads--"Greeks, Serbs, Bulgars, Germans, Armenians, Jews; arm yourselves to maintain order and to accomplish the great cause. Our fatherland is also yours. You like to live here, and it



is good to have you here. The old system chased you away from the common table, but from now on, our table is yours--our brotherly repast--we shall have the same rights."

The proclamation was signed by Neofit, Metropolit for Ungro-Wallachia; and by G. Scurto, J.C. Bratiano, and A.G. Golesco.

A draft of a constitution was submitted by the provisional government. Two days after it was proclaimed, Kotzebue, the Russian consul at Bucharest, addressed a note of protest to the prince.

On June 16, 1848, the provisional government issued a second proclamation which embodied this statement:

"Today all classes are fraternizing. Today the country is no more divided into classes, with opposing interests. Today all inhabitants of the land are Roumanians, ~~with~~ equal and brothers."

The hostile show of Russia placed Wallachia in an unpleasant situation. The boyars sympathizing with Russia were dissatisfied with the revolutionary movement. Inasmuch as they were instigated by Russia, they strongly opposed the provisional government. Turkey could not remain indifferent either, especially when Russia became active against the revolutionary movement. At the outbreak of the revolution, Turkey dispatched Shleiman Pasha to investigate conditions in Roumania. The Roumanian people, resenting Russia, were in favor of such investigations. Turkey was favorably disposed to approve the revolutionary movement because it was basically anti-Russian. The revolution seemed to be saved. The people demanded the burning of the Organic Law, and on September 6, 1848,-----

a solemn bonfire reduced this hated document to ashes.

Russia became increasingly resentful. She felt politically defeated by a handful of revolutionaries. However, being that the principalities were still under Turkish suzerainty, no radical solution was at hand. The Sublime Porte would have prevented a territorial absorption by Russia. She was, therefore, forced to adopt a more peaceable course. Russian diplomacy in Constantinople succeeded in convincing the Sultan that the revolutionary movement was dangerous for both countries. Shleiman's recognition of the revolutionary government was repudiated, and he himself was recalled. Turkish troops under the command of Foad Effendi were immediately dispatched to Roumania and with the assistance of Russian troops, order was instantly restored. Thus, the revolution failed, <sup>and</sup> its leaders were arrested, tortured, and exiled.

In this unsuccessful movement, Roumanian Jews played their part. In Wallachia <sup>there were</sup> ~~it was~~ Constantin Daniel Rosenthal and Barbu Iscovesco. Rosenthal came to Roumania from his native Hungary shortly before the revolution. He was naturalized very soon and thus became a Roumanian citizen. He joined the movement and worked ~~together~~ with C. A. Rosetti, one of its foremost leaders. After the collapse of the revolution, Rosenthal was exiled together with a number of other leaders. Some of these leaders were taken to Turkey and imprisoned, but Rosenthal succeeded in having them freed, and they went to Paris. Later he was sent by the Roumanian revolutionary leaders on a dangerous secret mission to Hungary and ~~he~~ was arrested in Budapest. Tortured by the police who wanted him to betray his comrades, Rosenthal died in prison.

Another Jewish participant who risked his life for the revolutionary cause in Roumania was Shae Senders of Moldavia. On behalf of the provisional government he undertook a mission to induce the Poles to desert the Russian camp and unite with the Roumanians.

After the revolution, Prince Bibescu granted a constitution which abolished the restrictions on the Jews and proclaimed all inhabitants equal before the law.

Grigory Ghica became ruler of Moldavia and Barbu Stirbei of Wallachia. This change proved to be beneficial to both principalities.

In Moldavia, Prince Ghica adopted a friendly policy toward the Jews. Many of the restrictive laws enacted by his predecessor were repealed. The law with reference to vagabonds was modified. Jews living there were not molested; only the newcomers were slightly restricted in their rights.

A resolution adopted by the council appointed by Prince Ghica read: "indigenous Jews, even those without means or useful vocation, are permitted to live here, as long as they are known to their community, or if some known person vouches for them."

A legal status was created for newcomer Jews although this decree recognized two classes of Jews--indigenous and recent comers--nevertheless the indigenous Jew thereby became de facto a Roumanian citizen.

The rural law enacted by Sturza in 1844 forbidding Jews to own inns in villages was also repealed by Grigory Ghica. All that was required of the innkeeper was: (1) to declare before a magistrate that he

possessed the means of conducting his business; (2) to pay the required inn tax of four ecus in gold annually in villages of 100 inhabitants, and of six ecus in gold in places of 200 inhabitants; (3) not to extend credit for more than fifteen piasters (a piaster was worth twenty-six cents) for alcohol consumed; (4) in addition, local judges were to see to it that peasants were not impoverished by drink.

Only the restrictions in regard to the location of synagogues were left unchanged. The clergy objected to the location of synagogues near churches and the government had to take it under consideration. The High Council adopted a resolution, subject to the approval of the prince, calling for the destruction of all synagogues built less than five hundred feet from a church and forbidding the construction of new synagogues except where this distance was maintained.

In 1852 a recruiting law was enacted, containing the following provisions:

- (1) Jews were to be subject to military duty like other indigenous classes.
- (2) They were to furnish one recruit for every ten families, the same proportion as in ~~the~~ other classes.
- (3) Every Jewish community had to furnish its contingent.
- (4) For recruiting purposes, Jews had to be registered in their respective departments.
- (5) The Jewish communities, officially divided into corporations, were to be divided into sections of seventy families each. Only rabbis and officers were to be exempt.

(6) Every Jewish community had to keep a register in which were to be entered in the seventy-family sections, the names of all the Jews recruited by order of the corporation, in accordance with the formulae to be adopted.

(7) Jews might substitute recruits by means of hiring, just as Christians could, provided the substitute was a Jew and enrolled voluntarily.

(8) Jewish public school graduates showing a certificate of good standing in their communities were to be exempt. The same privilege applied to boatswains, agriculture, and similar occupations.

(9) The recruiting age for Jews was to be from 18 to 24 years.

(10) The Jewish communities were to be held responsible for the enforcement of the recruiting law, and to furnish their respective departments with lists of their recruits.

(11) In case of desertion, the community had to replace the deserter with another recruit within three days.

Among the other changes introduced by Prince Ghica was the repeal of the old law which kept the Jews out of the villages. In 1852, at the intercession of the rabbi of Stambul, Ghica permitted Jews to live in villages, and to acquire vineyards in Moldavia.

In 1855, a different decree was issued by that prince. The Moldavian Jews then petitioned the Sublime Porte for permission to hold real property. Their request was granted, <sup>and</sup> the Grand Vizier recommended to the prince that he approve it, but the extra session

of the Divan (Council) rejected it.

With <sup>the</sup> exception of this act by the Council, it may be said that the Ghica regime was favorable to the Jews, and that their condition was ~~was~~ considerably ameliorated.

CHAPTER XIVThe Conference of Constantinople; The Treaty of Paris

During the revolution of 1848, Great Britain and France resented Russia's attitude in the principalities. But through her political intrigues Russia had succeeded in bringing Turkey under her influence, if not actually in making an ally of her. Furthermore, Russia had thus reached out into Asia, and, by reason of her contiguity to the Black Sea, she was a detriment to British commerce. France, too, which always had little love for despotism, was now more embittered under the rule of Napoleon III; Napoleon himself could not forget that Nicholas I had showed considerable reluctance in recognizing him as the Emperor of France although he had approved the coup d'état of 1851 in France.

More than any other country, Russia contributed to the abortiveness of the revolution of 1848. Through the help which she gave to Austria, the Hungarians were subdued. Necessarily, Austria became indebted to Russia for this assistance. In Germany, by reason of marital connections, Nicholas I had a great deal to say, so that the ruling princes all proved themselves vassals of St. Petersburg. Thus, in case of war, Russia could always count on Germany's sympathy and on her help as an ally.

The Russian Tzar, as has already been pointed out, had his eye on Constantinople. In order to succeed in that direction, he could count on Austria's gratitude for the assistance given her in 1848. He could count also on Prussia, which was an avowed

antagonist of the Napoleonic policy. Thus, while these two powers could hold France in check on the Rhine, Nicholas could regulate things on the Danube, on the Black Sea, and on the Bosphorus. As for Britain, the Tzar thought that he could win her over by letting her have Egypt and Candia, while Britain would permit him to take Moldavia, Bulgaria, and Servia for himself.

England, however, was rather skeptical. What Nicholas proposed was no bargain for her. For she saw that she would eventually secure Egypt anyhow. To permit Russia to expand toward the southwest was not the most desirable thing to do. She, therefore, held out a friendly hand to France.

This did not discourage the Tzar. In order to continue his game, he commissioned Alexander Sergevitch Mencicoff, in 1853, to induce Turkey to recognize the Russian protectorate over the Christians in the Ottoman empire. Turkey did not fall into this wily trap, and the Tzar now realized that he had gone a little too far, but that it was too late for him to retreat. On July 3, 1853, Russia occupied the two principalities. The ruling princes, Stirbei and Grigory Ghica, left their respective capitals and sought refuge in Vienna; here the ambassadors of the European powers later met, but were unable to reach any agreement.

As soon as the Russian army marched into the principalities, Europe began to stir. France and England demanded that Russia evacuate the principalities forthwith, but the Russians failed to move out. The then customary ultimatum followed, and in 1854 war was declared against Russia.



In the month of September, 1854, British and French fleets passed through the Dardanelles, and on October 4th Turkey declared war on Russia. On October 8th, Omar Pasha, chief of the Turkish army, demanded that Prince Gorchiakoff evacuate the principalities. An engagement took place between the Turkish and the Russian fleets in which the former was defeated. The British and French fleets then entered the Black Sea. There, subsequently, a battle was fought; Sevastopol fell, and Austria sent an ultimatum to Russia. The latter consented to an armistice and evacuated the principalities. To the great surprise of Europe, Austria occupied the evacuated territory and became the custodian of the Danube, and held it against any invader. Following this occupation, Tzar Nicholas I died, in 1855, and his son, Alexander II, succeeded him.

After the Crimean War, a conference of the Powers was held at Constantinople on January 11, 1856, at which an earnest effort was made to place the Jews in Roumania on an equal basis with the rest of the population. Two articles were inserted into the protocol by the French and British ambassadors.

Article 15 provided: "Strangers can own land in Moldavia and in Wallachia, and acquire the same duties as indigens, and be subject to the laws (of the land)." Article 18 provided: "All classes of the population, without distinction of birth or cult, shall enjoy civil rights, especially property rights in all its forms; but the exercise of political rights will be denied to indigens placed under foreign protection."

On January 16, 1856, the belligerent Powers accepted the terms of Great Britain, France, and Austria, and the war came to an end. One of the terms imposed on Russia was that she renounce her protectorate over the Balkan States. The Treaty of Paris was then concluded, on March 30, 1856; the signatories to it were France, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Turkey. In the interest of all concerned, the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire were guaranteed; and the two principalities were placed under the joint guarantee of the European Powers.

The treaty provided that all existing privileges in the principalities were to be retained, under guarantee of the Powers, but that no one Power was to exercise any prerogative in their internal affairs. Turkey undertook to conserve an independent and national administration, and full liberty of religion, legislation, commerce, and navigation. The statutes and ordinances hereto in existence were to be revised. A special commission of the contracting parties was to meet in Bucharest with a representative of the Sultan, and its members were to frame a new code of laws. The Commission was then to report its work to the Divans (Assemblies) representing all classes. By the terms of the Treaty of Paris, the Organic Law became null and void, and no Russian protectorate was to exist in the principalities as long as Turkish suzerainty was maintained.

Article 13 of the Treaty of Paris read: "All cults and their adherents shall enjoy equal liberty and equal protection in the

two principalities." Aliens were enabled to possess property in Moldavia and Wallachia, like indigenous citizens. All Moldavians and Wallachians, without exception, were made eligible to hold public office, and all classes, without distinction, could enjoy equal civil and political rights.

In 1856, <sup>when</sup> Theodor Balsh was appointed Caiman (assistant to the prince), the Jews desired to improve their status. A number of the autochthomous Jews petitioned him to issue an order directing the Council of Moldavia to institute some reforms with respect to property ownership by Jews. This petition, dated Jassy, July 10, 1856, was signed by L. Kahana, Michael Daniel, N.A. Kaufman, Moses Wexler, and others.

In a memoir addressed to the Congress at Paris, Prince Grigory Ghica of Moldavia declared that he had no objection to the Jews enjoying equal rights, if those who acquired them were to submit to the laws of the country by renouncing their previous potentate and becoming true Roumanian citizens.

In the Roumanian Parliament in 1857, Michael Cogalniceanu and Costach Negri were strongly in favor of a broad constitution. Cogalniceanu showed the great advantage to the country in the adoption of a broad principle which would unite all elements of the population.

Cogalniceanu had for many years advocated the principle of equal rights in the principalities, regardless of creed. Into the revolutionary program of 1848, he had already inserted the following provisions: "By progressive and humane measures the fusion of the

Jews and their changing into a state of useful citizens must be done as soon as possible." On October 25, 1858, at the session of the Council, he again declared: "We want Europe to be just to Roumania, and Roumania to be just to all her sons, without distinction."

#### THE TREATY OF PARIS OF 1858

A conference of the European powers was to be held in Paris, in 1858. The two principalities were requested to formulate a plan which would express the sentiment of the people. In order to safeguard the rights of all classes, Alexander Grigory Ghica, one of the most liberal Princes ever to occupy the throne of Moldavia, made thousands of Christian businessmen boyars and supplied them with diplomas, so that the business class might also have a voice in that meeting.

The Roumanian population was astir, and all classes were agitated. Meetings were held, and delegates were elected. The Council was to decide their future. Armenians and Jews who had no vote also met for the purpose of deciding what steps they were to take to safeguard their interests. The Armenians decided to send a delegate to Paris to work for their emancipation. Feeling that they were children of the soil, and relying on the good will of their country to treat them as such, the Jews decided to throw in their lot with the rest of the population.

The representatives of the Powers met in ~~Congress at~~ Paris

in order to bring security and stability into southeastern Europe, and the Jewish leaders of Jassy availed themselves of this opportunity. They sent a delegation to Paris to bring the Jewish question to the attention of the Congress, where they hoped to secure favorable action.

Under the terms of the protocol of Constantinople, of 1856, all inhabitants of the principalities were placed on an equal footing, but native Jews who were foreign subjects could enjoy no political rights. However, every native Jew who was without foreign protection "shall enjoy citizens' rights." The protocol of Paris of 1850 and that of 1858 contained the same provisions.

The commission appointed by the Powers, called to the attention of the conference at Paris the exclusion or limitation of rights provided by the Divans at Bucharest and at Jassy, and recommended careful consideration. But the English delegate called for the treatment of the Jews "according to Christian principles, with the same tolerance which they have always found in the rest of the Ottoman empire." The Russian delegate, Dr. Vasile, replied: "The moral and social state of the Jews in Moldavia is such that their admission to political rights and the suppression of certain restrictions concerning them may lead to unpleasantness."

The success with which the Armenians and the Catholics had met by petitioning the commission led the Jews of Roumania to ask their coreligionists in France to intercede in their behalf, with the conference, which at that time was in session in Paris.

Baron de Rothschild immediately addressed a letter to Count de Walewski, Minister under Napoleon III, asking him to interest himself in the cause of the Jews in Roumania. To this letter the Count replied sympathetically on July 24, 1858.

On June 5, 1858, Count Walewski had presented a paper to the conference in which he recommended the organization of the principalities on the principle of equality so that "Moldavians and Wallachians shall be equal before the law and equally admissible to all public offices in one or the other principality without distinction of origin or religion."

The principalities were then placed under Turkish suzerainty, but Turkey could not interfere in their internal affairs, which were left entirely to the government of the principalities.

In connection with the meeting of the European Powers in Paris at the close of the Crimean War, it is of considerable interest to note that the Jewish leaders at Jassy, availing themselves of the opportunity presented to them by the meeting, sent a delegation to the French capital for the purpose of bringing the question of the Roumanian Jews to the attention of the convention. But a group of pious Jews in Roumania raised their voices in protest against that move. These God-fearing men were afraid that, by gaining citizenship and by mingling with the Roumanian statesmen and politicians, their Judaism would be weakened. The petition and protest of these Orthodox Jews helped the Roumanian government to table the whole Jewish question since that some of the Jews themselves declining citizenship, and since the Jewish leaders themselves showed weakness there was nothing left for the convention to do but to pass this question over without taking any action.

The constitution which was adopted at the Convention of Paris provided that only Moldavians and Wallachians of Christian sects were to enjoy equal political rights; that the enjoyment of those rights might be extended to other cults by means of legislative action.

This apparently innocent last clause, inserted with the best intentions on the part of the Paris convention, was meant to enable all other inhabitants of the principalities to acquire citizenship rights, but was later distorted. The Roumanian anti-Semites used it as a weapon against the Jews; and it was used by the Jews as a basis for and as a strong argument in the demanding of naturalization. At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, it served as the subject of repartee between the German Chancellor, Prince Otto von Bismarck, backed by Benjamin Disraeli, the Earl of Beaconsfield, and the Russian representative. As far as Roumania herself was concerned, this single clause turned the Treaty of Paris of 1858 into a farce. However, Great Britain, Austria, France, Russia, Prussia, Sardinia, and Turkey, the seven European powers represented in this convention, met again six years later, in 1864, at Constantinople, and confirmed the action taken by the Congress.

XVCHAPTER ~~THIRTY TWO~~JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO ROUMANIA

A description or analysis of what the Roumanian Jews have contributed to the development of Roumania would require a special volume. This chapter will outline only the main facts pertaining to their role in the industrial and cultural life of the country. In the field of industry, the discovery of petroleum (1780) is of great importance.

In 1854 a Jewish workman from Galatz applied a rather primitive method of distilling petroleum. In 1857 two Jews bought a tract of land at Tetscani, and after finding petroleum, erected a small refinery, thus establishing the first petroleum industry of the country. In 1859 Wold Lazarovici, of Moenesti, also established a petroleum refinery.

Roumanian Jews soon extended the export of petroleum to Vienna. The first large-scale exporter of Roumanian petroleum was Joseph Teilar, who extracted paraffin from petroleum and established a large paraffin factory at Valea Ariuitor. He was also the first to improve the transportation of petroleum by importing fourteen tank cars, later donated to the Roumanian railways. When Austria attempted to cut off Roumanian export by imposing a heavy tax on petroleum, in 1870-71, Teilar defeated the attempt by establishing refineries at the Austrian border towns of Chemesh and Itscani. He brought the raw material here from where it was easily transported and sold in Vienna, competing successfully



with Austrian production. He was also the first to introduce the pipe system for the transportation of oil directly to Constanza.

While prior to 1828 there was no oil industry in Roumania, one Hayim Cozak, in that year, became the owner of 250 gallons of tar, for which he paid 500 lei. Another transaction followed in which a man by the name of Feivish invested the sum of 166 lei. By 1832 the export of petroleum by Jews amounted to 69,813 lei. In 1846 one Nuchem Chors constructed a refinery at Lucacesti, in the Bacau district. Ten years later, (1856) the export of petroleum by Jews had been considerably developed. In the following year Avram Meyer built an extremely large refinery. Others were built by Hayim Mogirescu in 1860, by S. Nadler in 1862, and by Avram Hayimson in 1865. These and other Jewish entrepreneurs installed machinery for driving wells. The industry and the export of its products was so greatly developed in course of time that eventually oil production amounted to over 2,000 carloads a day, with over 35,000 engaged in it.

The founder of the largest petroleum industry in Roumania, the Steaua Romana, was a man by the name of Kirshenbaum. Jacques Elias was the founder of the Columbia Company. Aurora, another large company, was founded by a man named Zentler.

In the district of Ploesti, oil and silk-worm production was at a low level. Jewish merchants saw possibilities in the development of these two industries, and before long they succeeded in raising the standard of both. Within a short while the values

increased tenfold, and made a definite contribution toward increasing the wealth of the country.

The same thing may be said about the tobacco industry and the distilleries in that district, which were developed by Jews.

The first match factory in Roumania was established by Samuel Goldenthal at Jassy, and by Adolph Stern, in association with Cerkez, at Bucharest. The first woolen factory was established by Abraham Lippe Juster, at Piatra-Neamtz. Another Jewish pioneer introduced the gas lamp into the country.

The sugar factory at Suceava and the one at Soscut were founded by the Jewish Philanthropist Elias, mentioned above.

The export of saltpeter was developed by Srul Veniminovici who had a large saltpeter plant. The Divan encouraged him in his undertaking by granting him 150 stinjin of firewood. (A stinjin is more than two cords.)

The Roumanian Merchant Marine was developed by Mendel Brothers of Galatz and Braila, the largest shipowners in the country and L. Mendel and Company developed a large export and marine business at Galatz.

Thirty-three distilleries, one whiskey factory, sixty-nine mills, and twenty-five bakeries were owned and operated by Jews. Several official documents in existence show that Jews were among the foremost merchants in Moldavia, and that they were quite numerous. One document, dating from 1769, says: "In each of the smaller towns, such as Suceava, Neamtz, Piatra, Bacau, Adjud, Berlad, Vaslui, Hussi, Falciu, Lapushna, Soroca, Movila, Harlau, Dorohoi, and Targu

Frumos, there are one or two merchants selling groceries, bread, tallow, candles, and similar merchandise. There are also drinking places selling wine and Jews selling whiskey, axle grease and crude oil. On market days, which are held once a week, each of the inhabitants brings whatever he has: Oxen, cows, horses, flour, wheat, maize, oats, butter, honey, wax, tallow, skins, etc., to sell and pay taxes. But in the cities like Cernauti, Botoshani, Focshani, Galatz, Kishihev, there are well established mercantile houses, some selling dry goods, others dealing in honey, oxen for slaughter, oxen for export, butter, tallow, wax, and they pay the fixed tax established by the government."

The proportion of business done by Jews in Bucovina may be estimated by the fact that, among them, there were two dealers in exchange, thirteen owners of large mercantile houses, seventy-five small merchants, three cattle handlers, four dealers in honey, two dealers in tobacco, six wine dealers, two fruit dealers, thirteen dealers in rabbit skins, 388 liquor dealers, and one fish dealer.

The Jews in Moldavia engaged in every trade. According to available records, there were among them: three watchmakers, two kettlemakers, three furriers, two tobacco spinners, three operators of coffee houses, two bootmakers, fifty-three tailors, one tanner, seven hawkers, one engraver of seals, three glaziers, one bookbinder, five butchers, two painters, two bricklayers. Jews engaged in other occupations included: six factors, fourteen stage-drivers, six water carriers, one boatman, one night watchman. The number engaged as clerks, journeymen, and similar positions, is not known as no records are available.

In agriculture, there were 170 Jews engaged as lessees of manors, sixty-five of whom held one-tenth of the manors on lease. A law enacted by Grigory Ghica in 1747 prohibiting Jews to hold land on lease remained a dead letter during his two terms of office. As has already been stated in a previous chapter, it was against the interests of the nobility, who used to spend their time and money abroad and left their estates to be managed by others. Finding the Jews better administrators of their estates, they ignored the princely restrictions, even those which they themselves had imposed.

~~CHAPTER X~~JEWISH PHYSICIANS IN ROUMANIA

Jewish physicians have played an important part in the history of Roumania. Ever since the two principalities were formed, Jewish physicians have been closely identified with the life of the Roumanian people and many of them have distinguished themselves professionally. Some of them attained great influence with various Roumanian princes and with dignitaries of the church, also rendered valuable service to the country. Their skill was greatly appreciated in Moldavia, where they represented two-thirds of the practicing physicians. While there is no record available as to their exact number, we must assume that in both Moldavia and Wallachia where the canonical code of Matei Basarab forbade them to practice and the priests warned the people against taking medical advice and aid from Jewish doctors, although they themselves were treated by their personal Jewish physicians, there was a considerable number of them in practice.

It would seem very strange if, in those days when Jewish physicians enjoyed the confidence of the people of other countries, they had not been called to the principalities. Nor is it probable that the Jews left themselves without medical service, especially in places where their population was large. As proof we may cite the eminent physician and Rabbi, Joseph Solomon Del Medigo, at Jassy in the 16th century.

In the early part of the 16th century, when Stefan the

Great fell seriously ill, he was treated by the personal Jewish physician of the Tartar Khan.

Under Nicolai Mavrocordat (1719-39) we meet with a Jewish physician named De Tausga, a diplomat and advisor of the Prince.

Another Jewish doctor, de Fonseca, played an important part in the regime of that same Nicolai Mavrocordat. He took a bold stand against the prince's adversaries in Turkey who were instigating <sup>a rebellion</sup> against him.

DeFonseca was a Marrane who, like many other Jews in Spain and in Portugal, was forced to profess Christianity while at heart he remained a Jew. Voltaire acclaimed him "a savant and alert scholar, well versed and perhaps the only philosopher of his race".

DeFonseca was not the only Jewish physician who stood on intimate relations with Prince Mavrocordat. The latter was a warm friend of another Jewish doctor, Tobia Cohen, <sup>an outstanding</sup> ~~foremost~~ scholar and confidant of Rumi Pasha. Robias (or Tobia) Cohen studied at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, Germany. He was admitted by the express order of Emperor Frederick the Great and during his entire period of study he was supported by the elector of Brandenburg. He then went to Padua, Italy, where he obtained his degree. Later, he established himself at Constantinople where he soon earned a great reputation and became intimate with Mavrocordat. He had gone to Brusa, whence he went to Jerusalem, where he died in 1729 at the age of seventy-seven.

Another eminent physician in Jassy was Dr. Joseph Cuneyan, a contemporary of Dr. Cohen and Dr. Fonseca. He died on

October 23, 1732, and found his eternal peace at the old cemetery in Jassy.

Voivoda Alexander Mavrocordat V, known also as Ferariu (1785-87), also had a Jewish physician.

The Jewish physicians in Moldavia had no political rights, yet they played an important part in the social structure of the principality, particularly in Jassy. The oldest record available of a Jewish physician who practiced medicine in Jassy is that of Rabbi Solomon ben Aravi, originally from Yemen, Arabia, (later part of the 16th and early part of the 17th century)

A tombstone inscription dated February 3, 1825, records the name of a Jewish physician Nissim, son of Boaz (Sephardi), originally from Rhodes, where he completed his studies. He had an extensive practice among Jews and non-Jews.

After 1830, the number of Jewish physicians increased in Jassy. Some of them came from Poland, others from various other European countries. They established enviable reputations and even obtained appointments in the service of the government. One of them, Blaustein, was elected a member of the Superior Sanitary Corporation, and administrator of the physical natural cabinet. Dr. Schreiber, of Jassy, was appointed head of the Museum of Anatomy of the Medical faculty of Bucharest in 1860. He was a prolific writer and made considerable contributions to medical literature.

Similarly, two other Jewish physicians played an important part in the Roumanian life of the 19th century. One was the famous scholar, Dr. Julius (Iuliu) Barasch, and the other

was Dr. Drey. In 1843, the former was appointed Doctor of Quarantine at Calarash, while the latter was appointed District Physician at Braila.

All that we know about Dr. Drey (his first name is unknown), is that he did not hold office very long, and that later he was House Physician to Princess Ruxanda Sturza. Princess Ruxanda lived in Odessa, afflicted with some disease which kept her confined to bed for seven months, and from which she died on January 16, 1844. During her illness Dr. Drey took great pains to aid her, making every effort to alleviate her sufferings. As a result her brother, Prince Alexander Sturza, first cousin of the Prince of Moldavia, highly recommended Dr. Drey to Mihai.

In his letter from Odessa dated January 29, 1844, Alexander wrote to his cousin: "Ruxanda left with me her Dr. Drey who treated her for fully seven months and showed an unlimited devotion to her. If he should decide to leave Russia, will you have the goodness to give him some fixed post in Moldavia? I stand guarantor for his knowledge. His skill is such as is rarely to be found, especially his painstaking way of fulfilling his duty. Please answer favorably in regard to this matter. His appointment will be of great benefit to our country. He was willing to accompany my sister abroad, had she been strong enough to undertake the journey."

On February 11, Prince Mihai replied in all probability inquiring whether the doctor was willing to accept a position and whether he had any conditions to impose before accepting. To this Alexander replied on February 25:



"My excellent doctor wishes to serve Moldavia and Moldavia will gain much by his appointment. In Wallachia his annual salary as physician for the district of Braila was 170 ducats; my sister paid him a similar amount and something extra. If your Highness will consent definitely to assure that salary to him so that I may notify him on behalf of your highness, he is ready to leave at once. Therefore, my dear cousin, I ask you to have the goodness to let me know definitely of your intention in regard to this matter."

~~Obviously~~ <sup>Apparently</sup> the prince did not grant his cousin's request and did not make the appointment for, according to a letter from Dr. Barasch written in 1854, Dr. Drey continued to live in Odessa.

Dr. Issac Silberberg, originally from Russia, settled in Jassy in 1858 and was soon appointed army physician with the rank of Major. In 1867 he became Chief of the Medical Staff of the Jewish hospital in that city. Active in Jewish affairs he organized the Union of Roumanian Jews of Jassy.

Another Jewish physician whose ability was recognized was Dr. Almogen of Husi. He was the first Jewish physician decorated by the King in recognition for valuable services rendered to the cause of Hygiene in Roumania.

Other noted Jewish physicians of the 19th century included: E. Braunstein, Alfonso Brociner, Emil Dorian, Ettinger, Friedman, Goldstein, Gluckman, Ghelherter, Leon Gaster, Grossman, Julius Heilpern, C. Heller, L. Iarchi, Henri Iscovescu, Kailowitz, Lowenthal, Karpel Lippe, Max Landsberg, B. Lebel, Alexander

Manoilescu, Maurice Nisescu, M. Roth, A. Radovici, S. Ritter, Rosenfeld, Miron Segale, Schachman (chief of the Brancoveanu Hospital in Bucharest), Stroninger, Stein, Stefan Stanca, Benjamin Segel, Benedict Steiner, his son Sigmund Steiner, Bernard Tausic, A. Vianu, Prof. Moritz Wertheimer, P. Westfield, Samuel Wexler, and Ygrec.

In 1880 Dr. M. Roth, disturbed by the overwhelming mortality rate prevailing among the peasants, which he found to be due to the primitive hygienic conditions under which they were living, called the alarming conditions to the attention of the government. Prior to Roth's raising of his voice, the rural medical service had been very poor. There were no midwives -- even as late as 1836 some of the villagers were without either these or nurses. Drug stores were still unknown there. In the district of Vlasca in 1831 there were seventeen midwives to cover 183 villages and the number of infant deaths was 227. Roth took up this problem in the ninth decade of the 19th century and succeeded in greatly improving these deplorable conditions.

Even in the capital of Roumania at that time conditions were not much better. Maternity hospitals were unknown, and no physician was ever called in maternity cases. The midwife -- usually an ignorant old woman -- filled that place; this resulted in a number of fatalities which was in proportion to her lack of medical knowledge. No one gave this matter any thought until Dr. Miron Segale brought it up and organized a maternity society. A maternity hospital was then established in one of the suburbs of Bucharest in 1909. Under the patronage of Queen Marie this society established maternity branches in every ward of the city.

202

The lives of hundreds of infants and many young mothers were thus saved. Segale served that society for over twenty years until his death in 1929.

Thanks, also to Dr. Maurice Nisescu, infant mortality was soon reduced to practically zero. He had brought this important matter to the attention of the Roumanian Academy, which expressed its gratitude to him for having discovered the cause, and for contributing his talents and services toward the great improvement which resulted.

As a physician in the rural district of Botoshani, Dr. Alexander Manoelescu in 1894 found an enormous infant mortality. Analysing the mortality rate over a period of twenty-five years, he discovered it to be the highest in Europe. In order to check it, he found<sup>ed</sup> a society for the care of new-born infants, under the patronage of Queen Elizabeth. This society achieved very satisfactory results.

The survey published by Manoelescu in 1894 showed that out of 51,464 births, 37,004 infants died in their first year. An investigation of infant mortl<sup>l</sup>ity in the Doburja showed the following percentages among different nationalities: Turks-29.27%; Bulgarians, Serbians, etc.-38.82%; Saxons-37.27%; Roumanians-42.37%; the total Roumanian mortality-50%.

Jewish physicians were foremost in the war against alcoholism, and the same Manoelescu supplied the Metropolit, Pimen, with valuable statistics on the subject which were read in the churches. These figures were employed in the international movement against alcoholism. The Roumanian Senate recognized the valuable

72

contribution to his cause and to other fields of medicine and hygiene made by Manoelescu. At his own expense he had printed thousands of copies of his brochure entitled, Advice for the Care of the Children of Peasants. In 1895 he organized the first sanitary centers in Roumania. In an article in which he covered a period of thirty years -- 1879 to 1908 -- Manoelescu showed statistical ethnic mortality in the district of Constanza to be as follows: Roumanians-42.37%; other orthodox persons-38.82%; Germans-37.27%; Mussulmans-29.27%; Jews-32%.

Dr. Vaida attributed infant mortality, miscarriages, and the decrease in the population to Jewish physicians. But this learned gentleman either did not know, or wilfully ignored the fact that the real causes were manifold: (1) lack of hygienic arrangements; the people living in a primitive state with sanitary provisions unknown in towns and villages; with certain sections of large cities in a wretched, unhealthful state; (2) the ignorance of young mothers, who did not understand the care of their infants; (3) the increase in the number of abortions as the result of lack of medical attendance and of the post war conditions; (4) the fact that thousands of rural communities were then and still are without medical service. But the followers of the anti-Semitic Professor Cuza nevertheless cried out that the medical profession was over-crowded and advocated the application of numerous restrictions to Jews. The few Jewish physicians who perceived these evils sought to call attention to them in the works they published and to remedy them as much as possible. Thus a work published by Dr. M. Roth in 1880 under the title of Memoriu Asupra Causelor

173

Mortalitatei Populatiunei Romano Crestino, in Raport cu cea din Rit Mosaic, (Memoir on the Causes of the Mortality of the Roumanian Christian Population, Compared with That of the Mosaic Cult), caused considerable embarrassment to Dr. Vaida.

Another Jewish physician, Stefan Stanca, published a book in 1889, entitled Medicul Social Ca Factor Patologic (The Social Physician as a Pathological Factor) in which he brought out some astonishing facts. Dr. Stanca was so beloved by the peasants in his district that on his death they asked their priest to hold a special service in his memory. Still another Jewish doctor pointed out that the high mortality rate among Christian women in childbirth was caused by febra puerperala, (puerperal fever) and that of infants by falcaritsa (lockjaw). As a result, the government was compelled to adopt serious measures to eliminate or reduce their causes.

Other Jewish physicians distinguished themselves by valuable services which they rendered to the Roumanian people in saving hundreds of lives. Among them were Drs. Gluckman, Ygrec, Stein, Stefan Stanca and Ghelherter. The last named founded a hospital at Bucharest, had inscribed on its front the legend "For the Love of Humanity" and made it non-sectarian. The first hospital for children was established by Dr. Julius Barasch.

After the Romano-Bulgarian War of 1913, an epidemic of cholera broke out in Bucharest. Panic-stricken by ~~fear of~~ the plague, the people turned wherever they could to try to save their lives and there were hardly any persons left to care for the stricken. Dr. Samuel Wexler remained calm throughout this crisis,

caring for the victims, carrying them in his arms, and treating them at the risk of his own life. The many sacrifices which he made earned him official recognition and he was decorated by the King. Other Jewish physicians in the sanitary service, although small in number, labored hard to protect the health of the Christian population.

When Roumania entered the first World War, many Jewish physicians enrolled in the army with the rank of lieutenant, captain or major, depending on their seniority in practice. That they brought honor to their country, rank and profession, is evidenced by the number of them who fell, out of all proportion to the total number of physicians in the army. Many of them were decorated by Roumania and fifty of them by foreign powers.

An order, #29, issued by the Division Com<sup>m</sup>andant under ~~which~~<sup>whom</sup> they served, makes special mention of Drs. Sculy and Rosenfeld, fallen on the field of battle: "How they have fulfilled their noble mission by sacrificing their own lives for the lives of their comrade! The bravest soldiers at the front can do no better than these physicians have done. Their sacrifices have brought about the inscription of their names in the golden book of the sacrifices demanded for the enlargement of the country and the consolidation of the Roumanian people. Their names will remain engraved in the memory of the soldiers of the Tenth Division for whom they devoted and sacrificed themselves. (Signed) Colonel Cihoski, Com<sup>m</sup>andant of the Tenth Division."

Dr. Friedman of Campina, a <sup>S</sup>Colonel in the reserves, was killed in action. At the grave Senator Miculescu, Chief of the Medical Regiment, deeply lamenting the loss of this Jewish physician,

said in part: "There are many who have done their duty in time of war, but there are not many who, like Dr. Friedman, had such a high conception of duty and knew how to identify themselves with it, so that they completely forgot and lost themselves in it."

## OTHER FIELDS OF ENDEAVOR

An alphabetical list of Roumanian Jews who distinguished themselves in the various scientific, artistic, scholarly and professional fields, including archaeology, architecture, art, astronomy, chemistry, economics, education, engineering, exploration, historical research, invention, journalism, jurisprudential history, law, lexicography, literary criticism, Jewish lore, literature, mathematics, music, pedagogy, philology, philosophy, poetry, public office, publishing, theatre, translation, writing and other fields, follows:

### A. ARCHAEOLOGY:

Professor Joseph Fleischer.

### B. ARCHITECTURE:

Leonida, foremost Roumanian architect, who designed the beautiful modern buildings of Bucharest.

### C. ART:

Julius Feld; the Fulman family; A. Gropeanu; N. Gropper; Marcel Iancu; Isacescu; Barbu Iscovescu; Iser; Mayer Klang; Maxy; Perachin; Daniel Rosenthal; Sanielevici; Mandel and Arthur Segal; Isaac Sofer; Nicolai and Isidor Vermont; Mariora Ventura.

### D. ARTISTS IN VOICE:

Matilda Adlerson; Nissen Blumenthal; Jeane Brandeis; Rosa Francesca; Samu Friedman; Charlotte Gluckman (Feliciano), prima donna and professor of music at the Roumanian Academy of Music in Bucharest; Adeline Hirsch; Elise Littman; Elise Odesiano



(in opera); Mordecai David Strliski.

#### E. ASTRONOMY:

Dr. Julius Barasch; Dr. Emil Dorian; L. Floriiu; Dr. Julius Heilpern; Dr. Sigmund B. Vermont, editor of the astronomical magazine Globul; Dr. Ygrec.

#### F. CHEMISTRY:

Carl Cosiner; Dr. L. Edeleanu; Dr. Lebel.

#### G. ECONOMICS:

S. Antin; Maximilian Sanielevici; George Strol.

#### H. EDUCATION:

David Emanuel, professor at the University of Bucharest; Marcu Farchi, professor of philosophy; Hillel Kahana; A. Mibashan (Menahem Mendel Braunstein); Oscar Neuschotz (born in Jassy, later settled in Berlin) appointed professor of German literature at the University of Bucharest in 1894. He was formerly editor of Das Literarische Rumanien in collaboration with Carmen Sylva; Dr. Feder Lewin, Dean of Letters at the University of France, born at Jassy.

#### I. ENGINEERING:

Isidor Blumen; Dr. M. Cajol; Julius Popper; Paul Speier.

#### J. EXPLORATION:

Julius Popper, of Bucharest, who toured Asia, Africa, Australia, the United States, Mexico, and South America. In South America he gave Roumanian names to rivers, mountains, and other places. Paul Speier was another Roumanian Jew who did considerable exploration.

#### K. HISTORY:

Joseph Kaufman; M.H. Halevy; Jacob Psanter; S. A. Rosanes;

Elias and Moses Schwarzfild; Maurice Segal; Aureliu Turou; H. Blazian; S. Cris-Christian; Rafael Flachs; also Professor Joseph Fleischer, of the Lyceum of Suceava, who rendered considerable aid to S.F. Marion, of the Roumanian Academy, in the investigation of the history of the Monastery Todoreu.

#### L. INVENTION:

A. L. Brociner, who invented a powerful explosive called "Brocinerita"; Paul Speier, of Jassy, who was awarded 1,000 marks by the Technical Institute of Charlottenburg, Prussia, for a technical invention.

#### M. JOURNALISM:

Isaac Auerbach, editor and founder of the Eraternitate, who was expelled from the country in 1885; Michael Asiel; Blumenfeld; Menahem Mendel Braunstein (A. Mibashan); Marco Brociner; Emil Fagura (O. Honigman); Isaac Fermo; M. Finkels; H. Fior; Moses Gaster; Giordano (Goldner); Constantin Graur; Hoffer Brothers (publishers of Lumea); Solomon Janowitz (Tributo); Sanieel Labin (Spartacus); Moise Leibovici (founder of the Universul, with L. Steinberg), Professor Leo Neuschotz, who collaborated with Carmen Sylva; Emil and Simon Pauker; Alexander Rubin, editor of L'Independance Roumaine; Dr. Elias and Moses Schwarzfild; Leopold Stern; Streitman; Wertheimer; Wexler; David Wortman.

#### N. JURISPRUDENCE:

Marcu Barasch; Joseph Cohen; Lupu Dichter; Dr. Feder Lewin, Dean of Letters at the University of France (born in Jassy); I. Negreanu; Iuliu S. Seveanu; Aureliu Turcu.

## O. LAW:

Cernea; Max Gaster; Goldenthal; Feder Lewin; Adolph Stern; Valeanu; Wortman.

## P. LEXICOGRAPHY:

Dr. Moses Gaster; S. I. Grossman; Lazar Shaineanu, who compiled a German-Roumanian dictionary; Dr. Henry Tiktin, author of a Roumanian grammar for use in the public schools and of a dictionary, which was published by the Roumanian government; ~~Tiktin was later appointed~~ professor of German at the University of Bucharest.

## Q. LITERARY CRITICISM:

Dobrogeanu Gherea; Barbu Lazareanu; Endic Sanielevici; Ion Trivale; Aureliu Weiss.

## R. LITERATURE:

Dr. M. Beck; Joseph Berkowitz; A. S. Birnberg; Emil Birnberg; Kopel Brim (died in 1890); Menahem Mendel Braunstein (A. Mibashan), born in Jassy in 1859, published the Judisher Volksfreund (in 1837); Alfons and Marco Brociner; Ludwig Calman; Horia Carp; Eliezer and Abner Casvan; Isidor Diamant; Herman Ferester; B. Finkelstein; M. E. Finkelstein; Dr. W. Finkelstein; Nachman Frenkel, of Jassy (born at Brody in 1833), journalist, published the Neue Judische Zeitung at Jassy in 1881, and the Neue Zeit at Botoshani in 1884; Gartenberg; Moses Gaster (journalist, chief London Rabbi, folklorist, born in Bucharest in 1856, expelled from the country in 1885, died in London in 1939); Abraham Solomon Gold, rabbi at Ploesti, born in Jassy in 1859, published Fraternitatea in 1879, and later Apartorul; Meshilem (Mosullam)

Zalman Goldbaum, author, born in Galicia, came to Jassy in 1887; Abraham Goldfaden, father of the Jewish stage, born in old-Konstantin, Russia, in 1840, published Israelitisches Volksblatt in Cernauti in 1876, and published the Idische Ilustrierte Zeitung, in New York, in 1887. He died in New York in 1908; S. Goldenthal; William Goldner; I. Greenberg; Solomon Grossman; L. Grunberg; H. Gutman; Hayim ben Solomon; M.H. Hahvy; Julius Heilpern, physician, scientific and astronomical author; Mme. Lie Hirsu; Leon Horowitz (born in Minsk, Russia, in 1847), author of Roumania and America. He spent three months in Roumania at the instance of the Alliance Israelite Universelle; A. L. Ipcar; Solomon Janowitz; Hillel Kahana (born in Stanislaw, Poland, in 1821), settled in Botoshani in 1860, director of the Jewish boys' school; Jacob Hayim Korn; Ephraim Landau, rabbi; Adolph Last (Sarcina); Joseph Lateiner, playwright; Dr. I. Lebel; Bernard Lebel, novelist, of Jassy; Hayim Leibovici; Antoine Levy; I.J. Linetzki (born in Russia, in 1839), author, humorist and journalist came to Botoshani in 1886, where he published Der National in Yiddish; Dr. Karpel Lippe (Born in Stanislaw, Poland; died in 1915); author, physician, and prolific writer in several languages; F. Lowenthal, publisher of Koroth Haittim; J. Lupescu; Leon Margosish; Moise Mattes; Abraham Mendelovici; D r. Nacht; I. Nebreanu; Oscar Neuschotz, editor; Rabbi Jacob I. Niemirower; Chief Rabbi; Israel Ornstein (born in Yampol, Galicia, in 1831), author of several books; Moses Ornstein, of Bacau and Ploesti (born in Galicia), author of Haoleh and other works; Petreanu Iancu; Dr. M. Picot; Marcu (Mordecai) Pineles (born in Tishminitz in 1836), later settled in Galatz, ~~where he became~~ prolific writer; N. Popper; M.S. Rabener; Barnish Rapaport; Ronetti Roman, author and playwright; S. A. Rosanes, historian; M. Rosenfeld; Dr. M. Roth;; Dr. Solomon

Rubin; Franz Schalberg; A. Schnap; Professor Solomon Schechter;

✓ Moses Schwarzfeld (born in Jassy in 1857), editor of ~~the~~ Egalitatea; L. Shaineanu; D. Shaicovici; David S. Silberbush (born in Galicia in 1855), published Uhor at Botoshani after coming to Roumania in 1882, and later, at Lebov, contributed to Hamelitz; Dr. Arthur Silbersweig; Behr Sufrin (born at Piatra in 1855), Craiova journalist and lecturer, published Die Judische Presse at Galatz, and in 1884, appointed director of the Jewish school in Piatra; I. Susman; Rabbi Aaron Moses ben Jacob Taubes; Rabbi Samuel Isaac Taubes (born in Sniatin, Galicia, in 1837), became a prolific writer at Berlad; Israel Teller, of Galatz (born at Zlotchow, Galicia, in 1836), contributed to the Galatzer Ismaelit and to other publications (1888); H.L. (Zevi Eliezer) Teller of Botoshani, (born in Zlotchow, Galicia, in 1840), taught in that city from 1866 to 1886, author of a number of books; Henry Tiktin, Professor at Jassy University; Jacob S. T. Fachtman (born in Uruz in 1831; died in Ackerman, Bessarabia), a prolific writer; Aureliu Turcu; Baron von Waldberg; D. Weissberg; Joseph Wexler; Wortman.

#### S. JEWISH LORE:

Eliezer Casvan; Dr. Moses Gaster; Dr. Karpel Lippe; Mibashan; Dr. Nacht; Dr. Jacob I. Niemirower; M. S. Rabener; Professor Solomon Schechter.

#### T. MATHEMATICS:

David Emanuel, professor of mathematics at the University of Bucharest; S. Sanielevici; Stammer, of Jassy.

#### U. MUSIC:

Matilda Adelruba; Jean Brandeis; Leon Brill; Mlle. Rosa Buffy; Cecil Cohen; Leopold Cromberg, basso; Carlotta Feliciano; Fochs; B. Franchetti; Carol Fruhling, pianist; Stan Goldesteanu; Charlotte Grossman; Adeline Hirsch; Phillip Kranz, cellist; Philip Lazar;

Cohen Linar; Mlle. Louise Litta; Leon Mendelsohn; Mihailovici; Nadulescu, operatic tenor; Mlle. Eliza Odeseanu; Arnold Joseph Rose, violinist; V. Rosenblum; Francesca Rozan.

#### V. PEDAGOGY:

Professor David Emanuel, of the University of Bucharest; Leon Feder; Dr. Friedman, of Jassy; Hillel Kahana; Feder Lewin, dean of the Faculty of Letters of the University of France (1893); Mibashan; Moses Schwartz; L. Shaineanu, professor at the University of Bucharest; H. L. Teller, Botoshani; Israel Teller, of Gahatz (born in Galicia).

#### W. PHILOLOGY:

Dr. Moses Gaster; Henry Tiktin; L. Shaineanu.

#### X. PHILOSOPHY:

Dr. Julius Barash; Lothar Birkel; Dr. Bucar; L. Florin; Moses Gaster; Professor A. Spiru.

#### Y. POETRY:

A. Axelrod; I. Bach; Camil Baltazu; Adolph Bick; H. Bonciu; Marco Brociner; Mihai Camanu; Abner Casvan; Stefan Craniceanu; W. Christian; S. Cruceanu; Liviu Delianu; Al. Dominic; Emil Dorian; Leon Feraru, Professor of Romance Languages, University, Brooklyn; B. R. Fondainu; Enrico Fortuna; Giordano; M. S. Goldbaum; D. Iacobescu; D. Jurescu; Ier. Laureanu; S. Lazar; Hayim Lippe; B. Luca; V. Mana; V. Monda; Alexander Mancelescu; Itzik Manger; B. Nemteanu; Oscar Neuschotz; Paul Paun; M. S. Rabaner; E. Relgis; H. Rheinstein; Ronetti Roman; Charlotte Silberstein; George Silviu; G. Spina; Dr. Adolph Steuerma<sup>n</sup>, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ A. Terziman; A. Toma; R. Torcer<sup>a</sup><sub>u</sub>; Adrea Verca; Iliaia Veronca; Wolf Zbarjer (Ehrenkranz).

#### Z. PUBLIC OFFICE:

Maurice Blank, commissioner for Roumania at the Paris

Exposition of 1898, together with Jacob Spanier and engineer Katz; F. A. Benveniste, of Craiova, member of the National Legion; Isidor Blumeru, secretary to the Italian Minister of Commerce and Industry, distinguished by his many works; Alfons Lupu Brociner, chief of the Medical Laboratory at Bucharest; Marco Brociner, overseer of the Danube at Galatz; Dr. Lazar Edeleanu, Head of the Chemical Bureau in Bucharest (1890); Professor David Emanuel, of the University of Bucharest, ~~member~~ member of the General Council of Public Instruction, member of the commission charged with elaboration of the by-laws of the faculty (1900); Jonah Goldberg, of Jassy, Minister at Burma, and later governor of Burma; S. A. Goldenthal, Lawyer at Jassy; Abraham Halfan, of Bucharest, consul general of the Ottoman Empire in the city (1879); Isaac ben Joseph, secretary to Alexander Mircea (1567-77), held similar position under Ivan the Terrible; Hillel Kahana, in 1836, instructor of religion; Dr. Label, chief of the Bacteriological Institute, at Jassy, also assistant in pharmacology and therapeutics at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Bucharest over ten years; Mendel brothers, of the shipping firm at Galatz and Braila, consuls for Sweden, Norway and Roumania at Antwerp, Belgium, in 1889; Morris Mathias chief of the special bureau of the Roumanian railways; Dr. Maurice Moscovitz, of Neamtz, chief physician in the city hospital; Ezra Pinkas, of Turmu Maguele, administrator of the government tobacco depot; Dr. Samuel Ritter, president of the Academy of Sports; Ronetti Roman, official translator in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Isaac Shor, steward to Stefan Voda (1457) and chancellor under Bogdan Voda (1504-17); Benedict Steiner held high office, with the

rank of "Pitar Domesc," under Stirbei Voda (1851); Dr. Henry Tiktin, professor of German at the University of Jassy.

