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The revolutions of 1848 lie directly in the middle of a great period of transition for Jews in Central Europe. The early steps toward political and legal emancipation had been taken, and the revolution held the promise of the sudden granting of equality before the law; the reform movement, initiated in the Jewish communities of the German states, had begun to spread southward; and the growing forces of capitalism and urbanization seemed to hold the keys to social recognition and acceptance in the Christian environment. The liberal promise of the revolutions' ideals held with it the Jews' hopes for rapid further progress in both assimilation into an increasingly modern society and acceptance within a predominantly Christian society.

Against the background of Jewish economic prosperity and the increasing calls in Czech-Jewish communities for political and religious reform in order to better Jewish social status, and within the revolutionary context of 1848, the Österreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden (hereafter OCO) made its appearance. This journal is an important source that has been largely ignored by historians. Most references to it merely show that Jews had an outlet for their ideas, and occasionally it is cited in biographical essays on the more famous of its contributors. Its value for future historians was in fact explicitly noted by Marcus Teller, who, perhaps sensing the imminent end of the revolutionary times, wrote in its penultimate issue that the OCO birgt [...] die Materialien für den künftigen Geschichtsschreiber in sich, und hat als solche ihren bleibenden Wert für die Zukunft gesichert. Als eine solche werden diese Blätter dem künftigen Verfasser einer Geschichte der Juden und des Judentums im Jahre 1848 dienen.

This overlooking of the OCO is unfortunate for two reasons. First, the historiography of Jews in the western half of the Habsburg Empire (most prominently in the Bohemian Lands), while covered very well for the periods of the "Jewish Enlighten-1

1 The author's attention was drawn to the OCO by a note in Kisch, Guido: In Search of Freedom. A History of Czechoslovak Jews in America. London 1949, 27, 263–4. Kisch refers to it there as "available but hitherto neglected by researchers."

2 It is also interesting to note that the OCO has been largely forgotten in the listings of journals to which the subjects of lexicons contributed. The author found only three references to it in the over 100 citations researched in the Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich, Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950 and Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon.

3 OCO, 420. Citations will use the OCO's continuous pagination for ease in locating.
ment" of the late eighteenth century and the era of national conflict in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, shows a lacuna around 1848. There has been no substantial work written in the last fifty years on Jews in the period of revolution or the reaction that followed it. While substantial articles exist, these either provide only an overview of the political forces at work, or center on particular issues whose impact is lost without a meaningful study of their context.

Second, there is a problem of perspective on real Jewish social concerns of the period in question. Most considerations of the Jewish community center on one of three issues: Jewish economic participation, religious reform, or political and legal developments. In these, the reader is presented with data on Jews' commercial importance, exposed to a range of religious debates, and confronted by a commemorative litany of the achievements of exceptional Jews. All of these studies encounter difficulties in portraying the Jews' true concerns, attitudes, and responses to the revolutionary ferment adequately.

The most important criticism of the recent historiography can be levelled at all of the three of the main branches - economic studies, histories of the reform movement, and general political surveys. In these works one receives much information about the social issues Jews' should grieve about, and factual representations of how they attempted to correct them are presented. Unfortunately, very little indication is given of what issues the Jews themselves saw as important at the time, particularly for the crucial revolutionary year when patterns of Jewish political loyalty were formed in the Czech lands. This explains the value of the OCO. As the only political journal open to and responsible for Jewish issues, and Jewish issues alone, in the revolutionary year, it is a unique source, which should not be overlooked in any attempt to understand the pressures and strains Jewish communities were subject to in the chaos of that year. Its pages were open to all Jews, although it, like all journals in times requiring political decisiveness, had biases, as we shall see. This study represents an attempt to show the changes in Jewish social composition that were revealing themselves in the mid-nineteenth century through the contributorship of the OCO, and to portray the concerns that Jews themselves held in the political and social maelstrom of the revolutionary year.


The OCO’s brief history commenced after the March days’ successes brought press freedom to Vienna, and it was printed in that city by its editor Isidor Busch. It appeared a total of forty-nine times, two or three times each week between the 24th of March and the 25th of October, when Windischgrätz’s forces lay siege to the capital and closed the doors of the OCO forever. The geographic dispersion of the unsolicited letters and articles the OCO published, as well as that of the reports on the “Auf nach Amerika” emigration committees discussed below, indicate that copies of it spread as far north as Berlin, and east as far as Lemberg (Lvov), Preßburg (Bratislava), and Pest, but it apparently did not penetrate beyond Habsburg borders south or west. The availability of subscriptions, delivered by post, also indicates fairly wide dispersion. The OCO was also carried to the United States, apparently by ship, where it was sold in New York City by Helmich and Co.

Unfortunately, there is no information on the quantity of the OCO’s readers, nor on that readership’s social composition. Three points can be reasonably assumed, however, even without such data. First, the price (3 kr. per issue, 1 fl. 30 kr. for three months and 3 fl. for six month), certainly made it accessible to all the business-class Jews in the urban areas, and placed it within the reach of the leaders of the small-town Jewish communities. Second, the prominence and geographic variety of the contributors would have made most of them well-known to readers in the western half of the Empire. The religious and literary significance of the Rabbis and writers contributing to the OCO would have made their views valued in themselves, and their comments on the pressing issues of the day even more so. Third, even if the number of copies sold were relatively small, the closeness of the Jewish communities provided fertile ground for the second- and third-hand reading common to journals of the time.

Before beginning an analysis of the content of the OCO’s articles, it is important to come to an understanding of the composition of the contributors, particularly those whose articles appear most often. It is impossible to judge the exact number of actual contributors, as well as the frequency of their appearance in print, for the large majority of the articles published appear without names attached, perhaps out of prescient concern over possible reprisals if the revolution failed. Occasionally the authors leave their initials, but more often the only distinguishing sign is a descriptive subtitle, such as “Freundlicher Rath eines Böhmen an seine Landsleute,” or more cryptically, “Der ewige Jude.” The only internal source for contributors appeared in the first issue, which contained a list of forty-one contributors.

