

Perlmann, Joel

Working Paper

"Race or People": Federal Race Classifications for Europeans in America, 1898-1913

Working Paper, No. 320

Provided in Cooperation with:

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

Suggested Citation: Perlmann, Joel (2001) : "Race or People": Federal Race Classifications for Europeans in America, 1898-1913, Working Paper, No. 320, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/23234>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Working Paper No. 320

"Race or People": Federal Race Classifications for Europeans in America, 1898-1913

by
[Joel Perlmann](#)

January 2001

INTRODUCTION

The Levy Institute recently hosted a conference on recent changes in the federal racial classification system; a seemingly technical matter, the definitions behind classifications were bound up at the deepest levels with the history of legal thinking, social science, the federal bureaucracy and American popular culture. The present work is inspired by very similar concerns, although exclusively in a historical context; I explore here the connections between a narrow history of a federal racial classification system and these wider domains of American life, almost exclusively in the decade after 1900. I trace the evolution of the racial classification system introduced to classify American immigrants, a system that remained largely unchanged for the next fifty years, until well after the Second World War. Most of these immigrants were from Europe; and most of the discussion about classification concerned the Europeans groups, although through that discussion we also learn a good deal about the way in which more fundamental divisions between Europeans, 'Orientals' and Africans were conceived.

The distinctions made in this classification system is of some interest in itself, as is the way in which contemporaries discussed explicitly their notions of race--their fluid and ultimately inconsistent notions. These particular discussion are especially interesting because for various reasons the speakers often discussed race in comparison with other terms they used to distinguish among groups--ethnicity, nationality, peoplehood and so on). Yet for the most part the discussants are not scholars who spend their time refining such distinctions.

My larger interest, however, is in the connection between these discussions about race and immigration on the one hand and the developments of federal procedures and bureaucrats' behavior on the other. This interest developed partly from my experience thinking about the contemporary debates over the census and Multiraciality; at the same time I found myself using some of the data collected around 1900 by the American immigration authorities. Because I used not only the published records but manuscripts in which immigrants were listed on official forms, I found myself intrigued not only by the changing nature of the forms, but also by the changing nature of the instructions that had been printed right on those forms each year.

A group of federal officials at first tried to find a practical solution to the need to classify immigrants in socially significant ways--an intellectual and a practical problem. Then it turned

out that the system of classification had to be defended against vociferous and repeated criticism from articulate ethnic interest groups--more specifically, against a number of Jewish organizations. The officials, of course, changed over the years, and new bureaucratic users inherited the classification system, often no doubt with precious little knowledge of how it had come into being. These new officials tried to defend it, and to placate the ethnic lobby (a lobby that was also changing). What began as a fairly off-hand work at ethnic sorting was now criticized as unscientific, and in turn defended either as scientific or as necessary and practical.

Then, around 1910, an episode occurred which I think few know about today, even among professional historians. The immigration experts working with the famous and influential United States Immigration Commission, and the senators on that Commission, tried to extend the usage of the race classification system developed for Europeans into the United States decennial Census of 1910. This effort, and the protest to stop it, involved several stages including hearings from which we have verbatim transcripts. Eventually that effort failed--because of the same protesting Jewish organizations. But it resurfaced in a new form proposed by the same players, and resulted in the inclusion of the mother-tongue question in the census of 1910-- not least because other Jewish organizations, and organizations of other ethnic groups had very much wanted the race question extended to Europeans. Finally, in later years, the decline of the system of racial classification of immigrants also has a surprising denouement, involving among other things a long-forgotten survey of some 140 leading American social scientists.

Thus the history I want to illuminate here lies at a strange intersection of American institutional and intellectual history and American Jewish history; many of the most influential and best-connected American Jewish leaders and organizations of the period 1895-1920 weighed in as interested parties to issues of classification, much more consistently and forcefully than the did any other interested ethnic, racial or religious group or organization. A parallel with the present-day struggles of classification may help illuminate what sort of connections I have in mind. When the history of discussion about the racial categories of the 2000 Census is written, the outlook and activities of Afro-Americans, (as well as Hispanics, Asians and others of course) will be important to consider, whether in civil-rights or in multi-race organizations, and through other channels. Their efforts will make that historical research a part of Afro-American history, but not less therefore a part of the general institutional and social history of the census and of thinking about race.⁽¹⁾

In this paper, I follow the development of the classification scheme discussions closely through its formative decade, from the last years of the 1890s through about 1913, by which time three revealing publications close the prewar developments: the United States Immigration Commission's massive *Reports* , including its volume 5, *The Dictionary of Races and Peoples*; the critique of the *Reports* by I. A. Hourwich in *Immigration and Labor* and the publication of the Census Bureau reports on mother tongue in the 1910 enumeration.⁽²⁾

The discussions about the classification scheme itself, and the effort to broaden its use to the census, die down after that time, and in any case take on new forms later, in the wake of World War I, and the success of restriction. In an epilogue I sketch these developments very briefly; however, I expect to return to the survey of social scientists from 1944-45 in a later paper.

Most of the documents that capture this story were published at the time; some appeared as learned treatises, but these works have had their historians, and I have been more interested in other contexts of expression. Some of these latter were reports by officials (for example the annual *Report* of the Commissioner General of Immigration), instructions for classifying immigrants by race or people, or in verbatim transcriptions of congressional hearings. I have quoted very liberally from these sources in order to convey the usage of terms, and sometimes the puzzlement over the usage of others. Finally, I have exploited two archives of correspondence in order to add to the flavor of the discussions and the struggles over these themes; I also have quoted very liberally from the letters I found. This extensive use of quotations may annoy or puzzle some readers, but it is central to my purposes; I thought in fact of presenting the material as an anthology of the texts preceded by an introductory essay. However, it would have been hard to comment on particular sentences had I adopted that format.

While the paper covers the years 1898-1913, most of the narrative centers on two shorter time periods, the years 1898-1903, during which the classification scheme was created, refined and initially contested, and then a series of related incidents around the year 1910. Developments between these two moments, and after the second, can be covered more briefly.

I have explained the rationale for this study in terms of the parallels to similar issues in our own time, historical understandings of race in connection with American immigration, connections of bureaucracies and larger themes of American life, and the intersection of some of these themes with American Jewish history. However, a final word needs to be said about the particular classification scheme itself, the narrow specific topic whose history touches on all these other elements--the list of races and peoples. Far from being a merely an interesting point of departure for the study of larger themes, the classification scheme itself was and remains of enormous importance. It served as the organizing principle through which we have received whatever we know of the last great wave of immigration, covering roughly the first quarter of the twentieth century. Anyone who has been introduced to the history of American immigration, however cursorily, has been taught with the help of the racial classification scheme I will be discussing. The statistics gathered and organized using that scheme have served as, and remain, the basis for all discussions of immigrant origins during that time. Even such a simple matter as the number of immigrants from each ethnic origin, not to mention the differences among these immigrant groups in terms of age, gender, literacy, occupations, remigration rates and so on--all this information was collected at America's gates by classifying the immigrants in terms of race or people. Whatever the distaste one may have today for the language and some of the concepts behind the classification scheme, it is important to appreciate not only that the scheme was widely used at the time, but also that it has played a central role in the study of American history. Where did this classification scheme come from?

CREATING THE LIST OF RACES AND PEOPLES

Presenting and Justifying the List

Prior to 1899, immigrants were classified simply in terms of their country of origin. The 1898 *Report* of the United States Commissioner-General of Immigration hinted that a new classification scheme was in the works.

[W]ith the beginning of the new fiscal year, there will be inaugurated a compilation of reports of immigration that will throw much additional light upon the subject. [T]he new reports give, in addition to the data furnished by those now in use, arrivals of immigrants by race. . . Such a distribution by race appears much more rational than the present one, which simply reports the countries whence the immigrants respectively come, and gives no clue to their characteristics and their resultant influence upon the community of which they are to become members. [\(3\)](#)

The next year, when the racial category was first used in the published reports, the 1899 *Report* elaborates on these themes. First, however, the Commissioner-General of Immigration anticipates the objection that changing the classification scheme for immigrants will create problems in studying time series--a perennial objection to any change in a data collection scheme (understandably enough)--as those who have followed the Census race classification debates of our own time will know. The Commissioner assured readers that some tabulations would continue to be presented by country of origin as well as by race, and that other tabulations will relate (cross-tabulate) the two aspects of immigrant origins, thus helping to 'bridge' the transition in categories.

The key point, however, is the justification for change, for classifying by races rather than only by countries of origin. During the 1890s, the sources of American immigration had been shifting, with increasing proportions of the newcomers arriving from the multi-national empires of central and eastern Europe (Russia, Austro-Hungary, Turkey, Germany); knowing the immigrant's country of origin did not tell much about the immigrant. Was an immigrant from Russia a Finn or a Pole or a Jew? One thing was almost certain: the immigrant listed as 'Russian' by country of birth was not an ethnic Russian. And what of the immigrant from Austro-Hungary? The related justification was the argument that these differences among peoples were important, and implicitly the argument was that assimilation was slow, or imperfect. In fact it is this aspect of the matter that the Commissioner-General stresses in his justification.

[I]n addition to showing the recent geographical or political origin of aliens who come to this country to settle, there is shown also the distinctive race to which they respectively belong, using the term "race" in its popular rather than in its strict ethnological sense; so that from an experience of the distinguishing occupations of each race, its moral mental and physical characteristics, and their development under American institutions, a basis may be formed for estimating its effect . . . From this aspect an Englishman does not lose his race characteristics by coming from South Africa, a German his by coming from France, or a Hebrew his though he come from any country on the globe. [\(4\)](#)

The Commissioner's data on race were collected from the passenger lists that were part of the ship manifest completed for every vessel entering the United States. The information on these passenger lists evolved considerably over time. By the 1890s, a good deal of information was being collected--social and economic information reminiscent of the information gathered on American Census manuscript schedules of the same period. The forms were to be completed by a responsible person on each ship, for example the ship's surgeon. Eventually, the law required that the forms be filled out before the ship departed from its port of origin, thereby increasing the chances that any would-be immigrants with a high chance of rejection by American authorities would be detained before the voyage;

otherwise the steamship companies might bear the cost of returning them to Europe. [\(5\)](#)

From Principle to Data Collection

So much for the initial official presentation of the new classification system. Yet behind these published pages lies a puzzle, because in fact at the time the 1899 *Report* first reported immigrant races, and for the three following years as well, the passenger list form then in use did not include a question about the immigrant's race. The questions on those forms resulted from congressional mandates: these questions were explicitly listed in federal immigration laws. But race was not included on the list until 1903. And indeed, in that year, a column "race or people," was added to the passenger list forms. So how were the Commissioner's published race tabulations for the years 1899-1903 completed?

At the hearings for the 1899 Industrial Commission, a congressional committee, Dr. M. Victor Safford, Surgeon, United States Immigration Service, Port of New York, described for the Commission how the scheme of races was developed.

"I served with Mr. McSweeney, and Mr. Campbell of Washington and Mr. Rogers of Philadelphia, the committee which had the revision of statistics in charge. I was secretary of that committee [which reported to Terrence Powderly, the Commissioner-General of Immigration]. . . . That plan could be best stated as substituting for the territorial classification of the people who come here the language or race classification. In other words, people that speak the same language and that have the same religious ties and that are bound to ally themselves together in this country, and whether they want to or not, be forced into the same occupations, were classified together. That was the main change. The old political division is still maintained. (131).

Thus 'race' classification can be referred to, at least as an operating principle as 'language or race classification'. In the very next phrase, he elaborates further: the race classification places together those who 'speak the same language and have the same religious ties. . . . '

Another member of that in-house committee at the Bureau of Immigration, Edward F McSweeney, Assistant Commissioner of immigration at the Port of New York, also testified at the Industrial Commission hearings. During his testimony a questioner handed him a newspaper article of the same day, arguing that the "classification does not do the Hebrews justice, and also a claim that the Hebrew is the only religion that is distinctively and particularly brought out in the last annual report." McSweeney responded that the author of the newspaper article

". . . [D]oes not know what he is talking about. . . . The former classifications [by nationality] are not at all accurate. . . . You will notice in this that we have differentiated as between the Italians of the North and the South. We have not done this because we wished to make any invidious distinctions or to throw any aspersions on any race, but simply in order to get at these races industrially as they come to this country. In some cases the mother tongue might give us an idea of the races, but sometimes the tongue would not do that, and then we had to ask what their religion was. . . . [O]ur asking the religion is simply a means to this end and as it is asked of all peoples there can be no ground of complaint. (91-2).

Terrence Powderly, remembered for his leadership of the Knights of Labor, was serving as

Commissioner-General of Immigration when the classification was developed (and also when these hearings took place); he had helped the 1896 McKinley election campaign, and was rewarded with the post the following year. McSweeney himself had been active in the AFL and worked for Grover Cleveland who appointed him in 1893. The two former labor leaders worked together until dismissed together by Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. At the end of the nineties, the others mentioned in these passages, Safford, Campbell and Rodgers, worked in the Immigration Bureau in Ellis Island, Washington, DC and Philadelphia respectively. [\(6\)](#)

What exactly were these investigators trying to achieve, and how practically speaking did they hope to achieve it? Clearly, they understood that 'country of origin' was giving them inadequate information about immigrants, because so many of the arrivals originated in the multinational empires. Would geographic province within the Empire help? It would in some cases, but only when province captured a single people living there. The presence of the Jews alone often made the classification by province imperfect; but there were also other examples of immigrating groups that comprised minorities in a given province. As the passages above suggest, language and religion might be adequate criteria--but criteria of what? On the one hand the officials seem to be arguing that language and religion link immigrants and that clustering is what they are trying to capture; on the other hand, they seem to be saying that language and religion serve as external manifestations of something more, and that race captures that something. Which do they mean? These are not epistemologists; they are public officials looking for a practical solution.

It is also possible that even in these relatively vague descriptions of the how the categories came about, we can see some differences between McSweeney's and Safford's views and those of Powderly. The two subordinates may have been more concerned about invidious comparisons, about criteria of language and religion for defining similar groups in industrial America. By contrast, Powderly's comment about racial characteristics as a justification for the new system in 1899 seems to place more emphasis on inherent group differences. However, it is also possible that the difference only one of context; Powderly was writing before much if any criticism of the new classification scheme had been heard. McSweeney and Safford were testifying a year later partly at least in response to criticism and to what they viewed as misunderstandings. Even Powderly, in his annual report, had made sure to stress that the usage of 'race' in the classification was in "its popular rather than in its strict ethnological sense." Thus a certain sloppiness of classification, is appropriate, and official statistics gatherers need not define the meaning of terms too carefully.

The Early Forms, 1898-1903

The passenger lists of 1898-1902 did not call for 'race or people' information; how, then, could the immigration officials present the data on that subject in the annual *Reports* covering those years? Between 1899 and 1903, there seem to have been two arrangements, one probably in use in most immigration stations, the other in use in the crucial New York station. At the other immigration stations, American officials reviewed the passenger lists, perhaps while facing the immigrants themselves, and added a notation about 'race or people.' [\(7\)](#) By contrast, in New York, a supplemental form was added to the passenger list forms during the 1899-1903 period, not on the basis of any congressional mandate, but apparently on the initiative of the interested officials themselves. [\(8\)](#) This supplemental form did *not* include an item on 'race or people.' Instead it included items on "color," "country and

province of birth," "mother tongue," and "religion"⁽⁹⁾--that is, on the various criteria that might serve as basis for a classificatory scheme of races. The immigrant characteristics listed on the supplemental form, it seems clear, were the basis for the racial tabulations for the Port of New York during the years 1899-1903. For example, a Russian whose mother tongue was Yiddish and whose religion was Judaism was classified as belonging to the Hebrew race.