#### AA. PUBLISHERS:

Jews were the first publishers of popular books in Roumania. Among them were: Leon Alkaly, of Bucharest, who published mainly classical works; S. Cironey; Ignaz Herz; Emilian and Virgil Munteanu; Samitca Brothers, of Craiova; H. Stehberg.

M. Schwartz published the first Roumanian alphabet in Latin characters (1864), also the first elementary arithmetic; up to that time Roumanian books were printed in Cyrillic by a very primitive, impractical method.

Other Jewish publishers included: Sigmund Carmelin, publisher of L'Echo Danubien from 1864 to 1875; Michael Asiel (publisher of the Hayoetz and the Judisher Telegraf) succeeded by his two sons; Marcu Feldman; Moses Schwarzfeld, publisher of Fraternitatea, anuar Pentru Israeliti; and Egalitatea.

#### BB. SCIENCE:

Aaron Aronson, famous as an agrarian scientist; Dr. Julius Barasch, scientist; Isidor Blumeru, statistician; Ludwig Calman, Professor of railway science, and first investigator in that field; Dr. Leon Gaster, electrophysics; Dr. Feder Lewin; Dr. S. Mendelsohn; Leopold Negreanu; Sigismund Rosen; Max Sanielevici, foremost statistician in Roumania; S. Sanielevici; Nathan Silberberg; Moses Stammer; Paul Weisengrun; Dr. Ema Zuhr.

#### CC. THEATRE:

Richard Bernard; Z. Burlenescu; Sofia Carp; Paul Ginsberg, who later became director of the French Theatre in St. Petersburg; Abraham Goldfaden, poet and playwright, father of the Yiddish



Theatre in Roumania; Kanner; V. Leoneseo; Sigmund Mogulescu, born in Russia, developed the Jewish stage in Roumania; F. Paulman, actress; Maurice Morrison, Shakespearian Tragedien; Rosenberg; Rosenblum; the Scaratescu family; Rachel Vermont. ~~DD, TRANSLATORS.~~  
DD TRANSLATORS

Among the Jews who have enriched Roumanian literature through their translations from other languages, and who acquainted the outside world with Roumanian works by translating these into other languages, are: Dr. Julius Barasch, translated medical works into Roumanian; I. Bauman, translated Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe; J. Bick; Eliezer and Abner Gasvan; Joseph Cohl, translated Alexander Dumas' The Count of Monte Cristo; D. N. Frankel; S. I. Grossman, L. Lupesco; N. C. Popper; M. S. Rabener, translated Alexandri's poems into Hebrew; Ronetti Roman; C. Sateanu; M. Schwartz; Adolph Stern, translated Shakespeare and Schiller into Roumanian; Leopold Stern; Dr. Adolph Steuerman; Aaron Moses Taubes (1789-1841), translated Alexandri into Hebrew; Israel Teller, translated poems by Alexandri into Hebrew, and works by Lessing into Roumanian; B.V. Vermont; Leon Wolff!

EE JEWS DECORATED IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR VALUE TO THE COUNTRY (Those who served in the various wars are not included in this list.)

By King Carol I, of Roumania: Rabbi J. Bensenior; Maurice Blank, banker; Professor Ludwig Calman; J. Comberg; Albert Daniel; Michael Daniel, banker; Dr. Lazar Edeleanu; Beneditto Franchetti;

217

Rabbi S. Frank; Dr. Moses Gaster; S. I. Grossman; Solomon Halfan; Dr. Lebel; Dr. London; Minnie and Rosa Mendel; Marcu Mendel, of Galatz; Hillel Menoah; J. Pasmantier; M. Rosanis; L. Shaineanu; Elias Sharaga; Joseph Simionovici; Dr. Sigmund Steiner; Chief Rabbi Taubes (1904), for the furtherance of science and education; M. D. Weiss; Dr. Samuel Wexler.

By King Milan of Serbia: G. Carola; L. Golesteanu; Joseph Lebel; L. Mendelsohn.

By the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph and by Emperor William I of Germany: <sup>Colonel</sup> ~~Major~~ Brocier; (also by the Turkish Sultan); Jacques Neuschotz; Adolph Stern.

By the French Government: G. Carola; B. Franchetti.

FFJ JEWS IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE UNDER KING CAROL I AND KING FERDINAND:

Abraham Emanuel Gaster (1834-1927), ~~consul general~~ <sup>under</sup> to Holland by Carol I, and decorated with the rank of Chevalier of Roumania.

Carol Tarcauanu, ~~vice-consul~~ <sup>under</sup> to the United States in New York by King Ferdinand.

GG JEWS IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE UNDER KING CAROL II:

Among the Jews who achieved distinction, whose abilities were recognized by the Roumanian government and were appointed to high office in the diplomatic and other services <sup>by</sup> King Carol II are the following:

Louis Dreyfus, consul general at Paris.

Cotnareanu, consul general to France.

Lucien Lang, consul general to Belgium.

Louis Landau, consul general to Belgium.

Henri Untermans, consul general to Belgium.

I. Sigal, ~~Consul~~ general to Belgium.

The <sup>reason why</sup> ~~fact that~~ four were appointed to the same office by the same king is not clear. Nor are we in a position to state when they were appointed and their ~~manner~~ of succession, or the place where they functioned.

Barkowitz, commercial attache at Jerusalem.

Elfant, commercial attache at Madrid.

Jacques Gaster, consul general in Amsterdam, Holland.

Sadi Kirschner, Judicial consul, Roumanian Embassy, at Brussels, Belgium.

A. Lorenz, architect, Royal Palace, Bucharest.

Pohn, commercial attache at Rome.

Jacques Salmonowitz, consul general to Switzerland.

I. Vasco, consul general in Berlin.

~~Chapter Sixty-one~~The Roumanian Jews on the Battlefield in the First World War

Roumanian men of learning have extremely hazy memories as regards the part played by Roumanian Jews in the first World War. Professor Cuza found that only 15,969 Roumanian Jews served in that war. But the Roumanian General Elevra gives the number of mobilized Roumanian Jews as 35,000. When confronted with this figure, Cuza evinced extremely sound logic; even 35,000, said that learned professor, was not enough for, according to the total Jewish population of the land, which he placed at 500,000, they should have actually enrolled 50,000 Jewish soldiers.

Some of General Elevra's figures also require revision. According to the General, 26,000 Jewish soldiers were held as prisoners and deserters in enemy camps. But upon examining the official bulletin in the government newspaper Monitorul Oficial, we find that only 449 were held in enemy camps and 3,049 were unaccounted for. Obviously, out of a population of 230,000 Jews who allegedly furnished 10 percent of its youth, or 23,000 soldiers, 26,000 out of that number could not have deserted and been held as prisoners in enemy camps.

Compared with the total number of 7,457,311 inhabitants in the Old Kingdom, of whom 745,731, or 10 per cent served in the army, the Jewish population furnished 35,000, or 15 per cent.

The number of Roumanian Jewish soldiers who fell in the War was 882, or 3.83 per cent of their total in the service. That of the Roumanian non-Jewish soldiers was 37,853, or 5.7 per cent.

A similar revision must be made with reference to the number

of deserters cited in Cuza's figures. Cuza stated that only 1 per cent of the Roumanian soldiers deserted to the enemy, whereas the number of Jewish deserters amounted to 4.72 per cent, that is to say, twenty-six Jewish deserters to every Christian deserter.

But we find the percentage of Jewish deserters given in the Monitorul Oficial, is 3.042 per cent. The number of Roumanian non-Jewish deserters, on the other hand, was 98,609, or 13.22 per cent. Not only that, but the number of Jewish soldiers who deserted must have been much smaller, because many of the Jews killed on the battlefield were reported "deserted".

In 1916 the total population of the Old Kingdom was 7,897,311. The Jews numbered 230,000, or about 3 per cent; of this number, 17-1/2 per cent actually went to the battlefield. A total of 35,000 Jewish soldiers fought for their country in the Allied cause, and 3-1/4 per cent of them were decorated for bravery and for distinguished service. A total of 882 Roumanian Jewish soldiers gave their lives on the battlefield, and 740, or 3.21 per cent of the enlisted Jewish soldiers, were wounded. The total Christian war dead was 37,853. Jewish soldiers taken prisoner by the enemy amounted to 449, or 1.95 per cent of their total, as against 11,322 Roumanian Christian soldiers, or 1.65 per cent. Missing Jewish soldiers numbered 3,043. Those decorated were 825, or 3.6 per cent.

JEWISH SOLDIERS IN THE ROUMANIAN ARMY

In a preceding chapter a few illustrations were given of distinguished service performed by Jews in the Roumanian Army. Now we will show the bitter life of the Jewish soldier, how he was treated and what he endured. For, despite a few examples of the decoration of Jewish soldiers and of their appreciation, it may safely be said that if the lot of the Jews in civil life in Roumania was bitter, in the Army it was almost beyond endurance. The Jewish soldier was absolutely helpless, subject to the whim and hatred of his superiors, the corporal, the sergeant, the sergeant major, and the lieutenant, each abusing the subordinate Jewish soldier. As for the higher ranking officers from whom the officers of lower rank took their pattern, they had still greater power, and made the Jews under them feel it. We thus find that, in 1907, in the seventh cavalry regiment at Jassy, five Jewish soldiers were brutally beaten at the order of their commandant, and were sent to the military hospital in a frightful condition.

Prejudice against Jewish soldiers as well as discrimination against them had begun decades before the incident just cited. In 1877 there was a scarcity of commissioned officers in the army. It happened that at that time, Maurice Brociner had passed the officers' examination successfully. However, the fact that he stood at the head of the promotion list with high marks availed him nothing. The Minister of War rejected him because "under the law no Jew may hold a commissioned office in the army." When a number of Jewish young men presented themselves at the prefecture in answer

to a call for recruits and offered to enlist, they were told that no Jews were wanted in the Roumanian army.

At the order of Colonel Creceanu, a Jewish soldier with four years of service and an excellent record, was cruelly beaten in front of his regiment, and in the presence of officers of high rank. The commandant added insult to injury by saying: "Through such treatment I shall see that no Jew will be serving in my regiment."

In the 13th Dorobantz (a branch of infantry) regiment in Jassy, beating was the ~~usual~~ lot of the Jewish soldier. At the same time, no Jew was permitted to do the purchasing of supplies for that regiment.

At Dorohoi, Colonel Marashescu, commandant of the 8th regiment of infantry, under some flimsy pretext, ordered eight Jewish soldiers to step out of the ranks. Six robust soldiers were then commanded to step forth. At a signal from the colonel, they seized one of the Jewish soldiers and stretched him out prone on the ground. Three of them held him by the head and three by the feet, while the sergeant major flogged him mercilessly. One after the other these Jewish soldiers were lashed, until streams of blood flowed on the pavement beneath them. Unconscious and almost lifeless, they were then thrown into a military prison.

But the darkest and most painful chapter in the history of the Roumanian Jews is the manner in which Jewish soldiers were treated, tried, and sentenced in the first World War. A continuous

and bitter propaganda was carried on against them throughout the latter period of the war, and on innumerable occasions they were beaten and tortured. As a result of widespread calumny, many Jewish soldiers fell at the hands of assassins in uniform. Many of them were executed by sham legal proceedings, contrary to law. In more than one case the prosecuting attorney demanded conviction even when the innocence of the accused was fully established. Those who were fortunate enough to escape death were sent to the salt mines to spend the rest of their days in darkness and chains.

The Roumanian court-martial knew no limits, and recognized no rule of evidence in cases involving Jewish defendants. When the accused was a Jew, almost invariably a conviction was the result.

How the Jewish soldiers were treated during the first World War is told by one David Smiel of Berest. He had taken part in several battles in which his regiment was engaged against the Germans. In one of these engagements he was wounded, and was left helpless on the battlefield by his comrades. The enemy found him, and he was taken to a German military hospital; after his recovery he was held a prisoner. Eventually he returned home; his regiment had his honorable record. <sup>at head quarters</sup> Three fully years after his return he was summoned to appear, but, through the negligence of some official, he was not served with the summons. In default, therefore, he was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment. Ignorant of his fate, he went to the doctor of his regiment to be treated for the wound he had received during the war, and was seized and incarcerated. Fortunately, he was able to prove that



he had spent all the days of his captivity in a Hungarian prison camp, and was freed.

Herman Strul was drafted in 1915, and was immediately sent to the field of battle. There he took part in the first engagement of his regiment at Ardeal. He fought at St. George, and four days and nights at Moghlasush, where he earned a bonus of 300 lei. He was wounded in battle at Fata Noastra, but refused to go to a hospital. Instead, he remained with his regiment, and as soon as he was able to move about took part in another engagement. This time he was wounded in the right eye and left arm, and one of his thumbs became paralyzed; he was sent to a hospital, where he stayed for seventeen days and then returned to the front, fighting at Balsh, Slatina, and Cosba. Together with seven other soldiers, he was left to guard the bridge near the latter town. Exposed there, he became a target for the Germans, and after his comrades had deserted him, he was seriously wounded and for the third time thrown into a trench. Finally, picked up and brought to Floesti on November 10, he was admitted to the hospital by Major Dr. Avramescu, where he remained until November 21. Meanwhile, on November 13, he was reported to his regiment as a deserter. Eight days later the hospital was evacuated, the more seriously wounded were sent to other places, and the rest were told to ~~gt~~ get away as best they could. Strul left the hospital on crutches, traversing a distance of thirty kilometers to reach Mizil, where he was taken prisoner by a German patrol, brought to Floesti and placed in the hospital, from which he was sent to a prison camp.

Strul escaped from this camp, was caught, sent to Rusciuc,

then to Tarnova, next to Sofia, thence to Asia-Minor and later to Constantinople. There he was taken as a spy and brought to Ruscius, where he became sick and was again placed in a hospital. He remained in the hospital until November 26, 1917 when he escaped in a rowboat and returned to Bucharest. He soon enrolled as a policeman, but on March 1, 1918, he was arrested, and after being kept in prison for eight months, was sentenced to five years at hard labor, notwithstanding the fact that the records, which were not produced at his trial, would have showed his honorable, patriotic conduct and varied experiences as a loyal soldier in the Roumanian army. On December 30 he was degraded, and on March 1, 1920, his prison term began.

Twenty-two Jewish soldiers, one of them a graduate of the teachers' seminary in Jerusalem, named Feldman, were picked out from the ranks and sent to the front. On the way the sergeant in charge showed them the order for their transfer. This is what it said: "We are sending you twenty-two Jews who are suspected of espionage, and of agitating against the government. You are accordingly requested to place them in the front line."

On February 15, 1917, the Roumanian Red Cross sent out the following order:

"You are hereby directed not to be swayed by remorse in regard to Jews, because the welfare of the country's defense comes first. Therefore, it is hereby ordered that all Jews in the (service of the) Roumanian Red Cross institutions be discharged and sent to the front. Only Jewish physicians shall take their places, and even these for a limited time only, be-

cause these aliens wait on the sick so that they may escape service."

Lieutenant Colonel Enescu, commandant of the Mircea Voda regiment, encamped at Cernauti, hitched a Jewish soldier under his command to a carriage and made him pull it through snow-covered streets. Not being satisfied with his performance as a horse, Captain Constantinescu of that regiment ordered him flogged.

While Jewish young men were being treated in this manner and offering their lives in the service of their country, many Christian Roumanians, among them more than one ranking officer, deserted their commands in time of war and joined the enemy. One such deserter was an adjutant on the staff of Colonel Lambrino who, for a consideration of 4,000 kronen, delivered a thirty-two page plan of Roumanian operations to the German command. There was also the case of three other high ranking officers: Colonels Surza, Jurescu, and Craniuceanu, who showed their intense "patriotism" by joining the enemy and taking with them the entire forces under their commands. Another officer, Lieutenant Vasile Negoiu, deserted, but was caught and sentenced to a term of five years in prison.

When Moses Wachtel, one of the foremost Jews in Jassy, appealed to General Aprescu to have the abuse of the Jews stopped, he replied: "It is about time that you realize the our government wants to get rid of the Jews. In order to reach that end, we shall stop at nothing. As to the Jewish soldiers at the front,

we have only one way of getting rid of them. We have a simple mathematical calculus, so that those Jews who survive will envy the dead."

In the provinces the Jews were subjected to even greater mistreatment. Every Sabbath they were forced out of their homes, driven through the streets, and compelled to perform manual labor, such as digging trenches, repairing roads, and the like. While they submitted meekly, without a murmur, they were brutally beaten by the police, so that within two or three days they broke down. Two of these victims, Moses Lerner and Alter Strulovici, died as a result of such beatings.

As soon as Roumania entered the first World War, she cut off all communication between the Jews of Roumania and those of Russia. The Roumanian government saw to it that no knowledge of the abuses which the Jews suffered there reached the outside world. Now, more than ever before, the Roumanian government under Bratiano proceeded against the Jews in a most brutal manner.

With the coming of the Russian Revolution (1917), the overthrow of the czarist regime, and the establishment of the democratic government, the Roumanian Jews hoped that their government would change and treat them better. Instead, they were now made to feel the hand of the oppressor even more severely. Instead of the former name, "Straini," which was so frequently applied to the Jews, a new word, "Spion" (spy), was created, and this was applied to every Jew in Roumania. The slightest expression of hope for a better life was sufficient cause for incarceration and endless torture behind bars.

~~CHAPTER XXIX~~PHILANTHROPY

Among the outstanding Jews who left an indelible mark in Roumanian Jewish life was the philanthropist, Jacob Lobel, of Bucharest. Until the end of his life he was the director of the Banca de Roumania, which he had built up from the former Ottoman Bank in that city. Through his patriotic and energetic efforts, Lobel enhanced Roumanian commerce. He was held in high esteem by the Roumanian nobility, and had free entry to the royal palace. Jointly with Dr. Barasch, he worked for the cultural elevation of his fellow Jews, and was the originator of a movement for better understanding between Christians and Jews.

Jacob Lobel was instrumental in completing the building of the Coral Temple, which was begun in 1857 but had been interrupted. Eleven Jewish leaders met in Lobel's home in 1864, and the sum of 200 ducats was raised. The name of "Principali Fundatori Al Templului Coral" (Principal Founders of the Coral Temple) was adopted, with Lobel elected president. 600 ducats was raised shortly thereafter. On July 21 of that year the foundation of the new Temple was laid. It is interesting to note that a number of Christians, reciprocating the Jews' liberal contributions to many non-Jewish causes, donated liberally to the building fund of that great Sephardic Temple. Michael Cogalniceanu alone gave the sum of 9,450 lei.

Upon the death of his wife in 1866, and as a result of anti-Jewish agitations which led many Jews to leave Roumania, Lobel moved to the City of Brashov. But he did not lose his interest in Jewish

229

affairs in Bucharest. Shortly thereafter he established a maternity hospital there, one in Brashov, and one in Paris, in memory of his wife, Carolina. He founded the Jacob and Carolina Lobel Institute of boys and girls, which is the pride of Jews in the Roumanian capital. He also created a fund for the aid of poor Jewish students, and one, in memory of his parents, for clothing for the needy.

When Lobel died on July 3, 1867, he left many legacies to Christians and Jews alike. He bequeathed the sum of 2,000 ducats to a central Jewish school, some money to the Temple, and 1,000 piasters to each of several societies.

The Jewish banker Jacob Neuschotz, of Jassy, created a fund of 5,000 gulden for scholarships for Moldavian students at Vienna; established a Jewish school for children; and erected the Temple at Jassy which is still standing. When Carol I was crowned, in 1881, Neuschotz gave the sum of 12,000 lei to the King for a fund to aid widows and orphans of soldiers who had fought in the War of Independence. He contributed considerable sums to the Roumanian Academy of Bucharest. At one time he offered the sum of 90,000 lei for the benefit of Christian educational and benevolent institutions, but for some reason the Prime Minister refused to accept the gift. Despite his manifold acts of generosity and philanthropy, Neuschotz, on one occasion, together with the eminent and liberal merchant Abraham Strul, the agriculturist Joseph Singer, and the physician Rosenthal, who was called the "father of the poor" because he treated them without charge, were refused citizenship by the Roumanian government. But the Council of the

Comuna of Sherbanesti gave Neuschotz a testimonial for his charities to Christians, and in protest against the fine imposed upon him at Jassy for having a Christian servant in his employ. Upon his death on September 4, 1888, Neuschotz had the sum of 10,000 lei distributed to the poor -- Christians and Jews alike. Among the legacies he left were; for the Roumanian Academy, 20,000 lei, 30,000 lei for the Jewish hospital at Jassy, and 25,000 lei for the Jewish cemetery there.

The first fund for students of merit at the University of Bucharest was established by a Roumanian Jew.

The three brothers, Leon, Israel Hayim, and Albert E. Daniel, Jassy bankers, on the occasion of the coronation of King Carol I (May 10, 1881), donated 15,000 lei in state bonds to the Roumanian Academy, the income of which was to be employed for the enrichment of the historical archives dealing with Roumanian history. Another of the Daniels, Joachim, also a banker at Jassy, donated 130,000 lei for the improvement of the Jewish cemetery there.

The statue in Bucharest erected to memory of Mihai the Brave, owes its existence to the initiative of Roumanins Jews. Headed by Rabbi Antoine Levy, the Jewish community there opened subscription lists and made it possible.

The first foundation established for the benefit of students at the University of Bucharest was set up in 1869 by Hillel Menoah. In September 1834, to relieve the financial strain under which his country was laboring, Menoah offered a loan of 2000,000 lei to the government. When Colomon Halfan, the Jewish



291  
224

banker, who was already the country's creditor, offered to assist the government by extending his loan, Menoah's loan was no longer necessary. Later, however, he did lend his government the sum of 2,500,000 lei. In 1848 one of his sons donated 150,000 lei to the University of Bucharest to assist Roumanian students. Anton George left 30,000 lei for the same purpose.

Roumanian Jews had a large part in establishing many of the eighty-three foundations set up in Roumania since 1860, the year in which the Roumanian Academy was founded.

Jewish philanthropy established many charitable and social institutions in Roumania, aided by benefactors from foreign countries. Such institutions included the people's kitchen in Bucharest, feeding 500 hungry persons daily; a new Jewish hospital erected in Galatz in 1903, at a cost of 140,000 lei, and with a capacity of sixty beds; the Jewish Caritas Hospital in Bucharest; and various loan societies.

In conclusion, we deem it of interest to cite a few acts of charity on the part of Jews for needy Christians. The brothers Wexler, Weisengrun, and Juster of Jassy, donated 10,000 kilograms of flour for poor peasants in that district. The banker Mayerhoffer donated 10,000 kilograms of maize and 10,000 of straw for the peasants. I.E. Garfunkel, of that city, distributed a quantity of corn to ninety-two peasants of that district, in two successive years. Ezra Pinkas and Garfunkel also distributed large quantities of firewood to the poor of Turno Magureli and Podul Illoaei, respectively. At Harlau a committee of Jews raised the sum of 5,856 lei for the relief of the sufferers of the city which had been



232  
232  
destroyed by fire; on this occasion the government donated 50,000  
lei and King Carol 4,000.

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### LANGUAGE AND CULTURE OF THE ROUMANIAN JEWS

The early Jewish inhabitants of Roumania apparently understood the language of the country. In a rabbinical source of 1605, one finds a story of a certain Jew pleasing a Roumanian priest by talking "Wallachian," the language which he understood. Undoubtedly, besides the Roumanian language, they must have spoken or understood other languages in use at that time, especially the popular languages, like Hebrew and Yiddish.

In the beginning of the 19th century, due to the great mass immigration of Polish Jews, the Roumanian language began to lose ground to Yiddish among the Jews in Moldavia. Whatever language the Jews may have spoken in Roumania, Yiddish was developed in the process of assimilation, according to Dr. M. H. Halevy. This was a rather lengthy process which ended in the 19th century. For even today nearly all the Karaites in Lithuania, Poland, the Ukraine, and the Crimea speak a pure Tatar dialect, in which language their prayers and even their Bible were composed. Before the Spanish exiles of 1492 settled in the Turkish empire, the Byzantine Jews who passed through Roumania on their way to the Slavia countries spoke Greek, and only after they were overwhelmed by the influx of the Sephardic newcomers did they begin to acquire and utilize the Spanish tongue. The same process affected the Slav<sup>C</sup> Jews from Kiev to Prague, where they spoke the language or the dialect of the land in which they lived.

The same curious phenomenon may be traced to Roumania. The Yiddish language came into the land <sup>with</sup> by the higher social and cultural strata of Jews beginning with the time of Chmielnicki persecutions (1648 to 1658) when Polish Jews emigrated to Roumania. In the beginning of the 19th century, due to the ~~great~~ mass immigration of the Polish Jews, the Roumanian language began to be spoken. The influx of great numbers of Polish Jews, who proved themselves intellectually superior, had a beneficial effect on the Roumanian Jews.

For some of the Roumanian Jews culture was not a terra incognita. If we are to judge by the illustrious rabbis, the Jews in Roumania in the 16th and 17th centuries, had a standard of culture and lore which was not low. It was an imported culture, for when they came to Roumania they brought their learning and desire for culture with them. But the backward and sluggish Roumanian Jews, with their oriental temperament, had a great influence over them causing them to develop a certain indifference toward intellectual life.

The inferior cultural state of the Roumanian Jews during the past three centuries was caused in great measure also by their gullibility, through the ease with which they could be influenced and misled by such adventurers as the notorious Jacob Leibowicz, and by visionaries. Despite their inferiority ~~in~~ cultural ~~state~~ the Roumanian Jews ~~have~~ produce<sup>d</sup> a number of celebrities of their own.

More than one attempt was made to bring some light into their lives, more especially, as has been indicated above, to persuade them to discard some of the outlandish habits and customs which

were more fanatical than religious, but without success. Besides the resistance which these Jews offered, a still greater obstacle was set up by Hasidism, which had struck deep roots into their lives.

This sect had won a great following among the Jews of Moldavia, who believed in the miracles performed by their Zaddikim (the Hasidic Rebbes). The Zaddik, as a holy man, exercised unlimited power and influence over his followers. The wild stories circulated with regard to his superhuman powers and <sup>the</sup> miracles he performed dimmed their intellect and blinded them. Thus, when the Belzer Rebbe came on a "visit" to Radautz, the Moldavian Jews swarmed thither, and left heavy gratuities (Pidyonim) on his table. With the growth of Hasidism in Moldavia, large numbers of Jews went regularly on pilgrimages to the Rebbes -- to Sadagora, to Zydvavzov, to Berdichev, and to other places. Eventually, each Rebbe gained a considerable following in Moldavia, and this in time the Hasidim came to be in the majority there.

The peculiar dress, mannerisms, and mode of worship of the Hasidim retarded culture in Moldavia to a considerable degree. All the strange features of the movement so conspicuous in Galicia and in Poland were imported into the principality: their different mode of worship, their songs, dances, and <sup>the</sup> peculiar gestures used in religious services, their peculiar feasts and their strange method of observing Jewish customs; the sight of the Hasid's Streimel (foxtail cap), the long loose caftan with Pantoffel (slippers), his

trouserlessness, his drawers stuck into his ~~stock~~<sup>stockings</sup>, his long bushy and unkempt sidelocks, his thin, untrimmed pointed beard, and the large-brimmed black beaver hat worn at all seasons of the year -- all this was repulsive to Jews and non-Jews alike in Moldavia.

Hasidim went hand in hand with the ignorant Meladdedim (teachers) of the Chedarim in depressing the cultural status of the Roumanian Jews. The former was hard to attack, and was in fact dangerous, because of the grip which the Zaddik had on the Jewish masses. The Heder, on the other hand, seemed to be far more easily susceptible to change. Jewish intellectual leaders thought, therefore, that by changing the system of instruction, by establishing modern schools under trained pedagogues, the Jewish children would receive better instruction, and an intelligent generation would thus be enabled to grow up. The Chedarim, with their unprogressive and untutored Meladdedim, would in this way gradually disappear, and the well-instructed youths would develop into cultured and useful citizens and members of the Jewish community. The Moldavian government was willing to assist in this worthwhile cause, but Hasidic opposition at that time was too strong.

As regards the Zaddikin, Levy Segal, director of the Baron de Rothschild School in Bucharest, made a strong appeal to the Roumanian Jews not to accept every preacher as a Zaddik.

The ultra-reactionary mental status of the so-called spiritual leaders of the Moldavian Jews may be illustrated by the following facts:

Rabbi Horwitz, of Falticeni, was suddenly seized with doubt,

in 1853, as to the fitness of that year's wheat crop for the Passover Matzoth. In order to safeguard his flock, he addressed an inquiry to the chief rabbi at Jassy, also to some of the leading rabbinic scholars abroad. But the chief rabbi and a few others decided that he was wrong.

In another case, the chief rabbi of the same city had been too severe with a Jewish transgressor. This was the case of a young Jewish man of Jassy who ate Treifa, not taking his religion seriously. The rabbi punished him by having him parade in the streets for eight hours with a piece of Treifa meat, hanging on his chest from his neck.

At Cernauti the rabbi, in order to have the Jews of the city observe the Sabbath, managed to have a city ordinance passed by the authorities and to have notices set up through the city. This ordinance provided that any person who violated the Sabbath by buying or selling anything on that day was to be fined the sum of fifty gulden.

A practical rabbi at Bucharest instructed his sexton to remind his flock not to forget him with their gifts on Purim.

It was a rare thing, in the whole of Moldavia, to find a rabbi with a preliminary higher education. In 1910, for example, the Minister of Cults directed the school inspectors to hold examinations for Jews desiring to occupy the post of rabbi. When they presented certificates to the effect that they had passed an examination before a rabbinical board, they were found to be unable to speak or write Roumanian.

As against the deficiency of these candidates, the Zaddik of Bohushi went them one better. For on the occasion of his visit to Braila to take the baths, in 1898, a delegation of his adherents came to greet him, and ~~addressed~~ <sup>he spoke to</sup> them as follows:

"Let the children of Israel turn back to God and His Torah first before they return to the Holy Land, so that they may be able to observe <sup>then</sup> all the customs and rules applicable to it."

It was unfortunate that those few enlightened spiritual leaders who might have wished to shed a little light into the dark lives of the Roumanian Jews deemed such an attempt unwise at that time. This we gather from a letter written by Rabbi Tevi Josephson to Rabbi Abnew Kasvan of Rimnic Sarat in 1878, in which the writer suggested that some amendments be made in Jewish life regarding the custom that men should not go about bareheaded, that women should shave the hair off their heads after marriage and wear a Sheitel, and that wine should not be drunk from the hand of a Christian, and the like. But although Rabbi Kasvan agreed with him in principle, he thought it was too dangerous to attempt such changes at that time.

A princely decree of 1864 provided that Jews living in the proximity of the border line had to furnish guards. Some of the Jewish communities managed to evade this decree by the payment of money. But the Jews of Leova found a more direct way of being exempted from such duty; they sent a representative to Bucharest with a petition addressed to the legislature that they be permitted to pay a certain sum in lieu of service as border guards, and pleaded:

"Owing to the fact that we Jews are generally timid and unable to shoot even a rabbit -- a weakness which caused us to lose our land, and for two thousand years made us subordinate to everybody -- we can be of no use as soldiers to our fatherland. The Government will, therefore, do well to accept our money instead of our sons."

When this petition was read in open Parliament, it was greeted with uproarious laughter, as was only to be expected. The resentment expressed by Senator Costfaro, to the effect that he did not believe a Jewish community capable of writing such a childish petition, had a soothing effect upon the House. In fact, some of its members rather sympathized with those provincial Jews.

When the Haskalah (enlightenment) began to make its way into Roumania a large number of the Jews then devoted their attention to culture and learning. Hebrew studies flourished in Moldavia from this period on. The immigrations of the Polish and Russian Jews brought erudition in their train. The wave of the Haskalah which affected Eastern Europe from the middle of the 19th century on did not fail to have <sup>its</sup> influence over the Jews of Moldavia, where many of the Maskilim were to be found. They included names like Solomon Schechter, Moses Gaster, Elias Schwarzfeld, M.S. Rabenor, Wexler, Kasvan, Taubes, Pineles, and a host of others.

Petrescu-Cumene, after a thorough study of the Jews in Roumania, their suffering, the treatment they had received from the government, the many restrictions enacted against them, and their cultural and material status, concludes by offering them the following well-meant advice:



"The Jews should enter into the general humane movement: they should seek knowledge (science) and practice humility and devotion, give up faith in an anthropomorphous God, to the end that they may consecrate themselves to a grander and higher ideal. Then, by developing their particular faculties, will they become an incalculable force for progress and humanity.

"Yes, they should alienate themselves from all absurd chauvinism; they should frankly place their rare intelligence and their indisputable force at the service of the fatherland; they should lay the foundation and scatter among the national population like the Armenians and Mohammedans of the Dobruja. And, whatever their religious belief, Roumania will open wide her large arms, for no other land is more tolerant, more accommodating and more hospitable than the ancient Kingdom of Decebal."

XVII  
CHAPTER FORTY-NINE

THE MODE OF DRESS OF THE ROUMANIAN JEWS

Outside of their strictly Jewish life, the Jews endeavored in many ways to become Romanized. No particular style of dress was imposed upon them in Moldavia. Many of them dressed like the rest of the people. Nor were the Jews in Russia, Poland, and Turkey, exceptions to this. As for the so-called Polish dress which the Jews adopted and from which they found it so difficult to break away, ~~it was~~ was an imitation of the dress worn in the past by the Polish and Russian nobility, which was also the old fashion of the Roumanians. Thus, even in their dress the Jews did not differ from their neighbors, the non-Jewish Roumanians. Such was the case involving a dead body, the nationality of which, by reason of the style of dress, could not be ascertained until it was disrobed. Even then, however, it could not be told with certainty whether it was a body of a Turk or a Jew.

There was also a case in the year of 1605 of a Polish Jew. The dead body could not be recognized as that of a Jew because there was nothing on it to indicate whether it was a Christian Pole, or a Jew, since both Jewish Poles and Christian Poles dressed alike. This applied only to Moldavia. In Wallachia, it was not permissible for Jews to dress in any other color than black; nor could they wear yellow or red boots -- only black -- so that their dress looked

somewhat different from that of the Christian merchants or city folk. Jewish girls in that principality either had their hair made up like the Christian girls, or put up in braids. Jewish women had their hair cut close, or covered their heads with ~~kerchiefs~~ a kerchiefs, which they adorned with gold ducats hanging around their faces. Obviously, the restriction was not of long duration, because Carra, who describes minutely the style of dress prevalent in the principalities, does not mention any distinction in Jewish dress.

The ordinary weekday dress of the Jews was similar to that of the non-Jews. On the Sabbath and on holidays, however, they would dress "Jewish", i.e., they would wear a long kaftan with a girdle, over which was a fur-lined jacket with a long, large coat on top of that -- which they wore summer and winter. They wore no collar and tie with their Sabbath or holiday outfit. For headgear, they wore a cone-shaped velvet cap trimmed with twelve foxtails.

But dress was not the only thing in respect to which the Jews in that early period resembled and did not differ from their Roumanian Christian neighbors. Thus, in the year 1605, a Jew lived on very friendly terms with a priest at Galatz. The vocations which the Jews exercised brought them in close contact with all classes of Roumanian society, and necessarily led to their adoption of common customs and ways of living. At a later period, however, due to the influx of large numbers of Polish Jews, the customs prevailing among the Roumanian Jews, like those of their non-Jewish neighbors, unconsciously underwent slight changes. This was all the more so since the immigrant Polish Jews, while not superior in numbers to the indigenous Jews, were intellectually superior.

Therefore, as long as the Roumanians adhered to the Oriental style of dress, the Jews there retained it. But as soon as the former discarded their mode of dress, and adopted the European style, the Roumanian Jews discarded theirs also. The Jews in Roumania <sup>had</sup> adopted the style of dress of the Polish and Russian Jews. The adoption of that style of dress was a gradual process which began in the latter part of the 18th century and continued in the first part of the 19th, when the influx of Polish Jews into Moldavia became heavy.

German and Polish Jewish exiles brought with them to Roumania a bourgeois style of dress which was retained as a mark of distinction. Eventually it was dropped in the cities and villages, but it came to be looked upon as a traditionally "national" holy garment. As late as the middle of the 19th century, elderly Jews could be seen dressed in that style in Poland, the Ukraine, Moldavia, and Wallachia.

A great many of the Jews were progressive in many respects. And while the country was moving along slowly, as compared with the Western European nations, the Roumanian Jews moved a little faster. They kept abreast of the times as far as their circumstances permitted. It is true that Hasidism had penetrated into their life and retarded their progress, but the average Roumanian Jew strove to give his child a modern education. The average Jewish child there learned to speak at least two languages -- German and French -- besides Roumanian. But in the matter of dress, the

Roumanian Jews remained conspicuously conservative for a long time. The agglomeration of Polish and Russian Jews had made a deep impression on Roumanian Jewish life, as had their habits, styles and customs, many of which were adopted. As a result, an Occidental visitor, coming to Roumania, could not tell whether he was in Poland, Russia, or Roumania, since everywhere he met the same style of dress... beaver hat, velvet cone-shaped hat, beard, and earlocks (Peoth) -- and the like.

But the younger element, especially the Jewish youths who had finished their studies in German or French universities, could not, upon their return home adjust themselves to their former manner of life, nor could they follow their seniors' style of dress. Furthermore, these young men kept up their interest in foreign culture by reading periodicals, newspapers, and books published abroad. They were thus able, by comparison, to see how much behind the times their people were. Finding themselves alien in the midst of their own people, these youths formed circles of their own.

It so happened that at one of the meetings the progressive Jewish youths, headed by an able young man named E. Finkelstein, decided to effect a change in Roumanian Jewish life. As the first step in this direction, they were determined to persuade their fellow Jews to discard their medieval garb. This intellectual group filed a petition in which they outlined their plan, with Prince Mihai Sturza, praying to be incorporated.

As a result of this action, on November 8th, 1847,

Prince Sturza issued a decree directing the Jews of Moldavia to discard their style of dress and adopt the modern European style. At the same time, one of the leaders of the group made a strong appeal to the Jews, pleading for unity and peace. Urging the necessity of a reform in the Jewish mode of dress which was repulsive to both Jew and non-Jew, he said:

"Oh ye stiffnecked brothers: - Permit me to tell you that your garb, your style of dress, is not holy, and was not ordained by God. You can be just as pious, just as God-fearing, and ~~even~~ dress like everyone else. Let me tell you, in your own interest, how much insult, how much abuse -- in Moldavia especially -- you will spare yourselves through a change in your dress, and how much prestige you will gain in the eyes of our fellow citizens."

The underlying object of this movement, and of the decree which followed, was to diminish the enmity of Christians toward Jews, and to enable Jewish children to attend the public schools without being sneered at by their schoolmates. As to the extent to which that movement and idea succeeded, and what effect the princely decree had on the older element, those people who have had occasion lately to visit such Moldavian cities as Botoshani and Jassy, must have been in a position to form some conclusion. However, at that time the sole and immediate result was that the senior element among the Jews raised a bitter storm of protest, and the Kehillah petitioned the prince to rescind the decree. Accordingly, in that same year, the following princely decree was issued:

"Pursuant to the order of the prefectures regarding the dress of young bachelors in European style, the community of the capital (Jassy) addressed a complaint to His Highness, in consequence of which, under Decree #1708, the department is advised not to use violence; to watch and make them obey the decree without compulsion, and report the result."

Moderate in tone was a decree issued in 1847 on the subject of Jewish dress and the admission of Jews into the public schools.

In 1852, a law introduced in Parliament affecting the Jews of Moldavia in this regard was withdrawn after the intervention of the rabbi in Constantinople.

The famous ministerial circular issued by Mihai Gogalniceanu, in the year of 1859, previously cited, ordered the Jews in Moldavia to dress in the European style. It was read in the synagogues, and other public places. While no mention was made in that order regarding beards and earlocks, the Jews were filled with consternation, particularly since some over-zealous ward men took it upon themselves to enforce the order and, with shears in their hands, held the Jews up in the streets and cut off their beards and earlocks. However, this rowdyism was soon stopped by the military commandant at Jassy.

CHAPTER XVIIIPART. IIITHE UNITED PRINCIPALITIES  
DURING THE REIGN OF PRINCE CUZA

Moldavia and Wallachia, while still under Turkish suzerainty, united in 1859 under the name of "United Principalities". John Alexander Cuza was elected reigning prince. The country sensed the advent of better times. However, Vienna was not satisfied and an Austrian army marched in. Italy, vitally interested in the very existence of such a buffer state, disapproved of the Austrian invasion and mobilized her own army, forcing Austria to retreat.

The Jews hailed Cuza's election as the dawn of a new era. Celebrations were held throughout the country. Torchlight processions serenaded the prefect (of Bucharest) who gave assurance that the prince would strive for the welfare of all without distinction of creed.

Cuza certainly lived up to his promise. In a throne speech delivered at the opening of Parliament in 1865, he commended the Jews and urged their emancipation.

In November, 1859, Roumania adopted a new constitution. All monopoly, special privileges, titles, and ranks were abolished. Equal rights and privileges were guaranteed to all Christian religions. However, the constitution was apparently oblivious of the Jews.



248

Nevertheless, efforts were made to ameliorate the condition of the indigenous Jews. Communal laws were enacted and provisions were made in the civil code in favor of the Jews.

In 1860, Prince Cuza addressed the Assembly with regard to Article 46 of the Constitution, concerning the rights of Jews. Again, in his throne message of December 18, 1865, Cuza promised that his government "will take measures to emancipate Roumanians of Jewish faith."

The Minister of Cults, Boltineanu, proposed to the Council of Ministers full emancipation of the Jews, and Cuza concurred. But the Council did not agree to it. Finally a bill was introduced, ambiguous in content, and dilatory in scope. A Roumanian statesman, Cracti, suggested the emancipation of only those Jews "who have never enjoyed the protection of a foreign power."

Those who were in favor of granting Jews some rights appealed to the Roumanian Jews to help weaken the opposition by westernizing their dress, sending their children to public schools, and training them to become Roumanians. The appeal was translated into Yiddish and read in the synagogues by rabbis.

The Jewish intellectuals did their share to <sup>strengthen the</sup> ~~mend the~~ relationship ~~between~~ between Jews and Roumanians and remove every obstacle in the way to Jewish emancipation. ~~Secular schools for Jewish children were opened to replace emancipation.~~ Secular schools for Jewish children were opened to replace the religious heders. In 1861 the Society Unirea Israelita was formed with branches all over the land to counteract the opposition and educate the

Jewish masses. This educational society aroused dissatisfaction among the orthodox masses. Their leaders violently attacked the adherents of secularization of Jewish life.

The unrest created in the principalities after the Crimean War of 1855 brought some good results. The Jews won a new and mighty protector in the person of Napoleon III of France and the government made energetic and sincere efforts to ameliorate the condition of the Jews. Minister Catacuzin invited Jewish leaders to a conference and recommended that they drift away from the old educational system and enable the younger generation to receive modern education. The same leaders were also invited to participate in a conference with ~~the Minister of Public Instruction~~ the ~~Ministry~~<sup>er</sup> of Public Instruction. ~~the~~ political reaction in the country rendered the efforts of Jewish education superfluous. Prince Cuza <sup>seemed</sup> ~~was~~ somewhat indifferent to the task of Jewish emancipation, although he gave ample proof of his broadmindedness and sincerity. His friendship was not strong enough to protect Jews against restrictions enacted by his regime. Immediately after his election, a ritual murder accusation was instigated at Galatz <sup>in</sup> {1859}, and as a result the ~~synagogue~~ synagogue was demolished, <sup>and</sup> the homes of a number of Jews pillaged.

In 1860, the Minister of the Interior, Golesco, issued a circular ordering Jewish owners and lessees of manor lands to evacuate within fourteen days. The European press was shocked.

In June, 1861, the Minister of the Interior unearthed an ~~old~~, obsolete law of 1844, promulgated by Mihai Sturza, pro-

2155

hibiting Jews from selling alcoholic beverages in rural districts and leasing hotels. Instructions were sent to the prefects to forbid Jews in the rural districts to keep hotels and inns or to lease estates, and to order their removal within fifteen days. In spite of the fact that this old law had already been repealed by Prince Grigory Ghica, Minister Colesco endeavored to justify his ruling as a necessary measure. At the same time he tried to manifest the liberalism of his government by appointing Jews to public office. Adolph Buckner <sup>became</sup> ~~as~~ Inspector of Finance, and Dr. Iuliu (Julius) Barasch was made professor at the University of Bucharest.

Shortly after the United Principalities had been formed, and the name "Roumania" had been adopted, the Roumanian people began to demand the annexation of Bucovina and Siebenburgen (Transylvania), then a part of Austria. A campaign against the "Germanization" of alleged Roumanian people began. Because the Jews spoke German, they were made the scapegoats. The anti-Semitic spirit began to manifest itself. Roumanian politicians resented the idea of emancipation and became abusive of the Jews. The agitation against Jews strongly affected the country's economic condition. Roumania was so financially impoverished that it was unable to meet the yearly tribute to Turkey. Not supported by his people, and strongly opposed by the boyars and the church, Cuza had to resort to radical measures. He emptied the treasures of the monasteries, sequestrated their lands, and distributed them among the landless serfs. The enraged clergy, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Serbia appealed

to the Sultan for protection against Cuza's action.

From 1858 to 1864, the country was constantly in a turmoil ~~over~~<sup>over</sup> the question of emancipation of the Jews. The gypsies, totaling 300,000, had been emancipated in 1858, and were gradually absorbed by Roumanian society. The Armenians also were emancipated. But the country strongly opposed the possible emancipation of the Jews. Of course, there were many who favored Jewish emancipation, but they were not strong enough to influence those opposed to it.

In 1864, the Jewish problem was discussed in the Roumanian Parliament. Ghica, the President of the Council of Ministers, held that the Jews were already Roumanians. Nevertheless, he insisted that the word "Christian" should be inserted in a bill which was being considered. Boeresco was against any restriction with regard to Jews, which he considered obsolete. Despite his eloquent plea, the President of the Council of Ministers accused Boeresco of yielding Moldavia to the Jews.

Boeresco was not alone in his plea in favor of the Jews. Costaforo, a member of Parliament, joined him on March 5, 1864, in pointing out the injustice done to the Roumanians by the denial of equal rights to the Jews.

The agitation unabated, Prince Cuza pursued his friendly policy toward the Jews. Parliament passed a law in 1864 giving the indigenous Jews the right to vote with some limitations. This was the only concession granted to the Jews, although some minor reforms advantageous to them were instituted. Jews were admitted to colleges and given inferior ranks in the army.

Prince Cuza frequently declared his sentiment in favor of Jewish emancipation. In his message at the opening of

257

Parliament (1864) he reiterated his position. He repeated it again and again.

The Jews, having confidence in the Prince sent him a solemn message of gratitude. Services were held in synagogues. Anti-Semitism was not permitted. When the Roumanian press attacked the Jews the Prince warned the editors to refrain from further abuse of the Jewish population.

The broad spirit of tolerance manifested by Prince Cuza toward Jews is also evidenced by a ministerial circular of Vasile A. Urechea, Minister of Public Instruction, directing that Jewish children should be admitted to public schools. He wrote, "The Jews should not ask for separate schools, because separation of schools will perpetuate their separation from the Roumanian nation. They will not get accustomed to Roumanian life, but will grow from childhood with the idea of separation between Jews and Christians." Such remarks on the part of the ~~minister~~ <sup>sovereign</sup> justified the optimism of the Jewish leaders.

The part which Minister of the Interior Cogalniceanu played in the attempt to emancipate the Jews cannot be over-emphasized. In a circular addressed to the inhabitants of Jassy (1864) as Minister and as President of the Council of Ministers, he said to the Jews: "As I told you once before, I say now; Your future is on the benches of our schools and in the ranks of our army." In an address before Parliament on March 5, 1864, he said "We must not assume that in order to become a Roumanian, one must be a Christian; I consider native Jews as Roumanians, although they are not Christians." On the following day, con-

253

tinuing his speech in Parliament, he said: "The desire which inspires all of us is to see the happy day in Roumania when all her sons will enjoy the same rights and the difference of religion will be left to the Temple. Gentlemen, no one is more eager to see this day than the government for it will be the day of Roumanian brotherhood."

Despite these eloquent pleas, the majority in Parliament were against equality for the Jews. Petitions of the opposition were circulated in Jassy with attacks on the Jews. The government had to stop the solicitation of such petitions. Small handbills with venomous invectives against Jews were distributed in the streets. The Jews of Jassy, mostly foreign subjects, became alarmed and swamped their consulates. From Bucharest instructions were sent to the local authorities in Moldavia to maintain order and not <sup>to</sup> permit disturbances. Although the prefect at Jassy issued an order prohibiting participation in anti-Jewish agitations, the spirit of unrest continued.

In many places the Jews were beaten. The agitation assumed dangerous proportions. At Bacau, <sup>a</sup>the mob was emboldened by the encouragement it received from the chief of police. His subordinates remained passive and indifferent. In Bucharest the Jewish quarter was invaded, their homes pillaged, the synagogue demolished. They appealed to the government to restore order; several delegations of Jews from Moldavia went to Bucharest and appealed to the prince for protection.

Prince Cuza was unable to get along with his politicians. They did not like his internal policies, and he was far from accepting theirs. Roumanian politics were in the hands of the

nobility -- landowners -- who were in connivance with the clergy. The church had a great deal to say in governmental affairs. Ninety per cent of the land, the wealth of the country, was held by the nobility and the church. The boyars ~~and~~ framed the laws to suit themselves. The peasant was the lifelong slave of the landowner.

Cuza had seen in the deplorable condition of the peasants and, after a bitter struggle, in which he jeopardized his throne, succeeded in having them freed. But this was not sufficient. A political emancipation of the peasants without land was a hollow reform. The church possessed all the land but the clergy did no tilling. Cuza removed this evil by the radical measures mentioned before. The emancipation of the Jews did not follow the emancipation of the peasantry as it had been expected.

Cuza had been willing to emancipate the foreigners for a price of 40,000 ducats. The Armenians, smaller in number (about 50,000) were emancipated by paying their share, about one-fifth of the total sum. But the Jews, who were five times as numerous and who had to raise the sum of 32,000 ducats, found it beyond their means to do so and were, therefore, dropped from the plan of emancipation.

The act of transferring the church lands to the peasants was the climax of the quarrel between Cuza and the politicians. The feeling of the boyars against the ruler was very strong. The clergy, too, helped in widening the breach. As a result, Prince Cuza was dethroned on February 11, 1866. The usual crop of pretenders and aspirants then sprouted, ready to

255

ascend the throne. However, the Roumanian leaders decided to have no more native princes.