Six men — Isidor Busch, Leopold Kompert, Simon Szántó, Simon Hock, and the Rabbis Isaac Noah Mannheimer and Abraham Geiger — formed the OCO’s core, and influenced its direction in several ways. A balance of secular and religious concerns found its expression in a strong reform bias shown by the religious position of the two

---


7 OCO 52, 140.
Rabbis, and supported by Kompert's assimilationist posture. An interest in the political issues raised by Jewish faith came equally from all six. The Bohemian bias the journal developed can be attributed to both the importance of the anti-Semitic disturbances there, and to the increased sensitivity of the primary contributors arising from the fact that four of them spent time in Bohemia. Simon Hock, we shall see, becomes increasingly important as the OCO's reporter in Prague. Szantó's preoccupation with education added that facet to the political and religious reform issues, as did Busch's and Kompert's growing concern with the question of emigration.

Although these men are of particular importance for this study because of the frequency and leadership of their commentaries, the entire group of contributors reads like a list of the leading lights of the Jewish community. Moreover, this list provides the careful researcher with information on the social composition of the newly-rising Jewish intelligentsia in the western Empire. After Joseph II's Tolerenzpatent opened the doors of higher education to Jews, intellectuals from the different districts began to meet one another in the universities and join together, forming small intellectual bands. However, it wasn't until the generation born in the second and third decade of the nineteenth century, that these smaller groups came into extensive contact with one another, and a "Jewish intelligentsia" can truly be spoken of and characterized. The most fertile ground for this contact beyond local boundaries came after the completion of university education, and through the medium of two sets of journals, one literary and one religious-historical. For those concerned with literature, the OCO contributor Ludwig August Frankl's weekly magazine, the "Sonntagsblätter", was undoubtedly the most important, with Busch's "Jahrbuch," the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums," and "Orient" forming a second tier. Those motivated by the reformist historical science of Judaism's development - following OCO contributors Abraham Geiger, Leopold Zunz, and Isaac Marcus Jost - wrote for historico-religious journals, the most prominent being Geiger's "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie." The intellectual predigree of the OCO's contributors is evidenced by the large number of them who contributed to these prominent serials. Of the roughly twenty-five contributors for whom information on publication in periodical literature is easily accessible, at least seven appear in each of the journals named above.

Another gauge of the importance of the OCO can be gleaned from the positions and literary contributions of the men involved. Although there is a total of fifty known contributors, substantial information is available on only thirty-six (72%). The group includes the most important members of both the secular and religious worlds from across the Empire, as a brief survey will indicate. Mannheimer was the leader of the Jewish community in Vienna, and Geiger was Rabbi in Breslau. They were joined by six other prominent Rabbis or Predigern: Saul Isaac Kämpf (Prediger in Prague), Salomon Rapoport (Chief Rabbi of Prague), Abraham Kohn (Chief Rabbi of Lemberg (Lvov), Leopold Stein (Chief Rabbi of Frankfurt a. Main), Gotthold Salomon (Prediger in Hamburg), and Michael Sachs (Prediger in Prague and Berlin). Isaac Marcus Jost should also be placed in this group; his nine volume Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage (1820-1828) became a standard text for moderate assimilationists and reformists, and was widely read by both Jews and Christians. These men were generally given to reform, representing the movement at three
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rabbinical conferences that discussed changes in Jewish services. The first meeting (Braunschweig), which was organized by the OCO contributor Ludwig Philippson, had Salomon and Geiger as its leaders; the second (Frankfurt) had Stein as chairman, Geiger as vice-chairman, and Jost as secretary; and the third was hosted by Geiger. The only exception to the reformist stance of the OCO's rabbinical contributors was Rapoport, who opposed almost every reform presented at these conferences.

The secular contributors were mainly literary men and journalists, the majority of whom were also reformist and liberal in their political outlook. Space permits only the most prominent to be named here. Ludwig August Frankl was probably the best known, both for the poetic works that had gained him recognition in the early 1830s and for his editorship of the “Sonntagsblätter.” Other important writers involved with the OCO include Ludwig Philippson (editor of the “Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums”), Joseph Ritter von Wertheimer (editor after 1854 of the “Jahrbuch für Israeliten,” and son of a previous Vienna community president, he was raised to nobility in 1868), Kompert, Siegfried Kapper (a poet who also gained fame by translating verse from several Slavic languages), and Anton Langer (prolific dramaturge and novelist). In all, ten of the thirty-six contributors for whom information is available published volumes of poetry, nine published collections of short stories, four published dramatic works, fifteen founded journals, and thirteen more edited journals.

The group of thirty-six also provides a portrait of the status of the Jewish intelligentsia at the time of its foundation. It is most helpful to begin with a discussion of the group's ages since they divide up (fortunately for the purpose of comparison) into three equal groups along this determinate: twelve each in the age categories of 18–30, 31–40, and 41–72, with an average age of 37.67. This grouping has the added advantage of representing three distinct generations. The “old group,” as I shall call it, forms the most clearly defined generational set. It contains members who would remember the implementation of the Tolerenzpatent in the last two decades of the eighteenth century, and many who would recall the decision of the Vienna peace council, allowing for reestablishment of the status quo regarding Jewish legal position in each country after the Napoleonic wars. The sons of the majority of this group were the first to attend universities within the Empire, although many travelled abroad to receive higher education, venturing primarily into the German states. The “middle group” was raised in the moderate economic growth of the 1820s and 1830s, attended universities, and became more a part of the secular world. The “young group” was the first to become more fully secularized, without the degree of tension that the slightly older “middle group” carried as intellectual baggage. I realize that the distinctions made here may seem slightly arbitrary, but marked differences existed between the three groups. As the forthcoming evidence will indicate, the older and younger contributors each form a cohesive group, with the middle group showing some similarities to both. Comparing different characteristics of the group as a whole with their relative proportions in each age grouping yields interesting information about the processes of assimilation, movement into the middle class, urbanization, reform, and secularization.

