

SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

Journal of the Southern Jewish Historical Society

Mark K. Bauman, *Editor*

MarkKBauman@aol.com

Bryan Edward Stone, *Managing Editor*

bstone@delmar.edu

Scott M. Langston, *Primary Sources Section Editor*

sclangston@charter.net

Stephen J. Whitfield, *Book Review Editor*

swhitfie@brandeis.edu

Jeremy Katz, *Exhibit and Film Review Editor*

jrkatz@thebreman.org

Shari Rabin, *Website Review Editor*

rabinsl@cofc.edu

Rachel Heimovics Braun, *Founding Managing Editor*

rheimovics@cfl.rr.com

2018
Volume 21



Southern Jewish History

Editorial Board

Robert Abzug	Lance Sussman
Ronald Bayor	Ellen Umansky
Karen Franklin	Deborah Weiner
Adam Mendelsohn	Daniel Weinfeld
Adam Meyer	Lee Shai Weissbach
Stuart Rockoff	Stephen J. Whitfield

Southern Jewish History is a publication of the Southern Jewish Historical Society available by subscription and a benefit of membership in the society. The opinions and statements expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the journal or of the Southern Jewish Historical Society.

Southern Jewish Historical Society OFFICERS: Dan Puckett, *President*; Phyllis Leffler, *Vice President and President Elect*; Eric Goldstein, *Secretary*; Les Bergen, *Treasurer*; Shari Rabin, *Corresponding Secretary*; Ellen Umansky, *Immediate Past President*. BOARD OF TRUSTEES: Ronald Bayor, Michael R. Cohen, Sharon Fahrner, Dana Herman, Jeremy Katz, Adam Meyer, Josh Parshall, Jim Pfeifer, Shari Rabin, Teri Tillman; Bernard Wax, *Board Member Emeritus*; Rachel Reagler Schulman, *Ex-Officio Board Member*.

For submission information and author guidelines, see <http://www.jewishsouth.org/submission-information-and-guidelines-authors>. For queries and all editorial matters: Mark K. Bauman, Editor, *Southern Jewish History*, 6856 Flagstone Way, Flowery Branch, GA 30542, MarkKBauman@aol.com. For journal subscriptions and advertising: Bryan Edward Stone, Managing Editor, PO Box 271432, Corpus Christi, TX 78427, bstone@delmar.edu. For membership and general information about the Southern Jewish Historical Society, visit www.jewishsouth.org or write to PO Box 71601, Marietta, GA 30007-1601.

Articles appearing in *Southern Jewish History* are abstracted and/or indexed in *Historical Abstracts*; *America: History and Life*; *Index to Jewish Periodicals*; *Journal of American History*; *Journal of Southern History*; *RAMBI-National Library of Israel*; *Immigration and Ethnic History Society Newsletter*; and the *Berman Jewish Policy Archive* (www.bjpa.org).

Southern Jewish History acknowledges with deep appreciation grants from the Covenant Foundation, New York, and the Helen Marie Stern Memorial Fund, Atlanta.

Copyright © 2018 by the Southern Jewish Historical Society

ISSN 1521-4206

PERMISSION STATEMENT

Consent by the Southern Jewish Historical Society is given for private use of articles and images that have appeared in *Southern Jewish History*. Copying or distributing any journal, article, image, or portion thereof, for any use other than private, is forbidden without the written permission of *Southern Jewish History*. To obtain that permission, please contact the editors at journal@jewishsouth.org.

PRIMARY SOURCES

The Galveston Diaspora: A Statistical View of
Jewish Immigration Through Texas, 1907–1913

by

Bryan Edward Stone*

**Statistics of Jewish Immigrants Who Arrived at the Port of
Galveston, Texas, During the Years 1907–1913 Inclusive,
Handled by Jewish Immigrants Information Bureau of
Galveston, Texas [1914].**

Letter from “Secretary” [David Bressler], April 13, 1914.¹

Between 1907 and 1914, nearly ten thousand Russian-Jewish immigrants arrived in the United States at Galveston, Texas, rather than the more common and familiar ports of the east coast. From there they dispersed throughout the country by rail, joining Jewish communities in hundreds of cities and towns where their skills and energy were desired. They were part of an organized, transnational effort known as the Galveston Movement (or Galveston Plan), by which organizers identified potential immigrants in Europe, matched them with American jobs, and facilitated their travel through Galveston to cities and towns throughout the country. In addition to such direct aid to immigrants, movement officials encouraged further migration by assisting Russian Jews coming to reunite with family members who had already immigrated and supported a significant number of “courtesy” cases, people who traveled independently but took advantage of movement officials’ guidance and support along the way.

* The author may be contacted at bstone@delmar.edu.

Harbor scene, Galveston, Texas, c. 1910.

(Courtesy of Forshey Postcard Collection, Rosenberg Library, Galveston.)

The Galveston Movement is a well-recognized event in American Jewish history and in the history of Jewish immigration to the United States. It has been the subject of numerous historical accounts, most notably Bernard Marinbach's near-definitive 1983 book *Galveston: Ellis Island of the West*, analyzed in articles and book chapters, and included in general narratives of American Jewish history. In addition, it has been the subject of a filmed docudrama, *West of Hester Street*, and figures prominently in a traveling museum exhibit, *Forgotten Gateway*, about immigration through Galveston.²

However, with the notable exception of the *Forgotten Gateway* exhibit, which included material gleaned from interviews with immigrants and their families, these narratives are institutional histories that take a broad, top-down view of the effort and focus on the well-known individuals who planned, supervised, and executed it. At best, they give only scant attention to the actual immigrants. Marinbach includes a small number of immigrant stories, including an extended account of Charles and Sarah Hoffman, who settled in Fort Worth, Texas.³ The memoir of Alexander Gurwitz, *Memories of Two Generations*, includes an account of Gurwitz's voyage from his home in Yenaveh,

Russia (Yenakiyev, Ukraine), to Galveston and on to San Antonio, Texas, that may be the only example of a Galveston immigrant narrating his personal journey from door to door.⁴ With these and a few other exceptions, judging from the published historical record, the Galveston Movement might have been a strictly bureaucratic effort acting on behalf of an abstract group known as “the immigrants.” Information about the actual immigrants as individuals is hard to locate.⁵

In my research on the Galveston Movement—which I conducted both for my history of Texas Jewry and for my introduction to Gurwitz’s memoir—I relied on a document I first discovered at the American Jewish Archives (AJA) in Cincinnati in 1996: “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants Who Arrived at the Port of Galveston, Texas, During the Years 1907–1913 Inclusive, Handled by Jewish Immigrants Information Bureau of Galveston, Texas.” This item is a report prepared by Galveston Movement officials, probably in early 1914, the final year of the movement. It consists entirely of tabular data showing statistical information about the immigrants, in particular the states and cities they traveled to, their ages and genders, and the professions they claimed to pursue. The tables do not provide a sense of each immigrant’s personal story—they say nothing, in fact, of individuals at all—but they contain valuable aggregate data that illuminates the Galveston immigrant experience. They help us imagine more clearly the beneficiaries of the institutional program that has been otherwise so thoroughly explained and documented.

Even without data for 1914, the partial final year of the effort, “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants” provides factual information of unparalleled detail and specificity about the Jews who arrived at Galveston. It shows, for example, that movement officials processed a grand total of 8,407 immigrants of whom 6,571 were male and 1,836 female; 1,271 were children. The immigrants were distributed to 235 cities in 32 states; Kansas City was the most frequent destination. The immigrants pursued 133 occupations, of which men’s tailor, clerk, and housewife were the most common. The data can be organized and extrapolated in a number of ways besides the format in which it was presented in the original document, making it a rich source of details like these that have otherwise been unknown or unsubstantiated. It makes it possible, furthermore, to evaluate the movement’s achievements in greater depth than previously.

The Galveston Movement: Origin, Methods, and Challenges

Between 1881 and 1924, more than 2.5 million eastern European Jews immigrated to the United States. The vast majority settled in New York City, where by 1910 about one-quarter of the population was Jewish.⁶ Even though this influx established New York as the Jewish cultural capital of the United States, it created severe problems. The Lower East Side, where most Jewish immigrants lived, was grossly overcrowded, unsanitary, and poor. Nevertheless, once they arrived in the Jewish neighborhood, immigrants were reluctant to leave. As squalid as it was, the small, compressed district provided Jewish culture, the Yiddish language, kosher food, synagogues, schools, rabbis—all traditional necessities that smaller communities were hard-pressed to supply. As the numbers of immigrants increased and conditions worsened, members of the established Jewish community, mostly of central European descent, doubted their ability to assist the newcomers and feared a rise of antisemitism as the immigrants' condition became widely known.

