DOROT

vol. 19

DOROT: The McGill Undergraduate Journal of Jewish Studies

DOROT:
The McGill Undergraduate Journal of Jewish Studies

Published by
The Jewish Studies Students' Association
of McGill University

Volume 19
2020-2021

The opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors included. They do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Jewish Studies or the Jewish Studies Students' Association.

Cover Art: Aaron Nadal

This is an annual publication of the Jewish Studies Students' Association of McGill University. All correspondence should be sent to:

855 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
H3A 2T7

Table of Contents

Montreal, Spring 2021

Preface

Dear Readers and Contributors to *Dorot*,

Every ordinary year it is an honor and a joy to celebrate the publication of *Dorot,* a journal run independently by students associated with McGill's Department of Jewish Studies. This year, the pandemic disruptions to our habits and best practices, especially to our ability to gather in normal collegial ways, turn the publication of this issue of *Dorot* into an extraordinary feat. Its timely appearance testifies to your ability to pull through exceptional adversity with good will and strength.

I hope that future years will spare you further opportunities to test your resilience. It may be reassuring to know that we *can* get through major challenges alright, even with flying colours. Nevertheless, I wish for you a more tranquil path as you continue to wind your ways forwards in search of interesting careers and personal contentment in your lives.

With warm best wishes,

Yael Halevi-Wise, Chair of the Department of Jewish Studies
Associate Professor of English and Jewish Studies
McGill University

Introduction

It is my privilege to present the 2020-2021 edition of *Dorot: The McGill Undergraduate Journal of Jewish Studies*.

I had the honour of working with a team of six wonderful editors, all of whom are dedicated and active students in the Jewish Studies community at McGill. I extend my deepest gratitude to Maya Abramson, Rachel Bernardo, Asa Brunet-Jailly, Sarah Farb, Aviva Ripstein, and Rebecca Turner. I also want to thank our cover artist, Aaron Nadal, for his incredible photograph of the Bagg Street Shul, Quebec's oldest living synagogue building, located in the Plateau in Montreal.

This year's edition of *Dorot* will forever represent the resiliency and strength of the students and faculty in the Jewish Studies department. The works presented in the journal demonstrate the spark and passion for Jewish learning that did not fade with the challenges and differences of online school. In this journal you will find six undergraduate papers: an analysis of Lamed Shapiro's short stories, by Sam Shepherd; a historical examination of the Salonican Jewish experience in Post-Ottoman Greece, by Andreas Iakovos Koch; a dissection of the varying interpretations of atonement in Judaism in the rabbinic, medieval, and modern eras, by Elinor Rosenberg; an overview of the history of social antisemitism in Toronto after the Second World War, by Melanie Rose; an exploration of the *halachot* of marijuana, by Alden Tabac; and an uncovering of the historical consolidation of Montreal's contemporary Jewish polity, by Gilli Cohen. Thank you to these students for sharing their impressive work with us, and congratulations!

The diversity of the papers in this journal reflects the richness of the Jewish Studies program at McGill. I wish to express my gratitude to a program that offers so much opportunity for learning and exploration in multiple areas of study. Being a part of the Jewish Studies department has also provided the chance to meet, learn from, and work with so many stellar professors, all of whom ensure that Jewish education is not only preserved, but thrives at McGill. I would like to extend my deepest thanks to Department Chair Professor Yael Halevi-Wise, whose guidance and support made this journal possible. I would also like to thank the Jewish Studies Students' Association for their assistance in promoting and creating the journal.

As my time at McGill concludes, I will cherish my involvement in the Jewish Studies classroom, both in-person and on Zoom. I am confident that this department will continue to flourish for years to come, and I look forward to reading next year's journal!

Please enjoy,

Arly Abramson
Editor-in-Chief

Jews Between Worlds in “White Challah” and “New Yorkish”

Sam Shepherd

Near the end of the 19th century, several waves of violent pogroms — targeted acts of mass, antisemitic violence — uprooted Jewish life in Eastern Europe. From 1881-1882, a wave of raids ravaged Jewish property in larger cities and small towns in the southwestern Russian empire.[1] The pogroms later escalated in violence, such as the Kishinev Pogrom (1903) in Bessarabia and the Russian loyalist pogroms of the Russian Revolution (1905-1907), which resulted in over a hundred Jewish casualties. Some Jews formed militant self-defence groups to counter these antisemitic attacks. Yet, many others emigrated to escape persecution. During The Great Migration (1881-1914), 1.6 million Russian Jews immigrated to America. The Eastern European immigrants were usually impoverished and of working-age, and many of them settled in urban areas, such as New York City.[2] Yiddish immigrant and author Lamed Shapiro captures the transition of Jews from Europe to America in two short stories: “White Challah” and “New Yorkish.” In the former story, Shapiro portrays a violent pogrom from the perspective of a Russian soldier. In the latter piece, Shapiro depicts an interfaith romance in New York City. In this paper, I argue that Shapiro uses descriptions of characters and food in the two stories to convey how Eastern European Jews found physical security when they immigrated to America. Shapiro also, however, uses food imagery and descriptions of settings in both texts to illustrate how Jews became alienated from their cultural and spiritual roots when they left the Old World.

Levi Joshua Shapiro was born on March 10th, 1878 in the Ukrainian shtetl Rzhyshchiv. In 1896, Shapiro moved to Warsaw in an attempt to

become the protege of Yiddish author I.L. Peretz. Yet, this attempt at befriending the literary giant was unsuccessful, and he later moved back to Ukraine after two years of unemployment. In 1905, Shapiro immigrated from Eastern Europe to America. After spending a four-month layover in London, in which he befriended Yiddish revolutionary Yosef Hayim Brenner, Shapiro ultimately settled in New York City. During his time in New York, Shapiro became a member of a group of Yiddish-speaking poets, critics, and artists called The *Yunge*. He assumed the pen name "Lamed Shapiro" to articulate both his modernist ideology and his Jewish roots. He married and moved to Chicago with a woman named Freydl, who later died in 1927. After his wife's death, Shapiro moved back to New York and became involved with the Communist newspaper *De Frunken.* Decades later, at age 68, Shapiro divorced from communist ideology and moved to Los Angeles. In 1948, Shapiro died in his Los Angeles home from the effects of lifelong alcoholism.[3]

Despite never witnessing antisemitic violence firsthand, Shapiro's life was marked by grief, multiple suicide attempts, and nomadism. He became a prolific short story writer and novelist during his time in America, articulating the experiences of Eastern European Jews as they abandoned the Old World to only then face exclusion and discrimination in North America. Shapiro's extensive knowledge of twentieth-century ideologies, the canon of Jewish literature, and personal experiences with tragedy all surface in his writing. His stories foreground themes such as antisemitic violence, grieving the loss of the traditional Eastern European way of life, and Jewish feelings of exclusion while living in America.[4]

In the 1919 short story "White Challah," Shapiro uses descriptions of characters and setting from the perspective of a Russian soldier to highlight

how Jews living in the shtetl endured extreme violence and physical insecurity. When the protagonist of the story, a foot-soldier named Vasil, recounts the journey of the pogroms through various Russian shtetls, he describes how the soldiers march "through foreign places inhabited by strange people who spoke an incomprehensible language and who looked frightened or angry."[5] These initial descriptions of the Jews paint them as otherworldly, unhappy people. The terms "foreign," "strange," and "incomprehensible" highlight Russian antisemitism, as the soldiers view Jews as totally dissimilar from their own culture. At the same time, the fact that Jews speak an "incomprehensible language" underscores their insularity, as they have yet to adopt the cultural values of greater European society. Further, the soldier's observations reveal that Jews were both "frightened" for their lives at the hands of violent pogroms, and their counter-violence demonstrates that they were "angry" at the Russians for disrupting their self-sufficient life in the shtetl. Later, as the Russian army continues moving forward between "Kolov and Zhadista,"[6] Vasil describes the murder of a wave of Jews:

> At first Vasil held back, but the loud screams of the women and children and the repulsive, terrified faces of the men with their long earlocks and caftans blowing in the wind drove him to a frenzy, and he cut into the Jews like a maddened bull. They were destroyed with merciful speed: the army trampled over them like a herd of galloping horses.[7]

The descriptions of Jews' "screams" and "repulsive, terrified faces" emphasize the horrific violence Jews endured at the behest of Russian pogroms. Moreover, despite earlier descriptions of "Jewish privates" enacting counter-violence, Shapiro underscores how Jews were ultimately defenceless against Russian soldiers, as they were "trampled over" and "destroyed with merciful

speed."[8] These two descriptions of anti-Jewish violence convey an asymmetrical power balance between the Russian pogroms and the countering Jewish army, which suggests that Eastern European Jews did not have the means to defend themselves successfully against the pogroms. Finally, after the anti-Jewish violence subsides, the narrator witnesses, "On the ruins of Dobroslawa (...) a madman, the sole survivor of the town, who howled like a dog."[9] This dark description of the final, remaining Jew in the town paints a grim portrait of the deterioration of Eastern European Jewry. The survivor's ultimate howl illustrates how the violence of the pogroms has dehumanized Jews, for, in the face of extreme violence, they cannot even articulate language. These sobering descriptions of Jewish characters when confronting devastating Russian pogroms illustrate how Jews in the Old World faced extreme insecurity and violence.

In contrast to the inhospitable conditions of Old World Europe, in the 1931 short story "New Yorkish," Lamed Shapiro uses imagery connoting luxury to convey how Jews acquired physical safety and economic privilege after immigrating to America. Instead of being "deathly pale"[10] like the Jewish man at the end of "White Challah," the protagonist of "New Yorkish," Manny, is healthy, for he has "a hairy chest, a little round belly, a body that seemed fleshy, though…".[11] Within the context of the story, the description of Manny's paunchiness illustrates his self-perceived inferiority when compared to his younger partner, Dolores. Still, on a more basic level, Shapiro's description of Manny being out of shape showcases how American Jews achieved greater physical security when they immigrated to America, as he can access enough food to be 'fleshy.'

Moreover, Shapiro describes how Manny consumes decadent foods to convey how Jews acquired economic privilege in America. At the beginning of the story, Manny consumes a decadent breakfast at a diner:

> The man with the sullen face got his pancakes, with honey and butter, and sat down at a small table near the hot counter. He worked methodically — first putting the pats of butter between the hot pancakes so that they would melt, then pouring himself some coffee from the automat faucet set into the wall and finally taking off his coat and hat and putting them on a hanger.[12]

Here, Shapiro articulates Manny's economic security through a description of what and how he eats. The pancakes he orders are rich with honey and butter, both of which are sweet, fattening flavour enhancers, which implies indulgence. The coffee he drinks stems from an automatic machine, which shows how Manny could access modern technology that minimizes manual labour. Manny also eats his meal "methodically." First, he places the butter between the cakes, then he pours his coffee, and finally, he hangs his coat on the rack. This fastidious order in his dining habits implies that Manny routinely frequents the restaurant and can thus afford to eat out often. Similarly, after watching a matinee with Dolores, Shapiro describes their choice to eat, "'Oysters,' Manny decided as they left the theatre. 'Let's have some oysters!'"[13] Oysters have a connotation of wealth, which implies that Manny has economic privilege and can afford to order expensive food. Finally, Shapiro's choice of the word "decided" and the inclusion of an exclamation mark in the phrase foregrounds Manny's privilege, as he does not pause to consider if he will be able to afford a lavish meal. Rather, he declares his desire, which implies confidence in his economic security. In stark contrast to the modest 'white challah' that impoverished Jews ate in the Old World,

Shapiro describes how the Jewish protagonist in "New Yorkish" has frequent access to decadent, expensive foods, which demonstrates how Jews acquired both physical security and economic privilege after immigrating to America.

Yet, while pancakes and oysters in "New Yorkish" represent what Jews *gained* in America, Shapiro uses the same food imagery in both texts to convey how Jews *lost* aspects of their traditional culture when they fled Eastern Europe. In "White Challah," the author describes how the titular food is a cornerstone of Jewish identity. Vasil's first description of the Jews is as "people who wore strange clothes, sat in stores, ate white challah, and had sold Christ."[14] In contrast, the few Jews within his regiment are indistinguishable from other soldiers, for "without white challah they looked almost like everybody else."[15] With these two early descriptions of Jews, Shapiro implies that the consumption of challah among Jews in Eastern Europe is such a ubiquitous custom that the food becomes a distinguisher of their ethnicity. Thus, Shapiro uses this food imagery to illustrate how Jews in Eastern Europe were connected to their cultural roots. Shapiro goes on to underscore the connection between challah and Eastern European Jewry in the story's gruesome final scene. When Vasil confronts a Jewish woman, he describes her appearance as, "Half a breast, a beautiful shoulder, a full, rounded hip — everything dazzling white and soft, like white challah, Damn it—these Jews are made of white Challah!"[16] Then, when Vasil cannibalizes the Jewish woman, he remarks how "White challah has the taste of a firm juicy orange. Warm and hot, and the more one sucks it the more burning the thirst. Sharp and thick, and strangely spiced."[17] Within the context of this scene, Vasil's act of cannibalism demonstrates the extremity and depravity of antisemitism and antisemitic tropes among 19th century Europeans. Yet, the specific imagery of

Jews appearing and tasting like challah also proves that Eastern European Jews were committed to maintaining their cultural customs. By associating challah with Jewish flesh, Shapiro emphasizes how Eastern European Jews were so devoted to the custom of eating challah on Shabbat that this food has become synonymous with their anatomy. The descriptions locate challah as an integral aspect of Jewish identity, which conveys how Jews in the Old World had a strong sense of connection to their culture and traditions.

In contrast, Shapiro describes how Manny eats more and more non-kosher food throughout the plot of "New Yorkish," demonstrating how Jews acculturated when they immigrated to the New World. Before introducing himself to Dolores, Manny habitually eats "pancakes, with honey and butter" at the diner.[18] Similarly, Manny suggests ice cream as their first date activity.[19] These descriptions of Manny's meals in the early section of the story show how Manny initially does not deviate from traditional Jewish culture. Pancakes are similar in texture and taste to challah. Similarly, while the diner is likely not strictly kosher, none of the ingredients in Manny's meal seriously break any laws of *kashrut*, nor does ice cream. The first few meals in the story reflect how Jews did not initially deviate from their cultural heritage when they left the Old World. However, as Manny becomes increasingly involved with his non-Jewish partner, he begins to eat *treyfe*. After watching a film with Dolores, the couple goes to a lunchroom where "Manny ordered oysters 'in their shells,' Dolores ordered an oyster chowder."[20] The laws of k*ashrut* dictate that Jews can only eat foods with fins and scales, thus forbidding oysters and other shellfish.[21] The concurrence between Manny's first date and the introduction of un-kosher food into the plot implies that dating a non-Jewish partner inspires Manny to deviate from his cultural roots. Finally, after

having sex with Dolores, the next day, "Manny brought in the milk from the hall, and the smell of a 'goyish' breakfast wafted through the apartment: eggs, bacon, fresh coffee."[22] On the most basic level, this breakfast represents Manny's renunciation of Jewish cultural customs because the Torah forbids the consumption of pork.[23] Yet, Shapiro's specific use of the adjective 'goyish' also reveals how this symbolism is intentional, for he makes the connection between acculturation and dating a Jewish non-partner obvious. The shift in Manny's diet from pancakes, to oysters, to ultimately bacon in "New Yorkish" acts as a microcosm for the acculturation of Jews into America. Shapiro emphasizes how Manny's relationship with a non-Jewish romantic partner in the New World inspires him to eventually abandon dietary customs that the Jews in the Old World revered.