8 See the table.
Appendix: Data on contributors distributed by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGES:</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-72</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>33 % (12)</td>
<td>33 % (12)</td>
<td>33 % (12)</td>
<td>100 % (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birthplace:
- Vienna: 42 % (5) 0 % (0) 8 % (1) 16.7 % (6)
- Bohemia: 33 % (4) 25 % (3) 25 % (3) 27.7 % (10)
- Prague: 17 % (2) 8 % (1) 8 % (1) 11.1 % (4)
- Moravia: 8 % (1) 17 % (2) 8 % (1) 11.1 % (4)
- German States: 8 % (1) 33 % (4) 33 % (4) 25.0 % (9)
- Poland/Galicia: 0 % (0) 17 % (2) 8 % (1) 8.3 % (3)
- Others: 8 % (1) 8 % (1) 16 % (2) 11.1 % (4)

TOTALS: 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (36)

Location in 1848:
- Austria-Vienna: 83 % (10) 33 % (4) 17 % (2) 44.4 % (16)
- Bohemia-Prague: 8 % (1) 17 % (2) 33 % (4) 19.4 % (7)
- German States: 8 % (1) 33 % (4) 25 % (3) 22.2 % (8)
- Others: 0 % (0) 17 % (2) 25 % (3) 13.0 % (5)

TOTALS: 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (36)

Urban/Rural Birth:
- Urban: 66 % (8) 58 % (7) 50 % (6) 58.3 % (21)
- Rural: 33 % (4) 42 % (5) 50 % (6) 41.7 % (15)

TOTALS: 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (36)

Knowledge of Hebrew:
- Urban Birth: 25 % (2/8) 86 % (6/7) 86 % (6/7) 64 % (14/22)
- Rural Birth: 50 % (2/4) 60 % (3/5) 100 % (5/5) 71 % (10/14)

Totals: 33 % (4/12) 75 % (9/12) 92 % (11/12) 67 % (24/36)

Primary Occupation:
- Religious: 8 % (1) 42 % (5) 75 % (9) 41.7 % (15)
- Free Professions: 58 % (7) 25 % (3) 0 % (0) 27.8 % (10)
- Professional or Academic: 17 % (2) 33 % (4) 25 % (3) 25.0 % (9)
- Bourgeois: 17 % (2) 0 % (0) 0 % (0) 5.5 % (2)

TOTALS: 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (12) 100 % (36)

University Education:
- Attended: 75 % (9/12) 58 % (7/12) 58 % (7/12) 64 % (23/36)
- Studied Law or Medicine: 42 % (5/12) 42 % (5/12) 33 % (4/12) 39 % (14/36)

Family Class:
- Data obtained: 75 % (9/12) 50 % (6/12) 67 % (8/12) 63.8 % (23/36)
- Nobility: 0 % (0/9) 17 % (1/6) 12.5 % (1/8) 8.7 % (2/23)
- Bourgeois: 56 % (5/9) 33 % (2/6) 12.5 % (1/8) 34.8 % (8/23)
- Academic: 0 % (0/9) 0 % (0/6) 12.5 % (1/8) 4.4 % (1/23)
- Religious: 44 % (4/9) 50 % (3/6) 25.8 % (2/8) 39.1 % (9/23)
- Poverty: 0 % (0/9) 0 % (0/6) 37.5 % (3/8) 13.0 % (3/23)

TOTALS: 100 % (9/9) 100 % (6/6) 100 % (8/8) 100 % (23/23)

Note: Raw data is given in parentheses.
In terms of the maintenance of traditional Judaism, three factors stand out as important in the data: the ability to speak Hebrew, the intellectual interest in religious matters, and occupational decisions. This last category can be divided into two distinct parts: the choice of a religious vocation outright and the choice of a religious vocation through the traditional transmission of religious occupation from father to son. Consideration of the linguistic question shows a marked change in the knowledge of Hebrew, defined as writing in the language, work about texts in the language, or any indication of knowledge beyond that of the formalized texts of worship. Sixty-six percent of the group as a whole spoke Hebrew, but it breaks down into 92% of the old group, 75% of the middle group, and only 33% of the young group. Three points are evident from this; the importance of Hebrew as a “mode of life” creating a sense of community among Jews was dying out, religious issues were no longer predominantly on the minds of Jews as the generations wore on, and Joseph II’s language laws were having their effect. As well, the increasing urbanization of Jews who had enough money to buy their way out of the small-town ghettos and into the growing cities has an effect on Hebrew knowledge, as rural birth is more directly to knowledge of the language, particularly among the youngest group, in which the rural-born were twice as likely to speak Hebrew as their urban counterparts.

The number of Jews concerned intellectually with religious issues shows a similar decline. Sixty-six percent of the old group published articles in journals concerned with religious issues or books on religious topics, whereas only 58% of the middle group did so, and a paltry 8% of the young group. These first two pieces of evidence are directly linked to one another, as knowledge of Hebrew would be necessary for consideration of religious issues, just as consideration of strictly religious issues would necessarily constitute a knowledge of Hebrew. Further conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the first two sets of information. The relationship between the percentage of the young group who knew Hebrew (33%) and that of those who put that knowledge to use (8%) shows the last residue of the parental generation’s religious devotion. The young apparently learned the language at a young age, but lost interest in Judaism and Jewish religious issues, rarely pursuing those that required the use of their language of worship.

The data on occupational choice reveals two interesting trends. The first is the decline of the importance of religious vocations. While 75% of the old group chose a religious occupation, only 42% of the middle group and 8% of the young group did so. This predisposition of the old group could be seen as their only hope of succeeding in the world, except for the facts that (1) the remaining 25% chose a professional occupation, and (2) of the three men born in poverty, two chose the professions and only one the rabbinate. It is interesting to note that study for professional careers, predominantly law and medicine, was chosen at a consistent rate through all three groups. The second interesting point is the increase in the percentage of free intellectuals through time. Whereas none of the old group chose this path, 25% of the middle group and 58% of the young group did.

Another important facet of traditional Judaism is the transmission of the religious vocation from father to son, sometimes even the direct donation of the same post. For example, OCO contributor Max Stern’s father had been the Talmud teacher in
Preßburg; when he went blind in 1825, the fourteen-year-old Max returned home to take his father’s place and served for nine years. This cycle seems to be broken by the young generation. Of the nine children of fathers with religious occupations, the one in the old group followed in his father’s footsteps, three of the four in the middle group pursed religious careers, but none of the three in the younger group did so.

The movement of Jews into urban areas and the middle-class in the wake of the Josephine reforms is also supported by evidence from the group, as well as a movement from the outlying areas into the capitals of Prague and Vienna. The percentages of those members of the growing intelligentsia born in urban areas rises consistently through the years. The old group is evenly divided between urban and rural, the middle group shows a slight (58%-42%) disposition towards the cities, but the urban-born members of the young group have a two-to-one numerical superiority over those born in rural areas. As well, of the fifteen born in the countryside only one still remained there by 1848, having taken a pulpit in a small town.