A variety of local and national Jewish charities was formed in the early twentieth century to help ease the struggles of East Side Jews. In 1901 communal workers in New York formed the Industrial Removal Office (IRO) with the purpose of reducing the city's overcrowding by "removing" Jews from New York and reestablishing them in communities throughout the nation. A network of IRO employees fanned out around the country seeking locales with specific labor demands that could be matched to individual Jewish workers in New York seeking employment. Once matched, the IRO sent the workers to the new town, where a local contact met them and became responsible for looking after them until they became independent. The national B'nai B'rith played a key role in this distribution, forming local committees in dozens of communities that accepted responsibility for placing this constant influx of new settlers. The IRO operated until 1922 and relocated about 79,000 immigrants from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia.⁷

But despite this apparent success, the IRO was barely making a dent in the massive numbers of Jewish immigrants continuing to arrive in New York, its primary focus. The city was by far the most frequent and convenient point of arrival for travelers leaving Europe, and as experience

continued to prove, it was nearly impossible to persuade immigrants to leave once they arrived. Financier Jacob Schiff, a prominent member of New York's German-Jewish elite and one of the IRO's strongest philanthropic backers, was concerned about its limited success. On the recommendation of U.S. immigration authorities, Schiff determined that rather than trying to remove immigrants who had already settled in New York, it might be easier to divert them to a different port of arrival and then disperse them to preselected destinations through a network of local agents built on the IRO model.

Schiff, who became the chair and sole financial supporter of the Galveston Plan, was responsible for the selection of Galveston as the program's point of entry. He chose the Texas city over New Orleans and other possibilities because it already received routine steamship service from Germany and was the Gulf port furthest to the west, where most of the immigrants were headed. Galveston was also the terminus of numerous railroad lines spreading throughout the American interior and was a small enough city, with a small enough Jewish population, not to run the risk that the immigrants would prefer to remain there rather than travel on to their selected destinations.⁸ When the organization began, he pledged five hundred thousand dollars to fund the project, which he hoped "would suffice to place from 20,000 to 25,000 people in the American 'Hinterland,' and I believe, with the successful settlement of such a number, others would readily follow of their own accord."⁹ The self-perpetuating result, if successful, would achieve nothing less than a complete diversion of Jewish immigration from New York to Galveston and into the hinterland beyond.

Schiff's audacious plan had three interlocking objectives, all of which prioritized the greatest possible dispersal of the immigrants. As conditions worsened for Jews in eastern Europe—devastating pogroms occurred in 1891, 1903, and 1905—it was imperative that the United States remain a refuge for them. Anti-immigration nativism was gathering strength with every arriving ship, and Schiff and his colleagues worried that a poor, unacculturated, and rapidly growing Jewish population in New York would supply a pretext for Congress to adopt restrictionist legislation. The key to preventing a nativist backlash, he considered, was dispersing the immigrants throughout the country. They would thus have a better opportunity to attain self-sufficiency and, not incidentally, be a

great deal less conspicuous. A program of dispersal was thus in the interest not only of recent immigrants who would have better employment potential outside New York, and of the preexisting Jewish community that felt responsible for their care, but of all Russian Jews who might seek sanctuary in the United States in the future.

In addition to this pragmatic political concern, Schiff was motivated by a second, more ideological objective: opposition to the emerging Zionist movement. Like many American Jews of his background, Schiff was deeply anti-Zionist, believing that a continued diaspora provided the best hope for Jewish survival. “[The] Jew must maintain his own identity – not *apart* in any autonomous body but *among* the nations,” he wrote to Israel Zangwill in 1905.¹⁰ Zangwill, the English playwright and activist, had formed the Jewish Territorial Organization (ITO) to seek the creation of a Jewish state somewhere other than Palestine, an effort Schiff also opposed as undesirable and impractical. Arguing that the Galveston Plan was, unlike Territorialism, “immediately practicable,” Schiff successfully diverted Zangwill from his mission by enlisting the ITO as a partner in the new effort.¹¹

Jacob Schiff.
(*Wikimedia Commons.*)

Israel Zangwill.
(*Wikimedia Commons.*)

Finally, Schiff saw the Galveston Plan as a means of strengthening Jewish communities in the United States by bringing an influx of population to smaller Jewish enclaves. Perhaps most importantly, Schiff the businessman believed that immigrants would contribute to the economic development of the American interior. The "great American 'Hinterland,'" he wrote, "needs the sturdy immigrant, capable of becoming promptly self-supporting."¹² The immigrants, he wrote, "have the pioneer spirit" and would be followed by waves of additional arrivals who "will be an asset to the growth of the western territory."¹³ All of these motives required the greatest possible dispersal of the immigrants, and as "Statistics of Jewish Immigrants" reveals, they were ultimately sent to more than two hundred cities. Schiff's goals, considered together, reveal the Galveston Plan to be essentially a distribution program to scatter Jews from the Russian Empire as widely as possible across the American landscape.

To accomplish this distribution, Schiff oversaw a vast global institutional infrastructure. In New York, he formed a steering committee comprised of wealthy and influential New York Jews including Cyrus Sulzberger and Felix Warburg. David M. Bressler, general manager of the IRO in New York, served as committee secretary and was responsible for most of its daily operations, including retooling the IRO's extensive national network of local community contacts to accommodate the new program. Under Zangwill's supervision in London, the ITO managed the European side of the effort, and from an office in Kiev, ITO partners distributed Yiddish-language advertisements touting the advantages of a Texas entry, promising that if immigrants traveled to Galveston, representatives would meet them on the dock, secure them jobs in new cities, and provide directions and tickets for their further travel. The ITO also worked closely with the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden* (Aid Society for German Jews), headquartered in Berlin, which facilitated the emigration of Jews from Germany. The *Hilfsverein* helped Schiff's staff expedite the movement of Russian Jews through the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Germany to Bremen, on the North Sea, from where the German Lloyd Line provided direct passage to Galveston.

While these international arrangements took shape, Morris D. Waldman, Bressler's assistant at the IRO in New York, traveled to Galveston in January 1907 to establish the Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau (JIIB), an office charged with arranging for the immigrants' care

upon arrival and their transportation onward. He carried a letter of introduction from Schiff to Rabbi Henry Cohen, who had served as the city's Jewish spiritual leader since 1888 and would continue to do so until his death in 1952. Cohen was already a local institution and the foremost rabbi in Texas. His enthusiastic support for the effort and his indefatigable advocacy of the immigrants would be a key to its success, and with the clear exception of Schiff, Cohen became the most visible individual supporting the Galveston Movement. He met every ship that arrived at his city, greeted each immigrant in Yiddish, arranged for them to receive kosher food and accommodations, argued on their behalf with U.S. immigration authorities, and guided them to the trains that took them to their new homes. Although Waldman was replaced as JIIB director in 1909 by social worker Henry Berman, who, in turn, was replaced in 1913 by Maurice Epstein, Cohen remained a consistent, humane, and universally admired presence.

Despite the good intentions and excessive talent of its personnel, as well as its methodically organized and well-funded structure, the Galveston Movement encountered a variety of ultimately insurmountable problems. These included, predictably, garden-variety institutional rivalries, especially in Europe, where the ITO and *Hilfsverein* tangled continuously over which immigrants to target and what assurances could responsibly be made to them. In the United States, local communal organizations charged with receiving the immigrants complained bitterly about larger-than-expected numbers they were required to place and, most commonly, that the immigrants they received did not actually possess the employable skills they had claimed they had and that communities had been promised.¹⁴

Institutional infighting, however, was the least of Schiff's concerns. At a meeting in New York on April 9, 1914, he met with the steering committee to discuss ending the program and cited two reasons as definitive. These are described in detail in the meeting minutes and are summarized in a letter dated April 13, 1914, four days after the meeting, probably written by committee secretary David Bressler. According to the letter, steamship service from Bremen to Galveston had proven "wholly inadequate" — uncomfortable, crowded, and long in duration, generally at least three weeks. Conditions on board the ships were notorious enough, in fact, so as "to discourage any considerable volume [of potential

immigrants] from availing themselves of the Galveston route."¹⁵ Letters home from America carried word, transmitted through European grapevines, of the horrors of travel to Galveston, and officials in Kiev found it increasingly difficult to sell potential immigrants on the route. Attempts had been made to persuade the Lloyd line to improve the treatment of its immigrant passengers, but these efforts had failed.