Finally, Shapiro uses descriptions of the settings and characters' appearances in both "White Challah" and "New Yorkish" to convey how Jews became alienated from their spirituality when they immigrated to America. Shapiro's descriptions of setting and appearances in "White Challah" show how Eastern European Jews valued spirituality, even when confronting violent antisemitism. When Vasil's army approaches Maliassy, the narrator describes the city as "the oldest and largest Jewish centre in the land, a seat of learning since the fourteenth century, a city of ancient synagogues and great yeshivas, with rabbis and modern scholars..."[24] This grand description of Maliassy paints religion as a central value of Eastern European Jewry. Through describing how the city contains "rabbis and modern scholars," Shapiro equates the two professions, implying that spirituality is as esteemed in the mores of Eastern European Jewry as education. Moreover, by describing how a city of "ancient synagogues and great yeshivas" has existed "since the

fourteenth century," Shapiro implies this value of spirituality is historically entrenched within Eastern European Jewish life. Also noteworthy, Shapiro presents this description of Maliassy from the point of view of a Russian soldier, Vasil. By having a cultural outsider remark on the splendour of Maliassy's synagogues and yeshivas, Shapiro implies that Jews in the Old World developed a reputation among other Europeans for being deeply spiritual people.

Furthermore, Vasil goes on to remark on the appearances and behaviours of Jews who are subject to these violent pogroms, which highlights their connection to religious spirituality. He describes the Jews the army encounters between Kolov and Zhaditsa as "repulsive, terrified faces of the men with long earlocks and black caftans blowing in the wind."[25] The description of "long earlocks" evokes the curled 'peyot' side-hair that ultra-Orthodox Jews grow out, for the Torah dictates, "Do not round off [the hair] at the edges of your head."[26] In a similar vein, the "black caftans" evoke the 'Bekishe' shawls that ultra-Orthodox Jews wear to convey their religious asceticism and modesty.[27] These descriptions of Jewish men at the moment of their death underscore their unyielding devotion to traditional religious practices. Moreover, when the pogroms upend Jewish life in Maliassy, Vasil notes that "Here, in Maliassy, the Jews fasted and prayed, confessing their sins to God, begging forgiveness of friend and enemy. Aged men recited Psalms and Lamentations…".[28] Jewish acts of religious devotion at the verge of their community's destruction convey how Eastern European Jews consider spirituality a central value, as they turn to prayer when confronted with violence.

While Shapiro highlights how Jews in the Old World were connected to their spirituality, the author uses the symbolism of a newsreel in "New Yorkish" to communicate how Jews became alienated from their spiritual roots when they immigrated to America. Midway through the story, Manny witnesses a newsreel called *The World Before Your Eyes* inside the theatre. He describes how the news broadcast depicts many short snapshots of American news in rapid succession, with each video covering a different subject than the last:

> Yale and Cornell are playing football, and Cornell wins. Hurray! A celluloid factory in Columbus, Ohio, has been destroyed in an explosion. The damage amounts to two million dollars. A kitten in a cellar survived, and sits snuggled in a policeman's elbow. A wounded firefighter has been admitted to a hospital, and the bodies of the missing workers have not yet been found… [29]

In Lea Garret's introduction in *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories,* the author describes how "Shapiro's America is a fractured world where meaning slips away."[30] The convoluted description of the newsreel illustrates this sense of fragmentation and alienation. Each clip within the broadcast differs vastly in terms of both tone and scope of the news subject covered. Within the selected passage alone, the newsreel juxtaposes a football win with a factory explosion, and a rescued kitten with a wounded firefighter. This dizzying series of clips confuses Shapiro's protagonist, as Manny remarks after watching the broadcast, "Oops! The survey is finished."[31] This exclamation conveys how there is no thematic thread linking the various subjects of the newsreel together. Manny cannot even process that the newsreel is ending because the selected clips are so disjointed. Shapiro expands on the chaotic structure of the newsreel by then sharing how Manny remarks, "Now comes the Comedy."[32]

This punchline conveys how there is no division in American media between news and slapstick entertainment, as they are presented in succession without pause. This scene foregrounds Manny's inability to find meaning in American life. Instead, Manny experiences a sense of alienation after consuming American media, which exemplifies how Jews distanced themselves from their spirituality when they transitioned into the New World.

Finally, Shapiro includes a dream scene in "New Yorkish" that conveys how Jews in America lost a sense of spiritual purity when they adapted to life in America. One night, Manny dreams about an idyllic day in a natural environment:

> The day is so hot that the grassy earth under Manny's body is as warm and yielding as a wool blanket. The day is so bright that through his closed eyelids he can clearly see the green valley far beneath, the pale blue sky, as if bleached with light, around and above the whole world, and the rich foliage of the chestnut tree high above his head.[33]

Manny's vision of a beautiful outdoor landscape conveys a sense of yearning for The Old World. In the tradition of English literature, the theory of 'pastoralism' describes the use of lavish nature imagery by urban writers to evoke nostalgia for a past, rural way of life.[34] In this dream scene, Shapiro evokes pastoralism in order to convey Manny's nostalgia for the purity of life in Eastern Europe. The exaggerated beauty of this scene, such as the "green valley," "rich foliage," and the sky "bleached with light," depicts the Old World as wholesome and lush, while associating the outdoors with Eastern Europe implies that Jews in the Old World had a great connection to nature. Yet, as Manny wakes, he describes how he "starts to open his eyes straight into absolute darkness. Unbelievable! Quickly he closes them again: darkness, blackness. He opens them again: blackness, darkness."[35] This description of

Manny's "darkness" as he returns to life in New York conveys that life in America is comparatively dismal and alienating. Even when Manny attempts to escape this darkness by repeatedly closing and opening his eyes, he cannot find light in American life. The juxtaposition between the colourful, bright environment of the Old World and the inescapable darkness of the New World suggests how Jews lost a sense of connection to their spiritual purity after immigration to America.

In the early twentieth century, a new generation of Yiddish authors emerged whose writing departed thematically from their literary antecedents. Whereas the fathers of Yiddish literature focused on how Eastern European Jews maintained their insularity when confronting a modernizing society, authors of the next generation, such as Lamed Shapiro, Shalom Asch, and I.B. Singer, wrote in an entirely different historical context. These authors witnessed the pogromization of Jewish life, and were influenced by European ideologies of the time, such as naturalism and Marxism. In "White Challah" and "New Yorkish," Lamed Shapiro describes Jewish characters transitioning between two worlds. He depicts European Jews who cling to tradition even in the face of devastating violence, but he also spotlights Jews who became alienated from their cultural and spiritual values after finding security in the United States. Interesting to note is how Shapiro does not depict immigration in neither a wholly positive nor wholly negative light. Instead, he articulates how this process included trade-offs and compromises. Jews found a safer, more comfortable life when they boarded steamships to America in the early 1900s, but much of their essential *Jewishness* — their historically entrenched cultural customs and spirituality — got lost overseas.

1 John Klier, "Pogroms," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe, 11 October 2010, accessed 14 April 2020, https://yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Pogroms.
2 Eli Lederhendler, "America," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe, 25 July 2017, accessed 14 April 2020, https://yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/America.
3 Lea Garret, introduction to *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories,* Lamed Shapiro (Yale University Press, 28 February 2007), x-xxii.
4 Garret, xii-xxii.
5 Lamed Shapiro, "White Challah" in *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories* (Yale University Press, 2007), 51.
6 Shapiro, "White Challah," 56.
7 Shapiro, 57.
8 Shapiro, 56.
9 Shapiro, 57.
10 Shapiro, 58.
11 Lamed Shapiro, "New Yorkish" in *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories* (Yale University Press, 2007), 209.
12 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 199.
13 Shapiro, 205.
14 Shapiro, "White Challah," 50.
15 Shapiro, 51.
16 Shapiro, 58.
17 Shapiro, 59.
18 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 199.
19 Shapiro, 201.
20 Shapiro, 205.
21 Leviticus 11:9, Deuteronomy 4:9.
22 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 210.
23 Leviticus 11:3; Deuteronomy 14:6.
24 Shapiro, "White Challah," 57.
25 Shapiro, 57.
26 Leviticus 19:27.
27 Yerrachmeil, Tilles, "Why the long Black Coat?" Chabad.org, https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3186/jewish/Why-the-Long-Black-Coat.htm.
28 Shapiro, "White Challah," 57.
29 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 203.
30 Garret, xxvi.
31 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 204.
32 Shapiro, 204.
33 Shapiro, 202.

34 Gordon M. Sayre, "The Oxymoron of American Pastoralism," *Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory* 69.4 (2013): 1.
35 Shapiro, "New Yorkish," 208.

Bibliography

Garret, Lea. "Introduction" in *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories.* Yale University Press, 28 February 2007. Pp. i-xxxi.

King James Holy Bible, New York.

Klier, John. "Pogroms." YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe. 11 October 2010. 14 April 2020. https://yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Pogroms.

Lederhendler, Eli. "America." YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe. 25 July 2017. 14 April 2020. https://yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/America.

Sayre, Gordon M. "The Oxymoron of American Pastoralism." *Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory* 69.4 (2013): 1.

Shapiro, Lamed. "New Yorkish" in *A Treasury of Yiddish Stories.* New York: Penguin Books, 1990. 198-212.

Shapiro, Lamed. "White Challah" in *The Cross and Other Jewish Stories*, Yale University Press, 2007. 50-59.

Tilles, Yerrachmeil. "Why the long Black Coat?" Chabad.org. https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3186/jewish/Why-the-Long-Black-Coat.htm.

Cleansing Hellas: Jews, Chams and Slav Macedonians in Post-Ottoman Greece

Andreas Iakovos Koch

Introduction

When Greek troops marched into Salonica in October 1912, a British observer commented that "the Jewish community of Salonika looks forward to a perpetuation of the Greek regime with a total absence of enthusiasm, if not with serious apprehension."[1] While the Ottoman Empire had long been characterized by its diversity of religious and linguistic communities, the modern Greek state to this day identifies itself as a homogeneous nation-state, built on the twin pillars of the Greek language and Greek Orthodox Christianity.[2]

Greek nationalism thus exerted a number of pressures on Salonican Jewry after 1913. Compulsory Greek language instruction forced Salonican Jews to prioritize the national language at the expense of Ladino or French. Legislation, like the Sunday-rest law, was designed to displace Jews from their dominant position in Salonica's economy. Beyond official policy, antisemitism was expressed by bigoted politicians and by the Greek ultranationalist press, contributing to outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence like the Campbell riots of 1935. Between 1941 and 1944, Greek institutions and individuals facilitated or profited from the deportation and near-total extermination of Salonica's Jews by the Nazi occupiers.

What of Greece's other minorities? Since the 1923 population exchange, only one officially recognized Muslim community exists, residing in the north-eastern region of Thrace. Until their expulsion in the 1940s, Albanian-speaking Muslims, known as Chams, lived in the north-western

region of Epirus. The Greek state since 1830 has also contained significant Christian minorities speaking languages other than Greek. These include Arvanites (who speak an Albanian dialect), Vlachs (also known as Aromanians, whose Latin language resembles Romanian), and Slav Macedonians. To the list of Christian minorities, one could add Asia Minor refugees like the Karamanlides, who spoke Turkish, and the Pontic Greeks, who spoke a distinctive dialect of Greek before they were assimilated into Greek society. Although they were officially 'Greek' by virtue of their Orthodox Christian faith and Turkish persecution, these refugees were often treated as foreigners by local Greeks in the interwar years.

In this paper, I compare the experiences under Greek rule of Salonican Jews, Muslim Chams and Christian Slav Macedonians, seeking to demonstrate a number of points. First, Salonican Jews were not the only community facing a difficult transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek nation-state. I argue that minorities like the Christian Slav Macedonians and Muslim Chams usually faced even more aggressive and coercive assimilation policies at the hands of the Greek state than did Sephardi Jews. Second, I hope to show the uneven nature of the Greek state's attitude towards its various linguistic and religious minorities, which may have been influenced by domestic politics, international pressure, and fears of irredentism. Third, I will address how the mass violence of the 1940s affected all three minorities. For over 90 percent of Greece's Jews, the Axis occupation brought deportation and death, while the survivors faced hostility or indifference from post-war Greek society. The post-war Greek state did commit itself to the restitution of property to survivors and approved the reinstatement of Salonica's Jewish community. On the other hand, the Greek authorities favoured a policy of violent expulsion

against Cham Muslims and Slav Macedonians, due to their association with the occupying forces or with the post-war communist insurgency.

Hellenization in the "Old Greece"

From 1821 to 1830, a brutal revolutionary war against the Ottoman Empire culminated in the establishment of an independent Greek kingdom. While most Muslims and Jews had been massacred or expelled from its territory, the new state's Christian population was still linguistically diverse. In their effort to forge a homogenous nation, Greek nationalists relied on a "centralized national school system, which was controlled and administered by the state."[3] Indeed, Aromanian, Arvanite, and Slavic speakers "found that a command of the Greek language was a major social and economic advantage," and often encouraged their children to favour Greek over their local languages.[4] The assimilation of linguistic minorities within the borders of 'Old Greece' was, therefore, comparatively mild compared to the more forceful methods which would characterize Greek policy in Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace from 1912 onwards.

Minorities in Greece's "New Territories"

In most cases, Ottoman authorities had ignored ethno-linguistic differences among the 'Rum millet' (Christian subjects) in their European provinces until the late nineteenth century. According to Mark Mazower, Slav-speaking peasants in Ottoman Macedonia had traditionally been equally indifferent to Greek or Bulgarian national identity, preferring to be "known simply […] as 'Christians.'"[5] However, in 1872, the Bulgarian Exarchate seceded from the Greek-dominated Patriarchate of Constantinople and sought to extend its jurisdiction over Macedonia's Slav Orthodox Christians.

Henceforth, those Slavs who pledged allegiance to the Exarchate were counted as Bulgarian, while those whose loyalties remained with the Patriarchate were seen as Greek. In this way, Orthodox Christian affiliation was itself divided and redefined along 'Greek' or 'Bulgarian' ethno-linguistic allegiances in the run-up to the Balkan Wars.

In addition to Bulgaria, the Greek state competed with Serbia and the Albanian nationalist movement to claim the inhabitants of Ottoman Macedonia as its own. Hellenization efforts were directed at the region's Albanian, Vlach, and Slavic Christian populations through political propaganda and the opening of Greek schools, which these minorities were "willing to attend," as previously noted.[6] Vlachs, in particular, tended to embrace Greek identity and assimilate into Greek society. While some Macedonian Slavs also claimed a 'Greek' identity, many instead identified with Bulgaria, whose language was similar to their own Slav-Macedonian dialects. Others joined the ranks of a 'Macedonian' movement, which favored an autonomous Macedonian state.