When the new Passenger List forms were introduced in 1903, the "Race or people" heading on the passenger lists was followed by an asterisk, directing officials to a comment at the bottom of the page:

"Race or people"--is to be determined by the stock from which they sprang and the language they speak. List of races will be found on the back of this sheet. ⁽¹⁰⁾

The various criteria on the preliminary form, namely province, language and religion, were now replaced by. . . what? First, language was preserved as one criterion, and a reference to 'stock' was added. One might think that the vague reference to stock would not have been of much use; alone perhaps it would have been insufficient. However, the instruction also called attention to language, and in addition the form listed some forty races and peoples from which to choose. The officials at the Bureau had four years of experience with a more fulsome set of descriptors; they had apparently concluded that the sparser definition would do the trick, that with it, immigrants and immigration clerks could choose a 'race or people. '

Early Efforts to Use and Refine the Classification

One interesting feature of the reporting in these early years is that there was no particular distinction between 'races' and 'peoples'; a second feature was the list of 'races and peoples' was not wholly fixed. Both features are clear in the annual *Report* of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the years 1899-1903. Whereas the forms show the point of contact between immigrant and bureaucracy, the reports show the results of that contact digested for presentation and comment. In the first discussion, the 1899 *Report*, there was no mention whatever of 'race or people,' only of 'race. ' In the *Reports* of 1900 and 1901, some tables refer to the classification scheme as "Race or people" while others refer to it as "Race." Thus in 1899 Table V presents immigrants by "the countries whence they came and the races to which they belong" but in 1900 the same heading is by "the countries whence they came and the race or people to which they belong." Still, in the discussion of that table, the *Report* refers to the designation simply as "race." Similarly, Table VIII showed the stated destinations (by state) of immigrants--in 1899 and in 1900 with headings that read ". . . showing their destinations by races" and in 1901 ". . . showing their destination by race or people." Yet even in 1901, the actual column heading for the groups in that table was simply "race," and the text also spoke simply of "races." Only from 1902 do both the heading of Table VIII and the heading of the relevant column both speak of "race or people." Moreover, the text often refers exclusively to race even in later years. ⁽¹¹⁾

In these same years, some uncertainty about the classifications also shows through in the details of the list itself: which "races or peoples" should be included, and how should they be grouped? Generally, however, it is only at the margins that the uncertainty shows through, not in the biggest groups: Hebrews are always listed, for example, as are the northern Italians, southern Italians, Irish and German. Still, between 1899 and 1900, Albanian and

Austrian are dropped as separate listings, South American and Central American (two races in 1899) are replaced by Spanish American. Bulgarian, Servian and Montenegrin are aggregated into one group; the Filipino group is added. And finally, while Magyars appear on the 1900 list, in 1899 Magyars and Hungarians had merited separate listings. In 1901 "Esquimaux," "Arabian," and "Swiss" make a brief appearance; in 1902 they are gone, as are "Hawaiian." Smaller indications of uncertainty about classification also are found in these years: should groups be listed alphabetically, or should some marginal groups be listed at the end; and should similar groups be listed together? Should Korean be spelled with a K or a C?

Finally, it appears that different parts of the report were handled by different offices, or at any rate by different clerks, so that the date at which one or another table shifts from "race" to "race or people" differs; the discussion of immigrant health, and the relevant column in tables on that topic are headed "race" in 1903, for example. [\(12\)](#)

In all this we see the Bureau of Immigration trying to make sense of a complicated new system, based loosely on ethnological scholarship and popular distinctions. The 'race or people' designation arose out of the depths of the Bureau of Immigration, in response to a clearly perceived need to get beyond the vagueness of listing immigrant arrivals by the multi-national empires from which they had come, and in response to a less-clearly articulated belief in the persistence of historical group origins (origins in 'races or peoples'). The form on which the data had been gathered was not the one later mandated by Congress, but an informal effort worked out within the Bureau based on province, language, and religion. Congress put its imprimatur on the system four years after the Bureau had begun using the system. At that point the direction at the bottom of the passenger list form defined how a race or people was to be determined, and that direction replaced the need to list explicitly the three criteria that had been ascertained during the preceding four years--province, language and religion.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE JEWISH PROTEST

The American Jewish elite began to challenge the race or people classification the year it was announced by Commissioner-General Powderly. One category in the race or people scheme was 'Hebrew. ' Looking back from the late twentieth century, it is crucial to understand that the basis of the protest was not that racial classification is inherently invidious. Nor was the protest really even about the classification of the Jews as a race; after all, the list included races and peoples. The protest was as much against the latter term as against the former. The Jewish opposition grew out of a different set of concerns. One senses in their protest a discomfort in being counted explicitly as Jews no matter what the classification scheme--on the grounds that attention led to increased antisemitism. However, the argument based on universal principals that they raised consistently grew out of the fact that the Jews were members of a religious group; consequently, to count the Jews by race or people was to count them by religion. What was more, since no other race or people was co-extensive with a religious grouping, no other group was being singled out for enumeration in religious terms. Even if all individuals were to be listed by religion, the argument went, the count would be unconstitutional since the government had no right to require information on religion from its citizens. Much worse, then, to single out one group for enumeration on a religious basis. To this could be added explicitly the argument that to count the Jews explicitly was to contribute to antisemitism--by drawing attention to them, or by singling out this religious group. To this the defenders of the race or people classification tried to argue that the

Jewish people may be co-extensive with a religious group, and may be the only such people, but the purpose of the classification scheme was not to single them out on the basis of religion, but on the basis of race or peoplehood. To this, in turn, the Jews argued that the result of the classification is what mattered in constitutional terms.

One reason that the Jewish reaction was so swift and strong probably had to do with the fact that at the outset, the Immigration Bureau in fact showed precious little concern for the argument that requiring individuals to state their religion might involve constitutional issues. Recall that the supplement to the passenger list used in the New York immigration station between 1898 and 1903 did in fact include an explicit question on religion (along with questions on province and mother tongue). Moreover, the information collected on those forms did find its way into print, albeit just barely. Buried deep in the Commissioner General's *Report* for 1899, a single table reported the religious affiliation of the immigrants.⁽¹³⁾ The table, interestingly, is accompanied by no discussion whatsoever; it does not even have a title relating it to religion. But one column of the table does report immigrant religion. No such table ever appeared in any later *Report*. Also, by late 1900, the religion column on the supplemental form used in the New York immigration station was often left blank.⁽¹⁴⁾ Very likely the Jewish protests were behind this retreat from explicit discussion of immigrant religion, and thereafter the arguments took the form I just described: that any discussion of the Jews as a religion was an unfortunate by-product of the fact that Judaism was co-extensive with the Jewish race.

We should pause here long enough to examine more specifically the Jews involved in this protest, since by the 1890s they were no longer representative (if they ever were) of most American Jews. The relevant Jewish organizations represented the older, largely second-generation, German-Jewish elite of 1900. At the core of their belief were twin ideals. First, Jews could be full members of modern enlightened societies because modern (reformed) Judaism was simply a religious faith, and thus the private affair of a group of citizens. And second, the glory of the United States in this context consisted in being the ideal state, in treating the Jew simply as a citizen on constitutional grounds--having a 'religion-blind' constitution, we might say. Such reformed Jews, for their part, did not and could not look forward an in-gathering in an resurrected ancient homeland, they renounced Zionism as a political movement, and they stressed their connections with Jews of other countries principally as co-religionists. All this is familiar to students of modern Jewish history: they can trace its evolution from pre-Enlightenment developments, through the responses a group of Jewish notables gave Napoleon, the reform of nineteenth century European Jewish religious life, and the 1884 Pittsburgh Platform of American Reform Judaism. This formulation, of course, left an awkward place for the concept of a 'Jewish people,' not only for political Zionists, or for those Jews who saw cultural survival in more than religious terms, but also, for this very this very same American Jewish elite, whose renowned efforts in defense of the persecuted eastern European Jews seemed to go well-beyond a concern for co-religionists. Nevertheless, the point in 1898 was not the tensions inherent in their position, but how that position determined their criticism of the immigration authorities.

At the time that Powderly and his colleagues developed the new scheme, many of the major American Jewish organizations--most notably the American Jewish Committee--had not yet been formed. But one major organization that did represent this German-Jewish reform elite in America was the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. At the end of the nineteenth

century, one of its lay leaders, Simon Wolf, represented the group in Washington, and was already well known for his close, behind the scenes, ties with elected and appointed officials. One indication of his role is captured in the title of his memoir, "*Presidents I have known, 1868-1915*". Another emerged in a comment of Secretary of Commerce and Labor Charles Nagel (who oversaw the Bureau of Immigration); in 1910, while criticizing the belligerence of a more militant Jewish activist, Nagel observed,

"Mr. Simon Wolf is in Washington and keeps a pretty close watch on us. If we ever miss him, we think the world is going to stop. I frequently inquire about eleven o'clock, 'Has Wolf been here?'. . . The way brother Wolf approaches us is calculated to get the best results, because he comes to us fairly, good-naturedly; and when he is defeated he recognizes our point of view."⁽¹⁵⁾

During the course of 1898 and early 1899, the decision to reclassify the immigrants came up in the American Jewish press. And Powderly and Wolf exchanged "a great deal of correspondence."

In one letter of April, 1899 Powderly complained to Wolf of the misunderstandings and sarcasm found in a Jewish newspaper article, and protesting that the purpose of the classification was not antisemitic.

"I believe that when our method of gathering statistics is understood, the Jews of this country will be the first to approve the measure. It will enable them to ascertain each year how many of their race and coreligionists have arrived, and will tend to show that they are a power in the United States. . ." [Moreover, other Americans will rejoice that such an attractive group of immigrants are arriving]. . . "[M]any of my associates in the industrial movements were Jews, and I can not recall a day when the Jew . . . did not stand for law and order. . ." ⁽¹⁶⁾

And so on for three paragraphs more. According to Wolf, Powderly and McSweeney eventually met with Jewish leaders in New York and the upshot was that (in the words of *The American Hebrew*), "Mr. Powderly has done wisely in deciding to abandon hereafter statistics concerning the religious denominations of immigrants."⁽¹⁷⁾ Although Wolf repeatedly mentioned that this promise had been made and carried out,⁽¹⁸⁾ in fact the only change due to these discussions (if any) appears to be the dropping of the published table on immigrant religion.⁽¹⁹⁾

In 1903, Wolf again became active in protesting the classification scheme, probably at the time Congress mandated the new passenger list forms, including the 'race or people' column. In order to bolster his case, Wolf wrote to various leading Jewish authorities to ask if the Jews in fact comprised a race at all, rather than a religious group who were members of the nation among whom they lived. To his probable dismay, of the dozen or so authorities he canvassed, about half argued with him that the Jews did in fact constitute a race. He nevertheless presented all these responses to various immigration authorities over the years, dismissing those that had asserted the Jews were a race with the observation that "it must not be forgotten that they are Zionists, who believe in the ultimate return of the Jews to Palestine."⁽²⁰⁾ By the end of 1903, Wolf had corresponded about the issue not only with Powderly and his successor, but also with the Secretaries of State and Commerce and had

discussed it with President Roosevelt.⁽²¹⁾ After the congressional mandate to collect the 'race or people' data in 1903, explicit discussion probably subsided again until the end of the decade.

THE PASSENGER LIST FORMS AND THE PRESENTATION OF THE DATA, 1904-11

How to Determine Race or People: The Instructions

While debate may have subsided, it would have been plain at the Bureau that the classification issue had the potential to cause problems. Nevertheless, several innovations were made in the coming years. Some of these innovations involved the directions on the passenger list forms used to gather the data, while other innovations involved the presentation of data in the annual *Report* of the Commissioner General. In 1906, additional "Instructions for Filling Alien Manifests" were printed on a page of the manifests. Included there was the admonition,

Column 9, (*Race or people*). . . . Special attention should be paid to the distinction between race and nationality, and manifests should be carefully revised by inspectors and registry clerks in this regard. For instance, "France" appearing on the manifest might not necessarily mean "French" by race or people, and similarly, "French" appearing on a manifest does not necessarily mean "France" by nationality. An alien who is Irish, German, or Hebrew by race might properly come under the heading of United Kingdom or any other country by nationality.⁽²²⁾

Presumably the elaboration was added because there had been some confusion with the sparser directions of earlier years. In particular, the Bureau clarifies the difference between race or people and nationality; while the latter may change the former apparently does not. The directions continue, "In this connections the following distinctions should be specially observed. . ."The first four distinctions that followed involved the Cuban, West-Indian and Spanish American races or peoples, and the "African (black)" race. The first three specifically exclude blacks, the fourth is defined:

AFRICAN (BLACK). "African (black)" refers to the African Negro, whether coming from Cuba, or other islands of the West Indies, North or South America, Europe, or Africa. Any alien whose appearance indicates an admixture of Negro blood should be classified under this heading.

Thus, the first order of business is to distinguish the European subgroups from the larger, more basic black-white division, and to reassert a variant of the one-drop rule. In fact, only one other distinction was noted for "special attention." The Italians, the largest immigrant group of the period, are to be distinguished into Northern and Southern according to their origins as natives of various provinces of Italy "and their descendants whether residing in Italy. . . or any other country." Most of the Northern Italians "speak a Gallic dialect of the Italian language." Although these were the only racial distinctions singled out for "special attention," it is clear from the general directions quoted earlier that other racial distinctions were important to the authorities as well: Irish, Hebrews and so on.

Five years later, in 1911, the comment that race or people "is to be determined by the stock from which they sprang and the language they speak" was clarified.

"Race or people" is to be determined by the stock from which aliens sprang and the language they speak. The original stock or blood shall be the basis of the classification independent of language. The mother tongue is to be used only to assist in determining the original stock.
(23)

This version of the instructions remained unchanged for decades, at least through the nineteen-twenties, by which time the legislation drastically restricting immigration was fully in place. Here the implications inherent in the earlier formulations become explicit; language is not the underlying meaning of the category but only a means to determining that underlying reality. After all, if it were otherwise, why add this new clarification to the instruction? In the light of later discussions concerning the use of language instead of race, the explicit explication on the form is important. True, it is buried deep in the technicalities of the form; but millions of copies of the form were published. In this context at least, race is not merely language. The use of blood as the criterion both in this instruction and in the preceding one concerning African blood, suggests the possibility that the meaning for 'race' was consistent for the authors of these instructions--consistent in distinguishing among Europeans on the one hand and between blacks and whites on the other.

These elaborated directions skirted, but hint at, two threats to the intellectual constructions of race. First, how are mixed-race persons to be treated? Surely there were more than a handful of these among the immigrants; what of their 'race or people?' Only in connection with blacks and whites is racial intermarriage discussed: any "admixture of Negro blood" places the individual in the "African" racial group. Other racial "admixtures" are ignored. Second, how is cultural change and assimilation to be incorporated into this scheme? The only hint that there may be a large issue lurking here is that the language and race are not perfectly coextensive: language will usually be a good guide to racial origins, but not always; the directions insist on "stock or blood" as the determining factor. In practice, of course, the officials completing the form could hardly have been able to make such distinctions when cultural change had occurred. How well could officials have identified a Northern or a Southern Italian's descendants when these were coming from "any other country" [than Italy] and if the mother tongue had been lost? Indeed, the vague directions on identifying race could persist only because the social origins of most immigrants did not pose challenges--in most cases, "stock or blood" and language did not diverge. Most immigrants, especially from Europe, after all, came from socially definable groups that had not intermarried with other such groups, and had not assimilated culturally into other peoples. The complicated labeling problems posed by intermarriage and cultural change might have bothered the purist, or someone who objected to the classification system in principle; but they did not fundamentally confound the use of the scheme.

'Grand Divisions of Race'

In the reports of the half dozen years after 1904, we learn of efforts to organize the race data more meaningfully. The 40 or so 'races and peoples' are classified into large 'grand divisions of race.'

"More than 95 per cent of the immigration to this country comes from Europe. This European immigration may be separated by race into well-recognized divisions, which confirm more or less to geographical location. With the assistance of Prof. Otis T. Mason, Curator of Ethnology, National Museum, most of these races or peoples, or more properly subdivisions of

race, coming from Europe have been groups into four grand divisions. . . Teutonic. . . Iberic. . . Celtic. . . Slavic. . . . The Mongolic division has also been added. . ."(24)

In this scheme, of the largest groups of immigrants, North Italians were Celtic, South Italians Iberic; Hebrews were Slavic. This new scheme shows up in charts and summary tables, and seems to be accepted for a few content areas of the *Report* (on populations of penal and charitable institutions, for example); but it is not included in the basic tables on immigrants by sex, age, country of origin, occupation or destination. The basic classification of races and peoples, thus preceded the supra-organizational work of Smithsonian scholar Otis Mason by some half dozen years.(25) The bureaucrats worked out a loose classification, and the authority of anthropological science was added later. The same pattern would be continued when the Immigration Commission turned its sights on the classification system after 1907.

The advantage of the 'broad divisions of race' for the Commissioner-General of Immigration was at least partly political: it provided a way of distinguishing racially the old from the new immigration. The relatively extensive use of the 'grand divisions' of race only persists for three years, through *Reports* of 1904, 05 and 06, but the general conclusion is listed for several years after that as well. Thus, for example, the 1908 *Report* informs the reader that "Until very recent times immigration was almost entirely from the Teutonic and Keltic countries. . . with a considerably greater proportion of the former. . . However, now 66% of our immigration comes from the Slavic and Iberic countries. . ."(26)

Races vs. Peoples

The meaning of 'people' was never explicitly separated from that of race in the *Reports* , never justified the way racial classification had been in 1899 or the way 'grand divisions of race' were after 1904. The non-technical nature of the term 'people' may have softened the impact of using a racial scheme in an era when race was increasingly a topic of scholarly discussion. If one disagreed that a given group, the Jews, for instance, or the Irish, constituted a race, one could probably accept the weaker contention that they formed a 'people.' There is some direct confirmation in an unpublished letter that the words 'or people' were initially added, at least in part, with an eye to loosening the narrow meanings one might attach to race. In December of 1908, W. W. Husband was serving as Secretary to the United States Immigration Commission; he was asked by Willaim R. Wheeler, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to explain the Commission procedures in connection with a complaint that Wheeler was investigating.