*Rabbi Henry Cohen
with immigrants, c. 1907.
(Courtesy of Congregation
B'nai Israel, Galveston.)*

An even more frustrating problem was "the unduly severe enforcement of the Immigration Laws and Regulations at the Port of Galveston."¹⁶ According to Bressler's letter, research presented at the termination meeting by Maurice Epstein, the latest manager of the Galveston JIIB office, indicated that an average of 4.3 percent of immigrants arriving in Galveston were excluded or deported, usually for perceived health problems, whereas the deportation rate at northern ports averaged between 0.6 percent and 1.1 percent. The figure for Galveston had, in fact, risen significantly in early 1914 to 5.87 percent. "It was further pointed out that there were instances of immigrants excluded at Galveston who experienced no difficulty subsequently in gaining admission at a northern port."¹⁷ Word of the harsh inspections at Galveston and the likelihood of being returned to Europe or forced to seek entry at another American port further eroded the willingness of potential immigrants to book their passage to Texas.

Immigration authorities in Galveston may have been stricter in their inspections and admissions than those in New York and other cities for

U.S. Life Saving Station and Federal Immigration Station, Galveston.

(Courtesy of Galveston Photographic Subject Files,

Rosenberg Library, Galveston.)

several reasons. Galveston received fewer immigrants overall, so inspectors may have given more attention to each one and discovered a greater number of problems. Possibly also, the extended voyage at sea affected the health of the immigrants so that more arrived in Galveston exhibiting medical issues that compelled their exclusion. Bernard Marinbach, however, attributes the greater rigor to the personnel assigned to the immigration station in Galveston, officials who were conspicuous in their resistance to immigration and to Jews in particular.¹⁸

These difficulties, Bressler's letter relates, "constituted an insurmountable handicap to the realization of the purpose for which the movement was started." The committee's goal had been to divert Jewish immigration from New York to Galveston, but that effort had clearly failed. "[Because] of these handicaps, no deflection of Jewish immigration in any appreciable volume had been accomplished." At no time, in fact, had the number of Jewish immigrants arriving in Galveston risen above 3 percent of the national total.¹⁹ With more than \$235,000 of Schiff's money already expended, the committee voted to terminate the program as of September 1914. The committee members, of course, did not know that

World War I would begin in August, virtually eliminating travel across Europe and greatly increasing the expense and hazard of transatlantic passage. The onset of war was not a consideration in ending the Galveston Movement, but it almost certainly would have made any further activity impossible.

How the Data are Presented

At the final meeting of the Galveston Movement steering committee, according to Bressler's letter, members were advised that their effort "had handled and distributed between 8000 and 9000 people consisting of men, women and children."²⁰ They were given statistics on deportations supplied by Maurice Epstein, who also reported the numbers of immigrants who had arrived during the first three months of 1914: an average of 162 per month, down from 217 per month for the same period in 1913.²¹ Extensive qualitative discussion ensued concerning conditions on board the passenger liners and about the hardships of dealing with American immigration authorities, but the committee's interest in numerical data is clear from the reports of that meeting. This was, in nearly every respect, a data-driven enterprise.

The existence of a document like "Statistics of Jewish Immigrants," therefore, is no surprise, even if its provenance is unclear. The document does not indicate where the data was collected, where the report was composed, or whose files were consulted to gather the information it contains. It does not credit an author or researcher or supply a cover letter, and nothing in the document hints at its intended purpose or audience. The document, among the Henry Cohen Papers at the AJA, is attached to a copy of Bressler's letter describing the final committee meeting. Cohen did not attend that meeting, but he was in frequent correspondence with everyone involved in the effort, and he collected and kept a variety of documentation related to the program in which he was so personally engaged. He possibly received the report from New York along with the letter attached to it.

The document's title, however, identifies its subjects as the immigrants handled by the JIIB "of Galveston, Texas," which suggests that the data it contains was gathered in Galveston rather than by the IRO in New York. I could not locate another copy of the document, furthermore, in a search of the JIIB records, which were extracted from the files of the IRO

and are now held by the American Jewish Historical Society. If it had been created in New York, it would likely be in that collection.²² The few researchers, including Marinbach, who have consulted the document cite only the copy in the Cohen Papers at the AJA. No other archival collection appears to hold the document, suggesting that Cohen's copy may be the only one that has survived. Cohen did not likely personally collate the data—record-keeping was not his forté or his role in the enterprise—but it may have been gathered by JIIB staff directed by Maurice Epstein and working closely with Cohen. Epstein had, in any case, supplied other statistical data to the IRO and to Schiff's steering committee and clearly had the means at his disposal to do so.

Even without knowing its author or origination, the data that "Statistics of Jewish Immigrants" contains is clear and essential. The document is arranged into three sections: 1) distribution of the immigrants by the states where they were settled, which is further broken down by city; 2) statistics of trades, including a separate table quantifying the immigrants' most common trades; and 3) statistics on age and gender. The state and city data is divided into "Bureau Territory" and "General Territory." "Bureau Territory" refers to states where the JIIB put its main emphasis, had the strongest local connections, and aimed primarily to place the immigrants. These are: Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. The total number of immigrants sent to these states was 7,886. "Other Territory" is everywhere else, including states in the Far West and Northeast, where the JIIB did not place an organizational emphasis but where the immigrants went anyway for a variety of reasons, often to reunite with family members. Those states outside the bureau's primary scope account for only 521 of the total immigrants it helped to place.

The tables on trades are roughly organized by type of work, although these divisions are not labeled. Included among the trades listings are "None" (possibly comprised mostly of children, although the report does not specify) and "House-wife." Housewives number 535 out of a total of 1,225 female immigrants over the age of fifteen; if most of the immigrants listed with no profession were in fact children, then nearly half of the adult women worked in paying trades. Age tables are broken

down by age group and gender and indicate ages ranging from infant to forty-six and older.

In all of the tables, immigrants are subdivided into three categories: "Direct," "Reunion," and "Courtesy," terms used by the JIIB to distinguish the various forms of assistance it provided. Direct removals were those who received the bureau's primary attention, while reunion and courtesy cases were those the bureau assisted but had not recruited or originally planned to help. Schiff's willingness to extend assistance to these unforeseen arrivals illustrates his wish to promote ongoing migration—his desire that bureau removals be followed by family and others traveling along the same route to Galveston.

Direct removals were most commonly men between thirty-one and thirty-five whom movement officials had selected for direct assistance. They were identified as potential immigrants in Russia, encouraged to purchase passage to Galveston, matched with specific contacts and jobs in selected American cities, and sent at bureau expense to their final destinations. With 6,115 cases, direct removals naturally constituted the bulk of the bureau's activity. Reunion cases, who were expected to pay their own expenses, were immigrants traveling to join those whom the bureau had brought previously. Reunions numbered 1,004 cases, of which 338 were adult women (over fifteen years old), the rest children of both sexes; only 180 men over fifteen years old were reunited with their families in this way.

Courtesy cases were those who, for a variety of reasons, availed themselves of the bureau's financial support or guidance, although they had not been identified or recruited by European caseworkers. They numbered 1,288, roughly equal parts male and female, the largest share being children. The presence of so many courtesy cases suggests that one of Schiff's original goals was materializing: families of Russian Jews seeking to go to America were independently choosing Galveston as their preferred port of entry, even when movement officials had not singled them out for attention. Immigrants without bureau-determined destinations traveled alongside the bureau's placements throughout Europe and crossed the Atlantic on the same ships. They went to Galveston of their own accord, chose their own ultimate destinations, and traveled entirely at their own expense, but they arrived in Galveston interspersed among those the bureau had supported all along. Bureau officials recognized

them as a different category of immigrants, but nonetheless attempted to convey them if they could. In some cases, the bureau extended financial support to courtesy cases who arrived in Galveston without the means to travel further. The JIB preferred to pay the rest of their transportation costs rather than see them deported back to Europe.