In the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), Greece seized control of Epirus, most of Macedonia and western Thrace. The conquest of Salonica was met with dismay by the city's Jewish community, who feared the end of their "economic prosperity"[7] and communal autonomy. In the months following annexation, the Greek government "proclaimed its willingness to protect Jewish interests, in particular, and the country's new minorities in general."[8] The President of Salonica's Jewish community, Jacob Cazes, therefore petitioned for the official recognition of the community and others in Greece, along with

> the right to operate Jewish schools and to teach Jewish languages, in addition to that of the state, and to administer Jewish hospitals and other philanthropic institutions, [and] that the members of each Jewish community be exempt from observing Sunday as the day of rest.[9]

Although the ruling Venizelist government "opposed the existence of self-governing communal bodies within [Greece's] borders,"[10] the royalist government elected in 1920 granted Jacob Cazes' requests, albeit in the name of 'religious' rather than 'national' rights.[11]

In the wake of the Balkan Wars, many Muslims residing in the New Territories fled to Anatolia. Those who were not compelled to leave faced expropriations and other restrictions on their property rights. In 1923, the Treaty of Lausanne stipulated the mandatory 'exchange' of Greece's 'Turks' (about 400,000) for Turkey's 'Greeks' (up to 1.5 million),[12] with religion serving as the criterion for Greekness and Turkishness. While the Muslim minority of Thrace was exempted from the exchange under the Greco-Turkish agreement, the Albanian-speaking Cham Muslims of Epirus were also spared expulsion *in extremis* by Albanian and Italian lobbying, despite the strong Greek preference for their removal.[13] Nevertheless, the Chams faced legal restrictions on their cultural and property rights and harassment by state officials. As for the Slavs of Macedonia, over 280,000 fled to Bulgaria after 1912, either due to armed conflict or as part of supposedly voluntary population exchanges. Those who fled as refugees were often denied re-entry by Greek officials and pro-Bulgarian activists were deported to islands in the Aegean Sea. The resettlement of Greek refugees also played a major role in the displacement of Slavs throughout Greek Macedonia.[14]

Hellenizing the Economy, Hellenizing the Land

Before the arrival of the Asia Minor refugees, the population of Salonica had been roughly 30 percent Greek Orthodox, 25 percent Muslim, and 40 percent Jewish. In Macedonia as a whole, 513,000 Greek-speaking Christians had constituted 43 percent of the population.[15] The arrival of hundreds of thousands of Greek refugees, however, significantly altered these demographics.[16] By 1926, the influx had made Salonica 80 percent Greek, with Jews now just 15 to 20 percent of the population. The new reality, as well as the reconstruction of Salonica's center after a 1917 fire, allowed Greek authorities to displace Jews from the city's economy in favour of the refugees. Between 1922 and 1924, Greek local and national legislation forced out Jews working in the port and fishing business, imposed Sunday as a mandatory rest day, and disproportionately taxed Jewish businesses. Refugees enjoyed exemptions from taxes and fees, allowing them to give "tough competition to the Jewish merchants."[17]

In Epirus, refugee resettlement went hand-in-hand with policies aimed at pressuring Muslim Chams to emigrate. Greek refugees from Asia Minor were settled in Cham areas and were "used as a tool for applying more pressure against Muslims for them to decide to leave Greece."[18] The newcomers took advantage of land expropriation laws targeting Muslims and often settled in the houses of local Muslims. Local authorities encouraged these spontaneous appropriations or assisted them with "harassment tactics."[19] Continued state harassment, restrictions on property rights, and encroachment by refugees "gradually led to the financial devastation of the Muslim population."[20]

Massive refugee settlement in the Macedonian countryside also had a huge impact on the Slav Macedonian peasant population. While some Greek officials attributed Slav emigration to their affinity with Bulgaria, Elisabeth Kontogiorgi contends that "a more likely reason was the social pressure exerted on the Slav Macedonians by the incoming refugees, who in many instances made life unbearable for [them]."[21] Asia Minor refugees were encouraged to settle in sensitive border villages "where the Slavophone element was, from a Greek point of view, uncomfortably large."[22] Authorities then changed these villages' Slavic names, translating them into Greek or renaming them after the places of origin of the newcomers.

Schooling and Language

Describing Turkish nationalists' views of non-Turkish Muslims in the early 20th Century, Ugur Ümit Üngör argues that the former saw the latter as "assimilable raw ethnic material,"[23] who could be moulded into Turks through aggressive assimilation. Meanwhile, non-Muslims were generally essentialized as "unturkifiable."[24] After 1912, the Greek nation-state displayed a similar differential attitude towards its Christian and non-Christian minorities. While non-Greek Christians were pressured to assimilate into Greek society, certain religious minorities enjoyed a measure of linguistic and cultural autonomy. Salonica's Jewish community continued to use Ladino in schools throughout the interwar years, alongside obligatory Greek language instruction,[25] and the banning of Ladino and Hebrew on Salonican road signs in 1923.[26]

Still, the right of religious minorities to teach their languages was never simply granted but rather had to be secured through negotiation. Devin

Naar demonstrates that in Salonica, "multilingualism in the curriculum and its implications for national loyalty became hotly contested issues in Jewish education," requiring Jewish leaders to "regularly negotiate" with Greek authorities.[27] In the late 1930s, controversies erupted over Christian Greek teachers attempting to proselytize among Jewish students, as well as over the Ministry of Education's attempts to exert more control over the curriculum in Jewish schools.[28] By 1938, negotiations had led to a bilingual Hebrew-Greek curriculum. While Ladino lost its place in the classroom, the Jewish community succeeded in maintaining its own schools and preserving a place for Jewish religious and cultural education in the curriculum.[29]

In Epirus, Muslim Chams lobbied the Greek government for the right to operate Albanian-language schools with little success. Although the state agreed to appoint "half a dozen of teachers […] to teach the Albanian language"[30] in Greek public schools in 1935, this gesture hardly constituted an autonomous system of education. When the lack of educational and cultural rights for Greece's Chams was raised at the League of Nations in 1936, the Greek official response was dismissive, claiming the limited Albanian instruction was "amply sufficient for [the group's] cultural needs."[31] While Jewish schools operated freely in Salonica, Greek authorities neither permitted autonomous Cham schools nor acknowledged the existence of an Albanian minority in Epirus, due to fears of Albanian irredentism in the region.

For Macedonia's Slav speakers, the prospect of operating schools in the Slav Macedonian or Bulgarian languages eventually became impossible due to similar worries about Bulgarian and Serbian irredentism. In many Macedonian villages prior to the 1920s, "almost no one spoke Greek, (and) priests taught children the (Slav) Macedonian language."[32] Between 1923 and

1936, "a consistent complaint of Greek nationalists was the fact that the Greek (state) was too weak and hesitant in its dealings with the minority, unwilling to adopt harsh measures against the Slavo-Macedonians and forcing them to acculturate to Hellenism."[33] In 1936, the Slav Macedonian language was banned by the Metaxas dictatorship and locals were persecuted for using it.[34] As a local Slav Macedonian villager interviewed by the BBC in 2019 recalls, the language ban pervaded all spheres of life, with "policemen eavesdropping on mourners at funerals and listening at windows to catch anyone speaking or singing in the forbidden tongue."[35]

Occupation, Holocaust, Liberation, and Ethnic Cleansing

In recent times, Greek complicity in the destruction of the Salonican Jewish community has been widely documented. In many cases, Greek collaborationist authorities assisted in the ghettoization and deportation of the city's Jews, or simply made no effort to prevent it. One of the most damning episodes of Greek involvement in the Holocaust is the destruction of Salonica's historic Jewish cemetery by the Municipality of Thessaloniki in 1942. Ever since the 1930s, municipal authorities had pushed for the expropriation of the cemetery in order to expand the Aristotelian University, yet this effort was successfully resisted by the Jewish community. In 1942, after the Nazis had seized Jewish men for forced labour, the municipality took advantage of the Jews' predicament and requested the cemetery as "ransom" for the imprisoned labourers.[36] After the deportation of the Jews in 1943, the local city council took steps to further erase the Jewish face of the city by removing Jewish street names and replacing them with the names of Macedonian geographic landmarks or Greek heroes. Leon Saltiel states:

> The renaming of the streets that had Jewish names was driven by the need to erase the Jewish character of the city and obliterate its Jewish past. The available evidence points to an initiative of the local Greek authorities […] without any German intervention, at least in this first phase.[37]

Finally, the Greek Service for the Disposal of Jewish Property (YDIP) was founded in 1943 to distribute 2,300 Jewish shops and 12,000 apartments to local Greeks and Greek refugees. In practice, the Germans often bypassed the YDIP and handed out property to their collaborators.[38]

In Epirus, the Axis occupation was welcomed by many Chams, whose relations with the Greek state were at an all-time low. In 1940, some Cham refugees in Albania had fought with the invading Italians, who had promised the annexation of Epirus to Albania. When the Greek army reoccupied the area in 1941, it "exiled nearly the entire male Cham population, and turned a blind eye to the atrocities committed by local Greeks against Chams."[39] The return of Italian forces in 1941, therefore, provided an opportunity for Chams to exact revenge on their Christian neighbors and to regain some of the "property and power they had lost during the preceding decades."[40] Cham collaboration continued when German troops replaced the Italians in 1943, with Cham paramilitaries committing "atrocities, murders, theft of flocks and any other type of movable property."[41] At the same time, a minority of Chams joined the ranks of ELAS, the communist guerilla army that dominated the Greek countryside. ELAS clashed both with the occupation forces and with the nationalist guerilla EDES organization, which was concentrated in Epirus.

When German forces withdrew from the country in October 1944, surviving Jews finally emerged from hiding. For the Muslim Chams of Epirus, liberation meant the beginning of their own violent erasure from Greek

territory at the hands of the vengeful nationalist EDES. As Baltsiotis explains, during the German withdrawal, "battalions of EDES guerillas shot and slaughtered not only the surrendering armed forces of Muslim Chams but also women and children," ultimately killing more than 1,200. Greek civilians also engaged in "looting and killing" as Chams fled the country.[42] By 1951, only 127 Muslim Chams were counted in the national census, "while the rest, whose number remains unknown [...], converted to Christianity and intermarried with Greeks."[43]

Struggles for Justice, Restitution and Return

As Jewish survivors returned to Salonica in 1945, they faced a struggle to regain their properties and rebuild their shattered lives. Although Jews faced hostility from local Greeks and witnessed the ongoing destruction of their cemetery, the Greek state did take official steps to rehabilitate its Jewish community and restore property to surviving Jewish owners. In late 1945, the Obligatory Law 808 obliged "caretakers" of Jewish property "to surrender their properties to their lawful beneficiaries," and an "Organization for the Care and Rehabilitation of the Jews of Greece" (OPAIE) was established for survivors of the Nazi death camps.[44]

In practice, restitution was complicated by the difficulties many survivors faced in proving ownership, by bureaucracy, and by associations of 'caretakers' who lobbied to retain control of their ill-acquired properties.[45] In addition, the contemporaneous Greek civil war (1944-1949) turned erstwhile Nazi collaborators into reliable anti-communists valued by the royalist government. Jews who had joined the leftist guerillas during Nazi rule now faced suspicion and imprisonment by the right-wing authorities.[46]

The magnanimity of the post-war government towards Greek collaborators was not extended to the Chams of Epirus. In 1945 and 1946, over 2100 mainly male Chams were convicted *in absentia* as war criminals and collaborators with the occupation forces. Their remaining property and assets were confiscated by the state, while Greek authorities cultivated a narrative that Muslim Chams "abandoned their properties and acted against the [Greek] nation abroad."[47]

Although the Greek state had not directly carried out the violent ethnic cleansing of Chams in 1944, it clearly viewed their elimination positively. It confirmed this attitude by barring Chams from returning to their lands, and by expropriating their property thereafter. imprisonment by the right-wing authorities.[48]

In the case of the Slav Macedonians, 'ethnic cleansing' had not truly occurred on any systematic scale after Greece's liberation. Instead, both Greeks and Slavs who had fought for the communists during the civil war were deprived of their citizenship and property as they fled the country. Between 1982 and 1985, the newly elected Socialist government enacted laws allowing civil war refugees to return to Greece and reclaim their property. However, the laws only applied to those who were ethnic Greeks.[49] Those who identified as Slav Macedonians were, therefore, denied the right to return. To this day, between 30,000 and 40,000 Slav Macedonian refugees are barred from returning to northern Greece, and they are even barred from visiting on special occasions, or to visit the graves of loved ones.[50] The property of these refugees either lay abandoned or was redistributed to Greeks and Vlachs, hundreds of whom were resettled in formerly Slav areas.[51]

Conclusion

From its inception, the Greek nation-state pursued the assimilation of its Christian linguistic minorities. In some cases, particularly in the early years of the state, linguistic minorities played an active role in their own acculturation. With Greek having been the prestigious language of the economy, intellectual elite, and Orthodox Church, many Arvanites and Vlachs embraced Greek as a means of social promotion before and after Greek independence. However, Greek policy towards all minorities arguably became harsher in the wake of the Balkan Wars, the First World War, the Greco-Turkish War, and the population 'transfers' that followed. Refugees themselves became a crucial tool for Greek nationalists to change the ethnic composition of their new territories to cement Greek claims to the land. Jews and other minorities were greatly impacted by these policies of Hellenization.

Since both the Muslim Chams and Slav Macedonians were heavily associated with the threat of Albanian and Bulgarian irredentism, they faced harsh policies ranging from language-bans to expulsion. Although they also faced suspicion and hostility, Salonican Jews were given more freedom to express a distinct Jewish identity. The Slav Macedonian language was banned in public and private by the Metaxas dictatorship in the 1930s, whereas no such draconian measures were ever taken against Ladino. While Albanian or Bulgarian irredentists within Greece faced imprisonment or exile, Jews in Salonica remained free to openly debate the merits of Jewish nationalism since Zionism posed no threat to Greek territorial integrity.

In the context of the mass violence that characterized the 1940s, most of Salonica's Jews perished in Nazi death camps and many Greek individuals and state officials actively participated in the erasure of the Jewish presence

from Salonica. Nevertheless, the Greek state did take steps to rehabilitate the survivors of the Holocaust after liberation, albeit inconsistently and ineffectively. On the other hand, the era of 'liberation' meant violent expulsion for the Muslim Chams of Epirus as well as many Slav Macedonians. Refugees from both these groups were denied any kind of amnesty, restitution, or right of return by the Greek state and continue to be denied these rights today.

1 K.E. Fleming, *Greece: A Jewish History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 68.
2 Fleming, *Greece: A Jewish History*, 21.
3 Theodore Zervas, *Formal and Informal Education during the Rise of Greek Nationalism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 17.
4 Zervas, *Formal and Informal Education during the Rise of Greek Nationalism*, 20.
5 Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2005), 242.
6 Zervas, *Formal and Informal Education during the Rise of Greek Nationalism*, 55.
7 Fleming, 68.
8 Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts*, 162.
9 Devin Naar, *Jewish Salonica : Between the Ottoman Empire and Modern Greece* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016), 48.
10 Naar, *Jewish Salonica : Between the Ottoman Empire and Modern Greece*, 49.
11 Naar, 50.
12 Fleming, 82.
13 Lambros Baltsiotis, "The Muslim Chams of Northwestern Greece," *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, no. 12 (2011).
14 Victor Roudometof, *Collective Memory, National Identity, and Ethnic Conflict* (London: Praeger, 2002), 97.
15 Fleming, 86.
16 Fleming, 87.
17 Fleming, 84.
18 Baltsiotis, "The Muslim Chams of Northwestern Greece," 34.
19 Baltsiotis, 33.
20 Baltsiotis, 35.
21 Elisabeth Kontogiorgi, *Population Exchange in Greek Macedonia: The Rural Settlement of Refugees* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 204.
22 Kontogiorgi, *Population Exchange in Greek Macedonia: The Rural Settlement of Refugees*, 208.
23 Ugur Ümit Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 171.