This shift mirrors the change in class composition of the families of the contributors. Only 12% of the families of the old group can be classified as bourgeois, the rate rises to 33% for the middle group and to 55% for the youngest group. As well, 62% of the families in the bourgeois category are those of members of the young group. The dispersion of the sons of these bourgeois families shows the chronological obverse of the transmission of class values that the religious families demonstrated. Of the eight bourgeois families none fell into the old group, so no conclusions can be drawn regarding their sons. Of the three bourgeois families of the middle group, two of the sons pursued religious careers and one (Joseph Saalschütz) became a professor of archaeology. Of the five sons of bourgeois families in the young group, however, three chose journalistic and literary careers and the other two became a banker and a stockbroker, respectively. This stands in stark contrast to the sons of religious families, who increasingly chose not to follow in their father’s footsteps.

A move to urban areas frequently means moving to Vienna, particularly for those contributors from the Czech lands. The number of the contributors in Vienna rises from the six born there to sixteen by 1848. Of the ten added, five were Bohemian and one Moravian. This change among the Czech-Jewish population is also evident in that of the fourteen born in Bohemia and Moravia (only four of whom were born in urban areas), seven lived in Prague in 1848, six had moved to Vienna, and only one remained in the countryside.

In summary, the evidence shows the Jewish intelligentsia arising in a period of increasing secularization, urbanization and embourgeoisement. There was a general decline in the knowledge of Hebrew, concern with religious matters, choice of religious occupation, and rural residence. There was a corresponding increase in the number of those living in cities, particularly in the politically active capitals of Vienna and Prague, and of those choosing a career in the free professions, business, and finance.

Now that the OCO’s value and prominence have been established, we can examine its form and content. Issues range from four to seventeen pages in length, with the average issue consisting of nine pages. The typical issue contains two or three leading arti-
les ranging from one to three pages in length, and occasionally paragraphs from recently published works by or about Jews or announcements or reviews of these. Poetry and short stories are also common. At the end of each issue lie the Wochenberichte, reports from the OCO’s correspondents in various locations around the Empire. In some cases the updates are gleaned from local newspapers. These are very important for the OCO’s attempt to cover adequately and speak to the entire western half of the Empire. Each issue contains at least two pages of Berichte. Information appears in almost every issue on events in Vienna, Prague and Pest. Less frequently, reports originating in Brody, Lemberg (Lvov), and Preßburg (Bratislava) are published, with the last of these gaining more attention in the wake of anti-Semitic uprisings there. Coverage of Berlin and other German cities (especially Frankfurt during the meeting of the Parliament) also exists, and, more rarely, of events in Russia, France, England, the Netherlands, Italy, and Norway. These Berichte are not so much factual accounts of occurrences as recountings of recent events in an informal manner. Many read very much like personal letters, and often they are indeed taken from letters to the contributors written by friends who live or are travelling abroad. This is most often the case with those places least often reported upon.

Since the OCO’s articles show a distinct development over the journal’s history, our analysis must proceed chronologically. From its beginning in March, Jews made important contributors to the revolution. Adolph Fischhof delivered his famous “Wer an diesem Tag keinen Mut hat, gehört in die Kinderstube!” speech to the students collected in front of the Landhaus on the thirteenth, and was later elected to the Vienna Parliament along with his co-religionists Mannheimer, Joseph Goldmark, and Rabbi Meiseis. Two Jews, Karl Bernard Herschmann and Heinrich Spitzer, were among those killed in the battle between the military and students after Fischhof’s speech, and the latter is eulogized in the OCO’s premier issue.

The lead article, however, is an “Erklärung bezüglich über die Judenfrage” by Mannheimer, who is the dominant force in these early issues. His counseling of caution in the discussion of emancipation, and reliance upon the humanity of Christians and respect for the rule of law as the true path towards emancipation are taken up by all. He had delivered a sermon at the funeral service for the fallen revolutionaries (who were buried in a common grave) on the seventeenth, which was reprinted and widely
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9 See the editor’s note at the bottom of OCO, 188.
11 OCO, 6–9.
read in Vienna by Jews and Christians alike. Speaking on that occasion before an almost entirely Christian audience, Mannheimer honored the dead primarily for their fight for “Wahrheit, Freiheit, Recht und Würde,” and made very little mention of Spitzer’s and Herschmann’s Judaism. Only at the end did he imply their religion and make a short plea for Jewish equality, noting that the Christians

habt gewollt, daß die toten Juden da mit Euch ruhen in Euerer, in einer Erde. Sie haben gekämpft für Euch, geblutet für Euch! Sie ruhen in Euerer Erde! Vergönnet nun aber auch denen, die den gleichen Kampf gekämpft und den schwereren, daß sie mit Euch leben auf einer Erde, frei und unverkümmt wie Ihr.

His emphasis on law and humanity remained the same when he addressed Jews in a sermon the following day and in his lead article in March 24th’s OCO, which contains a long quote from the 18th’s sermon. His comments on emancipation in both of these preach the same value of understanding and the call for equality that his Grabrede had shown in practice. He argues that patience is necessary because “Es wird eine Weile dauern, bis daß sich alles ordnet und ausgleicht,” a claim that is reinforced by his sermon the seventh day of Pesach (4/24) which chose as its theme “stehet fest und still!” Both texts call for restraint in the discussion of Jewish emancipation, arguing that overeager demands for equality might raise the charge that Jews are only interested in the revolution for their own benefit, and arguing that Austria should desire to free its Jews so as not to be seen as similar to Russia (a derogatory comparison that is a recurrent theme), and because Jews stand with Christians for the fatherland, freedom, law, and respect.