What the Data Show: Destinations

“Statistics of Jewish Immigrants” provides texture and detail that improves our understanding of the identities of the Galveston immigrants. Although it contains only numerical data, its figures suggest a variety of observations about the movement and its participants that amplify and illustrate what we already knew and point to new directions for future research.

The first set of tables, breaking down immigrant arrivals by destination, is presented alphabetically by state, within the bureau’s territory and then outside it. By compiling and reordering the data in these tables, one can see at a glance which states and cities were the most popular destinations and how many communities in each state received immigrants (see Tables 1, 2, and 3).

TABLE 1. States receiving Galveston immigrants, all categories, 1907–1913.²³

State	Arrivals	% of total	State	Arrivals	% of total
<i>Texas</i>	2,144	26%	Michigan	26	< 1%
<i>Iowa</i>	1,225	15%	Georgia	25	< 1%
<i>Missouri</i>	1,099	13%	Ohio	19	< 1%
<i>Minnesota</i>	997	12%	Oregon	19	< 1%
<i>Nebraska</i>	641	8%	Utah	19	< 1%
California	349	4%	Kentucky	17	< 1%
<i>Louisiana</i>	296	4%	Washington	15	< 1%
<i>Colorado</i>	284	3%	Arizona	8	< 1%
<i>Illinois</i>	283	3%	Alabama	6	< 1%
<i>Oklahoma</i>	245	3%	Connecticut	5	< 1%
<i>Kansas</i>	208	2%	New York	4	< 1%
<i>Tennessee</i>	191	2%	Indiana	2	< 1%
<i>Arkansas</i>	155	2%	Massachusetts	2	< 1%
<i>Wisconsin</i>	48	1%	New Mexico	2	< 1%
<i>Mississippi</i>	35	< 1%	Nevada	2	< 1%
<i>North Dakota</i>	35	< 1%	Rhode Island	1	< 1%
Total				8,407	

NOTE: *Italics* indicate “bureau territory.”

TABLE 2. Cities receiving Galveston immigrants, all categories, 1907-1913.

City	Total arrivals	City	Total arrivals
Kansas City, MO	716	Colorado Springs, CO	38
St. Paul, MN	547	Chicago, IL	36
Omaha, NE	473	Muscataine, IA	36
Houston, TX	392	Pine Bluff, AR	34
Dallas, TX	343	Council Bluffs, IA	33
Minneapolis, MN	316	Waterloo, IA	31
Galveston, TX	287	El Paso, TX	30
Ft. Worth, TX	263	Joplin, MO	30
Des Moines, IA	250	Ft. Smith, AR	29
Rock Island, IL	213	Milwaukee, WI	29
New Orleans, LA	204	Victoria, TX	29
San Francisco, CA	201	Wharton, TX	28
Davenport, IA	189	Detroit, MI	24
San Antonio, TX	184	Quincy, IL	24
Memphis, TN	178	Ft. Dodge, IA	21
Lincoln, NE	149	Helena, AR	21
Burlington, IA	143	Atlanta, GA	20
Oklahoma City, OK	140	Oakland, CA	20
St. Louis, MO	140	Calvert, TX	19
Dubuque, IA	136	Corsicana, TX	19
Sioux City, IA	134	Portland, OR	19
Denver, CO	133	Salt Lake City, UT	19
St. Joseph, MO	133	Centreville, IA	18
Los Angeles, CA	121	Palestine, TX	18
Waco, TX	117	Superior, WI	18
Cedar Rapids, IA	111	Austin, TX	17
Duluth, MN	95	Hugo, OK	17
Ottumwa, IA	92	Denison, TX	16
Pueblo, CO	87	Fargo, ND	16
Cleburne, TX	82	Lawton, OK	16
Leavenworth, KS	66	Seattle, WA	15
Little Rock, AR	66	Natchez, MS	14
Topeka, KS	63	Ashley, ND	13
Texarkana, TX	58	Port Arthur, TX	13
Sedalia, MO	55	Tulsa, OK	13
Tyler, TX	50	Chisholm, MN	12
Marshall, TX	46	Lake Charles, LA	12
Shreveport, LA	45	Louisville, KY	12
Beaumont, TX	43	Ardmore, OK	11
Wichita, KS	43	Vicksburg, MS	11

136 SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

TABLE 2, cont.

<u>City</u>	<u>Total arrivals</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Total arrivals</u>
Bryan, TX	10	Bridgeport, CT	4
Cincinnati, OH	10	Danville, IL	4
Nashville, TN	10	Grand Island, NE	4
San Marcos, TX	10	Guthrie, OK	4
Chickasha, OK	9	Keokuk, IA	4
Cleveland, OH	9	Macon, GA	4
Corpus Christi, TX	9	Mingus, TX	4
Dublin, TX	9	Navasota, TX	4
Gainesville, TX	9	Parsons, KS	4
Hannibal, MO	9	Seguin, TX	4
McAlester, OK	9	Lexington, KY	4
Oscalooza, IA	9	Tucson, AZ	4
Shawnee, OK	9	Amarillo, TX	3
Texas City, TX	9	Chatanooga, TN	3
Yoakum, TX	9	Clinton, IA	3
Atchison, KS	8	Eagle Lake, TX	3
Cripple Creek, CO	8	Ft. Scott, KS	3
Hastings, NE	8	Gatesville, TX	3
Marshalltown, IA	8	Hallettsville, TX	3
Virginia, MN	8	Hot Springs, AR	3
Vivian, LA	8	Imperial, CA	3
Alexandria, LA	7	Iowa City, IA	3
Hibbing, MN	7	Lafayette, LA	3
Hutchinson, KS	7	Nocona, TX	3
Iola, KS	7	Pittsburg, KS	3
Laredo, TX	7	Selma, AL	3
Okmulgee, OK	7	Webb City, MO	3
Springfield, MO	7	Argenta, AR	2
Victor, CO	7	Birmingham, AL	2
Hattiesburg, MS	6	Boston, MA	2
Liberty, TX	6	Chariton, IA	2
Luling, TX	6	Denton, TX	2
Monroe, LA	6	DeRidder, LA	2
Baton Rouge, LA	5	Dickinson, TX	2
El Reno, OK	5	Douglas, AZ	2
Eveleth, MN	5	Durant, OK	2
Grand Forks, ND	5	Ennis, TX	2
Hamilton, TX	5	Fremont, NE	2
Moberly, MO	5	Gilbert, MN	2
Staples, MN	5	Independence, KS	2

TABLE 2, cont.

<u>City</u>	<u>Total arrivals</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Total arrivals</u>
Indianapolis, IN	2	Galena, KS	1
Lake Providence, LA	2	Gilmer, TX	1
McKinney, TX	2	Gonzales, TX	1
Monte Vista, CO	2	Grand Rapids, MI	1
Nehawka, NE	2	Hartford, CT	1
New York City, NY	2	Hempstead, TX	1
Pecos, TX	2	Hockley, TX	1
Pierce, TX	2	Holdrege, NE	1
Richmond, TX	2	Humble, TX	1
San Diego, CA	2	Kankakee, IL	1
Silsbee, TX	2	Kenedy, TX	1
Teague, TX	2	La Junta, CO	1
Trinidad, CO	2	La Grange, TX	1
Waverly, IA	2	La Mesa, NM	1
Weimar, TX	2	Lockhart, TX	1
Wichita Falls, TX	2	Marquez, TX	1
Winnemucca, NV	2	Maywood, IL	1
Yazoo City, MS	2	Mesquite, NM	1
Anderson, TX	1	Mobile, AL	1
Aurora, IL	1	Muskogee, OK	1
Bastrop, LA	1	Nacogdoches, TX	1
Beeville, TX	1	Napoleonville, LA	1
Bremond, TX	1	Newport, KY	1
Boulder, CO	1	Norfolk, NE	1
Bowman, ND	1	Nowata, OK	1
Brooklyn, NY	1	Okawville, IL	1
Brownwood, TX	1	Peoria, IL	1
Carthage, MO	1	Phoenix, AZ	1
Clifton, AZ	1	Rochester, NY	1
Cottage Grove, WI	1	Rosenberg, TX	1
Cruger, MS	1	Salina, KS	1
Del Norte, CO	1	Savannah, GA	1
Duncan, OK	1	Silver City, MS	1
Evanston, IL	1	Stockton, CA	1
Falls City, NE	1	Taylor, TX	1
Flint, MI	1	Temple, TX	1
Franklin, TX	1	Terrell, TX	1
Fruitville, CA	1	Woonsocket, RI	1
		Total²⁴	8,470

TABLE 3. Number of cities in each state receiving Galveston immigrants, 1907–1913.