You will note that the words "race or people" are used by the Commission. Let me explain that some nationalities prefer the latter word and, as one suits the purpose quite as well as the other, both were included.(27)

A distinction must be made here between two groups: the Bureau of Immigration had developed the race or people classification and had been using it for a decade at the time this letter was written; the Immigration Commission had been called into being by act of Congress only the year before and adopted this classification system (for continuity with Bureau figures). We cannot be absolutely sure that the 1908 Husband letter reflects the 1898 usage of Powderly, McSweeney, Safford and others at the Bureau of Immigration, but it does seem a reasonable conclusion.

The point is important because at least some ethnologists were using the term 'people' in a more precise technical way. For example, Daniel G. Brinton, published a series of lectures in 1890 under the title *Races and Peoples*; he explained the terms thus.

Race.-- A variety or sub-species of the species *Man* , presenting a number of distinct and permanent (hereditary) traits of the character above described [physical, linguistic and religious].

Branch. --A portion of a race separated geographically, linguistically or otherwise from other portions of the race.

Stock .--A portion of a branch united by some prominent trait, especially language, offering presumptive evidence of demonstrable relationship. The individual elements of a stock are its *peoples*.

A *Group* consists of a number of these peoples who are connected together by a closer tie, geographical, linguistic or physical, than that which unites members of a stock. [\(28\)](#)

So there was a usage for 'peoples' that went beyond the common meaning of the term; moreover, that usage nicely paralleled the common meaning. One need not believe a given group to be a race; the number of races was debated by the experts anyway, and perhaps races were very broad classificatory tools. Peoples were much more limited subdivisions of races and peoples were closer to the common understanding of historical experiences.

Codification: The Dictionary of Races and Peoples

As I've stressed, the officials in the Bureau of Immigration made no effort to link these technical and common usages of race vs. people during the first decade of its use; that task of formalization, of retroactive scholarly justification, was a challenge picked up by the United States Immigration Commission after 1907. On the one hand, the Commission staff strove to create the authoritative record on immigration; on the other hand, if they wanted data comparable to those collected over the past decade, the staff members were pretty well bound to the race and people list. So they did use the list, but sought to make it authoritative. They engaged an ethnologist of their own, one Daniel Folkmar, to write the *Dictionary of Races and Peoples*. Most of the *Dictionary*, which appeared in 1911, comprises a description of physical as well as cultural characteristics thought to define each race or people, with some discussion of their histories. For our purposes, however, the introduction to the volume is the most interesting, because it is here that Folkmar sets out the justification for the classificatory efforts in which the Bureau of Immigration (and now the Immigration Commission) has been engaged. The classification scheme looks rather more formalized and definitive than it did before--especially if we remember the early uses of the terms in the Commissioner-General of Immigration's annual *Report* between 1899 and 1904. Nevertheless, even in the *Dictionary*, much is made of the tentative character of the classifications. Some plan for classification could hardly be avoided in the wake of eastern European immigration.

"[M]any new ethnical factors have been added to the population of the United States. . . The true racial status of many of them [the newer immigrants] was imperfectly understood even in communities where they were most numerous, and the difficulties encountered in properly

classifying the many ethnical names that were employed to designate various races or peoples [led to this volume]. . . ."The bureau recognizes 45 races or peoples among immigrants coming to the United States, and of these 36 are indigenous to Europe."[\(29\)](#)

However, Folkmar continues, the status of this classification system need not pass muster as scientific truth; there is no claim that all those concerned with ethnology, or even any of them, will find the Bureau's classification scheme wholly accurate in terms of the best criteria of that discipline.

[This Dictionary] is not to be regarded as written for the ethnologist but for the student of immigration; for the one who wants in convenient form an approximately correct statement as to the ethnical status of immigrant races or peoples, their languages, their numbers, and the countries from which they come. . . . The number of the chief divisions or basic races of mankind is more in dispute at the present time than [before]. . . . The sciences of anthropology and ethnology are not far enough advanced to be in agreement upon many questions that arise in such a study.

The crucial point is that the basis of classifying immigrant races and peoples is not directly tied to physical differences; rather the criterion is chiefly linguistic. This may not be the long term goal of the science of ethnology, but in order to sort among the peoples of Europe, whose specific racial origins are mixed, it will always be a useful criterion, and more to the point, it's all the immigration authorities can hope to do given the data available to them and the present state of understanding races.

[T]he primary classification of mankind into five grand divisions may be made upon physical or somatological grounds, while the subdivisions of these into a multitude of smaller "races" or peoples is made largely upon a linguistic basis. The practical arguments for adopting such a classification are unanswerable. It is not merely because it is most convenient to call a man English, Irish, or German according to the language spoken by him or by his ancestors in the old home; this is also the classification that has the sanction of law in immigration statistics and in the censuses of foreign countries. In no other way can figures be found that are comparable as to population, immigration, and distribution of immigrants. While it is well to find a classification by physical characteristics insisted upon in the able works of Ripley, Deniker, and others, it is manifestly impracticable to use such a classification in immigration work or in a census. The immigrant inspector or the enumerator in the field may easily ascertain the mother tongue of an individual, but he has neither the time nor the training to determine whether that individual is dolichocephalic or brachycephalic in type. He may not even know that these terms refer to the shape of the head and are considered to be of fundamental importance by the school of ethnologists just referred to.

Even as we look to the future, Folkmar asserts, we cannot predict what will prove to most helpful in establishing the lines of ethnological division.

"[I]t may be that neither the ethnical nor the linguistic school has reached the ultimate word, but that a more natural and acceptable classification of peoples will be based in the future upon continuity of descent among the members of a race or of a stock, whether such genetic relationship be established by somatological, linguistic, sociological, or historical evidence, or by all combined.

There was a science out there; but it was yet imperfect; if the Bureau had been somewhat crude in earlier publications, here would be a detailed statement of what is known and what is still debated. And in any case, new science alone could not dictate what the immigration authorities would have to use as they classified a million immigrants a year.

CONGRESS MANDATES INCLUSION OF EUROPEAN RACES IN THE 1910 CENSUS

The First Round: January, 1909

All of the issues discussed thus far came to a head during the period December 1908-April, 1910--definitions and purposes of the race and language classification, their relevance to the Jews, the views of various spokesmen for the immigrants. In one way or another, these debates involved the Immigration Commission investigations.

As I've already noted, the Commission staff felt obliged, to accept the race or people classification, but that decision did not end the choices they had to make about classification. First, the Bureau only counted immigrant arrivals; the Commission was interested in assimilatory tendencies and therefore studied not only immigrants in the United States but also their children. How, then, would ethnic origin in the second generation be treated? It is worth noting that they did not extend their searches across more than two generations; the contrasts they stressed, between new and old immigrations, did not require extending the generational story farther back in time than two generations (the new groups had as yet no third generation of any size). Nevertheless, the commission made their definitions of affiliation operationally clear, and the clarity is interesting when one realizes the subject is race. As W. W. Husband put it (in the Dec. 1908 letter to Wheeler cited earlier), "[B]eyond the second generation the Commission made no reference to races except in the case of Orientals, negroes and American Indians. . ."⁽³⁰⁾ Race, then, disappears conceptually in the third generation of whites; it only remains for the color-based groups.

But if the Commission members and their staff agreed to restrict distinctions of white origins to two generations, they sought at the same time to extend the scope of investigation from their own surveys to the entire American population, through the United States Census. The Thirteenth Decennial Census of Population was coming up; if that enumeration could gather data on races and peoples, the information available would be priceless. Of course, there was already a race question in the 1910 Census, but this was listed as the 'Color' question, the purpose of which was to classify the whites and non-whites (blacks, American Indians and some 'Orientals'). The race or people question would vastly extend the meaning of census color data, greatly advancing the investigative work underway on American immigration.

And so, on January 8, 1909, Senator Chester I. Long, head of the Senate Committee on the Census introduced, among a series of amendments to the 1910 Census Bill, "a committee amendment . . . to insert the word 'race'" into the list of items to be canvassed; and the measure passed without discussion, by voice vote.⁽³¹⁾ In the memory of Colorado senator Simon Guggenheim a few months later, it was Senator Dillingham, chairman of the Immigration Commission, who proposed the measure on the floor.⁽³²⁾ Guggenheim was probably mistaken about the specifics (the *Congressional Record* indicates only the proposal by Long); however, Guggenheim was no doubt correct in ascribing the impetus for the

measure to the Immigration Commission. There the matter rested for a brief moment: the Senate resolved to add the race question in addition to the color question to the 1910 Census. That the intent was to use the race or people classification scheme, or something very like it, is also clear from the subsequent record.

It was the German-origin, Reform-Jewish elite that once again rose to challenge this legislative move. However, in the earlier protests of 1900, this elite had been represented mainly through the Jewish press and the informal efforts of Simon Wolf and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC); by 1910, an effective and ongoing defensive organization was in place, an organization more broadly conceived than the UAHC, namely the American Jewish Committee (AJC). The AJC's executive board included many of the most powerful Jews in America, in terms of wealth as well as political clout. They tended to work quietly by letter writing and discussion, rather than by public mobilization; in this latter arena they were less comfortable; moreover, in the public domain they tended to lose out to leaders of the vastly larger east-European Jewish immigrant masses. To the horror of the Americanized 'German-Jewish elite,' among the various segments of east-European Jewish immigrants Yiddish culture, Jewish socialist movements, Zionist leanings, and traditional orthodox Judaism all loomed large--rather than a reformed Jewish religion well-suited to participation in a modern middle-class society. Most of the national leadership of the AJC approached the relevant questions from roughly this latter vantage point, as had Simon Wolf in 1900: Jews should be regarded as a religious grouping of citizens, and the American polity must ignore their religious status. By contrast, treating Jews as a 'race or people' had the effect of singling out their religious identity.⁽³³⁾

Against this background, the AJC took note of the insertion of the 'race' item into the 1910 Census form within 24 hours of the brief activity on the Senate floor. Within three days of the passage of Long's amendment, AJC President Mayer Sulzberger sent a handwritten note from Philadelphia to the AJC Secretary in New York, Doctor Herbert Friedenwald:

Dear Doctor,

The House Census Bill. . . was amended to include the ascertainment of "race". . . . Please call at once a conference of our New York members to consider whether our policy is to do anything. . . . This is *urgent* [underlined twice]. Whatever is to be done must be done quickly.⁽³⁴⁾

At about the same time Cyrus Adler (a member of the AJC Executive Committee) was contacting a legal authority in Washington to clarify "the use of the word 'race' in federal law."⁽³⁵⁾ The next day, Friedenwald reported to Sulzberger what he had accomplished on the first day of activity:

I discovered this morning that the House had appointed a conference Committee of which Crumpacker of Indiana is Chairman. I conferred with Dr. Adler by telephone and Telegraphed to Mr. Newberger of Indianapolis and to Senator [Simon] Guggenheim [Republican of Colorado]. I telephoned to our Washington man [attorney Fulton M. Brylawski?] and instructed him to see Senator Guggenheim and Mr. Goldfogle [Congressman from New York] and others, and also told him what to say. I telegraphed to our advisory member Dr. Rosenau in Washington and also wrote him the enclosed letter which has also been sent to Senator Guggenheim and Mr. Goldfogle. Mr [Louis] Marshall [attorney and a member of the Executive Committee]

telegraphed to Mr Goldfogle and to Senator Carter [Republican of Montana]. I also telegraphed to Mr. Newman to protest to Senator McEnery [of Louisiana] who is the ranking member of the democrats of the Senate Committee. Have you communicated with Senator Penrose [Republican of Pennsylvania]? If not, it might be advisable. [\(36\)](#)

Friedenwald in fact cabled Guggenheim that day: "Amendment to Census Bill adopted by Senate Friday introduces new features requiring American Citizens to state race to Census taker. Our Committee much opposed." [\(37\)](#) Later in the day, he elaborated the AJC position in a letter. Since anthropologists did not agree as to the meaning of the term race, he argued,

. . . the schedules are bound to follow the practice of the Immigration Bureau, which in turn is being followed by the United States Immigration Commission. Their schedule of races is a purely arbitrary one and will not be supported by any modern anthropologists. Besides, what can they do if a Jew answers that he belongs to the Caucasian race? And what value will there be in statistics collected upon so involved a subject by ignorant census taker[s]?

Moreover, for the Jews, this involves a religious element, for almost everyone who says he is a member of the Jewish race professes the Jewish religion. American citizens are American citizens, and as such their racial and religious affiliations are nobody's business. There is no understanding of the meaning of the word "race" which justifies the investigation which it is proposed the Census Bureau shall undertake. So far as citizenship of the United States is concerned, we know only the great divisions of the human family,--white, black, American Indian and others. [Otherwise, we will] land ourselves in justifying discrimination against certain classes of citizens, which will result in a destruction of the American idea of the equality of all citizens.

For these reasons, we are opposed to the investigations it is proposed the Census Bureau shall make into the "race" of American citizens, and trust that you will use your influence against the amendment. [\(38\)](#)

Investigating the 'great divisions of race' seems to be acceptable for state investigation--yet, if we allow state recognition of more refined racial divisions "we land ourselves in justifying discrimination against certain classes of citizens." Friedenwald does not seem to feel the need to explain why investigating the great divisions of race does not 'land ourselves in justifying discrimination [and] destruction of the American idea of the equality of all citizens.'

Friedenwald followed up the next day with another letter, including some further information on the complexity of understanding the term race by Cyrus Adler. [\(39\)](#) Adler seems to be most intent on showing the vagueness and uncertainty of the term, especially as applied to Jews; but if he ever proceeded with his question on how federal law had used the term race in the past, he does not say so.

The *American National Biography* informs us that Simon Guggenheim is best remembered for the fellowship program he endowed and his years as Senator from Colorado (where his family was immensely influential) are best recalled for the quality and quantity of liquor at the parties he hosted. [\(40\)](#) However, his role in stopping the extension of the race or people classification to the Census were critical. He wrote to the Chair of the Senate Census

Committee within the day, met with him soon after, and argued forcefully at committee hearings. [\(41\)](#)

On the morning of Friday, January 15, 1909, the House-Senate Census Bill Conference Committee held a hearing to reconcile versions of the bill--including the amendment on race included in the Senate but not in the House version. The senators agreed to drop the race question; Friedenwald was sent telegrams later that morning by both Congressman Sabath [of Illinois] and Congressman Goldfogle--"The word 'race' in Census bill stricken out by conferees" --and the full Senate supported their motion five days later. [\(42\)](#)

Thus the whole episode occurred within a twelve-day period. Not surprisingly, it has been entirely ignored in intellectual and political histories of racial thinking and of immigration as well as in histories of the United States Census. Nevertheless, the episode reveals how close public thinking and discussion had come to moving racial discourse in a new direction. What it might have meant to American discussions of race, ethnicity and immigration to have extended that classification into the Census is an intriguing hypothetical which, thankfully, we need not resolve. Certainly census questions reflect a popular cultural moment, but the existence of census categories can also shape later habits of thought. Such a shaping might be especially important at a time when the popular usage of a term, and the social position of groups in question is not fully clear and solidified. The relevant habits of thoughts would surely not have outlasted World War II, just as the Commissioner of Immigration's passenger lists forms did not include the 'race or people' classifications and directions for very long after the War. But the extension of that classification to the Census--and its extension to the second generation--might have helped shape the uses of race during more than three decades, shaped them in ways strange to us today. The day after the Senate floor vote to accept the conferees version of the Census Bill (that had stricken the 'race' question), AJC Secretary Friedenwald sat down to write to W. W. Husband, Secretary of the Immigration Commission to take the matter a step farther.

"Though I am personally of the opinion that groups of individuals have marked racial traits, . . . I believe that the Immigration Commission is treading on dangerous ground in making investigations of this character. . . In view therefore of the involved nature of the investigations along racial lines which the Immigration Commission is undertaking, and the dangers that may arise in creating race questions in this country as a result of these investigations, I venture to express the hope that the Immigration Commission will reconsider its determination to collect these statistics in this way. Whether rightly or wrongly, the great majority of American citizens who happen to be of the Jewish faith object seriously to stating that they are other than American citizens. . . ." [\(43\)](#)

While the major impetus for the AJC opposition to the race question was the violation of Jewish identity as religious in nature, more was becoming involved, a sense that utilization of race categories created new 'race questions' that were problematic in their own right. This emphasis was not the central one for the AJC, the role of 'race' in federal law was not pursued by Cyrus Adler, the most obvious problem with race usage was only the sloppiness of the so-called expertise, the AJC was willing to accept color-defined races--but despite all this there was still an emerging minor theme that a focus on race in and of itself could raise problems, and that these problems affected all those of European origin, not just the Jews.