Prince Carol von Hohenzollern, a protege of Napoleon III, was elected ruler of Roumania. On May 10, 1866, the new ruler made his triumphal entry into Bucharest accompanied by John C. Bratiano.

9



Chapter ~~XII~~ XIX.The Reign of Carol I.

The new ruler, Carol I, immediately formed a cabinet representing both principalities. Most of its members were liberals, former leaders of the revolution of 1848, such as Lascar Catargiu, John C. Bratiano, Peter Mavrogheni, C. A. Rosetti, John Cantacuzino, John Ghica, and Dimitri Sturza. The election of Carol and his assumption of power were not in accordance with the diplomatic code. The United Principalities had been formed under a guarantee by the European Powers. Therefore, as guarantors, they should have been consulted before the choice was made. France was resentful. She considered it a breach of faith, and her Minister of Justice, Drouyin, regarded it a direct affront to the Powers because a native should be permitted to occupy the Roumanian throne. Most embittered of all was Turkey, which foresaw the waning of her own influence in the Balkans. However, she found little sympathy among the other Powers. The enthronement of Carol was a fait accompli, and there was noway out of ~~it~~. ~~the situation.~~

After the formation of the United Principalities, an anti-union party was formed at Bucharest and Jassy. It had already been decided that the successor to the dethroned Prince Cuza will be Carol of Hohenzollern. While a plebiscite was to be held, the anti-unionists at Jassy organized a revolt party for the purpose of dissolving the union and of electing Neculai R. Roznovanu as prince of Moldavia. On April 3, 1866, they issued a manifesto and instigated street demonstrations.

✓ The army was called <sup>out</sup> in. Dead and wounded fell on both sides.  
Many Jews were also among the dead and wounded.

The union of the two Roumanian principalities had affected the conditions of Jews in Moldavia. Instead of Jassy, Bucharest became the capital. This change was deeply resented by the people of Moldavia. The question of the union and the transfer of the capital to Bucharest was still being agitated and the country was torn asunder.

The Moldavian leaders tried to put their plans to establish the court of cassation at Jassy as a compensation, but without success. Moldavia then decided to secede from the union and to have a separate parliament and an army, and to recognize Carol as their nominal prince only. The agitation assumed a serious mark. The presence of a Wallachian army commandant in Jassy was resented.

Stefan Golesco, the prefect of Jassy, issued an appeal to the people to maintain order, charging that the disturbers consisted of "aliens without standing--Jews and Servians belonging to Roznovanu."

The Jews of Jassy, offended by such charges, protested vigorously to the prefect. On April 4, 1866, he issued a second proclamation, in which he rectified the "clerical error" and absolved the Jews from any part in that disturbance.

Informed by the Minister of the Interior that the Jews had also taken part in that rebellion, the Jewish federation of Bucharest inquired in Jassy, and received a reply on April 5, 1866 that the high government and the prefect are convinced of the good and peaceable conduct of the Jews.

In every section of the government in Moldavia, a radical change was noticeable. Judiciary and other office-holders were removed and

replaced by officials less favorable to the Jews. The liberal district attorney of Jassy was substituted by an anti-Semite Taku; Gusti, of similar mentality, as Minister of Cults. ~~The anti-Semite, Gusti, was appointed.~~

The politicians were trying to "save" the country from the hands of the Jews. Commerce and industry in the principalities, to which the Roumanian Jews had greatly contributed had made tremendous gains. Greeks, Bulgarians, and Armenians were strong competitors with Jews, and their feelings against the Jews became more embittered now. They had only one desire--to see the Jews driven from the country. Complaints were sent to the prince and to the mayors that the Jewish tradesmen, artisans, and industrialists take away their bread.

With the development of commerce and industry, a middle class sprang up in the latter part of the 19th century. This new class detested the Jewish merchant. These professional politicians, lawyers, literary, agitators, and teachers, a patriotic element, looked up the state as a source of security for themselves.

With the assumption of power by Carol, with Bratiano in the cabinet, a change for the worse took place. The obsolete Organic Law<sup>1</sup> was brought to life and vigorously enforced. A long chain of oppressive laws followed. The country now turned into a boiling cauldron of torture and persecution. That land, only yesterday, a haven to the Jew, became for him an inferno. In June, 1866, only a month after Carol's accession to the throne, the Jews at Jassy were already molested. The prefect, Grigory Sturza, took energetic steps and checked the disorders. At Bacau and at Oltenitza, too, anti-Jewish disorders, took place and at Jassy many Jewish families had to seek refuge against the mob.

On the occasion of a visit made by Prince Carol to Jassy in 1866, the Jews of that city erected a triumphal arch, with an inscription in Roumanian and Hebrew. But the mayor ordered the Hebrew letters removed. <sup>And</sup> When the Jews refused, the mayor withdrew his demand. <sup>And</sup> They were not permitted to greet the prince. A squadron of cavalry chased the Jews away.

However, Prince Carol did receive a delegation of Jews who brought him their good wishes. The Christian merchants of Jassy availed themselves of the opportunity and presented to Carol a petition in which a complaint against the alleged commercial monopoly of the Jews <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ aired ~~up~~. They asked that the Jews should be denied the right to deal in food and in spirituous beverages.

From Jassy, Carol went to Braila, where, on November 16, 1866, he received a delegation of Jews consisting of Jacob Lobel, Samuel Lobel, and A. Pineles. When they extended to him an invitation to visit their Temple, Carol exclaimed, "What, you have here such a well-organized congregation?" When the conversation turned on the restriction against the Jews' owning land, Carol said: "Such a law does not and should not exist. Anyway, I shall make a note of it." When Pineles told him that Jews were compelled to send their children abroad to be educated, because of the difficulties for Jews in attending native schools which were under church influence, Carol replied: "True! Unfortunately, this is bound up with the financial difficulties of the country, which do not permit yet the subsidization of Jewish schools." He promised to help establish their own schools.

A movement favorable to the Jews was inaugurated. They were to be allowed to hold property in the cities so as to bind them to the land.

There were many Roumanians who admired and respected the Jews. Such was John Heliade Radulescu. Senator Constantin Sutzo, who criticized Bratiano's anti-Jewish policy, and Colonel Grigory Sturza, prefect of the district of Jassy.

Shortly after the accession of Carol I, the Parliament debated the framing of a new constitution. The Jewish question was again under consideration. While many of the deputies were strongly hostile to the Jews, some pleaded very earnestly in their behalf. Among the latter were Ghica Comanishteanu, Racovitza, and Epureanu. With reference to the question of the naturalization of the Jews of Roumania, Comanishteanu argued that religion should not be a bar to citizenship.

He was of the opinion that it <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ in the interest of the state, to let the Jews become citizens.

Ghica Comanishteanu's speech was delivered in Parliament on June 18, 1866. In the same spirit another deputy, Costache Epureanu, delivered a passionate plea in defense of Jews.

The deputies, Costa Foru and Lascar Catargiu, delivered addresses showing the value of the Jews in Roumania and regretting the injustice with which they were being treated.

Roumania adopted a new constitution, <sup>of which</sup> Article 7 <sup>ed</sup> ~~providing~~ that "only aliens, professing the Christian faith, can be naturalized," and therefore, naturalization granted in 1864 became null and void. This article was later interpreted by the highest court of the land, that Jews were aliens, and therefore incapable of becoming natjralized as long as

they are not Christians.

In June, 1866, with the discussions of the new constitution <sup>the</sup> still on agenda, a painful political farce was played which proved to be the beginning of an era of persecution of the Jews in Roumania. Bratiano tried to introduce an amendment into the constitution facilitating the emancipation of the indigenous Jews. On June 30<sup>th</sup>, when this question was on the agenda in the Chamber of Deputies, a hostile demonstration was held in the courtyard of the Chambers and in the adjacent streets. Bratiano, the Chairman of the Chambers, and a few of the deputies came out and assured the people that the Jews would not be emancipated. A governmental circular <sup>then</sup> was issued in which the Jews were blamed for the disorders.

as follows:

The origin of these "disorders" was ~~very interesting~~: In accordance with the promise given by Bratiano to the eminent French-Jewish leader Adolphe Cremieux, the government introduced a clause into the constitution which would have solved the Jewish question and emancipated the Jews in Roumania. The matter was referred to the constitutional committee of the Assembly, and this committee rendered a negative report. But, this did not settle the matter. The Chambers further debated the question and various amendments were proposed. A number of orators attacked and villified the Jews. The government adroitly exerted every possible method to sway the Chambers and to have its members execute its maneuvers. Suddenly, after Grigory Lahovary, replying to an anti-Semitic deputy, had finished an eloquent and impressive appeal in behalf of the Jews, a frightful noise was heard from a mob outside of the Chambers.

Then John C. Bratiano, Minister of Finance, took the floor and delivered an address withdrawing the article in favor of the Jews and

referring to the tumultuous behavior of the mob outside, he threatened with imminent grave consequences.

Having finished his oration, Bratiano suggested they take a recess until order was restored. The house adjourned. Bratiano appeared on the balcony, addressed the crowd, and assured them that no rights would be granted to the Jews. The bill favorable to the Jews which he himself introduced into Parliament and which had been voted upon favorably was thus withdrawn. Article 6 of the constitution was replaced by the notorious Article 7 which sealed the fate of the Jews in Roumania.

~~Now the Jews were placed beyond the law and considered aliens.~~  
~~The old Organic Law was revived again.~~

Was John C. Bratiano Honest?

John C. Bratiano, who had taken part in the revolution of 1848, and at that time had showed his love for Roumanian Jews, invited them to join the revolution; this Bratiano, who had dethroned Prince John Alexander Cuza, brought Prince Carol, disguised, to Roumania, and placed him on the throne, was now the master. He had achieved power, and was the leader of the liberal party which always retained its power. Thus, he was virtually a dictator. He was feared and followed almost blindly for nearly half a century, and during all that time the legislature did his bidding; Bratiano never introduced a bill in Parliament which did not become a law. Was he honest when he made the promise to assist in the emancipation of the Jews?

At that time, Prince Carol was quite a young man, inexperienced in politics. He certainly had no idea as to political moves in Roumania, more dishonest than in any other part of the world. He was a newcomer, not knowing the country or its people, not even speaking the language of the country. Bratiano was his closest friend, hence "Uncle John" did all things, proposed all measures, and the good prince unflinchingly carried out or approved them.

Personally, Bratiano was a man of iron, with a strong will. Fearless and defiant of public opinion, he tolerated no opposition, and no argument could move him to change his decision, once made. He was firm in his conviction, so that all the eloquence and all the pleading in the world could not make him change his mind. Whether it was a protest by indignant citizens, a remonstrance by foreign representatives, or threats by European Powers, Bratiano would listen calmly and unmoved, and would remain indifferent to all pleadings and appeals. Whenever it suited his purpose, he would even refuse an interview to foremost European representatives, such as Count de Beust. Neither the Russian Bear, nor the British Lion, nor even the Iron Chancellor of Germany, Bismarck, could move him by threats or other means. If the giant of Berlin was a man of iron, his prototpye--physically a miniature--was a man of steel; hard, unbending, unyielding, always resisting.



Bratiano promised to introduce Article 6 into the Constitution, thereby completely emancipating all the Jews in Roumania. The Chambers met. The House was under his control; his party was in the majority. The question was being debated, and the opposition was not strong enough--in fact, it was weak, very weak. Who would have dared to oppose the great Roumanian patriot, the man who had consecrated his life to the benefit of his country, the astute statesman who had adroitly elevated his country to a high level by bringing it into the orbit of the family of nations through the influence of a Hohenzollern on the Roumanian throne? This great and powerful man, the most influential in Roumania, the actual ruler, was now about to put his signature on an act which would have elevated him in the opinion of Jews and Christians at home and abroad. This good man who was anxious to make Roumania a united, happy nation of Christians and Jews, was about to see the dream of 1848 realized, by making all the Roumanian Jews citizens of his beloved country, when alas! his hand was halted, and it began to shake; his voice was stifled, and his face paled. A howling mob outside the Chambers protested against the emancipation of the Jews. A band of Roumanian citizens from the capital, a collection from the slums of Bucharest, all the riffraff from the saloons, all the anti-prohibitionists, all the element which is never on good terms with the police, all that low contingent was outside the Chambers (for the Chambers were always well guarded by a squadron of gendarmes), yelling and protesting against the emancipation of the Jews.

Inside the Chambers, the deliberations ceased instantly. Business was suspended. Minister Bratiano, accompanied by a few deputies, came out onto the balcony, and at a motion of his hand, in fact at the mere sight of this great patriot leader, that wild howling, shouting, yelling, screaming mob was silenced. The erstwhile bellicose, rebellious, indignant patriots, that uncontrollable mob, now stood like little children in the classroom at the sight of their teacher. Convinced that the sentiments of the "people" were against the granting of citizenship rights to the Jews, the great man, Bratiano, assured them that they had nothing to fear, that no rights would be granted to the Jews as long as They objected.

Having thus satisfied himself that the country was against this plan, the honorable Mr. Bratiano gave it up. Those good citizens, on the other hand, who composed that patriotic and anxious mob, were evidently in doubt whether their great minister was convinced of their objections, so they offered striking and convincing proof of their patriotic sentiments by invading the Jewish quarter, assaulting Jewish men and women, demolishing their homes and destroying the synagogues.

Now the question is: Did Bratiano know that his country was against the emancipation of the Jews? If he did know, why did he attempt

to pass an act which meant political suicide for himself? If he did not know, why did he not first feel out the pulse of the country and learn how it would react? And if the country was against it--if that drunken mob of outlaws can be called "the country"--was he the kind of man that could be so easily scared? Was he such a weakling that the mere sight of a few hoodlums would make him abandon a plan so dear to his heart and so ~~scared~~ to his principles, forget the dignity of his office and of the man, and readily yield to a band of drunkards?

Let us assume that Bratiano was very much in earnest and that he really wanted to make a united Roumania by emancipating the Jews--the only Roumanian element which had not yet been emancipated. Let us assume also that the opposition of that mob in the courtyard of the Chambers was a shocking surprise to him, and that in order to pacify that mob, he had to come out and satisfy them, as he did, that they had nothing to fear, that the Jews would <sup>1</sup>Not be emancipated. Grant also that, as a shrewd politician, seeing a possibility that the demonstration might lead to more serious disorders, he receded from his position and capitulated. Would not such a bitter surrender in itself have stirred up within <sup>him</sup> a feeling of bitter resentment against that element which had opposed him in so lofty a plan and in such a disgraceful manner?

Grant <sup>ing</sup> also that he had to yield, that he realized that he had made a mistake, and that he gave up the idea of the emancipation of the Jews in order that he might be able to carry out other plans which he had in mind for the good of his country and for that of his party. Would not that act alone, the act of having yielded to the will of the people, have endeared him to the hearts of the people of his country? Would not the mere

abandoning of that idea have made him the idol of that people which he had enabled to gain such a signal victory over the Jews?

After satisfying "the country" that the Jews would not be emancipated, why was it necessary for Bratiano to send out that notorious circular which opened up an era of endless persecution of the Jews? Would not the mere fact that the rioters got off scot-free, and that none of them was arrested, punished, or even asked any questions, have been sufficient proof that his heart was with them? Why was it necessary to follow up that circular with a series of restrictive laws against the Jews? Surely from the Jewish element Bratiano had nothing to fear--they were strangers, and had no voice in the country or in its affairs. From the country he had positively nothing to expect but loyalty to his party and gratitude to himself. Why then did he have to embark on that sea of hatred which he created and on that policy which he relentlessly pursued against the Jews? Now that he had yielded to the "will of the people," since he had shown his true patriotism by foregoing his own will and judgement in favor of the will and judgement of his people, he could very well have rested on his laurels. Why was he so bitter and so vindictive?

There is still another question: How did that mob come to be? How did its members know what was going on in the Chambers on that day? The matter had not been advertised, and no announcement had appeared in the press that the Jewish question was to come up for discussion. In fact, there was no Jewish question pending! Roumanian anti-Semites at that time were not so active as they were in the second and third decades of the 20th century. Who was it who organized that mob and directed it to march up the hill to Parliament? When was this done? Who instigated

that march? Where did those hooligans, the members of that mob, meet before they began their march to the hill? Where was the police when the mob began their march leading up to the hill of the Metropole where Parliament was in session? They had to pass Calea Victoria, in front of the prefecture. Did not any of the police authorities see that gang marching in a not-too-friendly mood in the direction of Parliament? And when it reached the courtyard of Parliament, what was the attitude of the gendarmes there? Did any one telegraph or appeal to police headquarters to tell of the presence of that mob and to ask for instructions?

Grant that Bratiano was taken by surprise, and that neither he nor any of the representatives in Parliament had the slightest inkling that such a furious protest would be made. Let it be assumed, also, that the mob really composed an element of earnest Roumanian citizens who saw in the emancipation of the Jews a real danger to the country. After being assured by the minister that nothing would be done along the lines previously planned; after Bratiano had talked to them so convincingly--and Bratiano understood mob psychology, and knew how to convey an idea--after he had told them positively that the matter would be dropped, all they had to do was to withdraw to their grog shops, or to their homes, or disperse, and rest. Instead, they left the hill, <sup>or</sup> marched down in the direction of the Jewish quarter, and committed a series of crimes, attacks, and acts of vandalism such as only a reckless gang which had nothing to fear at the hands of the authorities could have perpetrated.

The answer to these not very puzzling questions is not very hard to find. Bratiano never intended, and never wanted, and never dreamed of

emancipation. But Bratiano was a cunning, shrewd politician, and he did not want to take any chances. Not to have brought the matter up at all would have been an omission for which he could never have forgiven himself. For any change in the government would have led to the bringing up of the matter and then it could have been carried through even against his wishes. Then, also, he wanted to play fair, to show the country that he was a man of his word, and to keep the promise which he had made in 1848. Also, he desired to convince the European Powers that the Roumanians were not quite ready for the plan to emancipate the Jews. But how could he achieve this result? How could he convince anybody that the country was against it? Better yet, how could he kill this scheme effectively, and in such a manner that no reflection would be cast upon his honor? What is more, if he should succeed in eliminating that emancipation project, he would not only be gaining a great triumph for the liberal party, but he would become a national hero.

The way to accomplish all this was very simple: The question would come up in Parliament unostentatiously; the forum would be opened, and the debates would proceed. At a given signal by one of his henchman, the gang of hoodlums would march up; their deafening yells would stop the debate, and he would request some of his deputies to step out with him onto the balcony. He would assure the "citizens" that their wishes would be granted; immediately the country would be saved and the "alien" Jews would not get their rights. In order to complete the work, and by way of compensation, "the boys" would finish the job. And they did. A ministerial circular was then sent out to the prefects in the provinces, instructing them to enforce the vagabond law so as to free the country from that

14

plague of "vagabonds." Three weeks later this was supplemented with another circular, urging the prefects to enforce the rural law against the Jews.

Thus, the "liberal" Bratiano party finally took off its mask, and came out openly with a declaration of its policy, which it stated definitely to be anti-Jewish. What followed thereafter is a matter of history. If the policy announced by the liberal party was not clear enough, a group of Jewish students at Jassy and Bucharest, in order to ingratiate themselves with the Roumanian politicians, came out in the Roumanian press with a proclamation that assimilation was the only avenue for the Jews in Roumania to pursue. They also tried to prevail upon the Jewish leaders in Bucharest, who wanted to have the former legal status of the Jewish community restored, by declaring that they, the students, were against the formation of any Jewish community in Bucharest; that they, the students, were not interested in Roumanian Jewish schools or in Roumanian Jewish hospitals. The stand they took may be summed up in the following few words: "We are Roumanians, and Roumanians we shall always be." These students then attacked the Jewish press in the Roumanian newspapers, accusing these Jewish periodicals of slandering the country. They even attacked the Alliance Israelite Universelle for interfering in the internal affairs of Roumania. It was a reckless and ill-advised venture in which these Jewish students engaged, and one which they regretted later. But the damage had already been done, and it could not be undone. It certainly harmed the Jewish cause in Roumania, considerably.

CHAPTER ~~FOURTEEN~~ XX.AFTER THE BRATIANO ACT

The riots in the Jewish quarter clearly indicated the antipathy of the authorities toward Jews. On the eve of the Parliamentary debate rumors of imminent disorders were spreading like wild fire. The government did not take the necessary precautions. The Jews consoled themselves that only one of them was a victim of these riots.

The Jassy authorities acted more decently than those of Bucharest. The prefect issued a proclamation appealing to the people not to disgrace the country before the world. He pleaded with them not to attack the Jews and informed them that the guilty would be severely punished.

A delegation of Jews from Bucharest was received by Prince Carol, and he assured them that compensation would be made for the damages caused by the demolition of the Temple. Carol donated the first 2,000 ducats out of his own purse. The extent of the damage was over 50,000 ducats.

The good will of the Prince did not restrain the rioters. Demolition of Jewish-owned property, the enactment of <sup>the</sup> "vagabond" law, the drowning of several Jews in the Danube at Galatz, and a long chain of persecutions followed. Thus was the "Jewish question" created. The population was now instigated to hatred of the Jews.



In a circular to the prefects in the provinces, Bratiano pursued his anti-Jewish campaign, and on May 6, 1867, he ordered a vigorous enforcement of the anti-Jewish restrictions. Jews were forbidden to live in rural districts. Under the cloak of the vagabond law, Jews were harassed, hunted and imprisoned, and many of them, including natives, were expelled. Arrests continued daily, and the prisons were crowded with reputable Jewish merchants, arbitrarily labeled as vagabonds. The panic-stricken Jews appealed to their foreign consuls, but the Monitor Official denied the facts of persecutions.

The Court of Cassation ruled that only subjects of foreign powers could be expelled. Native Jews, as Roumanian subjects, were not aliens, and, therefore, could not be expelled. The children of native citizens were recognized as citizens de jure. The same applied to Jews born in Roumania. However, the government gave its own autocratic interpretation of the ruling of the Supreme Court.

Some of the expelled Jews appealed from the decision and the former president of the Council of Ministers, Emanuel Costache Epurean, then a deputy, argued the appeal. The decision of the lower court was reversed, and the Jews were set at liberty. This decision did not abate further persecutions. Old residents were dragged to police stations, beaten, placed under arrest, and subsequently expelled. Several deputies protested against such brutal treatment, but Bratiano was unmoved. A wave of terrorism against Jews swept the country.

The mayor at Jassy issued an order forbidding Jews to employ Christian servants. At Roman they were forbidden to erect tabernacles for the Sukkoth holiday. At Berlad the Jewish community was forbidden

to slaughter fowl and cattle in accordance with Jewish ritual. At Craiova a mortgage placed on a building owned by a Jew was rejected by the court on the ground that the Jew had no right to own real property.

At Dorohoi over 100 reputable Jews were arrested in the streets as vagabonds. Twenty of them were Austrian subjects, and only the intervention of their consul saved them from prison. At Stefanesti, Jews were forbidden to open their stores before noon on Sundays and holidays. Sixty Jewish storekeepers were fined because, following an old practice, they hung out goods in front of their stores. However, the Christian storekeepers who practiced the very same custom, were not fined.

In the villages, the local authorities were also busy with clearing out the Jews. Violence continued. Even womenfolk were not spared from the severity of the hunt and the expulsions.

During this period of continuous persecution of the Jews, the English and Austrian governments instructed their representatives at Bucharest to intercede with the Sublime Porte at Constantinople, with the Prince at Bucharest, and with Cabinet Members, to stop the persecutions. Bratiano denied the facts of persecutions submitted to him. Prince Carol I expressed his displeasure with the situation, but was unable to change the course of events.

The protests of foreign consuls and the bad impression created abroad, compelled Carol I to remove Bratiano from office. After Parliament was dissolved and Bratiano returned to power, acts of violence increased. The mayor of Roman took a notion to convert

the Jewish cemetery into a public park; at Bacau, the sub-prefect was enforcing the vagabond law against the Jews; fines were again arbitrarily imposed upon them, and some of the Jews were beaten for employing Christian help. In the middle of the winter, the same sub-prefect ordered Jews driven out of the villages.

Some of the mayors, however, showed human feelings and refused to obey the anti-Jewish orders, and permitted the Jews to remain in the villages.

Since there was never a law in Roumania prohibiting Jews to live in rural districts, the ministerial circulars of Bratiano (May 5, 1868), and of Cogalniceanu (January 27, 1869) were basically illegal. Bratiano maintained that expulsion from the rural districts was a preventive measure against epidemic diseases.

In 1867, several mayors denied the Jews the rights of bidding at tax auction sales. In 1864, Jewish lawyers were forbidden to practice law. In 1869, they were excluded from medical practice. This act was annulled in 1871 by a decree of Minister Alexander D. Ghica ~~by~~ permitting a native and naturalized Jewish citizen to study medicine.

The Roumanian representatives abroad felt embarrassed by the situation and by the imposed necessity of whitewashing their government. In an interview with Lord Clarendon, the British foreign secretary, Minister Vasile Boeresco alleged that the Moldavian

Jews were still uncivilized and barbaric, and gave this as a reason for the animosity. Nevertheless, he promised that the persecutions would cease. Similar promises were given to the British Consul General in Bucharest, to make representations to Prince Carol. The Roumanian government, in defense, published a note, in the Roumanian press, justifying the treatment of the Jews.

Panatie Balush protested bitterly against the anti-Jewish agitation and persecution of the Jews, and pleaded that such tactics undermined the prestige of the country. A number of eminent Moldavians deplored and excoriated the vicious actions committee against Jews. One of them, Senator Panaiti, appealed to Bratiano to recall his edict of expulsion. The Moldavian newspaper, Gazeta De Iasy, came out with a strong protest against the minister's attitude to the Jews, and accused him of violating the basic law of the country.

The Jewish leaders, Jonah, Byck, Leb Kahana, and Dr. Silbersweig, of Jassy, did their utmost to ameliorate the condition of their people. They appealed to foreign consuls and to the ministers on behalf of the indigenous Jews. While reproaching them for having invoked the aid of foreign consuls, the minister promised them to relent.

The Bratiano regime went on unchecked. At Berlad excesses were committed, with the prefect passively looking on at the demolition of Jewish-owned property. He did later telegraph to Bucharest for instructions. A military detachment arrived, and when the commandant wanted to dispell the mob, the prefect counselled against the use of force, and suggested an appeal to reason instead. When word came from Bucharest to stop the excesses and to arrest the aggressors,

"Patriotic" Roumanians strongly remonstrated. The mayor promised to reimburse the Jews for the losses sustained. A princely decree was sent to the prefects instructing them to protect the Jews. This unusual intercession in favor of the Jews did not diminish the general trend of treating them as aliens and alleged enemies of the country.

CHAPTER ~~XXVIII~~ XXI.Tolerance and Anti-Semitism

It may sound strange to say that Roumania was always tolerant toward the Jews. True they have suffered a great deal there, as has also the rest of the population throughout the entire history of that country. But the fact still remains that up to the second half of the 19th century, Roumania was to the Jews what the United States is today-- a land of refuge in which every downtrodden person found a home. Jews came thither from Russia, Poland, Galicia, and Hungary, and settled there, working and prospering without interference.

A Jewish question did not exist in the principalities until the rivalry between Austria and Russia began. It manifested itself the more strongly since each of these two countries sought to impress its influence upon the land. The Turkish empire began to decay after the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-1774, and the peace of Kutschukainardski. The provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia were returned to their respective princes under Turkish suzerainty, but Russia was their representative at Constantinople. In 1782, ~~the~~ Russian and Austrian consuls were installed at Bucharest. Russia took it upon herself to protect the Christians in the Orient, while Austria undertook to protect the Jews.

Feeling that they were under Austrian protection, the Jews began to learn the German language. They used it in their

daily intercourse, and a perfect "Jargon" (Yiddish) was developed there. And, strangely enough, while Austria persecuted, oppressed and expelled her own Jews in Bucovina, she protected those living in the two principalities. This protection had its own special object: Austria's hope of annexing the two principalities. In the event of success, she would have a homogeneous population which meanwhile was under her protection and which would surely welcome her.

Foreign subjects in Turkey stood under the so-called "capitulations", i.e., consular jurisdiction. These "capitulations", which were rescinded by the Sublime Porte after the first World War, had existed in the principalities, which were Turkish territory down to 1879. Under the terms of the treaty of 1838, all foreign subjects had enjoyed special privileges.

The Russian consul surrounded himself with a horde of Roumanian patriots, instigated the population against Austria, who, on the other hand, did <sup>its</sup> ~~his~~ utmost to weaken Russian influence, and offered protection to every Jew.

As we have already shown, the anti-Jewish policy in Roumania was an imported article from Russia. The Russian occupation of 1828 to 1834 and the Organic Law framed by the Russian General, Paul V. Kisseleff, <sup>^</sup> were the seeds of the hatred which was planted there. Those seeds bloomed in the late 1860's and ripened in the 1870's.

Proof of tolerance and absence of anti-Jewishness in the principalities is the interesting fact that several Jews held high offices under the various princes. Such a person was Isaiah (popularly, Shaia), son of Joseph, a Spanish Jew, master of the

Slavonic languages, who was secretary to Alexander Mircea Voia, in 1573. ~~Sahia~~ Sahia's son, Solomon, was confidential advisor to Peter the Lame in 1580. Vasile Lupu, in 1556, had the noted Dr. Cohen, his personal physician, represent him in diplomatic matters, notably in the correspondence carried on by Cohen in behalf of the prince for the purpose of establishing friendly relations between Sweden and the Sultan.

In 1741 Prince Constantin Mavrocordat decreed that no Christian servant under the age of thirty should be in the service of Jews. Local guilds were also forbidden to sell their products to Jews and to Armenians, but these prohibitions were not directed exclusively against Jews.

Other princes granted privileges to the Jews or conferred rights on their religious leaders. Prince Constantin Mihai Cioban Racovitza had confidential relations with certain Jews who made it profitable for him, and whom he in turn compensated by exempting them from taxes and other duties. In 1759 he granted privileges to the Hahambasha Isaac, and exempted him from taxes. His successor, John Tudor Voivod, recognized these privileges in 1783.

Under Alexander Constantin Moruzi (1777-82<sup>✓</sup> and 1792-94), the Jews enjoyed considerable freedom. True, some decrees were issued against them, but these were not designed to be oppressive. Thus, in his decree of September 26, 1794, Moruzi forbade strangers to settle in the villages, but he did not aim especially against Jews. The word "strangers" was certainly not applied to the Jews at that time, because they were all recognized as indigens. It was a general order directed against strangers, newcomers (of every race) who might want to settle there.



Against this negative order, which some might construe as having been unfriendly to the Jews, stands another decree issued by the same prince in that same year which shows how broadminded he actually was.

At the instance of the bishop of Focshani, Jewish butchers were forbidden to sell meat, the result of a complaint filed by Christians, instigated by the clergy. But when the Jewish butchers complained to Prince Ypsilanti, he issued a decree, on June 18, 1803, overruling the bishop. It should be remembered that Focshani is situated partly in Wallachia and partly in Moldavia, and that at that time (the first decade of the 19th century) the Moldavian part of the city was overwhelmingly Jewish, while the Wallachian part had only three Jewish families.

Every attempt to annoy the Jews was made by ~~the~~ non-Roumanians within the country, or by some Roumanians with the motive of extorting money or of killing off competition. Furthermore, the princely government did its utmost in every instance to protect the Jews. The various decrees issued, even those containing some restrictions against the Jews, indicate that the government was solicitous for harmony between Jews and Christians. Thus, the plans approved by Caragea, on May 16, 1818, for the building of a synagogue in Bucharest, near the <sup>River</sup> Dambovitza, provided that a high brick wall should be built around it, so that the Jews should not be annoyed by outsiders.

A ministerial circular of June 25, 1857, forbidding the harboring of any stranger or acquaintance, even a relative, without first notifying the authorities, was not directed against Jews

alone, but against all inhabitants.

All these restrictive measures and laws did not affect the Jews alone, but also aliens. And, as has already been indicated, even those which were specifically against Jews were the result of complaints filed by their competitors, and not due to anti-Semitic propaganda. Again, even after a law had been enacted, it was, in many cases, repealed.

After the revolution of 1848 and in the period from 1848 to 1857, some signs of anti-Semitism began to appear in the land. However, it could strike no roots there, since the government did not permit it. This we may gather from the following incident. An anti-Semitic pamphlet appeared at Bucharest in 1858. In it the Jews and their religion were attacked, and Rosetti was accused of being in sympathy with them and of having been paid by them. Rosetti replied promptly to this accusation with an article published in his paper, Romanul, on August 4, 1858, in which, among other things, he said that he had been paid only by the sympathy and aid extended to him by the Jews while he was in exile from the country, and by the blood which they had shed together with him in the common patriotic cause.

But this was not all. A princely decree was then issued, ordering the suppression of that anti-Semitic pamphlet Prastie, as well as of another similar publication, the Alcatuire Aurita. ~~This decree, because of its tone and spirit, deserves to be reproduced here.~~

The first signs of actual anti-Jewish sentiment appeared

in a decree issued by Voivode Scarlet Calimach, on May 12, 1817, which recited a complaint by Christian merchants of Botoshani against their Jewish competitors in that city. Those merchants asked that restrictive measures be taken against Jews, that they should not even be allowed to draw water from the same wells as the Christians of the city. However, the Prince took a broad view of the matter by branding the complaint as malicious, and in his decree stated that the Jews have been living there for centuries, they were not to be molested; that they and their posterity might continue to live in peace and enjoy all the privileges granted to them in the past, also those granted in previous decrees and that in the present decree. (A copy of the original of this hrisov was in the possession of the Jewish community of Botoshani.)

But even this complaint was not prompted by anti-Semitic sentiments. It was an imported article, not "made in Roumania". It was instigated by a Greek named Trandoff, who had a business grudge against his Jewish competitors, whom he wanted to compel to take a parcel of land off his hands.

The restriction in the constitution of the furriers' guild at Botoshani, formed in 1820, was not against Jews alone. It read: "No member shall take in a foreigner as apprentice to learn the trade. That is to say: Armenians or Jews, so that they may not eventually control this guild and have it fall into their hands."

That the Jews were always considered indigens is proved by many official documents showing payments of taxes made by Jews to the tax collectors between the years 1694 and 1704; these records

were published by the Directia Archivelor Statului (office of the State Archives ).

Native Jews were always considered Roumanians. This is shown by the interest which the government took in Jewish cultural affairs.

Even after the Organic Law had been enacted, the Roumanian government continued to treat the Jews, whether indigens or Sudits, as its own sons and did not oppress them.

The various nationalities, each wearing a different, peculiar style of dress, were also protected in this respect. A decree issued in 1775 by the Sublime Porte, for example, provided: " None of the inhabitants in Wallachia shall be molested on account of his dress."

In every official document or decree issued at the beginning of the 19th century a distinction was made between Jewish indigens, Sudits, and aliens. Even as early as the 16th century, in an order of expulsion issued by Peter the Lame, only Polish Jews were expelled, but none of the indigenous Jews. In the 19th century, due to the unsafe conditions so prevalent at that time, both Christians and Jews were forced by the arbitrary abuse foisted upon the people by the government to seek protection under the foreign consulates in order to obtain the necessary protection against their own country. In this manner the natives -- both Jews and Christians -- were compelled to brand themselves as "aliens," a classification which, though they were unable to foresee it, was to become a powerful instrument of evil and mischief later in the hands of the Roumanian anti-Semites. As late as 1864, under Prince Cuza, the Jews in Roumania were recognized as indigenous. They were even designated as "Israeliti Pamanteni" ( indigenous Jews ), were subdivided into four categories and could participate in communal elections.

In 1880, Dr. Maurice Moscovici, of Bucharest, was appointed chief physician for the Bucharest city hospital. Joseph Brociner held an important position at the customhouse at Galatz. Ronetti Roman served the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In 1880, Dr. Maurice Meyerhoffer, the Jewish banker, and Isaac Lebowitz and D. Wortman were appointed judges of the tribunal of Camara, in the Jassy district.

The Board of Aldermen of Jassy was dissolved because it refused to enroll the naturalized Jews of that city.

The Chamber of Commerce of Jassy, in 1912, elected Moritz Wachtel its president.

At Pitesti, two Jews, Joseph Herdan and Israel Isefovici, were elected members of the Board of Trade.

That Jews enjoyed autonomy in Moldavia we learn from a princely order issued by Grigory Chica on May 21, 1711.

It would not be amiss, perhaps, if we should cite what the great Roumanian queen, Elizabeth ( Carmen Sylva ), said in the spirit of tolerance.

" Who could sit on a throne without bending the knee before Moses? He is the sovereign who first organized his nation and had it so constructed that it was able to withstand every storm. If the world had accepted the Mosaic laws, it would not have known what tuberculosis, cancer, diphtheria and so many other diseases are which ravage humanity.

" In Moses there lived the strongest human power.

" How strange? we live, and all of us subsist by the Bible, and at the same time we maltreat the people who have

given us that Bible, the most wonderful book<sup>that</sup> has ever existed or exists. We would easily get along without all other books, but without this life-giving spring, never.

"Those who are being prepared to occupy the throne ought to be educated like Moses -- in science, especially medical science. They should also study the Bible more than any other book.

"The most powerful nations have disappeared, but Moses' people are still here. Instead of admiring them, we are filled with envy and hatred of them."

The noble sensibilities of that great queen were hurt, and it pained her to see the sufferings of humanity and the abuse and injustice inflicted upon the Jews. In this regard she expressed herself thus:

"Some one called this earth 'the Devil's Island.'

But we could make it better, not by luxury, not by licentiousness, but by tolerance and liberty, gentleness and peace. All these good things we can find in the Sermon on the Mount and in the books of Moses. But sometimes people seem to be controlled by the devil, and are willing to throw themselves into the abyss.

"If Christ could come down to earth today, he would be amazed to see persons who call themselves 'Christians!'

"Christians justify their hatred of the Jews and all the persecutions which they have subjected this worthy and admirable people by recalling the crucifixion of Christ. Let us be honest with ourselves.

"What would the Christians of today do if Christ should reappear? I am afraid that they would not even cry 'Hoshanah' and would immediately brand him a dangerous socialist, and would surely shut Him up in an insane asylum.

"Where are the dogmas of Christ? He would never have countenanced an inquisition invented in His name, to put up the rack and to create torture. Christ wanted to improve on the precepts of Moses by adding kindness. But the people were not fit as yet for kindness. If we compared our thoughts and deeds with the Sermon on the Mount, we should blush."

With reference to the weaklings who desert the religion of their fathers and embrace another religion, the queen said:

"Since every religion is the work of man, and since we picture God according to our imagination, there is no sense in deserting the religion in which one was born. On the contrary it would be better for each member to endeavor to elevate, purify and ennoble it. Only degenerate Jews embrace Christianity and adjust themselves to their new Christianity -- not to that Christianity as it was originally given, but to that kind of Christianity which Tolstoi repudiated and refused to recognize as Christian."

With reference to the Jews, Carmen Sylva said:

"Instead of persecuting them, it would be better to learn something from them. The Jewish people should be utilized as a yeast to ferment the other nations -- to influence them to pursue higher ideals."

11



We find further proof of the tolerance of the Roumanians in the fact that notwithstanding the continuous agitations of the anti-Semites against the Jews over a period of three-quarters of a century, the Roumanian people - the true Roumanians -- could not be influenced in the least. We find this in their daily lives, in their dealings with the Jews, and in all their relations with them.

As we have already pointed out we shall reiterate: anti-Semitism was born in Roumania with the advent of John C. Bratiano to power. This doctrine was manifested in the press, in Parliament, in the public schools, and with it a "Jewish question" was generated. It began with the question of ~~the~~ emancipation of the Jews, and developed to such an extent that it affected every sphere of Jewish life in Roumania. Laws were enacted and ministerial circulars were sent out to the provinces with the sole object of oppressing the Jews, restricting their activities, and eliminating them from the country's economic life. Hatred of the Jews was continually preached, and they ~~were~~ were denounced as a danger to the country to whose development they had contributed the major part.

"Looking at the past," wrote Costaforu in one of his articles, "we find that our country owes much to its Jews, very much in regard to its economic progress. Had it not been for them -- had it been left to the initiative of the Roumanians themselves -- and if it would not have been moved, sustained, conducted, and organized by the Jews who have imported capital and intelligence into the country, we would have remained far behind the degree of prosperity which we have reached in the last fifty years."

15

Costaforu remained a strong defender of the Jews and a champion of Jewish rights <sup>To</sup> ~~until~~ the ~~very~~ end of his life. When he died in 1935, the Jews were stricken with sorrow, which they expressed both privately and publicly. He was one of the few Roumanian statesmen who had the courage to defend them against the Bratiano persecution.

Another friend of the Roumanian Jews was George Vucinikof, of Roman, who died in 1887. He served as senator and whenever he had the opportunity he showed them his friendship. As prefect of the Roman district he rendered valuable services to the Jews thereby establishing and maintaining Jewish schools, and as mayor of Roman he opposed the demolition of a synagogue which stood near a church.

A third prominent defender of the Jews was George Panu, noted Roumanian journalist, who championed their cause in his newspaper. For years Panu conducted a vehement campaign against the Roumanian government because of its persecution of the Jews. On one occasion Panu interested himself in behalf of a Jew who had been naturalized but whose naturalization papers were never issued to him and who, under the vagabond law, had been expelled from the village in which he had lived for a number of years. When Panu came to the then premier, Lascar Catargiu, and pleaded for the persecuted Jew, the premier answered him: "Do not come to me with Jewish questions." Panu was known for many years as a liberal, broadminded man. However, he too, eventually fell under the spell of the anti-Semites. Similarly, take Ionescu and Marghiloman changed their viewpoint, after having been counted among the progressive and broadminded Roumanian statesmen for many years.

CHAPTERSPIRIT OF THE ROUMANIAN PEOPLE TOWARD THE JEWS

Despite all the sufferings which the Jews endured in the principalities, the Roumanian people generally showed itself tolerant of them, in comparison with the people of other countries. What contributed to that feeling of tolerance was: (1) the lack of excessive religious sentiment among the lower strata of the population, and the admitted secular ignorance of the Roumanian priesthood. Unlike the Russian moujik, the Roumanian is not passionately religious, nor is he concerned with the manner in which others worship. The priest who lives beside him could not imbue him with the religious fanaticism which made for excesses in Catholic countries. (2) the influence of their suzerain -- Turkey, Poland <sup>or</sup> ~~of~~ Hungary -- on the principalities led to kind treatment of the Jews. (3) the great influence which Turkish Jews had at Constantinople, especially in the 15th and 16th centuries, and the high regard in which they were held by the Sultans, Vizier, and Pashas. This was so strong that whenever the Prince or Boyar wanted some special favor, they had to invoke the aid of the Turkish Jews at Constantinople.

On the other hand, when the Jews in the principalities were threatened by some evil, they turned to their coreligionists in the Turkish capital. At times the Prince himself had to pay with his throne for harming a Jew. Such was the case of John Macrocordat, of Moldavia (1744-47).

The peaceful way of life of the Jews, giving no cause for complaint, and their commercial aptitude and enterprising spirit proved useful to the country and to the boyars. Thus, under Vasile Lupu, when the fury of the population had broken out against the Greek despoilers, the Jews were able to move about freely, without being molested.

A still more characteristic fact is that in all the popular literature, even to this day, it is the Greek who always appears as the villain and the outlaw, but nowhere did the Jew appear in any unfavorable light. In fact, the Jew is almost unknown as a bad character in Roumanian literature. The Bulgar and the Moscovite are usually painted as villains, and in the portrayal of a knave or clown the Roumanian priest, deacon or monk, is usually taken as a model. Similarly, every joke is told at the expense of the ~~priest~~ <sup>priest</sup>, but not of the Jew.

Contrasting with the dark side of the Jews' life in Roumania, there was the more serene and tolerant aspect in many instances <sup>of</sup> harmonious cooperation, which proves again that the Roumanian people as a whole are not and never were anti-semitic.

On September 15, 1891, a number of Christians met in Bucharest with the object of promoting closer relations between

Christians and Jews. They issued an appeal to all Roumanian citizens to join their movement, and cited the many restrictive laws passed against the Jews, the provisions in the Treaty of Berlin, the attitude of other countries toward Jews, their usefulness to Roumania, and the agitation conducted against them by the lower, ignorant elements in the land.

The sale and distribution of the literature of the Tisza-Eszlar trial, in Hungary, containing the most gruesome pictures of Jews, were prohibited by the Roumanian government in 1887. At the same time, a poem tending to instill hatred against the Jews was forbidden.

Further proof of the spirit of tolerance and friendliness of the Roumanian people toward their Jewish neighbors, despite the hostility shown by the government, is a petition, filed with the government and addressed to the Prince by fourteen Moldavian boyars, requesting official action against "inhuman and illegal acts committed in contempt of judicial power and usurpation by administrative and municipal authorities, by order and under the eyes of the Minister of the Interior, perpetrated in flagrant violation of the Constitution and of all our law." The acts complained of included driving out hundreds of Jews and transporting them in chains by military escort.

In contrast with these sentiments of both peasants and boyars, a different feeling was shown some twenty years later when King Carol and Queen Elizabeth visited Constanza. They were greeted by a Jewish delegation and showed themselves sympathetic toward

their Jewish subjects. For some unknown reason, the royal pair failed to visit the synagogue, to which they were invited. None of the Jews were invited to the banquet given in honor of the rulers, who resented this fact very strongly when they learned of it later. The Queen, to show her displeasure and resentment, invited a number of Jewish women to a luncheon at her hotel. Before they left Constanza, the prefect of the district presented a list of prisoners to the king to be pardoned. He scanned the list and saw no Jews on it. When he asked the Minister of the Interior for an explanation, the latter was compelled to state that the Roumanian prisons <sup>held</sup> ~~had~~ no Jews.

CITIZENSHIP

Jewish citizenship in Roumania was a game which politicians had been playing for three-quarters of a century. It began with John Alexander Cuza in 1862; continued under his successor, Carol I, in 1866; was played in the Treaty of Berlin which turned out to be a farce; and it was supposed to have ended with the Treaty of Versailles under which all inhabitants of Roumania became citizens of the kingdom. As far as that treaty is concerned, to all intents and purposes, the Jews were recognized as citizens of Roumania. In the eyes of the entire world, that long and perplexing Jewish question was definitely settled. Minorities were made equal before the law, accepted by <sup>all</sup> the world, but not by Roumania's politicians. All the belligerent nations, parties to that treaty, had readily signed it, but not the Roumanian representatives. It took Roumania some time to make up its mind, but King Ferdinand finally accepted the document and reluctantly, the treaty was signed. But Roumanian politicians resorted to every trick and chicanery, every scheme they could think of, to evade the treaty — "forced" upon them.

Roumania had already signed a treaty with Germany in 1916, by which she had formally recognized her Jews as citizens. But on joining the Allies, and as soon as the German Army of Occupation had evacuated her territory, the treaty was forgotten.

A naturalization law which Roumania had enacted after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles proved obnoxious to the Jews, and they petitioned their government to have the law amended by removing the objectionable clauses. A commission was appointed to examine Jewish claims for naturalization (only to have them rejected). A slow process followed by which the authorities protracted the procedure so that the machinery of creating citizens worked ~~very~~ slowly. But that did not satisfy the Roumanian patriots and they began a movement of protest against the naturalization of Jews, and demanded their expulsion from the country. A new law was then enacted by which only Jewish veterans of the War of 1913 and the First World War (1916-18), their wives and children, widows and orphans of Jewish soldiers who had fallen in battle, could be naturalized. All other Jews had to prove that they had never been under the protection of a foreign state -- proof which was impossible to produce. On May 22, 1920, a Royal decree was issued to that effect.

In 1923, a new constitution was adopted in which provision was made for aliens to obtain citizenship. It also provided that those who at the time of the merger of the new provinces with the old kingdom, had been citizens of their respective provinces, should be considered citizens of Greater Roumania. Jews of the old kingdom could obtain citizenship within three months after the adoption of the constitution, provided ~~that~~ they had resided permanently in Roumania since 1916. By this provision, the Roumanian government was able to place obstacles in the way of applicants.

Shortly thereafter, G. Marzescu, Minister of Justice, introduced a bill to fix the status of the Jews in the newly annexed provinces but it was strenuously opposed by the anti-Semites, so it had to undergo



some change before it became a law.

The Roumanian government showed as much respect for the Treaty of 1919 as it had for that of ~~the one~~ of 1878, ~~known as~~ the Treaty of Berlin. The Treaty of Versailles, as we have seen, provided for ~~the~~ granting citizenship to all Jews without any formality. But the Minister of Justice prescribed certain restrictions for the naturalization of inhabitants in the new territories. There were also certain laws on the statute books which prescribed the length of domicile required and these were not uniform, as, for example, in Bucovina, where they retained the Austro-Hungarian Heimstrecht ~~law~~ of December 5, 1896, which required ten years' residence to be eligible for naturalization; in Transylvania, the Hungarian law of four years' residence was still in force; in Bessarabia they followed the Russian law, which, paradoxically enough, was more favorable to the Jewish applicants.

The Marzescu law gave the applicant the right to appeal. Between the years 1924 and 1927, thousands of Jews fully qualified for citizenship under the election law of 1918, were made stateless, though 95% of them were native Roumanians.

In 1935 and 1936, the efforts of the government to disfranchise Jews became more pronounced. Cuza advocated a revision of the constitution by removing the Jewish clause "which was inspired by international Jews, the Lords of the Versailles Treaty of Paris." The object of the anti-Semitic agitation was to subject Jewish citizens to the same restrictions to which non-Roumanian citizens were under the  ~~Roumanian~~ Roumanian-personal-law of 1934. "Roumania's new constitution," said Cuza, "must be framed in accordance with the law of protection of national labor, which must be the natural desire of all Roumanians, and which is now in process of enforcement."

Following their policy of using technicalities to block naturalization without violating treaty obligations, the Roumanian government ostensibly proceeded with the enfranchisement of their Jews. But in order to play safe and prevent fraud, they enacted the Marzescu<sup>law</sup> which required the applicant to produce proof which they knew was impossible.

Shortly thereafter, parliament was moved by Deputy Pamfil Seica to submit the naturalization of Jews to a thorough "revision". The legislative Council held that the bill was unconstitutional. The decision stated that: "The bill lacks factual documentation and takes for its premise the assertion that there are cases of fraudulent registration, an assertion from which emanate all the logical consequences mentioned in the bill. In such a delicate matter as this, closely bound up with international treaties, it is desirable that the bill be based on facts established by various state organs. The aforementioned documentation is especially necessary because the bill provides for popular action whereby every citizen shall have the right to denounce to the commission those who were illegally registered. Now this procedure, although it seems to have certain advantages, presents many obstacles -- it may open a way for denunciation, for vengeance or for blackmail. And this would take up the time of the commission which will have to deal with all kinds of unfounded denunciations; it would even become so burdened with work that it would not have sufficient time to handle cases which might have a basis for action."