State	Number of cities	State	Number of cities
Texas	69	Georgia	3
Iowa	19	Kentucky	3
Oklahoma	15	Michigan	3
Kansas	12	New York	2
Louisiana	12	Tennessee	3
Colorado	10	Wisconsin	3
Illinois	10	Connecticut	2
Missouri	10	New Mexico	2
Minnesota	9	Ohio	2
Nebraska	9	Indiana	1
California	7	Massachusetts	1
Arkansas	6	Nevada	1
Mississippi	6	Oregon	1
Arizona	4	Rhode Island	1
North Dakota	4	Utah	1
Alabama	3	Washington	1
		Total	235

As a group, these tables demonstrate the tremendous diffusion of the immigrants throughout the country. Many of the more popular destinations—states like Iowa and Nebraska, cities like Des Moines and Omaha—are not immediately obvious as places to which Jews would be drawn. Their appearance so high on these lists indicates that movement organizers chose them for reasons other than Jewish continuity or community. Perhaps they were home to especially willing and competent agents to place the immigrants, or perhaps their transportation systems made them relatively easy to reach. Further study of individual communities is needed to ascertain their appeal.

In any case, dispersal, as explained above, was the movement's unifying purpose, and this data reveals the extent to which it succeeded. As Schiff noted in the final steering committee meeting reported in Bressler's letter, the movement had not achieved its primary goal of diverting Jewish immigration permanently to Galveston, and Galveston immigrants represented a mere fraction of the overall Jewish immigration to America, but

to the extent that dispersal was the goal, these figures prove that the Galveston Movement succeeded for the relatively small number of people it assisted.

Immigrants arriving in Galveston were transported to 235 American cities in 32 states, with only 16 states failing to receive immigrants. Previous studies of the Galveston Movement have focused on its executive activities in New York, Galveston, Kiev, and London—the sites from where the international effort was coordinated. These figures confirm, however, that the Galveston Movement influenced hundreds of local communities, some of which received significant numbers of new arrivals who undoubtedly affected the behavior and activity of the Jewish community. Research remains to be done on most of these American cities and the impact the arrival of so many Russian Jews may have had on them. How were the immigrants received in places like Ottumwa, Iowa (92 immigrants), Victoria, Texas (29), Quincy, Illinois (24), and Natchez, Mississippi (14)? How long did they remain in those communities? Did their distinctive language and religious practice have an effect on Jewish customs there? “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants” suggests that the Galveston Movement could usefully be reconsidered and studied as a local, rather than a national or global, phenomenon. The effects of the effort on individual communities are an important and largely untold story.

Nonetheless, the data provided in “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants” make some general observations about the movement’s regional outlook possible. As Table 4 reveals, the largest share of the immigrants were directed to midwestern states, notably Iowa and Missouri; Kansas City received more of the immigrants than any other community. The South places second, with Texas receiving by far the greatest number within the region. The West and Northeast were barely contemplated by movement planners—the Northeast, indeed, was the region from which they were trying to remove immigrants—and they consequently received many fewer than either the Midwest or South.

During the movement’s planning stages, organizers tended to assume that the South would not provide suitable destinations, and they anticipated directing immigrants to the Midwest and West instead. As Marinbach explains, Schiff “did not want the Jews to be used as pawns in the poisoned racial politics of the South.”²⁵ This view probably accounts

TABLE 4. Galveston immigrants by destination region, 1908–1913.

Region/State²⁶	Immigrants	No. of Cities
<i>Midwest</i>	4,583	82
Iowa	1,225	19
Missouri	1,099	10
Minnesota	997	9
Nebraska	641	9
Illinois	283	10
Kansas	208	12
Wisconsin	48	3
North Dakota	35	4
Michigan	26	3
Ohio	19	2
Indiana	2	1
<i>South</i>	3,114	120
Texas	2,144	69
Louisiana	296	12
Oklahoma	245	15
Tennessee	191	3
Arkansas	155	6
Mississippi	35	6
Georgia	25	3
Kentucky	17	3
Alabama	6	3
<i>West</i>	698	27
California	349	7
Colorado	284	10
Oregon	19	1
Utah	19	1
Washington	15	1
Arizona	8	4
Nevada	2	1
New Mexico	2	2
<i>Northeast</i>	12	6
Connecticut	5	2
New York	4	2
Massachusetts	2	1
Rhode Island	1	1

for why the movement entirely neglected southern states with larger populations, notably Virginia and South Carolina; Schiff ruled these out immediately, thus organizers never made contacts in the Jewish communities there, and neither state received a single Galveston immigrant. Schiff's mind was always on the hinterland, and accordingly the southern states most involved in the effort were those furthest to the west—Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas—which clearly also offered the shortest traveling distance from Galveston. Significantly, however, although the Midwest received more immigrants overall than the South, the movement reached a much greater number of southern communities—120 in total. This fact, suggesting the wide range of the movement's effect in the South, indicates a growing awareness among American Jewish leaders of the possibilities of the South as a region ripe for the development of Jewish population and institutions. It also implies a direct link between the American South and eastern Europe, where immigrants' families remained. The Galveston Movement reinforced the South as part of an international network of migration and communication.

Of the southern states, Texas was clearly the most involved in the effort and not only because the organization brought immigrants through a Texas port. For the first several months of the effort, David Bressler, running the enterprise from New York, actively discouraged attempts to describe Texas as an immigrant destination. The immigrants' path was to run through Galveston and Texas to points further west. However, under pressure from Jewish leaders across Texas, who desired an influx they saw as beneficial to their communities, Bressler relented and began strengthening contacts in Texas towns. By the end of the program, fully 25 percent of the Galveston immigrants had made their homes in Texas. The Lone Star State accounts for more than two-thirds of the South's total number of immigrants (2,144 of 3,114) and more than half of its recipient cities (69 of 120). Of the ten American cities receiving the most immigrants, four are in Texas. Exclusive of Texas, the South would still have been the second most popular destination region for Galveston immigrants, but its prominence would have been substantially reduced.

The statistical data for Texas reveals a phenomenon that deserves greater in-depth study. The Texas cities receiving the largest numbers of immigrants were, predictably, the state's largest: Houston, Dallas, Galveston, Fort Worth, and San Antonio. But many smaller communities like

Waco (with 117 immigrants), Cleburne (82), Texarkana (58), and Tyler (50) seem disproportionately involved. Influxes of this scale must have massively impacted their relatively small and loosely organized Jewish communities.

The data for California also suggest the need for further study. The state was not part of the bureau's primary territory, so it received just 69 direct placements. These were followed, however, by 248 courtesy cases, making California the western state most greatly affected by the Galveston Movement. The large number of courtesy cases suggests the popularity of California as a Jewish destination independent of the movement's activities, as well as the convenience of travel from Galveston to the western state. Even if California was not part of the bureau's main focus, the influx of so many Galveston Jews must have significantly affected these communities.

What the Data Show: Occupations

The records offered in "Statistics of Jewish Immigrants" related to the immigrants' occupations open a unique window into their working lives. The huge array of professions evidenced here provides a glimpse into Jewish life in Europe, where the immigrants were trained and began their careers, and illuminates some of the characteristics of those Russian Jews who sought to immigrate. Although the document's author did not label the divisions they created in this section of the document, the occupations are arranged by type of work and could be designated as follows (see Table 5): shoe and leather work; clothing manufacture, repair, and care; metal and machine trades; carpentry and woodwork; medical, musical, and educational fields; construction; food services; housewares and home decoration; transportation; paper trades; jewelry; and miscellaneous manufacturing and services.²⁷ In total, 133 occupations are listed (including "None"). The most common trade among the direct removals was men's tailor. Housewives were most common among the reunion and courtesy cases, indicating the frequency with which the movement was able to reunite women with their husbands.