The Second Round: April, 1909

About three months after the failure of the Senate bill to include the race question in the 1910 Census, the United States Immigration Commission staff tried to revive the issue; this time in the ongoing hearings of the Senate Census Committee. On April 6, Immigration Commission Secretary, W. W. Husband, came "to make a brief statement on an amendment which the Commission desires" namely, the race amendment. He brought with him Daniel Folkmar, just then engaged in writing the *Dictionary of Races and Peoples* for the Commission. Husband explained that the argument from the point of view of data collection was compelling. "The commission's and all immigration statistics are now kept by race as well as by country of birth." The crucial argument for the racial statistics, Husband stressed, was that so many races came from the multinational empires: Poles, Slovaks, Germans, etc.

If the next census is taken by country of birth alone, the identity of these races will be lost; but if taken by race also, the census will afford complete data as to the stability, progress, distribution, occupation, and other interesting data relative to these recent immigrants. [\(44\)](#)

The hearing was remarkable in several respects. First, the committee of senators included progressive Robert La Follete as the new chair of the Committee, and Colorado Republican Simon Guggenheim, who had been very active on the matter back in January.

The Committee may not have been experts on issues of ethnicity--even if they took their duties with utmost seriousness, those duties, after all, involved many issues besides ethnicity such as patronage implications of census taking or the rights of card-reading-machine manufacturers. Nevertheless, the Committee included half a dozen United States Senators; these were not scholars of ethnology, but they were knowledgeable and sophisticated Americans, and men who did have some special reasons for awareness of demographic and ethnic issues. It is therefore fascinating to follow their discussions when they were confronted with the issue of 'races and peoples.' The context was also unusual because the usual roles, of the German-Jewish elite coming as supplicants to government officials was dramatically reversed, in that Guggenheim, articulating the views and interests of that elite, was here in the role of the honored committee member, and the government bureaucrats were the deferential supplicants. Finally, the hearings forced Husband and Folkmar to discuss explicitly, and in more detail than they usually would, several aspects of their thinking--notably the connections between language and 'blood' as criteria of analysis.

After Husband's brief explanation, mostly given to examples of the multiple races found in each country of birth, the transcript shows troubled questioning from the very outset.

SENATOR CARTER. How do you distinguish between nationality race in your classification? What do you mean by the word "race?"

MR. HUSBAND. It is not the racial classification by color that is commonly known but a race classification which was agreed upon, I believe by the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution; at least, I understand someone connected with the Smithsonian Institution worked out the classification of races.

SENATOR CARTER. You refer to the Poles as a race; they are not a race at all. As I understand the word "race," it is a nationality. Would you refer to the Irish as a race? They are not a race; they are part of a race.

In fact, as we have seen, the classification had been worked up ca. 1898 by several of the officials at the Immigration Bureau in Powderly's time (Safford, McSweeney, etc). About 1904 some help in organizing the data into 'grand divisions' of races for the annual reports was requested from Otis Mason at the Smithsonian, but the tables on races and peoples had been appearing for some five years by that time, and could not derive their legitimacy from Mason.

On the matter of terminology, Carter is puzzled, and the clarification that race is not just color does not satisfy him. We not only can see the fluidity of the terms, and the real puzzlement of the senators; we also learn something about how well known the Immigration Bureau's classification scheme was at this time, namely not well-known at all. Recall that at this time the Bureau had been tabulating in terms of race or people for a full decade; but clearly what they were doing was far from universally understood even by well-placed members of the American elite.

At this point Guggenheim jumped in to remind the committee that "this whole question was threshed out in a bill before this time. . . I appeared before this committee, with other people, . . . there were many good reasons given and many good letters written at the time. . . ." He then proceeded to restate variants of the AJC objection:

Take my own case. I was born in Philadelphia. Under this census bill, they put me down as a Hebrew, not as an American. . . . There is a Jewish society in New York which called my attention to this [the AJC] . . . As Senator Carter just brought out, many should be classed in the white race, as Americans are. The negro belongs to the African race, for example. There are five races.

But now Other senators find Guggenheim's own position on these matters unclear too.

SENATOR CUMMINS [Republican of Iowa]. Yours is the broad definition of race?

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Yes.

SENATOR CARTER. I imagine that in taking the census they would find extreme difficulty in the refinements of the races to which your remarks refer, Senator Guggenheim.

THE CHAIRMAN [La Follette]. Suppose it were limited to immigrants? I can see there would be extreme difficulty if that question is asked of everybody. It would be a question of where the racial lines should be drawn. Conditions are such that a great many people could not really state where they belonged, but if you limited it strictly to immigrants, that difficulty might be avoided. . . .

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Why should there be a distinction? Take a man of the Jewish religion from Russia; is he a Jew or a Russian?

THE CHAIRMAN. I can see broad ethnological reasons why some time it would be important to know from what blood and race the man came.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Why not ask his religion?

Now Chairman La Follette may have been silently mulling over this last from Guggenheim; at any rate, he does not pick up the thread again. McCumber steps in, perhaps trying to smooth ruffled feathers.

SENATOR MCCUMBER. The Jews are not a race, of course. They do not belong to a race merely because they are Jews. . .

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. They are to be classified as a race under the proposed classification.

SENATOR CUMMINS. We will have first to agree upon a definition of what is a race.

Thus neither what constitutes a race, nor what is permissible to ask was quite clear to the senators. Husband himself now tried to shift the discussion from these matters to what he regarded as more practical matters. In the Immigration Commission usage 'race' is a matter of two generations only--unlike 'color. 'Presumably, a census enumeration by race would work the same way, he says. Also, if the Census Bureau found a particular part of the race classification scheme problematic, it could change that part.

SENATOR TALIAFERRO. Perhaps it would be well to permit the gentleman to conclude his statement.

THE CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Husband.

MR. HUSBAND. I would say that in inserting the word "race" it was the intention that it would include immigrants only. . . [whereas as originally proposed the amendment included also] the second generation Then, so far as racial classification is concerned, . . . the commission was obliged to adopt the racial classification of the bureau, as the statistics must be compared. . . [Some contend that this] is not a scientific classification. . . [However, the Census Bureau need not adopt it] without serious consideration. Senator Guggenheim spoke of the classification of Hebrews as a race. That is done under the bureau classification, and necessarily the commission adopted it. . . . There should be a very careful classification of races made before the census is taken.

Only a moment before Husband had claimed scientific status for the list of races and peoples, compiled as it was by, or with the help of, the Smithsonian. But if that status is challenged, he now argues, a more authoritative list could be created. His chief point here may be simply to suggest a compromise on the matter of the Hebrew race. Now the senators interrupt again, raising complications of enumeration: how will people react to the question, and who will decide about racial origins?

SENATOR CUMMINS. After all, it would depend upon the judgement of the man who made the census, because there are a dozen ways of classifying races recognized by ethnology.

MR. HUSBAND. The experience of the commission has been that it came to be perfectly natural in canvassing among immigrants to ask their race. . . . Several races were found in that way of which we had never heard, and which were not in the bureau classification; but still the persons interviewed insisted they were of that race and objected to being classified as anything else.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. The may be wrong.

MR. HUSBAND. They may be wrong, yes.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. They are wrong.

SENATOR CUMMINS. Do you claim the Spanish and Italian people as of different races?

MR. HUSBAND. Yes. . . .

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Suppose they were Jews who came from Spain, would they be classified as Jews or Spaniards?

MR. HUSBAND. That would depend a good deal on what the man claimed to be.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. I do not think that has anything to do with it. It is purely a question of what is right.

The senators return to the sort of problem their colleague (Guggenheim) is concerned about.

SENATOR CUMMINS. [Establishing that Guggenheim's parents were born in Switzerland, and he in Philadelphia]; then they would be put down as what?. . . .

MR. HUSBAND. Under the plan I have in mind he would be put down as of the American race. . . . [And information about his parents race would not be listed].

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. I would be classified as a Jew under the original scheme and not as an American. However you may have changed the plan since This whole thing, Mr. Chairman, was thrashed out a month ago by Senator Long.

Now La Follette tried to step in once more, quite possibly genuinely confused.

THE CHAIRMAN. I just do not get your objection to this, Senator Guggenheim. What objection can one have to having the race to which they belong correctly entered?

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Because it is not correct when stated in that way; the Jews are not a race. . . [T]hey belong to the country from which they came just as much as other people who have come. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN. Then if they are not a race they would not be classed. They would be classed simply as foreign-born citizens under whatever race that country was classified.

[to Husband] Are you doing this work now?

MR. HUSBAND. All the work that is being done by the Immigration Commission is being done by races.

SENATOR CARTER. And in that classification you treat the Irish and a race and the Poles as a

race, and so forth.

MR. HUSBAND. Yes, sir.

SENATOR CARTER. There seems to be a confusion of nationality and race?

SENATOR CUMMINS. Nationality would strike you as better than race?

MR. HUSBAND. Everything is taken by nationality also.

Again, the senators struggle with the usage of race, and its place among other possible terms for classification. The misunderstanding over nationality arises from the fact that in the usage of the Bureau of Immigration and the Immigration Commission this term refers to country of origin and political allegiance, whereas the senators want to use it as 'people' might be used by Husband. In any case, are the familiar races simply colors?

SENATOR MCCUMBER. Suppose you include in this "race," in its broadest sense, as the Caucasian and Mongolian races, as we know them, and then in addition you simply get the nationality, would not that answer every purpose?. . . We would like to know how many black people, and how many yellow people there are, anyhow. . . .

MR. NORTH [Director of the Census]. There are five classifications, white, black Chinese, Japanese and Indians.

SENATOR CUMMINS. These are not colors. Under the head of colors what would you put down? What would a Chinaman be?

SENATOR SHIVELY. With reference to the Malays, for instance, you do not tabulate them as brown?

MR. HUSBAND. No, sir; we tabulate them by country of birth.

Notice that the senators are facing inconsistencies not entirely unlike those that arise today in the classification of Asians by race. In present usage, the global term 'Asians' can serve as the race category, but in fact, many of the various peoples of Asia are listed as subgroups under the rubric of race: Vietnamese, Chinese, Japanese, etc. In the usage of 1909, there was no generic census category for Asians, although such a generic usage was implied by the color classification. Instead, the 1909 usage was to pick out the few most common Asian groups and add them to the list of races and peoples, parallel in specificity to the other peoples on the list. Since the number of Asian immigrants was small (not least because immigration from parts of Asia was severely restricted), the need for many Asian terms seemed pointless. However, under scrutiny, the system tended to breakdown: Chinese were counted as a race, but not Malays (who presumably ended up in the miscellaneous category of races and peoples, along with various European groups).

SENATOR BAILEY. It looks to me like it [the race classification proposed] would not be much better than a geography. If you are going to give the race--still it would seem to be an incongruous thing to take the Irishman in his country and call it a race instead of a nationality, and then take the Hebrew for his religion. They are not even a nationality except

of the the nationality where they are born. . . . Of course, by races they would be Caucasians.

SENATOR SHIVELY. Under your present system of classification, suppose the nativity of the individual to be Austria. Suppose he were of Polish origin. Is there anything in the classification you make now that discloses that fact--that he is Polish?

MR. HUSBAND. Yes. . . . He is German or some other race--a Pole or a Bohemian.. . . Given all these problems, could the Census Committee accept the Immigration Commission's strategy, however imperfect that strategy, simply to provide data that is consistent with what has been collected from immigrants?

SENATOR BAILEY. The trouble is they want us to conform our bill to what they are doing in another place.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. Take the place of this Jew who comes from Austria. . . . You are making a mistake to say a Jew belongs to the Jewish race--that is a religion and not a race.

MR. HUSBAND. I will say that the commission does, but whether it is right or wrong I do not know. . . . If it is not right the Census Bureau ought to strike that out. I think there is room for improvement in the racial classification the commission is using, but it is the only one available and the latest immigration statistics are according to that classification.

CHAIRMAN [after a break during which the Secretary of Commerce and Labor testifies about other matters] "Had you finished, Mr. Husband?"

MR. HUSBAND. Yes. . . . I want to add that [I am here] purely because immigration statistics are now classified by race and if the census could be taken by race it would add a great deal of value to the knowledge of immigration. . . .

SENATOR CARTER. But, Mr. Husband, it would be of no value to you unless taken on parallel lines and substantially under the same classification that you have adopted.

MR. HUSBAND. Well I think it would be substantially the same, Senator; there would be some difference, I have no doubt, but it would be substantially the same.

SENATOR CARTER. Well, if we should develop a general racial subdivision known to ethnology [i. e. : "Caucasians, Semitics. . . Aryans. . . and so on"] instead of the principalities, kingdoms and States to which you refer. . . [that] would be of practically no value. . . .

MR. HUSBAND. No it would add nothing. . . .

The concepts of race, people, nationality, geographic origin, political allegiance, and religion were all floating in the intellectual stew. The Jewish issue, of course, was a key impetus to the senators' ruminations; and since some of the senators were on the same committee in the preceding session of congress, when the issue had been aired, they may have been familiar with the arguments. In fact, they may have understood that this amendment would never pass and that they might as well gain some points with Guggenheim by helping to frustrate it. But such an explanation of the transcript would be at best incomplete. It is clear from the remarks of La Follette, for example, that he is trying to follow Guggenheim's

argument and willing to challenge his colleague when he cannot follow. Moreover, it is equally clear that more than the Jewish issue is troubling the senators. The Jewish issue may be the extreme case, both because the group's spokesmen were outspoken and because the nature of its identity raises the added complexity of religion. Still, it is clear that the senators perceive a general problem of usages: national origin (Irish, Spanish) vs. race, and 'nationality' vs. race (Poles, Bohemians) and similar overlaps when color and nationality are confused (Chinese, Indian, Malay, yellow). Many of these issues would resurface in the Supreme Court's troubled entry into the thicket of definitions of white and Caucasian a decade later. It is intriguing however, that the senators did not make better use of the concept of 'people' or 'nationality' as a way out of these limited discussions of 'race.' And of course, there is no mention of ethnic group, the term that became so common later. Possibly the Guggenheim pressure on the race/religion overlap distracted them from such an outcome; for the Jewish problem, the a people (or nation)/religion overlap was just as unsatisfying. In any case, the senators clearly reveal first that many of them have only the faintest awareness of how the American immigration authorities have been classifying immigrants for a decade, and second, that they are profoundly unclear on the meanings of race and nationality, especially (but not exclusively) among Europeans; beyond black white red and yellow, nothing is certain.

That much, however, is certain: the ambiguities of classifying Europeans by race do not seem to carry over to as a challenge to race differences between blacks, American Indians and whites, although at a minimum the status of the mixed race person (mulatto or European/American Indian for example) might have given them pause, and the proliferation of 'races' among the Asians--Chinese, Japanese, Indian--raised other questions about the principles behind classifications outside Europe. Still, in this context, the peoples of southern and eastern Europe are not 'in between' in the sense of being situated outside the white race. In comparison to the color divide, the divisions among European peoples do seem to place all of them within that large rubric. As Barrett and Roediger have argued, we cannot expect consistency of usage across time and context at a time when identities are being solidified. And the divisions among Europeans may well have been very important to the senators; nevertheless, in this time and context there seems to be doubt as to where Poles, Magyars, Jews and others fit with regard to color divisions. [\(45\)](#)

The committee now welcomes Folkmar, who naively begins, "It might be well to preface my very brief remarks by defining what we mean by race." But Folkmar does have an approach to offer that has not yet been heard in this discussion. He gives the example of the Serbian census categories, in which "The point is that race is according to language and not color." And the issue is relevant to the objections by "some of our Jewish friends."

The question can be asked in this way: 'What language do you speak?'. . . practically all of our Hebrew friends speak the languages of other countries of Europe. . . JudeoDeutsch', Spagnuoli. . . It amounts to what the Senator has said; they would be counted with Spaniards or Germans, if we wished to interpret it in that way, making the language the test, as with all other races.

SENATOR CARTER. Would not your classification by languages practically wipe Austria off the map?

DOCTOR FOLKMAR. That is just what we want, of course, so far as races are concerned. We want to get rid of the present use of 'Austrian' and of 'Russian' as ethnical terms. . . .

SENATOR CARTER. The consideration of the language of the individual as a test of race is purely arbitrary, is it not? Would not mistakes be made in the use of this inquiry. . . ?The number of so-called races . . . would be almost unlimited. . . for instance in the Philippine Islands, we would have a great many languages. . . We only recognize in general two races there now . . . [Asiatic and "natives commingled with the Spaniards"]. . .

DOCTOR FOLKMAR. . . . [The many small groups could be classified as "others"]. Practically, that is done now in our own immigration bureau. We have just 40 subdivisions.