The appearance of “Nur keine Juden-Emanzipation,” the most widely-circulated anti-Semitic pamphlet of the revolution (over 25,000 copies), also gains notice in the OCO. Mannheimer’s rebuttal, notably, doesn’t call for its suppression, concluding “Gut! Dafür ist Denk- und Redefreiheit!” The pamphlet’s argument centers on the stereotype of Jews as greedy capitalists, and hence a force for reactionary politics, whose emancipation would place Christians-Austrians once again under the yoke of

12 Mannheimer showed up at the Cathedral unexpectedly, shocking all in attendance, and was asked to speak. On this remarkable incident, and especially for quotes from the surprised Priest Anton Füster’s memories, see Rosenmann (1922), 77 ff. Mannheimers article appeared in OCO, 1–6.
13 Rosenmann (1922), 137.
16 OCO, 5.
Jewish financial tyranny. Mannheimer argues against this misconception, but the issue of Jewish wealth is undoubtedly problematic for the assimilationists, as evidenced by the Bohemian Leopold Kompert's devotion of three articles to the question. These argue two main points; that poor Jews as well as those with wealth must be free, and that Jews must reject the lure of materialism if they wish to destroy prejudice and achieve true freedom. Kompert expresses his belief in the holiness of the poor Jew, who lives in small towns and travels from village to village, hawking wares from packs on their backs. They are the Jews most in contact with the agrarian Volk, and theirs is the image of Jews that the Volk has. They must not be forgotten in the strivings for emancipation, for they are the one remaining chance for Jews to truly become one with the Volk, as the “Absolutismus des Goldes” of the small clique of wealthy Jews must be overthrown for the revolution's victories to be secure. Jews themselves, he argues, must take the first step of rejecting their wealthy brethren, if they wish to remove the scourge of prejudice exhibited in “Nur keine Juden-Emanzipation” and be free to be united with the Volk: “machen wir den Anfang, verbrennen wir zuerst unsere Adelsdiplome, die wir auf der Goldwage aufgewogen... Wir wollen mit dem Volk, und fürs Volk leben!”

Kompert also argues that without the freedoms of citizenship, Jews will remain a people who can never become members of the social and economic groups that are the foci of the web of social identity. Without equality they will remain almost an unpeople, having only gradations of wealth and poverty:


The scenes of Jewish rejoicing at the anticipation that full emancipation was at hand that had been evident in Vienna were repeated in Prague, and the journal turned increasingly to developments in the Bohemian capital. As Simon Hock reports in a Berichte of March 28: “die vollkommene Einigkeit und Brüderlichkeit.” The actions of the St. Václav's Bath Committee only heightened Jews' expectations, as did the enacting by Graf Stadion of a list of student requests. Hock comments that the third point of the student's petition demanded that “Kein Talent soll seines religiösen Glaubensbekenntnisses wegen von der Lehrkanzeln der höheren Unterrichtsanstalten ausgeschlossen sein. [...] Hiernech kann auch der Jude Professor werden und schon morgen zu lehren anfangen.” The Jews saw this step as a necessary concomitant to Jo-

---

17 See von Helfert: Konfessionale Frage. Österreichisches Jahrbuch 7 (1877) 68 f. Note also that David Mendel entitles his call to his coreligionists, which exorts them not to make political concessions and accept only limited relief from legal restrictions, “Nur keine Konzessionen,” an obvious play on “Nur keine Juden-Emanzipation”. See below, and OCO, 241 f.
18 These were entitled “Für unsere armen Juden,” Die Juden und die Geldaristokratie,” and “Für unsere armen Juden II.”
19 OCO, 19 f., 33 f., and 36 f.
20 OCO, 36 f.
21 OCO, 15.
seph II's opening of the universities to them and hoped that it was a precursor of further improvements in social status through entrance into other respected posts.

The question of the elections to the Prague city council was an important one, since it would indicate the revolutionary government's commitment to Jewish equality and the weight Jewish voices would be given in determining the legislative fate of the Jen densteuer and legal codes pertaining to Jews, Hock joyously reports that Heute ist die Wahl des Bürgermeisters, auch allen Juden, die in der Christenstadt Häuser haben, ist das Wahlrecht zugestanden, das Ghetto oder die Judenstadt hat ein Comité von 12 Wählern ernannt und dadurch ist das Princip anerkannt, daß auch die Juden einen Theil der Bürger schaft ausmachen.

The anti-Semitic undercurrent that had long existed in the Czech lands unfortunately began to resurface as a result of the general chaos of the revolutionary year, particularly in the more radically nationalist areas of the countryside. In the excitement and emancipatory promise of the times, however, the liberal Jews of the OCO were willing to dismiss small outbreaks and console themselves that such incidents were unimportant in the larger context of the dawning of a new age in Jewish-Christian relations. As the correspondent who covered an arson attack reports: "Exesse gegen Juden sind nur in Ledits (Ledetsch) vorgefallen, und bereits wurden vom Oberstburggrafen die nöthigen Verfügungen getroffen, und es ist nicht zu fürchten, daß solche weiter stattfänden." This overconfidence reaches an extreme in an unknown author who goes so far as to claim, regarding the same incident, that it "bedarf keines Commentars; vielmehr ist es selbst ein Commentar zu andere Verfolgungen. Es ist der Communismus, der sich regt und zuerst gegen die schwächsten schlußlosesten Theil wendet." This overconfidence reaches an extreme in an unknown author who goes so far as to claim, regarding the same incident, that it "bedarf keines Commentars; vielmehr ist es selbst ein Commentar zu andere Verfolgungen. Es ist der Communismus, der sich regt und zuerst gegen die schwächsten schlußlosesten Theil wendet".

Voices dissenting from the generally rosy picture of the revolution's success in Prague begin to be heard in the OCO's pages shortly thereafter. The question arises whether the nationalist direction the Bohemian National Committee is increasingly pursuing and the general spread of the national rebirth, will aid or harm the cause of emancipation. "Dr. B," the author of "Was thut jetzt den Israelitischen Böhmens Noth?" maintains that the rising nationalism will stand as a barrier to Jewish freedom. He believes that the anti-Semitism of lower classes, who are those most inflamed by Czech patriotism, may have an impact on those groups (intellectuals, etc.) within the movement most willing to extend full rights immediately to the Bohemian Jewry.