Despite the opinion of the Legislative Council, revision was ordered. Instructions were sent out to local authorities in the province to take up the revision of all cases of naturalization after World War I. The word "revision" was understood to mean the examination of every such case and on the slightest doubt as to its regularity, a prompt report to the Minister of Justice. Every regis-

tered Jewish Citizen, except those naturalized in old Roumania, and those who were not registered, were ordered to appear at the ~~Mayory~~ <sup>Mayor's</sup> of their localities within twenty days after date of publication of the decree.

As soon as Goga came to power, a new ministerial decree was published "concerning the revision of citizenship," applicable exclusively to Jews, to show cause why their names should not be stricken from the rolls. And when Archbishop Miron Christea assumed the premiership after Goga's dismissal, the "revision" proceeded unabated and with more vigor.

The revision dragged on through 1938 and 1939, and every obstacle that could be raised was used to cancel Jewish citizenship. Moreover, it was evident that the function of the courts was not to aid the petitioner to establish his right, but to deny it -- even to war veterans, widows, and orphans, whose ancestors had been natives of the country for generations.

The immediate effect of the revision was that those whose citizenship was cancelled and those whose cases were still pending were classed as aliens. They had to apply to the local police for permits to enable them to retain their residences in the land of their birth. To aggravate their lot further, those Jews of the old Kingdom, who up to August 16, 1916, had been aliens, and those who had settled in Bessarabia after March 7, 1919, in Transylvania and Bucovina after December 3, 1918, were given only three months' time to stay. Finally, the revision of the citizenship papers was ended and on November 24, 1939, the Minister of Justice published his report, showing the following result of the "revision:"

203,424 family heads, numbering, with their dependents, 617,396 <sup>persons</sup> ~~souls~~, had been subjected to revision. Of these, 126,284 (with 392,172 dependents), were permitted to retain their status; 73,253

(with 225,222 dependents), lost their citizenship, and 12,887 cases were still pending. There were also 91,570 -- more than half of those registered in different localities -- reported by their respective mayors. Those who had failed to register were declared aliens, making the total number of stateless Jews 270,000, whose citizenship was revised. But this does not necessarily imply that they were all foreign-born or citizens of another country. It only shows the ingenuity of the Roumanian courts in having maneuvered so that they could disenfranchise that number of Jewish citizens, whose legality in a similar situation could be questioned in no other country in the world.

It should be noted that the majority of the victims of this revision were persons who were unable to produce the required documents to support their citizenship claims, while one-third of them represented cases of failure to present the documents in time.

Chapter ~~XXV~~ XXIIINaturalization of the Jews

After Roumania had proclaimed itself a kingdom in 1881, the Jewish question continued to agitate the country. The Parliament debated the question, and the orators surpassed one another in eloquence, arguing either for or against the emancipation of the Jews; meanwhile, many applications for citizenship were filed by Jews. Any applicant who inquired about the status of his application, was advised to "go to Palestine." Furthermore, as a general rule, these applications were rejected. During the period between 1880 and 1904 many applications for naturalization filed by Jews were refused, on various grounds.

The application of A. S. Goldenthal, a prominent resident of Jassy, was rejected for lack of proof that his father had not been under foreign protection. His son, a native Roumanian and a lawyer by profession, was also denied citizenship, as were five other Jewish applicants whose petitions had been endorsed by members of the cabinet and by a deputy of the Chambers. On the other hand, five native Roumanian Jews were naturalized in 1881, but only after an expenditure of large sums of money; two of these spent over 100,000 lei for the privilege.

A clear instance of the workings of the law is seen in the case of the Weisengriin family. Weisengriin, a Jewish

banker of Jassy, was a naturalized citizen; one son, who was born before the event, remained an alien. A second son, born after the father had been naturalized, was recognized as a Roumanian citizen.

The Jewish banker, Jacob Neuschotz, who spent over 10,000 lei annually for the relief of the poor, founded an orphan asylum which he maintained, and created a stipend fund for Christian students, was refused naturalization in 1881. Every Jewish officer in the reserves, if he was born before his father became a citizen, was stricken from the rolls. Dr. Elias Fischer, a native of Roumania and a veteran of the Russo-Turkish war, was refused naturalization. In 1884, Max Shapiro, a sergeant in the reserves and a native of Roumania, was also refused citizenship.

Besides these individual applications for citizenship, Roumanian Jews more than once petitioned Parliament to become naturalized collectively. As early as the year 1874, they presented a petition prepared by the American Consul General, Peixotto, pleading for emancipation and denying the false accusation that they were aliens in the country of their birth. In 1879, a similar petition urged the revision of Article 7 of the Constitution to facilitate the possibility of naturalization. (1) More than thirty years later, in 1910, the Jews, who had not yet secured ~~any~~ naturalization, found another such memorandum necessary. Memoirs were also presented to the king and to the ministry, pleading for

recognition, urging that Jews be not treated as stepchildren. On these occasions both the king and Bratiano, the premier, promised consideration.

The 1890 sessions of Parliament lasted 160 days; a number of Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbians, and members of other nationalities -- all Christians -- were emancipated, but not a single Jew was found deserving of that honor.

In 1893, seventy-two applications for naturalization were acted upon favorably, but not one of these successful applicants was a Jew. In 1910, however, fifteen Jews were naturalized.

In January, 1897, Manole Halfan, son of the Bucharest banker Solomon Halfan, was refused naturalization. Solomon Halfan, himself, was a naturalized citizen, and his son was a student of literature at the University of Bucharest.

The Court of Cassation, in the case of Ornstein vs. Ornstein, of May 26, 1904, held that a native Roumanian Jew could not be considered an alien, was entitled to all the rights of a citizen, and had to be treated as a Roumanian. It held, also, that foreign protection enjoyed by the parents of a native Jew was purely of a diplomatic nature, and was not to be confounded with foreign citizenship. In July of the same year, a decision of this court held that the minor son of a native Roumanian citizen was de jure a citizen. Up to that time, such sons were considered aliens, and had to make personal application for citizenship, which, however, was never granted to them.

While the high courts were thus sometimes inclined to give a broad interpretation to the laws affecting the rights of Jews, the anti-Jewish legislative mill, during the period from 1880 to 1904, continued to grind out rural, comuna (village), bourse, and licensing laws especially designed to restrict the Jews and to aggravate existing disabilities. No wonder, then, that Jews were so eager to leave Roumania. During the last three years of this period, in 1902, 1903, and 1904, more than 20,000 Jews emigrated from Roumania to various parts of the world.

In the thirty-two years between 1880 and 1912, out of a population of 250,000 Jews, only 361 were naturalized; whereas between 1894 and 1904, a total of 6,529 Jews who had been born and educated in Roumania, however, established in business and paying taxes there, were expelled from the country under the vagabond law.

The Jews of Jassy, working vigorously in the struggle for emancipation and naturalization with the rest of the Jews of Roumania, organized themselves into a society called Zionele. There were many movements looking toward the naturalization of the Jews of Jassy in the latter part of the 19th century, including one for assimilation, but eventually all these died out, and the would-be assimilators became ardent Zionists.

By May 15, 1880, over 2,000 petitions for naturalization had been filed by Jews. Of these, 500 were rejected by the Minister of Justice under various pretexts. The rest reached the Chamber of Deputies whose committee on naturalization took 300



under consideration. However, the Chambers voted favorably on only fifty-two, and adjourned five or six of these. It took the Chambers fully six months to grant citizenship to a grand total of forty-five Jews. At that rate, considering that the sessions of Parliament lasted only three months every year, it would have taken several hundred years to naturalize only 40,000 Jews.

In Roumania, unfortunately, the procedure of naturalization was different from the simple American method. The easiest way to become a citizen <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ naturally to embrace Christianity. In all other cases, the applicant for citizenship had to provide himself with a number of affidavits which he submitted with his application to the Minister of Justice. After examining these papers, the Minister forwarded them to the king, accompanied by a bill to be introduced into Parliament for the granting of the citizenship asked. From the king, the papers were sent to the Council of Ministers, and then to the Chambers. Here, a special committee was appointed to examine them. If they were in order, the committee prepared a report recommending to the Minister of Justice the introduction of a bill to this effect, and he had the matter placed on the day calendar of the Chambers. If the bill obtained a majority vote, it was sent to the Senate. There, the same procedure, with some addition, took place, and it required a two-thirds vote. If this ~~was~~ obtained, the bill went to the king for approval, after which it became a law, and the applicant became naturalized.

This was the law. How it worked in practice, let

Dr. Moses Gaster tell:

"I filed my petition for citizenship on February 23, 1880. With the approval of the king, it was sent to the Chambers. First in 1883, and then in 1884, it was highly recommended by the respective committees, and placed on the day calendar, but it was taken off, and up to this day (1885) it is still undisposed of. The report of the committee recommended the granting of my petition, in view of my distinguished service."

Incidentally, Dr. Gaster was expelled as a vagabond in that same year, 1885, but the government provided him with a passport. Thus, according to this logic, to the outside world Roumania proclaimed him an honorable citizen, and demanded his protection, but at home he was a "vagabond."

When naturalization could be circumvented at Piatra, in the early 1880's, the mayor, as the elections approached, refused to have six emancipated Jews enrolled, so that "the election sheets may not be soiled with Jewish names." The naturalization certificate was taken away from one of these six Jews, so that his liquor store might be closed. <sup>so long as</sup> ~~if~~ he could not show that he was a citizen, his liquor store could not be ~~not~~ opened.

JEWISH EMIGRATION FROM ROUMANIA

No accurate record of the first Roumanian-Jewish emigrants to the United States is available. According to the American Jewish Year Book (1901-1902), as early as 1840 a group of Roumanian Jews came to New York.

While sporadic emigration landed Roumanian Jews in every part of the world, very few crossed the Atlantic Ocean. In 1872, the American consul general, Peixotto, conceived the idea of mass emigration to the United States.

After receiving assurances that the Roumanian government would encourage emigration, and reporting the condition of the Jews in Roumania to the Jews in the United States, he submitted a detailed memorandum to the Roumanian Minister of the Interior, O. Costaforo. The matter was handed over to the Council of Ministers and Costaforo' was empowered to issue free passports to poor emigrants.

This important decision was announced at a conference held by various representative Jews in Brussels, under the chairmanship of Adolph Cremieux. Peixotto's plan was not approved although American, British, German, French, and Austrian Jewry favored the idea.

After the War of Independence (1877-78), Roumanian Jews, disillusioned in their hope for equal rights, began to emigrate to Palestine. Emigration societies were formed all over the country. In 1881 these organizations assembled at a Congress in Focshani. A central committee was formed with headquarters at Galatz, for the purpose of promoting emigration to Palestine. The Independent Order B'nai B'rith took an important part in this movement, and

contributed to its success.

The Roumanian government failed in its promise to facilitate Jewish emigration. Despite official impediments, a total of 62,854 Roumanian Jews landed in the United States between 1899 and 1914.

Some Roumanian Jews sought new homes in Great Britain, France, and Holland, in various countries of Asia, as well as in Canada, Argentina, and South Africa.

Under the auspices of the B'nai B'rith, committees for assisting emigrants were organized in Bucharest and Jassy, headed by Dr. Adolph Stern and Rabbi Jacob Neimrower.

Many obstacles were placed in the way of Jewish emigration. Authorities often refused to grant passports. Many were held up at their trains. A group of emigrants at Piatra, waiting for a train, was stopped when the tax collector appeared with bills of unpaid taxes. The money they had saved for the long journey was taken away for tax arrears. Those unable to pay were deprived of their meager belongings, which the tax collector seized.

On April 19, 1900, a group of seventy young emigrants organized themselves under the name of "Drumeti" (wayfarers), and left Berlad afoot. This and similar groups thereafter were known as the "Pedestrian Emigrants." To make sure that their exodus was orderly, the local police assembled them in the market place. A wagon with two horses to transport their few possessions was given to them. A good-hearted Christian baker gave them a wagonload of bread and several kilograms of salted olives. Bound for Botoshani, they stopped at Jassy, Harlau, and other places where they were greeted with great sympathy. At Botoshani they were met by a large number of

Jews and Christians, and were shown generous hospitality.

As a result of the success of this first group, other groups of Jewish youths were formed. In every locality meetings were held and plans for emigration discussed. Several publications appeared, such as, Drumeti, Prietinii (friends), Dat Ajutor (lend help), Jidovul Ratacitor (wandering Jew), Exodul (exodus), and Remas Bun (good-bye), to publicize this peculiar method of emigration.

On May 30, 1900, a group of fifty Jewish youths left their native city of Piatra. Before their arrival at the Hungarian border, Hungarian Jews had obtained permission for them to cross. They were assisted in many ways while passing through Hungary. At Vienna, the Alliance Israelite Universelle had provided railroad tickets to Hamburg for them, whence they were to embark for the United States.

At home, the Jewish community of Piatra organized an aid society for the support of families of the emigrants. On July 4, 1900, a second group called "~~Montefiore~~" left Piatra; it gave theatrical performances in different cities to raise funds for expenses. For some unknown reason the members of this group were ordered to return home. Seven days later, on July 11, a group of thirty Jewish families left Piatra by train. When they reached Turnu Severin, they were stopped and ordered to return. The same thing happened with a group which left on July 17. A fifth group of ten families, formed under the name of "Max Nordau", ready to emigrate, abandoned the idea after learning the fate of the other emigrants. A sixth group, consisting of 100 families, formed to leave for Canada, gave up their plan because of insurmountable difficulties.

The country did not remain indifferent to this movement. The

mass emigration and the pedestrian groups created a sensation and were publicized in the foreign and Roumanian press. Roumanian newspapers demanded that the emigration which was depriving the country of the best of its youth be stopped. The Roumanian government finally put a stop to it.

Some emigrants were held up at Budapest, and not permitted to continue their journey. The Jews of that city raised 50,000 kronen, to enable them to continue their journey overseas. Every city along the route was confronted with the ~~problem~~ problem of the emigrants. Hungary, Austria, Germany, and France requested the Roumanian government to issue passports only to those who had the means to travel. About the year 1900 European Jewish communities had already begun to grumble at the heavy task which had been imposed upon them. For besides the reception, accomodation, care, and expediting the emigrants, these communities also had to guarantee that none of the transient emigrants would ever become public charges.

Although Jews responded generously to the growing demands of the movement, the situation was far from satisfactory. At Vienna, the influx of migrants became too complex for the Jewish community to handle. Some, 1,400 of them had to encamp outside the city. 500 were crowded into large vacant buildings. The Jews of that city were faced with the dilemma of helping them reach their destination, or <sup>of</sup> forcing them to return home. The local police intervened and many of the Jews were returned to Roumania by force. Six hundred were packed into freight cars; many succumbed on the way, others committed suicide, and those who arrived at the Roumanian border were refused entry.

The Dutch government, hearing of the deplorable situation at Vienna, forbade the entry of Jewish emigrants into Holland. In Prussia many emigrants were subjected to abuse and humiliation at the hands of the police. In Paris and London, however, the Jewish communities had prepared for the reception of their guests.

That the emigration of the Jews, especially of the skilled workers and artisans, was keenly felt by Roumania may be seen from a statement of the mayor of Jassy, in the Univeraul of September 3, 1902, in which he complained of the desolation of the town because of the departure of over 6,000 Jews, mostly artisans, laborers, and shopkeepers.

Another effect created by <sup>the</sup> Jewish emigration was the falling off of the government revenues. In Jassy alone, according to the Mayor, the tax revenue fell to half its former total, a loss of 1,000,000 lei every year. The president of the Jassy Chamber of Commerce declared: "This unfortunate condition which compels the Jews to emigrate is detrimental to the country and must be stopped."

The emigration of Roumanian Jews to the United States brought forth the "Hay Note" <sup>of the American government.</sup> in 1902, addressed to the signatory Powers of the Treaty of Berlin. Bratiano took this note very seriously, and addressed a communication to the European Powers suggesting some workable action to stop the exodus, but his note was ignored.

In June 1900, a conference of Jewish leaders was held in Paris to deal with the Roumanian-Jewish situation. Three points were on the agenda:

(1) What to do with the Jews who were compelled to leave Roumania?

(2) What was to be done for the Jews who were able, for the time being, to remain in Roumania?

(3) What steps to take to induce the Roumanian government to change its oppressive policy?

The conference decided: (1) to raise funds and appoint a special committee to devise a systematic method of emigration, to provide the emigrants with necessities, and to assist them at their points of destination; (2) to establish soup kitchens in Roumania, alleviate their misery, and prevent mass emigration; (3) with regard to the Roumanian government, it was decided to do nothing for the time being.

In November, 1902, the Minister of the Interior addressed a circular letter to the prefects, instructing them to facilitate the emigration of Jews to the United States, provided each emigrant signed a declaration renouncing Roumanian citizenship and <sup>promised</sup> never to return.

In 1903, Major W. Evans Gordon, head of a British Royal Commission, made a tour of Russia, Poland, Galicia, and Roumania, and investigated the cause of emigration. He reported the "action of the Roumanian government, in the question of naturalization alone, is in itself sufficient proof of their malignant policy against the Jews, as it is also a clear and unmistakable breach of the spirit, if not of the letter, of the treaty under which Roumanian independence was granted."

He then went on to cite detailed evidence that the large emigration was the result of government policy, and declared that, were restrictions not imposed, the Roumanian Jews could be valuable to the economic life of Roumania. "The emigrants are solid workingmen, each of them provided with a trade or handicraft that finds a ready market in the country of their adoption."



Painful as was the shunting of emigrant Jews from place to place, it was more painful to note the fear which filled many Jews in Europe and the United States. The Jews in the United States had the still greater problem of distributing them throughout the West, covering their expenses, and assuring their existence by providing employment.

By 1901 those who had reached the United States and found employment sent cheerful letters home. The continued persecution in Roumania, (still further increased) the stream of emigration so that by 1904 over 40,000 Jews had emigrated from Roumania, a large number of them to the United States.

Eventually, the emigration of Jews from Roumania decreased gradually so that during the years of the first World War, and through 1919, only eight Jews emigrated. But later, despite immigration restrictions imposed by the United States, 41,647 Jews came from Roumania between 1919 and 1927.

CHAPTER ~~FORTY-SIX~~ XXV.ROUMANIAN JEWISH EMIGRATION TO PALESTINE

The colonization of Palestine idea was conceived by two rabbis -- Elijah Guttmacher and Zevi Hirsch Kalischer, as early as the year 1860. The first colonies established there were settled by Roumanian Jews. The movement to put the idea into actual practice was started in Russia, and remained dormant, but it struck root in Roumania, where Dr. Karpel Lippe, Dr. Moses Gaster, and Samuel Pineles began the work by organizing the Roumanian Jews.

It was generally agreed that emigration was the only cure for the ills of the Jews in Roumania. But there was a division of opinion as to whither such emigrants were to go - to Palestine or the United States. Although in the 1880's a strong emigration to the United States and to Canada had developed, the Palestinian idea was still strongly agitated. Jewish immigration <sup>to</sup> ~~from~~ Palestine from Roumania is, therefore, intimately connected with the Zionist movement in Roumania.

In 1873, at Nicarcesti, in the district of Tecuci, a group of 100 Jewish families joined together and bound themselves each to deposit 500 francs, besides the possession of funds sufficient to procure agricultural implements, cattle, and the like, in order to emigrate to Palestine.

In 1879, a group of eleven families, from Moinesti, under

the leadership of Eliezer Rokeah, was organized. In September, of that year they embarked from Galatz for Palestine, where they established the colony known as Zichron Yaakov, in honor of the Jewish philanthropist, Jacob Neuschotz, of Jassy. This colony later developed into the largest and most beautiful in Palestine.

In 1880 Rokeah organized another group of Roumanian Jews, who brought a tract of land in the village of Gi-Ouni. He then issued an appeal to the Jews in Roumania, urging them to colonize the Holy Land. In the same year one hundred families, requested the Alliance Israelite Universelle to procure for them land in Palestine to establish a colony. Each of them was to invest the sum of 400 francs, and pay off the balance in installments.

In 1881 the emigrational movement from Roumania assumed vast proportions. Most of the emigrants left the country with the <sup>intention</sup> ~~air~~ of taking up agriculture. A group of 1,000 Botoshani Jews sent a delegation to London to secure aid for the emigration of Jews from their country to Palestine. Not even the disillusionment caused by the failure of the Scotch missionary, Eliezer Bassin, to keep the promise made to many Jews to assist them in their transportation to Palestine <sup>after he had</sup> ~~and~~ persuaded them to dispose of all their goods and prepare themselves for sailing, was able to halt the enthusiasm to settle in Palestine. In the same year, 500 Roumanian Jewish families registered with the Alliance Israelite to emigrate; it assisted them to the extent of 500 francs per family, in addition to free passage.

In 1882 a second group of twenty-six Jewish families from Moinesti bought a tract of land in Palestine and established

thereon the colony Rosh Pinah. While they bought this land with <sup>their</sup> own funds, they later had to be assisted by Baron Maurice de Hirsch. Eventually, as other colonies found themselves in difficulties, Baron Edmond de Rothschild assumed the care of three of them.

In the same year, 1882, 280 Jewish families registered for emigration, and the Roumanian government provided them with free passage to the port of embarkation. Emigration became intensified but by the end of that year it died out. While it is true that the central committees had been established to facilitate it, they lacked the necessary means. Meanwhile, the movement had one good effect; many Jews in Moldavia, forsaking their previous occupations, now took up agriculture. The "Luftmensch" of yesterday was now tilling the Roumanian soil, to the utter astonishment and consternation of the anti-Semites there, who maintained that the Jews would never work to earn an "honest living".

A total of 228 Moldavian Jews embarked ~~in that port~~ during that year for Syria, where a tract of land had been bought for them. In December of the same year sixty-three Jewish families left Jassy, bound for Haifa, near which city a tract of land had been purchased for them by the Central Emigration Society.

The emigration movement had by this time penetrated to every corner of the land. In every locality they organized themselves into groups which either intended to emigrate or to assist emigrants. At Bacau a group of fifty Jewish families organized themselves to emigrate to Palestine; each contributed the sum of

500 francs to a fund wherewith to establish an agricultural colony there. To raise funds, the Jewish community of Focshani raised the meat tax and created additional taxes. The movement impressed Roumanian Jewry with the hope not only that it would improve the lot of the emigrants themselves, but also that it would redound to the benefit of those Jews who remained at home.

Since the Jews of Roumania showed such enthusiasm over the prospect of becoming farmers in Palestine, Osias Brociner, an eminent agriculturist of Adjud, donated a tract of land to thirty Jewish families.

With the exception of Jerusalem, the Turkish government opened all her ports and her vast fields to the immigrant Jews. But even there the restriction applied only to groups of 100 or more, but not against individual Jewish immigrants.

In Bucharest there was formed a corporation with a capital of 1,000,000 francs to establish a colony in Palestine as well as factories and other commercial enterprises which would furnish employment to thousands of workers.

The colonists of Rosh Pinah, consisting of former Moinesti Jews, also became discouraged at this time, and were in an unhappy state, whether as the result of mismanagement and maladministration or because of the difficulty experienced in adjusting themselves to their new homes and occupation. ~~they were unhappy.~~ The known cause was the failure of their friends at home to assist them, a source on which those colonists had counted when they established the colony. This failure was the result of a disastrous fire at Mondesti. The colonists appealed to F. Viniziani, the representative of the Baron de Hirsch Fund, who investigated

4

conditions and promised relief.

In 1885 there was formed at Jassy a committee headed by Neuschotz with the object of facilitating emigration. The sum of 70,000 francs was raised for that purpose. Conditions in Roumania becoming worse practically from day to day, and Roumanian Jews clamoring to emigrate but lacking the necessary funds, Dr. Karpel Lippe made a strong appeal to world Jewry for assistance. Various additional societies were formed in that year for this purpose in Roumania, and the Central Committee at Galatz performed especially meritorious work.

But the Roumanian press, always unfriendly to the Jews, thought that the emigration~~ni~~ movement was merely a bluff intended to scare the government. Some of these newspapers were good enough to bring against the Jews the accusation that, instead of emigrating, they were actually invading the country by bringing in Jews from Galicia and Russia. One Jew left the country, said one Bratiano-controlled newspaper, and a hundred came into the land in his place. When Bratiano was interpellated in Parliament as to "why the government does not take advantage of the Jewish movement to get rid of them," he replied that the government was willing to grant the Jews every facility to emigrate by giving them railroad tickets at half the usual cost. But as soon as the first contingent of emigrants was ready to leave, obstacles were put in their way by the government. The Roumanian press, on the other hand, explained the government's refusal to reduce the railway rate, thus "because Jewish merchants wanted to use that reduction for their own private business."

5

Zionism had already taken root in southeastern Europe, and the Roumanian Jews had responded enthusiastically. Now that governmental oppression was felt the more severely, the situation became still more acute. While the hearts of the great masses of the Jews beat warmly for the Holy Land, while their souls burned to return to the land of their ancestors, and to till that sacred soil, the soil of their fathers, a large part of the Roumanian Jews preferred the United States to Palestine and Syria. The Palestinian enthusiasts, on the other hand, held that Turkey, being hospitable, was free of prejudice and no one could tell what the future might bring in America.

Agitators sprang up in Roumania, kindling to a consuming flame the desire of the Jews to emigrate. All the thought, efforts and actions of the Jewish population was then concentrated on that goal of emigration. Whither they were to go made little difference to them; each group was willing to follow its compass into whatever direction it would point, whether to Palestine or to America. But the Roumanian government was not pleased with the situation which it had itself created. True, it wanted to get rid of the Jews, but an emigration en masse, which the world at large would look upon as the result of persecution, was something which neither Bratiano nor his fellow politicians desired.

In 1887, emigration continued in greater proportions, mostly of skilled young workmen from Jassy, Piatra, Roman, Buhushi, Bucharest, Berlad and Hussi, with the latter city furnishing the largest number.

This time the Roumanian newspapers, which had heretofore showed great anxiety to get rid of what they termed the "Jewish pestilence," were for obvious reasons rather reticent.

The emigration societies which had sprung up all over the country in the earlier years of the ninth decade of the 19th century now dwindled away, and very few showed signs that they were still in existence. The society Doresh Lezion, organized by Dr. Lippe and by A. Mibashan (Menahem Mendel Braunstein) in Jassy, endeavored to direct emigrants to Palestine, but failed. The few branches which it had established died out.

The group of 228 emigrants sent out in 1882 by the Jewish community of Galatz, six of whom had bought a tract of land and established the colony of Samarin (Shomron, Samaria), had to endure all the hardships of pioneer life. They improvised shanties, built in the Arabian style, and adapted themselves to the cultivation of the soil. But when the harvest time came, in June 1883, they found the heat unbearable. Only one of them had will power enough to go out with his wife and his two daughters to gather the crop from the entire field. Poverty stricken and wearied by hard work, these pioneers became physically weak and unfit for work, and mortality had increased among them. But the representative of Baron de Hirsch took care of them. Suitable dwellings were then provided and means of living were distributed every month. A common kitchen was constructed and opened.

These few colonists had hardly begun to breathe a little more freely when Isaac Lobel, in whose name the land had been bought, died. Under Turkish law, the land passed over to the state in such cases. The matter was finally straightened out, and the colony's



name was changed to Zichron Yaakov, in memory of the father of Baron de Rothschild. 12,500 dunams of land were then added to the colony. Fifty frame houses sent to them from Galatz were then erected, also a school, a synagogue and two public bath houses.

At Jassy, a Zionist society was founded in 1899, under the name of the Dr. Moses Gaster Society. While it was the general desire to emigrate to Palestine, some persons advocated also Cyprus, Armenia and other lands. At the same time, the Jewish Colonial Bank had been organized, and over 50,000 shares were subscribed for by 15,000 Roumanian Jews. Rabbi Casvan, of Rimnic Sarat, and Rabbis Landau and Hillel Kahana, of Botoshani, showed especial enthusiasm, and were very active in the promotion of Palestinian interests. A group of eighty-six Jewish families consisting of some 400 persons emigrated to Anatolia.

The emigration of so many Jewish bread winners as well as of additional groups who left for the United States in that year from Berlad and Bucharest, increased so much the more the long prevailing misery of the Jews of Roumania. A committee consisting of Rabbi Niemirower of Jassy, Pineles of Galatz, and Adolph Solomon of Braila was then dispatched to Paris to appeal for aid. This was followed by a conference held at Paris in June of that year at which it was decided what was to be done with those unfortunates who were compelled to leave Roumania.

The Roumanian newspaper, Aurora, opened a subscription list for the relief of Jewish emigrants, to which many Jews responded generously. Besides emigration to the United States at this time, there was a movement to Cyprus, which slowed down by the end of

4

the 19th century. The Turkish Consuls were instructed not to visa passports for Palestine. But there was still immigration of Roumanian Jews into England, France and Germany, bound for Egypt, the Transvaal, the United States, China and Anatolia.

The colonies established at Baylick, in Turkey, were in a pitiable condition. Four hundred of the 600 colonists settled there were stricken with fever, and lacked medical attention. The climate, obviously, did not agree with them. The Alliance Israelite transported them to a more healthful climate. But many of those who had left for Asia Minor returned to Roumania.

The emigration of the Jews from Roumania had another tragic side. For some enterprising persons made a "racket" of it. After many of these unfortunates had been misled and deprived of their means, a society was organized, under the name of "Ajutoru", with the object of protecting prospective emigrants.

While the stream of emigration abated somewhat after 1902, many Jews continued to leave for the United States, Canada and Palestine. Zionist societies were organized in many cities, one at Focshani, another at Bucharest under the name of Israel Zangwill to encourage emigration to Palestine. Two colonies were established in Anatolia, near Esky-Shehir, by emigrant Jews from Tulcea and Botoshani.

CHAPTER ~~THIRTY-FIVE~~ XXVISIGNS OF ENMITY AGAINST THE JEWS

Originally, anti-Semitism was unknown in Roumania. While the Jews in that country were never showered with love, suffered many tribulations, and lived under a multiplicity of restrictions, it cannot be said that anti-Semitism was the cause, but rather the spirit of the time in which they lived. If, as has been shown, some of the codes contained provisions unfavorable to the Jews, they were the products of canonical law which even the reigning Prince could not ignore. Despite the restrictions in the statute books, the Jews lived in comparative peace. They engaged in commerce and industry, in export and import trade, held and managed large landed estates, played an important part in the world of finance, and their influence was felt and effectively used in matters concerning even the throne. As a result of this influence, which included the free entry of many Jews to the princely palace, most restrictions were either repealed or treated as dead letters.

Anti-Semitism did not exist in the universities of Roumania either. At Jassy there was a constantly increasing number of Jewish professors. In 1940 there were practically none. Professor Cuza became the arch anti-Semite of the universities, and his students showed that they were good pupils by

absorbing everything ~~which~~ their fanatical teacher taught them. Even Iorga, who formerly disagreed with Professor Cuza's anti-Semitism, and more than once attacked him in the press, later changed to a rabid anti-Semite in consonance with Cuza.

According to the Turkish Minister Blanque Bey, Roumanian hatred of the Jews was due to jealousy cherished by the indolent class against the active, productive class. Baron Offenberg believed that the shameful excesses which occurred in Roumania were the result of weakness on the part of the unfit and corrupt local officials who permitted them. Furthermore, he declared that the government in Bucharest was too weak to deal firmly with the situation.

In fairness to Roumanian law, it must be stated that up to 1940 the penal code did not permit the casting of aspersions on any religion, creed, or the clergy. But no one dared to call Cuza or any of his followers to account. For this reason the Aparararea Nationala could with impunity publish a number of articles "showing" that Jews used Christian blood during Passover, and for the same reason the forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion were given wide publicity in Roumania.

In 1855, a pamphlet written by a priest in Moldavia appeared, attacking the Jews, charging them with every crime imaginable, and advocating that they be dispossessed from their

homes and interned in a ghetto beyond the city limits. The author also urged that a close watch be kept over them, so that Christians might not be contaminated by them.

Similarly, two Roumanian newspapers appeared; the Steaua (Star) and the Zimbrul (Kernel), whose "noble" mission it was to preach hatred <sup>of</sup> ~~against~~ the Jews. Thanks to the Austrian occupation, the poison spread by these two newspapers had little effect, although some traces of it remained.

Living in an uncivilized country, its people still in a primitive state, overburdened with superstition, and under the guidance of an ignorant and corrupt clergy, the Jews could not escape being subjected to some disturbances, but it was not due to anti-Semitism. Whether it was a ritual murder accusation or a charge of desecrating the host, it was the result of instigation by some drunken priest or vindictive business competitor, or a mere attempt to extort money from the Jews.

These sporadic outbursts were, for the most part, suppressed by local authorities; very often the accuser confessed and the innocent Jewish victims were released. If one Jewish community was stricken by such a calamity, the others carried on their business activities undisturbed, and lived their normal lives unmolested. The word "anti-Semitism" was unknown in Roumania just as "Nazism" was unknown in Germany before the advent of Adolph Hitler. In Roumania, it was a creation of the second half of the 19th century. It became an instrument in the

hands of unscrupulous Roumanian politicians to stir up the passions of the masses. Demagogues found it the easiest and most direct way of gaining office, while those already in office found it the best means of retaining power. In any event, anti-Semitism was unpopular with the people. The country was attractive to persecuted Jews of other lands. Every newcomer was welcomed by the landowners and by the government.

Needless to say, under such conditions, no one thought of anti-Semitism. Aside from this, the Roumanian people were, by nature, kindly, peaceable, and hospitable, and found in the Jew a friend in need. They were not susceptible to anti-Jewish influence. We need no better proof of this than the fact that after an arduous campaign of anti-Semitic propaganda and Jew-baiting, the peasantry was not infected.

In none of the early cruelties inflicted by Roumanian princes, such as Mihai, Aron and Peter Voda, to which the Jews fell victims, were the perpetrators prompted by what we would call "anti-Semitism" today. These acts of oppression and cruelty were inflicted in the spirit of the times to which the Greeks, Turks and Armenians were also subjected. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Aron of Moldavia slaughtered his creditors, among whom were nineteen Jews, the Polish Jews who were living there at the time were not molested.

Despite the general good will toward Jews which was

characteristic of the people, at the beginning of the 19th century, signs of hostility against them began to appear. Under Prince Moruzi some unrest was felt as a symptom of agitation against the Jews. In 1803 a movement aimed at prohibiting Jews to slaughter cattle in the same places as Christians was stopped by Prince Ypsilanti.

It is claimed by some writers that these early anti-Jewish movements were instigated by foreign elements. But we fail to see this, and we cannot find the seat of those foreign elements either within or without the country. Those "foreign elements" could not agitate from within because: (1) they were not sufficiently numerous to exercise such influence in the country; (2) the activities and influence of the Jews were not such as to provoke the ire of a foreign element; (3) nowhere can we find that there was the remotest agitation on the part of any foreigners against the Jews. Furthermore, whoever those "foreign elements" may have been, they must have worked under cover, with the result that all through Roumanian history no trace can be found of them or of their insidious work against the Jews.

But why seek the anti-Jewish movement among foreign elements? Cannot a Moldavian politician hate? Those good "patriots" had given ample proof before, and have given more since, of their ability to hate; It is more probable<sup>e</sup> that, due to the increase of Polish and Russian Jews in Moldavia, and

the competition they gave the Roumanian merchants, the latter began to feel the effect and started agitating against the Jews. The result attained by such agitation would undoubtedly be two-fold:

(1) It would weaken the influence of the newcomers already established.

(2) It would discourage those abroad from coming to a country which was anti-Jewish.

As we shall see later on, these movements sprang up sporadically, brought unrest and much suffering to the Jews in Roumania. Those behind the misdeeds were no strangers, but good Roumanian Christians, mostly high governmental officials - indeed, the government itself.

Was it a stranger who stirred up the population when a Jewish jeweler was denounced on the suspicion that he had stolen some articles from a church? Was it the work of strangers when a ritual murder accusation was brought against the Jews, and Prince Alexander Constantin Ypsilanti was so wrought up about it that on April 12, 1804, he issued a decree invoking the aid of the Metropolitane in publishing a denial of that absurdity.

That medieval legend of ritual murder was deeply rooted in the minds of the illiterate in Eastern Europe. The Polish peasantry had been fed with it, the Russians believed it, and the illiterate, superstitious Roumanians swallowed it without



the help of "foreign elements." The politicians did not need any "foreign element." That is why Prince Ypsilanti tried to weaken that superstition through the agency of the Metropolite. That is why John George Caragea, the Patriarch, sought to wipe out the superstition by prohibiting Christian minors from being employed as servants in Jewish homes. Surely it was not because of "foreign elements" that when Prince Caragea authorized the construction of a synagogue in Bucharest he ordered it fenced in by a wall so as to protect it against vandals.

We become more convinced that no "foreign element" instigated the anti-Jewish movement, and that immigration was the cause when we consider that up to the 18th century there was only one class of Jews in Roumania; the indigenous Jews. But by the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, we find two categories of Jews: indigenous Jews who were Roumanian subjects and were considered Roumanians; and the immigrant Jews, who remained subjects of their former countries. Only the latter were considered aliens, and remained under the protection of their respective consuls.

#### Ritual Murder and Other False Accusations.

Up to the middle of the 19th century, Roumania stood on a par with Holland, Turkey and Poland as regards religious tolerance. But she was not free from ritual murder accusations. To this the Roumanian clergy contributed, mostly by reason of the interest which they found in anti-Jewish writings which the monks had translated into Roumanian.

Anti-Jewish literature in Roumania is of comparatively recent date, i.e., about the middle of the 19th century. In 1771, an anti-Jewish writing appeared in Jassy. It was a translation from latin into Greek and from Greek into Roumanian, but it circulated only among the few educated clergymen and very few laymen read it. Furthermore, that translation was not intended to expose the Jews as committing murder in the performance of their ritual, but merely as a "moral lesson" to "induce and enlighten them in the true faith". Yet even this was the product of an apostate, in the second regime of Alexander Constantin Moruzi.

The first effective poison injected into Roumanian life ~~was~~ the Organic Law, ~~was~~ introduced during the Russian occupation (1828-1834). Under this law the two categories of Jews were merged into one by designating them as "the Jewish nation." Henceforth, in all official documents, there were autochthonous Jews and alien Jews. We thus find, in the report of August 18, 1832, filed by the extraordinary council of administration, the following item: "And because the Jewish community is especially divided into Spanish Jews and Polish Jews, the rabbi will be elected by the autochthon and not by alien Jews." Otherwise, more than one document favorable to the Jews was issued by Mihai Sturza.

Ritual murder accusations made their appearance frequently, and in many instances more than one Jewish victim suffered because of them. The belief in this vile legend had so embedded itself in the minds of the illiterate population that whenever an incident presented itself, the peaceable Roumanian people of that locality would be turned into a furious mob and attack the Jews.

As a superstitious people, the Roumanians, with all their tolerance, could not escape the effects of the ritual murder legend which was injected there. As a result, the following ritual murder accusations were brought against the Jews:

(1) The first blood accusation was made at Neamtz in 1710 by a Jewish apostate. The immediate effect was an attack on the homes of Jews. Five Jews were killed and twenty-two of the foremost Jews of that town were put in prison.

(2) In ~~1817~~<sup>1717</sup>, under Mihai Racovitza, a Christian child was killed in Onitzcani. Several Jews were arrested, charged with the child's murder for the purpose of extracting its blood. The actual object of this blood accusation was the extortion of money from the Jews, but the accused were freed as the result of an appeal to the Sublime Porte.

(3) In 1726, another accusation, minor in import, was brought against the Jews under Racovitza. A similar incident occurred in the same city in 1765.

(4) The blood accusation was made at Onitzcani, in Bessarabia. This case caused a sensation and found considerable space in a contemporary chronicle.

(5) In 1783, an Armenian child was found dead in Botoshani during the Easter holidays, and the Jews were accused of having killed it in order to extract blood for ritual purposes. The charge was proved false, and the victims were set free.

(6) In 1797, at Galatz, during the Easter season, Greeks who were in litigation with Jews brought such an accusation, and caused a riot against the Jews.

(7) (8) and (9), Minor blood accusations occurred at Bucharest, without serious consequences, in the year 1801 when another ritual murder charge was brought against a number of Polish Jews and they were attacked by a mob and the Agie (prefecture) protected them.

(10) New accusations of the same nature were made in 1804 and 1805. With Caragea's ascension to the throne in 1815, the situation of the Jews did not improve. He owed his throne to the efforts of an influential Jew named Basarghen Pasha of Constantinople, who, in return for the use of his influence, obtained a promise from the prince that he would protect the Jews which he did.

While the Jews in Wallachia were fewer in number than those in Moldavia, they suffered more severely at the hands of the princes and the fanatical priests. Jews were treated worse than Gypsies. There were many streets through which the Jews dared not go.

Very often, and without the slightest provocation, disturbances would break out which caused considerable trouble and damage to the Jews. Five specific cases are recorded (1770, 1785, 1801, 1806, and 1820) in which the people in Bucharest maltreated the Jews. This was done at the instigation of priests who were always eager to convert Jews by force.

Whenever the mob attacked Jews, the boyars would protect them and offer them a refuge in their mansions, where they were kept until the storm was over. In cases of incursion, revolution or Turkish invasion, the boyars would find refuge in the homes of the Jews; not only did they receive protection, but Jews would intercede

with the pashas in their behalf. Such cases happened not only in Wallachia, but in Moldavia as well.

(11), In 1815, at Ploesti, a Christian offered to sell a child to one Smil Ghedalia, of that city, for the Jewish Passover blood which they were commonly believed to need. When the Christian called the next day with the child, the police were waiting for him. At Neamtz, also, a ritual murder charge was brought against a Jew and the whole Jewish community was attacked.

(12), In 1816, under Scarlat Calimach, at Neamtz; the accused were discharged.

(13) In 1824, at Bacau, the Jews were accused of the ritual murder of a four year old Christian girl, whose mother had sold her to a Turk. The accused Jews were arrested; the family of one was tortured in an effort to extort a confession. The child was found alive. The plotters were made to suffer.

(14), In 1834, at Hangu, again in the district of Neamtz, an accusation was brought against twelve Jews, who were arrested and tortured, and then freed. In the following year, at Piatra, several Jews were condemned to death on a ritual accusation, but their sentence was subsequently commuted to life imprisonment in the Ocna salt mines, and this only after the untiring efforts of Michael Daniel, the banker and philanthropist.

In that year, excesses were committed against the Jews at Galatz on Easter Eve after the service, as the people were coming out of the churches. Excesses took place in that city during the Easter celebration. In 1840 and 1842

(15) In 1834, under Alexander Ghica, at Bucharest during the Easter season.

(16) A minor blood accusation occurred at Piatra in 1835.

(17) In 1841, at Piatra, a thief who accused the Jews of a ritual murder confessed.

(18) On December 26 to 27, 1847, as a result of the same false rumor of blood accusation, a fierce riot broke out against the Jews at Galatz. They were assaulted, many of them were killed, and their houses were pillaged. The authorities made no effort to restore order. In this case there was no actual ritual murder accusation, but the Jews paid the price for the mistake which the rioters had made.

(19) In 1848, a second ritual murder charge against Jews of that city proved of minor consequence, and brought no evil result.

(20) At Tecuci a ritual murder accusation was brought against the Jews on April 12, 1859. Fifteen Jews were arrested and taken from the synagogue, and on April 14th, during the morning service, a mob broke into the synagogue and beat the worshippers almost to the point of death. Their blood streamed into the streets. Fifty Scrolls of the Law were torn to shreds, the sacred books and ornaments of the synagogue were destroyed, every Jewish house was sacked, and men, women and children were beaten and wounded. The arrested Jews were finally set at liberty.

12

1857

(21) On April 13, that year, a rumor was spread at Galatz that in a grave near the synagogue there had been found the body of a Christian boy, thirteen years of age, who had been killed by the Jews for ritual purposes.

(22) In 1859, at Galatz, several Jews were accused of having committed a ritual murder. They were later discharged.

(23) In 1864, at Ismail; the accused Jews were discharged.

(24) In Calarash, on December 12, 1867; the accused were discharged.

(25) In 1871 at Ploesti; the child supposed to have been killed by Jews for ritual purposes was recovered.

(26) In 1871, a similar accusation at Bucharest had the same results.

(27) In 1881, at Calarash, on September 16 the accused Jews were discharged.

Notwithstanding the energetic denunciation of these stupid charges by Heliade Radulescu as early as the year 1837, the Roumanian press gave wide publicity to the false accusations.

There were a number of other blood accusations against Jews in the course of the 19th century, despite the fact that this baseless accusation which found its way into Roumania was more than once refuted and combatted in the course of that century by enlightened Roumanian Christians. Prominent Roumanians who denounced the accusation were Prince Constantin Alexander Ypsilanti (1804) previously mentioned, the Patriarch Dositein

(1805), Prince Alexander Dimitre Ghica (1858), and the eminent Costache Rosetti (in the same year).

In addition to the blood accusation, there were other oppressive and vexatious acts against the Jews in Roumania. One of these illustrates the helplessness of the Roumanian government in cases involving canonic law. A Jewish girl was baptized against the frantic protests of her mother, a Prussian subject living in Roumania. The Prussian consul general, Neigebauer, demanded the return of the girl. The Roumanian government merely recognized the wrong which had been done.

In the fall of 1823, during the Feast of Tabernacles (Sukkoth), Jews were annoyed by Christians in Moldavia, and they resented it. When the Jews complained to the Aga (prefect), he told them "You can go back to where you came from. We need no spies to denounce us to the Porte of Constantinople.

In 1836, on complaint of the clergy, Jews were ordered to keep their stores closed on Sundays and other holidays, so that Jewish women might not be seen on those days sitting at their windows, doing their handiwork "on purpose, so as to desecrate the Christian religion."

Most of the sufferings which the Jews in Roumania endured in the past, except those caused by invasions and insurrections, were at the hands of the Greeks. The files are replete with authentic documents telling of Greek brutalities against the Jews in the principalities. Those Jews who lived in the Danubian ports suffered much more. In those cities they were, at certain



times, subjected to mockery, derision and insults, which developed into excesses and bloodshed. Such Danubian ports as Galatz and Braila always had an agglomeration of Greek and other undesirable elements, who were inclined toward robbery and theft. In the winter, when navigation on the Danube was at a standstill, these elements were increased by hordes of unoccupied sailors who had come there with their vessels or floats. Commercial envy, on the one hand, and religious fanaticism and lust for robbery, on the other, intensified these elements in their feeling against the Jews. During the Easter holidays, and often on other Christian feast days, they would arrange entertainments which were not only absurd but coupled with danger. In their fanatical frenzy, and for their supposed amusement, they would put a figure of wood or straw, dress it up like a Jew, string it up at the topmost of a ship, and hop around it moisily. Or they would drag it through the streets, poking it with their sticks and fists, stabbing it with their knives, throwing stones at it, pulling its beard and earlocks, and hurling every kind of degrading remark at it. They would thus execute a regular auto de fe, to the accompaniment of yells, shouts, and whistling by the mass of scum and riffraff that would usually be attracted to these scenes.

When asked what their purpose was in this kind of entertainment, they said that it was to avenge the pain and suffering which the Jews had caused Christ. It is easy to understand that

in the heat of such excitement, with a mob blind with hatred and keyed up to a frenzy, one spark of provocation would suffice to turn them into uncontrollable fury and madness. The result would invariably be that from the straw-made Jew they would turn to the Jew of flesh and bone.

Under such conditions neither the local authorities nor the foreign consuls could control the fanatics. In fact, the authorities often felt themselves lucky if they could prevent the flame from spreading out to other localities. It happened quite often that the outlaws devastated the Jewish quarter, as well as the synagogues of the unfortunate and unoffending Jews, and sometimes would even break into the Christian quarters.

One of these violent scenes took place at Galatz in 1834. Coming out from church on Easter eve after high Mass, several Greeks attacked the house of one Burech, the oldest Jew living in the city. The pretext was that he was a "Christ-killer." The rioters threw his goods on the floor, and removed all the merchandise from his store. A more savage outrage took place in that same city in the spring of 1840, probably also during the Easter celebration. From an unofficial document we learn that the tumult which followed assumed serious proportions and that the authorities had to resort to vigorous measures.

Preventative measures taken by the Council in this connection and approved by the Prince read as follows:

"For the purpose of maintaining peace and order, personal

safety and the safety of the Jews in the city of Galatz, who have more than once been the victims of disturbances and fights in their midst, more especially by certain strangers who, without having given any security for their quiet and good behavior, and without any material status, are nestling here, it is absolutely necessary to put the following measures in force ... These measures consisted of thirteen articles, and were compiled on April 28, 1840; copies of them were sent out to the Secretary of State, the Minister of the Interior, and to the Russian, Austrian, British, French, Prussian, and Greek Consuls.

While these measures had some effect, the anti-Jewish excesses did not cease entirely. This was due mainly to the fact that the law was not enforced by the local authorities, who quite often were the accomplices of the rioters, if not the actual instigators of the anti-Jewish outbreaks.

CHAPTER XXVIIFRIENDS AND ENEMIES OF THE JEWS

The Roumanian anti-Semites were progressive; they not only kept abreast of Germany, the most enlightened country at that time, but in some respects they were even ahead of her, at least forty years before Hitler's advent. In Roumania, even at the end of the 19th century, baptism was no safeguard against anti-Semitism. Thus, when the famous philologist Lazar Shaineanu applied for naturalization, the Roumanian Parliament rejected his application although he had embraced Christianity. His brother, also a baptized Christian, met with the same fate. Nor was Hitler the originator of the auto de fe for Jewish and liberal books. A similar act of vandalism took place at Jassy during the Orthodox Easter Festival thirty years before Hitler. The works of Immanuel Kant, Benedict Spinoza, Schopenhauer, Ernest Renan, Max Nordau and many others were burned in the courtyard of the cathedral by Roumanian patriots on the pretext that the books were anti-religious and therefore dangerous.

There were two political parties in Roumania which were composed chiefly of narrow-minded, fanatical intellectuals and professional politicians: the Liberals, known as the "Red" party; and the Conservatives, known as the "White" party. These alternated in power from time to time, but while each had a different platform, as far as the Jews were concerned both stood on the same plank -- persecution. The Conservative party represented the great

landowners and boyars, persons of wealth and influence. The Liberals strove to attain these two desiderata, and reach their goal by way of political office. The vast interests of the Conservatives in the country's economic and agricultural life enabled their politics to have more substance, to be more healthful, than the meaningless and dishonest political catchwords and phrases of the opposition. Although the Liberals and Conservatives differed from one another economically and politically, in respect to the Jews, they had to unite in order to neutralize the dangerous political weapon which they had.

The people whom these two parties were supposed to represent never hated the Jews. H. Canini divided the enemies of the Jews into ten groups:

- 1) All the lawyers who, besides their professional jealousy, are obsessed with the fear that the Jewish lawyers are intellectually their superiors. Therefore, they did their utmost to drive the Jewish attorney out of his profession.

- 2) Every functionary in the government service, who knows no other way of earning a living. This group, corrupt and famished, has no economic stability. They exist only as long as they are drawing their salaries -- as long as their party is in power. They fear the competition of the Jews more than that of their Christian political adversaries.