Significantly, the Committee did not directly challenge the linguistic criterion for race, beyond Carter's question as to whether language is an arbitrary criterion. Nor did they explore its utility any further either. In particular, is language classification a substitute for race classification or a criterion for race classification? And in either case, can the practical need for data be addressed by simply replacing the race question with the language question? This is the direction of future compromise, but it is not raised here; perhaps quite simply none of the senators thought of it; or perhaps no one knew whether it met the Jewish concerns. Folkmar, surely, thought of it ("The question can be asked in this way: 'What language do you speak?'. . ."), however when deflected, he does not return to the issue. Perhaps he was simply confused or intimidated when the Senators led him in less helpful directions; or perhaps he simply was not authorized to explicitly suggest discarding a race amendment and adopting a language amendment for the census bill. After all, Husband had begun by requesting a race amendment on behalf of the Immigration Commission.

So the senators simply drifted back to other issues. Unlike Husband, Folkmar is not vague about the origin of the categories.

SENATOR CUMMINS. Who established that [the 40 subdivisions of races and peoples]?

DOCTOR FOLKMAR. It originated with a committee of three, as I have been told. . . This committee was not dogmatic, but rather a practical committee, composed of gentlemen who had had experience in immigration work. . . . it was then framed, or worked over by Professor Mason, who was considered the most capable ethnologist to turn it over to, and he grouped the forty into five divisions.

Once again, committee members showed skepticism about whether census takers could accomplish the classification, whether Austrians should be called such, and so on; they close with the old chestnut:

SENATOR BAILEY: If I were a Hebrew and had been born here, and they wanted to say I was anything but an American I would have a difference with the enumerator. I perhaps would refuse to answer their questions.

SENATOR CUMMINS. I would not have any hesitancy in stating from what blood I was.

SENATOR BAILEY. No; but in the case I reference it would be a matter of religion.

SENATOR GUGGENHEIM. That is the point: it is the question of religion.

And so ended the committee's efforts to make the necessary distinctions. No vote was taken at the hearings, but surely it must have been clear, after Guggenheim's sharp comments, that the Immigration Commission's request would go nowhere without much hard fighting, and apparently the will or the votes for such a fight were not there. Once again, for the second time in three months, an effort to extend the usage of race from color to 'race or people' failed to enter the Census system.

THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION HEARINGS, DECEMBER, 1909

Six months after these events, the Immigration Commission itself held open hearings to accommodate interested parties; both avid restrictionists, such as the leaders of the Immigration Restriction League, and avid defenders of immigration testified. Strikingly, about half of the entire volume of hearing transcripts and appendices is devoted to submissions of Jewish organizations.⁽⁴⁶⁾ At one of these sessions, the ubiquitous Simon Wolf (now in his mid-seventies), and the AJC Executive Board Member (and federal judge) Julian Mack testified about a range of issues. Include in that session is another long interchange with Senators, Congressmen and other experts on immigration concerning the race or people classification scheme. Wolf began with his usual theme, "The point we make is this: A Jew coming from Russia is a Russian; from Roumania a Roumanian. . . that Hebrew or Jewish is simply a religion."⁽⁴⁷⁾ He managed to utter a few sentences along these lines, But Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was having none of it.⁽⁴⁸⁾

SENATOR LODGE. What if he comes from Poland?

MR. WOLF. I suppose he is a Pole; or if he belongs--

SENATOR LODGE. 'Poland' is a geographic expression [i. e. : not a state in 1910]. . . . Do you think that Poles ought to be classified as Prussians, Austrians, Russians, depending upon which part of Poland they come from?

MR. WOLF. I do.

SENATOR LODGE. And the Irish as British.

MR. WOLF. Yes, sir. . . . [A] certain portion of the Jewish people claim that the Jews are a race, especially the Zionists, who cling to the idea of returning to Palestine and founding a Jewish state; and I am not sneaking for that portion of the Jewish people.

SENATOR LODGE. No; I understand there is a difference.

Mr. WOLF. The reform element in the United States and throughout the world that class which has not been living in Russia and Romana under medieval conditions, is decidedly on the lines I have indicated, that is, that we are citizens of the country in which we reside, and we have been fighting in every possible way against the idea of founding a Jewish state. . . . Russia and Roumania . . . recognize the Jew racially. . . Therefore the tabulating of the Jew as such. . . is strengthening the hands of the people who have oppressed him

SENATOR LODGE. Do I understand you to deny that the Jews are a race?

MR. WOLF. I [asked several experts including] . . . Dr. Cyrus Adler . . . and their [replies in the negative] are found in this little pamphlet which I will leave with you.

SENATOR LODGE. That I think is an important point. I have always supposed they were. I find [the point confirmed] in the preface of *The Jewish Encyclopedia* which is signed by Cyrus Adler . . . Do you mean to deny . . . that the word 'Jew' is a racial term? . . . How would you classify Benjamin Disraeli? Was he a Jew? . . . He was baptized. He then ceased to be a Jew?

One of the problems Wolf and his sympathizers was having was the prevalence of 'Zionists' and their increasingly outspoken pronouncements--or more generally, with Jews who thought of themselves in terms of peoplehood, nationality or race. The Immigration Commission staff had done its homework, not only by clarifying this point but specifically by finding statements such as the introduction to the *Jewish Encyclopedia* that spoke distinctly about the Jews as a people and a race.

Lodge then raises a different challenge: how to classify individuals born in the Jewish faith who later converted; did their racial status, or that of their children, change upon conversion? No, he argued, and thereby meant to negate the claim that the Hebrew race and adherent to Judaism were really such perfectly co-extensive groups. The classic example for such discussions was Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield. Disraeli trumpeted his Jewish origins, thus identifying himself as a Jew by race but not by religion.

MR. WOLF. Yes; religiously he ceased to be a Jew.

SENATOR LODGE. Ah! Religiously. He was very proud of the fact that he was a Jew. . . Did the fact that he changed his religion alter his race? . . . Are there not a great many Jews who . . . for one reason or another have abandoned their faith, as people in all religions frequently do--would be classified as Jews? . . . I have never supposed for one moment that the Jews who are put down in the immigration returns as such are classified according to religion.

MR. WOLF. You classify them under the supposition as I understand -

SENATOR LODGE. On the supposition that it is a race. . . as the Poles are a race, though they have no country and no nationality; as the Irish are a race although they have no nationality and no country. . . It is important, very important, to get the race classification as nearly as we can.

MR. WOLF. Yes.

Now, having left Wolf to think about this one, Lodge charges on, providing a thumbnail sketch of his racial views. Henry Cabot Lodge had made race his special area of study since his days as an academic, and later had extended his racial outlook to the immigration question, since the early nineties. In 1896, a decade and a half before our hearing, he had delivered a long Senate speech that staked out the argument. Long historical processes determined differences in the characters of different groups. Some groups were similar enough to intermingle easily, without confusing the long historical development, others not. Lodge did not need eugenics or a clear biological grounding for this view; the key was the importance of such processes for human history and progress, not the precise details of how they occurred. We have already seen many uses of 'race' that seem to be no more specific than

'people. ' But 'race' or 'people' could also denote more restrictive concepts: groups whose nature was determined by exceedingly long historical processes, impossible to change in a generation or two. In this sense, the key word is not 'nature' or 'biology' but 'unassimilable. 'The processes that make groups what they are need not be known to know that groups either can or cannot intermingle easily and without negative affects. Assimilation also was a concept that could be used without clarifying too many assumptions about what makes a group like or unlike another. In sum, unlike the Senators on the Census Committee, Lodge was thoroughly familiar with the issues he was confronting when Wolf and Mack appeared; he had clear positions.

SENATOR LODGE. As you all know there are what are called the scientific races - that is, the races which are defined by physical peculiarities - the great divisions like the Mongol the Negro the North American Indian the Aryan the Semitic. Those are what are called the scientific races where the difference in the skulls and so on has all been retained. Of course in Europe there has been a great mixture of races and the scientific divisions have largely disappeared. But there are peoples which have been formed gradually as the English, the German in which there is a great mixture of blood but which are historically racial just as the Poles are historically a race. They may not be scientifically a race because there is a considerable admixture of blood. But the classification made by the Immigration Bureau is on the basis of historic races in contradistinction to the broad scientific divisions which would be of no value whatever in making returns. I had always supposed that this classification was made exactly as they classify the Irish and the Pole as the Syrian and the Armenian. It would be an absurdity to classify the Syrians and the Armenian as Turks. They are subjects of the Sultan of Turkey of course- they are Turks politically. [\(49\)](#)

This sketch of racial views is entirely consistent with Lodge's major 1896 Senate speech on immigration restriction. However, consistency is not completeness; at least two crucial elements found in that old speech do not term up in this sketch at the hearings. First, the southern and eastern Europeans will not easily assimilate with the English ways of the United States; racially the new immigrants are too distinct for that. Second, in the 1896 Senate speech he insisted on the tenacity of race over time in a much stronger and detailed way than he did in these 1910 Immigration Commission hearings. In 1896, for example, he averred, you can educate "a Hindoo" at Oxford, but "you cannot make him an Englishman. . . . The men of each race possess an indestructible stock of ideas, traditions, sentiments, modes of thought, an unconscious inheritance from their ancestors, upon which argument has no effect." [\(50\)](#)

Wolf retreats by observing that such views were behind the Senate's failed race amendment to the census bill, as though that failure would stigmatize Lodge's position. But Lodge knows all about that too.

MR. WOLF. You are aware that the Census Bureau some time ago attempted to classify in the same manner and it was prohibited from doing so.

SENATOR LODGE. The word race was stricken out of the census bill. I think It was a great mistake. It makes the returns almost valueless.

Eventually, the discussion turns from the immigrants to their descendants: if races are so important and long-lasting, what are the implications for classifying later-generation

descendants of immigrants?

SENATOR LODGE. We are none of us American racially. We are Americans politically and geographically but we are not American racially.

Mr. WOLF. No; I suppose the true American are the Indians.

Senator LODGE. Certainly.

REPRESENTATIVE BENNET. Or the Moundbuilders.

Mr. WHEELER. [\(51\)](#) I must say that I never understood the word Jew or the word Hebrew to describe a religion. I have running through my mind now half a dozen prominent Jewish families in San Francisco who attend Christian churches. But we know them all as Jews.

This last is reminiscent of Lodge's statement earlier: "I have never supposed for one moment that the Jews who are put down in the immigration returns as such are classified according to religion." One or both men may be exaggerating for emphasis, but it is still striking that they each urge not merely that Jews are more than merely members of a religious group but also that Jews are not primarily to be conceived in religious terms.

Eventually, Julian Mack, who (like Wolf) had come to testify about a wide variety of other issues is tempted beyond endurance to get involved in the exchanges on the classification system.

Mr. MACK. Permit me to say a word. If Disraeli had come to this country after he had attained his fame he certainly would have said in answer to the question asked him at the port that he was an Englishman.

Senator LODGE. He would have been classed racially as a Jew.

MR. MACK. Would some officer at the port have that power?

SENATOR LODGE. It is not a question as to where a man happens to live or what his allegiance is. If we were to classify men according to their allegiance we would classify them in a manner which would be useless. . . .

Mr. MACK. Of what value is your classification?. . .

SENATOR LODGE. [T]here is a general belief that the Jews are a strongly defined race. . . [T]hey have maintained their racial status in a very extraordinary way . . .

There are, I know, bodies of Jews who are not racially Jews at all. Doctor Adler refers to one tribe in Abyssinia [that is Jewish in faith]. If we had here an immigration of Abyssinians they would never be classified as Jews, no matter what their faith might be. . . They

would not be classified as Jews on account of their religion. . . .

The argument about the Abyssinian Jews is the other side of the Disraeli argument: just as a

convert from Judaism does not change his race, so a tribe of converts to Judaism do not change theirs. That the group is African adds to the punch; it is as though Lodge is daring Wolf to say that various groups of European Jews--the Jews of Frankfurt and Russia, for example--are just as close as the Jews of Frankfurt and Abyssinia. All that unites either pair, by Wolf, is their status as co-religionists.

Mack tries to steer the discussion back to the implications of race classification for the descendants of the immigrants.

MR. MACK. . . . I do not know how you could claim to be any more of an American than I am because your ancestors have been here probably ten generations and mine only three generations, although I know of plenty of Jews who have been here for eight generations.

Mr. WHEELER. You would not be classified other than as an American

MR. MACK. I would not?

Mr. WHEELER. Under the present system.

MR. MACK. But Senator Lodge just said that he would classify Beaconsfield as a Jew and not as an Englishman.

Senator LODGE. Racially.

Mr. WOLF. That is the same case.

SENATOR LODGE. I am not now speaking of political classifications. I am speaking of racial classification, and this is used by the immigration authorities solely as a race classification. For the allegation that it is used as a religious classification I have seen no warrant whatever. . . . There is no discrimination whatever, as I understand. I should be the last man to favor any discrimination whatever. . . . This is purely an attempt to get at the ethnology of it. It must be approximate. All ethnology is approximate.

In essence, Lodge's position is that although races matter a good deal for character and society, and must be taken into account in setting immigration policy, once an immigrant is accepted into the polity, his citizenship status is identical to any other American's.

In the end, Lodge adds, classifications will always be imperfect. That imperfection is an opening wedge for Mack to raise another objection.

Mr. MACK. I am afraid ethnology is not in a position at the present date to form the best basis. Ethnology has not advanced that far.

Senator LODGE. You can go approximately that far.

Mr. MACK. You can divide the world into five races.

Ethnology is crude; the best Mack can say for it is to support the color line. There is no hint that Mack, at any rate, has any doubt about where the Jews and the other new immigrants fit

in terms of the five races. Wolf now distracts them to take up the old argument that the classification scheme can lead to anti-Semitic feeling; Lodge claims to doubt that connection.⁽⁵²⁾ And eventually Mack tries once more to pull the discussion back to the wider political implications of classifying the offspring of immigrants by races.

Mr. MACK. Your classification for the purposes of your work is not merely of those coming in. You are classifying the Americans. You are classifying the American children in the schools racially. You would call my child in the school racially a Jew. I would call my child in the school racially an American.

REPRESENTATIVE BENNET. You are mistaken about that.

Mr. MACK. So I am informed.

Representative BENNET. No we call your child an American-born child.

Mr. MACK. If you adhere logically to what you were saying you would classify me because my father was born in Germany as an American-born child of the Jewish race. I would disclaim that. I do not recognize the Jewish race. There are Jews who do. I do not.

Unfortunately for Mack, he admits to the division of opinion among Jews, and Lodge presses him on that, in ways that will come back to haunt Mack later.

Senator LODGE. There is some division on this question?

Mr. MACK. Yes. The newer element of Jews in this country who largely are not yet American citizens recognize that division and claim there is a Jewish race - that it is historical-and they want to re-create it as a nation. They really claim the Jewish nation rather than the Jewish race. A Jewish nation nonexistent at present they would like to reestablish as one of the great political nations of the world.

Senator LODGE. Like the Poles?

Mr. MACK. Yes. The Poles classify themselves not racially as Poles; they classify themselves nationally as Poles because at one time they were a nation and they want to reestablish that nation. I am very sure a majority of Jews who are American citizens care nothing about the reestablishment of the Jewish nation as a nation and therefore do not feel themselves nationally Jews. They certainly do not feel themselves racially Jews although they are proud of the achievements of all the men who have been born Jews so far as those men have given them cause to be proud of it. They are proud of their Jewish ancestry, but in no other sense.

Senator LODGE. They are proud of their race and justly so.

Mr MACK. They are proud of their people.

Mr WOLF. I have maintained a hundred times yes a thousand times before Committees of Congress and everywhere else that they are proud of their people.

Mack, throughout, tried to force attention to the injurious implications of classifying

generations of Americans by 'race.' Once again, he does not manage to take the discussion far down that road.

Mr. MACK. My father was a foreigner who came here when he was 13 years old.

Senator LODGE. You would be classified as of foreign parentage.

Mr. MACK. I would be classified by you racially as a native-born child of the Jewish race.

REPRESENTATIVE BENNET (to Mr. Husband). How would he be classified under our school inquiry?

Mr. HUSBAND. Just according to what he said his parents were.

Mr. MACK. If I said my father was a Jew, born in Germany, you would put me down as a Jew in race. . . . You would amaze me if you did it There is one practical reason to be interposed against this classification, particularly in dealing with people who are here. To stir up race feeling is, as we all know, highly injurious. You are not classifying the Protestants and the Catholics in any manner racially, but you are classifying the Jews. . . . [Y]ou immediately raise

the feeling that they are of a foreign race; that they are foreign to us; that they are not Americans the same as we are.

Senator LODGE. We class the Germans as Germans. How can we do it otherwise? We are all immigrants.