With such a large number and variety of occupations, the near-absence of Jewish parochial trades stands out. There are among the immigrants no rabbis and just eleven *shochtim*. "Butchers" are listed separately and could include kosher food preparers. The sixty-four

TABLE 5. Trades of Galveston immigrants by type, 1908–1913.

Type of Trade	Total	Most Common Trade in Type
Shoe and leather work	685	Shoemaker (463)
Clothing manufacture, repair, and care	1,352	Men's tailor (551)
Metal and machine trades	547	Locksmith (183)
Carpentry and woodwork	525	Carpenter (370)
Medical, musical, and educational	144	Teacher (64)
Construction	72	Glazier (39)
Food services	415	Butcher (202)
Housewares and home decoration	204	Painter (146)
Transportation	63	Driver (34)
Paper trades	69	Book binder (51)
Miscellaneous	2,845	None (765); Clerk (537)
Jewelry	73	Watchmaker (47)
Total	6,994	

“teachers” may include rabbis and *melamdim*. Even if Jewish parochial workers were counted among these butchers and teachers, however, they still represent a miniscule portion of the total number of immigrants. This information attests to the movement’s overriding interest in enlisting immigrants who would become self-supporting, enterprising, and productive in an American setting. Schiff explicitly discouraged the recruitment of immigrants in religiously oriented professions, just as he discouraged the selection of those who prioritized religious observance. Schiff, as Marinbach explains, “saw nothing wrong with this stipulation and defended it as being entirely consistent with the labor conditions of the West.”²⁸ Judging from the available statistics, this did not become an absolute prohibition, but the lack of emphasis and even discouragement had its desired statistical impact. Further study could gauge the impact of religiosity, or lack thereof, on the immigrants and receiving communities.

What the Data Show: Age and Gender

Finally, the data provided in “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants” pertaining to age and gender corroborate much of what is already known or

could readily be guessed about the immigrants. In the original document, the data are broken down into age groupings that make it difficult to discern the total numbers of immigrants by age, gender, or category. Compiling and rearranging the data makes this possible (see Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9).

Given what is known of the Galveston Movement, several observations from this data stand to reason. The “average” Galveston immigrant was male, between thirty-one and thirty-five years of age.²⁹ This would be the most employable group and therefore logically the prime target of movement coordinators. Necessarily, then, the same category represents the largest portion of the direct placements. Also, predictably, the

TABLE 6. All categories by age and gender, 1908–1913.

Age	Male	Female	Total
Under 15	660	611	1,271
15-30	1,677	467	2,144
31-35	3,242	542	3,784
36-45	920	166	1,086
46+	72	50	122
Total	6,571	1,836	8,407

TABLE 7. Direct placements by age and gender, 1908–1913.

Age	Male	Female	Total
Under 15	160	163	323
15-30	1,376	204	1,580
31-35	3,039	240	3,279
36-45	844	44	888
46+	35	10	45
Total	5,454	661	6,115

TABLE 8. Reunion cases by age and gender, 1908–1913.

Age	Male	Female	Total
Under 15	254	232	486
15-30	86	105	191
31-35	58	152	210
36-45	28	65	93
46+	8	16	24
Total	434	570	1,004
Exclusive of Children	180	338	518

TABLE 9. Courtesy cases by age and gender, 1908–1913.

Age	Male	Female	Total
Under 15	246	216	462
15-30	215	158	373
31-35	145	150	295
36-45	48	57	105
46+	29	24	53
Total	683	605	1,288

largest groups among reunion cases were women and children. The numbers of male and female reunion cases seem roughly balanced unless children are removed, in which case it becomes clear that of 518 adult reunions, the vast majority were women. These data give some texture to our understanding of the movement without offering surprises.

Surprising, perhaps, is the number of children under fifteen, both as direct placements (323) and reunion/courtesy cases (948). In addition, the number of housewives, as noted above, and the large number of immigrants over thirty-six years old (1,208) suggests the extent to which the Galveston Movement was not exclusively, as it is usually depicted, a job placement service. It was, rather, a form of Jewish family service, facilitating the immigration and placement of entire families, including significant numbers of children, clearly important objectives of the immigrants and their sponsors.

*Immigrants at customs inspection station, Galveston, Texas, c. 1910.
(Courtesy of Forshey Postcard Collection, Rosenberg Library, Galveston.)*

Conclusion

At the final meeting of the Galveston Movement steering committee, at which Schiff announced the impending termination of the effort, the tone of the conversation was generally bleak. As the letter by Bressler summarizing the meeting attests, Schiff and the other committee members concluded that their attempt to deflect the major flow or at least substantial numbers of Jewish immigration from New York to Galveston had failed. Schiff was at pains, however, to point out their positive outcomes as well:

The Chairman, in summing up the situation, repeated emphatically what had been brought out upon many previous occasions, namely that the placement of the Jewish immigrants by the Galveston Bureau had been attended with gratifying success; that insofar as the welfare of the immigrants in and by itself was concerned, the money expended by the Bureau, since its inception, had been thoroughly justified; that within the limitation of the comparatively small number of immigrants handled by the Bureau, their successful settlement in the interior had already attracted, and would undoubtedly continue to attract a number of their dependents and friends who otherwise would have come to, and remained in one of the ports of the Atlantic seaboard.³⁰

The data contained in "Statistics of Jewish Immigrants" affirms Schiff's faith in the effort's achievements. He and his staff had not succeeded in altering the direction of Jewish immigration or of establishing the Galveston route as a familiar, let alone the default choice, for Jewish immigrants from Russia. They had, however, settled more than 8,000 people and given them opportunities for professional advancement and economic security they would almost certainly have lacked had they landed in New York or been returned to Russia. Schiff and his staff also had augmented the number of Jews in hundreds of small enclaves, in many cases providing an influx that substantially altered the Jewish population of these hinterland communities. This must be counted a success, even if it was not among the movement's main purposes, and much research remains to be done on how this influx may have affected specific communities.

"Statistics of Jewish Immigrants" provides a valuable starting point for developing a deeper understanding of the Jewish people in hundreds of American communities who benefited from the institutional efforts of professional staff in New York, Galveston, London, and Kiev. While the

movement by no means affected the South exclusively, it made a southern city and state the focal point of an international effort, and it brought southern Jewish communities into closer institutional contact with those elsewhere in the United States and Europe. Finally, by bringing thousands of Russian Jews directly into hundreds of American communities, it shaped those communities in ways we have barely begun to understand.

NOTE ON THE TEXT

In the original document, transcribed below, there are a number of obvious arithmetical errors. In some cases, lines of figures were added incorrectly, in others totals from one table were transferred incorrectly to other tables. In cases like these where the mistake is clear, I have inserted the correct sums in brackets next to the errant originals. With these corrections included, the grand totals align perfectly: column totals provided in the original document are correct, and the grand totals reported for state distributions of all three categories match the totals for age and gender. The grand total of immigrants by trade, however (6,985 [6,994] people in all three categories), is significantly less than the overall grand total (8,407 in all categories). Much of this difference would be accounted for if the trades total does not include children, but the document does not clarify this point. Possibly also data on trades were not collected for every immigrant.

Inexplicable and irremediable mathematical errors exist in the tables breaking down the data by state. In several cases, totaling the given number of immigrants sent to all cities in a state does not result in the same figure reported in the state distribution totals. Because the state distribution totals match the age/gender totals, I assume they are correct. There are, therefore, mistakes in the reporting of some city data, but it is impossible to determine which cities. I have not attempted to correct these but have noted the errors in endnotes appended to the tables where they occur.

The original document begins with a table of contents, which I have not reproduced here, nor have I preserved the original pagination. I have adjusted the tables' formatting and title styles to save space and enhance clarity but have otherwise tried to reproduce them as faithfully as possible. I have indicated necessary editorial corrections in brackets.

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

oOo-

**Statistics of Jewish Immigrants Who Arrived at the Port of
Galveston, Texas, During the Years 1907–1913 Inclusive,
Handled by Jewish Immigrants Information Bureau of
Galveston, Texas [1914].**

STATISTICS OF DISTRIBUTION

Total State Distribution

A) Bureau Territory.