3) The professional politicians who want to retain their power, and fear the Jew as a keener and more clever politician.

4) Physicians, and servants of the state, who, like the lawyers, fear the Jews as competitors.

5) Army officers, professors, and teachers who fear that the invasion of the Jews into their respective fields will reduce the demand for their own services.

6) The business group, unable to compete with the Jewish businessman in commerce or finance, would like to drive him from the market.

7) Innkeepers in the villages, who were instrumental in having the rural liquor law enacted and the Jews expelled.

8) Lessees of farm lands, and contractors of public works and tolls.

9) Trade school graduates, who would feel more secure if the Jews were eliminated from their trades.

10) Corrupt politicians, in or out of office, who live on the sweat of the Jews, whom they oppress and persecute, and from whom they extort money to let them live in peace. ¶ As long as the Jew is oppressed, Canini concluded, there will always be some good Christian who, for a consideration, will be willing to help him.

The former Minister of Public Instruction, Maiorescu, explained that Roumania had been commercially developed by the Jews, and, culturally, was dependent on the French, Germans, and Italians. To eliminate these foreign influences, a genuinely Roumanian

commercial and intellectual civilization must be created to replace them.

This argument did not convince the Roumanian politicians, who continued to enact laws affecting the Jews adversely. While the government pursued such an unworthy course, the Jews were not discouraged, nor did they permit their children to remain ignorant. They provided modern schools and modern teachers for them. The Jewish communities made every effort not only to make good Jews of their youth, but also good Roumanians. However, even in this effort, obstacles were placed in their way by the Roumanian government. Despite these obstacles, the Jews did not weaken in their love for their country. With unparelled tenacity and unyielding perseverance, they pursued their course as peaceable and law-abiding citizens. In the hope of convincing their Roumanian fellow-citizens and the government of their usefulness to their country, and ~~thereby~~ deserved better treatment, they continued their efforts to gain recognition. Now and then they petitioned the government for naturalization, and if their efforts brought no results, they petitioned again and again.

Thus, in December, 1897, when the Jews met in Bucharest for such a purpose, a mob of hooligans appeared on the street soon after the meeting opened. They invaded the Jewish quarter, assaulted the Jews, broke into the Temple and some of the synagogues, and destroyed a number of Jewish homes and stores. This disturbance led to an interpellation in Parliament by Deputy Peter Carp in the course of which, inter alia, he accused the government of instigating hatred between Christians and Jews, instead of taking steps to remove the causes of friction.

His pathetic and eloquent plea had no effect. The government pursued its policy uninterruptedly and continued to enact restrictive laws against the Jews. Restrictions alone did not satisfy the Roumanian statesmen, nor did they leave it solely to their local henchmen to carry on their diabolical work against the Jews. They injected their Jew hatred into their school children as well, by textbooks such as a simplified geography written by I.G. Tufescu. This book was for the use of students in their eighth year Lyceum and it described the Jews as foreigners in one chapter, while in another<sup>it</sup> admitted that the Sefardic Jews had been living in Roumania for a long time. After a distorted description of the physical and moral character of the Jews, Tufescu concluded that by forcing them to emigrate, "their number will be greatly reduced, and those who remain will have to behave and identify themselves with the interests of the country. As soon as this happens, we shall receive them as citizens."

Another Roumanian patriot, the notorious Professor Cuza, became frightfully alarmed at the grave danger which the Jews constituted for Roumania. He showed "statistical" figures that the Roumanian population was decreasing, while the number of Jews was increasing from day to day. According to his figures mortality among Christians was greater than among Jews, while the reverse was true of the birth rate. The Professor explained this phenomenon in the following "learned" way: By increasing in number, the Jews were snatching away every means of livelihood from the Roumanians who, as a result, were going to disappear entirely.

Such were the principles implanted in the minds of the



Christian youths in the classroom and the lecture hall. Outside of the classroom we already know what was being done by way of oppression and persecution of the Jews.

The Minister of Public Instruction also had a good idea. In order to teach the children in the schools sobriety, he had pictures introduced into the classrooms, showing Jews dressed in their old Orthodox style forcing peasants to drink until they were poisoned. But the European press did not remain indifferent to this libel of the Jews, and the minister, embarrassed, announced that these pictures would no longer be shown in the public schools.

On February 21, 1902, a trades organization law was promulgated, which resulted in depriving thousands of Jewish artisans of their daily bread. This law, too, was attacked by the European press as an act of barbarity. The German press, especially, was greatly wrought up over it and warned Roumania not to expect a loan from Germany, which she needed badly.

This criticism from the outside world, instead of changing the policy of the Roumanian government merely forced it to resort to another expedient. It had thousands of leaflets printed in Hebrew and distributed among the Roumanian-Jewish artisans. These leaflets, which were supposed to have emanated from the Jews, stated that the newly-enacted trades organization law was intended to unite all classes of Roumanian workmen and help the Jews in their trades. The leaflets also advised Jews to leave the country and not to rely on the Alliance Israelite Universelle for assistance. But the Jewish community promptly repudiated the leaflets, and branded them as frauds.

The artisan law was discussed in the British Parliament. Viscount Chanborne, at that time Under-Secretary of State, declared it to be inconsistent with Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin. He stated, furthermore, that the British ~~Minister~~<sup>W</sup> at Bucharest had made representations to the Roumanian government on the subject, and would continue to do whatever he could in the interests of the Jews of that country. A delegation of the Anglo-Jewish Association, and of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, called on Lord Salisbury and asked the protection of the British ministry for the Roumanian Jews. In his reply Lord Salisbury expressed his regret that, on both legal and humanitarian grounds, the Treaty of Berlin should have produced such slight benefit to the Jews of Roumania, and he assured the delegation of Britain's continued interest in improving their condition.

In 1902, a bulletin appeared in London, with the object of arousing public opinion to the gravity of the Jewish situation in Roumania. One of its issues enumerated the hostile enactments against the Jews in that country, and detailed the treatment they received at the hands of the Roumanian government. The Jews in western Europe concluded that the only possible solution of the problem of those unfortunates ~~were~~<sup>was</sup> emigration. The Israelitische Allianz of Vienna, feeling that the first impact would fall upon the Austrian-Jewish community, called on Dr. Theodor Herzl, for advice and assistance. He advised the convoking of a conference of all Jewish alliances, including the Anglo-Jewish Association and the British Board of Guardians, to discuss the situation. An appeal was then issued, signed by N. Baker, Jacog de Haas, and L.J. Greenberg, members of the Zionist Executive Board of England, to attend this

conference (April 11, 1902).

The Roumanian Jews also appealed to Dr. Moses Gaster of London to help save them from impending disaster. The Jewish press in various Western European lands gave lengthy accounts of the condition of the Jews in Roumania. Yet who could fully describe the actual suffering, the panic with which they were seized on account of the new disabilities projected against them? Tens of thousands of tradesmen were to be deprived of every right to earn a living. Beggary was their only prospect. Their only ray of hope was the possibility that the Anglo-Jewish Association might do something through political, financial, diplomatic, and social channels. It was suggested that a committee be appointed at once to obtain from the Roumanian government the assurance that it would not deal so harshly with the Jews by enacting such painful legislation.

The anti-Semites carried their propaganda into the Army, and succeeded in enrolling a number of commissioned officers in their ranks. When the matter was brought to the attention of General Lahovari, then Minister of War, he ordered these officers to withdraw their membership, and forbade all army officers to join any anti-Semitic organization. A similar order sent to rural school teachers by the Minister of Education had received no attention. Moreover, many high officials and university professors openly proclaimed that they were members of the anti-Semitic league.

The civilized world was deeply moved by the treatment of the Jews in Roumania. The European press thundered in condemnation of the Bratiano government. Among the influential and noted men of Great Britain, who expressed themselves publicly and emphatically against the Roumanian policy toward the Jews, were the

following: The Lord Bishop of London; The Right Honorable W.E.R. Lecky; the Right Honorable Earl of Meath; the Right Honorable Herbert J. Gladstone; the Very Reverend W.H. Freemantle, D.D., Dean of Ripon; Henry Bradhurst, M.P.; Professor A.D. Disey; the Right Honorable Earl of Fortesque; Sir Lewis M. Iver; Lord Kelvin; the Marquis of Ripon; The Lord Bishop of Wakefield; General Booth; the Right Honorable Sir William Harcourt; the Honorable H.H. Asquith; the Right Honorable Jesse Collings; Major Evans Gordon, and many others.

Peter Carp came to power as premier in June, 1902, with Olenescu as Minister of the Interior. As soon as his regime assumed office, a circular was sent to the prefects in the provinces, directing them to cease persecution of the Jews, and permit those who had been expelled from the villages to return. However, it was not long before expulsions were renewed under that same Carp regime, and carried out with the same violence and brutality as under the former Bratiano regime. Even those Jews who held permits to dwell in villages were expelled, and their permits ~~were~~ revoked. While these brutal expulsions were going on, the peasants proved to be more humane than the local authorities. They petitioned the government to permit the Jews to remain with them. Such was the case in the districts of Roman, Jassy, Falciu and others. In more than one instance the petition was headed by the local priest.

The liberals soon succeeded the Carp regime, but as far as the Jews were concerned, the change had little significance. For during his term of office Carp did not improve their condition.

although he had always shown himself to be a friend of the Jews. Anti-Semitic forces were as active as usual, but public attention was focused upon fighting which developed among themselves, and upon charges of dishonesty and thievery which they hurled at each other.

Anti-Semitism in Roumania became a public scandal, but no criminal action was taken against any of the anti-Semites. The leading spirit of the movement was Dimitrescu, a Bohemian by birth, who held a high office in the Bureau of the Minister of Education, but there were other public servants of the higher stratum who were active in the anti-Semitic movement. One of the judges of the court of cassation was a member of the League of Anti-Semites. When the frauds perpetrated by his comrades in this organization ~~became~~<sup>became</sup> public, he resigned his membership. Serious though these frauds were, not a single newspaper in the land raised its voice in protest.

Mass emigration of Jews from Roumania began in 1902. The greater part of these involuntary emigrants turned toward the United States. The sight of these unfortunates, when they landed on American soil, moved the American government to intense pity. A people driven by its government to the point of starvation and forced to emigrate to unknown and distant shores was a thing inconceivable to the American people. While the American government was not a signatory to the Treaty of Berlin, it was nevertheless filled with indignation when it read the report of its representatives in Roumania on the condition of the Jews there. On August 11, 1902, the United States Secretary of State,

John Hay, issued what has come to be known as a historic document, the "Hay Note", to the signatory Powers of the Treaty of Berlin, guarantors of Roumanian independence. In this note, which he sent through the representatives of the United States in France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Russia, Secretary Hay called the attention of the powers to the cruelties and the deplorable state in which the Jews were driven to emigration. He pleaded that Roumania be made to recognize her responsibility to the Powers and to humanity, and cease her cruelties. At the same time, a note of protest was sent by the American government, through the representative at Bucharest, to the Roumanian government.

The moral effect of the Hay Note on the civilized world was tremendous. Officially, however, no action was taken except by Great Britain, which inquired of the signatory Powers what they proposed to do in the matter. But the Roumanian government, which felt the reproach very keenly, could not remain silent. It had to plead to the indictment contained in the note of the Secretary of State, and issued a statement through its representatives abroad, promising that naturalization of the Jews would come about gradually. The discussion of the incident in the European press characterized the treatment of the Jews in Roumania as "monstrous and exceeding in cruelty the laws enacted by Louis XIV in his persecution of the Huguenots . . . an open defiance of the rights of justice and ordinary decency."

The Hay Note was discussed by the British Foreign Secretary with the other Powers, but it was not formally brought to the

attention of the Roumanian government; the same government which had taken an active part in the matter of the Roumanian Jews now refrained from exerting great pressure.

Whether the Hay Note produced any effect or not, it did elicit a confession of wrongdoing from the former minister, Take Ionescu, who made the following declaration: "I have sinned, we have all sinned, and I proclaim publicly, Pater, Peccavi, all of us have been wrong. The Roumanian politicians have sinned in pursuing a policy of persecution of the Jews for some dozen years."

The heavy Jewish emigration which developed in 1902 was rather embarrassing to the Roumanian government. Sturza, however, found a logical excuse for it by throwing the blame upon the Zionists. These villains, he implied, came to Roumania deliberately to arrange for a wholesale emigration and create disturbances, solely to humiliate the Roumanian government.

The extent to which Great Britain resented Roumanian treatment of the Jews was demonstrated in the fact that, at the inauguration of Sir Marcus Samuel as Lord Mayor of London, the Roumanian Minister in the British capital was not on the list of invited guests sent to the Corps Diplomatique. The omission of his name from such an important function had a twofold effect: it greatly humiliated the Roumanians, and it produced a tremendous effect in England and on the continent. The general opinion was that this was the most effective way of showing Roumania what discrimination meant. Needless to say, the Roumanian government was



shocked by this act of the British, and the Roumanian press expressed its humiliation strongly.

In France a number of non-Jewish leaders now became interested in the situation of the Roumanian Jews. These included Francois de Presseuse, Senator Trassieux, president of the League for the Rights of Man, M. Jaures, and Emile Zola, all of them active in the struggle for justice in the Dreyfus affair. Furthermore, European indignation produced a softening effect on the Roumanian press and a favorable reaction toward the Jews set in. Nevertheless, the Roumanian charge d'affaires at Rome, Zanfirescu, could not refrain from attacking the Jews in Roumania as usurers. In answer, the Italian newspaper, Tribuna pointed out that these accusations were universal; that wherever Jews were oppressed, fantastic reasons were usually given for their persecution; and that as soon as the oppression ceased, the accusations ceased. It asserted that in Roumania the Jews played only a small part in the usury field, while the actual usurers were almost exclusively Christians, some of whom held high office and were active anti-Semites.

At this time Roumanian finances were in bad shape, and the government was hard pressed for money. This situation compelled it to seek a loan abroad, but with little success. When Jewish bankers were approached, they responded favorably, offering a loan of 400,000,000 francs at low interest provided ~~that~~ the Roumanian Jews were emancipated. This proposition was received coolly in the Roumanian Parliament.



To create a better impression abroad, Premier Sturza tried to divert attention from the Jewish situation in Roumania. With his characteristic frankness, he denied the charge that Roumania was not living up to the terms of the treaty of Berlin. He even insisted that his country was tolerant. To prove his statement, he pointed to two Jews -- Blank and Halfan -- who belonged to different political parties. Forgetting Iorga's contention and that of other statesmen, that the Jews were "nouveaux venus" in Roumania, he divided the Jews into three categories: (1) those who were in the country at the time of the Dacians; (2) proteges of foreign Powers, the greater part of whom were formerly under Austro-Hungarian protection; (3) Jews who immigrated from Russia and Galicia. Two years later, Sturza proclaimed a new classification: the Spanish Jews, who were of a high class, and those of Moldavia, who "are not Israelites at all, but Mongolians who were converted to Judaism many centuries ago."

He blamed the emigration of Jews in 1899 on the bad harvest and denied that the artisan law was aimed against the Jews. He flatly denied that there was any religious persecution in Roumania, or that the government had any desire to drive the Jews out.

The financial crisis was increased by the emigration of Jews. Houses became vacant, and their owners were without any prospect of securing new tenants. The houses that were occupied contained tenants who were unable to pay their rent.

At this time a publicity campaign of whitewashing the

Roumanian government was being carried on in the European press. The government was worried about the loan of the 175,000,000 francs of 1879 for which they had issued treasury notes, which was to fall due shortly. While the Roumanian <sup>Min</sup> Minister of Finance had succeeded in having the Disconto Gesellschaft of Berlin underwrite the conversion of these treasury notes into amortizable rents, this did not afford much relief nor enhance Roumania's credit. On the contrary, it showed the desperate condition of Roumanian finances. The government was frank enough to tell the German government that unless the conversion could be effected, Roumania would have to suspend payment. In that event, the German holders would suffer heavily. They even went so far as to hint that in case of bankruptcy the king would have to abdicate, and, since he was a Hohenzollern, the German government would feel the blow keenly. Through such maneuvers, high pressure was brought to bear on the Disconto Bank, which yielded, but exacted a high rate of interest, and demanded that the Roumanian government do something to change public opinion in regard to the Jewish question.

Immediately the Roumanian politicians changed front, and made themselves appear in the European press as being kindly disposed toward the Jews. If a favorable impression could be created in England, France, Holland, Belgium and other countries, they hoped that the German investors would be able to unload some of the Roumanian holdings in those countries.

A council of Ministers was held at Bucharest in January, 1903, to discuss the Jewish question. King Carol presided. Minister Sturza suggested that in order to pacify the Jews, the pending petition for naturalization should be acted upon favorably.

The members of Parliament were whipped into line and a list of petitions was prepared.

As a result of this maneuver, three Jews were enfranchised, but this only rendered the Roumanian leaders more ridiculous, and they were heartily laughed at by the Roumanian press and the rest of Europe. To prove that Roumania had lived up to the terms of the Treaty of Berlin, the minister boasted that at one stroke she had emancipated 883 Jews who had served in the War of Independence -- more than 600 of whom had fallen on the battlefield of Bulgaria, but the fact remains that, in the course of twenty-five years, from 1878 to 1903, a total of ninety-two Jews were granted Roumanian citizenship.

While the Roumanian government continued its oppression of the Jews, and enacted new restrictive laws against them, the peasants were in full sympathy with the Jews. They resented the action of their government, and in every instance showed their friendship toward them. But the politicians were determined to carry on their hostile campaign against the Jews. Minister of Cults, Haret, in a Parliament speech, branded the Jews as "the great enemies of the Roumanian people, the only disturbing element and enemy of the peasants." Clubs were organized in every town, village, and hamlet to combat competition by Jews and eliminate them from the country's economic life.

Even Carmen Sylva, despite her great liking for Jewish literature, could not restrain her pen from reflecting on her Jewish subjects. However, in fairness to this broadminded queen,

it must be said that <sup>what</sup> ~~when~~ she wrote in the Century Magazine in 1906 was more a defense than an expression of sympathy for the Roumanian peasant. She was unfair, however, when she blamed the peasants' poverty on the "strangers," a term which in Roumania was understood to mean the Jews.

When, in 1906, A. Catargiu, secretary to the Roumanian legation, lectured at the Chamber of Commerce in London, with the object of encouraging trade relations, embarrassing questions which he could not answer were put to him. Myatovich, the former minister to Servia, gave an unflattering opinion of the Roumanian anti-Jewish policy and expressed the hope that a change would soon be brought about.

In 1907, a Roumanian native Jew, Cociu Abramescu, returning to his fatherland from which he had been expelled, was immediately arrested. The case was fought in the higher courts, where the defendant pleaded that, since he was a native Roumanian, not an alien, he could not be expelled as such. The Court of Cassation held that although he was a Roumanian by birth and had served in the army, he was still an alien, subject to expulsion. This encouraged the authorities to push the expulsion of Jews from the Jassy district still further. Large sums were raised for them in Germany, Austria, France, and the United States.

The distress suffered by the Jews in Moldavia in 1907 was frightful. Armand Kaminka, secretary of the Israelitische Allianz at Vienna, who made a tour through Roumania, found that the government had reduced them to abject poverty, and their

condition was appalling. In 1907, the Allianz sent 50,000 francs for the relief of the Jews of Jassy, 90,000 for the Botoshani district, and 10,000 for the relief of expelled families. Yet these and other sums contributed from abroad covered only a portion of the actual needs.

That year saw the continued harassing of Jews throughout the country. Commercial travelers were interfered with and annoyed. Jewish children were expelled from the public schools. Jewish students were driven out of the school of fine arts. A rule provided that aliens seeking admission to this school had to produce consular certificates from their respective governments. Hence, Roumanian Jews, who were not foreign subjects, but were considered aliens nevertheless, were denied enrollment. The same tactics were followed in the school of architecture, military schools, and vocational schools. Although the Hillel brothers of Bucharest had established a university fund of 200,000 lei, the faculty ruled that only Christians could be admitted. Prizes awarded from that fund for essays were granted exclusively to Christian students.

A law enacted in 1910, placed every Jew under the direct supervision of the police, like ~~an~~ ordinary felon. A Jewish merchant who wanted to go to an adjacent locality had to obtain permission from the prefect of that district.

When a rumor reached Roumania that a pogrom was raging in Bessarabia, the Roumanian government dispatched a heavy military detachment to the frontier to prevent the victims from crossing

into Roumania. This action was severely criticized by the Roumanian press as barbarism on the part of their government.

Similar sentiments were expressed by the peasants of several villages when, a short time later, the local authorities attempted to expel the Jews who were "exploiting" them. These peasants issued a strong protest to the authorities, and the Jews were permitted to remain. Different feeling prevailed in the Roumanian capital, where university students, at the instigation of Iorge and Cuza, carried on a violent campaign against the Jews. Furthermore, when Ronetti Roman's drama Menasse was about to be played, the management was forced to withdraw it from the repertory. This action appeared so ridiculous that the Roumanian statesman Costaforo asked these super-patriots, in an open letter, to state their objections to such a masterful work.

<sup>To</sup>  
~~In the presence of~~ a delegation of Jassy Jews headed by Dr. Jacob Niemirower, the Metropolitane Primus of that city expressed himself as totally opposed to anti-Semitism and to the conduct and expressions of Cuza in particular. He also pointed out that at the Bellis trial of 1913 in Russia he had taken a strong stand against the blood accusation. Yet this did not influence the Roumanian politicians in the least; they permitted Cuza to deliver a course of lectures on anti-Semitism at the University of Bucharest. But in Germany the court chaplain, Adolph Stocker, was compelled to file a written guarantee that he would not use the prayer-meeting which he wished to address, as a pretext for vilification of the Jews.

The Roumanian government made use of a book by Radu Rosetti, published under the pseudonym of "Verax". It was hostile to the Jews and proved to be unreliable. Nevertheless, this distorted and slanderous publication was distributed in various European countries. Unfortunately for its sponsors, the reaction was disappointing to the Roumanian government.

In 1912 two laws designed expressly against the Jews dealt with the economic life of Roumania. One of these made it compulsory to employ 75% Roumanians and only 25% Jews. A second permitted the employment in the native industries, only aliens, whose governments had reciprocal treaties with Roumania. It followed that those "aliens" in Roumania who did not belong to a country bound by reciprocal treaties could not be employed. The Jews obtained an audience with King Carol, who, moved by their pleas and by the inhumanity of these legislative acts, recommended that the Ministry of Industry ameliorate the conditions. This note had the desired effect. The Chambers modified the industrial act so as to exempt all "aliens" who enjoyed no foreign protection, from the necessity of proving reciprocal treaty relations.

That year saw the Jewish question hotly debated in the Roumanian press. The "argument" of the arch anti-Semite Cuza had his disciples, their minds beclouded with hatred of the Jews, sounded ridiculous and absurd. Cuza could see nothing but danger and evil in the Jews, and had only one remedy: their extermination.

On the other hand, Deputy Petresco-Comene favored the emancipation of the Jews, provided they numbered no more than 20,000.



However, since they were more numerous, possessed qualities superior to those of the natives, and lived apart from the rest of the population, he argued that they were dangerous to the country. Another good patriot, John Lahovary, while more reasonable, expressed some nervousness as to the future of his country.

Among the strong advocates of emancipation for the Jews were the two great Roumanians, Carp and Maioresco, who had fought valiently for it for many years. Another such advocate was Professor Vasilescu of the University of Bucharest, who urged the revision of Article 7 of the Constitution, saying: "It is unjust and useless to the country to deny emancipation to the Jews." But he, too, believed that the restriction on ownership of rural property ought to remain, for the protection of the peasants. Another professor of that university, Dr. Istrate, believed that "we ought to consider the indigenous Jews as brothers, and open the doors of naturalization to them. I am convinced that they will prove themselves good patriots, as they are in other countries. At any rate, it is preferable to have these thousands of Jews as citizens than as strangers." The silver-tongued statesman, Take Ionescu, was fervently in favor of Jewish emancipation. Stambler gives a beautiful picture of the inner soul of the Roumanian Jew which deserves a place in the history of the Jews of Roumania. Among other Roumanian writers favorable to the Jews were Ciurcou, Costaforu, Drago, and Socor. Ciurcou, believing that the Jewish question was solely an economic one, saw no danger in their emancipation: on the contrary, the danger which he envisaged was in not granting them rights, and he argued that such rights were to be



accorded not only to the Jews, but to all aliens definitely established in Roumania. "As for the Jews whom we treat as strangers," he said, "they are in fact Roumanians from father to son -- they are better Roumanians than certain lawmakers among the deputies and Senators. To grant rights to the Jews is a matter of justice and humanity."

CHAPTER ~~THIRTY-TWO~~ XXVIII

SHIFTING WINDS OF POLITICAL ANTI-SEMITISM

The Averescu government went out of office in 1927, and a coalition government was formed by Prince Stirbei. The new cabinet issued a manifesto in which it promised protection of life and property of all citizens without distinction of race, religion, or nationality. In reality, nothing was changed and the policy of the predecessor was followed faithfully.

A new cabinet was formed with Iorga as premier, and this too, followed the policy of its predecessor. Finally, in 1931, after a felonious attack on the life of Emanuel Socol, editor of the Adeverul, by one of the anti-Semites, the government woke up and announced a series of measures. Raids were made on Iron Guard nests in a number of cities where arms and ammunition were discovered in large quantities; hundreds of high school students were found belonging to secret anti-Semitic organizations.

At the University of Jassy, disorders developed into violent riots which brought forth a declaration from the then Prince Carol that it was impossible to entertain the demands of restricting the admission of Jewish students. Following that declaration, a band of students broke into the medical college of Bucharest and forced the Jewish students out of the class room. Similar disorders took place

at the Cluj University which the Government was forced to close. At Jassy a congress of University professors resolved against the introduction of numerous clauses. A similar sentiment was expressed in parliament by Deputy Simionescu, former rector of the University of Jassy, branded<sup>ing</sup> the disturbances in the universities as <sup>a</sup>reactionary movement, as a blind to bring about a Fascist government in Roumania.

In Bessarabia, which was under the military administration of General Popescu, violent and summary execution under martial law was often resorted to.

Anti-Semitic demonstrations were carried on in many of the leading cities. Christian students attacked their Jewish classmates and their professors unchecked. From the floor of parliament the ~~Minister~~ of <sup>E</sup>ducation was charged with having encouraged such unlawful acts.

At a conference of university deans presided over by the Minister of Education a resolution was adopted to demand of the Jewish communities to supply their proportional number of <sup>cadavers</sup> ~~carcasses~~ to the medical school. Unable to comply, the Jewish students were automatically excluded from the medical schools.

A vicious propaganda was carried on and a brochure was circulated instigating the Christian population against the Jews, promising them immunity from punishment. The hideous ritual murder by Jews was circulated through the mail on illustrated postal cards. An article, titled "Ucide" (kill), was published in the paper "Carpatii" calling its readers to violent action against the Jews, with the promise of immunity.

Because crime in Roumania went unpunished, murder became a passtime to the anti-Semites<sup>e</sup>, and if no murder was committed, excesses were a daily occurrence. Thus, at the instance of Bishop Grosie, 150 students came to Kishineff and marched through the streets, and perpetrated excesses against the Jews, desecrating the synagogues and destroying Jewish property while the authorities remained passive.

These excesses did not escape the attention of the outside world. Protests poured in from every European center: The League De/ Droits des L'Hommes, Paris, the Joint Foreign Committee of London, Alliance Israelite Universelle/ of Paris, Comité des Délégations Juive, Paris, Jewish Sejm Club, Warsaw, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, Cincinnati, Ohio, American Jewish Congress, New York, Federation of Council of Churches of Christ, Boston, all raised their voices in vehement denunciation of the Roumanian government.

The French Professor, Aulard, declared, in his speech in Parliment "In Roumania, numerus clausus does not exist legally but in practice it exists in the form of acts of brutality and violence committed by students against their Jewish colleagues and even against their professors."

In their endeavor to eliminate the Jews from the economic field, the anti-Semites succeeded in influencing the banks and other credit institutions to discriminate against credit-seeking Jewish merchants. The government, enacted the so-called National

law, by which Jews were excluded from the economic field. In Bessarabia, the government ~~had~~ expropriated 10,000 Jewish farmers and the same policy was followed in Moldavia, in the Dorohoi district, where the land of 63 Jewish farmers was confiscated.

The government was interpellated in parliament and was accused of failing to take precautionary measures, although it had been warned in advance of what was coming. The only satisfaction the Jews had was a statement by Minister Duca to the effect that the government deplored the riots and would rebuild the desecrated synagogues. The prefects of Oradea Mare and of Cluj were then dismissed. None of the vandals, however, was brought to justice; student meetings were forbidden and the Christian Students' League dissolved.

The Duca regime did not stop there. Of the Bucharest students, 30 were given prison sentences ranging from ten days to six months, and were permanently expelled from the university. 300 were suspended for one year. At Jassy, fifteen students, and in Cluj, a greater number of them from the university were imprisoned and expelled.

Of the police, three prefects, a director and inspector, a commissar, and two sub-commissars were dismissed. A sum of 24 million lei was allotted to those whose property was damaged due to these riots and for the reconstruction of the synagogues. At Buzeu, the Chief of Police was dismissed for failing to prevent an

anti-Jewish demonstration; that dismissal did not influence the Bishop of that town, who ordered the Jewish delegates to leave the platform at a public celebration of the 10th anniversary of Greater Roumania.

A new election was approaching and the peasant party, headed by Maniu, placed a number of Jewish names on the official ballot. One Jewish political leader, Filderman, found it more to his interest to support the Bratiano ticket. The Peasant Party was victorious in the elections - a very anti-Semitic candidate was defeated and its Jewish candidates were elected. Needless to say the Jews in and outside Roumania were embittered at Filderman's pro-Bratiano politics.

As soon as Maniu came to power, a delegation of Jewish deputies submitted to Maniu a memorandum in which they embodied six points of reform of Jewish interest, most of which were carried out. Shortly thereafter, a bill affecting Jewish Kehilas was introduced in parliament; the Jews protested vigorously against its enactment.

Hardly a year had passed under the Maniu administration, when disorders broke out again and the temperature of that government had dropped. The minister of Justice stated in parliament that anti-Semitic activities and their agitation were permissible and legal under the law.

On the death of King Ferdinand, in 1926, his son, Carol, ~~having~~ renounced the right of succession to the throne, <sup>and</sup> a regency took <sup>over</sup> ~~place~~. In June, 1930, Carol returned from his exile and seized the throne. His coming to the throne brought some relief to the Jews in Roumania, but it turned out to be only temporary relief

as subsequent events have shown. The peasant and liberal parties tried to make capital of the Jewish vote and both placed Jewish names on the electoral ticket, with the result that the Jewish candidates were elected to both chambers. Chief Rabbi Nimirower was elected Senator. Jewish scholars received university appointments. State subsidies were granted to Jewish religious institutions. Despite all their show of liberalism, neither of the two parties showed any inclination to suppress anti-Semitism. In fact, they both gave material aid to those fanatics. It was, therefore, but natural for the Cuzists and the Iron Guard to become more aggressive. The League of Archangel merged with the Iron Guard, and Codreanu created the so-called "Gangs of Death," which proved to be beyond the law. Henceforth, crime went unpunished -- no jury would convict any of the Iron Guard.

Finally, the government woke up, and in 1933, with the liberal party in power, and Duca Premier, a ministerial decree was signed, dissolving the Iron Guard. For this Duca paid with his life, while waiting for his train to take him to the capital,

George Stănescu succeeded Duca as premier with an announcement that he would stamp out anti-Semitic agitation. To what extent he kept his promise the record is somewhat hazy.

Maniu came out with a statement condemning anti-Jewish agitation and declared that "Roumania will not tolerate a serious anti-Semitic movement of a general character." But that did not prevent the Cuzists in Bucovina from attacking Jews in their homes and in the synagogues. And when the notorious Codreanu and his henchmen, Stelescu, were arrested and charged with organizing

disturbances, they were discharged.

Advocating the adoption of Hitler's policy, Cuza informed the press that he would solve the Jewish question by following the method Hitler used in Germany.

When a gun was fired by an Iron Guard at the Chief Rabbi Niemirower, while he was on his way to the Temple, no explanation was given. The would-be assassin was even saved from prison by being sent to an insane asylum. The Minister of Education, on the other hand, was busy in cancelling the subsidy for Jewish institutions but did not touch any of the non-Jewish institutions, some of whose subsidies were even increased.

King Carol II sprang a surprise on his people when on December 27, 1937, after the shooting of the Minister of the Interior, Armand Calinescu, by the Iron Guard, he appointed Octavian Goga, a rabid anti-Semite as premier and made him virtual dictator of Roumania. But the civilized world was already overfed with those Roumanian anti-Semitic charges. Therefore, every civilized man and woman felt so much more outraged.

Goga acted quickly ~~and lost no time~~ and, as we have already shown, proceeded immediately with the utmost severity to enforce the alien law on the disfranchised Jews and imposed ~~an insurmountable~~ scale of taxes on them which most of them were unable to meet. Many of those delinquents were sent far away from their homes, where they were forcibly put to hard labor on public works. With the approval of the king a drive was inaugurated against "500,000 Jewish vagabonds, who had entered the country



illegally and obtained citizenship by fraud."

It should not be surprising that such figures were given by Premier Goga. His Majesty, King Carol II, had made a similar slip of the tongue on the occasion of his visit to London on January 10, 1938, when he had told a representative of the London Daily News that 250,000 Jews had entered the country illegally. Explaining his Goga appointment, his Majesty stated that he had no alternative but to follow public opinion, that those Jews who had entered illegally and fraudulently, did not come under minority rights.

"Public opinion" in Roumania! was public opinion in favor of Goga? If it was, was he dismissed in face of it, or because public opinion changed?

On <sup>23</sup>the 23rd of January, 1938, Goga issued a supplementary decree, for revision of Jewish citizenship, which he intended to use to facilitate the elimination of Jews from liberal professions. The largest number ousted were Jewish lawyers in the Ilfov district (Bucharest).

Goga's political life was rather short. On February 2, 1938, Carol dismissed him peremptorily and appointed Hiron Christea Premier. The new Premier, Christea, lost no time in proving his love for the Jews by a virulent attack on them.

The Bar Association of Bucharest and other professional bodies, following the code of the Iron Guard, adopted a resolution to eliminate the Jews from their professional roster. The

enlightened syndicate of Roumanian journalists did not fall below their brethren of other professions. They went as far as to segregate Jewish journalists from the press table in parliament. Demand also was made that Jewish lecturers be removed and numerus clausus be also adopted.

At Hotin, Bishop Titu ordered a boycott against the Jews; ~~and~~ the Iron Guard did not wait for a second order but proceeded at once to put that order into effect. It was followed by anti-Jewish riots at Bucharest and in Moldavia.

Goga's ascension to power had made the Iron Guard more brazen and defiant, ~~but did not contribute~~<sup>nothing</sup> to the security of the Jews there. To put his pronouncement, "Roumania for Roumanians," into practice, Goga had removed a number of Jewish department chiefs, suppressed three democratic Jewish dailies and dismissed every Jew in public office. A list of anti-Semitic measures was then published and every Jewish book store was ordered closed.

As was always the case, anti-Semitic agitation in Roumania was only a blind to cover the usurptions of the government plots against even the crown. On April 17, 1939, the police uncovered a Fascist plot against the state and against the King. 200 Iron Guards leaders and their chief were arrested. Their quarters all over the country were raided and documents showing espionage and sedition was discovered. Codreanu was indicted and convicted on a charge of high treason.

THE INTERVENTION OF WORLD JEWRY

On his way to Turkey in 1866 Adolphe Crémieux, President of the Alliance Israelite Universelle of France, was invited to visit Roumania. Roumania was, at that time, preoccupied with the ~~task~~ of framing a new constitution. The Jews were interested in what they considered ~~a~~ a Magna Carta for Roumania, which would decide their political status.

Crémieux arrived in Bucharest in June of that year, and was received with great honors. On the fourteenth he was received by Prince Carol, and availed himself of this occasion to touch on the lot of the Jews in Roumania. Carol agreed with the French visitor that the prejudices were a disgrace, and that complete emancipation of the Jews was very desirable, and assured Crémieux that he was in favor of it.

Shortly after Crémieux's arrival he was invited by the President of the Chambers to address Parliament. Crémieux was a masterful speaker, a ~~keen~~ lawyer, and ~~an~~ able diplomat. His address went straight to the point, and centered attention on the Jewish question. Among other things he said:

"Do you have to accord complete emancipation to Jews born in Roumania? A violent prejudice dominates this simple question, and there is deep hatred of the Jews. Is this hatred just, is it legitimate?

"Gentlemen, how can it be that sixty generations should be expiating the crimes of the past, in endless punishment? How many times has philosophy been astonished by these Divine words: 'I will punish the sins of the fathers down to the third and fourth generations?'

"You, gentlemen, who, much to our joy, love France so much, whom you glorify, do you recall the great principles established in the 18th century -- mistakes are personal, punishment is personal? Liberty and freedom of worship are one of the rights of man, a point of solidarity between father and son. In fact, there is nothing more unjust than this solidarity of a guilty and an innocent person, simply because of a blood relationship that binds them. And if you apply this injustice to the solution of a question, it becomes frightful."

Mavrocordat, a deputy, remarked that the Jews in Roumania disliked the Roumanian people and this caused the anti-Jewish feelings. Whereupon Crémieux replied:

"The objections seem to be serious, but they vanish when confronted with contemporary facts. Permit me first to tell you that the hatred of Christians by Jews is justified. So many persecutions, so many killings, to avenge a crime which they cannot understand makes it excusable. But my answer will be decisive: You have made the Jews what they are. <sup>Hold</sup> ~~Stretch~~ out your hand to them and you will see how the cleavage will vanish with surprising rapidity. The proof is heralded everywhere. Look at the Jews in all of the countries where they march alongside the citizens of other cults. Have they the prejudice against the Christians of which you speak? Not at all. However, formerly it existed in Belgium, in Holland, in England, in France, all over, and it was as strong as in Roumania, because there, as here, the contempt and vile hatred prevailed. It existed at the beginning of the century and it has left the most painful memories.

"Forty years later, gentlemen, it was only a dim recollection. Elevate the Jews in Roumania and they will forget that you have trodden them with your feet; they will set themselves up nobly; in a few years you will see them happy to fraternize with you, your worthy equals. They are charged with keeping themselves segregated; this

is because they are afraid of you.

"What have you to fear from carrying out this act of brotherly justice? Cast your eyes on Europe, on all the states which have adopted them! Have they cause to regret this adoption? Their conduct above all is worthy of the equality which will level them with you."

This address was received with great admiration. Rosetti and others spoke, assuring Crémieux that the Jews in Roumania had a future. But Trompeta Carpatilor, the Roumanian Press, reacted unfavorably and published an article by Caesar Boliac, formerly a leader in the revolution of 1848. He expressed admiration for Crémieux, but found his speech irrelevant to Roumanian interests. He warned the Roumanian deputies to be watchful, lest they be influenced by Crémieux, and fail to see the danger to the country if Jews should be emancipated. Crémieux himself expressed his views on Roumania in a private letter to a friend. "In Roumania," he wrote, "the liberal party is the party which professes publicly its most advanced opinions and sympathizes greatly with the revolution of 1848, but when it comes to religious and social questions, this party is still living in the 15th and 16th centuries." To another friend, he wrote: "It is not in Bucharest, but in Paris, in London, in the lands of civilization, that the Jewish cause must be pleaded."

However, Crémieux <sup>seemed</sup> ~~appeared~~ to have been impressed by his visit to Roumania. Upon his return to France, the Roumanian Jews appealed to him to intercede in their behalf against the disturbances. He promptly addressed the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, and was informed that the French consul at Bucharest had been instructed to protest to the Roumanian government against the treatment of the Jews.

In January, 1867, the Roumanian Minister extraordinary to France visited Crémieux in Paris, and assured him of the best intentions of the Roumanian government to ameliorate the condition of the Jews. Realizing the high prestige enjoyed by Crémieux in the financial and political world, Bratiano delegated Picot, his private secretary, to convey to Crémieux his assurance in the same spirit. Crémieux apparently had little faith in Bratiano's promise, and wrote to Prince Carol direct in behalf of the Jews. Some satisfactory results were finally brought by those letters and visits. For a while, the persecution diminished to some extent.

On July 4, that same year, Carol visited Moldavia and stopped in Jassy. He accepted the invitation of the Jews to attend religious services in the Neuschotz Temple, and to receive a delegation. Before leaving Jassy, Carol received the European representatives of Jassy who informed him of the conditions in Moldavia, of the persecution of the Jews, and of the outrageous politics of Bratiano.

Now, as we consider the situation of the Jews there, and as we compare the treatment of the Jews in Russia with that in Roumania, we must admit that they were better off under the Moscovites. While in spirit there was very little difference, and while the seeds of hatred planted in Roumania had been imported from Russia, there was still a great difference. All the evil in both countries came from above, from the governments, but in Russia, there was no political aspect involved. Everything, the

the pogroms included, emanated from the government. But in Roumania it was the political parties which used the Jewish question which they themselves had created as a means to gain or to regain power, to outdo the other in "saving the country from the Jewish danger."

After Carol's return from Jassy frantic appeals from the Jews at Jassy reached the Alliance Israelite Universelle, at Paris in 1867, praying for help against the persecutions. The only course for the Alliance to pursue was to invoke the aid of Emperor Napoleon III by having Crémieux obtain an audience. But there was an obstacle for Crémieux to overcome. Once he had stood on very intimate terms with the house of Bonaparte. He had also had a great deal of confidence in the republican propensities and sentiments of Louis Napoleon. When the French monarchy could endure no longer, and Louis Philippe had left France, Crémieux rendered him very valuable services. As soon as it was apparent that the president of the Second Republic was leaning in the direction of monarchy, Crémieux broke away from him. Hence, on December 2, 1851, Crémieux, together with a number of the foremost members of the National Assembly, was arrested and held for twenty-three days behind locked doors. His relations with the Imperial Court had thus been broken off. How could he now, in 1867 appear before the emperor as a suppliant in behalf of his oppressed fellow Jews in Roumania?

Nevertheless, Crémieux went, and was graciously received by Napoleon III, who proved to be familiar with conditions in Roumania.



As he listened to Crémieux, Napoleon could not understand why such unbelievable persecutions should be carried on in Roumania, and asked Crémieux to explain.

"Sir", said Crémieux, "there are so many private interests in Roumania which demand such disturbances. I am only able to assure Your Majesty that only a few years ago the Roumanian people did not know what hatred of a people of another faith meant." The emperor showed indignation, and said: "Cette oppression ne peut se tolérer ni se comprendre. Je vais le témoigner au Prince. Mes sympathies sont acquises à de si grandes infortunes."

On that very day, May 12, 1867, Carol received the following telegram from Napoleon III:

"I must inform Your Highness of the extent to which public opinion is wrought up here over the persecution of the victims who, it is said, are the Israelites of Moldavia. I cannot believe that the enlightened government of Your Highness approves of measures which are repulsive to mankind and to civilization."

Carol instantly sent the following reply:

"Your Majesty may be assured that I have no less concern for the Jewish population than Your Majesty. The measures which my government has felt ~~to~~ necessary to take form no exceptional measures, and are a part of the common law. I shall order a rigorous investigation to learn whether some underlings did not go beyond their instructions. The guilty will be dealt with in the strictest sense of the law."



On May 24, 1867, Bratiano dispatched instructions to the Mayor at Jassy "to exercise a continued watch and a severe control on all the Jewish benevolent and educational institutions." Three days later, on May 27, 1867, St. Clair, the British vice-consul at Jassy, reported to the consul general, John Green, at Bucharest, that he had called on the prefect and had remonstrated with him against the expulsion of the Jews. The official explained that he was under the jurisdiction of the Minister of the Interior, and, therefore, no other instructions were valid for him.

While the mad debauchery of the government was going on in Roumania, and while Parliament could think of nothing else but anti-Jewish legislation, the people at large were not influenced in the least. The average Roumanian, especially the peasant, was mild, docile, goodhearted, and lived <sup>in</sup> peacefully with his Jewish neighbor. They were greatly annoyed by the anti-Semitic disturbances. In 1867, fifteen Roumanians of the nobility, former members of the cabinet, sent a protest to Prince Carol against the persecution of the Jews.

Alarmed by this frightful state of affairs, the Jews and the chief rabbi of Jassy telegraphed to Lord Stanley (May 23, 1867). The Jewish Community of Jassy appealed to Sir Moses Montefiore and to Sir Frances Goldsmid.

Petitions signed by prominent non-Jewish Roumanians were sent to Carol. The European countries, through their respected <sup>iv2.</sup> representatives, protested against Bratiano's policy. The Jews in the leading capitals of Europe made every effort to have the conditions of the Jews in Roumania ameliorated. In the Roumanian Parliament, Deputy Carp accused Bratiano of legalizing the ill-treatment of the Jews.

At the instance of the Alliance, the French government instructed its representatives at Jassy "to take prompt and energetic steps to put a stop to an iniquity which is a dishonor to the Roumanian government." In a joint note of July 15, 1867, this indignation found expression in a note of the European consuls in Jassy. Tense correspondence was carried on between the Alliance and London, Crémieux, Goldsmid, Rothschild, Stanley, Hammond, Lyons, Bloomfield, St. Clair (in Jassy) and Green (in Bucharest). But the Bratiano government flatly denied the incriminating accusations.

The situation in Galatz was no better, than at Jassy. On July 16<sup>th</sup> Prince Carol visited Galatz. The prefect succeeded in preventing the Jews from being received in audience by the ruler. But at Braila Jews were received by him. He visited the Temple, where a special service was tendered in his honor. This had little effect upon his attitude toward the Jewish population. He still considered them to be a menace to the country.

The ringleaders of the anti-Jewish acts, predominately professionals, formed propaganda committees against the Jews. The head of these committees was Bratiano who rewarded his followers with political favors. The erection of a Temple at Galatz, planned by the Jewish community for many years, was not permitted. Conditions became so bad that the Jews were driven to despair. Turning to their coreligionists abroad, the Jewish community of Galatz sent a telegraphic appeal to Sir Moses Montefiore in London on July 18, 1867. Prompted by that appeal, Sir Moses Montefiore resolved to go to Roumania and plead in behalf of his unfortunate coreligionists.

He was received by Prince Carol on the day following his arrival. The reception was short and very formal, in conformity with the accepted rules of foreign diplomatic meetings. The British Consul General, Green,

accompanied Montefiore. He stayed in Roumania only a short while. His quick departure was ascribed to persistent rumors of attempted demonstrations against the unwelcome Briton.

Montefiore received numerous anonymous letters, hostile to his mission, and this accelerated his departure. For the same reason he did not visit Jassy. However, before leaving, he met some of the leaders of the government and of the Jews -- then he wrote ~~another~~ to Prince Carol setting forth the case of the Jews in Roumania. The reply from Carol, penned in his usual repetitious and ambiguous language, stated that he was concerned with the welfare of all Roumanians and disclaimed any responsibility of his government for the cases "which disturbed the Israelites."

The reception given to Sir Moses Montefiore, and the assurances by Prince Carol and Minister Golesco contributed nothing to the improvement of the status of the Jews.

The years following Montefiore's visit were years of continued vexation and permanent persecution of the Jews. On October 27, ~~of 1867~~, ~~that same year (1867)~~, less than two months after the visit of Montefiore, Sir Francis Goldsmid was called upon to write to the British foreign office deploring the ill-treatment of the Jews in Roumania. He stated that the assurances of the Roumanian government that it would stop religious oppression could not be trusted.

Thus, The situation of the Jews in Roumania grew steadily worse, despite the protests of foreign representatives and eminent Jews from other countries. The Roumanian government made facile promises, that the situation would be ameliorated, but local officials used their power arbitrarily to stir up the lower strata of the urban population against the Jews.

CHAPTER ~~FIFTEEN~~ XXX  
Protests  
THE INTERVENTION OF EUROPEAN POWERS

Otto von Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor of Germany, was profoundly moved by the ill-treatment of the Roumanian Jews. He instructed the Prussian agent at Bucharest to cooperate with the other foreign representatives on behalf of Jews. He was very much in sympathy with Carol, to whom the mistreatment of the Jews was repugnant, but who was anxious to maintain order in his country at any price. Against his own politicians he was meek and helpless.

On February 19, 1868, Count Keyserling, the Prussian agent in Bucharest, and the British Consul General, Green, had an audience with Prince Carol, at which they pointed out the importance of preventing a recurrence of any acts of violence. Carol assured them that strict measures had been taken to protect the Jews.

On the heels of these assurances, the following telegram was sent to Sir Francis Goldsmid of London by the Jewish Committee at Jassy:

"Thirty-one radical deputies have introduced the following bill into Chambers:

1. Jews cannot establish themselves in rural districts; they must first obtain special authorization.

2. Those who infringe on these laws will be considered vagabonds and expelled by the mayors.
3. Jews may neither sell nor buy houses.
4. Jews may not hold land, forests, vineyards, sheepfolds, windmills, foundries, taverns, or public houses on lease.
5. Jews may not compete in any enterprise, nor can they associate with Christians for that purpose.
6. Jews may <sup>without</sup> not engage in commercial enterprises ~~under~~ the mayor's authorization. Violators of this law will be punished by fine and will have no standing in court.
7. All Jewish committees are suppressed. All laws not in conformity with this act are abrogated.

Take steps through your government and through the other Powers to prevent a great misfortune. Pray wire Prince Carol at once. He is interested in the lot of all Roumanian Jews."

The telegram was brought to the attention of Lord Stanley, who instructed the British ~~Consul~~ <sup>General</sup> in Bucharest to remind Prince Carol of his solemn promise to warrant the Jews' security.

On March 28, 1868, Green, the British ~~Consul~~ <sup>General</sup>, was received by Prince Carol, and discussed with him the proposed law affecting the Jews. The Prince told Green that "he looks upon the proposed law, which has been introduced into Chambers by the Independent Liberals, simply as a disgrace."

The same day Green informed Lord Stanley that Prince Carol was opposed to the proposed law against the Jews and that he would never sanction it.

In view of the new move ~~made~~ by the Bratiano government, the Alliance Israelite Universelle asked Prince Bismarck to intercede with Prince Carol, and received a reassuring reply.

The British Foreign Office felt discouraged. In a note to Sir Francis Goldsmid, Lord Stanley wrote:

"I fear that we can do no more than that which we have done for the Jews in Wallachia. Prince Carol promises fairly and his intentions are doubtless excellent. But he has an unruly people to deal with, and bigoted besides, and jealous too, of the successful industry of the Jews."

In a letter dated April 10, 1868, Montefiore asked the Foreign Office whether it was advisable for him to make a second trip to Roumania. No sooner had he dispatched this letter than he received this frantic appeal from the Jewish community of Sereth in Moldavia.