Mack objects that There are immigrants and immigrants; Jews are distrusted whereas, the Germans (for example) and even the Irish are regarded reasonably favorably as "representatives of two great nations of the world." Now Lodge tries to get back to definitions, and they trade terms and criteria for classification, until Senator Dillingham, the Chairman, pushes them to conclude.

Senator LODGE. Is there an Irish nation?

Mr. MACK They want to be very strongly. They would resent being called Englishmen.

Senator LODGE. They would, and I would resent it if I were an Irishman An Irishman is classified as an Irishman no matter where he comes from.

Mr. MACK. No matter whether he believes in home rule or not.

SENATOR LODGE. No matter what country he comes from-whether Australia or Canada.

REPRESENTATIVE BENNET. Has not one of your coreligionists who comes from Russia the same right, when he gets to Ellis Island, to say he is a Jew that an Irishman who comes from Belgium has to say he is an Irishman?

Mr. MACK. I should say not, because the Irishman who comes from Belgium undoubtedly is still

an English subject. He is an Irishman But . . . The question I was addressing myself to was your classification of Americans in America.

SENATOR LODGE. We are not classifying Americans in America.

THE CHAIRMAN [Senator Dillingham]. It seems to me Mr. Wolf's contention would come to this: we would be compelled to go back of the whole question of race and take them by their political associations.

SENATOR LODGE. The classification, of course, would be worthless.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

JEWISH PROTESTS AGAINST WOLF AND MACK AND THE AJC RETREAT, DECEMBER, 1909-FEBRUARY, 1910

The Wolf and Mack testimonies at the Immigration Commission hearing received immediate, and in some cases, outraged, attention from the Jewish press; many American Jews did feel that such German Jewish sensibilities represented them. The upshot was a series of angry protests, in the press and in correspondence both to the Immigration Commission itself and to the AJC. The AJC executive was in a particularly awkward position, since it had not sent Mack to make such statements, but it had sent Mack, and many members of the executive committee no doubt agreed with Mack's statements.

The hearings had taken place on December 4th. On the 6th Friedenwald reported on the hearings to Mayer Sulzberger, President of the AJC. His major concern was the likely restrictionist recommendations of the Immigration Commission, but he also offered this summary of the discussion on racial classification, which he had attended.

I accompanied Judge Mack to the hearing . . . Mr. Simon Wolf was also present and presented an argument against the classification of Hebrews as a race. . . His argument was very general and not very convincing, and I think made little impression. . . Senator Lodge asked particularly searching questions which were very difficult to answer, and it was plain that the attitude of the Commission [is fixed]. . . After Mr. Wolf got through Judge Mack spoke on the same subject, and made a more convincing argument than Mr Wolf, though I doubt [any]. . . effect.

By the 13 Mayer Sulzberger, head of the AJC was asking Friedenwald, his Secretary, to check with other executive board members on a meeting to discuss AJC action on immigration questions generally. Two days later, Friedenwald wrote back to Sulzberger that indeed Executive Committee members thought they should meet, and not least because they were uncomfortable about what had been said by Wolf and Mack.

One member of the Executive Committee especially held views that differed sharply from those presented at the hearings; Judah Magnes was a young reform rabbi, in a sense *the* reform rabbi, since he was already at the head of New York's aristocratic Temple Emanu-El; but his interests in the Jewish people's living cultural forms had always been much broader than that of German-Jewish reform, and were becoming ever-more so. By the time of this episode he had established the New York Kehillah, a city-wide organization meant to represent

all Jews, of whatever religious orientation, including secular socialists. And he was favorably disposed to Zionist aspirations. [\(53\)](#) He was not the only member of the AJC Board who was uncomfortable with the Mack performance, but he was especially so, and his views therefore were not so unlike those of the Yiddish press. Friedenwald reported to Sulzberger,

As you know. . . the Yiddish press has been very condemnatory of Judge Mack's and Mr. Wolf's opposition to the classification of Hebrews among other races. Dr. Magnes is particularly up in arms. While I told him that Judge Mack expressed his individual views, he feels that it is generally regarded that he spoke for the committee, whereas he [Magnes] holds that the Committee has taken no position and that a statement to that effect should be issued. I have, so far, prevented him from making any public statement to this effect. . .

But others would make public statements. A Zionist society in Baltimore wrote to the Dillingham Commission to support "the stand taken by you that the Jews are a strongly identified race and that the present method of classifying immigrants, Jewish immigrants included, is the only useful one." [\(54\)](#) Eventually Magnes's organization, the New York City Kehillah also mounted an official protest, urging the AJC to disclaim "the statements made by Judge Mack to the fact that the Jews are not a race. . . . believing that we are both race and a nation." [\(55\)](#)

Friedenwald was also hearing from the other side. Mack wrote to Friedenwald soon after the hearings to say he had hoped for stronger AJC public backing for his statement and a clear declaration that what he had said was in fact AJC policy. [\(56\)](#) Moreover, Mack enclosed a letter he had himself received from David Phillipson, a reform leader very supportive of Mack's traditional line, and troubled by the absence of a clear AJC statement. Phillipson added,

I fear however that your efforts [to end the racial classification of Hebrews] will be hampered so long as the 'nationalist' nonsense continues to be advocated in pulpits as prominent as Emanuel of New York; witness the recent address entitled "Reform on a nationalist Basis."

In any case, Friedenwald could soon write (no doubt with some relief), "at it's meeting of December 28, 1909, the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee resolved that it is unwise to make any further attempt to have the classification 'Hebrews' altered as no good purpose can at this time be served by further agitation of the subject." [\(57\)](#)

OTHER IMMIGRANT PROTESTS TO DROPPING RACE; A. HOURWICH'S LANGUAGE SOLUTION

Notwithstanding the concern of some Jewish groups about the racial classifications, many Southern and Eastern European immigrants were disgusted at being listed only by country of birth, and therefore only as members of one of the multi-national empires that were oppressing their people. For example, these 'races or peoples' were being classified either as Russian or Austro-Hungarian by country of birth: Armenian; Bohemian and Moravian; Croatian and Slovenian; Dalmatian, Bosnian and Herzegovinian; Finn; German; Hebrew; Lithuanian; Magyar; Pole; Russian; Ruthenian; and Slovak. By late 1909, then, the Census Bureau was being pressed to add more ethnic information not only by the powerful members of the

Immigration Commission, but also by immigrant groups themselves, and others such as social work groups. [\(58\)](#)

Faced with the conflicting demands of different interest groups, the Director of the Census, Dana Durand, called a conference of interested parties. We don't have a fulsome record of that conference, but we do have the recollections of one apparently crucial participant. Isaac A. Hourwich was a Russian Jewish immigrant himself, who attained a PhD in economics. By 1910, he was in fact working as a federal government statistician. He published in several languages--Russian and Yiddish as well as English--and is best remembered today for *Immigration and Labor*, the earliest authoritative critique of the findings of the 41 volumes of Immigration Commission Reports, and in many ways the most memorable critique because it showed how the supposed racial or cultural differences between old and new immigrant groups in fact were reducible to differences in length of residence, immigrant occupational experience in Europe and similar factors. But in early 1910, this work of Hourwich lay in the future. [\(59\)](#)

Hourwich later recalled that it was he who had suggested a solution to the Census Bureau conference on the race question: namely use of a mother-tongue question instead. His own description (in Yiddish) is interesting for its terminology as well as for the gritty narrative.

In 1898 the official immigration statistics began to indicate nationality of arriving immigrants and the Jews were for the first time listed as a specific nationality [nationalitaet]. Against this, the American German-Jewish elite [*Amerikaner Yahudim*] protested strongly that this would stimulate anti-Semitic tendencies, but their protests did not help.

There is no doubt that the classification by nationalities [*nationaliteten*] is the result of race hatred [*raasen-has*] against the immigrants which has increased greatly in the recent period. . . [It is] directed not against the Jews alone, but against the Italians, Poles and other Slavic nationalities

[At the 1910 Senate Census Committee hearings, the nationality question encountered] sharply questioned from the Jewish Senator Guggenheim. He argued that the Jews are not at all a nationality but a religious sect, and [constitutional provisions ensuring religious freedom prohibit state inquiry into religion]. . . . Well, when a Jewish Senator says no one should ask Jews whether they are Jewish, obviously the gentile senators, out of deference to their colleague, will not insist on the question: it is no great matter [*grosse dayge*] whether one will have statistics about Jews or not; and the question was eliminated.

. . . . [Later, Poles and Czechs protested that they would be enumerated as Austrians, Russians or Germans]. Congress asked the Director of the Census for his opinion . . . the Director convened a conference of all the census experts . . . It had become a delicate question: on the one hand the Jewish senator doesn't want the nationality question; on the other side, leaders of the Poles and Czechs [wanted their nationalities enumerated] . . . I proposed that one could pose a question concerning 'mother tongue' -- that is not about religion at all.

Thus the origin of the mother-tongue question as a replacement for the 'race' question to distinguish among European immigrants. Before discussing this step in the narrative more fully, I want to draw attention to I. A. Hourwich's usage of race and related terms. Hourwich

speaks clearly of 'race-hatred' to describe anti-immigrant sentiments in the United States; yet he never once uses the word race in connection with the Immigration Commission's 'race or people' classification scheme--always the term 'nationality' appears. This is no accident; when he published *Immigration and Labor* in 1912, his monumental critique of the Commission's *Report*, his usage was similar. In that work, he castigated the Commission for organizing their data, and in particular data on economic trends, around the racial classification. Not that a careful study of the immigrant in the economy would have been inappropriate, he insists. Quite the contrary, "the popular prejudice against the new immigrant races justified an unbiased comparative study of their social and economic conditions in the United States." The problem, rather was that the Commission staff "were themselves so completely under the sway of popular sentiments that they perceived the effect of race differences" everywhere, discarding even a concern for tiny, biased samples of evidence.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Indeed it would seem as if they "proceeded upon the supposition that immigrant races represented separate zoological species." And thus, "The adoption of the 'race' idea as the basis for a classification has inevitably led to" presentation of tiny numbers in table cells (in order to preserve the racial differences).⁽⁶¹⁾ But Hourwich had no time to quibble over the terms: he was not faulting the the Commission for using 'race' rather than 'nationality.' The point was the mistaken belief that behavior was determined by the differences along this dimension (denoted as race or nationality) rather than by more or less universal patterns of economic behavior, for example responses to job market opportunities for individuals of differing skill levels. But the argument still allows the race usage. Thus, he stresses the principle that immigration is most often an economic movement, and that "it is obvious that the immigrant's standard of living in his own country must have been below the American standard. This is as true of the old as of the new immigration." Of course, there are exceptions in the migrations of the politically persecuted, nevertheless, since 1890,

"of all the races which have come to this country, the Jews, the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Russians, the Finns and the Armenians, have furnished the only immigrants of this class. As to all others it was just the higher standard of living of the American wage-earner that induced them, like most races that preceded them, to emigrate to the United States."⁽⁶²⁾

The point is that even so vehement a critique of the Commission's methods and assumptions--a critic whose principal argument was that the Commission mistakenly placed the racial classification at the center of its explanatory framework--himself has no trouble using the term race in the sense of 'people' or 'nationality'. For some the term race brought with it one underlying set of beliefs (and excluded contrary beliefs)--for example, for Henry Cabot Lodge, race usage probably implied (at least for some races) a sense in the basic persistence of crucially important group characteristics over very long historical periods, with little likelihood that those could be changed (whether those rested in biology, and if so by what mechanisms is actually a more minor point). However, clearly Hourwich found such views--not to speak of the more precise formulations that would come from Madison Grant--contemptible trash. Yet he was able to use the racial terminology in the looser way.

Neither in his Yiddish article nor in the long book does he comment on the usage matter explicitly. However, in the second edition of *Immigration and Labor*, published in 1922, when the race discourse around him has hardened, and become more of a touchstone to a range of beliefs, he does comment in his new preface,

"Immigration is treated in this book solely as an economic question [for, despite other sources of opposition and prejudice, it was the economic issues that drove the policy debates on immigration restriction] . . . Our statesmen in Washington took scant notice of the academic disquisitions in the domains of anthropology, ethnology, sociology, eugenics and political science, which presented the old arguments of the Know-Nothings dressed up in a modern scientific garb. [\(63\)](#)

Yet Hourwich himself has no trouble using the term race, nor did he see a need to change the usage for the second edition.

Now, why was 'mother tongue' an acceptable compromise whereas 'race' was not. The answer, it now seems clear, is not that race was perceived by opponents primarily as a term that involved clearly pejorative and fatalistic implications about unassimilable races--not in 1910 when the battle was fought out.

Given the alignment of forces--the fact that the only strong opposition was coming from the AJC--the question inevitably emerges, how did the AJC react to the Hourwich compromise? I have not found explicit AJC discussion of the matter, and the point itself is revealing. It may be, simply that Hourwich was right: that his compromise met the AJC objections, since many Jews spoke Yiddish, including very nearly all recent Jewish immigrants to America, other Jews did not, including some in America (not least the second and third generation of mid-century Jewish immigrants from Germany). Thus one could not say that for Jews religion and mother tongue were coextensive the way one could say that religion and race were coextensive for Jews. Still, as Lodge and others never tired of saying, even religion and race were not fully coextensive, and certainly, Jews would be the only religious group in the Yiddish-mother tongue category. Thus it does not take a staggering act of imagination to see Wolf or even Mack or Marshall or Friedenwald protesting this new compromise. The fact that they apparently did not fight it is related, I think, to the rest of the developments of the prior year: the vehement protests from other immigrant groups, from social workers, from the many 'east-side' Jews who protested the Wolf and Mack claims, and even to the dissension of Judah Magnes with the AJC executive board itself. This potato was best dropped.

Whether Hourwich's role in the language compromise was as central as he later would recall, I cannot say. Surely, as the Folkmar testimony at the Senate Census Committee in particular shows, others understood that they could treat language as the classification rather than treat language as the only explicit criterion in a race classification. The idea reverberated through ethnology, and in addition, as both Folkmar and Hourwich stressed, it was not unusual in east-European Censuses. Still, it is quite possible that Hourwich's recollection is correct as to the specific: that he raised the solution at the crucial moment in Durand's conference at the Census Bureau.

In any case, Durand urged, and Congress easily accepted, the amendment to add the mother tongue question to the 1910 Census. Since the Census forms had already been printed and distributed without this question, urgent last-minute supplemental instructions were added, squeezing mother tongue into the space originally intended only for birthplace, and parents' mother tongues into the space originally intended only for parents' birthplaces. The discussion in Congress was brief, but it again revealed some of the uncertainty as to terms and the appeals to many immigrant groups who supported what a portion of the Jewish groups opposed. The connection to the original race amendment is clear as well as the

studious avoidance of the mention of Jewish immigrant.

MR. CRUMPACKER. . . There are countries in Europe. . . where political division is not a correct designation or a true criterion of the question of nationality or race, or racial distinction. [Examples include] Russia, Austria and Turkey . . . the Kingdom of Great Britain . . . [So] The object of the proposed resolution is to classify the alien-born population of the United States according to race or mother tongue as far as it can be done Those people feel a just attachment to mother country. . . and this great body of adopted citizens have petitioned Congress to make the classification. . . . a large delegation. . . visited this city last week. . . .

MR. SABATH [who proposed the act in the House] . . . Its main purpose is to preserve in the census statistics the various nationalities of our foreign-born population coming principally from Austria-Hungary and Russia. A great many thousands of Bohemians, Poles, Lithuanians and numerous classes of Slavs would lose their identity with respect to their nationalities in the enumeration under the present Census act. [\(64\)](#)

Sabath, who was now active among the supporters of the mother tongue amendment, had been among the congressmen working with the AJC against the race amendment back in January, 1909. Now, in April, 1910, everyone was lining up in favor. [\(65\)](#)

THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION REPORTS AND THE 1910 CENSUS ON RACE CLASSIFICATIONS

As Hourwich was to observe soon after the Immigration Commission *Reports* appeared, the work is organized around the race classification. And so it is not surprising not only that a volume is devoted to the classification, but also that the nature of the Jewish protest is discussed explicitly in the introductory summary. The Commissioners note that the racial classification scheme originated with the Bureau of Immigration a decade before.

In this connection it may be explained the the Commission, like the bureau, uses the term "race" in a broad sense, the distinction being largely a matter of language and geography, rather than the physical characteristics such as determines the various more restricted racial classifications in use, the most common of which divides mankind into only five races. . . . In most European countries population statistics, including censuses, are recorded by the racial or language classification. . . . When the bill providing for the census of 1910 was under consideration in Congress, the Senate, at the instance of the Immigration Commission, inserted an amendment that the foreign-born should be recorded by race as well as by place of birth, but the provision was eliminated from the bill in conference. Later however, the [mother tongue question was approved]. . . . By this amendment the result desired by the Commission will be essentially attained.