24 Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950*, 172.
25 Naar, 157.
26 Fleming, 85.
27 Naar, 157.
28 Naar, 176.
29 Naar, 182.
30 Baltsiotis, 49.
31 Baltsiotis, 50.
32 *Denying Ethnic Identity: The Macedonians of Greece*, Human Rights Watch (New York, 1994), 40.
33 Roudometof, *Collective Memory, National Identity, and Ethnic Conflict*, 102.
34 *Denying Ethnic Identity: The Macedonians of Greece*, 39.
35 "Greece's invisible minority - the Macedonian Slavs," *BBC*, 24 Feb 2019 2019, https://www.bbc.com/news/stories-47258809.
36 Naar, 274.
37 Leon Saltiel, "A City against Its Citizens? Thessaloniki and the Jews," in *The Holocaust in Greece*, ed. Georgos Antoniou (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 121.
38 Stratos Dordanas, "The Jewish Community of Thessaloniki and the Christian Collaborators: “Those that are Leaving and What They are Leaving Behind," in *The Holocaust in Greece*, ed. Georgos Antoniou (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 212.
39 Baltsiotis, 56.
40 Baltsiotis, 58.
41 Baltsiotis, 58.
42 Baltsiotis, 59.
43 Baltsiotis, 60.
44 Dordanas, "The Jewish Community of Thessaloniki and the Christian Collaborators: “Those that are Leaving and What They are Leaving Behind," 221.
45 Maria Vassilikou Philip Carabott, "“New Men vs Old Jews”: Greek Jewry in the Wake of the Shoah, 1945– 1947," in *The Holocaust in Greece*, ed. Georgos Antoniou (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 264.
46 Dordanas, "The Jewish Community of Thessaloniki and the Christian Collaborators: “Those that are Leaving and What They are Leaving Behind," 220.
47 Baltsiotis, 63.
48 Dordanas, 220.
49 Roudometof, *Collective Memory, National Identity, and Ethnic Conflict*, 124.
50 *Denying Ethnic Identity: The Macedonians of Greece*, 29.
51 Riki Van Boeschoten, "When Difference Matters: Sociopolitical Dimensions of Ethnicity in the District of Florina," in *Macedonia: The Politics of Identity and Difference*, ed. Jane Cowan (London: Pluto Press, 2000), 33.

Bibliography

Baltsiotis, Lambros. "The Muslim Chams of Northwestern Greece." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, no. 12 (2011).

Boeschoten, Riki Van. "When Difference Matters: Sociopolitical Dimensions of Ethnicity in the District of Florina." In *Macedonia: The Politics of Identity and Difference*, edited by Jane Cowan. London: Pluto Press, 2000.

Denying Ethnic Identity: The Macedonians of Greece. Human Rights Watch (New York: 1994).

Dordanas, Stratos. "The Jewish Community of Thessaloniki and the Christian Collaborators: “Those That Are Leaving and What They Are Leaving Behind." In *The Holocaust in Greece*, edited by Georgos Antoniou. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Fleming, K.E. *Greece: A Jewish History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

"Greece's Invisible Minority - the Macedonian Slavs." *BBC*, 24 Feb 2019. https://www.bbc.com/news/stories-47258809.

Kontogiorgi, Elisabeth. *Population Exchange in Greek Macedonia: The Rural Settlement of Refugees.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.

Mazower, Mark. *Salonica, City of Ghosts.* New York: Alfred Knopf, 2005.

Naar, Devin. *Jewish Salonica : Between the Ottoman Empire and Modern Greece.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016.

Philip Carabott, Maria Vassilikou. "“New Men Vs Old Jews”: Greek Jewry in the Wake of the Shoah, 1945– 1947." In *The Holocaust in Greece*, edited by Georgos Antoniou. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Roudometof, Victor. *Collective Memory, National Identity, and Ethnic Conflict.* London: Praeger, 2002.

Saltiel, Leon. "A City against Its Citizens? Thessaloniki and the Jews." In *The Holocaust in Greece*, edited by Georgos Antoniou. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Üngör, Ugur Ümit. *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Zervas, Theodore. *Formal and Informal Education During the Rise of Greek Nationalism.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Sincerity in Atonement: The Focus of the Rabbinic, Medieval, and Modern Eras

Elinor Rosenberg

Guilt prompts individuals and societies to grapple with the consequences of their thoughts and actions. During the Temple period, sacrifice was the primary mode of resolving guilt. As time progressed through the rabbinic period, the medieval period, and the modern period, methods for resolving guilt evolved. This paper will argue that sincerity is at the forefront of atonement. Focusing on the *asham talui* and other forms of atonement, this paper will explore the interpretations and practices of atonement in the rabbinic, medieval, and modern eras.

Jewish groups needed to prevent the uncertainty surrounding guilt from inhibiting existence in society. Simultaneously, atonement rituals increasingly became focused upon specific processes that required dedication to details and longer-term commitment. Reducing constant uncertainty about purity and increasing focus on the discipline required for ritual processes of atonement allowed Jewish groups to focus on the crucial situations concerning guilt, which made atonement more sincere.

Without a proper space to resolve the doubt, doubt and guilt can be conflated, preventing cases of true guilt from being resolved. The asham talui is a sacrifice carried out in cases of uncertain guilt. Mishnah Keritot 6:3 contains Rabbi Eliezer's claim that an asham talui can be carried out daily.[1] Rabbi Eliezer describes how Bava ben Buti performed an asham talui everyday besides Yom Kippur. Bava ben Buti claimed that "had they allowed me, I would have offered one even [on Yom Kippur], but they said to me, wait until you have come to a state of doubt".[2] The sages ruled that one may not

bring an asham talui "except for a sin that [is punished by] karet [when done intentionally] and for which one brings a *hatat* [when done unwittingly]."[3] Bava ben Buti's dedication to ensuring that he is not guilty is admirable; however, the regularity of this offering prevents him from acknowledging specific instances of potential sin and it dilutes the meaning of the offering. The sages ensured that people would exclusively offer the asham talui for a specific event, increasing their sincerity with the sacrifice. Bringing the asham talui daily can indicate a level of neuroticism.

Sigmund Freud draws parallels between neurosis and religion since both are based in rituals that lock people into their activities and struggle with giving up. Freud states that a "ceremonial starts as an action for defence, or insurance, a protective measure."[4] These rituals, which repress individuals' impulses, provide a sense of security. People grow to depend upon these rituals and can lose sight of the initial reason for the rituals. Bava ben Buti's daily asham talui became more of a habit that he viewed as a necessary protective measure against guilt instead of a ritual for defined circumstances. Freud's parallel between neurosis and religion illustrates how genuineness can be lost in terms of ritual atonement, particularly when doubt is not constrained.

Rabbinic restrictions regarding which cases involving doubt required atonement prevented people from constantly worrying about impurity. This increased the significance of ritual atonement when there was a reasonable chance of impurity. Rather than adopting the realist perspective, which depends on a correlation to reality, rabbis used nominalism, which creates absolute categories for laws and eliminates some uncertainty.[5] For example, all of Jerusalem could have been rendered impure because of bones found in the city which would have undermined daily life. Nonetheless, the rabbis

innovated rules to minimize constant doubt and maximize the meaning of atonement for true uncertainty. This is illustrated by the fact that uncertainty in the public domain is considered pure, while uncertainty in the private domain is considered impure.[6] This judgement "enable[s] contact and interaction with spaces that invite uncertainty."[7] Jews were able to live freely without worrying about purity and only worrying about impurity in situations where it was relevant. Countering Rabbi Eliezer, some rabbis state that people should only bring an ashahm talui for a "real, unknown uncertainty."[8] These rabbis likely descended from the Pharisees.[9] The rules about the public domain, among other rabbinic innovations regarding doubt, decrease the number of instances in which there is an uncertainty for which individuals must bring an asham talui or do an equivalent form of atonement. In contrast, the Sadducees were the Temple priests who carried a reputation for following the letter of the law while neglecting to follow the spirit of the law. The Sadducees could have been extremely careful about doubt in terms of impurity, but their asham offerings would have undermined the purpose of guilt and atonement.

The Hellenistic idea that the spiritual components are more important than physical components could have given the Pharisees the inspiration to focus on the spirit of impurity law. Further, the nominalism of the rabbis centred sincerity and the spirit of the law within atonement rituals. The Hellenistic idea that the spirit of the law is essential persisted throughout these eras of Judaism. However, rather than diminishing the letter of the law in terms of atonement rituals, the rabbinic era and medieval era connected the process of these rituals to discipline, and therefore greater sincerity, in terms of atonement. Talal Asad argues that ritual is not about meaning but about

discipline.[10] While Asad's theory emerged from early Christian monasticism, his theory applies across religions. Furthermore, early Christian monasticism influenced Judaism, particularly the Hasidei Ashkenaz. He argues that the discipline that underpins these rituals forces individuals to be aware of the atonement process and place greater intention within it. Discipline leads to the "formation and exercise of virtues" because it is a "complex learning process."[11] This means that discipline is not exercised through repetition but rather through the steady cultivation of the necessary virtues. Asad would argue that the daily asham talui of Bava ben Buti does not necessarily lead to greater discipline because it existed as repetition without relating to a specific scenario for which atonement would correlate with the formation of virtues.

The framing of the sacrificial process in the rabbinic era also revolved around discipline. The rabbis interpret sacrifice to be more interactive and increase the restraint necessary to perform the steps of sacrificial atonement. Rather than focusing on the animal's flesh which is pleasing to God, the rabbis focus upon steps involving the animal's blood. The rabbis describe four steps to this sacrifice: slaughter of the sacrificial animal; reception of the blood of the slaughtered animal in a vessel; walking away with the vessel of blood from the place of sacrifice to the altar; and tossing of the blood onto the altar.[12] These steps minimize the role of the priest, which increases the individual responsibility of the person offering the sacrifice. The focus on blood also means that the sacrifice is less about God receiving the sacrifice and more about the discipline required to offer the sacrifice. Additionally, while confession is part of the asham offering in the Torah, confession is not necessary for all atonement in the Torah. However, confession through repentance became critical in the rabbinic period.

The rabbis created four categories of atonement -- the Day of Atonement, suffering, death, and repentance -- since sacrifice was not possible without a Temple. Repentance was the baseline form necessary for the three other forms of atonement.[13] Repentance includes confession as a conscious recognition of the sin that a person committed. Requiring repentance forces individuals to be more deliberate in terms of their sacrificial atonement. Combining the interactive steps of sacrifice described in rabbinic literature with the later alternatives to sacrifice (all of which require repentance) illustrates how sincerity is at the forefront of atonement. The discipline necessary to properly give sacrifices and the conscious reflection for repentance reveals how the rabbinic era emphasized deliberate atonement.

The practices of the Hasidei Ashkenaz illustrate this form of atonement. The German Jewish Pietist sect lived in the medieval era and embraced ascetic practices that required discipline and in turn, the sincerity necessary for atonement. Talmudist and kabbalist Rokeah lists the four steps of repentance of the Hasidei Ashkenaz as the "Law of Rosh Hashanah 206": repentance of repetition; repentance of the fence; repentance of balance; and repentance of Scripture.[14] Repentance of repetition consists of people confronting whatever made them sin and not sinning again. This necessitates intense focus and a strong will through discipline. Repentance of the fence occurs when a sinner puts a block between themselves and whatever made them sin and has the willpower to ignore it and move on.[15] Repentance of repetition and repentance of Scripture are measures to avoid future sins, illustrating how repentance requires long-term discipline to avoid future sins. Repentance of balance occurs when the pain of the punishment corresponds to the sin. For example, a man who sleeps with a married woman would have to

"weigh his pain according to the enjoyment that he experienced with her. For an entire year he cannot eat meat nor drink wine, except on Shabbat, holidays, and Purim. He should not eat warm bread nor wash himself, among other torments according to Laws of Repentance 10."[16] Undergoing the pain equivalent to the pleasure from a sin forces awareness of the consequences of one's sin. This awareness increases the personal significance of the atonement process. Similarly, repentance of Scripture occurs when a sinner commits a sin punishable by the death penalty. Suffering is used as a substitute for the death penalty when the death penalty is not possible. Laws of Repentance 11 states that "one who sleeps with a married woman... should sit in the ice or snow every day for an hour once or twice daily."[17] A sin that is punishable by death deserves attention from the sinner and forces the sinner to experience the pain that their sin caused. Repentance of balance and repentance of Scripture are both about the processes of suffering and pain, and not about the final point. The detailed steps of repentance require discipline, and over time, the sinner cultivates virtues and atones.

The discipline underpinning the Hasidei Ashkenaz's ascetic practices increases individual sincerity surrounding these atonement rituals. However, some rabbis, like Rabbi Landau, expressed concern that "ascetic practices would come to be perceived as a quick substitute for the sincere and complete moral transformation," the transformation that constitutes "authentic Jewish repentance."[18] Rabbi Landau argues that the ascetic practices block genuineness since the ascetic practices can be viewed as an easy fix. While it is possible that these ascetic practices could sometimes be a substitute, the long-term nature of these ascetic practices demands personal reflection and intention. Additionally, Montefiore's assertion that repentance underpins

suffering as a form of atonement illustrates how necessary deliberate attention is for atonement among the Hasidei Ashkenaz's ascetic practices.[19]

Constantly worrying about guilt and specific rituals can impede daily life, so the rabbis clarified situations of doubt to centre the focus upon only those that were truly serious. Additionally, the emphasis on detailed steps of sacrifice and repentance for the Hasidei Ashkenaz increased the discipline and as a result, the sincerity behind the sacrifices. Focusing on the details of the physical atonement process prompts internal virtue cultivation and growth. Sincere action requires clear circumstances and specific steps so that individuals can completely dedicate themselves to that situation. Further, in setting up a specific situation and giving steps to resolve the situation, guidelines are of the most importance, exemplifying the benefits of structured situations for resolving guilt and more broadly across disciplines. Thus, throughout the rabbinic period, the medieval period, and modern period, the importance of sincerity within guilt and ritual atonement increased.

1 "Mishnah Keritot 6," https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Keritot.6.
2 "Mishnah Keritot 6"
3 Moshe Halbertal, *The Birth of Doubt: Confronting Uncertainty in Early Rabbinic Literature*. (Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies, 2020), 67.
4 Sigmund Freud, *Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices* (1907), 120.
5 Halbertal, *The Birth of Doubt: Confronting Uncertainty in Early Rabbinic Literature,* 78.
6 Halbertal, 84.
7 Halbertal, 85.
8 Halbertal, 68.
9 Shlomo Zuckier, "JWST 205: Guilt and Repentance in Rabbinic Literature," (class lecture, McGill University, QC, October 21, 2020).
10 Talal Asad, "On Ritual and Discipline in Medieval Christian Monasticism." *Economy and Society* 16, no. 2 (May 1987): 192.
11 Asad, "On Ritual and Discipline in Medieval Christian Monasticism," 193.

12 DR. S Mira Balberg, *Blood for Thought: The Reinvention of Sacrifice in Early Rabbinic Literature,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017), 71.
13 C. G. Montefiore, "Rabbinic Conceptions of Repentance," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 16,
no. 2 (1904): 257
14 Rokeah, *Citations on German Jewish Pietism*
15 Rokeah.
16 Rokeah.
17 Rokeah.
18 Eliezer Segal, "Sins in the Balance," In *In Those Days, At This Time: Holiness and History in the Jewish Calendar*, 35–40. (Calgary, Alberta, Canada: University of Calgary Press, 2008), 40.
19 Montefiore, 218.

Bibliography

Asad, Talal. "On Ritual and Discipline in Medieval Christian Monasticism." *Economy and Society* 16, no. 2 (May 1987): 159–203. doi: 10.1080/03085148700000002.

Balberg, DR. S Mira. *Blood for Thought: The Reinvention of Sacrifice in Early Rabbinic Literature.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017.

Freud, Sigmund. *Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices,* 1907.

Halbertal, Moshe. *The Birth of Doubt: Confronting Uncertainty in Early Rabbinic Literature*. Brown Judaic Studies 366. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies, 2020.

"Mishnah Keritot 6." https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Keritot.6.

Montefiore, C. G. "Rabbinic Conceptions of Repentance." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 16, no. 2 (1904): 209-57. doi:10.2307/1450754.

Rokeah. *Citations on German Jewish Pietism*

Segal, Eliezer. "Sins in the Balance." In *In Those Days, At This Time: Holiness and History in the Jewish Calendar.*, 35–40. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: University of Calgary Press, 2008.