"Hundreds of Jewish families of this (Bacau) district are being expelled and driven from their dwellings in the villages in a barbaric manner, without regard to great losses with infants and the aged exposed to the rigors of the season. All this is being done by order of the prefect of Bacau. All the complaints taken to the Minister at Bucharest are fruitless, and our deplorable position becomes worse from day to day, so every minute we are menaced with danger."

Hammond, from the foreign office, replied to Monefiore's letter of April 10th thus:

"I have laid before Lord Stanley your letter of yesterday and the telegram therein enclosed respecting the persecution of the Jews at Bacau, and in reply I am to state to you that, while regretting the persecution to which the Jews in the principalities are exposed, His Lordship considers that the instructions which he has already given to Mr. Green have exhausted all the means of Her Majesty's Government for interfering in their behalf, and he can only rely, as he does most fully, on Mr. Green executing those instructions with the utmost fidelity and zeal."

Russia pursued a different attitude. Germany never had too much love for Jews. Nevertheless, her Jews were treated decently. In those disturbing days when Bratiano was waging war against his Jews, the Prussian government joined with the other European Powers in protesting against the persecutions in Roumania. On April 18, 1868, Baron Thielau of Berlin, informed Lord A. Loftus, that the Prussian government had the "most positive assurance from Prince Carol of his humane disposition towards the Jews."

Such assurances were not sufficient to satisfy British Jewry. <sup>The</sup> Jews of England had no doubt as to the good intentions of the Prince. They maintained that the ruler was "not strictly and truthfully informed of the occurrences which had taken place in the provinces and of the acts of persecution to which the Jews had been subjected."

Meanwhile, Crémieux sent an illuminating letter to Goldsmid. In this letter he speaks of a series of documents in his possession on the Jewish situation in Roumania. He calls the attention of Goldsmid to the letters -- from <sup>The</sup> Alliance Israelite Universelle, <sup>the</sup> Committee of Focshani, the Committee of Bucharest and others confirming previous reports. He states that the majority of the deputies in the Chambers want the expulsion of Jews and if it were not for the fear of European public opinion, and the warning of the European Powers, <sup>The</sup> 19th century "would have seen the carrying out against our coreligionists in the principalities the crime which had tainted Spain with shame and misery. He, therefore, appeals to the English Jews not to relax their efforts but to increase them because the situation in Roumania was never as grave as



it is now."

Bratiano, in his speech delivered in the Chambers on April 5, 1868, boldly defied the Powers and said: "The government will take measures against vagabonds whether they are aliens, Jews or any other nationality, even Roumanians."

In an interview with Anton Levy, he said: "The Jews are being driven from the rural places because such is the law of the land. The country suffers immensely from the Jews, and because of that, the Chambers and the government engage to take efficient measures, but with less violence."

In view of the many denials issued by the Bratiano government, there was still some ground to doubt the reports of the Roumanian events which filled Europe with indignation. Lord Bloomfield wrote to Lord Stanley on April 20, 1868, ~~in which he assured~~ him that there was every reason to believe that the former impressions on the subject were not far from the truth.

But Bratiano was not moved by the action of the foreign Consuls, for on August 24, 1868, Lord Stanley was informed by British vice-Consul St. Clair of the expulsion of five hundred Jewish families from the Bacau district. The French and the Austrian consuls likewise reported the same occurrence to their respective governments. But Bratiano denied it, stating: "These reports have been circulated by those who wish to provoke agitation in the country; neither at Bacau nor anywhere else has anything of that sort occurred."

In view of these conflicting statements, Baron Eder, the Austrian representative in Bucharest, took up the subject with



Golesco, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Golesco flatly denied the facts. Baron Eder made his own investigations and received information contradicting Golesco, from the Austrian Consul at Jassy.

In all the anti-Jewish enactments introduced by the Bratiano government against the Jews, no mention was ever made of the word, "Jew". Officially the terms "vagabond" or "Straini" were used.

While these sentiments against the Jews were frequently uttered by Bratiano, the civilized world, through its diplomatic representatives, endeavored to put a stop to the hostile acts. Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne, the French Ambassador to England, discussed the Jewish situation in the principalities with Lord Stanley, who told him of the new outrages at Bacau, stating that he had instructed the British consul in Bucharest to protest.

In Jassy, the Foreign Consuls meeting in the office of the Austrian Consul, discussed the Jewish situation and declared that Bratiano was responsible.

In a speech in Parliament on April 5th, Bratiano sought to justify himself before Europe.

England lost its patience with the Bratiano government, and being eager to stop its cruelties, cast about for the proper manner in which to accomplish it. In his instructions to Green, Lord Stanley branded Bratiano as the chief instigator.

Austria was also beginning to tire of the situation and of Bratiano's tactics. In a letter of April 21, 1868, Count Apponyi stated how glad he was "to cooperate with France and Great

Britain to bring the Moldo-Wallachian government to understand that it must adopt a conduct more in conformity with its own interest."

At the request of M. DeWolfrath, Consul General of Austria at Jassy, a joint note was signed by the British, Austrian, French, Greek, Prussian, and Russian agents, and dispatched to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The closing paragraph of this interesting note reads: "Consequently, the undersigned have repeatedly been led to the conviction that the denials so categorically made to the agents and Consuls General at Bucharest by the Roumanian government are in flagrant contrast to the facts which they are in a position to establish."

The Bratiano government still persisted in its denials, and kept the Prince in ignorance of what was going on. Golesco could do nothing but deny everything, while the various Consuls placed "no confidence in its contradictions." Strangely enough, the French Consul at Jassy found the facts to be as bad as reported, but the prefect at Bacau denied everything. This denial came at a time when the mayor of Beresti ordered several Jews to leave town in ten days.

Golesco, in a letter, admitted the occurrence of the hostile acts, but attempted to justify them on national economic grounds. He gave the number of Jews in the principalities at that time as exceeding 500,000, whereas the official figures published by the same government recorded only 134,168.

At the time when European governments were sending their vigorous protests to the Roumanian government, Russia stood aloof,

disinterested in the treatment of the Jews in Roumania. On the contrary, she criticized the powers, especially Austria, and assured Bratiano of her sympathy. She even instructed Baron Offenber<sup>g</sup>, her Consul General, to inform the government that it could surely count on Russia's support and not to yield to the Austrian threats. However, when the Russian representative at Berlin attempted to influence the German government in favor of Carol's dominion, Prince Bismarck resented it, declaring that Roumanian events provoked Europe, and demanded satisfactory assurance that the Bratiano government would cease ill-treating the Jews. He even threatened to intervene in favor of the Austrian demands, which he believed would be justified. Russia was asked to support this view. The Russian Minister, Prince Gortchakoff, then deserted Golesco and his unsavory politics.

Bratiano felt the sting of Bismarck's remarks, and showed signs of yielding. As evidence of his good faith, Bratiano instructed Golesco to "give every assistance to his agents." He also told him that the government was resolved to combat energetically every act of violence, but that he was also resolved not to tolerate "the intervention of strangers in our internal affairs."

This bold assertion was made by Premier Bratiano for European diplomatic consumption to impress the Powers supporting the Austrian demands for reparation. Furthermore, after a brief visit to Moldavia, Prince Carol was compelled to admit the existence

of grievances against the authorities. Lecca was then dismissed from his post, and another prefect was appointed in his place. Then Golesco's resignation followed.

Austria demanded the restoration of the homes of the expelled Jews who were her subjects. However, the British representative feared that this would establish a precedent that might include all expelled Jews. If this demand were resisted by Bratiano, they felt, joint action would have to be taken in presenting other demands to his government. Baron Eder also feared that this would only tend to weaken the position of the foreign representatives, and if the Russian and Prussian agents remained cool to the proposition, it would lend strength to the Bratiano government. The British representatives, therefore, suggested caution because it might lead to precarious and critical conditions which Europe would have to face. However, Baron Eder was not concerned with that. The British government then approved of the Austrian demands and added that its interest "in the fate of the Jews in the principalities is not limited to that portion of the population, but extends generally and comprehensively to all <sup>the</sup> Jews, particularly to natives."

Bratiano finally yielded. A conference was arranged ~~be~~ <sup>for</sup> the Austrian, British and French agents, and himself. At this conference, held on June 10, 1868, Bratiano agreed to restore the expelled Jews to their homes and to reimburse them for the losses which they had suffered. He also agreed "without delay to introduce a measure granting all the Jews born in the principalities of native parents the same civil and political rights as Christians."

This protocol was signed on June 11, 1868.

The British representative in Roumania was skeptical. The Austrian Jewish subjects at Jassy were indeed overjoyed, and through their representative thanked the Austrian Consul General, Count von Wolfrath, for his stand on behalf of the persecuted Jews.

Although the protocol was signed on June 11, 1868, up to July 4~~th~~ of that year, Bratiano had not communicated with the signers in conformity with his promise. On July 25~~th~~, Baron Eder received a note from him in which he said: "All illegal acts brought to the knowledge of the government (with reference to the Jews) have been repaired." This declaration covered all those who had been expelled, including nationals of Austria and other countries.

Having reached an agreement with Austria, Bratiano now sought to create a favorable impression in Europe. For that purpose, his friend Rosetti, an astute statesman, resorted to a novel idea. In addition to his newspaper (Romanul), he issued another paper under the title of Israelitul Roman (The Romanian Jew), edited by Anton Levy, an alleged friend of Bratiano. By giving it the appearance of a Jewish publication, he sought to reconcile the Roumanian Jews to their government. Quite naturally, this "Jewish" newspaper whitewashed his government in everything it had done. The publication of this newspaper was intended for European consumption, to convince Europe that this was an independent publication which told the truth. But the Moldavian

and Wallachian Jews were not deceived by it. The life of this "Jewish" newspaper was short and its oblivion well deserved.

Besides the Israelitul Roman, another publication appeared under the name of L'Echo Danubien,<sup>edited</sup> by S. Carmellin. H. Levy commercialized his relations with Bratiano as well as he could. In order to foster Jewish interests the Jewish community paid him liberally, and he did write some articles favorable to the Jews. In order to combat the influence of L'Echo Danubien, which actually defended the Jews, Bratiano, in 1869, began the publication of another newspaper, under the title of L'Etoile de 'Orient, and made his Jewish friend Levy editor-in-chief. In order to silence L'Echo Danubien, Levy offered Carmellin a place in his paper, but he declined. The double game was played by Levy until he was finally exposed. Bratiano managed to have Carmellin indicted on a libel charge. The trial took place on March 8, 1869, before a jury, and Carmellin was acquitted.

Cognalniceanu, upon assuming the office of Minister of the Interior in 1869, declared in a circular letter to the prefects; "I do not want this administration to play the patriotic part. As Minister of the Interior I have a special mission to defend the good understanding among all the inhabitants without distinction of nationality, religion, or opinion." He went on to assure friend and foe that his regime would be impartial and that their lives, honor, and goods, would be equally protected.

On June 6, 1869, a circular letter directed the prefects to expel all Jews in their respective jurisdictions before

October of that year. To make sure that this order was carried out, Cogalniceanu followed it with another more emphatic order "not to delay for a moment the execution and disposition of said circular."

The British Consul General immediately got in touch with Cogalniceanu and the Prince, and remonstrated against this drastic order. He also instructed the vice-Consuls at Jassy and Galatz to "watch closely" and report to him. Similarly, he instructed a Jewish delegation, which had called to thank him and his government for the interest they had taken, to report to him promptly any move by the new government against the <sup>Jewish</sup> people.

The condition of the Jews in Moldavia prompted Marquis La Valette to instruct the French Consul at Bucharest to inform the Roumanian government of the emperor's grief on learning of the new oppressions, and that the Roumanian government should respect the convention of 1858. The British and Austrian governments joined in these sentiments.

A circular sent out by Cogalniceanu as Minister of the Interior, forbidding the Jews to engage in the liquor business in the rural districts, held out the prospect of emancipation of the Jews.

It is said that the circular which Cogalniceanu issued, emanated from him as a politician and not as an enemy of the Jews. At any rate, he was not of the Bratiano type. In fact, at one time, he even telegraphed to the prefects not to molest Jews in the villages, but the instructions were ignored by the prefects. It must be admitted that he acted in good faith, and that he did not play

a double game -- one with the Jews and one with the Christians. He meant what he said and he very candidly informed the Chambers that he did not believe in solving the Jewish question by persecutions.

A princely decree issued in 1869 permitted Jews to bid on public works. Following this mild concession, there came a ministerial circular addressed to the prefects, ordering them not to permit Jews to engage in the liquor traffic in the rural districts.

A ministerial order later directed the authorities at the boundaries not to permit the entry of Jews and vagabonds. Due to the fact that the agitation against the Jews had reached a stage at which many Jews of Moldavia sought refuge in Cernauti (Czernowitz), the Austrian government at the instance of the Jewish leaders at Cernauti, instructed its representative at Bucharest to make representations to the government with respect to that order. A raid on Jews living in the villages was then made, and the unfortunates were expelled. At Bacau in the winter of 1869 the Jews were driven from their homes and their households ~~were~~ plundered. Many of the adults, and some of the children, died of exposure. In the district of Falciu, 500 Jewish families were expelled in the same manner. In the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, this was not enough, and he regretted that he could not show better results.

At the instance of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, acting jointly with Sir Francis Goldsmid and the Rothchilds of London, the British Foreign Office remonstrated with the government at Bucharest, but without tangible results. The agonized cries of the unfortunates reached such alarming proportions that all European Jewry became greatly alarmed.



In 1869, Rabbi Isaac Taubes and Armand Levy came to Bucharest to urge the repeal of an ordinance enacted by the city council at Berlad. Bratiano reproached the rabbi saying: "Ye leaders, guides of the (Jewish) people, when will you open the eyes of the people? Look at their degrading style of dress. Why should not the bodies of the Jews be covered in European style? This is the cause of the prejudice against them."

The city ordinance at Berlad was annulled on October 11, 1869. While the Jewish delegation headed by Taubes and Armand Levy was pleading on behalf of the Jews of Berlad and Galatz, a report reached them from Roman, that the Jewish quarter had been attacked and great damage caused.

When in June, 1869, Cogalniceanu issued an order to the prefects in the provinces not to expel the Jews from the rural districts, another order was added that the Jews should first be allowed to collect their debts from the peasants. However, despite this order, as early as August, 1869, Jews were brutally driven from their homes, not even ~~being~~ permitted to take with them the things they needed. When Boeresco, the Roumanian Minister of Justice, was approached by Abraham Halfan and Armand Levy for help, he promised to intercede with Cogalniceanu. However, not having received satisfaction from the latter, Halfan and Levy appealed to the Alliance Israelite Universelle, but in view of a previous declaration by Cogalniceanu that neither the Alliance nor the French Foreign Minister, LaValette, had the right to interfere in Roumanian affairs, they were unable to achieve anything.

In the meantime, a letter from Sir Moses Montefiore, to which was attached a frantic appeal from the Jews of Bacau, stated that "the violence and intensity of these persecutions have rarely been exceeded even during the dark ages," and he pleaded with Great Britain to take such steps in the matter as might tend to save the unhappy Jewish population of that country. Receipt of this communication was acknowledged by Mr. Hammond, with the assurance that a copy of it would be sent to John Green, at Bucharest.

Green and Mellinet promptly communicated with Prince Ghica, and received from him a reply in which he stated: "The Roumanians do not pretend to be more civilized in 1869 than the French were from 1806 to 1812. His Excellency, the Marquis de La Valette, knows better than I do the exceptional measures which Napoleon I took in the interests of France against the Jews of Alsace and Lorraine."

In an interview Prince Carol stated to a reporter that the uneasiness abroad was attributable to the total ignorance of the Jewish question and added that the Jews habitually exaggerated their complaints. He defended the circular sent out by Cogalniceanu forbidding Jews to engage in distilling and selling spirituous beverages in the rural districts. Green also had an interview with B. Boeresco, Minister of Justice, who gave him a copy of the circular sent out to the prefects, admonishing them against cruelties and excess of zeal, urging them to respect contracts and leases, and stating that "the laws are for all those who inhabit Roumania and who have an equal right to protection without

distinction of religion."

In reply to representations made by Mellinet, the French Consul General at Bucharest, Cogalniceanu issued a pamphlet under the title of Note of the Minister of the Interior to the President of the Council of Ministers, in which he argued that the Jewish question was an internal affair of Roumania. Furthermore, he declared that his country had an autonomous status which was respected even by the Sultan. He maintained that the Jewish question was not religious, but ~~an~~ economic; that his country was always tolerant; that Jews lacked patriotism and were always an alien element; that, instead of looking to the government for relief, they invoked foreign influence abroad, such as the Alliance Israelite Universelle. He averred that the ministerial order issued against the Jews in the villages on June 6, 1869, was lawful, because they were not permitted to live there. He believed that a constitutional commission would be acceptable to the people.

While waiting at Rusciuc, in 1869, for the arrival of the Austrian emperor, Minister Cogalniceanu pledged that except for the right to engage in the liquor traffic in the villages, all civil rights would be restored to the Jews in the principalities.

In fairness to Cogalniceanu, it must be said that he felt confronted by a situation which Bratiano had created by his circulars. The country was in a nervous state, <sup>a condition</sup> ~~not a condition~~ created by Bratiano's henchmen. Cogalniceanu was a man of sound judgment. He was also free of that venom and bitter hatred in which his predecessor in office excelled. He could not let things rest as they were, nor could he resort to the methods of Bratiano.

The continued protests made by foreign powers also gave him cause for serious thought. He got a notion to settle the expelled Jews in the lands of Bessarabia, and believed that this would eventually satisfy the European Powers; there would be no more expulsions, and Jews would become a useful and productive element in the country.

Before putting this plan into execution, he issued a circular to the prefects in Moldavia, on August 16, 1868, acquainting them with his plan and requesting them to make a survey of the ~~regions~~ regions-state lands -- and to report their fitness in every respect. Great Britain, however, did not favor this plan.

At the instance of the Alliance, as a result of the disturbing conditions prevailing in Roumania in 1869, the French Consul General in Bucharest, Mellinet, addressed a letter of sharp protest to the Roumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs in mid-June, 1869. In a similar protest addressed to D. Ghica, the British representative declared: "All the guaranteeing Powers, supported by public opinion everywhere, expressed to the General Golesco government their disapproval of measures similar to those which have now been taken against the Jews in Moldavia, And the present cabinet under the presidency of Your Excellency, must expect to incur censure no less energetic."

In the midst of this whirl, the authorities in the principalities did not agree with the respective policies which they were pursuing or were to pursue. Cogalniceanu found it hard to understand Bratiano's intentions. In his absence, Boeresco undid what Cogalniceanu had done, and on his return, Cogalniceanu

rejected Boeresco's acts. Boeresco, in his capacity as Minister of Justice, tried to convince the Earl of Clarendon, in London, that "the Jews, particularly those of Moldavia, were as rough and barbaric as in the Middle Ages." When the Earl suggested that they ought to be civilized by kind treatment, Boeresco agreed, and promised to comply with his advice.

Cogalniceanu, on the other hand, assured the British Consul General that he was "the best friend the Jews have in the principalities" that he had sanctioned the erection of two synagogues, much against local opposition; that he was even in favor of granting political rights to Jews. He stated that to one concession he would agree, namely, that Jews could sell spirituous beverages to the Moldavian peasants. To make sure that the peasants would not become "demoralized," he sent out a circular order decreeing that, with the approaching fall, Jews should disappear from the villages. He also introduced in Parliament a bill for the appointment of a commission for the study of the Jewish situation, so that the government might be able to draft laws regulating their condition consistent with the needs of the country.

On the occasion of a visit of Prince Carol to Vienna in 1869, a delegation of Viennese Jews, called on him pleading in behalf of their coreligionists in Roumania.

In the British House of Commons, <sup>one member,</sup> ~~Deputy~~ Solomon, exhorted the British government to implore the Roumanian government to treat its Jews in the spirit of the 19th century. The under-Secretary informed him that the government had already made such representations.

Berthold Auerbach, the eminent German-Jewish poet and novelist, was an intimate friend of Prince Antoine Hohenzollern. Well-informed about the persecutions of the Jews in Roumania, Auerbach decided to go to that country and appeal to his friend on the throne in behalf of his persecuted fellow-Jews.

The visit which Moses Montefiore made there altered his plans. He, therefore, wrote to Prince Antoine in 1869 and received the following reply:

" Revered friend: I would have answered your very serious letter long before, if in that interval, I had not been carried away by an anxiety to make sure of the very alarming dispatches regarding Jewish persecution in Moldavia which came to my notice. My son feels deeply hurt that such arbitrary action should be in the remotest degree imputed to him. He and his government positively deny that such shameful abuse of power has been inflicted on the Jews, and they ascribe the origin of these widely circulated stories to certain sources abroad unfriendly to Roumania.

" But since there is a possibility that terroristic measures may have been taken by some low-ranking functionaries, my son has firmly decided that, if such events should happen again, he will investigate them personally and severely punish the guilty without regard in which political interests they may have been acting. By this act he aligns himself with the views of humanity and shows openly that he is bent on rooting out vileness wherever he may find it. His spirit and feeling of heart and his entire upbringing stand me as a guaranty."

Prince Antoine was anxious to subdue the tone of the Vienna Freie Presse with which Auerbach was connected, in regard to the Roumanian Jewish question. Being so intimate with Auerbach, Antoine had addressed himself to him ( 1868 ) and asked him to use his influence in that regard. In his anxiety to create the desired effect, and without thinking of its consequences, Auerbach had transmitted the letter to the editor,

who was thrilled with it and made it front page news. This greatly embarrassed Prince Antoine. The Jews in Roumania, on the other hand, gave this letter a friendly interpretation.

Kaiser Wilhelm I, of Germany, had little sympathy with Carol's excuses with regard to the oppression of the Jews in the principalities. In a letter addressed to the Prince he criticized his government severely for its harsh dealings with the Jews.

Unmindful of the criticisms made abroad, the politicians in the principalities found it to their advantage to oppress the Jews. In order to make themselves popular and to win votes in the elections, they would paint the Jews in the blackest colors, and held them up as the only cause of domestic troubles, promising, if elected, that the Jews would be driven from the country. While each politician and office seeker was painting such terrible pictures of the Jews and of the beautiful paradise in which the people would be living after his election, his eye was on the ballot, and his mind was fixed on the harvest which he would reap by making the Jews pay for every word which he was not saying against them.

The year 1869 had left Roumanian Jews deprived of basic rights, in spite of the international intervention and greatly publicized picture of the plight and destiny of this considerable part of the Roumanian population.

Chapter XXXI  
~~Part Four~~

ATTEMPTS AT SOLUTION

The period from 1870 to 1872

THE ISMAIL AFFAIR

Two years passed during which the Jewish situation did not change. At the close of 1869, renewed riots signaled the revival of anti-Jewish discriminations. In the district of Bacau Jewish homes were pillaged and the inmates driven from their dwellings. Ninety-four Jewish families, comprising about 500 persons, were expelled early in 1870 from the district of Falciu.

A city ordinance forbade Jews to employ Christian servants. The application, however, was left to the discretion of the local officials. Two years later, in 1872, Mayor Gusti issued an order to raid Jewish homes in search of Christian servants. The servants -- valets, coachmen, wet nurses, governesses, and maids} -- pleaded at the City Hall for permission to remain with their Jewish employers.

During the Easter holiday of 1870, riots broke out at Tecuci. The government restored order by sending troops. On May 29 and 30 of the same year, riots broke out at Botoshani, but were soon suppressed.

An incident at Giurgiu, on June 7 of that year, caused a break of relations between Austria and Roumania. Two Austrian Jewish tradesmen arrived at Giurgiu but were not allowed to land. When they protested they were detained by the Roumanian police. After a strong protest by the Austrian consul they were released.



They were Austrian subjects and the Roumanian government had to pay them damages amounting to 1,000 francs.

Count Daru, Lord Lyons, and Baron Metternich met in February, 1870, and discussed the Roumanian situation in view of the pledge given by Cogalniceanu that the council of Ministers, and not the government would take up the Jewish question. Otherwise it would immediately cause the intervention of the other powers.

Meanwhile, the Chica cabinet resigned. A new cabinet was formed and it followed the Bratiano policy. Cogalniceanu again reminded the prefects about the law forbidding Jews to live in the villages. In Parliament, the Minister of the Interior was questioned about the activity of the Alliance Israelite Universelle in Roumania, which the government considered offensive, and about the assurance given to Lord Clarendon that the Jews would be emancipated.

Parliamentary deputies collected funds from Jews promising to make bills introduced against them ineffective. It became quite a source of revenue to them. Journalists and editors resorted to the same tactics. Soon private schemers also found it profitable. Pascu, editor of Adunarea Nationala, conceived a scheme to publish a pamphlet of an alleged confession of a ritual murder by a Jassy rabbi. He then extorted a considerable sum of money from gullible Jews, and fleeced a number of his Christian friends.

In March, 1871, the Council of Ministers passed a law denying foreigners without specific vocation entry to the country. However, those with a minimum capital of 5,000 piasters were permitted to enter. Since most Jewish merchants conducted an interstate business, this law was aimed specifically at them.

The Jassy tobacco factory owned by the state employed over 1,000 workers, all Jews, as no Christians were available, but the mayor prohibited Jews from dealing in tobacco. He also excluded Jews from being employed as cattle slaughterers. All Jewish protests were ignored.

The mayor also objected strongly to Jews owning pharmacies. A native of Jassy, Sigmund Blaustein, holding a pharmacist's license approved by the Minister, was not permitted to open a drug store. Finally, an order from Bucharest made the mayor change his decision, and the permit was issued.

In Galatz, Jews were not permitted to erect a new synagogue on the ground that it would be located too close to a Church.

In recruiting the 1870 contingent for the army, the prefect at Botoshani ordered the local commission to raid the synagogue, and seize boys eligible for military conscription.

These frightful reports reached the Jews in the United States and prompted them to take some action. A meeting was held in the home of Joseph Seligman, president of the American Roumanian Society, to organize proper aid for their fellow-Jews in Roumania.

At the same time, Simon Wolf, president of the American Order of B'Nai B'rith, interceded with the United States government to instruct Edward Joy Morris, its Minister at Constantinople, to inquire about the Jewish situation in Roumania. At that time the question of a commercial agent to Roumania was being discussed. Adolph Buchner, a native Roumanian Jew of Bucharest, was recommended to the United States Senate for appointment as American Consul General. However, the Roumanian government did not approve the appointment. <sup>The</sup> B'nai

B'rith then succeeded in having Benjamin Franklin Peixotto appointed to the post, and the Roumanian government agreed.

Some Romanian Jews, however, were not satisfied with this appointment because Peixotto lacked knowledge of Roumanian and French, two languages indispensable for diplomatic service in Roumania. They preferred Buchner.

Nevertheless, the appointment of Peixotto was confirmed and he assumed office during one of the darkest periods of Roumanian history. Moses Montefiore's visit to Roumania failed to improve the condition of the Jews. Cremieux's efforts were also painfully disappointing. Peixotto's arrival in December, 1871, aroused new hopes in the hearts of the Jews, who looked upon him almost as a new Messiah. An American diplomat, a Jew, they thought, would be able to open new vistas for them. They would be given a chance to live and work like their coreligionists in the countries of the western world.

The Jewish press in Roumania and in western European countries was profuse in praising Peixotto. A Hebrew writer, M. S. Rabener, publisher of the Hebrew quarterly Zimrath Haaretz, dedicated an issue to him (1872) exalting and praising the noted American Jew. Poems in Hebrew Biblical style and literary beauty, were written about the newly-appointed diplomat from America.

#### THE ISMAIL AFFAIR

Ismail, a town in Bessarabia with a population of 20,000, mostly Russians and Bulgarians, and only about 800 Jewish families, witnessed a blasphemous theft committed in one of the churches on the night of January 2, 1872. The theory was advanced that it was not an ordinary robbery, but an act of desecration. Jacob Silberman, a converted Jew from Lithuania, who was a deserter from the Russian Army, and had lived in Ismail only three months,

was arrested on suspicion. At first he incriminated his employer, a Jewish tailor, who was immediately arrested and tortured in order to compel him to make a confession and to reveal his accomplices. The tailor's house was searched, but no trace of his guilt was found. The thief then brought in the name of M. Goldschlager, president of the congregation, as the instigator of the theft. "He took me to the church," Silberman said. "He promised to make me the richest man in the world, and a saint among Jews, if I would commit the sacrilege." Some of the stolen articles, with the exception of a cross, were found in the latrine of the Hotel Pascatowitz, some in the Place Iliadi. The rabbi and Goldschlager lived in this hotel, and the synagogue was situated in the Place Iliadi. The rabbi and Goldschlager were placed under arrest.

Riots followed. In the evening of January 24, 1872, a number of Jewish homes on the outskirts of the town were totally wrecked and the inmates beaten. Over sixty homes were destroyed. This riotous orgy continued for two days and nights, up to ~~the~~ <sup>26</sup> ~~26th~~ of January. In the course of the riots, while the infuriated mob was devastating the town, the prefect was engaged in a card game in the home of a friend. It was later proved that seven weeks in advance he had had full knowledge of this orgy. None of the local authorities, however, was called upon to answer for this lack of action.

Some of the wealthier Jews of Ismail left the town, while those who lacked the means found themselves on the streets,

without shelter, clothing, or food. Their Christian friends of yesterday now looked upon them with scorn and vindictiveness. Only the Greeks of the town were sympathetic toward the Jews. The Greek consul especially exerted himself, and rendered as much comfort and aid as he could to these unfortunates. Most of the Jews of Ismail hid themselves as soon as those riots broke out; others took refuge at the homes of their consuls.

On January 29, 1872, information came to the Austrian consul at Bucharest regarding ill-treatment of Jews at Ismail. Inquiries made at the offices of the ministry of the interior brought no information. Strict silence was maintained by the government.

On February 2, 1872, the American consul general at Bucharest received from the Jews of Wilcow, a fishing village on the Black Sea with twenty Jewish families, the following telegram:

"We are all robbed, stripped of our homes and beaten: in immediate danger of our lives. We pray you to intercede with the Roumanian government. Unhappy Jewish Congregation, Wilcow."

~~At his request, a military detachment was sent to this hamlet.~~ At his request, a military detachment was sent to this hamlet. On February 7, Jews were again molested at Ismail. Disorders also broke out in Cahul, an adjacent town. Several persons were killed and a number injured. The British Consul General in Bucharest called a meeting of his colleagues for the purpose of according protection to the Jews. After considerable damage had been done at Ismail, a military detachment arrived at last. Goldschlager and the rabbi were still under arrest.

When news of disorders came from other places, the government sent additional troops. An investigation committee arrived from Bucharest and found local authorities uncooperative. Witnesses were intimidated or disappeared suddenly, and the Jews were continually terrorized. The general opinion was that the government was responsible for the riots.

The impoverished Jewish community of Ismail issued a heart-rending appeal for help. Peizotto warmly endorsed the appeal. The entire civilized world was shocked by these events, and other European powers were moved to take action against Roumania.

On February 12, Earl Granville, the British Foreign Secretary, telegraphed to <sup>the</sup> British Consul, Green, in Bucharest to do "what he could for the protection of the Jews at Ismail." At the same time Granville, supported by the Italian government, proposed a conference of the powers. Russia and Germany were reluctant to accept the proposal, claiming that this would stir up the Eastern question again.

At a meeting in the Mansion House in London, the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Bishop of Gloucester protested against the

anti-Jewish riots at Ismail. The Roumanian government was bitterly condemned and held responsible for these attacks. Immediate relief was demanded for the oppressed Jews. The American Consul General sent a report to Secretary <sup>of State</sup> Hamilton Fish in Washington, and immediately received instructions to help the victims. The Board of Delegates of American Israelites was kept informed, of the course of events.

At Ismail the <sup>(district attorney)</sup> procurator made his investigation as a result of which the rabbi and several of the other arrested Jews were set free. This action brought forth strong protests from the other people of Ismail, who demanded that Parliament order the punishment and expulsion of the Jews. Many other petitions were sent from Bessarabia to Parliament requesting that the Jews be expelled from the entire province.

Finally 180 rioters were arrested, of whom thirty were indicted. At Ploesti, where the examination was conducted, the apostate exonerated the arrested Jews and declared them innocent of having had any part in this crime. He claimed that the police coerced him into blaming the rabbi and the president of the congregation. This declaration, however, did not appease the incited people, and riots spread to other towns such as Galatz and Kilia.

Cahul, a small town on the banks of the Pruth, with a population of 17,000 of whom 1,000 were Jews, was invaded by peasants bound on driving out the Jews. A local prominent Jew reported it to the prefect, who dispatched a military detachment

to patrol the streets. As a precautionary measure, six hundred of the Jews were placed in the military barracks for safety. They remained there several days.

While the trial of Ismail rioters was going on at Ploesti a movement was started to massacre the local Jews. The case was transferred to Buzeu, where it was tried before a jury of twelve peasants, of whom nine were illiterate. <sup>They</sup> ~~and~~ found the defendants guilty. Silberman was sentenced to five years at hard labor. The rabbi, Goldschlager, and three other Jews were sentenced to three years' at hard labor. A sentence of solitary confinement of two other Jews was commuted to two years' ordinary imprisonment.

In Parliament, several deputies severely criticized the district attorney and the government, and bitterly assailed the Jews, although the government admitted that they had been beaten by Greeks and Russians. Peixotto, not satisfied with the government's explanation, requested a meeting of the Consuls. The meeting was held at the British Consulate. There it was established beyond doubt that the official version of the turmoil was not in accord with the facts.

The Jewish community of Ismail delegated two representatives to present a memorandum to the Roumanian government and ask for protection for the Jews. One of the representatives was a Jewish farmer named Calman Goldenberg, a British subject who had resided in Ismail for six years.

The memorandum, addressed to Minister Catargiu, sought to establish the innocence of the accused by pointing out relevant



facts which had not been presented when the trumped-up charges were considered. As previously stated, most of the Greeks at Ismail did not participate in the anti-Jewish riots. The Greek Consul at Ismail proudly reported to his superior, the Consul General in Bucharest, as follows:

"What I observe with regard to the animosity and hatred against the Israelites is general: but what, on the other hand, makes me feel proud is the attitude of our nationals, who not only abstained from mixing in the barbaric scenes, but have given generous protection to the persecuted Jews."

On February 27, 1872, the British Consul General at Bucharest forwarded to Earl Granville, at London, a copy of a petition handed to him by Peixotto, which had been presented to the Roumanian government by the Jewish deputation at Cahul. This petition stated the grievances of the Jews, and pointed to the role of the local administration in inciting the riots. On receipt of this petition, Granville telegraphed instructions to Green to investigate the situation, and make a strong protest to the Roumanian government. Green, not satisfied with the general apologetic statement of the Roumanian attorney general, decided to interrogate Prime Minister Catargiu.

He explained the Catargiu how Great Britain felt about the serious charges of the delegates of the Jewish community of Cahul; that they had "caused a most painful impression, and it is surprising that such barbarities could be practiced, if not without complicity, at least with the remissness of the Roumanian

officials." Catargiu countered with the assurances that "the most energetic measures were already being taken to protect the Jews, and that a number of functionaries had been dismissed, and that many of the accusations made by the Jews were baseless."

Green was not pleased by this evasive reply and reminded the Minister of the many broken promises and unfulfilled pledges.

Although Costaforu had promised the foreign agents and the Chambers to send a report of his investigation regarding the dismissed functionaries, a month passed, but no report was forthcoming. A telegram from the Jews in Cahul to Peixotto, contradicted Catargiu's statement. Forty-six arrested as principal rioters were set free, and the lives of all the Jews in the community were still in danger.

Green was determined to force a clear statement of the situation. In a letter to Earl Granville on March 25, he wrote; "I shall continue to do all in my power to obtain redress for the past and security for the future."

With Jewish Passover approaching, and with a frightful forecast of a possible revival of the blood accusation, Sir Francis Goldsmid wrote to Viscount Enfield (April 11, 1872), suggesting that Lord Granville should instruct Green to remind the Roumanian government of the necessity of taking precautions to prevent such accusations.

This being accomplished, the Roumanian authorities received a note from the British Consul General on the matter. The Prince gave assurance that his government had taken all possible precautions

for the safety of the Jews.

The apprehension of English Jewry prompted them to further action. A number of eminent English Jews planned to call a meeting in London to discuss the Jewish difficulties in Roumania. They wanted to be informed by Peixotto what Roumania had done in that respect. Green had a long conversation with Peixotto and the required information was forwarded to Anthony Rothschild.

After a visit of the attorney general, Minister of Justice, Costafora, decided to make a personal inquiry, and went to Bessarabia, visiting Ismail, Wilcow and Cahul. Green was then informed by Prince Carol that, according to reports from Costafora, "The Jews have been treated most cruelly, and are entitled to relief." The acting German Consul informed Green that he had been directed by his government to act in concert with his colleagues regarding the protection of the Jews.

The verdict against the innocent Jews tried for the Ismail crime aroused great indignation and shocked the representatives of the foreign powers. The French, German, English, and Italian representatives received instructions from their governments to send a protest to the Roumanian government. They drew up the protest and all the Consuls, except the Russian, signed it.

In a letter to Carol, the German Emperor also touched upon the verdict of the Roumanian jury, and although he admitted a dislike for the Jews, he thought the verdict was cruel and reflected on the good faith of the Roumanian government.

The joint diplomatic note of protest produced quick results. The Rabbi and the President of the congregation, who had been convicted, were immediately set free by a decree signed by the Prince on April 20, 1872.

The Jewish community of Ismail was jubilant and sent Peixotte a letter of gratitude for his untiring efforts in behalf of the accused Jews. A dinner was tendered in his honor. The Jewish community at Bucharest adopted a resolution expressing gratitude for his efforts in behalf of all the Jews in Roumania.

Unfortunately, the relations between Peixotto and some of the Roumanian Jewish leaders soon cooled. Considering themselves to be Roumanian patriots, they resented external interference in the internal affairs of their country.

Despite the apparent solution of the Ismail affair, the vexatious question of Roumanian Jews was still on the minds of European diplomats and statesmen. Sir Francis Goldsmid, in a letter to Earl Granville, of April 26, 1872, maintained that "it is of little use to repeat at Bucharest representations like those which have hitherto produced so little effect, and some strong proceedings are indispensable."

Since under Article 27 of the Treaty of Paris, and Article 8 of the Convention of 1858, the guaranteeing powers had the full right to authorize Turkey to interfere to restore internal order, Sir Francis suggested that England propose to the other guarantee powers, that they should unite in requesting measures necessary for placing the Jews in a position conforming to the convention of

1858, and for securing their persons and properties. Such measures should include the immediate liberation of the four Jews falsely convicted, and the indemnification of the Jews for the sufferings they had been caused through the riots at Ismail, Wilcow, and Cahul. However, in order to determine the precise nature of the measures to be taken, the powers should appoint, and request Roumania to receive a joint commission charged with the settlement of this important question.

England rejected Goldsmid's suggestion that the powers, guarantors of Roumania invoke the Treaty of Paris, which they had signed, on the grounds that Russia would not collaborate, and that intervention would be ineffectual unless it was backed by an armed force. Nevertheless, the British government indicated its willingness to circularize the signatory powers with a view to making a joint representation. Only Russia refused to collaborate in such collective effort.

Britain was, therefore, resolved to press for a resolution in Roumania. Dissatisfied with the protracted measures and meager results, she addressed herself to Turkey, the suzerain of Roumania, and received a very encouraging reply.

In the meantime (April 27, 1872) Minister Costaforo had sent to foreign agents of Roumania a lengthy circular restating boldly the official position of his government in the Ismail affair. The purpose was to offset the joint note which the diplomatic agents of the foreign powers had sent on April 18.

Instead of publishing this circular denying the facts and impeaching the veracity of all the foreign agents in Bucharest, Costaforo could have taken the proper and more honorable course, by publishing the result of the judicial investigation and thus, establish<sup>ing</sup> the truth. This he could not afford to do, so he followed the less honorable course of instituting proceedings against the Greek Consul at Braila in retaliation for his signing the joint note. Similarly, he endeavored to have the United States recall its Consul General from Bucharest.

Whatever effect the circular letter sent by Costaforo to the Roumanian agents abroad may have had on public opinion, it was clear that the events at Ismail, Cahul, and Wilcow had made a very bad impression.

Roumania was ready to claim innocence. Costafor~~o~~ undertook a whitewashing mission to Turkey. Meeting the British representative, H. Elliot, at Therapia, he hastened to assure him that all the reports were exaggerated and that "the Jews had not been ill-treated at all; in reality, their position is more satisfactory, than that of the Christian public." To bolster his contention, he submitted a propaganda pamphlet on the Jewish question prepared by his government.

But the Englishman informed him that if this document had to be taken as the expression of his government, there was no hope for a mutual understanding. Costaforo then attempted appeasement. He said that police protection had been increased considerably and that the jury law of his country would be modified. He hoped, therefore, that his government would "not be pressed by any collective action of the other Powers, which would greatly add to the difficulties which already beset Prince Carol." However, Elliot was unconvinced and persistent.

To Server Pasha, Costaforo repeated the promise given to Elliot. The Pasha was anxious to know whether Great Britain would not abstain from advocating a joint representation to Prince Carol. Particularly, was he in favor of abolishing the jury system because of the "total unfitness of the Roumanian people for such an institution." Elliot replied that "what was known of Roumanian judges was not calculated to inspire much confidence." It was then suggested to Costaforo that, instead of abolishing trial by jury, it would be more advisable to admit Jews as jurors. This was rejected by the Roumanian minister as preposterous.

The task of the Roumanian Minister's journey to Turkey was self-evident. His government wanted to immobilize the joint representation of the foreign representatives. Costaforo even suggested that the British Consul in Bucharest should mention the localities where an increase of police force was needed. But the Britisher was skeptical and insisted that as long as Costaforo continued to blame the Jews, he "must not expect her Majesty's government to agree with him."

Finding the propaganda pamphlet ineffectual, and with world opinion unfavorable to Roumania, her officials were in search of new unexplained arguments and alibis. The blame for the state of affairs was put on Peixotto, ~~the U.S. Consul in Roumania~~. The American Jew, a distinguished lawyer, was labelled as the chief trouble maker.

In a note of July 21, 1872, to Earl Granville, St. John, the British Consul, spoke in a different way. He regretted that the collective missive had never reached the public, as it was never intended to lower the Roumanian people in the eyes of the other nations. He joined the Roumanian statesmen in blaming Peixotto.

He suggested to Peixotto, that he propose some scheme for the emigration of the Jews to the United States. The American Consul was not averse to the idea. According to St. John, Peixotto had inquired of the Roumanian government what assistance it would offer to emigrants, but all it offered was free passports to poor Jews. St. John made his deduction that "should the facility offered for emigration be insufficient to induce the Jewish population to avail themselves of the opportunity, it would go far to refute the accusation brought by Peixotto against the authorities in this country." In answer to his note, the Roumanian government declared that at the moment, it would not take definite measures in the absence of the legislature, but that it would submit the question to the Chambers as soon as the sessions were resumed. Meanwhile, the Minister of Foreign Affairs obtained from his colleagues the authority to give



free passports to all the Israelites who wished to leave the country, in order to establish themselves somewhere else. The declaration of the Council of Ministers was highly approved <sup>by</sup> ~~by His Highness~~, the reigning Prince.

Francis Goldsmid did not approve of Peixotto's scheme. He averred that removing a few thousand Jews might be feasible, but not 200,000. "It would serve<sup>d</sup>, he wrote to Hammond (September 11, 1872), "only to divert attention from the really important question as to what measures should the Roumanian government take to protect its Jews from oppression, and secure for them the civil rights to which they are entitled according to the ordinary rules of justice, and under the express stipulation of the treaties guaranteeing the political existence of Roumania.

A second collective note by the foreign representatives in Bucharest was addressed to the Roumanian government in June, 1872, in regard to the Buzeu trial. This was signed by Germany, Austria, the United States, France, Great Britain, Italy, Greece, and Holland.

The British vice-Consul, S<sup>r</sup>. John had developed a pro-Roumanian attitude, and even more, a lack of sympathy with the view of the American Consul General which were shared by his colleague, H. Elliot, the British Consul General at Therapia. In a letter of September 16, 1872, to Earl Granville, Elliot wrote:

"No one can pretend to deny that the Jews are cruelly oppressed in those {Roumanian countries, but I may be permitted to observe that the very gross exaggerations of the ill treatment to which they were subjected are universally attributed to the American Consul General at Bucharest, even when not apparently emanating from that source."

Elliot even hinted that the American Consul at Therapia "would not concur in this opinion," and in a letter of September 14, 1872, to Earl Granville, he contradicted Elliot's view. All that he had previously said regarding the ill-treatment of the Jews, he found to be true. He quoted Gostaforo as telling him that "the state of suffering to which the Jewish population had been reduced was a most heartrending sight which had drawn tears from his eyes and gold from his pocket."

"Leaving aside the barbarity of the mob," continued Green, "the torture to which the Jewish prisoners were subjected by the officials seems to be established beyond a doubt." No one trusted Peixotto, and asked him for supporting testimony, which the American Consul gladly supplied.

The public indignation against the Roumanian government expressed itself in a spontaneous campaign for funds for the unfortunate..

Sticking to its version, however, the Roumanian government continued to plead innocence. Judge Sturza, who denied Jews the right to defend themselves in court, and who introduced the oath More Judaico, was dismissed by the Minister of Justice. The storm over the Ismail affair quieted down. The Roumanian government took steps towards placating the European powers and public opinion. A brief period of relative freedom from violent oppression rewarded the Jews for the years of unrest and insecurity they had suffered in Roumania.

CHAPTER ~~SEVENTEEN~~ XXXIITHE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND THE ROUMANIAN JEWS

The history of the Jews in Roumania would be incomplete without mentioning the part which American Jewry played in it, especially the efforts made in their behalf by the International Order of B'nai B'rith. Nor will the story be complete without narrating the interest taken by the government of the United States. A brief recapitulation is, therefore, necessary.

The situation of the Jews in Roumania had deteriorated so much that the entire civilized world became interested. Great Britain, France, Germany and even Czarist Russia, were moved to action. French Jewry became alarmed, British Jewry read with pain, and American Jewry was stricken with sorrow at the treatment which their coreligionists were receiving at the hands of the Roumanian government. The effects of Cremieux' journey to Bucharest, where he pleaded the cause of his coreligionists in the Roumanian Parliament, and with Prince Carol I, also the effects of Sir Moses Montefiore in Roumania, and his plea for the amelioration of the conditions of the Jews, we have stated at length in a preceding chapter. In 1869 Cremieux went to Roumania again on the same mission. But conditions did not change. Representations were made in 1867 by the American Minister at Constantinople, at the direction of the United States Secretary of State, W. H. Seward, but had no result.

In 1870, the persecution of the Jews in Roumania had reached

such a state that the Board of Delegates of American Israelites brought it to the attention of President Ulysses S. Grant, at the instance of Simon Wolf, of Washington, D.C., at that time president of B'nai B'rith. The Senate passed a resolution of inquiry in regard to the Jewish situation in Roumania, addressed to the president. A similar resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives.

At that time the United States had no consul in Roumania, President Grant now agreed to appoint one to serve at Bucharest. Adolph Buchner, a Roumanian Jew residing in Bucharest, who had served as secretary to Louis J. Czapiny, the former United States Consul there, (June 20, 1866 to June 30, 1869), was about to receive the appointment. However, when Buchner's chances seemed to be meagre, Cremieux appealed to Benjamin Franklin Peixotta, former president of B'nai B'rith, to accept the office; Peixotto agreed and was appointed American Consul General to Roumania.

The appointment was made without provision for the maintenance of the office or salary of the Consul General. The order of B'nai B'rith, together with the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, and the American Roumanian Committee, undertook to provide the necessary funds.

Soon after the formation of the American Roumanian Committee, the London Roumanian Committee rendered valuable assistance in cooperation with the Alliance Israelite Universelle, of Paris, the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden, of Berlin, and the Isrealitische Allianz of Vienna.

In December, 1870, Peixotto went to Washington to receive instructions from Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State, and take leave of President Grant. The president, addressing him, said:

"Respect for human rights is the first duty of those set as rulers over nations. And the humbler, poorer, more abject and more miserable a people may be, black or white, Jew or Christian, the greater should be the concern of those in authority to extend protection, to rescue and redeem them and raise them to equality with the most enlightened. The story of the suffering of the Hebrews of Roumania profoundly touches every sensibility of our nation. It is one long series of outrages and wrongs; even if there be exaggerations in the accounts which have reached us, enough is evident to make it imperative on all civilized nations to extend their moral aid in behalf of a people so unhappy. I trust Prince Charles and his ministers and the public men of that country may be brought to see that the future of their nation lies in a direction totally opposite to these Draconic laws and persecutions, whether great or petty, which have heretofore invidiously marked their character. It is not by Chinese walls or Spanish expatriation that nations great or small can hope to make progress in our day. I have no doubt that your presence and influence together with the efforts of your colleagues of the guaranteeing powers with whom, in this matter, you will always be prompt to act, will result in mitigating the evils complained of and in

terminating them. The United States, knowing no distinction between her own citizens on account of religion or nativity, naturally believes in a civilization the world over which will secure the same universal views."

Peixotto arrived at Bucharest in February 1871. The first person with whom he communicated was the German ~~Consul~~<sup>C</sup> General, von Radowitz. In their conversation the American ~~Consul~~<sup>a</sup> General asked his colleague why the Jews were persecuted in Roumania.

"Because", replied the German representative, "they are more intelligent, industrious, economical, more frugal, and enterprising."

Within a few days Peixotto was received in private audience by Prince Carol, to whom he delivered the following letter from the President of the United States:

"Executive Mansion, Washington, D.C. December 8, 1870. The bearer of this letter, Mr. Benjamin Franklin Peixotto, who has accepted the important, though unremunerative, position of the United States Consul General to Roumania, is commended to the good offices of all representatives of this government abroad. Mr. Peixotto has undertaken the duties of his present office more as a missionary work for the benefit of the people he represents than to secure any benefit for himself -- a work in which all citizens will wish him the greatest success..

The United States, knowing no distinction of her own citizens on account of religion or nativity, naturally believes in a

civilization the world over which will secure the same universal views.

Signed

U. S. Grant"

Peixotto's arrival in 1871, aroused new hopes in the hearts of the Jews, who looked upon him almost as a new Messiah. An American diplomat, a Jew, they thought, would be able to open new vistas for them. They would be given a chance to live and work like their coreligionists in the countries of the Western world.

The Jewish press in Roumania and in western European countries was profuse in praising Peixotto. A Hebrew writer, M.S. Rabener, publisher of the Hebrew quarterly Zimrath Haaretz, dedicated an issue to him (1872) exalting and praising the noted American Jew. Poems in Hebrew Biblical style and literary beauty were written about the newly-appointed diplomat from America.

On April 6, 1871, the American <sup>e</sup>Consul General was officially received by Prince Carol at his palace. After the ceremonies and the official introduction, Peixotto, addressing the Prince, began as follows;

"Monseigneur: In presenting my credentials as representative of the government of the United States, I am happy to be able to express in the name of the President his best wishes for your Highness and for the prosperity of the country over which you have been called to govern.