Once again, the operational meaning of race can be captured by linguistic distinctions, whatever one may mean by race beyond those distinctions. Here again, the disclaimer sounds remarkably like that of the Census Bureau explaining in our own time that race is used not as a scientific term but as one inherited from the domain of law and bureaucratic procedure. But this usage, derived from the Bureau of Immigration is rather a long way from the statement the Bureau issued to clarify its instructions for classification of race or people on the passenger list forms in the very same year that the Immigration Commission was publishing its *Report* : "The original stock or blood shall be the basis of the classification

independent of language. The mother tongue is to be used only to assist in determining the original stock"[\(66\)](#)

The introduction to the Commission *Report* proceeds to note that only from one group, the Jews, had objections to the racial classification been raised. The introduction cites the Wolf and Mack testimony, as well as subsequent correspondence other Jewish groups criticizing the Wolf-Mack position, and concludes simply that "the terms in question [Hebrew race or people] are used interchangeably to designate a religion as well as a race or people, but the commission has employed them only in the latter sense."

In the Census Bureau's own reports, published in 1913, *Population 1910: General Report and Analysis*, the introductory material to relevant chapters leaves one with the impression of multiple authors, with different sensitivity to the debates we have followed. Thus the chapter on the "Country of Birth of the Foreign Born" begins with a usage of race that seems to fit right in with the work of the Bureau of Immigration.

On account of the variety of races represented among the immigrants from certain foreign countries, the Bureau of the Census has avoided the use of such terms as "Germans," "Russians," "Austrians," etc. . . . Confusion would arise from identifying country of birth with race or nationality. Persons born in Germany, for example, not all Germans, but include Poles, Hebrews, and others. . . [\(67\)](#)

These Census Bureau authors, then, like their senators, do not seem to know whether 'Pole' and 'Hebrew' designate 'race or nationality;' the term 'people' has dropped out. By contrast, A long chapter on the children of the foreign-born is extremely cautious in justifying the work: "Interest attaches not only to the statistics of persons born in specified foreign countries, but also to the statistics regarding the native children of persons born in those countries, that is, persons of foreign parentage or of mixed parentage."[\(68\)](#) Why 'interest attaches' is not the obligation of these narrowly focused demographers to explain. Comments such as Powderly's back in 1899 that an Irishman remains Irish even if he moves to England, a Hebrew remains of that race whatever his country of birth, comments such as Lodge's along the same lines, Gugenheim's and his colleagues concerns about the number of generations for which European 'races' should be noted Among Americans--from all such concerns the authors of this chapter stay far away.

Appropriately enough, some awareness of the problems of classification and terms shows up best in the new chapter on "Mother Tongue of the Foreign White Stock;" this, after all, is the topic added as a result of the debates on races. The chapter Introduction includes a subsection "Mother tongue in relation to ethnic stock," Neither of the other two chapters used the term 'ethnic;' this chapter used the term without definition.

In most cases the returns for mother tongue may be taken as indicative of ethnic stock. The principal exception to this rule appears in the case of persons reported as English and Celtic, this group including four ethnically distinct peoples, namely, the English, the Irish, the Scotch, and the Welsh. In the case of these people country of origin statistics come much nearer showing ethnic composition than do mother tongue statistics While English and Celtic as a mother tongue covers more than one group of people, the opposite is true of Yiddish, which is the mother tongue of only part of the Hebrews, the others being returned as speaking Polish Russian, German, etc. A comparison of the returns for mother tongue made by

persons born in Russia, Austria, and Germany, however, with the returns on "race" given for immigrants in the reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, indicates that the census returns on Yiddish-speaking people give a fairly complete enumeration of the foreign-born Hebrews in the United States. [\(69\)](#)

The only use of the term 'race' in this explanation is in quotation marks, and it refers to the Immigration Commission reports. 'People' floats loosely in the text, but usually as a plural of person. The rest of the chapter's methodological introduction concerns how to classify languages into groups. This context would have been a fine opportunity for many authors to discuss historical factors about which races and peoples were part of one family, and hence why their languages are also of one family; but there is only one brief mention of this sort of thinking in the text (which otherwise stays at the level of 'language groups'): the Albanian and Turkish languages are listed near each other "because of the close relation of the two races geographically, socially, and politically." With the exception of this usage of 'race,' the chapter avoids the reliance on the concept so widespread in the discussions we have observed and common too in the other relevant chapters of the same census volume.

EPILOGUE: LATER USE OF THE RACE OR PEOPLE CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

In the end, the questions on mother tongue and parental mother tongues, were asked in the 1920 Census as well. The race or people classification scheme was used by the United States immigration authorities until well after World War II, on passenger lists and in the annual *Reports* of the immigration authorities. The Jewish groups who had opposed the classification before 1910 occasionally did so in the coming years as well. Thus in 1922 Wolf makes his pitch again, this time to W. W. Husband, who has risen to the post of Commissioner-General of Immigration. The latter tells Wolf that "I am very familiar with past discussions over this subject" and reminds him of the 1910 hearings. [\(70\)](#) The following year, Max Kohler, son of a leading reform rabbi and himself a very active attorney on issues of Jewish and other immigrants' civil rights, testifies on the subject before a House Committee on Immigration. [\(71\)](#) Interestingly, however, Kohler changed his mind soon after these hearings; and the reasons why he did so reflect the developments of the early twenties and presage those of the thirties and forties. In 1927, Husband and Kohler had reminisced about the matter (appropriately enough, the occasion being Wolf's death). Husband told Kohler that the race classification had never meant to classify by Jews by religion, and that "The classification of races or peoples was little more than a classification of mother tongue groups." To some extent, this formulation was the effect of hindsight, and the compromise over mother tongue; back in 1909, at the Senate hearings, and at the Immigration Commission during the same time, Husband was less clear that race usage could be reduced to language. In any case, Kohler writes back that he has come to believe the Bureau's classification scheme was justified after all.

"For some purposes at least, we Hebrews constitute a race [And so] there is no adequate objection. . . to classifying Hebrew immigrants on ship's manifests as 'Hebrews' by race, while at the same time specifying their nationality. . . [I]t is practically a designation of 'language.' . . [I]t is their misfortune that this is also practically synonymous with their religion and therefore happens to be a religious classification, incidently, though not exclusively."

What influenced Kohler was the increasing weight he now gave to the many statements that

Jews were something more than co-religionists--a 'race' perhaps, certainly a 'people. 'He does, nevertheless, make a point of taking issue with a statement of Husband's that the Commission members had never been interested in "the religious beliefs or connections of any immigrants." That is more than he can stomach: he cannot "acquiesce in that view as to certain members of the Commission."

Now, in thinking back from the vantage of 1927, to the debates ca. 1910,, Kohler takes the argument in a new direction.

I think the action of the Commission, in conducting all its investigations in terms of race, was most deplorable and greatly injured the position of millions of residents of our country, and was a great blow at true American ideals. . . It led logically to Quota Laws, based on racial distinctions and preferences, which I abhor, while conceding that the War required new methods of restricting immigration.[\(72\)](#)

If Husband responded to Kohler's letter, the answer has been lost.

This argument may have been clear to some participants earlier--for example in 1909 when Cyrus Adler asks the attorney Brylawski to look into the use of the term race in federal legislation, or when Mack argues for the political importance of the race classification with Lodge in 1910, or in Hourwich's critiques of 1912. Now, after the quota law success and its explicit connection with racial thinking, Kohler recognizes the evil of race for its own sake. Still, there is no evidence here that race means any more than ethnicity or nationality or peoplehood. Any of these terms could have served as the basis of a dreadfully misguided immigration policy, even without fulsome detail about unassimilable groups.

Thus the Quota Laws, and the rhetoric around them, changed the concerns over races and peoples; almost certainly, the increasing dominance of the east-European Jewish elements over the older, much smaller, German-Jewish elite in American Jewish life also dampened the old concerns of Jewish opposition to the classification scheme. In the interwar years, the most striking challenge to the racial classification came not from the Jews but from the Mexicans. Their numbers had risen after the 1910 Mexican Revolution and by the late twenties, the Census Bureau officials were considering how to handle the classification of the Mexicans in racial terms. They did not fit neatly, as the officials of our own times were to rediscover, into the available racial (color) categories: black, white, red or yellow. In the 1930 Census therefore, the course of (apparent) least resistance was used, and a category for a Mexican race was added. But Mexican Americans, aided by the Mexican Government, protested and the category was dropped before the next Census. The Mexican protest, logically enough, was extended also to the classifications of the immigration authorities, and 'Mexican' was accordingly dropped from the list of races and peoples, where it had been used for over three decades. Mexicans were now 'white' or 'other' by race and people. The Mexican chapter highlights how the bureaucracy responded to the potential intellectual challenge to the whole classification system: first by adding a category for 'Mexican' race in the narrowly American definitional system and then by deleting that category from both the narrow racial classification of the Census and the wider 'race or people' system of the immigration authorities without taking on the contentious task of rethinking either classification system as a whole.

Then, in 1943, two years into American hostilities with the Nazi regime, the Commissioner

General of immigration (possibly at the suggestion of some Jewish groups) removed the 'Hebrew' classification from the list of races and peoples. The list itself remained; probably, it still seemed to have some value in sorting by ethnicity or peoplehood rather than by citizenship--although surely its value was vastly decreased after the collapse of the prewar multinational empires. However, there was another point: the congressional mandate in immigration legislation included collection of 'race' information. Quite apart from concern to enumerate immigrants who had black blood, the immigration laws of course treated Oriental and European immigrants very differently. The race or people classification was the manner in which the Bureau of Immigration collected the mandated race data. Had they taken up the thorny issue of modifying the manner of collecting race data, it would have been with the need to collect the data in some other manner. In the end, probably four considerations explained the persistence of the classification scheme through the World War II era, even after the Hebrews had been dropped from the list--first, the continuing residual value of European peoplehood data, second, the congressional mandate for race information of some kind (albeit not necessarily on Europeans) third, the political difficulties in getting involved in wholesale reclassification and fourth, the argument about consistency and continuity with past statistics. The upshot was that the system remained in place, with all immigrants classified by race or people--with Mexicans listed in that scheme as 'white' and Jews listed under the racial group of the country of origin (e. g. 'Russians') or where no such race existed, as 'white'--they and the Mexicans being the only immigrants listed as 'white.' [\(73\)](#)

However this time the opposition among American Jews comprised above all those of east-European Jewish origin who were themselves either recent immigrants from eastern Europe or those actively involved with that culture. In particular, the YIVO Institute, the leading Institute of Jewish research took the leading role in clarifying the issues. YIVO had been founded in Vilna before the First World War, and had moved briefly to Paris and then permanently to New York during the Second. Most of its writings were published in the Yiddish language, writings of cultural and social history as well as of a social-scientific nature. Its interest, in other words, was in the Jews as an independent people with its own religion and a wider distinctive culture; Zionism might be one response to the needs of this people, but was not necessarily the only or best response. YIVO affiliates and other like-minded scholars naturally thought that in order to aid the European-Jewish remnant after the worst catastrophe of its long history, and more generally to understand Jewish history, the solution of making Jewish numbers invisible to American immigration authorities and Census takers was a travesty. When some of these YIVO scholars learned that the United States Immigration Bureau was now set to drop 'Hebrew' from its list of races and peoples--they protested bitterly. Soon enough, they must have discovered just how complex the issue was, and just how long it had been a matter of tortured debate, in which the interests of the Jewish immigrants were far from clear: was better data the desideratum, or the lowest levels of anti-Semitism?

Accordingly, in 1944, YIVO sent out a questionnaire to many American experts--mostly general social scientists, but also some Jewish scholars. This was a long way from the list to which Simon Wolf had written many decades earlier, but the goal was somewhat similar: to clarify 'expert' response to the question of how Jews and immigrants generally should be classified given the complex considerations. Fully 140 people responded; the list of those who did reads like a *Who's Who?* of American social science in these years.

YIVO published the results in 1945, along with three essays that show the Institute's own

concerns very well. One is a thought piece by Jacob Lestchinsky arguing for retaining the classification of Jews in some form; Lestchinsky was an important demographer of east-European Jewish life, removed for the moment to New York. A second was an historical description of the Jews in the race and people classification by the professor of American Jewish sociology at Yeshiva University, Nathan Goldberg. A third paper (by YIVO affiliate and Yiddish professor Max Weinreich) evaluated the issues in the responses. All three represented in different ways polar opposites of the old AJC leadership, as far as the American Jewish population was concerned. Yet now it is Weinreich who seems to be well aware of the limitations of drawing too much attention to Jews by having federally-gathered statistics on them.

And so now the matter evolved fairly quickly to its end; the race or people category was dropped for the Jews. Like the Mexicans, they were now whites or others to the immigration authorities, and to the Census enumerators they were designated as whites by race and as members of whatever birthplace group they listed. Mother tongue was a less burning question as the old waves of immigration receded (and the new still lay in the future); but when the question was asked the children of Jewish immigrants might indicate Yiddish (parental mother tongue was never asked again after the 1920 census).

Within a few years, the whole race or people classification was abandoned in favor of birthplace and language for Europeans. The problems of a multinational birthplace seemed minor after the border changes of two world wars--all four of the great prewar empires (Austro-Hungarian, German, Russian and Ottoman) had disappeared after the first war, and the residual advantages of specifying ethnic identity (more clearly than by birthplace alone) seemed distasteful after the second war. Still, the distinctions were not so distasteful that race disappeared altogether from the immigration forms -- only that it disappeared among Europeans; the five color divisions were preserved.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Margo J., and Stephen E. Fienberg. 1999. *Who Counts? The Politics of Census-taking In Contemporary America* . New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Archdeacon, Thomas. 1984. *Becoming American : An Ethnic History* . New York: Collier Macmillan.

Brinton, Daniel G. 1890. *Races and Peoples : Lectures on the Science of Ethnography*. New York: NDC Hodges.

Conarroe, Joel. 2000. "Guggenheim, Simon." *American National Biography*. February. Online at <http://www.anb.org/index.html>.

Forcey, Charles B. 2000. "Powderly, Terence Vincent." *American National Biography*. February. Online at <http://www.anb.org/index.html>.

Gleason, Phillip. 1980. "American Identity and Americanization." In Thernstrom, Stephan, ed. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* . Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Goren, Arthur A. 1970. *New York Jews and the Quest for Community: The Kehillah Experiment, 1908-1922* . New York: Columbia University Press.

Handlin, Oscar. 1957. *Race and Nationality in American Life* . Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.

Higham, John. 1992. *Strangers In the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* . 2nd ed. New York: Rutgers University Press, Ryerson Press.

Hourwich, Isaac A. 1917. "The Jews in America: A Statistical Overview from the Recent Census." In *Selected Works* [Yiddish], vol. 2. New York: I. A. Hourwich Publication Committee, 97-104.

-----, 1922. *Immigration and Labor: The Economic Aspects of European Immigration to the United States* . New York: B. W. Heubsch.

Hutchinson, E. P. 1981. *Legislative History of American Immigration Policy, 1798-1965* . Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. 1909. "The Restriction of Immigration: Speech In the Senate, March 16, 1896." In *Speeches and Addresses* , 1884-1909 by Henry Cabot Lodge. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 245-66.

Magnes, Judah Leon. 1982. In Goren, Arthur A., ed. *Dissenter in Zion: From the Writings of Judah L. Magnes* . Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nagel, Charles. 1911. "Address." In *Thirty- Seventh Annual Report*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 6617-35.

Nobles, Melissa. 2000. *Shades of Citizenship: Race and the Census in Modern Politics* . Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Powderly, Terrence V. 1940. *The Path I Trod: The Autobiography of Terrence V. Powderly* . Carman, Harry J. et al., eds. New York: Columbia University Press.

Safford, Victor. 1925. *Immigration Problems: Personal Experiences of an Official* . New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

Skerry, Peter. 2000. *Counting on the Census?: Race, Group Identity, and the Evasion of Politics*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1913. "Population. General Report and Analytical Tables." In *Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910* , vol. I. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Chapters vii-ix.

U. S. Bureau of Immigration. 1898-1912. *Annual Report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year Ended . . . (ARCGI)* . Washington, D.C.: USGPO

U. S. Congress. 1909. "Hearings Before the Committee on the Census of the Senate on the Bill (H. R. 1033) to Provide for the Thirteenth and Subsequent Decennial Censuses." 1st Session, 61st Congress. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 29-42.

U. S. Congress, 1909-1910. *Congressional Record* . Washington, D.C.: USGPO.

U. S. Immigration Commission. 1911. 1907-1910 [USIC] *Reports of the Immigration Commission*. Vol. 1, "Abstract of Reports," vol. 5, "Dictionary of Races and Peoples," vol. 41, Statements and Recommendations Submitted by Societies." Washington, D.C.: USGPO.

U. S. Industrial Commission. 1901. *Reports of the Industrial Commission on Immigration, Including Testimony*. . . Vol. XV. Washington, D.C.: USGPO .