Zuckier, Shlomo. "JWST 205: Guilt and Repentance in Rabbinic Literature." Class lecture, McGill University, QC, October 21, 2020.

Crumbling Barriers: Social Antisemitism in Post-Second World War Toronto

Melanie Rose

The Second World War represented a turning point for the entire world, and this was evident in the city of Toronto. After the war, Toronto transitioned from an Anglo-Saxon Protestant city to a modern city admired for its diversity. At the same time, in the wake of the Holocaust, an international human rights movement emerged, resulting in several provincial governments enacting legislation to ban discrimination in education, housing, and employment.[1] For the Toronto Jewish community, these changes were welcome and had positive effects on their daily lives in the city. However, despite an increase in available opportunities, Toronto Jews continued to face social antisemitism, which barred the Jewish community from accessing the elite levels of society. Thus, while the Holocaust indirectly led to an end of overt antisemitism, as well as introducing legal means with which to prosecute discrimination, the tragedies of it did not completely eliminate antisemitism in Toronto. Through an analysis of employment opportunities and elite clubs, this paper will argue that, although human rights legislation led to a relatively swift end to legal discrimination, it took many decades after the first human rights legislation was enacted for the barriers of social antisemitism in postwar Toronto to recede.

After the Holocaust, the international community was forced to face the reality of the Nazi regime and the horrors it had inflicted in Europe, especially upon the Jewish people. One result of this was the emergence of the international human rights movement. In December 1948, Canada signed onto the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).[2]

Canadian rights groups used this signing to push for legal protections for minorities in Canada. Several provincial governments, including Ontario, enacted human rights legislation.[3] In 1962, the Ontario government enshrined a human rights code that combined its previous acts to eliminate discrimination in housing, employment, education, and access to goods and services.[4] Previously, in 1960, Ontario established the Ontario Anti-Discrimination Commission Act to form a commission that was responsible for upholding all human rights acts, which later became the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC).[5] As a result, in the postwar period, Jewish people in Toronto no longer experienced much legal discrimination.

However, Toronto Jews still had to grapple with social antisemitism. Social antisemitism is the exclusion of Jewish people from elite societal organizations, including country clubs, corporate boards, and private schools.[6] Social antisemitism is easier to hide, as it is often more subjective and subtler than previous forms legal of antisemitism. Thus, it is hard to prove, and therefore, regulate this form of antisemitism. Another feature of social antisemitism is varying degrees of acceptance of Judaism. That is, some groups may not explicitly exclude someone for being Jewish, so long as they are not overtly or visibly Jewish. In postwar Toronto, Jewish people were thus not always able to fully express themselves as Jewish in public spaces.[7]

Growing opportunities in employment for Toronto Jews in the postwar period demonstrate one way in which the Holocaust indirectly impacted Jewish people's lives in Toronto after World War II. One of several human rights legislations enacted in this period, the Ontario *Fair Employment Practices Act, 1951,* states that one cannot discriminate against a person in employment due to their "race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of

origin," in accordance with the UDHR.[8] The reference to the UDHR shows the Holocaust's impact on this piece of legislation. Further, as a result of the Act, employers could no longer legally discriminate against minorities in the hiring process, which included Jewish people. However, Toronto Jews still faced exclusion in terms of career advancement and access to top positions.

In a *Toronto Daily Star* article from 1961, the author gives an example of a department chief who greeted his new Jewish junior executive with the acknowledgement that the young man was "the first… Jewish person to reach this position in the company," and, while the department chief was proud of that, the Jewish man had to "go slowly because not everyone upstairs [was] as liberal as [the department chief was] about these things."[9] In giving the Jewish executive this information, the department chief warned him that he might lose his job if higher officials learned he was Jewish. While the young Jewish man was able to get the job as a junior executive, there was also no guarantee that he would be able to advance in it due to the attitudes of the people in the top executive positions at the company. The Jewish executive was aware of this, stating that he "felt as though the stairway to the top was guarded" by "something [he] would never be able to penetrate."[10] Thus, although the *Fair Employment Practices Act* quickly eliminated legal discrimination in opportunities for employment, this example shows that antisemitic attitudes persisted socially, limiting a Jewish person's opportunities for career advancement.

A 1964 article highlights this continuing exclusion of Jewish people from positions of power in business. It states that there were fewer than ten Jewish people on the boards of directors for major corporations in all of Canada.[11] Despite this, Jewish people were actually the most highly

represented minority group. However, for Jewish people, this low number was significant since in job sectors where individuals are able to progress at their own rates – such as the labour force – Jewish people were overrepresented.[12] If Jewish people were able to succeed when given full opportunities, this implies that there was another barrier to their advancement in business even after legal interventions: his barrier was social antisemitism.

Discrimination in employment was not limited to the business field. In the law profession, recent Jewish law school graduates had trouble getting hired for articling positions at law firms.[13] Further, as of 1964, there had only been one Jewish justice on the bench of the Supreme Court of Ontario, despite hundreds of Jewish students being called to the bar. Jewish students would thus apply to Jewish law firms, where they actually had a chance of getting hired.[14] Jewish students also faced discrimination in the medical field up until the early 1960s. Prior to the Second World War, there were quotas on the number of Jewish students allowed into medical schools. After the war, the University of Toronto Faculty of Medicine conspired to limit Jewish admissions by setting higher grade requirements.[15] Furthermore, many Jewish students struggled to get residencies at hospitals once they graduated. These situations indicate that although discrimination in education was no longer legal, social antisemitism persisted and affected the treatment of Jewish people.

A 1985 article in the *Toronto Star* reveals that, about twenty-five years later, Toronto Jews still felt as though there were barriers to career advancement in general, and obtaining top positions in business and government more specifically.[16] However, while Toronto Jews perceived this continuance of social antisemitism, this does not fully reflect the reality of the

time period.[17] From the 1960s to the 1980s, Jewish people were given further employment opportunities, including access to top positions. In 1962, the University of Toronto Faculty of Medicine recognized the Jewish hospital, Mount Sinai, as a teaching affiliate, which served as a symbol of the university's growing acceptance of Jewish people.[18] Law firms also slowly accepted more Jewish graduates as articling students. As Jewish people were becoming more prominent in Toronto's economic and professional fields, these law firms feared that the Jewish community would boycott them. Further, the firms began to realize that they were denying themselves of some of the best law school graduates, who could end up working for their competitors.[19] Thus, while the hiring of Jewish articling students was motivated by self-interest , it still gave Toronto Jews access to job opportunities in law firms from which they had previously been denied. In the early 1960s, there were already signs of the slow acceptance of Jewish people in corporate boards. For example, after previously being passed over for the job due to antisemitism, in 1961, Louis Rasminsky was appointed the Governor of the Bank of Canada.[20]

In Toronto, Jewish people were also successful in the realm of politics. In 1955, Nathan Phillips became both the first Jewish and first non-Protestant mayor of Toronto. His electoral success, which he achieved in spite of his opponent actively campaigning against him as a Jewish man, reflected both Toronto's changing demographics and growing acceptance of Jewish people. Upon Phillips' election, it was no longer notable to see a Jewish person in Toronto's municipal politics.[21] In the 1960s, Jewish people were elected as Members of Ontario's Provincial Parliament, and one of them, Allan Grossman, was a minister in the Ontario cabinet.[22] As Prime Minister,

Pierre Trudeau appointed four Jewish people to the federal cabinet. Although this does not pertain to the Toronto Jewish community specifically, it demonstrates how the barriers for Jewish people in politics were decreasing at every level of government, even the federal level. A significant appointment made by Trudeau was that of Bora Laskin, a Jewish man from Ontario, as the fourteenth Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada in 1973.[23] Laskin, a former University of Toronto law professor, held the highest legal position in Canada, illustrating the abundance of opportunities available to Jewish people.[24]

Another longstanding symbol of exclusion of Jewish people in Toronto was the lack of access to elite private clubs. Representing the highest levels of society, this form of social antisemitism was subtle and hard to eliminate as it relied on clubs' memberships to abolish membership discrimination. The *Fair Accommodation Practices Act, 1954* disallowed discrimination in housing and in public places, and Jewish people were thus allowed full access . However, elite clubs were private, so they did not have to adhere directly to the Act.[25] Members of the clubs defined 'elite' by "frequency of interaction, homogeneity in social background, and class continuity," which implied common values about the role of society, as well as the corporate world's place in it.[26] For the elite, most of whom already held executive positions in corporations, clubs were not a symbol of one's status; rather, one already needed to have status in order to gain access to these clubs. Further, these clubs served to gatekeep access to power by limiting their membership. In the postwar period, corporate elites were also on boards of universities, philanthropic organizations, and royal commissions, giving them significant influence and social status in Canada.[27] The combination of club

membership, philanthropy involvement, and societal participation allowed elites to form networks with other elites and push their interests onto Toronto society.[28] Thus, by keeping certain people out of clubs, elites were able to protect their access to power, influence, and important social networks. There was also a racial and ethnic aspect to this exclusivity as most of the clubs' membership was Anglo-Saxon Protestant. Therefore, the exclusion of minorities from clubs ensured that the circle of elites was limited to white Protestants.[29]

Clubs did not openly discriminate against Jewish people or other minorities but instead refused membership through a method known as 'blackballing.'[30] At most clubs, members voted on whether or not they wanted to allow an applicant to join the club. While the exact rules differed between clubs, usually a small number of negative votes, sometimes even one, could cancel out a significantly larger number of positive votes.[31] This ensured that a small group of antisemitic members could prevent Jewish people from gaining membership. It was an open secret that clubs across the country rejected Jewish people for being Jewish, and in Toronto, the Jewish community knew they were not welcome in the elite private clubs.[32] Some Toronto Jews did try to gain access to elite clubs, and throughout the postwar period, they were denied. In 1982, a retired Jewish lawyer tried to get membership to the Summit Golf and Country Club in Richmond Hill. While the club denied that his rejection was due to his religion, the former membership chairman, who quit over the incident, alleged that there was both antisemitism in the board of directors and within the club itself. A Jewish member of the club at the time stated that he also believed the Jewish lawyer was rejected because he was Jewish, although this member did not quit.[33] A University of Toronto

professor, whose daughter was rejected from a different Toronto-area golf club, stated that Jewish people were denied membership to these clubs "for no real reason, other than that [they] had the wrong religion."[34] Membership rejection was a form of social antisemitism, and it was a subtle form of discrimination because it was hard to prove and up to the discretion of the club's members.

However, there are a few cases of Jewish people being allowed membership to clubs. In 1960, the newly founded Donalda Club had a policy of no discrimination and an integrated membership.[35] Nonetheless, as a new club, it did not represent the same barriers to society that other elite Toronto clubs did. For Jewish people, the club that most symbolized social antisemitism was the family-oriented Granite Club. In the late 1960s, Toronto Jews took advantage of the Granite Club's need for a new location to force them into negotiations over their membership policies.[36]

The Granite Club intended to build a new facility in North York, a suburb of Toronto with a large Jewish population. Sol Littman, the newly appointed national director for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith Canada, proposed a challenge to the Granite Club's ability to construct a new building by claiming it engaged in antisemitic membership practices.[37] Littman's intention was to convince the Granite Club to change its membership policies and allow Jewish people to join. The complaint against the re-zoning application went all the way to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). B'nai Brith knew that the OMB would reject the application; according to Daniel Hill, who served as director of the OHRC in the early 1960s, the Commission only "had jurisdiction over a private club's employment practices but none over its membership policies."[38] Thus, there

was no legal way to ban the Granite Club's perceived discriminatory practices. However, the aim was to generate bad press against the Granite Club, in order to convince them to enter into negotiations with B'nai Brith. The plan worked, and the newly elected Granite Club committee agreed to negotiate. Eventually, the two groups reached an agreement, in which B'nai Brith would remove its complaint to the OMB, and the Granite Club would allow Jewish people to be members.[39] While the OMB approved the Club's re-zoning request before the Granite Club and B'nai Brith made anything official, the two still held a press conference in January 1970 to "announce that wounds had been healed" and that Jewish people would be accepted into the club's membership.[40] The Granite Club case is significant because it shows the Toronto Jewish community's ability to fight back against social antisemitism and achieve the desired result of removing societal barriers for Jewish people. In contrast to employment, where social antisemitism gradually eroded over time, here Jewish groups used their agency to eliminate discriminatory practices.

Overall, social antisemitism in Toronto took longer to decline than other forms of discrimination that had explicitly been made illegal, as seen through the continued exclusion of Jewish people from corporate boards and elite clubs. Although the decline was gradual compared to the abrupt end of legal discrimination, the barriers imposed by social antisemitism did begin to lower in Toronto, demonstrated by Toronto Jews' growing access to the elite levels of society.

1 Ira Robinson, “Post-War Canadian Jewry,” in *Canada’s Jews: In Time, Space and Spirit* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013), 97.
2 Harold Troper, *The defining decade: identity, politics, and the Canadian Jewish community in the 1960s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 7.
3 Gerald J. J. Tulchinsky, *Canada’s Jews: A People’s Journey* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 407.
4 “A bit of history | Ontario Human Rights Commission.”
5 Ontario (1960) "c 270 Ontario Anti-Discrimination Commission Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 3, Article 48. Available at: http://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/rso/vol1960/iss3/48.
6 Robinson, “Post-War Canadian Jewry,” 102.
7 Troper, *The defining decade*, 86.
8 Ontario (1960) "c 132 Fair Employment Practices Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 2, Article 7. Available at: http://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/rso/vol1960/iss2/7.
9 Arnold Bruner, “Barriers to Jews Crumbling in Canada,” *Toronto Daily Star* (Toronto, ON), Sep. 14, 1961.
10 Bruner, “Barriers to Jews Crumbling in Canada,” Sep. 14, 1961.
11 “No room at the top for Jews and other minorities in Canadian business,” *Toronto Daily Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 7, 1964.
12 “No room at the top for Jews and other minorities in Canadian business,” Jan. 7, 1964.
13 Troper, 91.
14 Troper, 93.
15 Troper, 92; Tulchinsky, *Canada’s Jews: A People’s Journey*, 415.
16 Martin Goldfarb, “Most Canadian Jews ‘very satisfied’ in Metro,” *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Dec. 8, 1985.
17 Goldfarb, “Most Canadian Jews ‘very satisfied’ in Metro,” Dec. 8, 1985.
18 Troper, 92.
19 Troper, 93.
20 Tulchinsky, 415.
21 Troper, 90.
22 “No room at the top for Jews and other minorities in Canadian business,” Jan. 7, 1964.
23 Troper, 217.
24 Troper, 92.
25 Ontario (1960) "c 131 Fair Accommodation Practices Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 2, Article 6.
26 John Porter, Jack Jedwab, Wallace Clement, Vic Satzewich and Richard C. Helmes-Hayes, “IX: The Economic Elite and Social Structure,” in *The Vertical*

Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015, 305.
27 Porter, "IX: The Economic Elite and Social Structure," 299-300.
28 Porter, 305-306.
29 Troper, 249.
30 Bill Schiller, "Private clubs serving 'the elite' last bastion of discrimination?" *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 4, 1987.
31 Schiller, "Private clubs serving 'the elite' last bastion of discrimination?"
32 Troper, 253.
33 Schiller, "Private clubs serving 'the elite' last bastion of discrimination?"
34 Schiller, "Private clubs serving 'the elite' last bastion of discrimination?"
35 "No room at the top for Jews and other minorities in Canadian business," Jan. 7, 1964.
36 Troper, 254.
37 Troper, 254.
38 "OMB delays ruling in Granite Club case," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto, ON), Dec. 20, 1969.
39 Troper, 261.
40 Bill Schiller, "Jews won right to join Granite Club in 1970," *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 4, 1987.