State.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Arkansas.	149	3	3	155
Colorado.	171	8	105	284
Illinois.	242	36	5	283
Iowa.	1,138	72 [71]	15 [16]	1,225
Kansas.	178	26	4	208
Louisiana.	189	51	56	296
Minnesota.	922	50	25	997
Missouri.	781	200	118	1,099
Mississippi.	30	1	4	35
Nebraska.	505	81	55	641
North Dakota.	31	4	No	35
Oklahoma.	200	26	19	245
Tennessee.	165	20	6	191
Texas.	1,159	378	607	2,134 [2,144]
Wisconsin.	48	No	No	48

B) General territory.

State.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Alabama.	4	No	2	6
Arizona.	8	"	No	8
California.	69	32	249 [248]	349
Connecticut.	1	No	4	5
Georgia.	25	"	No	25
Indiana.	2	"	"	2
Kentucky.	17	"	"	17
Michigan.	26	"	"	26
Massachusetts.	No	"	2	2
New Mexico.	"	1	1	2

State.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
New York.	"	"	4	4
Ohio.	19	"	No	19
Oregon.	12	7	"	19
Rhode Island.	No	No	1	1
[Utah].	7	8	4	19
Washington.	15	No	No	15
Nevada.	2	"	"	2

Total of Direct Bureau Removals	6,115
Total of Reunions with Previous Bureau Removals	1,004
Total of Courtesy Cases	1,288
Grand Total of Removals	8,407

Statistics of State Distribution

A) Bureau territory.

Arkansas.

Town.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Argenta.	2	No	No	2
Ft. Smith.	28	"	1	29
Helena.	21	"	No	21
Hot Springs.	3	"	"	3
Little Rock.	63	3	"	66
Pine Bluff.	32	No	2	34
Total	149	3	3	155

Colorado.

Boulder.	1	No	No	1
Colorado Springs.	38	"	"	38
Cripple Creek.	7	"	1	8
Denver.	41	3	89	133
Del Norte.	No	No	1	1
La Junta.	1	"	No	1
[Monte] Vista.	No	No	2	2
Pueblo.	74	1	12	87
Trinidad.	2	No	No	2
Victor.	7	"	"	7
Total	171	8 ³¹	105	284

Illinois.

<u>Town.</u>	<u>Direct.</u>	<u>Reunion.</u>	<u>Courtesy.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
Aurora.	1	No	No	1
Chicago.	36	"	"	36
Danville.	No	"	4	4
Evanston.	1	"	No	1
Kankakee.	1	"	"	1
Peoria.	1	"	"	1
Maywood.	1	"	"	1
Okawville.	1	"	"	1
Quincy.	24	"	"	24
Rock Island.	176	36	1	213
Total	242	36	5	283

Iowa.

Burlington.	141	2	No	143
Cedar Rapids.	90	21	"	111
Centreville.	18	No	"	18
Chariton.	No	2	"	2
Clinton.	3	No	"	3
Council Bluffs.	25	4	4	33
Davenport.	174	15	No	189
Marshalltown.	8	No	No	8
Ottumwa.	92	No	No	92
Des Moines.	234	16	No	250
Dubuque.	132	3	1	136
Ft. Dodge.	20	1	No	21
Iowa City.	3	No	"	3
Keokuk.	4	"	"	4
Muscatine.	36	"	"	36
Oscalooza.	9	"	"	9
Sioux City.	119	6	9	134
Waterloo.	30	No	1	31
Waverly.	No	1	1	2
Total	1,138	72 [71]	15 [16]	1,225

Kansas.

Atchison.	8	No	No	8
Ft. Scott.	3	"	"	3
Galena.	1	"	"	1
Hutchinson.	7	"	"	7
Iola.	7	"	"	7

<u>Town.</u>	<u>Direct.</u>	<u>Reunion.</u>	<u>Courtesy.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
Independence.	2	"	"	2
Leavenworth.	61	5	"	66
Parsons.	4	No	"	4
Pittsburg.	3	"	"	3
Salina.	1	"	"	1
Topeka.	54	9	"	63
Wichita.	27	12	4	43
Total	178	26	4	208

Louisiana.

Bastrop.	No	No	1	1
Baton Rouge.	5	"	No	5
[DeRidder].	2	"	"	2
Lafayette.	3	"	"	3
Lake Charles.	12	"	"	12
Lake Providence.	2	"	"	2
Napoleonville.	1	"	"	1
New Orleans.	132	34	38	204
Monroe.	4	No	2	6
Shreveport.	21	9	15	45
Vivian.	1	7	No	8
Alexandria.	6	1	"	7
Total	189	51	56	296

Minnesota.

[Chisholm].	12	No	No	12
Duluth.	95	"	"	95
[Eveleth].	5	"	"	5
Gilbert.	2	"	"	2
Hibbing.	4	3	"	7
Minneapolis.	269	26	21	316
St. Paul.	522	21	4	547
Staples.	5	No	No	5
Virginia.	8	"	"	8
Total	922	50	25	997

Mississippi.

Cruger.	1	No	No	1
Hattiesburg.	3	"	3	6
Natchez.	14	"	No	14

154 SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

<u>Town.</u>	<u>Direct.</u>	<u>Reunion.</u>	<u>Courtesy.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
Vicksburg.	10	1	"	11
Yazoo City.	2	No	"	2
Silver City.	No	"	1	1
Total	30	1	4	35

Missouri.

Carthage.	1	No	No	1
Hannibal.	9	"	"	9
Joplin.	26	4	"	30
Kansas City.	449	177	90	716
Moberly.	5	No	No	5
Sedalia.	53	1	1	55
St. Joseph.	109	11	13	133
St. Louis.	119	7	14	140
Springfield.	7	No	No	7
Webb City.	3	"	"	3
Total	781	200	118	1,099

Nebraska.

[Fremont].	2	No	No	2
[Falls] City.	1	"	"	1
Grand Island.	4	"	"	4
Hastings.	7	1	"	8
[Holdrege].	1	"	"	1
Lincoln.	109	36	4	149
Norfolk.	1	No	No	1
Nehawka.	No	"	2	2
Omaha.	380	44	49	473
Total	505	81	55	641

North Dakota.

Ashley.	13	No	No	13
Bowman.	1	"	"	1
Fargo.	12	4	"	16
Grand Forks.	5	No	"	5
Total	31	4	No	34 [35]

Oklahoma.

Chickasha.	9	No	No	9
Ardmore.	11	"	"	11

Town.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Duncan.	1	"	"	1
Durant.	No	"	2	2
El Reno.	5	"	No	5
Guthrie.	4	"	"	4
Hugo.	4	9	4	17
Lawton.	12	No	4	12 [16]
[McAlester].	8	"	1	9
Muskogee.	1	"	"	1
Nowata.	1	"	"	1
Oklahoma City.	125	11	4	140
Okmulgee.	1	5	1	7
[Shawnee].	7	No	2	9
Tulsa.	11	1	1	13
Total	200	26	19	245

Tennessee.

[Chattanooga].	3	No	No	3
Memphis.	152	20	6	178
Nashville.	10	No	No	10
Total	165	20	6	191

Texas.

Anderson.	1	No	No	1
Amarillo.	3	"	"	3
Austin.	9	6	2	17
Beaumont.	32	8	3	42 [43]
Beeville.	1	No	No	1
[Bremond].	No	"	1	1
Bryan.	6	"	4	10
Brownwood.	1	"	No	1
Calvert.	17	"	2	19
Corsicana.	19	"	No	19
Corpus Christi.	5	3	1	9
Cleburne.	72	8	2	82
Dallas.	175	55	113	343
Denison.	12	2	2	16
Denton.	2	No	No	2
Dickinson.	2	"	"	2
Dublin.	6	3	"	9
Eagle Lake.	No	3	"	3
El Paso.	10	No	20	30

Town.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Ennis.	2	"	No	2
Franklin.	No	"	1	1
Ft. Worth.	158	50	55	263
Gatesville.	1	2	No	3
Gainesville.	7	No	2	9
Galveston.	120	84	83	287
Gilmer.	1	No	No	1
Gonzales.	1	"	"	1
[Hallettsville].	3	"	"	3
Hamilton.	4	1	"	5
Hempstead.	1	No	"	1
Houston.	182	72	138	392
Hockley.	1	No	No	1
Humble.	No	"	1	1
Kenedy.	1	"	No	1
[La Grange].	No	"	1	1
Laredo.	3	"	4	7
Liberty.	2	"	4	2 [6]
Lockhart.	No	"	1	1
Luling.	1	"	5	6
Marquez.	No	"	1	1
Marshall.	23	23	No	46
[McKinney].	No	No	2	2
Mingus.	2	"	2	2 [4]
[Nocona].	1	"	2	1 [3]
Nacogdoches.	No	"	1	1
Navasota.	4	"	No	4
Palestine.	16	1	1	18
Pecos.	No	No	2	2
Pierce.	2	"	No	2
Port Arthur.	10	1	2	13
Richmond.	No	No	2	2
Rosenberg.	1	"	No	1
San Antonio.	108	16	60	184
San Marcos.	3	No	7	10
Seguin.	1	"	3	4
Silsbee.	No	"	2	2
Temple.	1	"	No	1
Texarkana.	51	"	7	58
Tyler.	29	4	17	50
Taylor.	1	No	No	1
Teague.	2	"	"	2

Town.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Texas City.	1	"	8	9
[Terrell].	1	"	No	1
Waco.	73	16	28	117
Weimar.	1	No	1	2
Wichita Falls.	No	"	2	2
Wharton.	5	3	20	28
Victoria.	12	No	17	29
Yoakum.	9	"	No	9
Total ³²	1,159	378	607	2,144

Wisconsin.