Weil, Patrick. 1996. "Races at the Gate: The Rise and Fall of Racial Distinctions in the American Immigration Policy, 1898-1952." Unpublished paper. Institut d'etudes politique de Paris.

Wolf, Simon. 1899. "Report of Board of Delegates on Civil and Religious Rights." In *Twenty-Seventh Annual Report*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 4121-4.

----- . 1918. *The Presidents I Have Known from 1860-1918* . Washington, D.C.: Press of

B.S. Adams.

----- . 1926. *Selected Addresses and Papers of Simon Wolf* . Cincinnati, Ohio: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Yiddish Scientific Institute [YIVO]. 1945. *The Classification of Jewish Immigrants and its Implications: A Survey of Opinion; 140 Replies to a Questionnaire and Papers by Nathan Goldberg, Jacob Lestchinsky, and Max Weinreich*. New York:YIVO.

Manuscript Collections

American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS). Correspondence of Max Kohler.

American Jewish Committee (AJC) Archives. Correspondence of Mayer Sulzberger, Herbert Friedenwald, Cyrus Adler, and Julian Mack.

United States National Archives, microfilmed passenger lists (on forms, including instructions).

1. Melissa Nobles, *Shades of Citizenship*; Peter Skerry, *Counting on the Census?* and Margo Anderson and Stephan Fienberg, *Who Counts?* are early examples of such studies.

2. In 1907, the United States Immigration Commission was established by act of Congress to investigate all aspects of the immigration question. It eventually (1911) issued forty-one volumes of reports. On the cultural and political history of immigration, race and restriction see, for example, Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, chapter 6; Archdeacon, *Becoming*

American , chapter 6; Gleason, "American Identity and Americanization"; Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life* , chapters iv and v.

3. *ARCGI* , 1898 33-3. For all abbreviations in notes, see Bibliography.

4. *ARCGI* , 1899, 5.

5. Hutchinson, *Legislative history of American Immigration Policy*, 536-9.

6. Forcey, "Powderly, Terence Vincent," *American National Biography*; Powderly, *The Path I Trod*; Safford, *Immigration problems*; Weil, "Races at the Gate;" YIVO, *Classification of Jewish immigrants*," 90-94.

7. In some cases we have evidence of the reclassification because it is written somewhere on the form (typically next to "nationality"). In other cases, there is no marking on the extant forms. Perhaps these manuscripts were erroneously excluded from the pre-1903 racial counts; more likely, the official making the count simply kept the results on another sheet of paper and then aggregated the results and reported those to Washington.

8. The supplemental form may have been used at some other immigration stations too; I have not checked the records of most smaller immigration stations. I am grateful to Professor Ira Glazier for first calling the existence of the supplemental form to my attention.

9. To be precise: the supplemental form is found on the microfilm reels of the passenger lists for the port of New York, and not on the reels for a few other ports that I could easily check. I cannot rule out the possibility that such a form was in use at all immigration stations, but was only included in the microfilm reels for the Port of New York.

10. "Race or people" was originally listed as one of two items under a broader heading "nationality"; the other item under that heading was "country." However, some reconceptualization was clearly in progress, for after less than two years the form was changed slightly so that "race or people" was listed under its own heading. All quotations from the instructions for filling out the passenger lists are from the printed forms of the indicated year, found on printed copies of the forms in the National Archives microfilm series for the passenger lists.

11. See *ARCGI* , 1899-1903. Thus in 1902 the discussion of a detailed Table III, which cross-tabulated various characteristics (sex, age, etc.) by "race or people" is introduced in the text discussion, "it is of importance to note the various races which contributed to the sum total . . . As was the case last year, the Italian race maintains the lead. . ." There then follows an abbreviated version of Table III, showing a dozen important groups only, and an "all other" category; in this abbreviated version, the relevant column is headed "race."

12. *ARCGI* , 1903, 42, 73--perhaps because these are not numbered tables, called for in advance of the report, but are built into the text or into special reports to the Commissioner General.

13. *ARCGI*, 1899, 13.

14. If I am correct in supposing that the supplemental form was not used at all at numerous immigration stations, then it would seem that the 1899 published table on immigrant religious affiliation must have involved some estimation. After all, the religion item was only asked on the supplemental form, while the published table is meant to include all immigrant arrivals.

15. Nagel, "Address", 6627, 6633.

16. Cited in Wolf, *Presidents*, 259-63. Powderly did not, in fact state in the annual *Reports* any alarm about Jewish immigrants, although his successor shortly thereafter came closer, annually stressing the shift in the racial origins of immigrants and the need for restriction.

17. Wolf's position on the classification issue in his own words: "I have never for a moment wavered from the opinion that, first, the Jew at present has no nationality other than that to which he has sworn allegiance, and to which he owes obedience; second, the Jew, as an immigrant should not be classified as belonging to a race, because he does not land as a Jew, but comes as a native of the country in which he was born; third, that if this question is to be treated from a scientific or ethnological standpoint, then all immigrants should be treated uniformly so as to give the benefit of the classification to the world at large; fourth, but that if the classification is religious then I most solemnly protest, as it is contrary to the spirit and genius of our institutions and the government is assuming functions that were never contemplated in the Constitution of the United States; the administrative functions are political, not religious." See *Presidents I have Known*, 239-41.

18. See for example Wolf, "Report," 1899, 4121-2 (which also includes the quote from the *American Hebrew*) and Wolf, *Presidents*, 238. Wolf claimed that the collection of data by religion had been abandoned and later (he implies years later) recommenced, but given the consistent listing of Hebrews, it is difficult to see what he meant.

19. It is true that the question on religion was eventually also discarded from the supplement to the passenger list forms in favor of the direct question on 'race or people' but that change occurred some four years later. Moreover, the list of races or peoples included Hebrews in exactly the same way in every year.

20. Wolf, *Presidents*, 241.

21. Roosevelt told Wolf, "It seemed to be somewhat of a moot question as to the proper qualification." Wolf, *Presidents*, 264.

22. Instructions were printed on the forms for each year; microfilmed copies at National Archives.

23. No longer a footnote on the form, this elaboration was now placed at the head of the list of races.

24. USCGI, *Report* (1904), 162.

25. It is possible, of course, but not likely, that Mason had been consulted earlier on the scheme for creating the basic classification scheme. It is not likely first because the

Reports do not tell us of such involvement, and second the testimony of McSweeney and Safford in the 1899 hearings of the Industrial Commission also do not mention anyone else's involvement in creating the categories. These individuals probably would have claimed the authority of Smithsonian expertise to justify their work if it had been available.

26. USCGI, 1908, 62.

27. Husband to Wheeler, December 15, 1908. A copy of this letter is found in the correspondence of Max Kohler, AJHS. Kohler and Husband corresponded in the late 1920s about classifying Hebrews as a race (see below) and in that context Husband mentioned the letter to Wheeler that he had written two decades before and eventually found a copy of it for Kohler. It is clear from this letter that Husband is well acquainted with the criticisms of the classification by Jewish groups. Wheeler writes to ask for a clarification of Commission usage, because of Jewish criticism, and Husband allows that "it is not new to me." But, he says, "race and not religion is intended. . . should the case of a Hebrew who had adopted Christianity come to the attention of the Commission, that person would be regarded as a Hebrew just the same." This letter was sent only 3 weeks prior to the introduction of the race issue into the 1910 Census Bill, described below.

28. USIC, *Dictionary of Races and Peoples*, 99-100.

29. All quotations from the *Dictionary* are from "Introductory," pages 1-8.

30. Husband to Wheeler, 12/15/08, AJHS.

31. *Congressional Record*, Senate, January 8, 1909, 625a.

32. Senate Hearings (H. R. 1033; 1909), 31.

33. Voluntary reports (about membership and so on) provided by religious organizations to government authorities was fine; required definition of religious status by citizens, on the census or in the immigration form was not.

34. AJC Archives.

35. Fulton M. Brylawski letter to Adler acknowledging the request, 1/11/1909. AJC Archives.

36. Friedenwald to Sulzberger, 1/12/09, AJC Archives. On the 14th, Fulton Brylawski reported to Friedenwald that he had a long meeting with Congressman Sabath, repeating all the arguments Friedenwald had given, and that the Sabath had promised to meet with House Committee Chair Crumpacker. Brylawski also caught up with Congressman Bates and had tried to reach other representatives. Brylawski to Friedenwald, 1/14/09, AJC Archives.

37. AJC Archives.

38. Copy of letter to Guggenheim, 1/12/09 AJC Archives.

39. Friedenwald letter 1/13/09; another followed the next day, adding more arguments, including the complex interracial mixing of Americans, notably Jews and that "None of the

scientific branches of the government have determined the meaning of the term 'race'. . ."

40. Conarro, "Guggenheim, Simon."

41. Guggenheim to Friedenwald, 1/13/09, AJC Archives.

42. Goldfogle to Friedenwald, 1/15/09, AJC Archives. *Congressional Record, Senate* , January 20, 1909, 1153b. To date, I have not been able to locate a transcript of the House-Senate conference committee of 1/15/09.

43. Friedenwald to Husband 1/21/09, AJC Archives.

44. All quotations from the hearings in this section are cited in the order they appear in United States Congress, "Hearings before the [Senate] committee on the census . . . , 29-42.

45. Barrett and Roediger, "In-between peoples. "

46. These hearings were eventually published in USIC, *Reports*, vol 41. Included there as an appendix is also a long brief filed in the case of an immigrant refused entry (160ff). Part of the brief argues at length against classifying Jewish immigrants as Hebrews (for the reasons already discussed). The brief was never part of a judgement because the immigration authorities reversed themselves in the particular case before a court case was completed. One of the brief's co-authors, Julian Mack, testified that day on a range of issues.

47. Wolf stated that "Some years ago this question arose in the Immigration Bureau, when Mr. Powderly was Commissioner-General, and I was invited to New York. We argued the matter there at length, and the Bureau finally came to the conclusion to eliminate the word "Jew" from the immigration list, and I supposed the subject had ended then and there. But it has been revived. . ." USIC, *Reports* , vol. 41, 267. Here again it appears that Wolf thought there had been an agreement to eliminate the category Jew; as indicated earlier, he may have been confusing a decision to end publication of statistics under the explicit heading of religion. In any case, it is difficult to understand what had been abandoned under Powderly that 'has been revived' since Powderly's time.

48. The extensive quotations from this hearing appear in order, from USIC, *Reports*, vol. 41, 265-75.

49. Compare this off-hand description in the hearing to the text of the Senate speech of 1896. In that speech, Lodge explained that The Germanic peoples, and especially the English subdivision, and therefore the American offshoot are distinctive in the history of races.

"They have been welded together by more than a thousand years of wars, conquests, migrations, and struggles, both at home and abroad, and in so doing they have attained a fixity and definiteness of national character unknown to any other people. . . . [In the words of Le Bon,] 'The English alone represent a race almost entirely fixed. In them, the ancient Briton, the Saxon, and the Norman have been effaced to form a new and very homogeneous type' " (261). These traits are fixed, not forever, no doubt but, for a long time, and beyond the power of environment or specifically education to change them in a lifetime. Lodge, "Restriction of Immigration"

50. "That which identifies a race and sets it apart from others is not to be found merely or ultimately in its physical appearance, its institutions, its laws, its literature, or even its language. These are in the last analysis only the expression or the evidence of race. The achievements of the intellect pass easily from land to land and from people to people. The telephone, invented but yesterday, is used to-day in China, in Australia, or in South Africa as freely as in the United States. . . . You can take a Hindoo and give him the highest education the world can afford. He has a keen intelligence. He will absorb the learning of Oxford, he will acquire the manners and habits of England, he will sit in the British Parliament, but you cannot make him an Englishman. . . . [I]t has taken six thousand years and more to create the differences which exist between them. You cannot efface those differences thus made, by education in a single life, because they do not rest upon the intellect. What, then, is the matter of race?]It is so impalpable that we can scarcely define it. . . . The men of each race possess an indestructible stock of ideas, traditions, sentiments, modes of thought, an unconscious inheritance from their ancestors, upon which argument has no effect." Lodge, "Restriction of Immigration," 261-2. On new immigrants see 259-60 and 265-6.

51. William R. Wheeler, former Assistant Commissioner of Commerce and Labor, was one of the three Immigration Commission members who was not a Congressman.

52. "Mr. WOLF. I do not ignore the fact that when you state that so many Jews are coming to the United States it creates a feeling and sentiment among a class of people who are entirely ignorant and prejudiced. It is a prejudice that is entirely uncalled for, because they regard the Jew from an entirely different standpoint from that which I have no doubt this honorable Commission intends to take when it brings out its report. I have met it everywhere-on the rostrum in the newspapers in private conversation. The Hon. Mr. Wheeler when he was Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor-and none better ever sat in that chair-had quite a number of conversations with me on the subject- and, gentlemen, it is the absolute truth that when you classify these immigrants as Jews the anti-immigration leagues of the country the anti-Semites the people who are prejudiced against the Jews use it as a taunt and as a comment upon the enormous immigration of Jews to this country.

Senator LODGE. You do not think there is in this country any feeling of that sort to amount to anything?

Mr. WOLF. My dear friend Senator Lodge you of all men certainly do know that a great deal of it exists. I have come in contact with gentlemen from your own State. . . . "

53. Magnes quit the pulpit in 1910; during World War I he became an active pacifist leader, and in the twenties, the founding President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; in his last years (the forties) he founded and led 'Brit Shalom', a movement for a bi-national state in Palestine. See Magnes, *Dissenter in Zion* and Goren, *New York Jews and the Quest for Community*.

54. Copy of letter from Kadimah Society to United States Immigration Commission 2/9/10, AJC Archives. Also the Baltimore Federation of American Zionists protested on 2/2/10 to Friedenwald.

55. Bernard G. Richards, Secretary of the Jewish Community of New York (the Kehillah) to

Friedenwald, 2/18/1910, and including resolution adopted, AJC Archives.

56. Mack to Friedenwald, 12/15/09, AJC Archives. Mack also exchanged letters latter that month with Dillingham and Lodge on the classification scheme, but no new points were raised.

57. Friedenwald to Kadimah Society, 2/25/10; Sulzberger papers, AJC Archives.

58. An annual meeting of social workers complained that knowing the number of 'Russians' in Buffalo told them nothing, because they could be dealing with east European Jews or with Poles, whose needs were very different.

59. It was in fact the AJC that supported Hourwich's work, in another of its many steps to defend east-European Jews. Indeed, perhaps the events around the race amendment to the Census of 1910 helped bring Hourwich to the attention of the AJC.

60. Hourwich, *Immigration and Labor*, 55; see also 250 and 457.

61. *Ibid*, 57, 58.

62. Hourwich, *Immigration and Labor*, 228. One might think that when he paraphrases the commission he speaks of race and when he presents his own views he speaks of nationality, but that is by no means the uniform pattern, as this example shows.

63. Hourwich, *Immigration and Labor*, iii.

64. *Congressional Record*, March 17, 1910, 3290.

65. The only opposition now was expressed over procedural question as to the right to bring certain types of bills to the floor on certain days. But even in that procedural wrangle, the loose formulations about ethnicity and race are interesting; mother tongue indeed is not even always mentioned.

Mr. Hardwick. [The constitutional purpose of the census is] to find out how many people there are in the United States, not what kind of people they are or of what race or of what nationality they belong to. . . . (*Congressional Record*, 3282).

66. USIC, *Reports* (Washington, 1911), v. 1, 19-20.

67. United States Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census* (Population), 781.

68. United States Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census* (Population), 875.

69. United States Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census* (Population), 959.

70. Wolf, *Selected Addresses*, 296-8. In the same letter Husband mentions to Wolf "I remember writing a long letter to . . . Wheeler. . . and have tried to find a copy to send to you but have not succeeded." This in January, 1922; on March 7, 1927 Max Kohler, who apparently edited the Wolf volume, brought it to Husband's attention and asked about that

old letter. Husband (now assistant secretary of Commerce and Labor himself--as Wheeler had been when Husband wrote to him) promised to look for the old letter (3/14/'27), and eventually found it and sent it on to Kohler (3/21/'27). This 1909 Husband letter to Wheeler was cited earlier in connection with the meaning of 'people' in the 'race or people' term. When Kohler thanked Husband for digging up the old letter, written nearly two decades earlier, he commented, " I now recognize the genesis of the section of the report of the Immigration Commission on this question, printed in its. vol. 1 pp. 19-20"--that is, the section of the report's introduction which explains and defends the race or people classification. The Kohler-Husband Correspondence is in the Kohler file at AJHS.

71. Kohler to Husband, 3/23/1927, AJHS.

72. Kohler to Husband, 3/23/27, AJHS. Kohler elaborates these views, he tells Husband, in a address "Immigration and Racial Discrimination" which he will send on when it is published.

73. YIVO, *The Classification of Jewish Immigrants*, 10.