Wenn auch die großherzigen Stände Böhmens vielleicht aus Rücksicht fürs Volksvorurteil nicht die augenablicke Gleichstellung mit der christlichen Bevölkerung aussprechen werden, so wird doch, so hoffen wir, eure (jüdische Böhmer) Lage bedeutend erleichtert werden. He tries to link the position of the Jews to the nationalist countryside by comparing the Judensteuer to the roundly-hated feudal labor due, the Robot: "Wird nicht das Judenschutzgeld an die sogenannte Herrschaft mit der Robot ein und dasselbe.
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Leichenbegängnifs feiern, in einem Sarge begraben werden?" It is a symbol of the waning but still prevalent optimism that he closes with the cry that “die Zukunft ist nicht so düster als man im ersten Augenblicke glaubte möchten!" 26

The threat that Czech nationalism presented as a result of the anti-Semitism of its large lower middle-class advocacy threw the Bohemian political question firmly into the spotlight for the liberal Jews involved with the OCO. There were strong pressures for Jewish alliance, as well as repelling forces, on both sides of the German-Czech debate, but the linguistic litmus test placed them in the camp of the oppressors in the minds of many Czech nationalists. In order to better their political position with regard to the increasingly dominant Czech forces, calls were issued for the learning of the Czech language. These calls were not primarily motivated by opportunism, although the point is made that the turbulence of the path to emancipation might be considerably eased if Jews could say “wir sind Böhmer wie ihr!” in the Bohemian tongue. “Dr. B” writes that:


These linguistic aims are shown to be desired and supported by Czechs, as the OCO quotes the editor of the Czech magazine Kwěty:

Hoffen wir, daß die Zeit nicht mehr fern ist, wo neben der Psalmen Davids auch böhmische Nationallieder in israelitischen Schulen ertönen und israelitische Kinder ihre Gebethe und frommen Gefühl nicht nur in hebräischer und deutscher sondern auch in böhmischer Sprache zum Himmel senden werden 28.

In the middle of April come increased reports of anti-Semitic riots around Bohemia, and by the end of the month a plague of violence has taken hold of Prague. Hock, who had believed with the others in the isolated nature of earlier incidents, reports on the 26th of April that “Furchtbar sind wir als unseren süßen Träumen von Eintracht und Verbrüderung aufgeschreckt worden ... [der Traum] von Gleichheit und Bruderliebe ist plötzlich zerstorben.” 29 The path to destruction began with increased activity in anti-Semitic pamphlets, and was quickly followed by demands that all Jews in Christian areas of Prague return to the Judenstadt. Before the government could take action a riot occurred in the Tandemmarkt, where Jews were required to have their shops, on the 15th of April, which included several horrific suggestions on how to deal with the "Jewish Question:"

Während die Einen sich mit der Vertreibung derselben aus der sogenannnten Christenstadt begnügen wollten, wünschten die Andern auch eine Räumung des Tandemarkts, eine dritte Partei
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That even after witnessing this, however, Hock is able to express his hope and belief that this will be the final anti-Semitic outbreak before the onset of true brotherhood — "damit die gegenwärtige Judenverfolgungen die Vorboten einer kommenden Völker- und Glaubensverbrüderung werden, und dieß das letzte Aufflackern der Hassesflamme sei, die bald darauf für immer verlischt," — is a sign of how deeply Bohemian Jews wished to be accepted in their homeland.

Despite Hock’s hope, a Vienna Wochenbericht reports that many families have arrived there, in flight from Prague. His own Bericht of the 17th of May tells of further disturbances in the city, and points out that the National Guard and students had to be called to defend the Jews against a rioting mob in the Tandelmarkt. Hock finally surrenders his hope that the persecutions will die down, and ends with "Bisher ist zwar noch kein Schuß gefallen, aber alles fürchtet, daß es noch zu den ernstesten Konflikten kommen könnte, und wir sehen mit Angst der Zukunft entgegen." The Tandelmarkt, which closed after the riots of mid-April, had not been reopened until May eight, and then only under the protection of the National Guard and a student militia committee.

The OCO’s most suggestive analyses of the Bohemian anti-Jewish unrest portrays its causal basis as within Habsburg social development. These describe the riots as examples of modern anti-Semitism, pointing out their difference from the earlier religiously-motivated attacks and accenting the perception of Jews as alien economic oppressors. The anonymous author of "Die Judenverfolgungen und die Judensache" describes the attacks as having keine religiöse, sondern eine soziale Basis. Unsere Zeit hat sich bisher in dem Masse von allem religiösen Fragen entfernt gehalten, und die Parole des Glaubens entflammte so wenig ihre Streiter, daß in dem Brausen der Kampfsworte und Schlachtenrufe der Religion ganz verklingen [...] Auch haben die entzügelten Verfolger selbst das oft genug geklärt, daß sie die Juden nicht ihrer Religion wegen verfolgten, sondern aus ganz anderen Gründen und Ursachen.

The author reasons that these "anderen Gründe" arise from the misconception of the wealth of Jews as a social group. On this basis, then, the "Proletarier" would have two psychologically-valid reasons for opposing Jewish emancipation: on the one Hand, Jews are perceived as wealthy, and therefore as supporters of the oppressive absolutist system; on the other, they would oppose any steps toward Jewish freedom to defend their own position — "aus der Furcht von jüdischer Concurrenz, vor dem Umsichgreifen jüdischer Tüchtigkeit und Gewandtheit, wenn diese einmal sich einer gleichen Berechtigung mit den Uebrigen zu erfreuen haben würde." He believes that the attacks are a necessary part of the process of emancipation, however, because:
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Das Volk wird dem Juden sein Recht gleichsam als Sühne, als ein Geschenk bieten für alles Elend und alle Verfolgungen, die er zu erdulden hatte. [...] Es ist gut, daß das Volk die Juden wieder einmal elend, unglücklich sah. Es erinnert sich zu viel an die Geldsäcke. Gut, daß es die Juden wieder einmal in Jammer gesehen hat. Das Volk haßt keinen Unglücklichen."36

Another interesting perspective on the Verfolgungen in Prague is provided by Marcus Teller, who also argues from a social and economic perspective. He finds their foundation lying in the shortage of goods causing unrest across the Empire, exacerbated by the largely valid Christian claims of price gouging on the part of Jewish Tandelmarkt sellers. He writes that the Jewish businessmen must remove the basis for these claims, if peace and equality are to be achieved:

"Laßt ab, laßt baldigst ab, ehe es vielleicht zu spät wird, von den vielen Mißbräuchen. [...] Es wollen nämlich alle Verkäufer des Tandelmarks und auch jene außerhalb desselben einen Verein bilden, in welchem sie bestimmen, nur zu festgesetzten Preisen zu verkaufen. Sobald [...] dann wird eine neue licht- und glanzvolle Aera nicht nur für den Tandelmarkt, sondern für alle Israeliten Prags erscheinen."