"Since its foundation the government of the United States has always pursued the objective of entertaining friendly relations with all nations. Making no distinction whatever between their own citizens on account of religion and nationality, they naturally believe in a civilization which will disseminate over the entire globe the same liberty and enlightened views. The Hand of the Creator seems to have especially favored this beautiful land, and if the principles of justice and humanity by which Your Highness is animated in behalf of all its inhabitants, are carried into practice, the most sanguine hopes for its future will no doubt be realized. I shall ~~esteem~~<sup>deem</sup> myself happy if in the exercise of my official functions toward the government of Your Highness I can contribute in some measure to the prosperity and happiness of our respective countries."

In response, Prince Carol said:

"Sir: I have sincerely wished for sometime past to see the United States represented in this country. I am, therefore, happy to receive from your government your credentials as Diplomatic Agent and Consul General to Roumania. I am desirous that the most extended relations may be established between the two countries, The greatest advantage cannot fail to result therefrom for Roumania. I have always greatly admired your country, and I am convinced that it is owing to the blessed and hospitable spirit ~~by~~ which it is animated that it has attained such a high degree of development and prosperity.



"I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you in our midst for many years. My government will not fail to render the accomplishment of your mission as easy and agreeable as it is in their power."

✓ Soon after the arrival of the American <sup>e</sup>Consul General in Bucharest, the "Ismail Affair" (discussed in Chapter XVI), took place. In Washington, on May 20, 1872, the House of Representatives adopted the following resolution, in connection with the Ismail affair. "That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to join with the Italian Government in the protest against the intolerant and cruel treatment of the Jews in Roumania."

Secretary Fish had previously written to the American <sup>e</sup>Consul General at Bucharest as follows (Senate Document #75):  
"Department of State, April 10, 1872, Washington. Among the large number of Israelites in this country, there are probably few whose sympathies have not been intensely excited by the recent intelligence of the grievous persecution of their coreligionists in Roumania. The feeling has naturally been augmented by the contrast presented by the position of members of that persuasion here who are equals with all others before the law, which sternly forbids any oppression on account of religion. Indeed, it may be said that the people of this country universally abhor persecution anywhere for that cause, and deprecate the trials of which, according to later dispatches, the Israelites of Roumania have been victims."

425

"This government heartily sympathized with the popular instinct upon the subject, and while it has no disposition or intention to give offense by impertinently interfering in the internal affairs of Roumania, it is deemed to be due to humanity to remonstrate against any license or immunity which may have attended the outrages in that country. You are, therefore, authorized to address a note to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the principalities in which you will embody the views herein expressed, and you will also do anything which you discreetly can with a reasonable prospect of success towards preventing a recurrence or continuance of the persecution adverted to (Signed) Hamilton Fish".

In addition to the instructions issued to the American <sup>a</sup>Consul General in Bucharest, Fish also wrote to the American <sup>Mr</sup>Ministers at Vienna, London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, St. Petersburg, and Constantinople, as follows:

"Department of State, Washington, July 22, 1872. It has been suggested to this department, and the suggestion is concurred in, that if the sympathies which we entertain for the inhumanely persecuted Hebrews in the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were made known to the government to which you are accredited it might quicken and encourage the efforts of that government to discharge its duty as a protecting power, pursuant to the obligation of the treaty between certain European States. Although we are not a party to that instrument, and, as a rule, scrupulously abstain from interfering directly or indirectly in

the public affairs of that quarter, the grievance adverted to is so enormous as to impart to it, as it were, a cosmopolitan character in the redress of which all countries, governments and creeds are alike interested.

You will consequently communicate on this subject with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in such a way as you may suppose might be likely to compass the object in view, I am, etc. Hamilton Fish".

EVENTS IN THE YEARS 1872-1877

In the fall of 1872, the Parliament opened its new session. The Jewish question was not touched.

The affairs of Ismail, Cahul, and Wilcow were not yet forgotten when a new law was introduced aiming indirectly to deprive a large number of Jews from earning a livelihood. This was the law which excluded foreigners from selling alcohol or keeping inns in Roumania.

Peixotto vigorously remonstrated against the enactment of that law. The Roumanian Jews petitioned the government. The Austrian and Russian subjects residing in Roumania appealed to their respective consuls. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry in lower Austria asked the Austrian government to intercede with the Bratiano ministry, in behalf of these Jewish merchants.

The British government considered taking action, but a competent British jurist explained that this law, "though pressing with great severity against the Jews," was not contrary to Article 46 or any other article of the convention with Turkey of August 19, 1858. Hence, Great Britain would not be justified in taking part in a joint representation to the Roumanian government.

Franc<sup>is</sup>~~is~~ Goldsmid did not share the views of the ~~State~~ jurist. He convinced Granville that such a law was illegal, and asked the British in Vienna and Paris to report what steps the governments to which they were accredited had taken, or proposed to take, with a view to removing the disabilities from which the Jews would have to suffer.

The Jews in Roumania were greatly alarmed and appealed to their English coreligionists.

From information culled from various sources, the picture was very discouraging; Austria had no intention <sup>of</sup> ~~to~~ remonstrat<sup>ing</sup>~~ing~~, and so it was in other countries.

In 1873, Jews were forbidden to deal in tobacco. <sup>This</sup> ~~There, too,~~ restrictions reduced thousands of Jews to a state of poverty.

Although Prince Carol vetoed the tobacco law which had forced the Jews to resort to contraband, he defended the new liquor law and expressed himself firmly in favor of its enforcement, in spite of the violent condemnation abroad.

While the Roumanian situation was being aired in Europe by Great Britain, Peixotto brought the matter personally before the Sublime Porte calling attention to violations of provisions in the commercial treaty by the newly-enacted liquor law.

However, under the various conventions and conferences of the powers, the principalities were given a position which deprived the Sublime Porte of authority. While still under Turkish suzerainty, the Sublime Porte had no voice in the internal affairs of Roumania. Under the terms of the treaty between Turkey and the European powers, however, representations could be made to the controlling power for infractions of treaty obligations, but not as a suzerain power.

Disheartened by the recent defeats, the Jews renewed the struggle for civil and political rights. In this connection, a petition had been submitted (1874) and a copy forwarded to Earl Granville.

In February, 1874, a second petition prepared by Peixotto was filed by the Roumanian Jews in which they pleaded with Parliament for the rights of citizens, and denied allegations that they were aliens.

The liquor license law created perplexing problems. It was about to go into effect -- on April 3, 1874 -- and the Roumanian government was now anxious to have it postponed. It could not be repealed since the government was about to negotiate a loan abroad. A postponement

was almost a political necessity. Occidental Jewry sensed the propitious moment to approach the Roumanian government in behalf of the Jews.

On April 1, 1874, Goldsmid submitted to Lord Derby, the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, an essential memorandum on the situation of the Jews in Roumania, giving a summary of the events concerning them during the years 1867 through 1874. He pleaded with Lord Derby to exert himself in their behalf.

Unfortunately for the Jews, the Roumanian Chambers adjourned on April 4, without amending the liquor law. The Foreign Office advised Goldsmid on April 8 that assurance had been given to Consul General Green by the ministers that "great lenience will be shown in carrying out the law, and that verbal instructions to that effect have been forwarded to the local authorities." The "lenience" did not materialize. In a dispatch transmitted to Lord Derby complaints were expressed that "the law prohibiting Jews from selling spirituous liquor is being violently enforced."

On June 1, Lord Derby asked the British consul general at Bucharest to "urge strongly in the name of Her Majesty's Government that the promises of the Roumanian government respecting the Jews should be honorably fulfilled." On June 8, 1874, a deputation of Roumanian Jews called on Vivian, imploring him to use his influence in behalf of their coreligionists in Moldavia. At the same time the American consul general urged him to demand the immediate repeal of the obnoxious article in the liquor law.

Shortly after that, Vivian had an interview with Boeresco, and reminded him of his promise, which he did not deny. However, he said the government had instructed the prefects and the local authorities, as far as possible, not to enforce the law. They could not do the same in

the villages, he explained, because the peasants were being corrupted and ruined by the Jews.

Information pouring in described the plight of the victims of this restriction as frightful. Peixotto informed Goldsmid: "In the Bacau district 400 to 500 families were reduced to a state of starvation; in the districts of Roman and Focshani the utmost destitution prevailed; besides being thrown out of their stands in several villages, the Jews have been driven from their homes and ordered never to return."

The situation of the Jews afflicted by this law was indeed extremely precarious. Since the foreign representatives did not manifest a unity of action, there was little hope of improvement. The Roumanian government was aware of that discord.

The British representative pointed out to his colleagues that it would be dictating to the government if they were to set the time and method of repealing the anti-Jewish legislation, and that it might rebound against them at some future time. It was decided, therefore, to dangle the breach of faith before the eyes of the Roumanian government. This was their strongest weapon and the most vulnerable spot for the Roumanian government. Accordingly, appropriate letters were addressed to Boeresco by the French, German and British consuls.

While this action was being discussed by the representatives of the foreign Powers, the American consul general went a step further by demanding an audience with Prince Carol. The British representative declined to join him, but did address a communication to Minister Boeresco on June 9, 1874.

Evading the issue, Boeresco tried to explain to the British consul the distinction between Christians, foreign Jews, and native Jews. He claimed that in his promises he referred to the two classes -- Christians and foreign Jews -- only. Vivian pointed out that the pledge concerned

non-enforcement of the law. In principle, therefore, there was no question of foreign Jews, because their interests were sufficiently protected by other agents. Boeresco hoped to escape the issue by stating that if the subject concerned only Roumanians, the foreign governments should not interfere as it was strictly an internal affair. Vivian replied that he never interfered, but in a friendly way gave his interpretation of the matter of the persecution of the Jews.

Finally, Boeresco stated that all his government could promise in the case of the Roumanian Jews in the rural communities, was that the law would be applied as leniently as possible. Driving them from their homes he considered illegal. If the Jews would remain in their homes, and sell liquor in the name of a Roumanian, the government would not look upon it as an evasion of the law.

He also pledged that at the opening of the next session of Parliament, the repeal of Article 8 of the liquor law would be taken up and replaced by a law of police regulation and control of the leasing of public houses in the rural comunas.

Vivian was convinced that the Boeresco government would remove the objectionable laws.

The interview between the British consul general and Boeresco was brought to the attention of Queen Victoria and its context approved. Goldsmid received a telegram from the American consul general at Bucharest telling him that "the Roumanian government has firmly stopped the execution of the law excluding Jews from the trade in spirituous liquors."

In August, 1874, Prince Carol visited England. Goldsmid lost no time in availing himself of this excellent opportunity to urge Lord Derby to express to Carol that "Roumania cannot expect to be regarded by other states as a civilized country, or that her views and wishes would have the same weight as they might otherwise possess, as long as a numerous class of her subjects are exposed to persecution on account of



their religion." He also informed Lord Derby of the letters which he had received recently from Jews in all parts of Moldavia, complaining of persecution. Those unfortunate Jews had the courage to write to their more fortunate coreligionists abroad about their troubles; however, when the British consul general was making a tour of the country to investigate the complaints and learn about conditions at first hand, they were afraid to talk.

It turned out that Lord Derby was unable to see Prince Carol during his stay in London. In a letter to Goldsmid on August 29 he informed him that he would not have an opportunity to see the prince, but he assured Goldsmid of his continuing concern over the hardships to which the Jews in the principalities were subjected. On September 20, 1874, the London Roumanian Committee, of which Goldsmid was chairman, passed a resolution of gratitude to Lord Derby, and it was promptly acknowledged with thanks.

In November, 1874, the Jewish Messenger, of New York City, published an attack on the Roumanian government for its maltreatment of the Jews. As was to be expected, the government newspapers in Roumania retaliated with a similar attack on the American consul general at Bucharest, for his meddling in a "social question which is misunderstood and exaggerated abroad, and which time and the country itself, if left alone, will certainly settle in due time."

This brought forth letters from seven leading Jews in Bucharest, endorsing the view of the Roumanian newspapers, and expressing their belief that their salvation would come from the government and the legislature of Roumania.

The elections brought the government a thorough victory. The Jews' hope was now regarded as more favorable in accordance with the promises made by Boeresco and Catargiu. But reality did not confirm the expectations. A change in the liquor law would make the government unpopular.

The British consul general reminded Boeresco of his promise, but the minister replied that political reasons compelled a postponement until April or May of 1875. He believed that a project of law could then be introduced to the Chambers with a greater chance of success. Meanwhile, the appeal pending at Jassy with regard to Jewish rights in communal elections was decided adversely.

The commercial treaties between Roumania and her contracting Powers were now about to expire, and new treaties were being negotiated. Austria-Hungary was the first to open negotiations, and she insisted on reciprocal freedom of commerce for the subjects of the contracting parties without distinction.

The treaty between Austria and Roumania was finally concluded. Jews of Austria residing in Roumania were excluded from some of the benefits conferred upon the subjects of the Austro-Hungarian empire under that treaty. Mocatta, the vice-chairman of the committee to protect Jews in Roumania, asked Lord Derby whether England was willing to conclude a commercial treaty with Roumania along similar lines.

On January 18, 1876, the Anglo-Jewish Association wrote to Lord Derby with regard to certain reforms, especially the removal of some of the disabilities to which Christians in the territory covered by the Sublime Porte were subjected, and also with regard to the inclusion of a provision against Jewish disabilities in the Turkish Empire. Lord Derby replied that he would instruct the British Ambassador at Constantinople to include the Jews in the Turkish Empire.

H. Elliot informed Derby (February 10, 1876) that the Jewish population would henceforth be placed on terms of equality with the Christians. Roumania being Turkish territory, might be compelled to follow the same procedure.

In spite of various remonstrances and of reports by the government, Jews were still exposed to grave perils. According to a communication received from Mocatta and dated May 5, 1876, there were, in some instances, acts of persecution and violence against the Jews.

An edict issued by the prefect of the district declared that Jews were responsible for the misery of the country because the government was too lenient and neglected the enforcement of the rural law in regard to liquor sales. He ordered the enforcement of Articles 8 and 10, and forbade all transactions with Jews. On May 5, 1876, the Jews of Dorohoiu sent a telegram to Peixotto, asking him to request the British Consul General at Bucharest to exercise his influence in their behalf.

On that same day, the British consul general was addressing a communication to Lord Derby, telling him of the political agitation in the course of which the Jewish question cropped up again. As usual, each of the parties had pleaded innocence.

Informed of the Dorohoian affair by the American minister, the British consul telegraphed to the vice-consul at Jassy for detailed information, and also appealed to the president of the Council of Ministers to stop the chicanery before it assumed a nation-wide scope. It resulted in summoning the prefect of Dorohoiu to Bucharest, and a new inquiry by the attorney general.

The Roumanian authorities accused the Jews of factual exaggerations. It was admitted, however, that a Jew was beaten for refusing to pay for a license, and for endeavoring to decamp <sup>with</sup> his property in order to avoid having it attached. The government promised to dismiss the mayor and order a stay of execution for the property owner.

St. John's report confirmed the expulsion and the atrocities, expressed his astonishment at the indifference of the local prefect to a summons

to Bucharest, and suggested that the matters reported might be tied in some way to the candidacy of Bratiano. On receipt of this report the British consul general sent a copy, but without disclosing its source, to Minister Cornea showing him "the serious mischief that has already been done by the recent decree of the local authorities" at Dorohoiu. He again entreated the government "to act promptly; arrest the mischief before it spreads further."

The Roumanian government finished its inquiry at Dorohoiu on May 12, 1876. The British consul general was then able to send a copy to Lord Derby, adding that he was "assured by the present minister that he will not countenance the revival of the persecution of the Jews in any shape or form."

This report was signed by General Florescu, Minister of the Interior ad interim, who had thoroughly investigated the Dorohoiu affair and found that "there was not one act of persecution against the Israelites, <sup>but</sup> that only a few Jews, seeing that the prefect demanded strict application of the liquor and rural laws, had taken steps to change their domicile on April 3, the usual moving day. It was true that three innkeepers of Vitzcani had complained of having been maltreated by the mayor and that he had prevented their moving. After the judicial authorities came and investigated, they found the complaint unfounded. The prefect, however, had found that the mayor acted without authority of the law, and suspended him at once.

Minister Florescu maintained that, in spite of the complaints of some Jews, there was nothing in the prefect's circular contrary to the law which forbade aliens, without distinction, from engaging in the liquor business. The only fault he found was that the prefect had confined the law to Jews only. The minister promised that nothing would

be done by way of persecution in the enforcement of the liquor law, and that the prefect had taken it upon himself to see that no one gave the law a different interpretation.

A copy of this report was sent by the British Foreign Office to Mr. Moccato, who, on May 22, 1876, acknowledged receipt and expressed the gratitude of British Jewry for the "energetic action of Her Majesty's Government in the recent tolerant proceeding of the Roumanian Minister." He pointed out that it was the prompt representations of Mr. Vivian, acting in concert with the consuls of the Powers, that stayed the persecution of the Jews in Roumania. At the request of Cogalniceanu, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, the prefect was removed from office.

At that time the negotiation of a commercial treaty between Roumania and Great Britain was about to be concluded. Since Austria had already entered into such a treaty with Roumania, Mocatta addressed a communication to Lord Derby (July 5, 1876), pleading with him that Great Britain should take a firm stand. He also communicated with the British Ambassador in France to use his influence with the French government to exclude the objectionable clause from the new treaty. A letter received by Goldsmid from Paris stated that the British government had shown itself indifferent to the Jews in Roumania (in the treaty negotiations); this charge was emphatically denied by Lord Derby.

Some of the wealthy Roumanian Jews disapproved of Peixotto's tactics. One of them was the banker Halfan, who <sup>declared</sup> ~~admitted~~ publicly that Peixotto "made us the laughing stock of the world. Who asked him to denounce our government? And who authorized him to invoke the aid of the enlightened governments? Who told him to cause aid to be sent to the sufferers of Ismail and Cahul? Who sent him to invoke the aid of our government in behalf of those who desired to emigrate? Had he consulted

us? From the moment he put his feet on Roumanian soil he has done us much harm. The people resent Peixotto's appeal to raise money abroad for the poor Roumanian Jews. There are no poor Jews in Roumania. Speak with your brethren in America; let them recall this Peixotto so that he may no more besmire our name."

The wealthy Jews maintained that the motive behind Peixotto's activities was to minimize the influence of the Alliance Israelite Universelle in Paris. The elite of Roumanian Jewry sent a delegation to the Congress at Brussels, in opposition to Peixotto. Its members objected to the interference in the internal affairs of Roumania which "is good enough for us and we have no desire to leave it." Rabbi Taubes of Berlad was the only one who defended Peixotto at that Congress."

Peixotto did not let his office become a "turtleshell." Besides his official duties, he kept his door open to all who sought his advice. During his term of office in Bucharest he advised the Roumanian Jews as to their rights. His influence was felt by the Roumanian government and in Roumanian private life. Through his efforts, more than one prefect was removed from office for hostility toward the Jews. He was also instrumental in preventing much hostile legislation against the Jews. Recognizing the need for higher education, he was active in organizing and founding the Society Zion, which later was merged with the Order of B'nai B'rith.

In all his stay in Roumania Peixotto was untiring in his efforts to ameliorate the condition of the Jews. He assured them that the great republic he represented would defend their cause.

It was not long thereafter that he gained the confidence, not only of the Jews, but also of the Roumanian government. He spoke to Prince Carol, pleaded with government leaders in behalf of his people, and promoted the interests of the Jews, in cooperation with other foreign representatives. Neither denunciation by the Boyars, nor the jealous intrigues instituted by some of the hostile foreign representatives, nor vilification by individuals in the pay of the government, could dissuade him from his set purpose, nor cause him to relent in his efforts. Bravely and fearlessly he went on with his work in exposing Roumanian cruelties. Peixotto's enemies also found fault with him on the ground that, instead of reconciling the Jews with the Roumanians, he alienated one group from the other and caused a split between them. They finally forced him to promise not to interfere in their affairs unless requested to do so. He decided to leave Roumania, and Adolph Stern, the vice consul, finally became *Chargé d'Affaires*.

As soon as it became known (October, 1875) that Peixotto was to leave Roumania, a number of Jewish committees petitioned the government of the United States not to remove him from his position. Peixotto acceded to these pleadings and retained his position for another year. His presence had had a good effect. The Jews had enjoyed comparative immunity from violence. The tobacco and liquor laws were not rigorously enforced. But Bratiano, whose political career was temporarily halted by Peixotto's influence, could not forgive the American representative for the influence he wielded during his stay in Bucharest.



In 1876 Peixotto resigned, much to the regret of the Roumanian Jews, who had found in him an advisor, leader, and protector. That he was able to accomplish as much as he did was due largely to the splendid cooperation and support which B'nai B'rith had given him. The extent of his influence can be measured partly by the fact that six years later, in 1881, Lord Beaconsfield, ( Benjamin Disraeli ) told Herman Adler, British Chief Rabbi, that what Peixotto had done was of material aid in achieving the adoption of provisions in the Treaty of Berlin, securing the rights of Jews in Roumania.

At the Brussels conference of October 29 and 30, 1872, Peixotto and I. Seligman of New York represented the Jewry of the United States in the interest of the Jews in Roumania. The conference decided that the Roumanian Jews should petition their government for civil political rights. The petition was drawn up, but upon the advice of the Roumanian premier, it was not presented. Moreover, many of the influential Roumanian Jews were opposed to its presentation. Similarly, mass emigration of the Jews from Roumania, advocated by Peixotto and approved by Premier Costaforo, was disapproved by the conference.

American Jewry showed even greater interest in the misery which came upon the Roumanian Jews as an aftermath of the year 1877-78. In New York City, a committee headed by Judge M.S. Isaacs and Mr. Seligman was formed. This committee raised the sum of seven thousand dollars which it sent to Cremieux for distribution by the Alliance Israelite Universelle. At the conference of world Jewry held at Paris in 1878, Peixotto and Adolph Stern represented the Roumanian Jews, while the Reverend



H. S. Jacob represented American Jewry.

Thus during this crisis in the affairs of the Jews in Roumania, their more fortunate coreligionists in America, and particularly, the International Order of B'nai B'rith, were actively and outspokenly engaged in gaining the support of the American government for the oppressed and unhappy Roumanian Jews.

The new cabinet formed by Lascar Catargiu restored some degree of tranquility. The country made considerable progress. The railway system was extended, telegraphic communication was developed, and the army increased. The school system was still undeveloped.

In 1876, a law excluding Jews from military service was passed. During the parliamentary debates, one of the Bratiano brothers argued that military service would prompt the Jews to demand citizens' rights. A former minister of war said that although the Jews are unassimilable, they should make a contribution in blood to the Roumanian fatherland.

The political situation in Europe was not clear. With a war imminent, something ominous was in the air. A conference of European Jewry was held at Paris from December 2 to 15, 1876, organized by the Alliance Israelite Universelle. It was decided to send a memorandum to the European Powers concerning the Roumanian question. The Serbian Jewish question was also on the agenda, but since the Serbian government was favorably inclined toward the Jews, this matter was tabled.

The memorandum was delivered to the representatives of the European Powers assembled at the conference at Blois. Lord Derby,

the British minister, informed the delegates that his  
country was fully informed of

the condition of the Jews in the principalities, and would see to it that persecutions were stopped. He declared that a memoir would be sent to the British Ambassador at Constantinople to intercede with the Turkish government in behalf of the Jews. He advised the delegates to be on the alert, and arouse the European governments and public opinion at the propitious hour to bring about the cessation of persecutions. The same proposal was presented to the conference of European Powers then being held at Constantinople. It asked that the Jews in the principalities be considered on an equal basis with the rest of the population.

While these activities were going on abroad, the government at home, in defiance of the Powers and to spite the Alliance Israelite Universelle, renewed the order of expulsion of Jews from rural districts.

Turkey met some of the demands of the conference, granted a constitution, and created a parliamentary government. All cults in the Turkish empire were thus placed on an equal basis, and their adherents were admitted to all public offices without distinction. However, the conference insisted on other concessions, which the Sultan did not grant. It then adjourned without having accomplished as much as expected. It was apparent that war was in the making.

After the conference, the expulsion of Jews from the rural districts continued unabated. While this was going on in the provinces, the Minister of the Interior revised a decree of the year 1840 directed against strangers, and now applied it to all the Jews in Roumania. A general hunt was then instituted against the Jews, and they were evicted from their homes. In some of the districts they were allowed to remain only ten days. Some of the Jews pleaded to be permitted to remain in

their homes without engaging in the liquor traffic, but their request was denied. Three hundred families were driven out of the twenty-four villages where they had been living for many years.

The war threats became real when Russia declared war against Turkey in 1877, and Roumania allied herself with Russia. The Jewish problem became acute and more complicated as a result of the war. When Czar Alexander of Russia visited Roumania, his arrival in Jassy was "celebrated" by attacks on the Jews. Jewish-owned homes and shops were demolished, and men, women, and children were beaten. The European press broke into a storm of indignation against the Roumanian government for permitting such a state of anarchy, but the attacks were ignored.

To the Western mind conditions in Roumania were always an enigma, a problem hard to understand and, therefore, difficult to solve. The problem, as a certain writer remarked, was all the more difficult to understand since Roumania represented a double personality. The people were composed of two strata -- peasants and boyars -- two extremes, with no middle class. The people, the lower stratum, constituted a mild, good-natured, tolerant, and hospitable folk. In all its past, there is not a single instance in Roumanian history in which peasants rose against the Jews, not a single example that could be compared with the riots and massacres which occurred in Russia. This is especially remarkable when we consider the fact that, in view of the attitude of the courts in acquitting the defendants in the cases of the disorders which had taken place, any other people would have broken all bounds, in violation of all law and order. Not so the Roumanian peasants. In fact, there was a time when people feared that this would be the case in Roumania, but this fear turned out to be baseless.

As we have already briefly intimated above, the political horizon in southeastern Europe began to be clouded in the year 1876. Serbia, Bulgaria, Roshia, and Herzegovina were in the boiling pot. Turkey was holding the frying-pan, and Russia was stirring the fire. Independence was the stake. New territory for Russia was the price, although she called it "freedom for Christian serfs from the Turkish yoke." Roumania was not mentioned as yet, but it was understood that in case of war between Russia and Turkey, Russia would be badly in need of a passageway through Roumania. From a purely business standpoint, Roumania was entitled to be paid for such service, and Russia was willing to pay the price.

English Jewry recognized the fact that if war should break out, some changes would be made and some provisions in favor of the Jews inserted when the time came to frame the treaty of peace. With this object in view Sir Francis Goldsmid and Leopold Schloss, vice president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, addressed a memorandum to Lord Derby, asking that the English representatives who would be taking part in the peace negotiations, "whilst guarding the interests of various persons and various denominations in Serbia and the provinces concerned, should include the Israelites in the effort which will be made to secure equal civil and political rights for all subjects without regard to condition or creed." Lord Derby transmitted this request forthwith to Ambassador Elliot in Turkey, with instructions to bear it in mind, and Goldsmid was advised, accordingly.

In his reply, Ambassador Elliot pointed out to Lord Derby that Jews in Turkish territory needed protection in the Christian provinces only; that the Turkish government classed the people as Mussulman and non-Mussulman; therefore, any concession made to the latter would benefit the Jews as much as it would the Christians. Goldsmid was so informed by the Foreign Office.

Recognizing the great interest which Great Britain had taken, and in view of the opportunity to obtain some favorable concessions for the Jews, the London Board of Deputies of the British Jews, of which J.M. Montefiore was president,

441

presented a resolution to the Earl of Derby on November 29, 1876, asking the interest of the British government in the rights of the Jews in the Turkish empire.

An international Jewish conference was about to be held in Paris, and British Jewry was considering the sending of delegates to the conference. The Board of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews, representing several congregations of Jews of Great Britain and Ireland, resolved to communicate with the British government as to the proper medium of intercourse between the subjects of Great Britain and those of foreign powers.

The Jewish conference took place at Paris in December, 1876. According to Baron Henry de Worms, who, on December 19, 1876, informed Lord Derby that the object of that meeting was the consideration of the religious, civil, and political disabilities of the Jews in the East, the conference adopted a memorial in which the position of the Jews in the East was set forth. The memorial contained also a prayer that they be placed on an equal footing with the Christians. The conference also requested that this matter be presented at the conference of the powers to be held at Constantinople. Baron <sup>de</sup> Worms stated, likewise, that the Austrian Ambassador had promised to discuss the subject with Earl Derby.

On December 28, 1876, Earl Derby transmitted the memorial to the London Jews, and to the Marquis of Salisbury, together with the correspondence between the latter and Montefiore, and a copy of the London Times in which there was

17

given an account of a deputation of the Council of the Anglo-Jewish Association who called on him (Lord Derby) on December 27~~th~~. He suggested to him that he take such steps as he might deem advisable in dealing with the matter. The names of the members of the deputation which called on Earl Derby, as read by Baron <sup>de</sup> Worms when he introduced them to Earl Derby, were: Seargeant Simon, M.P.; Saul Issac, M.P.; Julius Goldsmid, M.P.; F.D. Moceata; Dr. Benisch; the Reverend A. Green; Isaac Seligman; Leopold Schloss; the Reverend M.H. Nathan; Alfred Henriques; Walter Josephs; M.H. Benjamin; A. Marsden; G.S. Joseph; Herbert Lausada; H.H. Collins; B.A. Lowey; James Levenson; J.M. Laurence. In introducing these gentlemen, Baron <sup>de</sup> Worms said: "They not only represented the Anglo-Jewish Association, but the opinion of a conference in which Europe and America were <sup>strongly</sup> ~~very influentially~~ represented." Lord Derby had given the deputation his assurance of his sympathetic interest.

Following this reception by Earl Derby, a painful report came to Dr. Lowey, who took <sup>cave</sup> pains to have it verified, that hundreds of Jewish families had been turned out of their houses and their homes in the district of Vaslui, thereby being caused great suffering. Many of these unfortunates, it was reported, had died of cold and hunger. Appeals to the Bucharest authorities remained unanswered. On January 4, 1877, Lowey brought the news of this new outrage to the attention of Earl Derby with an appeal to him to instruct the consul at Bucharest to take the necessary steps in the matter. On the



following day, having received similar news from another source in Roumania regarding the Vaslui expulsion, J.M. Montefiore also addressed a communication to Earl Derby containing the same appeal.

As against these heart-rending appeals, there came Etienne C. Schandre, diplomatic agent of Roumania in Paris, who called on Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador in Paris, and stoutly "denied that the Jews in the principalities are either ill-treated or discontent." He blamed it all on the Alliance Israelite Universelle and "such bodies, the complaints of which are the result of an agitation got up abroad to which the Jews actually living in Roumania are entire strangers."

Lord Derby transmitted the appeal of the Anglo-Jewish Association to Lieutenant Colonel Mansfield with instructions to "make an unofficial but earnest appeal to the Roumanian government on behalf of the Jews."

On the heels of this came a report to Lord Derby from St. John at Jassy, saying that the reports ~~to the effect~~ that hundreds of families had been driven out were far from the truth, and that things had been exaggerated. The only thing that did happen, he said, was that Article 8 of the liquor law had been rigidly enforced; that delinquent Jews were fined, and if the fine was not paid, all the delinquent's possessions were sequestrated and in some instances the Jew was summarily expelled from the comuna. That was all that had taken place, St. John said, then added:

"My Austrian colleague informed me that the prefect's

orders have been carried out with great brutality, and that the procedure of the authorities was contrary to the stipulations of the convention lately concluded with Austria, and had been submitted by him to his government." Also, St. John stated that the Austro-Hungarian consul general in Bucharest had been instructed to inquire into the matter, and that a Roumanian government official had been sent from Bucharest to investigate the matter.

On receipt of the report from Lord Lyons in regard to Schandre's denial, Lord Derby wired the facts to Lieutenant Colonel Mansfield and instructed him to report "how far Schandre is justified

---

in stating that the Jews in the principalities are neither ill-treated nor discontent." On January 16, 1877, Mansfield promptly replied that he, too, had heard about this thing and had investigated it and found it considerably exaggerated. This was followed, on January 18, 1877, by a letter from Rothschild and Son addressed to Lord Derby informing him of the sad and painful accounts of atrocities and persecutions near Jassy, coming from two reliable sources. On receipt of that communication, Lord Derby telegraphed to Lieutenant Colonel Mansfield, on January 19th, instructions to inquire further into the matter and to do whatever possible for the protection of the Jews.

It appears that Mansfield was too hasty in forming his conclusions in his report of January 16th, in which he said that things had been exaggerated, and that Jonescu as well as Prince Carol attributed this to ulterior motives. For Buria, the Austrian vice-consul, had investigated, and confirmed the version of the Jewish press in Moldavia that ninety-five families, perhaps 120, from sixty comunas, were expelled from their homes by order of Prefect Neron Lupasca, brother of the notorious Lupasca. Buria's report contained the further statement that representations had been made to the central government and orders sent out to restore the expelled Jews to their homes, but that their effects, furniture, and the like had meanwhile been pillaged, and had disappeared.

A Mr. Protopeesco, who was sent by Bucharest to investigate the conditions prevailing there, was met by Prefect Lupasca at Jassy, and was convinced by him how exaggerated things were,

that some families who were not molested escaped only by bribery of as high as twenty ducats a person. These facts were brought to light by the Austrian agent, who took considerable interest in getting at them because twenty-five of the expelled families were Austrian subjects.

Again Lieutenant Colonel Mansfield found occasion to say that the complaints made by Baron <sup>de</sup> Worms were exaggerated, and concluded by saying: "The outrages are glaring enough in themselves, without the aid of exaggeration." But this report was followed by a letter from Rothschild and Son which, dated February 1, 1877, and alluding to the report of Vice- Consul St. John with regard to the exaggeration said:

"The agent sent by us to Vaslui returned Friday and brought with him indisputable proof that about 100 families have been subjected to unheard of cruelties. These families are now in a most lamentable position, and if speedy assistance does not come forward, many of them must perish. I have hitherto been laboring under the most unfortunate delusion in considering the first published intelligence exaggerated. But, alas! it was all too true. The Prefect Lupasca has been acting among the poor Jews with the ferocity and rage of a hyena. We are about to publish shortly the documents referring to this matter and will forward them to you."

Following this letter from Rothschild and Son came an additional report from Lieutenant Colonel Mansfield to Lord Derby in which he tells of an interview which he had with Minister Jonesco who pleaded "general denial" in the absence of a good defense. He denied all that had been reported, and added that these reports were "exaggerated." He insisted that there was nothing unusual in what had happened, that because of bribery by the Jews things had been "neglected," but that now the law was being enforced.

23

Mansfield reached the conclusion that as long as the present condition of the Jews was maintained, by law, outrages and oppressions had to continue. What is worse is this, that either through terrorism or through the fear that denunciation would be visited upon the individual, it was almost impossible to get from the Jews the full story of whatever had happened.

A report from the British vice-consul at Jassy to Baron Worms, on January 22, 1877, bore out what Rothschild and Son had written. It told of Jews' being ejected and their wines and spirits confiscated and sold at public auction at various places.

To take a seventy-year old rabbi, the head of a Jewish community, and eight of his congregation, put them in chains and drive them afoot from Falciu to Jassy, a distance of over eighty miles, for an imaginary crime which they had never committed, is an illustration of the spirit of "tolerance" shown by the authorities of that district. ~~And~~ And at Focshani, eighty-eight Jews, old residents of the town, were sent across the border under the vagabond law.

Mansfield reported also, on January 25, 1877, in regard to Schandre's statement that the Jews were "neither ill-treated nor discontent in the United Principalities," by branding it a "perversion of facts." He, too, concluded that even if it were true that the Jews in Moldavia were an evil to the country, he did not believe in removing this evil by oppression and disabilities.

One thing is obvious as regards this period of history, and that is, that all the political parties in Roumania--the Liberals, the Conservatives, and the opposition to both--found a

useful instrument in the persecution of the Jews. It suited their purpose to perfection: either to expose the corruption of the party in power and thus weaken it; or, by molesting the Jews through the creation of disturbances, embarrass the administration. On the other hand, the party in power, by oppressing the Jews, showed the population how and by whom it was being robbed, and in this manner strengthened itself in the opinion of the people. But the main purpose of each party was to keep the peasants in ignorance of actual conditions, to hold them in subjection, by hiding their real oppressor, the boyar, who, with the aid of the government, which he always controlled, was able to hold them under his fist.

Colonel Penkowitz, who was sent to make an investigation, made his report to the Roumanian government; for obvious reasons it was not made public. However, it did leak out that this report completely confirmed all that had reached London. It certainly disagreed completely with what Schandre and Jonesco had said. How Jonesco was now to frame the note which he had promised to the British consul general was a problem which he alone had to solve. Meanwhile, three sub-prefects who had been active in the outrages in Moldavia were dismissed.

While it could not be expected that the Roumanian government should admit that it was prompted by outside influence, it was generally accepted that the pressure brought by the British and Austrian consuls was instrumental in the suspension of Lupasca as prefect; his place was filled by one Miclesco, who was also far from friendly to the Jews.

While Roumania was trying to "solve" the Jewish question by persecution, and remained deaf to all diplomatic remonstrations and blind to facts which were shocking to every sense of justice and humanity, her princely neighbor, Serbia, which also had some restrictions against her Jews, came to her senses. Instead of resorting to prevarication, distortion of facts and denials of the truth, instead of deceiving the Powers which called her attention to the fact that she was not living up to her obligations, she yielded. What is more, in the election held only a short time before this period, in 1872, a Jew was elected to the Scupchina (the national assembly). The Serbian government did this to prove to the world that Serbia was tolerant.

Serbia had a small population of Spanish Jews who had been living there for centuries and who were recognized as Serbian subjects, enjoying the same privileges as their Christian neighbors, except that they were restricted and could not live in rural districts. Polish Jews living in Serbia enjoyed a different status; these could not partake of the same privileges as their Spanish coreligionists because they were alien subjects. Prince Milan was frank enough to take the same view as Retisch, the Serbian Minister of Foreign Affairs (Retisch had said to Vice-Consul St. John that "a little Jewish element in the assembly would be desirable"), but went a little further in explaining to St. John the reasons for the restriction--i.e., the business jealousy of the Serbian merchants who were afraid of being overwhelmed by Polish and Roumanian Jews who would settle in Serbia and drive out the native Christian traders. What is more, the Serbian politicians realized that no government could last

twenty-four hours if it should advocate a change in that direction.

In England, the under-secretary of state brought up the Roumanian-Jewish question in the House of Commons, and spoke of Roumania in no flattering terms. It need not be said that the Roumanian government was not overjoyed with his sentiments. Minister Jonesco tried to give his version of the Moldavian outrage in his long-promised note, which finally reached the British consul at Bucharest in March, 1877. In this note to Consul General Mansfield, Jonesco gave a brief account of what had happened in the district of Vaslui, and told of the liquor law which provided that the holder of the license had to be a registered elector, as well as of the penalties which it provided. The Jonesco account stated further:

That on January 22, 1877, twenty-eight Jews from different comunas in the district of Vaslui complained to the minister that although they were not engaged in the liquor business, they were subjected to the penalties under Article 12; that they did not mean to violate the law, but that they were tolerated to do business and demanded the discontinuance of the actions pending against them, the annulment of the sequestration, and the return of the goods which had been removed. That the matter had been thoroughly investigated and it had been found that twenty-five Jews, according to their own declaration, had engaged in the sale of liquor without license; that notwithstanding the violation of the law, the Minister of Finance gave an order that this time only the offenders were exempt from paying fines, the confiscation was released, and he gave them three months' time in which to liquidate their businesses.



501  
451

That at the end of these three months, no one, under any pretext whatsoever, would be allowed to do business without complying with the law.

CHAPTER NINETEEN XXXIV

THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR

After her defeat in the Crimean War in 1856, Russia was driving to expand her influence in the Orient.

Roumania was an obstacle, geographically and in other ways, to this expansion. Despite the religious differences between them, and the heavy tribute imposed by the Sultan, Roumania preferred Turkish to Russian domination.

France considered herself the protector of Christians in the Orient, and Austria and Britain strongly opposed Russian expansion. Britain particularly could not permit Russia to sail through the ~~N~~arrows of the Bosphorus. This made her a real friend and protector of Turkey. However, Britain, fearing Germany's potential expansion even more than Russia's, had to modify her stand. An Anglo-Russian rapprochement was, therefore, a political necessity in order to check German imperialistic aims.

Russian agents in the Balkans were working assiduously, instigating the population against their Turkish rulers; in 1876 Russian inspired disorders broke out in the Balkans. War was inevitable. Concessions advanced by Turkey were too late. Austria saw a golden opportunity to gain an advantage over her rival, Russia, by attacking her in the rear. Through diplomatic efforts a portion of the spoils -- Bosnia and Herzegovina -- were offered in Austria.

It was now Russia's task to win Roumania to her side.

On April 16, 1877, an agreement was signed, by virtue of which Russian troops were to be allowed to march through Roumania in exchange for Russia's guarantee of Roumania's independence and integrity. A few days later, on April 23, Russia declared war on Turkey, and two weeks later Roumania declared war on Turkey.

The Roumanian Jews took an active part in the war. They welcomed the opportunity to show their patriotism. The first step taken by the Jews was to raise a million lei and contribute large sums to the government war chest and the Red Cross. Over 2,000 enlisted in the army. Hundreds of them fell on the battle-field in Bulgaria, where the main battles were fought. Of the 36,000 Roumanian soldiers besieging Plevna, more than 600 were Jews. Several Jewish commissioned officers were decorated for bravery. Many Jewish physicians in the army medical corps also received decorations for distinguished service. Jews who could not enlist, served the cause in other ways, giving freely of their money, cattle, horses, goods, ambulances, and medical supplies.

At the beginning of the war the central committee of Roumanian Jews issued the following appeal:

"Fellow Jews: The country is now going through hard times. It is the duty of everyone to contribute to the realization of its aspirations. The country in which we were born demands of us today that we repay to her a small part of our obligations. Contribute with more vigor, your arms, your knowledge, your goods, for the benefit of the country, each of you in his own circle whatever you can, each of you in your own locality. Those of you who would like to enroll as volunteers, and have no means of equipment can address themselves to our committee, who will provide them with whatever they need."

Summoned by the communities of Bucharest and Jassy, organizations were formed to aid the wounded. Jews made generous donations of cash, clothing, underwear, linen, and bandages to these organizations. The Zion Lodge organized four ambulance services with Jewish personnel. Two military hospitals were established in Bucharest. One hospital established by the Committee at Jassy was equipped with thirty beds, and the entire personnel was Jewish. There was also a local hospital with fifty beds in Jassy, supported jointly by Jewish and Christian women, in which Jewish nurses served.

At Bucharest a society was organized to equip Jewish volunteers. Only twenty of those who volunteered applied to this society for equipment; the rest outfitted themselves at their own expense. The Spanish-Jewish society gave 10,000 lei to the government war chest. An appeal by Mrs. Rosetti for a fund to set up an ambulance service was answered spontaneously by Roumanian Jews. At Jassy a similar appeal was made to the Moldavian Jews by a committee headed by the bankers Daniel and Neuschotz.

When the government opened a national subscription for the purchase of arms, the Jews responded unstintingly to this appeal.

Dr. Goldenthal, of Jassy, offered his sumptuous mansion as a military hospital. The Jewish community at Galatz furnished twenty-four beds for wounded soldiers. Society Zion furnished an ambulance with two physicians and three interns, as well as a pharmacist and five transportation wagons, all of which they maintained during the entire campaign. Many of the Jewish students

who enrolled in the Roumanian Red Cross fell victims of typhoid.

It was a short war. Roumania came out victorious, won a marshy patch of ground in the Dobruja, but had to cede Bassarabia to Russia. The Austrian agreement was not fulfilled.

There had been disquieting moments during the war. ~~period.~~ When a call for recruits was issued and a number of Jews presented themselves at one of the recruiting stations, they were rejected and made to understand that there was no place for them. When there was a shortage of officers in the army, and a Jewish officer successfully passed an examination for higher rank, he was rejected on the ground that under the law no Jew might hold a commission in the Army. The Roumanian press continued to display suspicion and lack of confidence in Jews and belittled their devotion. The Roumanian newspaper, Triumful, accused the Jews of supplying Turkey with barrels full of gold, of spying for the enemy, and of holding divine services in the synagogues at which prayers were uttered for Turkey's success. Moses Ascher, an influential Bucharest Jew, resented these accusations and published a refutation in La Roumania Libre, which forced the editor of Triumful to retract his charges.

THE CONGRESS AND TREATY OF BERLIN (1878)

The Congress of Berlin opened on June 13, 1878. Besides Russia and Turkey, all the leading European Powers; Germany, Austro-Hungary, France, Great Britain, and Italy, took part. The Congress recognized the independence of Serbia and Bulgaria. At the suggestion of the French delegate, the following rights were provided:

"Serbian subjects, of whatever religion they may be, shall enjoy full equality of rights. They can compete for any public office, function, or honorary office; difference of religion cannot be an obstacle; the practice of all religions will enjoy full liberty, and no obstacle shall be put in the way of their spiritual leaders, whether they be hierarchic organizations or different communities."

At first the Serbian representative raised some objections, but finally agreed to the proposed formula.

Cremieux, in a letter of June 21, 1876, urged Lord Beaconsfield that while the Christian and the Christian culture were being protected from Mohammedan persecution, the Jews should be protected against Christian persecution.

Before the opening of the Congress the Berlin Jewish community handed Bismarck a petition requesting support of the cause of Roumanian Jews. The Austro-Hungarian Premier, Andrassy, assured a delegation from his country that the cause of Roumanian Jewry would be presented at the Congress. On June 4, 1878, Dr. Ignatz Kuranda presented a petition, signed by twenty members of Parliament, which pointed out that over 80,000 Austrian Jewish subjects in Roumania were without protection, and urged Premier Andrassy to give the Roumanian Jewish cause his aid. The Vienna Isrealitische Allianz and the ultra-orthodox

society Shomre Israel (Guardians of Israel) of Lemberg submitted similar petitions.

Jews all over the world exerted their efforts in behalf of their coreligionists in Roumania. The Roumanian Jews were disorganized and disunited. There was an influential group who wished to keep the internal Jewish problem from becoming involved in international politics, and tried to reach an understanding with Roumania on domestic grounds. Others saw Jewish salvation only in an intervention by the Great Powers. This division of opinion was discussed in political circles and the press.

The Alliance Israelite Universelle sent three of its members, (Kahn, Netter, and Emanuel Felix Viniziani) to intercede with the representatives of the Powers in behalf of their Roumanian brethren. The Roumanian Jews <sup>sent</sup> ~~organized~~ a delegation to convince foreign representatives that the Roumanian Jewish question was purely an internal affair which should be solved within the country.

The defenders of internal solution were soon convinced that their method had no chance for success. The most eminent Jews, such as Professor Moritz Lazarus, Berthold Auerbach, and Jacob Bernays (a prominent German philologist) were untiring in their work in behalf of Roumanian Jewry. A friend of Bismarck and Baron Mortiz (Maurice) de Hirsch, were conspicuously active. In London, Sir Moses Montefiore was greatly interested in the plight of Roumanian Jews.

Since 1868 there was a Roumanian committee in Berlin, whose object was the amelioration of the condition of the Jews in Roumania. Gershon von Bleischroeder, and Baron Cohen, administrator of Kaiser Wilhelm's private dominions, were active in this committee. Bleischroeder's influence was far-reaching. It was generally known

that he and David Hansmann played an important part in the peace negotiations with France, and that his valuable services to the State brought him nobility.

The Alliance Israelite Universelle supplied the Congress with a memoir setting forth the entire Balkan-Jewish question. The text of this memorandum is given here verbatim:

"Sixteen months ago, Jewish delegates from all over Europe addressed the European conference at Constantinople and asked it to put an end to the oppressive rule to which the Jews in Roumania and Serbia are subjected, and to secure to those provinces of Turkey whose fate it was to be ruled by the Conference, the civil and political equality claimed for all Mussulmen. You are meeting today in order to resume the work of the Conference of Constantinople. As representatives of the Great Powers of Europe, you are called upon to establish in Eastern Europe a government under which populations of different races and beliefs may live peacefully with one another. Europe would not approve of a peace which was not based upon respect for the great principle of public rights; the equality of men among themselves; the freedom of religious belief; the necessity of writing into the constitution of oriental countries that, by the laws of civilization, religious belief cannot be a cause of inferiority for anyone. It is still more so by the necessity of suppressing the danger of permanent conflicts between peoples of different races and religion.

"The treaties of 1856 and 1858 resulted in the application of these principles in Roumania and Serbia; but the insufficiency of the stipulation of these treaties was the cause of breaking their spirit, and rendering a series of restrictive laws against the Jews of these two countries possible. In Serbia they were continually driven from the country and from villages, excluded from every employment, from every function, and reduced to a state of misery. But depriving them of most of their rights did not release them from any other obligation. Like all Serbians, they were subject to the blood tax; like them, they were bound to render military service.

"In the last war the Jews thought that they would overcome the feeling of the country toward them by dint of patriotism. They fought bravely and mingled their blood on the battlefield with that of their compatriots. If their sacrifices brought them some kind word from the Minister of the Interior, at the great Skupschtina, in 1877, their condition did not change at all. It was in vain, at the time the convention concluded between Serbia and Turkey in 1877, that Turkey claimed the rights for them which were stubbornly refused. Under



such rule, their number has long since diminished by half. In certain villages, they are constantly under the threat of edicts of expulsion. In Roumania, the condition of the Jews, who are very numerous, is still more frightful. For two years they have been subjected to the most cruel persecution. Almost every year, Europe is moved by the recital of riots, murder, pillage, and expulsion en masse, of which they are the victims. To these violences, legal persecution has been added by a set of laws excluding the Jews from all employment, from all liberal professions, from every public function, and from numerous branches of commerce, fettering them even in their free exercise of religious practices, and seeking by every possible means to reduce them to a state of misery. In vain have the guarantor powers, supported by Article 46 of the convention of Paris, which granted to the Jews of Roumania civil rights, remonstrated against this fatal and barbarous policy. No heed was paid either to their advice or to their remonstrance. Roumania, without pity for her Jews, has nevertheless, subjects who are devoted to work, useful to the development of commerce and industry, capable of elevating themselves and of doing honor to their country. In the last war, the service they rendered in the ambulance <sup>corps</sup> and in the hospitals, their conduct in the battlefield, have brought them public marks of recognition from their prince. Yet, a thing unheard of, some laws, and, still recently a decree of a court of justice, declared that these Jews, who shed their blood for the glory of their country, did not belong to any nationality or to any country.

"If such is the condition in Serbia and in Roumania with regard to the Jews, what has one to fear from other emancipated provinces of Turkey? Is it necessary to recall the sad episodes of Eski Zagra and Kazanik, in order to show the danger that threatens the Jews in Bulgaria and in a part of Rumelia? Thousands of them are still wandering about without shelter and without any means, far away from their country.