Bibliography

"A bit of history | Ontario Human Rights Commission." Accessed November 27. 2020. http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/bit-history#:~:text=Ontario%27s%20first%20Human%20Rights%20Code,ancestry%20and%20place%20of%20origin.

Bruner, Arnold. "Barriers to Jews Crumbling in Canada." *Toronto Daily Star* (Toronto, ON), Sep. 14, 1961.

Goldfarb, Martin. "Most Canadian Jews 'very satisfied' in Metro." *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Dec. 8, 1985.

"No room at the top for Jews and other minorities in Canadian business." *Toronto Daily Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 7, 1964.

"OMB delays ruling in Granite Club case." *Globe and Mail* (Toronto, ON), Dec. 20, 1969.

Ontario (1960) "c 131 Fair Accommodation Practices Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 2, Article 6. Available at: http://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/rso/vol1960/iss2/6.

Ontario (1960) "c 132 Fair Employment Practices Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 2, Article 7. Available at: http://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/rso/vol1960/iss2/7.

Ontario (1960) "c 270 Ontario Anti-Discrimination Commission Act," Ontario: Revised Statutes: Vol. 1960: Iss. 3, Article 48. Available at: http://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/rso/vol1960/iss3/48.

Porter, John, Jack Jedwab, Wallace Clement, Vic Satzewich and Richard C. Helmes-Hayes. “IX: The Economic Elite and Social Structure.” In *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*, 265-308. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Robinson, Ira. “Post-War Canadian Jewry.” In *Canada’s Jews: In Time, Space and Spirit*, 93-119. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013.

Schiller, Bill. “Jews won right to join Granite Club in 1970.” *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 4, 1987.

Schiller, Bill. “Private clubs serving ‘the elite’ last bastion of discrimination?” *Toronto Star* (Toronto, ON), Jan. 4, 1987.

Troper, Harold. *The defining decade: identity, politics, and the Canadian Jewish community in the 1960s*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Tulchinsky, Gerald J.J. *Canada’s Jews: A People’s Journey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

An Analysis of *Halachic* Articles Regarding Marijuana

Alden Tabac

The recent legalization of recreational marijuana in several countries around the world has required the *halachic* community to rule on the laws governing its use. Although halachic authorities rule against the use of recreational marijuana, they do permit the use of medicinal marijuana under certain circumstances. This paper will analyze Rabbi Tsvi Heber's article, "Why Recreational Marijuana Isn't Kosher,"[1] in which the Rabbi uses halachic sources to argue against the use of recreational marijuana on behalf of the COR (Canada's largest *kashrut* authority). In addition, this paper will discuss Rabbi Daniel Mann's article, "Halachic Consequences of Use of Medical Marijuana,"[2] to shed light on the permissibility of using medicinal marijuana before attending synagogue.

R. Heber begins his article by explaining why the COR has refused to certify the kashrut of medicinal marijuana in Canada. The COR is aware of the fact that doctors prescribe medicinal marijuana to their patients and that medicinal marijuana comes in forms that would require kashrut certification. For example, many medicinal marijuana products contain alcohol, oil, and gelatin. Without kashrut certification, halachically observant Jews would thus not be able to consume edible medicinal marijuana products. Moreover, the COR knows that other kashrut authorities, notably the Orthodox Union,[3] have put their hechsher on medicinal marijuana products. To clarify its opposition in light of the more lenient position of other kashrut authorities, the COR argues that endorsing medicinal marijuana may lead people to think that recreational marijuana is permissible. In the midst of Canada's legalization of recreational marijuana, there is also concern that producers of edible medicinal

marijuana will expand their businesses by selling their products for recreational use. It would be difficult for the COR to then retract their certification since the companies would not be acting illegally. The decision to retract certification would therefore be made on ethical, not halachic grounds. In addition, the COR argues that ease of access to edible medicinal marijuana will lead to its abuse for recreational purposes. Lastly, the availability of non-edible medicinal marijuana in pills and capsules along with kosher cannabis oils provide sufficient alternatives to patients in need, and these alternatives do not require a COR *hechsher* since they are classified as medicine rather than food. Although the COR's concerns are valid, the group does not explain the circumstances under which other kashrut authorities certified edible medicinal marijuana. By not addressing how their own ruling is superior to these other authorities which have certified edible medicinal marijuana, the COR raises doubts regarding the validity of their arguments.

After providing the COR's reasoning for not certifying edible medicinal marijuana products, R. Heber turns to why recreational marijuana is not kosher. The first argument he cites is the Tur's ruling that it is a mitzvah for one to take care of himself so that he can serve G-d strongly and in good health. That the Tur refers to this as a mitzvah implies that Jews are obligated to maintain their physical health. Moreover, several authorities rule that being careless with one's health transgresses a Torah prohibition. R. Heber has now established that Jews are obligated to take care of themselves health-wise and are also prohibited from being careless with their health. The combination of a positive commandment with a prohibition emphasizes the seriousness of this matter.

Citing R. Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, Rabbi Dr. Avraham Sofer Abraham states that taking drugs transgresses the prohibition of being careless with one's health. These drugs include marijuana. Further, R. Moshe Feinstein says that it is *pashut* (simple) that taking marijuana is among the most stringent prohibitions, so Jews must take great measures to get rid of marijuana from the Jewish people, particularly its younger generation. Although R. Heber does not include the basis of R. Feinstein's ruling, R. Feinstein rules based on the following effects that marijuana has: (1) it affects a person physically and mentally; (2) prevents a person from studying Torah and praying in the proper manner; (3) affects the proper performance of *mitzvot*; (4) causes its user to have stronger desires which is a problem of the rebellious son described in Deuteronomy 21:18 ; (4) using it violates the mitzvah to honour one's parents; (5) using it violates Maimonides' interpretation of the *mitzvah* to be holy; and (6) it influences its user to violate other commandments which increases impurity among the Jewish people.[4] R. Heber states that other prominent halachic authorities rule similarly to R. Feinstein, and argues that Canada's legalization of marijuana should not change halacha. Furthermore, R. Heber contends there is no reason to believe that marijuana's halachic status has changed since R. Feinstein gave his ruling several decades ago.

R. Heber then addresses a counter argument. Since using marijuana for recreational purposes is a common practice, it may be permissible under the principle of "Guardian of the Foolish." This Talmudic principle essentially means that G-d protects those who partake in unhealthy but common practices. However, G-d only guards the foolish when the practice in question does not pose a clear threat of danger. Given the well-documented dangers of

recreational marijuana use, R. Heber argues that users of recreational marijuana are not protected under the “Guardian of the Foolish" principle regardless of the commonality of the practice. R. Heber cites another opinion that the “Guardian of the Foolish" principle only applies in cases where people run into danger during their regular activities. Based on this argument, it is futile for recreational marijuana users to rely on the “Guardian of the Foolish" since they willingly place themselves in dangerous situations.

Although R. Heber’s argument applies to people who are aware of the dangers of recreational marijuana, perhaps the “foolish” people in question use marijuana without being cognizant of its dangers. Recreational marijuana is quite common among high-school and college-aged youths. People of this age often give in to peer pressure and tend to be unaware of the long-term effects of marijuana. Whereas the dangers of smoking cigarettes are prominently advertised in Canadian media, the only advertisements regarding marijuana are those that instruct users of recreational marijuana not to drive while under the influence. In addition, the government has legalized recreational marijuana during a period when smoking cigarettes is discouraged, which presumably leads people to believe that using marijuana must be safe. If it were dangerous, people would expect to see widespread media and education campaigns warning the use of recreational marijuana. Instead, they see a de facto endorsement of recreational marijuana from the federal government. In sum, R. Heber cannot reasonably conclude that people are aware of the documented dangers of marijuana, so his removal of recreational marijuana use from the “Guardian of the Foolish” principle is ineffective. In spite of this flaw, R. Heber’s other arguments are sufficiently effective to ban the recreational use of marijuana.

Returning to the article, R. Heber moves on to deal with occasional users of recreational marijuana. While some may argue that occasional use of recreational marijuana is similar to occasional smoking or drinking, R. Moshe Feinstein asserts that drug use is prohibited even when the nature of the use will not pose a health risk, on the grounds that the drug will cause many users to have an unnatural lust. As such, occasional drug users are comparable to the rebellious son that Deuteronomy 21:18 describes. Although the rebellious son has not yet transgressed any prohibitions, his actions have placed him in a downward spiral that, according to the Torah, subjects him to judgement for his future sins. R. Heber notes that halacha is clear in its prohibition against bringing about unnatural lust. Despite the validity of this specific argument, it is unclear why R. Heber treats it as its own point given that he has already cited R. Moshe Feinstein's prohibition of recreational marijuana. Had R. Heber listed the reasons for R. Feinstein's prohibition, he would have included this argument along with the several others that R. Feinstein gives in his ruling. Perhaps R. Heber did not list R. Feinstein's other reasons so that he could emphasize the significance of this specific point without subjecting readers to R. Feinstein's other arguments, which may not seem as cogent.

Following his arguments against the use of recreational marijuana, R. Heber deals with medicinal marijuana. Notwithstanding the permissibility of medicinal marijuana when prescribed by a doctor to a patient for a specific need, R. Heber argues that it is not permitted unless a licensed medical practitioner prescribes it. R. Heber bases this on the fact that (based on an interpretation of Berachot 60a) the requirement of a doctor to have a license in order to practice is a Torah precept. Doctors must have licenses to practice given the dangerous nature of their work, so R. Heber makes it clear that it is

not the prerogative of the patient or any unlicensed person to prescribe the dangerous substance of marijuana for medicinal purposes. The article concludes by reaffirming the everlasting mission of the Jewish people to protect themselves from societal norms like recreational marijuana use with the study and practice of Torah.

R. Heber's rather short statement on behalf of the COR regarding medicinal marijuana explains its permissibility but does not address the circumstances under which its use may come into question. Fortunately, Rabbi Daniel Mann deals with this topic in a responsum. He presents the following scenario: a Jew with a prescription for medicinal marijuana that helps him deal with pain only receives marijuana leaves as part of his prescription. Since he cannot smoke the leaves on Shabbat, he bakes cannabis brownies with them which take ninety minutes to have an effect. This person asks R. Mann if he can eat the brownies before attending synagogue on Shabbat and, if so, if he should make kiddush before eating them. As the brownies hinder his coordination and make him feel slightly drunk without affecting his thinking ability, he also wonders if he can perform the Priestly Blessing after eating them.

R. Mann begins his answer by pointing out that eating before Sabbath prayers is generally prohibited with the exception of water, although some also make exceptions for tea and coffee. Despite this rule, the *Mishnah Berura* states that Jews may eat before prayers if they must do so for their health. This is even permissible when they are not completely sick. Ultimately, R. Mann decides that someone with a prescription for medicinal marijuana is sufficiently sick to consume his treatment before prayers. Based on this reasoning, the person can eat his brownies before prayers on the Sabbath.

Whether or not the person can eat the brownies before *kiddush* is a trickier question. Notwithstanding the medicinal purpose of the brownies, the *Mishnah Berura* still requires their consumer to make a blessing on them if they have a decent taste. The halacha would thereby prohibit the person from eating the brownies before making kiddush. However, since one does not drink kiddush wine for health purposes, R. Mann must determine if kiddush would be necessary before eating the brownies. According to the *Beur Halacha*, one must make kiddush before eating for health purposes prior to prayers. This would require the person to make kiddush before eating the brownies. However, R. Moshe Feinstein rules that one is not required to make kiddush before eating something prior to prayers that is not consensually agreed upon as food that lends itself to kiddush. Given that the brownies are flour-based, and the person will eat more than the volume of an olive worth of them, the person must make kiddush according to the *Mishnah Berura*.

Having established that the person must make kiddush before eating the brownies, R. Mann questions whether it is preferable for him to ingest the marijuana in a form other than food. If possible, this would allow the person to avoid the far from optimal situation of eating and making kiddush before Sabbath prayers. However, there are issues with taking medicine on the Sabbath. Unfortunately, R. Mann does not explain what these issues are but rather points the reader to sources in which they can find more information. According to *Orchot Shabbat*, one may take medicine in the form of food on the Sabbath that is not recognized as medicine itself. R. Mann stresses that the person can likely justifiably take medicine on the Sabbath due to his condition as per the *Shulchan Aruch*. R. Mann only provides a reference to this section of the *Shulchan Aruch*, but he probably refers to the ruling that an ill Jew can

break the Sabbath to treat his illness if the action does not violate Sabbath labour that the Torah prohibits even in a case when he does not have an endangered body part.[5] That the prohibition against taking medicine on the Sabbath is rabbinic and not from the Torah allows the person to ingest marijuana on the Sabbath. Returning to the responsum, R. Mann argues that in spite of the likelihood that the person can take medicine on the Sabbath due to his condition, it is easier from a halachic perspective to allow him to eat before prayers than to take medicine on the Sabbath. If no medicinal form other than brownies will benefit the person in a greater way, R. Mann rules that he can eat the brownies based on the halacha that one may take medicine in the form of food that is not recognized as medicine.

R. Mann then turns to the question of whether the person, who is a *kohen*, may perform the Priestly Blessing at synagogue after consuming the marijuana brownies. The Gemara in *Ta'anit* rules that a kohen may not perform the priestly blessing while drunk. This ruling is based on a connection that the Rabbis draw between the Priestly Blessing and the laws governing Nazirites and priestly services in the Temple. It is clear from the Gemara that the prohibition against performing the Priestly Blessing while drunk is only a rabbinic enactment as opposed to a Torah law. Since only grape products are forbidden to Nazirites, and *kohanim* are only completely prohibited from serving in the Temple after drinking wine, some authorities (such as the Magen Avraham) rule that one is only prohibited from performing the Priestly Blessing after consuming an intoxicating substance if they are as drunk as Lot was. Lot's daughters made him so drunk that they were able to lie with him without him realizing,[6] so this level of drunkenness is far beyond what the person who consumes marijuana brownies will experience. However, the Taz

is stricter on this issue and rules that one may not perform the Priestly Blessing if they have consumed something that intoxicated them beyond the point of being fit to speak to a king. According to the *Mishnah Berura*, Jews should follow this stringency. Although the *Shulchan Aruch* forbids one from performing the Priestly Blessing if they have consumed more than a *revi'it* of wine,[7] R. Mann infers that substances other than wine are not included in this ruling. Regarding the Taz's ruling, R. Mann argues that it only applies to recreational drinking and cannot be reasonably applied to the person in question since he must become intoxicated for a medical purpose. Based on the information listed above, R. Mann rules that the person in question can perform the Priestly Blessing—which is a Torah law—after eating the marijuana brownies on the condition that he makes kiddush on grape juice and acts in a presentable manner during the blessing. The person must make kiddush on grape juice instead of wine because drinking wine would prohibit him from performing the Priestly Blessing.

Analyzing the halachic response to issues of marijuana is fascinating. It is amazing to see the combination of sources that the Rabbis use, some of which date back thousands of years, to rule on issues that arise with the times. For instance, one of the fundamental arguments against the use of recreational marijuana is that users are like the rebellious son described in Deuteronomy. Although the Torah never discusses marijuana, the Rabbis are able to connect the use of the substance with a Torah concept that appears to be completely unrelated, contextually speaking. Missing information generally comes along with contemporary halachic rulings since codified halacha could not provide details on issues that did not yet exist at the time of their composition. As such, responsa like R. Mann's are necessary to answer pressing questions that

are not addressed in more general rulings. That Rabbis can rule on issues as specific as to whether one can perform the Priestly Blessing after eating a marijuana brownie speaks to the effectiveness of the Jewish legal system which has endured for millennia. In conclusion, an analysis of halachic rulings regarding marijuana reflects the power of the Rabbis to apply both revealed and rabbinically enacted laws to make new authoritative legal decisions.