The June uprising in Prague caused an increase in the fears of even more attacks on Jews and their businesses, as well as a lacuna in the Wochenberichte from the city. The primary concern is over the mobilization of the workers in the cotton factories on Prague's outskirts. Many of the largest factories are Jewish-owned, and the community fears a repeat of the Luddite labor riots of 1844, which lasted several weeks and spread from machine-breaking to the attempted destruction of the Tandelmarkt, and finally to direct attacks on Jewish residential property. The social dislocation caused by fairly rapid industrialization in the textile industry was not perceived at the time, and claims were made that "Jewry and the pressure it exercised upon the working class were alone and solely responsible."38 In light of this, Hock's fears are well grounded:

Eine finstere Wolke lagert noch über unserem Horizont, es sind dies die Kottondruckerwirren. Haben dieselben schon vor 4 Jahren, in einer Zeit wo sonst nicht das leiseste Lüftchen von Unordnung wehte, uns Verfolgungen herbeigezogen, um so mehr sind selbe nun in der Sturmperiode der Revolution zu fürchten."

In these hectic June days, Prague's Jews found themselves dragged increasingly into the Czech–German political strife. They found themselves "wie gewöhnlich der Spielball der Revolution," at once courted by both groups and subject to verbal and physical attacks from both groups.40 Many even discussed appealing to the despised Windischgrätz and the reactionary military to save them from the possibility of warfare between Czechs and Germans with Jews caught in the crossfire. Since Hock was among the thousands of Jews who fled the city in the weeks immediately following the
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rebellion, the *Berichte* of this period are filed by Saul Isaac Kämpf, the city's head Rabbi.

In the aftermath of the uprising the Jewish contributors try to assess the dimension of the political change, how their position could have been better if a different course had been followed in the midst of the revolt, and how best to proceed in the new, Czech-dominanted environment. Simon Hock argues that the Prague community should have shown more support for the rebellion against the hated Windischgrätz, denouncing the laggardliness of the *Judenstadt*. He claims that Jews' failure to support the uprising must certainly hurt them politically:


Instead, Hock argues, the Jews took too much care in defending their property interests, also politically damaging given both Prague's recent radical shift. He describes vividly the signs that appeared on several Jewish businesses proclaiming "Holy is property, whether Jewish or Christian."

After the June days several articles appear on local Prague politics, expressing views both friendly and and antipathetic towards the Czechs. Abraham Schmiedl, a Moravian Rabbi, argues in his "Vertrauensmänner" that the Committee of Seven, which is to rule until elections can be held to collect a full assembly, shouldn't be trusted, referring to its members as "recht komisch Vertrauensmänner." Isidor Busch disagrees, saying that he knows some of the men personally. Schmiedl expands his argument to produce an injunction against trusting Czechs generally: "liegt denn die Zeit schon so lange hinter uns, wo diese Menschen sich aus der Judensteuer [. . .] die uns materiell und geistig darnieder drückte, ein Geschäft machten; wo sie gierig jede Denuntianten aufhaschten, die ihren Säckel voller, und die unsere leichter machte?!

Marcus Teller, however, takes the opposing side, personifying the deep love many Jews had for Bohemia and the Czech people, and their hopes for good relations between the groups, in two articles: "An einige Herren in Böhmen" and "Toleranz der Czechen." In the first, he argues that it is premature to blame the Czech people for the persecutions until all the evidence has been gathered and the Czechs' explanation for any violence perpetrated by them is heard. In this same article, he chastises Prague's Jewish residents for failing to play a larger role in the June uprising, pointing out that Jews had wandered into Bohemia centuries before Libussa and should be supporters of Czech nationalism if they truly desire to live up to their claim of loving the Bohe­mian fatherland.

Teller, in the very next issue, reverses field and takes the Czechs to task, however. Underneath a motto in Czech, and after proclaiming his deep love for the Czech
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Lands and people, he recounts for his Czech readers how he had tried through the years to show them the Bohemian Jews' love of their fatherland. Then he offers a challenge to the Czechs to prove their humanity, tolerance, and nobility:

Das Czechenthum hat der unbestrittenen Ruhm, der Fokus der slavischen Intelligenz zu sein. Der Intelligenz wohl - ob aber auch der Humanität? Man sollte es kaum glauben, daß Humanität nicht eng an Intelligenz gekettet ist, und doch - und doch - Welche ein Vergleich zwischen den Czechen und ihren anderen slavischen Brüdern! In Lemberg und Krakau verlangt man unbedingte Gleichstellung der Juden, in Bukarest wird die definitiv ausgesprochen [...] Sind die Polen, Ruthenen, Wallachen, Kroaten von minder edlem Blute als die Czechen?

Countinuing anti-Semitic violence in the Czech lands, coupled with slow action on Jewish issues, caused Jews to question their faith in the Czechs' ability and desire to change Jews political and legal status. Their wavering loyalties revealed themselves in the OCO in two ways: the consideration of strategic changes in the formulation of demands and increasingly strident calls for emigration. The first of these argued that since governments were not acting on Jews' pleas for an immediate granting of full legal and political rights, perhaps seeking concessions might enable Jews to make at least moderate gains.

The concessionary position took two forms; one political and one religious. The political strategy involved lessening demands, believing that a gradualist approach would be more likely to have success. Opposition to this conception was voiced by David Mendl, who argued that such a course had never succeeded in the past, and that a strategic retrenching in this crucial phase of the revolution could be interpreted by anti-Semites as a lack of confidence in the revolution's ultimate victory. Those in favor of religious concessions hoped that by sacrificing some religious positions - such as dietary restrictions and the celebration of the sabbath on Saturday - Jews could come to be seen as more like their Christian brothers and the road to equality would then stand open. Simon Hock disagrees, saying that the struggle for religious freedom is part of the revolutionary endeavor, and that without it, the revolution's success is worthless, for "Was ist die Freiheit der Zunge und äußerlicher Demonstration gegen die Freiheit des Gewissens und des innersten heiligsten Lebens?" He also argues that what the radically reformist Jews see as the destruction of the barriers between Jews and Christians is "Vergebliche Mühe! Tausend und aber tausend Barrikaden steigen in jedem Nu aus der Erde empor." Hock also points out that in those countries where Jews had the most freedoms and equality, no diminution of religious belief had been necessary to achieve their positions, and that anti-Semites make no distinction between the more liberal and more conservative Jews: "orthodoxe wie neologe Juden wurden mit gleicher Liberalität geplündert und fortgejagt."