"In the name of the Israelites, of humanity, we respectfully address Europe in favor of our unhappy coreligionists of Bulgaria, Rumelia, and Roumania. We and they are looking for an end of their suffering. Her protection to them is indispensable in the present and in the future. May Europe cause her powerful voice to be heard; may she proclaim the equality of men independent of all religious belief, and may she force the insertion of this principle in the constitution! May she at length be the vigorous guard over them!

"Such is the work which the world looks for to emanate from the Congress of 1878. It is demanded by the traditions of European policy, by the wishes of enlightened men of all nations. It will give peace to Europe and prosperity to countries cruelly tried by the war. It will be pregnant with happy results for all nations, glorious

for our epoch, and the memories of this Congress will remain indelible in the recollection of future generations."

The efforts invested in diplomatic advances inspired general cheerfulness. Lord Beaconsfield was very hopeful, as was von Bleichroeder. Von Bulow gave every assurance that the Roumanian Jewish question would be settled. Prince von Hohenlohe-Schillings, the third German delegate, was also determined to bring the matter to a successful conclusion, and the Italian representative, Count de Launay, shared his hopes. On June 19 Kahn was informed by Andrassy's secretary, that all the representatives were in favor of supporting the matter of settling the Jewish question raised by Lord Beaconsfield. On June 21 Bismarck told Bleichroeder that the Jewish question would now surely be <sup>taken up</sup> ~~be/~~. Bleichroeder himself was so certain of the satisfactory outcome of this question that he wanted to have the Russian-Jewish question included.

The Roumanian question was taken up on June 29. In the course of the discussion, Count de Launay, of Italy, suggested the insertion of the clause, that

"The Jews in Roumania who are not considered foreigners will enjoy Roumanian nationality without restriction."

Despite the objections of the Russian delegate, the Congress was able to carry on with its work.

Bratiano, as ~~the~~ Roumanian premier, attended the Congress. In vain did he appeal to the representatives of the Powers in behalf of Roumania and sought to ~~enforce~~ Russian gratitude. He received little sympathy. Prince Otto von Bismarck was frank enough to advise Bratiano not to bother with it, because Russia would not agree. Bratiano assured Bismarck that he was preparing a bill for the emancipation of the indigenous Jews of Roumania. The "alien Jews", he said,

"would have to be naturalized individually."

All the delegates, but the two Roumanians, Bratiano and Cogalniceanu, had agreed on the treaty. The Roumanian government became nervous. King Carol relates in his Memoirs: "On June 30, 1878; late in the evening, a telegram came from Berlin to the Chambers in which Bratiano and Cogalniceanu stated that they were informed by members of the Congress that Bessarabia is lost, and Roumanian independence follows Serbian pattern, and will be recognized only if it will undertake not to consider distinction of religion as an inequality for citizenship; that means that Roumania must grant citizens' rights to its Jewish inhabitants."

The two principal movers at the Congress of Berlin were Disraeli and Bismarck. Whatever were the motives of the governments they represented, the fact remains that through the diplomacy of these two men the small nations benefited. Bulgaria, Serbia, and Roumania became independent states; the Dobruja was annexed to Roumania.

Prince Carol felt somewhat relieved that the question was finally settled; yet, according to an entry in his Memoirs, he seems to have believed that the action of the Congress would meet with serious resentment at home. Cogalniceanu telegraphed to Carol to leave Sinaia at once and return to Bucharest, because the Jewish question would stir up the country.

During all the subsequent agitation, in debates on the platform, in the press, and in Parliament, there was not a sign, not even a ripple of popular anti-Semitic sentiment. Only the Roumanian politicians were indignant.

Prince Carol was greatly upset, according to his Memoirs ~~which~~ ~~are~~ (June 23, 1878), and he mentions the necessity of calling a

constitutional convention in order to solve the "so-called Jewish question which was forced upon the country."

The Roumanian politicians were not so much wrought up by the Jewish question as they were by the loss of Bessarabia, a loss against which they rebelled and for which they blamed Russian greed. Prince Carol had good reason to be embittered. He realized that resentment prevailed in the country. In accepting him -- a foreigner -- as prince to rule the country, his connections by marriage, friendship, and political relations, were discounted in favor of Roumania. They now convinced themselves that his influence was negligible. Many of the Roumanian leaders would <sup>have</sup> preferred to return to Turkish rule and forego independence. The Bratiano party was upset.

Russia was amazed at Roumanian ingratitude. Since Roumania had gained Dobruja through her kindness, she was anxious to soothe Roumania's feelings against her and to reestablish the former friendly relations between the two countries. She lost no time, and, through her agents in Roumania, painted frightful pictures of the danger involved in emancipation of the Jews. Hundreds of petitions were blindly signed by the ignorant peasants, protesting to Parliament against the emancipation of the Jews. Even this agitation was only a cover for the coup d'état planned by Prince Grigory Ghica, who sought to succeed Carol on the throne, and place himself under Russian protection, break away from Wallachia and unite Moldavia with Bessarabia. Since he cherished this plan, he became imbued with a personal aversion toward Carol as the protector of the Jews. Unfortunately for him, the plan did not work out, for Carol and the Tzar were now deeply interested in alleviating the pain caused by the loss of Bessarabia.

It was easy for Russia to assuage the grief suffered by

Roumania. Was not poor Russia a fellow sufferer as much a victim of European politics as Roumania? Was she not being repaid with stones for the bread which she had given to the Christian cause? She had won in war and lost in peace. And whose fault was it? The Jews', of course, Jews such as Disraeli, Montefiore, and the Alliance Israelite Universelle.

Roumania's representatives insisted that in their country the Jewish question was an internal affair which did not come within the scope of the Congress. When the question came up on June 24, the German and French delegates took an active and energetic part in the debate. Bismarck was unmovable; an experienced veteran warrior, he fought every opposing view. The strongest opponent was the Russian delegate, but even he yielded whenever he found himself pressed against the wall. The Roumanian-Jewish question was thus "solved," and world Jewry rejoiced.

For Beaconsfield this was a great diplomatic triumph. On his return to London, English Jewry gave him a grand reception, and the ninety-five-year-old Sir Moses Montefiore shook his hand warmly in gratitude for what he had done on behalf of his fellow Jews in Roumania. Baron Lionel Rothschild was publically acclaimed as the Great Liberator, in recognition of his energetic work on behalf of the Serbian and Roumanian Jews.

Be it said to the credit of that great German statesman that the Roumanian Jews owe him a debt of gratitude for the bold stand which he took in their behalf. If Article 44 of the treaty had been respected by the Roumanian government, the Jewish problem in Roumania would have been solved long before the first war.

CHAPTER ~~TWENTY-ONE~~ XXXVIBERLIN AFTERMATH

Was the Jewish question solved? Were the Jews still being considered "Straini" (strangers)?

The Congress created a situation unacceptable to the politicians of Bratiano's school. To pacify the Moldavian "patriots" who dreaded the idea of having Jews as equal citizens the Bratiano government now worried about getting around the "fatal" Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin.

There was no time to be spared. His government was considering whether it would be advisable to naturalize only a certain class of Jews, or all of them, and whether it was a matter for the administration or for Parliament to consider. France and Germany insisted that the treaty be respected. Rosetti, on the other hand, held that the Jews were aliens, and, therefore, did not come under the treaty provision. Minister Peter Carp proposed to strike out the article from the constitution and replace it with a modified one. The Roumanian politicians held that there was no such thing as "Roumanian Jews". New propositions were suggested to render it impossible for a Jew to become naturalized.

Great Britain and France protested against any classification of the Jews. When Germany and Italy were ready to conclude commercial treaties with Roumania, they refused to sign

at the last minute, unless Roumania would do away with racial and religious distinctions. Switzerland took the same stand.

The three great powers, Germany, Great Britain, and France, recognized Roumania's claims to independence because they were confident that the country was going to live up to its pledges. The fact still remained that "from 1879 to 1882, out of a total population of 269,000 Jews, only 200 were naturalized."

In his throne message, on November 27, 1878, Prince Carol declared that the country would be compelled to yield to the voice of Europe by removing from the constitution the principle of political inequality.

Carol's father, Prince Antoine, asserted: "It is high time to bring about the political equality of the Jews without too much talk." On every possible occasion, Carol pointed out that Roumania had been mistakenly accused of intolerance. "Roumania," he said, "will be admitted to the place she deserves in the opinion of the world, because she has shown by her valor that she can equal the most worthy nations; and as to her principles, she shares the beliefs and aspirations of the entire civilized world." Bratiano stubbornly declined to respect the treaty, and consistently denied the existence of a provision for equal rights. The politicians would not have defied all Europe by pursuing their policy of oppressive laws against their Jews. But when they saw the passive attitude of France toward the activities of her own Drumont, that of Germany toward her own



Stocker, that of Austria toward her own Lueger, they knew they had little to fear, and less to be embarrassed <sup>about</sup>. Bratiano counted on the weakness or jealousy of the other ~~nations~~, signatories of the treaty. He did not have very long to wait. This ~~clear~~ evident weakness helped him win the case. Silesian railroad interests, with which Germany was deeply involved, furnished the cure for the Roumanian ailment.

Bratiano had already learned from the Powers that whenever their own interests were involved, they were willing to be agreeable. The Roumanian politicians decided to appeal to the signatory Powers to postpone Jewish emancipation for a period of thirty or forty years.

As might be expected, the Roumanian press was violently against the Jews. In a missive from Berlin, Cogalniceanu informed Bucharest (June 22, 1878), that the principle of religious liberty proclaimed by the Congress "will have to be applied not only in Roumania, but in all the newly-formed states, and above all, in what concerns Mohammedans and Jews." The general opinion in Roumania was that the Jewish question had been solved. However, Roumania had a new problem.

Article 7 of the Roumanian Constitution made the Christian religion a pre-requisite for citizenship. The Treaty of Berlin contained a diametrically opposed provision. Therefore, Article 7 of the constitution would have to be revised. There was no doubt that the Jews would have to be placed on an equal



basis with the rest of the Roumanian population. But the Chambers were dissatisfied, and Bratiano began to maneuver diplomatically in order to evade Articles 43 and 44 of the treaty, and to induce the Powers to trust his honor. The Powers were obdurate, and Prince Carol was embarrassed by his government's attempt to substitute an oral promise for the written provision of the treaty. New provisions were proposed as to the manner of naturalization and when the Roumanian Ambassador, Rosetti, stated that the Jews in Roumania were aliens, England resented it and Bismarck instructed Andrassy to insist on "the equal status of all confessions," he said that he had "no faith in the good will of the Roumanian government."

Prince Carol counselled the leaders of the Roumanian state to treat the matter calmly and to act in a manner consistent with honor and dignity. In a letter to his father he wrote of his intention to carry through a program of amending the Roumanian constitution so as to give the Jews the same civil rights that they had in other countries. Roumania's position was exceptionally difficult because the Treaty established her independence.

Prince Carol was eager to have the question settled. He was not merely unopposed to the emancipation of the Jews, but very strongly favored it. However, he was also eager to have the Powers recognize Roumanian independence. To his father he expressed a desire for a gradual temperate solution of the Jewish question.

At a cabinet meeting held on November 28, 1878, Bratiano solemnly declared that the Treaty of Berlin had to be adhered to honestly, and that he wished to see to it that Article 7 of the constitution was modified. In view of the difficulties, Bratiano and Rosetti decided to make direct contact with the Powers. They visited various capitals, interviewed the heads of the respective governments, and pleaded with them to establish diplomatic relations. The British ambassador at Vienna told Bratiano to read the treaty and comply with its contents. In Italy, Rosetti fared still worse. Early in 1879, the Italian Parliament voted not to recognize Roumanian independence until Article 44 of the treaty had been complied with.

The question of recognition of Roumanian independence preoccupied every European capital. The Powers maintained that recognition of Roumania's independence depended upon her acceptance of the treaty.

In his Memoirs, Prince Carol gives a clear picture of the situation. He came to the conclusion that the Jews must be emancipated if the Powers were to be placated, and that the Jews could not be emancipated if his politicians continued their dilatory tactics. He felt that an energetic minister could have pushed through the necessary measures before the mounting of such strong opposition. In a letter, Carol indicated his understanding of the situation and expressed it as follows:

"While the country considers me a defender of the rights of the Jews, the foreign powers complain that I do not champion

with sufficient force the one path which can lead me to my goal, and which is imposed upon me by the constitution."

There was some support for Roumania's position in the councils of other countries. Marquis Popli, in the session of the Italian Senate (December 17, 1879), speaking on the Jewish question, said: "We must not insist too much. The Roumanian Constitution has special provisions on the matter. It is not for us to inflict a vote of defiance on this people. Roumania must be recognized now. There will be time enough to act after the breaking of relations if she does not respect the Treaty of Berlin. By pressing the question, we make the task harder for Prince Carol. It will make us lose the esteem and sympathy of Roumania."

The Bratiano government decided to submit the Jewish question to the Chambers. In his throne message, of January 17, 1879, the Prince recommended a revision of Article 7. The discussion of the revision of this article opened in the Chambers on February 22, 1879 and was very violent.

In his Memoirs, Prince Carol noted with regret that an unfortunate misconception by Rosetti had injected the Jewish question into the constitutional discussion. Article 7 of the constitution was the result. Furthermore, there was a provision in the law whereby Jews, like other aliens, could be naturalized after ten years' residence.

"At home," the prince wrote, "the Roumanian government is attacked for being liberal toward Jews, while abroad it is con-

demned for treating them like uncivilized people."

The Prince suggested striking out the restrictive article from the constitution; granting citizenship to native Jews whose parents were native Roumanians, never under foreign protection, under the following conditions: (a) that they comply with the military law, (b) that they pay their taxes, (c) that they be graduates of Roumanian schools, (d) that they engage in some enterprise from which the country would benefit.

The Prince was very pessimistic as to the outcome of the discussion. He demanded action. The ministers sought an evasive solution.

About Bratiano, the Prince wrote, "Abroad he is known as an oppressor of the Jews. At home he is branded as their protector." From the foregoing it is clear that the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin with regard to the Jews in Roumania remained meaningless. The opposition made an issue of it in an effort to overthrow Bratiano. He, on the other hand, took up the charge and made the Jewish question excellent ammunition for his political campaign. A commission was appointed by both houses of Parliament to prepare a draft whereby the provisions of Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin would be met to the satisfaction of the Powers. But Bratiano rejected the draft because it provided for non-Christians' relief only.

When the Chambers were opened in July, 1879, Bratiano requested them to adjourn and meet again behind closed doors. At that secret meeting he announced that he had received reliable information from abroad that the signatory Powers intended to send

a joint note to Roumania informing the government that they planned to make Article 44 of the treaty work. Bratiano warned of the danger of Jewish emancipation, and of the threats made by the foreign powers with regard to the Jewish question.

The signatory powers decided to act swiftly and energetically. But Bratiano was not frightened. Roumania's nearest neighbors, Austria and Russia, were on his side. He therefore did not have to fear the other countries. The question was, how long could this game of procrastination go on?

While Roumanian diplomats endeavored to evade the terms of the Treaty of Berlin, American Jewry <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ aroused, and started to take action. The American Board of Delegates, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the Board of Delegates, on Communal and Religious Rights, addressed a communication to the Secretary of State, William M. Evarts, urging him to prevent the inadvertant granting of any recognition to Roumania, which would carry with it the appearance of moral support from the United States. Simon Wolf, of Washington, D.C., who delivered the communication, interviewed President Rutherford B. Hayes, and the Secretaries, Carl Schurz and Sherman, who were in full accord with the tenor of the request. Orders to this effect were immediately issued (November 28, 1879) to the representatives of the United States abroad.

In London, Baron Henry De Worms, President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, worked strongly in behalf of his Roumanian coreligionists. Bratiano, however, was persistent in having

his view that his country had to be protected against the Jews. A delegation of the Anglo-Jewish Association called on Lord Salisbury, the British Secretary of State, and submitted a memorandum urging the British Government to demand full compliance on Roumania's part, according to the spirit and letter of the Treaty of Berlin. Baron de Worms pointed out that the provisions of the Berlin Treaty put the responsibility on the great Powers to see that it was executed. Lord Salisbury took a deep interest in the matter, and indicated that England was insisting on the execution of the treaty provision.

The Jews in Germany were also very active in the Roumanian-Jewish question. On August 1, 1879, they challenged the note sent by the Roumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Campaneanu, to the Roumanian agents abroad, in which he sought to influence the Powers to leave the Jewish question in abeyance.

Nor were the Roumanian Jews silent in their own behalf. On April 25, 1879, they sent a delegation of several representatives to solicit Bismarck's interposition in favor of the revision of Article 7 of the Roumanian Constitution and of executing Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin. Moreover, in June, 1879, they addressed a memorandum to the Roumanian Chambers, in which they pleaded for the revision of the Constitution.

While Europe was astir with the Roumanian-Jewish question, in August, 1879, Minister Sturza was seeking to obtain a loan, Campaneanu, the Roumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, continued to deny the occurrence of any persecution of the Jews, and endeavored to have the Jewish question postponed. Nevertheless,

the Roumanian government continued its hostile course against the Jews. The vagabond law was vigorously enforced once more, Jews were driven from their homes, and their property was left open to vandalism. In the face of all that was happening, the Roumanian cabinet covered every corner in Europe in an endeavor to win them to their point of view.

In one of his frequent tours, Bratiano called on Marquis Popoli to show him a letter from Carol in which he suggested that the Roumanian government follow a moderate course of conduct with reference to the Jews.

Bratiano pretended that he was in favor of Jewish emancipation "because the Jews were established in the country for a long time." When the question of revising Article 7 of the constitution came up in Parliament, he said: "I ask you once more, what shall be done with this article? Has it not done but ill to the country, and therefore, are we not all agreed that it would be better to have it removed, not only because the Treaty of Berlin compels us, but because we have seen that it hurts us very much without giving us the least advantage in exchange?" The Senate finally voted for revision.

Prince Carol was eager to have his government comply with the terms of the treaty. He realized that Europe was against Roumania. Again a warning came from the Roumanian representative in Berlin, which said: "Occidental Europe is preparing to send you a collective note. The situation is extremely grave. The most serious dangers are threatening our country if it does not yield

to the decision of the congress." But Bratiano remained obdurate. In reply to this warning, the representative at Berlin received this note:

"If they speak to you in that way, tell them formally that the country refuses every injunction coming from without. Such threats are liable to destroy the very things which the country seems determined to ask. Cabinets that lend themselves to such instigation are playing an inconsistent role, or are preparing dangerous crises."

The Roumanian Parliament finally rendered this decision: "The European Powers, meeting in congress at Berlin, built erroneously on what concerns the sentiments of religious intolerance in Roumania, acting on false information, so as to introduce Article 44 in the treaty as an affront to Roumania. A well-working state consists of one race only, or it must take the necessary means to form a homogeneous element."

The Bratiano group finally agreed to a revision of Article 7, in regard to which Prince Carol wrote to his father: "The project of law elaborated by the Committee of the Chambers is a provocation to Europe." However, Bratiano rejected the proposed bill.

✓ Meanwhile, the Stroussberg railway question sprang up; and the German investors wanted Roumania to take over the road and pay them off. Pressure was brought to bear on Bismarck, and he cooled off toward the Jewish question. Roumania started to talk terms through her minister, and Germany lent a willing ear. The



Roumanian cabinet resigned, and a new one was formed, again with Bratiano as premier.

The new Minister of Foreign Affairs, Boeresco, now started to speak a different language. The friendship toward Jews failed. He became a tough politician. The Jewish question was, to him, a piece of debris floating on the political sea. Once the shores were reached, the debris was superfluous. He knew that Russia would give him support. France was hesitant, but was willing to accept the Roumanian view of the danger of the Jewish problem.

In London, Boeresco met with less success than in Paris. Germany, however, did an about-face. "The German government is kindly disposed toward us", the Berlin Roumanian representative jubilantly wrote to his government, "what is more, there is an anti-Semitic current in Germany. Now is the propitious, psychological moment for the solution of the Jewish question. A minor solution has a better chance of acceptance at present than ever before."

Meantime, a number of Jews filed individual petitions for naturalization. The opponents of emancipation cunningly demonstrated the fact that the Jews themselves preferred to be naturalized individually than en masse. The government had already prepared a list of the few indigenous Jews who were to be naturalized. Since the government was going to add the names of the Jewish veterans of the recent war to that list, the Roumanian-Jewish leaders displayed willingness to accept the concession, and so informed the government.

The government accepted their offer, and capitalized on it abroad. Bratiano was elated. He told the Council of Ministers: "We are ready, if the opposition consents, to grant citizenship not to 3,000 but to 60,000 Jews. I am inclined to believe that we will acquire 60,000 good and sincere citizens who will bear prejudice against no Christian, because, since 1876, I have known the ardent patriotism of the Jews. I have seen them at work, fighting courageously on our side to defend our liberties and our rights."

Finally, on October 31, 1879, a new Article 7 became part of the Constitution, and on that very day the government presented a list of 888 Jewish war veterans to the Chambers, as acceptable citizens. These names were voted upon favorably. Thus, the honor of Roumania was saved. Bratiano triumphed, and Prince Carol was delighted. In his Memoirs the Prince comments: "The soul of the world is thus relieved of a great onus. Everybody has yielded something, and each one has his conscience relieved for not having fought in vain."

Having gained a victory at home and having also satisfied Europe by complying with Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin, Bratiano promised the Powers to promulgate a law immediately to naturalize the Jews individually. The rush of Jewish applications for citizenship was welcomed by the government, who exploited it as evidence that the Jews had cheerfully accepted the new law.

Waddington demanded that to Article 44 should be added: "Those born in Roumania, who up to their becoming of age never stood under foreign protection are, under Article 44, entitled to

civil and political rights."

But Bucharest was instructed by Boeresco not to accept even such a modest modification. Meanwhile, a change came in Berlin in regard to the matter of the Silesian railway. This dragged on until about September, 1879, when Liteanu, the Roumanian Ambassador, wired that "the feeling in Berlin is friendly to Roumania."

The Roumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs lost no time in inducing the signatory powers to accept the elimination of Article 7 in principle only, leaving the matter for later consideration. Article 7 was to read as follows:

"The difference of religious creed and confession will not constitute an impediment to the acquisition and exercise of civil and political rights in Roumania.

"1) Every stranger, without distinction of religion, whether he be subject to foreign protection or not, can obtain naturalization on the following conditions:

"a) He will address a petition to the government, praying for naturalization, indicating the capital he possesses, his profession or vocation, and his desire to establish himself in Roumania.

"b) From the date of his petition he will domicile himself in the country for ten years, and will be able to exercise the vocation in which he will engage.

"2) Exception as to the time (of domicile) will be made to:

"a) Those who will have brought useful industries or

inventions to Roumania; those who will distinguish themselves by their talents, or those who will have founded great commercial or industrial establishments in Roumania.

"b) Those born and brought up in Roumania by parents established there, who neither themselves nor their parents, have ever enjoyed foreign protection.

"c) Those who have served in the war of independence under the Roumanian flag and who could be naturalized collectively at the initiative of the government by the enactment of a special law.

"3) Naturalization can be granted only individually and by virtue of a special law.

"4) A special law will determine the manner by which aliens can establish themselves in Roumania.

"5) Only Roumanians or those who are naturalized Roumanians can acquire rural land in Roumania.

"The rights acquired prior to this date are respected.

"Existing international conventions (treaties) remain in force with all the clauses and details stipulated therein."

These modifications implied a complete nullification of the emancipation of the Jews in Roumania.

The Chambers immediately granted citizenship rights to 800 war veterans, to about 200 worthy candidates, and thus completed the magnanimous gesture of state justice.

The Powers tacitly accepted their defeat. Roumanian independence was recognized in spite of her failure to adhere to

the Treaty of Berlin.

Prince Antoine, in a letter to his son, commented: "The forced Jewish paragraph by the congress is a mere general humane phrase. It is left to the legislature to regulate that affair, and I am convinced that, with the exception of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, not a whisper will be heard, no matter what may be done in the execution of that paragraph."

Bratiano's ingenuity found a way to avoid further complications. Since Jews felt that they were citizens of Roumania, they had to correct the "errors" to avoid outbreaks as a result of Roumanian bitterness toward the Congress of Berlin, by a voluntary renunciation of the act of emancipation. Thus, he argued, Jews would display love for their country, and the Roumanian people would know how to appreciate it.

✓ On January 15, 1880, the repurchase of the Stroussberg line was approved by the Roumanian Chambers. In this way Roumania yielded to German interests. Bratiano allowed his country to pay this price not only for the recognition of her independence, but also in return for the retention of the obnoxious Article 7 in the Constitution, for the defeat of Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin, and for denying citizenship to her Jews.

On February 8, 1880, the German, British and French representatives notified the Roumanian Foreign Office in Bucharest that their countries recognized the Roumanian independence. Thus, Roumania attained the acme of diplomatic success.

16

The Jews had hoped that after the war, they too, would be recognized as citizens of the country for which they displayed unlimited devotion. They were bitterly disappointed. Roumania attained independence, and although the treaty provided

that racial and religious discriminations should be abolished, the Jewish question remained unsolved. Boeresco made a tour of the European capitals assuring the political leaders that there was no more Jewish question in Roumania. A memoir presented by the Roumanian representative at Paris on August 28, 1879, with reference to the revision of Article 7 of the Roumanian constitution, stated definitely:

"The situation of all the Jews in general, Roumanian subjects ~~or~~ aliens, will be much better than in the past. In fact, if after the revision of Article 7 and the naturalization law which will closely follow it, the condition of the Jews in the past will be compared with their new status, notable differences will be found in their favor. Just think: there will be three classes of Jews: aliens, Roumanian subjects, and citizens. In the past, alien Jews could under no circumstances acquire rural land; they could not hold state lands under farm lease; they could not bid at public auctions, nor contract for certain public enterprises. Their right to buy houses in towns was contested; they could not own inns in the country; finally, they could not be naturalized. These prohibitions and others were presented against them, not as aliens, but as Jews. After Article 7 of the constitution will be removed, all the prohibitionary laws will disappear, and there will be no distinction between our alien Jews and alien Christians, Mussulman or others. The Jews will, therefore, enjoy all the civil rights which will be recognized or accorded to all."

Despite all her protestations and promises, what Roumania actually did, instead of <sup>using</sup> the old classification of Jews as indigenous and foreign, was to classify all as aliens, regardless of their place of origin or the length of their residence.

Even those who had been born in Roumania, and whose families had lived there for centuries, were now deprived of its protection and exposed to the petty whim and caprice of every minor official. Their hopes of eventually acquiring Roumanian citizenship were rudely snuffed out. As indigenous Roumanian Jews, under Article 7, paragraph 2, they had to be naturalized. But as aliens, the government owed them nothing. To make the provision against the emancipation of any Jew stronger, the Council of Ministers provided that every applicant for citizenship had to furnish: (1) a certificate from his local authority declaring that he was born and educated in Roumania and that his parents lived in Roumania; (2) a certificate to the effect that neither he nor his parents were foreign subjects. Needless to say, such certificates were rarely obtained from the local authorities and even if, after spending money freely, one did succeed in obtaining such certificate, his application for citizenship was voted down in Parliament.

The irony of the situation to a European was, perhaps, nowhere better expressed than in Salisbury's astonished remark to Boeresco during the course of a conversation on the Jewish question in 1879: "What! You have people, father and son, who are Roumanian subjects, and you do not want them to become Roumanian citizens because they are Jews?"



CHAPTER XXXVIIA QUARTER CENTURY, 1880 - 1904The Hay Note

The assassination of the Russian Tzar in 1881 brought a storm of persecution upon the Jews in Russia and Germany, which soon reached Roumania. Many of the Russian revolutionists found refuge abroad, including Roumania. Thus, the Roumanian government was able to find a new excuse for oppressing the Jews. The government was criticized in Parliament for permitting Russian Jews to "swarm" into the country. It was then compelled to address the Russian government on the subject. Naturally, commerce suffered and many Roumanian firms at Jassy had to break off their relations with Odessa, the main commercial port to Roumania.

The campaign launched against the revolutionists in Russia brought great misfortune and ruin to many of the Roumanian Jews. The Roumanian people showed humane feelings and warm sympathy for the Russians who sought refuge in Roumania, but reactionaries saw an opportunity to stir up the people. At Turnu Severin, in Wallachia, leaflets against Jews were distributed in the streets. At Galatz, the leading Jews received threatening letters.

In the rural districts unlimited power in dealing with Jews was given to the local authorities. The census board of Buzeu imposed a "Jew Tax" on the wealthy. At Piatra, in 1882, the

Jewish community was taxed the sum of 1,200 francs annually for the maintenance of a music band in the parks. After 1881 Jews were not allowed to sell alcohol to Christians.

Three years after gaining independence, Roumania proclaimed herself a kingdom, (May 10, 1881), with Prince Carol I as King.

Two months later, a law was enacted excluding Jews from the exchanges, and providing that only Roumanians should act as brokers in all business transactions. Thousands of Jews were thus deprived of their livelihood.

Another law, passed in 1881, ordered Russian revolutionists who had found asylum in Roumania, to return to their native country. The Roumanian government applied this law to Jews. Nine Roumanian Jews were expelled in 1885, for refusing to accept willingly the oppression of their brothers. This outrage provoked a protest from the Roumanian press. Under this law, every alien touring or residing in Roumania had to possess a ticket of free residence, issued by the prefect. The Consuls and Ambassadors protested vigorously against the law, and were promised that it would be modified.

In 1881 a society was formed at Buzeu to eliminate Jews from the economic life of Roumania. The agitation of the society assumed such proportions that the Minister of the Interior felt impelled to send out a circular letter to the prefects instructing them to stop the anti-Jewish propaganda.

In September of the same year a delegation of Jews called on the Minister and complained that some prefects had expelled Jews

from their homes in Moldavia. He showed great sympathy, and proposed the formation of a mixed committee of Christians and Jews to decide the legality of expulsions. However, the delegates did not accept the proposition.

The Jews in the Dobruja did not fare any better than their coreligionists in the old principalities. After the war, in spite of the fact that the former Turkish subjects in the Dobruja were considered Roumanian subjects, the local authorities arbitrarily expelled Jews from the villages. One of the victims who protested against the illegal and brutal procedure, was placed under arrest, and released only on the order of the Minister of the Interior.

A ministerial decree dissolved all Jewish communities in Roumania. They no longer had a legal status and could therefore hold no property or establish charitable institutions, such as hospitals, schools, or public baths. In one of the towns in Moldavia, the Jewish community bath-house was confiscated because it no longer had<sup>a</sup> legal status. The Jews could not impose the Gabela (meat tax) on kosher meat slaughtered in the Jewish slaughter houses; the Roumanian municipalities abrogated this privilege and levied the tax on kosher meat themselves.

A law, passed on March 29, 1884, forbade Jewish ambulant commerce. When Jews were deprived of the opportunity of carrying on their ambulant trade, Gypsies, Russians, Oltenians, Moldavians, Hungarians, and Italians, peddled freely in the streets of Roumanian cities. Fairs were opened to Jews only on presentation

of a license, from which Christians were exempt. Jews were excluded from industrial expositions.

When a delegation, headed by Dr. Beck and Dr. Stern, called on King Carol to appeal on behalf of their coreligionists, they were told to direct their petition to the government. When they addressed the Minister of Foreign Affairs with regard to the difficulties which Jews experienced when they applied for passports to emigrate, the minister replied that Jews were enjoying the rights which they had requested.

The "Societatea Pentru Invetatura Poporului Roman" (Society for the Enlightenment of the Roumanian People), of Jassy, provided in its by-laws, that only such aliens who were Roumanian Christians might be admitted. Similarly, the society of university students refused to admit Jews.

The labor movement of Western Europe began to make inroads into Roumania. The tailoring trade, 2,000 strong, consisting mostly of Jews, was organized for a strike under the leadership of one Nathan Oscar. They succeeded in securing their demands. Christian members of that trade also benefited by this organization. It was the beginning of proletarian fraternization of workers regardless of creed. However, when a strike was declared by Jewish and Christian medical students and interns in Bucharest, the Jewish students displayed more solidarity than the non-Jewish, who very soon deserted their Jewish comrades. So deep were the seeds of prejudice among the intellectual, that a casual strike was unable to eradicate them.

The restrictive laws against the Jews had an undesirable reaction. An economic crisis gripped the country. Numerous business failures followed in rapid succession.

The Bratiano followers carried on the expulsion of Jews from many districts, thus accelerating the economic chaos. Veteran soldiers, and Jews with long records of residence, all became victims of the general expulsion. Sub-prefects were holding meetings, instigating the peasants to pillage the Jews.

A Roumanian economic congress held at Jassy in 1885 adopted an anti-Jewish program. As a result, a meeting of business men in Bucharest urged the government to enact more restrictions against Jews in business.

In August, 1886, an anti-Semitic congress at the Athensu, in Bucharest, adopted resolutions aiming at the elimination of Jews from the economic life of the country.

The situation in the field of education was no better. The law of compulsory education was not applied to Jews. Jewish children attended schools in great numbers, constituting 40 percent of the total enrollment in 1882 and 1883. In some schools they represented between 70 and 75 percent of the total enrollment. Roumanian "patriots" complained that the Jews were invading the public schools.

In 1885, the separate Jewish schools were ordered to close, on the pretext that the teachers did not possess academic degrees. In the same pattern, every possible sort of chicanery was used to keep Jewish children away from the public schools. Sixty Jewish

primary school graduates were refused promotion to the gymnasium or commercial school.

Jewish communities were forbidden to collect the meat tax (Gabela), the main source of income for the maintenance of schools, hospitals, and other charitable institutions. Invoking Article 12 of the constitution, the commission held that only Christian institutions were exempt from taxes.

This was followed by imposing a yearly school tax of six lei on every alien for attendance at public elementary school, and fifty lei for the secondary school. Even this did not satisfy the Minister of Education, who requested, in 1887, all principals of primary schools to enroll Roumanians and naturalized children first. In 1893, the school tax was increased to fifteen lei in the rural districts and to thirty lei in the cities, and even then Jewish children were to be admitted only "if there is room available." In 1890, a bill was introduced in Parliament, affecting still further the Jewish children in public schools. A petition signed by over 150 Christians and addressed to Parliament protested against it, and demanded that Jewish children be admitted to the public schools free of charge. Another bill, requesting the elimination of Jewish students from the secondary schools, was rejected, as too drastic.

Despite the imposition of a school tax which most Jewish parents could ill-afford to pay, the government, in 1896, introduced a revenue stamp on educational documents. For every examination, the child had to affix a revenue stamp to his application. As a result, the enrollment of Jewish children in the public schools fell

to about five percent of the total.

Thus the government practically eliminated Jewish students from the schools. In 1898 a new law restricted the admission of Jewish children to the public schools. Under this law, "alien" children were not admitted to the public schools except "if there is room left after the Christian children have been accommodated."

The year 1899 brought additional restrictions against the Jews in schools. Professional courses were free, but "aliens" could be admitted only in the proportion of one-fifteenth (about 6 percent) of the total enrollment.

The exclusion of Jewish children from the public schools compelled Jewish communities to found schools of their own. The Roumanian government did not find these schools satisfactory. A ministerial circular of October, 1899, forbade schools to be open on Sunday, and in April, 1900, another ministerial circular ordered that classes be held on Saturday.

In the midst of this cauldron of hatred and persecution, a voice was raised by an enlightened Roumanian, George Panu, editor of Lupta. He criticized the officials for their excessive zeal in persecuting the Jews. He expressed his doubts as to whether the country would benefit by it. The effect of his editorials on Jews and non-Jews in Roumania and abroad was tremendous.

The Jewish press also showed courage in protesting against the policy of oppression, and the Bratiano government decided to get rid of its Jewish opponents. As a result, on October 13, 1885,

a number of them were expelled from the country.

Among those expelled, besides the great scholar Moses Gaster, were Dr. Elias Schwarzfeld, editor of Fraternitatea; Michael Asriel, publisher of the Hayoetz; I. Bettelheim, editor of the Epoca, the Bukarester Zeitung, and the Neue Bukarester Zeitung; M. Rosenfeld, former editor of the Vocea Aparatorului of Jassy, then editor of the Vocea Dreptetii; I. Fior, publisher; and I. Auerbach, publisher of the Fraternitatea. They were ordered to leave the country within twenty-four hours.

Convinced that his expulsion was contrary to law the publicist Fior returned to Roumania, firmly resolved to resist legally any further attempt to expel him. As soon as he reentered the country, he was arrested and sentenced to fifteen days in prison. A higher court confirmed the sentence. The Court of Cassation reversed the sentence, but it was sent back to the lower court where he lost his case.

The restrictive policy of the Bratiano government brought the country to the verge of disaster. All commercial and industrial enterprises in which Jews had been engaged were at a standstill. The agriculture of the country was in a state of depression. For the Jews, emigration seemed to be the only salvation. The 1,563 Jews who left Roumania in 1884 were a drop in the sea, ~~and many more~~. Meantime, more restrictive ordinances were issued against them.

Under the law of 1864, only Roumanian citizens could practice law, but Jewish lawyers were permitted to appear before justices of the



peace. In 1884 even this privilege was taken away. However, they were permitted to serve as secretaries to lawyers, and to maintain offices as notaries. Later, these too, were eliminated. Jews could practice medicine up to the year 1893, when the privilege was taken away from them. They were also forbidden to serve on the railways. The law of 1881 aimed at the elimination of Jews from business brokerage. In order to join a corporation, one had to be a citizen, and the same rule was applied to brokers dealing in grains, cereals, and other commodities. To meet the demands of business houses, the government created a corps of Roumanian Dragomans (brokers).

In April, 1885, a law was passed permitting only Roumanians or naturalized Roumanians to conduct pharmacies. A decree of 1886 denied non-Roumanians the right of selling drugs. A law of 1887 excluded Jews from participation in the adjudication of communal leasing. No Jew was eligible to membership in the Chamber of Commerce, unless he enjoyed civil and political rights. On May 14, 1887, a law passed for the promotion of Roumanian industries provided that two-thirds of the ~~personnel of the~~ directors had to be Roumanians.

Jewish saddlers, shoemakers, and other artisans were forbidden to sell any of their products, except boots, which could not otherwise be obtained. Concessionaires on trains and in railroad stations had to employ at least three-fifths Roumanians.

The company which built the electric lines at Jassy was not permitted to employ Jews. The contract of the municipality for building the sewer system at Bucharest excluded Jews from employment. In

1899, Istrati, Minister of Public Works, forced the railroad administration to discharge all Jewish needle-makers, cart-vendors, porters, custom house and lumber workers, and painters.

The Crédit Agricole law provided that only Roumanians could borrow, and its administration must be entirely Roumanian.

Since they were compelled to live under such intolerable conditions, many of the Roumanian Jews wanted to leave the country. When the passport holder presented it to <sup>a</sup>the Roumanian consul abroad, it was taken away. He could not continue his journey, and was unable to return to his country. Roumanian representatives abroad denied protection to naturalized citizens. In order to return to his home, the Jew had to invoke foreign protection by securing a foreign passport. Thus a Jew who had left his country as a Roumanian returned later as a foreign subject.

#### The Rosetti Regime

Despite the intolerable conditions, the Roumanian Jews manifested their resentment and contempt for the Bratiano regime whenever the opportunity presented itself. Thus, in 1888, Jews participated in a demonstration in honor of three anti-Bratiano leaders.

In other cities, too, Jews participated in anti-government demonstrations. Over 400 outstanding non-Jewish citizens published an appeal pleading for the equality of the Jews.

In April, 1888, the Bratiano cabinet fell; a new cabinet was formed, composed of such men as Peter Carp and Take Ionescu, with Teodor Rosetti as premier. The first two were known as loyal friends of Jews. They had fought against the oppression of the Jews,

and often criticized the Bratiano government. But as soon as they came into power, they did not show the slightest disposition to repeal the onpressive laws enacted by their predecessors. However, after assuming office, they stopped the expulsion of Jews from the villages and permitted a certain category of expelled Jews to return to Roumania.

Although the new government did not encourage anti-Semitism, the Roumanian "patriots" continued their activities. At Braila, they organized a society called Unirea Lucratorilor Meserias/ (Union of Skilled Workmen) from which Jews were excluded. Similar organizations were later formed by various Christian trade groups.

While the harassing of Jews in the villages slackened, the Bratiano vagabond law was enforced in the cities. The spirit of intolerance prevailed in the public schools, as before. However, remarkable progress was demonstrated in the economic life of the country. Many factories were opened by Jews. At the Paris Exposition of 1889, Roumanian Jews were conspicuous and various distinctions were bestowed upon them.

Expressions of good-will toward Jews were made by some members of the Roumanian parliament/ and some civic-minded men of the press. After the fall of the Bratiano regime, the Jewish question came up again. At the session of February 7, 1888, Cogalniceanu declared that an objective dispassionate approach was required, especially in relation to the emancipation. In the opinion of the newspaper Respectul Legei/ of Focshani, "Anti-Semitic propaganda is incompatible

with the tendencies and traditions of the Roumanian people. The Olteanul of Craiova stated that the anti-Jewish policy was unjust and illogical.

The new cabinet reduced the pressure against the Jews, but the situation remained basically unchanged. The policy refused to relinquish its uncontrolled power.

In the latter part of 1888, expulsion of Jews had been resumed. The change of government in 1889 made the Jews believe better times were approaching for them. But when a delegation of Jewish leaders called upon the new premier, Lascar Catargiu, to express their felicitations, they touched upon the Jewish question, and the premier replied that for the present they should sacrifice their own interests for the benefit of the country. Nevertheless, for a short period after 1889, the Jews had a breathing spell from persecution.

It soon became apparent that the new regime would continue the policies of the old one. Some modification had been made in regard to Jews in the Army, but the same discriminatory methods were retained in the recruiting system. As before, Jewish soldiers could not expect promotion.

The Roumanian press continued to be biased against Jews and contributed to the intense feeling of anti-Semitism.

A bill was introduced into Parliament to exclude Jews from professional schools. Carp opposed the bill, and compelled its modification. Shortly thereafter he again had occasion to raise his voice against persecution of the Jews. He declared that the Jews were Roumanian subjects, that they enjoyed no foreign protection,

and were entitled to the natural protection of the state. In spite of his eloquence the bill was approved,

In April of that year, the Union of native Jews of Roumania addressed a memorandum to King Carol and Parliament praying for equal rights. The same year a number of young indigenous Jewish veterans of the army petitioned the Chambers to permit their reenlistment so that they might be eligible for advancement, but their request was not granted.

Earlier in 1893, the Roumanian lawmakers discovered that there were not enough restrictions against the Jews on the statute books, and they added one more - complete exclusion from schools.

Peter Carp protested against the enactment of communal laws excluding Jewish children from the schools. He admitted that Jewish prudence and intellectual faculties might be "dangerous" to the country, but that the "danger" resulted from the inability of the Roumanians to compete with them, because of lack of education.

In April, 1893, the Association of Indigenous Roumanian Jews, composed of former army men, unsuccessfully petitioned the Senate to be admitted to citizenship. This fact, as well as the expulsions and persecutions to which the Jews were subjected throughout the country, and the frequent denial of their legal rights, induced many to emigrate. In the course of this exodus, streams of emigrants from Roumania moved to many other parts of the world.

Soon the country began to feel the effects of the mass-emigration. The official Journal De La Roumania stated frankly, "The emigration is assuming considerable proportions, and in some respects disturbing.

It affects particularly that class of Jewish workmen which are not only useful but indispensable to us, since our Roumanians do not want to learn some of the trades." Small towns became depopulated, houses vacant, property values depreciated. To save its face, the government forced prospective emigrants to sign a declaration that they were leaving the country voluntarily. The government decreed emigration to be illegal and the frontiers were closed. The Austro-Hungarian authorities refused entry to those who left Roumania. Those who were not permitted to emigrate were subjected to new discriminations.

In 1896 a new school bill was introduced into the Chambers. Jewish students of Jassy and Bucharest requested the Chambers to remove restrictions against them in the educational system. Despite these protests, the bill became a law, and 55,000 Jewish children were deprived of school instruction.

In 1897, ~~the~~ Minister of War Berendei introduced a bill to exempt Jews from military service and substitute a special tax. 30,000 Jewish army reservists held a protest meeting. This time the bill was defeated. A mob of several thousand Roumanians headed by a group of students, called a meeting to express their dissatisfaction with the army regulation. They demolished and looted hundreds of Jewish-owned stores, invaded every cafe, and assaulted the patrons. They destroyed the iron fence around the Coral Temple <sup>otherwise</sup> and desecrated it. Similar scenes took place in Galatz and other cities. In the Chambers the government was openly accused of having instigated and encouraged the riots.

Excesses continued at Bucharest. The rioters became so

defiant that they announced in advance their destructive intentions. Minister of the Interior Pherekyde blamed the Jews for provoking the disorders.

Senator Carp again interpellated the government and criticized its action. He argued that it was impossible to eliminate the Jews by means of a general massacre; that they had to be re-educated and made useful to the country. The minister promised to compensate them for the losses caused by the riots, and punish the rioters. It was a symbolic compensation; the millions of lei in damages were repaid by 10,000 lei and allocated mainly to foreign subjects protected by international law. One hundred and fifty of the rioters were arrested, only seventeen of whom were tried, and all were finally acquitted.

Harassing the Jews became so widespread that even the very liberal regime of Peter Carp soon adopted the same pattern of bias. When Carp was interpellated in the Chambers regarding the abuse and expulsion of Jews from rural districts, he replied that under the law he was unable to change the situation. The former president of the Court of Cassation even went further, denying that there was any hostility toward Jews in Moldavia.

In 1902, Bernard Lazare, the eminent French-Jewish journalist visited Roumania. He made a short tour of the country and saw the misery of the Jews. Just before his departure, the anti-Semites organized a street demonstration, smashing windows, attacking Jews in their shops, and yelling, "down with the Jews!" The Bucharest police appealed to the Jews to have their guest leave quietly and not escort him to the railroad station.

CHAPTER ~~TWENTY-FOUR~~ XXXVIIITHE WAR WITH BULGARIA (1913)

In 1913 the Romano-Bulgarian war broke out. The Jews were called to arms and duly responded. Jews were included in every committee formed to aid the prosecution of the war, and the newspapers publicized Jewish courage and patriotic zeal.

Many Jewish soldiers died in that brief campaign of 1913. Minister Marghiloman praised them and said that no one would be more entitled to citizenship than "those Jews and other aliens born and raised in Roumania" who sacrificed their lives for the country. Take Ionescu was more emphatic. He said: "The Jews have acted nobly since the mobilization of the army, and uttered no complaints of their treatment," and concluded that post-war naturalization of the Jews was certain. Another statesman suggested naturalization for all Jews who served in the Army.

Many of them enlisted voluntarily, but were soon discharged and sent home on the ground that "no alien may enlist in the army as a volunteer." This insult was brought to the attention of the government by the Union of Indigenous Roumanian Jews.

Roumania was victorious in the war and gained a large section of Bulgarian territory in which many Jews were living. This made the Jewish question more difficult. The Bulgarian Jews feared that they would share the lot of their coreligionists in Roumania.



In January, 1913, the Jewish Central Consistory of Bulgaria had addressed a memorandum to the Council of Ministers at Sofia. It was signed by Marcu Ehrenpreis, chief rabbi of Bulgaria, and by President S. Penhas, and three members of the community, protesting the ceding of any territory to Roumania, and urging the Bulgarian government to protect the Bulgarian Jews.

The premier, in reply, assured them that he would bring the matter before the Council of Ministers, and that he was confident that the mediatory powers would find a satisfactory solution. Ehrenpreis succeeded in having a favorable provision with regard to the Jews, inserted in the Treaty of Bucharest after the close of the War. Under the terms of this treaty, the Jews in Dobruja, as well as those in the newly-annexed Bulgarian territory, were recognized as full-fledged Roumanian citizens.

This created an anomaly, which made the Roumanian policy more confusing and inconsistent: A group of Jews in a conquered territory were proclaimed citizens, while 250,000 Jews whose ancestors had lived in Roumania for centuries were still considered "aliens". After the end of the war of 1913, Roumania ruled that for the present "only mobilized soldiers may be emancipated." But no sooner had the army been demobilized than several categories of mobilized soldiers were created. By subdividing those mobilized soldiers into so many categories of service during the campaign, the number of Jewish veterans was reduced to a bare minimum.

Various countries in Europe made new pleas for the Jewish cause in Roumania. The European press raised strong objections to the Roumanian policy. The German press was very emphatic in its condemnation of Roumania. In June 1913, Georges Clemenceau published an article in which he severely criticized the Roumanian politicians for the ill-treatment of the Jews. He appealed to the civilized world to remedy the historic wrongs which had been committed against them. But the voices of indignation were of no avail, although Mishu, the Roumanian Minister at London, promised that <sup>Jews in annexed</sup> the Bulgarian territory would, without distinction, enjoy equal rights.

In less than a year after the close of the war with Bulgaria, the Bratiano ministry enacted new laws affecting both Jewish veterans in the army and their coreligionists in civil life. A law was passed whereby their homes became less secure, and they could be transferred to a locality especially designed for them, from which they would be unable to depart without official approval. In a bill introduced for the protection of the country against "aliens", General Hajdeu, Minister of War, demanded that the Jews be designated as aliens.

Following the precedent set by Bratiano in 1867, and in order to prevent any possibility of Jewish emancipation, the government launched an anti-naturalization movement in 1913. The Liga Culturala (Cultural League), with Nicolai Iorga, Professor Alexander C. Cuza, and V.C. Arion in the forefront, was then

organized to fight against naturalization.

The Liga Culturala adopted a vigorous program of action against the Jews. It held a convention in Bucharest and staged street demonstrations. Jewish homes in Bucharest were invaded and men and women were assaulted. The disorders assumed such proportions that the government felt impelled to issue orders to restore peace.

Roumanian politicians sought to divert public attention from the vexatious question facing the country. In 1913, a blood accusation was made in the capital of Roumania. The result was that the accusers and their lawyer were convicted of blackmail.

Aside from these ritual murder charges, things moved along normally in Roumania in 1913 and for several years after. The expulsion of Jews from rural districts was almost completed. The hunting of Jews proceeded as usual, and protests sent to the Prime Minister by the Jewish communities were ignored. In 1915, the Prime Minister sent an order directing the expulsion of all Jews from the frontier districts.

~~In 1913,~~ After the close of the Romano-Bulgarian War in 1913, Prince Carol (who later became King Carol II) visited the United States. He was the guest of honor at a luncheon tendered by Abraham Elkus, former United States Ambassador to Turkey. Among other guests present were, Cyrus Adler, Felix Warburg, Bernard M. Baruch, Louis Marshall, and Dr. Henry Moskowitz. In his remarks at this luncheon the Prince averred that he was a democrat and joined in the spirit of freedom prevalent in the United States. He

affirmed that he belonged to a royal democracy in which everybody was equal and where there was no discrimination on the grounds of religion or nationality. The true facts, however, belied his emphatic assertions.