1 Tsvi Heber, "Why Recreational Marijuana Isn't Kosher," COR, 2019, https://cor.ca/view/914:2/why_recreational_marijuana_isnt_kosher.html.
2 Daniel Mann, "Halachic Consequences of Use of Medical Marijuana," Torah Musings, July 11, 2017, https://www.torahmusings.com/2017/07/halachic-consequences-use-medical-marijuana/.
3 "OU Medical Marijuana Statement," OU Kosher Certification, November 21, 2016, https://oukosher.org/blog/consumer-news/ou-medical-marijuana-statement/
4 Yair Hoffman, "Is It Permitted To Invest In Legal Marijuana - A Halachic Analysis," The Yeshiva World, December 18, 2018, https://www.theyeshivaworld.com/news/general/1643746/is-it-permitted-to-invest-in-legal-marijuana-a-halachic-analysis.html.
5 *Shulchan Aruch*, Orach Chayim, 328:17.
6 Genesis 19:34-35.
7 *Shulchan Aruch*, Orach Chayim, 128:38.

Bibliography

Heber, Tsvi. "Why Recreational Marijuana Isn't Kosher." COR. 2019. https://cor.ca/view/914:2/why_recreational_marijuana_isnt_kosher.html.

Hoffman, Yair. "Is It Permitted To Invest In Legal Marijuana - A Halachic Analysis." The Yeshiva World. December 18, 2018.

Mann, Daniel. "Halachic Consequences of Use of Medical Marijuana." Torah Musings. July 11, 2017. https://www.torahmusings.com/2017/07/halachic-consequences-use-medical-marijuana/.

"OU Medical Marijuana Statement." OU Kosher Certification. November 21, 2016. https://oukosher.org/blog/consumer-news/ou-medical-marijuana-statement/.

Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim

Uncovering the Historical Consolidation of Montreal's Contemporary Jewish Polity (1882-1948)

Gilli Cohen

Introduction

Public life in Montreal from the late colonial period (c.1836) until the outset of Quebec's Quiet Revolution (c.1960) was dominated by Catholic influence, particularly within the jurisdictions of health care, education, and social services.[1] However, the Quiet Revolution resulted in the seismic expansion of Quebec's provincial government. In turn, these reforms diminished the cultural primacy of Catholic identity in Montreal and the influence of the Catholic parish in administering public services. [2] Indeed, Montreal's Jewish community evolved in a distinct way, contrasting the city's broader religious-political development. In the aftermath of the Quiet Revolution, the Jewish community continued to expand its institutional capacity; more than 3000 community organizations actively serve Jewish Montrealers today.[3] Additionally, Jewish self-identification within the city has seen an average increase over the past five decades.[4]

The endurance of Jewish communal life in the face of provincial secularization speaks to the ongoing social relevance of Montreal's "Jewish polity"[5]. The modern variant of this concept, outlined by political scientist Daniel Elazar, denotes a collection of Jewish institutions which enable community members to live their entire lives without utilizing secular government services.[6] Hence, the Jewish polity is relatively "institutionally complete"[7] when compared with nearly every other minority group community in North America; Jews can educate themselves, seek medical attention, and find work exclusively within their religious communities. While

the Jewish Montreal literature has addressed the institutional characteristics of the Jewish polity in its contemporary context, works tracking the genesis of its mature form remain relatively absent.[8] Furthermore, comprehensive comparisons between Catholic parish and Jewish polity administrative practices have been neglected in terms of understanding communal responses to Quebecois secularization. Thus, the goal of the proceeding work is to 1) uncover the developmental processes that have framed Montreal's Jewish polity, and 2) to question whether this institutional body has remained socially relevant according to administrative practices that differ from Catholic parish politics. The historical juncture spanning from 1882 to 1948 will be of primary importance throughout this analysis. This epoch may be seen as the polity-consolidation period, during which Montreal's Jewish community transitioned from resembling a shtetl-like community, bound by informal methods of congregation, into a relatively institutionally complete pseudo-state.

The polity consolidation period was pervaded by a minimalist provincial public service, a pattern of stratified Jewish immigration, cultural antisemitism, and a secular character to Jewish political leadership. There are then external and internal factors framing the Jewish polity's administrative autonomy and endurance. The external environment for which Jewish institutions were forced to adapt in Montreal will be analyzed preliminarily to understand the adaptive logic intrinsic to Jewish institutional autonomy. Subsequently, the secular-like leadership ethic common amongst the most prevalent Jewish communal organizations will be compared with the Catholic method of parochial organization in Montreal in an attempt to uncover how Jewish institutions and identity have contemporarily endured. Finally, the

institutional configuration of Montreal's Jewish polity will be outlined to contextualize the external and internal dynamics elucidated previously.

The External Context: Catholic Politics, Jewish Stratified Migration, and Cultural Antisemitism

The primacy of the Catholic Church over public service provision, patterns of Jewish stratified migration, and the pervasiveness of Quebecois antisemitism have contributed to the distinct form of Jewish communal organization in Montreal. Furthermore, these separate factors that permeated the polity-consolidation period shed light on the adaptive logic intrinsic to the institution-building process of Montreal's Jewish community.

After establishing the diocese of Montreal in 1836, the Catholic Church cemented itself as the city's central political administrator.[9] Furthermore, the Quebecois government employed a minimalist approach to social service distribution in favour of granting greater administrative powers to "private institutions."[10]As a result, by the dawn of Canadian independence, education, welfare, and health care were exclusively administered by religious entities.[11] However, prior to 1882, the only existing Jewish communal institutions in Montreal were two religious congregations and a single welfare society. The demography of Montreal's Jewish community at the time helps to uncover why Jewish political infrastructure was essentially absent pre-1882. From the 18th to mid-19th century, Jewish Montrealers were well incorporated into existing English-speaking, Protestant business networks. These settlers represented a class of officers in the British army, fur traders, and merchants requiring very little social assistance.[12] However, the subsequent cohort of Jewish immigrants, who were, on average, much poorer than their

predecessors, required a more robust political infrastructure to address their needs.

Hence, the stratified nature of Jewish migration may be understood according to two consecutive immigration clusters: an initial, wealthier, British and German, English-speaking cohort of Jews[13] and a subsequent chain of migration from working-class, Yiddish-speaking, Eastern European communities.[14] The former cohort of Jewish settlers began to arrive in Montreal in the late 18th century and remained a population of less than 500 as of Canadian Confederation. The latter group contributed to the continuous expansion of Montreal's Jewish community and prompted a drastic population explosion of Jewish Montrealers, reaching more than 78,000 persons by 1948.[15] Therefore, the socioeconomically stratified process to Jewish migration involved a wealthier, smaller, and secularly-oriented cluster cementing themselves within Montreal's society prior to a much more expansive, working-class cohort which generally lacked English language skills and required a more robust social welfare net. The former group was then capable of providing the material funds necessary to assist the latter group.

As is the case in many urban centers, antisemitism during Montreal's polity-consolidation period served as a reinforcement mechanism for Jewish communal solidarity. Furthermore, Francophone media, educational institutions, and non-governmental propaganda all contributed to the widespread social alienation of Montreal's Jewish population. The newspaper *Le Devoir*, founded by Quebec nationalist Henri Bourassa in 1910, was one such tool used to promote the alienation of Jews.[16] The editorial frequently referred to Jewish Quebecers as a "political cost," "undesirable elements to

Quebec society," and "impossible to assimilate."[17] Furthermore, Jews were not constitutionally recognized within the province as a denominational group, which led to a prolonged struggle that motivated Jewish activism for education rights. Public spaces in suburban and rural regions outside of Montreal such as St. Faustin and St. Agathe were home to hundreds of signs that read "Jews are not wanted" in the case of the former and "No Jews allowed" in the latter municipality.[18]

Thus, the story of Montreal's Jewish polity begins with an inhospitable external environment to which Jewish institutions were forced to respond. Catholic administrative domination created a political vacuum that left Montreal's Jews socially segregated. Stratified migration provided the impetus to fill this vacuum, and Quebecois antisemitism ensured an intracommunal sense of security relative to Quebec's hostile broader context.

The Internal Structure: The Administrative Ethos' of The Catholic Parish Versus Jewish Polity

The external circumstances that motivated the construction of an autonomous Jewish polity have thus far been addressed. Presently, I will look at the question of why Jewish institutions have remained socially relevant in Montreal's contemporary context according to the Jewish polity's internal administrative structure. To do so, the secular-like political ethos of the Jewish polity will be compared to the Catholic Church's monolithic-dogmatic approach to political administration. The geographic manifestation of these ideological differences will additionally be analyzed to understand how ethnolinguistic pluralism was inbuilt to Montreal's Jewish polity. In contrast to

the Jewish polity, the Catholic parish held a normative bias toward dogmatic and ethnolinguistic conformity.

Ahmedt Kuru's "Passive and Active Secularism" provides the principal theoretical justification for arguing that the Jewish secular-like administrative ethos resulted in the communal endurance of the Jewish polity. Kuru's passive versus assertive secularism dichotomy is the key to understanding divergences in the relevance of Catholic versus Jewish institutions in Montreal's context. Passive secularism is an ideology necessitating the secular state to play a passive role over the public presence of religious institutions.[19] Assertive secularism seeks to exclude religious institutions from the public sphere entirely.[20] Furthermore, whereas assertive secularism becomes societally dominant in contexts where religious and political authorities hold ideological antagonisms, passive secularism arises out of a consensus between religious and political authorities.[21]

Quebec's broader political context during the Quiet Revolution was shaped by an assertive backlash to Catholic political administration: Secularists clashed with the Catholic Church as the latter group held immense political control, and the former sought to remove this institution from its historical hegemonic place in Quebecois society.[22] Conversely, the most socially salient institutions erected within the Jewish polity were founded without ethnolinguistic affiliation. Such is the case for the Canadian Jewish Congress, the Baron De Hirsch society, and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. As a result, from the outset of the Jewish community's polity-consolidation, a clear delineation existed between religious dogma and political administration. Thus, the Jewish polity effectively held a societally

relevant place within Montreal as it never faced an assertive backlash to its leadership ethic.

The contrasting urban geography of Catholic parishes versus the Jewish polity assists in revealing the relative pluralism to Jewish administrative ideology. From 1920-1930, more than 50 parish churches were erected throughout the city of Montreal, each of which was 7x7 to 20x18 city blocks large.[23] Parishes were divided according to French versus Irish heritage and linguistic affiliation, whereas the major hub of Jewish settlement along St. Lawrence street can be seen as a single parochial structure, rather than a gridded network of synagogues that separated ethnolinguistic and denominational groups. The Jewish corridor, colloquially called "the Main," from Sherbrooke as the southernmost and St. Bernard as the northernmost border streets, was the center for the overwhelming majority of synagogues and Jewish businesses during the polity-consolidation period. This parochial ghetto was home to Conservative, Reform, and Orthodox congregations, Sephardic and Ashkenazi inhabitants, as well as English, French, and Yiddish businesses. Evidently, the pluralistic character of the Jewish polity's urban geography conveys an intrinsically passive secular character.

Now that the external and internal explanatory variables surrounding the polity-consolidation period have been addressed, a contextualization of these variables will be employed. A dissection of the institutional development of Montreal's Jewish polity is the means to achieve such an analytical feat.

The Polity-Consolidation Period

The Jewish polity is a concept first elucidated by Daniel Elazar in his work *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American*

Jewry. As expected from the title of his book, Elazar's exposé of Jewish communal organization does not directly analyze Jewish administration within the Canadian context. Nevertheless, the Jewish polity structure remains an appropriate institutional skeleton throughout North America. For instance, Toronto, New York City, Los Angeles, and Miami display broadly institutionally complete administrative structures.[24] In fact, urbanized Jewish communities throughout North America are contemporarily incorporated into a multinational network of non-profits. The "Jewish Federations of North America" incorporate variable cultural contexts under similar philanthropic schemes and an overarching denominationally unaffiliated ideology.[25] While differences between North American urban contexts remain, the Jewish polity structure endures as an analytically helpful framework for depicting the organizational structure of modernized urban Jewish communities. Elazar outlines an institutional skeleton for Jewish political organization as it stands in the context of post-industrialized America. Thus, by tracking the development of this skeleton, a contextual look to the internal and external influences at play can be further identified.

Elazar's Jewish polity skeleton consists of religious-congregational, educational-cultural, community relations, communal welfare, and Israel overseas organizations.[26] Similar to the contemporary jurisdictions of many Jewish communal institutions in Montreal, many polity-consolidation period organizations oversaw the distribution of services within multiple spheres. For instance, the Canadian Jewish Congress, a prototype organization for the later Jewish Federations, instituted in 1911, provided community relations, communal welfare, and Israel oversees functions.[27] Furthermore, the Baron de Hirsch Institute, the city's first Jewish welfare society, provided English

educational services for Yiddish-speaking immigrants while simultaneously providing shelter, food, and medical aid for the urban poor.[28]

One particular sphere of Montreal's Jewish metropole arose in relative isolation from the others and provides the foundation that the entire community's organizational structure has been based on.[29] Religious congregations and their built form served as the exclusive centers for Jewish life in Montreal during the first few decades of Jewish settlement in the city. From 1768 until 1882, Montreal had but three synagogues: Sheerith Israel, Shaar Hashomayim, and Temple Emanu-El.[30] The first two synagogues mentioned are traditional Orthodox congregations, serving Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews, respectively. Temple Emanu-el is a reform synagogue, and its foundation represents the emerging cultural significance of the wealthier, predominantly German,[31] English-speaking elite that was instrumental in framing Montreal's Jewish Metropole.[32] In the same year as Temple Emanu-el's construction, a plethora of synagogues were erected along "The Main," which would serve as the hub of Jewish life for decades to come. The pre-Temple Emanu-el period did not motivate the creation of a Jewish polity with an institutionally complete array of Jewish services as the Jewish community of the time was less than 500 persons.[33] As mentioned previously, this population did not require substantial public support because it was composed of predominantly wealthy English and German immigrants who were already integrated into existing anglicized business and cultural networks.

Many of the synagogues built at the outset of the polity-consolidation period followed a similar nationality-based form of congregation to that of Sheerith Israel and Shaar Hashomayim, the Spanish-Portuguese and Polish-German synagogues, respectively.[34] The notable synagogues B'nai Jacob

(Russian), Beth David (Romanian), and Shaare tefillah (Austrian-Hungarian) were erected from 1886-1892[35] and showcased a first step in the diversification of congregational affiliation that would come to characterize Montreal's Jewish community in the coming years. However, the majority of synagogues that peppered Saint Laurent Boulevard by the outset of the 20th century were "shtibels," much smaller congregations where membership was primarily framed by village affiliation and was orthodox in religious orientation.[36] Shtibels and the many nationality-based synagogues are also built examples of the second strata of Jewish migration. The first shtibels, which were established in 1882, thus mark the beginning of the polity-consolidation period, as Montreal transitioned from the "city of three synagogues" to a socioeconomically stratified Jewish community requiring a robust social welfare net.

The cluster of synagogues along "the Main" would serve as the epicentre of working-class Jewish life until the 1950s. By 1945, 44 separate congregations resided within a two-street radius from "the Main," with Sherbrooke street as the southernmost and Bernard as the northernmost border streets of the communal nucleus.[37] Whereas more affluent Jews in Montreal lived in the wealthier neighbourhood of Westmount and, as a result, were colloquially referred to as "uptown Jews," the cultural heart of Jewish religion, commerce, and political administration resided adjacent to the community's diverse agglomeration of congregations along "the Main."