The second important OCO response to the anti-Semitic violence and the increasingly difficult political position of the Jews showed itself in the creation of societies urging emigration to the United States. The "Auf nach Amerika" movement was named
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after the title of two articles by Leopold Kompert, whose call for emigration to America can only be ascribed to the Bohemian anti-Semitic attacks because of the timing of the campaign's initiation. It made its appearance at one peak of anti-Jewish unrest—in the same May sixth issue that contains Hock's report on the Prague riot and subsequent closing of the Tandelmarkt—and long before any sign of the revolution's failure.

The topic generated immediate interest across the Empire already in the issue with Kompert's first article, there was a short contribution by Isidor Busch—whose part in this cannot be understated: he co-chaired the Vienna Auswanderungscomité with Ludwig August Frankl—which named twenty-seven people (twenty-three single men and two married couples) who had decided to make the journey, and "grossentheils" had secured the necessary funds for the excursion. Of these, thirteen were from Hungarian-controlled lands (probably from Preßburg, where some of the worst riots took place), eight from Bohemia, four from Galicia, and two from Moravia. In addition to giving evidence about the journal's dispersion, this can be seen as a measurement of the severity of anti-Semitism in different areas of the Empire. The document also listed ages and occupations for the twenty-five men. Their ages ranged from eighteen to forty-two, with an average of twenty-six. The dominant occupational class listed was "Handelsmann" (15), but less profitable occupations, such as housepainter and pipe-maker, were also evident.

The cost of the journey was a source of major concern for those interested. Competing advertisements for steamship companies began to occupy the inside covers of the journal, and appeals were made for donations from those who decided to remain in the Empire, so that those who had chosen to emigrate could afford to buy land and farm equipment in their new homelands. The emigration committees that sprang up in Pest, Prague, Vienna and other towns and cities tried to make arrangements so that emigration was a feasible economic option. That many took advantage of this is apparent from Wochenberichte reports from Horiz and Prague, where Hock reports that "Die Liste der Personen, welchen in diesen Tagen Prag für immer verlassen haben...um in Nordamerika eine neue schönere Heimat zu suchen, würde eine ganze Seite füllen." Another plan for financial support, which gained no visible support, was presented in an anonymous "Offener Brief in Angelegenheit der Auswanderer," written by a Galician Jew from Brody. The letter described a plan whereby large sums of money could be obtained as loans from the wealthier Jews, which would then be lent to enable poorer Jews to emigrate. The new immigrants would be placed under the nominal supervision of an agent in the United States until the loan had been repaid. Although this plan never came to fruition, it indicates the variety of options explored by those who wished to emigrate or fostered emigration.

The movement had its detractors, however, who objected on both political and religious grounds. The political opponents, including David Mendl, argued that emigra-
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tion constituted a betrayal of one's fatherland, that the persecutions are no more than the "Help! Help!" cries of overexcited youngsters that will soon die down, and that a large amount of emigration could, in fact, increase the persecution of those who remain behind, as well as constituting a great disservice to those Christians who had supported the cause of Jewish emancipation and defended Jewish property against attack.

Religious opposition is presented by Abraham Schmiedl, who argues that Jewish communities like those in Europe do not exist in America, and that as a result Jews will be forced to leave the faith. He takes his motto from Psalms 37:3: "Bleib im Lande und nähre dich im Glauben und Vertrauen." It is the duty of each Jew to stay in the Empire and work for emancipation, a battle that will eventually be won, for the cause is a righteous one. One who emigrates betrays his Jewish brothers and forefathers who had died there for their religion, and "in der Flucht sein Heil sucht."

The strongest statement in favor of emigration is an anonymous one, written as an open letter to David Mendl and entitled "Und immer doch: Auf nach Amerika!" In a page laced with biting sarcasm, the author attacks both the political and religious detractors of emigration. He destroys Mendl's argument regarding the imminent disappearance of the anti-Semitic uprisings. He rejects the idea that emancipation will come to the Jews in the reasonably near future, and most certainly not from the governments of the anti-Semitic mobs. Finally, he changes Schmiedl's cry from "Bleib im Lande und nähre dich im Glauben und Vertrauen," to "Bleibet im Land, und - läßt Euch taufen!" pointing out the increasing number of conversions away from the faith, and arguing that remaining in old, weary communities was actually harming rather than preserving the religion. This polemic fittingly closes the discussion.

* * *

In conclusion, it is important to note the differences between the contributors of the younger and the older Jews. Although many of the articles are unsigned and information about the authors of many others is unobtainable, some tendencies may yet be described. The younger authors were much more in the radical camp. Kompert led the call for emigration, and was immediately supported in the "Auf nach America" movement by Busch, Friedrich Mannheimer, and Sigmund Herzl. All of these authors were members of the young group, and those who chose to emigrate were also primarily in the youngest group (although economic considerations certainly were a large part of the motivation). Unfortunately, nothing is known about the two who stood in opposition to emigration, David Mendl and Rabbi Abraham Schmiedl. However, it can be assumed likely that Schmiedl was at least middle aged, as the youngest practing Rabbi who contributed to the OCO was the thirty-seven year old Leopold Löw, and the second youngest Abraham Geiger, both of who were also reformers. Moderate reformist views were commonly expressed by the young authors, but these were tempered by
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an unwillingness to question the religion’s ethical foundations. In addition, the young authors tended to be more critical of the trends toward materialism and commerce in Jewish communities.

Perhaps these tendencies toward political liberalism, maintenance of the religion through reform, rejection of materialism, and willingness to emigrate, when taken in sum, provided the foundation for the strong Zionist movement evident in the Czech lands from the 1880s onward. As Simon Hock bitterly noted “Unser ganzes Sinnen und Trachten ist, o welche Schmach! den Juden in uns zu verleugnen und zu vernichten, im diametralen Gegensatz zu allen Völkern... Wir entsagen feige aller Hoffnung auf Wiedererlangung unser Selbständigkeit, ja so weit ist es gekommen, wir schämen uns des Gedankens, wieder wie einst ein großes freies Volk zu werden.” Even if no clear lines can be drawn between the two movements, the study of Bohemian Jews, caught in a complex web of revolutionary, nationalist and reformist pressures, still has much more of interest to yield.
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