Communal welfare organizations were the subsequent sort of institution to arise in Montreal's context and, as expected, the first organization of this type was nestled along "the Main," just south of Sherbrooke. The Baron de Hirsch Institute was erected in 1868 as the Young

Men's Hebrew Benevolent society. However, by 1900, with the growing financial burden of providing welfare for an exponentially increasing Jewish community, the organization turned to the secular-minded philanthropist Maurice de Hirsch to help fund community services.[38] The wealthy benefactor provided resources for the construction of a new building on Bleury Street, alongside a sheltering home for new immigrants.[39] By 1913, the Montreal Hebrew Orphan's Home was founded alongside the Friendly League of Jewish Women and the Welcome Club for Jewish Women as Baron de Hirsch-affiliated institutions. Additionally, by 1920, youth organizations, including Canadian Young Judea, B'nai Brith, and Hashomer Hatzair were active along "the Main." In a sense, these latter institutions constitute a sixth sphere of the Jewish polity in Montreal's context, as they ensured a deep sense of group identity through youth-targeted initiatives, including summer camps, youth retreats, and community outreach programs.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies would serve as an overarching bureaucracy establishing welfare, cultural, and Israel overseas organizations during the polity-consolidation period. This institution, erected in 1916, represents a critical point in the centralization of Montreal's Jewish metropole. The organization's founding president Maxwell Goldstein held a secular orientation when it came to the provision of social services.[40] Furthermore, the Federation was erected without denominational concerns or preoccupations concerning how Jewish philanthropies should function ideologically. Thus, the Federation was erected as an initiative to unite all of Montreal's emerging philanthropies, including the Baron de Hirsch Institute, the Herzl Dispensary, and the Young Men's Hebrew Association.[41] By 1948, the organization would additionally raise funds that would be used to support

philanthropic initiatives in the newly independent state of Israel. As a result, the concluding juncture of the polity-consolidation period arose in 1948, when Israel overseas functions were added to the list of administrative tasks headed by Montreal's Jewish community.

The educational-cultural sphere of Montreal's Jewish metropole developed through a process of public debate and antisemitic policy, which obstructed the proliferation of Jewish schools. To understand the "Jewish education question," one must first look to the constitutional precedent pertaining to education, set out in section 93 of the British North America Act, according to which provinces were granted exclusive jurisdiction over education.[42] Within this section, legal rights were framed in denominational terms which, excluded Judaism as a distinct denominational group. In Quebec's context, this was used to deny Jewish students equal educational rights and to prevent the creation of non-denominational or public school boards.[43] Jewish children were then designated under the jurisdiction of the Protestant school board since the emerging Jewish community of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was predominantly English-speaking.[44] Public debate concerning Jewish education came to a head during the landmark Pinsler case of 1901 when Jacob Pinsler, who graduated first in his elementary school class, was denied a scholarship on the grounds that his father did not own property that could be taxed and help fund Protestant schooling.[45] This case prompted three decades of Jewish-led activism which mobilized thousands of Jewish Montrealers.[46]

While the first all-day Jewish private school, the Jewish People's School, was constructed in 1927, the establishment of a separate Jewish educational school board was not commonly supported by the elite and

overwhelmingly secular members of Montreal's Jewish community. Furthermore, the Jewish Federation did not openly support Jewish education until the 1960s, when non-denominational schools were finally enacted. However, Rabbi Hirsch Wolofsky's community council, the Va'ad Hair, inaugurated in 1922, concerned itself with lobbying on behalf of Jewish education, kosher meat distribution, and Yiddish media.[46] Furthermore, it was the initiative of Wolofsky's Va'ad Hair that prominently addressed the educational-cultural niche of the Jewish polity, whereas social welfare remained the specific focus of the Jewish Federation. Thus, the divide between these two broad spheres of the Jewish polity further delineates the very prominent societal cleavage between immigrant Yiddish-speaking and wealthier, settled English-speaking Jews.

The institutional configuration of Montreal's Jewish polity showcases the salience of the external and internal variables elucidated at the outset of this work. Quebec's minimalist government, alongside Catholic political domination, led the Jewish community to erect their own benefit societies, cultural organizations, and social welfare institutions. Additionally, the "education question" reinforced Jewish solidarity; Jewish activism proliferated in response to the antisemetic framing of this political-cultural debate. Finally, the preceding wealthier, English-speaking cohort of secularly oriented Jews founded organizations such as the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and the Baron De Hirsch institute, which then benefited the subsequent strata of Yiddish-speaking Eastern European immigrants. The secular orientation of these institutions entailed that specific denominational and ethnolinguistic groups would have little control over the overarching Jewish administrative apparatus. Thus, the Jewish polity holds an intrinsic pluralism that was

initially erected through its myriad of religious congregations along “the Main” and expanded upon through its consolidation from 1882-1948.

Conclusion

The central historical juncture analyzed above, coined the polity-consolidation period, displays a process of Jewish demographic expansion and rapid institutional development. During this epoch, Montreal’s Jewish community constructed its infrastructural base along St. Laurent Boulevard, a corridor colloquially known as “the Main.” Additionally, this period was defined by a minimalist provincial public service, a stratified pattern to Jewish immigration, Quebecois cultural and political antisemitism, and a secular character to Jewish political leadership. The former three external circumstances thus urged Jewish institutions to respond to said circumstances by creating autonomous communal institutions. The secular stature internal to Jewish political administration has been argued to influence the contemporary social endurance of the Jewish polity. Whereas the Catholic Church in Quebec faced assertive secularist backlash during the Quiet Revolution, the Jewish polity’s passively secular ethos enabled a pluralistic equilibrium to be upheld during this period of social change. Nevertheless, the theoretical justifications provided for both the external and internal variables should not be regarded as absolute. Instead, these explanatory factors should provoke further research into the endurance of Montreal’s Jewish polity and whether the polity-consolidation period has framed a path dependence upheld in Montreal’s contemporary context.

1 Morton Weinfeld, Randal F. Schnoor, and Michelle Shames, *Like Everyone Else but Different: The Paradoxical Success of Canadian Jews* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018), 165.
2 David Seljak, "Why the Quiet Revolution Was 'Quiet': The Catholic Church's Reaction to the Secularization of Nationalism in Quebec after 1960," *CCHA Historical Studies* 62 (1996): 110.
3 Weinfeld et al., *Like Everyone Else but Different*, 170.
4 Québec, "Total Population by Major Denominations, Montréal and de Laval Administrative Regions, 2001."
5 Elazar, Daniel Judah Elazar, *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 277.
6 Raymond Breton, "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants," *American Journal of Sociology* 70.2 (1964): 194.
7 Breton, "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants," 194.
8 Pierre Anctil, "A Community in Transition: The Jews of Montréal," *Contemporary Jewry* 31.3 (2011): 226.
9 *L'Église de Montréal, 1836-1986*, 54.
10 *L'Église de Montréal*, 19.
11 Gregory Baum, *The Church in Quebec* (Outremont, Quebec: Novalis, 1991), 18.
12 "Jewish Community of Montreal | Databases – ANU Museum of the Jewish People," Accessed March 7, 2021.
13 "Jewish Community of Montreal."
14 Mario Nigro and Clare Mauro, "The Jewish Immigrant Experience and the Practice of Law in Montreal, 1830 to 1990 Note." *McGill Law Journal* 44.4 (1999): 999–1048.
15 Louis Rosenberg, "THE JEWISH POPULATION OF MONTREAL." 3.
16 Pierre Anctil, *A Reluctant Welcome for Jewish People: Voices in Le Devoir's Editorials, 1910-1947*, (Ottawa, Ontario: University of Ottawa Press, 2019), 3.
17 Anctil, *A Reluctant Welcome for Jewish People,* 89-105.
18 Montreal Holocaust Museum, "Brief History of Antisemitism in Canada."
19 Ahmet T. Kuru, "Passive and Assertive Secularism: Historical Conditions, Ideological Struggles, and State Policies toward Religion," *World Politics* 59, no. 4 (2007): 571.
20 Kuru. 571.
21 Kuru, 581.
22 Baum, *The Church in Quebec*, 15.
23 Baum, 16.
24 Elazar, *Community and Polity*, 177.
25 Barry Alexander Kosmin and Paul Ritterband, *Contemporary Jewish Philanthropy in America* (Rowman & Littlefield, 1991), 171.
26 Elazar, *Community and Polity*, 180.
27 Anctil, "A Community in Transition."

28 "Finding Aid to the Jewish Family Services/Baron de Hirsch Institute Fonds Jewish Public Library Archives, Montreal."
29 Aline Gubbay, *A Street Called the Main: The Story of Montreal's Boulevard Saint-Laurent* (Meridian Press, 1989), 81.
30 Ira Robinson and Québec. Institute for Canadian Jewish Studies, Concordia University Montréal, *Rabbis and Their Community: Studies in the Eastern European Orthodox Rabbinate in Montreal, 1896-1930*, (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2007), 12.
31 Robinson and Concordia University, *Rabbis and Their Community,*12.
32 Bettina Bradbury and Tamara Myers, *Negotiating Identities in 19th- and 20th-Century Montreal*, 176.
33 CJA, "History - Jewish Montreal."
34 Robinson and Concordia University, 12.
35 Sara Ferdman Tauben, "Aspirations and Adaptations: Immigrant Synagogues of Montreal, 1880s-1945," (Masters, Concordia University, 2004), 70-76.
36 Tauben, "Aspirations and Adaptations," 70-76.
37 Arthur Hart, *The Jew in Canada* (Now and Then Books, 2010), 5-15.
38 "Finding Aid to the Jewish Family Services/Baron de Hirsch Institute Fonds Jewish Public Library Archives, Montreal."
39 "Finding Aid to the Jewish Family Services/Baron de Hirsch Institute Fonds Jewish Public Library Archives, Montreal."
40 "Museum of Jewish Montreal."
41 "Museum of Jewish Montreal."
42 David Fraser, *"Honorary Protestants": The Jewish School Question in Montreal, 1867-1997,* Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, (Toronto: Published for the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History by University of Toronto Press, 2015), 10-15.
43 Fraser, *"Honorary Protestants,"* 10-15.
44 Fraser, 10-15.
45 Michael Rosenberg, "Ethnicity, Community, and the State; the Organizational Structures, Practices and Strategies of the Montreal Jewish Community's Day School System and Its Relations with the Quebec State," (Text, Carleton University, 1996), 5-25.
46 Robinson and Concordia University, 90-107.

Bibliography

Anctil, Pierre. "A Community in Transition: The Jews of Montréal." *Contemporary Jewry* 31, no. 3 (2011): 225–45.

Anctil, Pierre. *A Reluctant Welcome for Jewish People: Voices in Le Devoir's Editorials, 1910-1947*. Ottawa, Ontario: University of Ottawa Press, 2019.

Baum, Gregory 1923-2017. *The Church in Quebec*. Outremont, Quebec: Novalis, 1991.

Bradbury, Bettina, and Tamara Myers. *Negotiating Identities in 19th- and 20th-Century Montreal*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

Breton, Raymond. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 193–205.

"Brief History of Antisemitism in Canada." Montreal Holocaust Museum. Accessed March 9, 2021.

Elazar, Daniel Judah. *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995.

"Finding Aid to the Jewish Family Services/Baron de Hirsch Institute Fonds Jewish Public Library Archives, Montreal - Free Download PDF." Accessed January 24, 2021.

Fraser, David. *"Honorary Protestants": The Jewish School Question in Montreal, 1867-1997*. Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History. Toronto: Published for the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History by University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Gubbay, Aline. *A Street Called the Main: The Story of Montreal's Boulevard Saint-Laurent*. Montreal: Meridian Press, 1989.

Hart, Arthur Daniel. *The Jew in Canada*. Now and Then Books, 2010.

"History - Jewish Montreal." CJA, Federation. Accessed January 24, 2021.

"Jewish Community of Montreal | Databases – ANU Museum of the Jewish People." Accessed March 7, 2021.

Kosmin, Barry Alexander, and Paul Ritterband. *Contemporary Jewish Philanthropy in America*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991.

Kuru, Ahmet T. "Passive and Assertive Secularism: Historical Conditions, Ideological Struggles, and State Policies toward Religion." *World Politics* 59, no. 4 (2007): 568–94.

L'Église de Montréal, 1836-1986: aperçus d'hier et d'aujourd'hui. Montréal: Fides, 1986.

"Museum of Jewish Montreal." Accessed March 12, 2021.

Nigro, Mario, and Clare Mauro. “The Jewish Immigrant Experience and the Practice of Law in Montreal, 1830 to 1990 Note.” *McGill Law Journal* 44, no. 4 (1999 1998): 999–1048.

Québec, Institut de la Statistique du. “Total Population by Major Denominations, Montréal and de Laval Administrative Regions, 2001.” Accessed January 9, 2021.

Robinson, Ira, and Québec. Institute for Canadian Jewish Studies. Concordia University (Montréal. *Rabbis and Their Community: Studies in the Eastern European Orthodox Rabbinate in Montreal, 1896-1930*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2007.

Rosenberg, Louis. “THE JEWISH POPULATION OF MONTREAL,” n.d., 58.

Rosenberg, Michael. “Ethnicity, Community, and the State; the Organizational Structures, Practices and Strategies of the Montreal Jewish Community’s Day School System and Its Relations with the Quebec State.” Text, Carleton University, 1996.

Seljak, David. “Why the Quiet Revolution Was ‘Quiet’: The Catholic Church’s Reaction to the Secularization of Nationalism in Quebec after 1960." *CCHA, Historical Studies* 62 (1996): 109-124.

Tauben, Sara Ferdman. “Aspirations and Adaptations: Immigrant Synagogues of Montreal, 1880s-1945.” Masters, Concordia University, 2004.

Weinfeld, Morton, Randal F. Schnoor, and Michelle Shames. *Like Everyone Else but Different: The Paradoxical Success of Canadian Jews*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2018.

Author Profiles

ALDEN TABAC is a U2 honours Jewish Studies student with a minor in History. His involvement in McGill Jewish life includes executive board positions with the Jewish Studies Students' Association and Chabad at McGill. Hailing from Toronto, Alden is a musician, an avid baseball fan,, and is currently co-authoring an original commentary on *Pirkei Avot*. Inspired by his passion for Jewish law and ethics, he plans to attend law school after graduation from McGill to pursue a career as a lawyer.

ANDREAS IAKOVOS KOCH is an Arts graduate from Greece and Switzerland with a major in Political Science and a double minor in History and Arabic Language. His post-McGill interests include political activism, journalism, travel, and further studies in Balkan and Middle Eastern history.

ELINOR ROSENBERG is entering her third year at McGill where she is pursuing an honours degree in Geography and a minor in Jewish Studies. She is especially interested in using a geographic and spatial lens to understand Jewish communities. In Montreal, she enjoys mapping the Jewish community by walking through its neighborhoods and eateries.

GILLI COHEN is a U3 joint honors student of Political Science and Religious Studies. Gilli is passionate about analyzing the political capacity of religious groups, the religious rhetoric internalized by political institutions, and the prosperity of the Jewish community in light of globalized religion and secularization. In the near future, Gilli will be working and travelling prior to his envisioned return to academia.

MELANIE ROSE is a graduating student double majoring in History and Political Science. She is on the executive team for Chabad at McGill and is a writer for the McGill Journal of Political Science. Her interests include modern American history and Middle Eastern politics.

SAM SHEPHERD is a U2 History student with double minors in Jewish Studies and English Literature. During his time at McGill, he has developed a keen interest in student journalism, having worked as a writer and later as an editor at The Bull & Bear. After graduation, Sam plans to continue to explore his interests in storytelling, the Jewish-American experience, and contemporary social movements at the postgraduate level.