Milwaukee.	29	No	No	29
Superior.	18	"	"	18
Cottage [Grove].	1	"	"	1
Total	48	"	"	48

B) General territory.

Alabama.

Birmingham.	No	No	2	2
Mobile.	1	"	No	1
Selma.	3	"	"	3
Total	4	"	2	6

Arizona.

Clifton.	1	No	No	1
Douglas.	2	"	"	2
Phoenix.	1	"	"	1
Tucson.	4	"	"	4
Total	8	"	"	8

California.

Fruitville.	1	No	No	1
Imperial.	No	"	3	3
Los Angeles.	32	10	79	121
Oakland.	3	2	15	20
San Diego.	No	No	2	2
San Francisco.	33	20	148	201
Stockton.	No	No	1	1
Total	69	32	248	349

Connecticut.

<u>Town.</u>	<u>Direct.</u>	<u>Reunion.</u>	<u>Courtesy.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
Bridgeport.	No	No	4	4
Hartford.	1	"	No	1
Total.	1	No	4	5

Georgia.

Atlanta.	20	No	No	20
Macon.	4	"	"	4
Savannah.	1	"	"	1
Total.	25	"	"	25

Indiana.

Indianapolis.	2	No	No	2
Total.	2	No	No	2

Kentucky.

Louisville.	12	No	No	12
Newport.	1	"	"	1
[Lexington].	4	"	"	4
Total.	17	"	"	17

Michigan.

Detroit.	24	No	No	24
Flint.	1	"	"	1
Grand Rapids.	1	"	"	1
Total.	26	"	"	26

Massachusetts.

Boston.	No	No	2	2
Total.	No	No	2	2

New Mexico.

[La Mesa].	No	No	1	1
[Mesquite].	"	1	No	1
Total	"	1	1	2

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

160 SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

New York.

<u>Town.</u>	<u>Direct.</u>	<u>Reunion.</u>	<u>Courtesy.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
Brooklyn. ³³	No	No	1	1
New York City.	"	"	2	2
Rochester.	"	"	1	1
Total.	"	"	4	4

Ohio.

Cincinnati.	10	No	No	10
Cleveland.	9	"	"	9
Total	19	"	"	19

Oregon.

Portland.	12	7	No	17 [19]
Total	12	7	No	17 [19]

Rhode Island.

Woonsocket.	No	No	1	1
Total	No	No	1	1

[Utah].

Salt Lake City.	7	8	4	19
Total	7	8	4	19

Washington.

Seattle.	15	No	No	15
Total	15	No	No	15

Nevada.

Winnemucca.	2	No	No	2
Total	2	No	No	2

Total of Direct Bureau Removals	6,115
Total of Reunions With Previous Bureau Removals	1,004
Total of Courtesy Cases	1,288
Grand Total of Removals	8,407

STATISTICS OF TRADES

[Shoe and leather work.]

Trade.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Shoemaker.	417	10	36	463
Shoe-upperer.	162	2	2	166
Harness-maker.	25	No	2	27
Leather-worker.	20	1	No	21
Hide-dresser.	8	No	"	8

[Clothing manufacture, repair, and care.]

Tanner.	129	1	2	132
Tailor, men's.	437	40	74	551
" ladies.	46	1	2	49
Trimmer.	4	No	No	4
Umbrella-maker.	1	"	"	1
Weaver.	78	1	2	81
Hat-maker.	19	No	3	22
Cap-maker.	49	2	6	57
Buttonhole-maker.	1	No	No	1
Pants-maker.	1	"	"	1
Glove-maker.	1	"	"	1
Furrier.	31	"	"	31
Millinery.	7	3	2	12
Dressmaker.	100	41	59	200
Seamstress.	69	33	41	143
Cutter.	7	No	1	8
Corset-maker.	3	"	1	4
Coat-padder.	1	"	No	1
Dyer.	13	"	1	14
Lace-worker.	3	"	No	3
Hosiery-worker.	7	1	1	9
Embroider.	4	No	No	4
Cloth-presser.	4	"	1	5
Operator.	2	"	No	2
Last-maker.	2	"	"	2
Laundry-presser.	13	"	1	14

[Metal and machine trades.]

Tinner.	108	5	1	114
Gas-fitter.	1	No	No	1
Boiler-maker.	1	"	"	1

162 SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

Trade.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Technic.	2	No	1	3
Black-smith.	120	2	5	127
Lock-smith.	169	7	7	183
Copper-smith.	8	No	No	8
Gold-smith.	4	"	"	4
Metal-turner.	3	"	"	3
Oiler.	1	"	"	1
Wagon-worker.	2	"	"	2
Electrician.	20	"	1	21
Brass-worker.	6	"	No	6
Polisher.	2	"	"	2
[Zinc]-worker.	3	"	"	3
Iron-moulder.	4	"	"	4
Roofer.	3	"	"	3
Motor-man.	1	"	"	1
Copper-worker.	1	"	"	1
Machinist.	20	1	2	23
Mechanic.	24	No	1	25
Plumber.	10	1	No	11

[Carpentry and woodwork.]

Wheel-wright.	19	No	1	20
Cooper.	14	"	No	14
Wood-turner.	24	"	"	24
Wood-[carver].	5	"	"	5
Carpenter.	332	16	22	370
Cabinet-maker.	41	No	7	48
Shingle-maker.	13	"	No	13
Frame-maker.	3	"	"	3
Upholsterer.	23	1	4	28

[Medical, musical, and educational.]

Druggist.	18	No	2	20
Chemist.	4	"	No	4
Midwife.	3	"	"	3
Musician.	5	"	"	5
Teacher.	58	2	4	64
Pupil.	7	No	2	9
Book-keeper.	24	1	2	27
Dentist.	5	No	1	6
Tooth-technic.	2	"	1	3

Trade.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Stenographer.	2	"	1	2 [3]

[Construction.]

Brick-mason.	16	"	2	18
Plasterer.	2	"	No	2
Glazier.	39	"	"	39
Marble-worker.	7	"	"	7
Panel-maker.	1	"	"	1
Cement-worker.	3	"	"	3
Builder-supervisor.	1	"	"	1
Chimney-sweeper.	1	"	"	1

[Food services.]

Butcher.	187	4	11	202
Waiter.	5	No	1	6
Wine-distiller.	3	"	1	3 [4]
Wine-presser.	1	"	1	1 [2]
Confectioner.	32	No	No	32
Macaroni-worker.	1	"	"	1
Baker.	125	6	11	142
Cook.	2	No	No	2
Shoichet [<i>shochet</i>].	9	"	2	11
[Sausage]-maker.	6	"	1	7
Brewer.	6	"	No	6

[Housewares and home decoration.]

Brush-maker.	18	"	1	19
Bristle-cleaner.	5	"	1	6
Painter.	125	4	17	146
Photographer.	13	No	4	17
Paper-hanger.	9	"	1	10
Drapery-maker.	2	"	No	2
Decorator.	3	1	"	4

[Transportation.]

Cab-man.	26	1	2	29
Driver.	32	1	1	34

164 SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

[Paper trades.]

Trade.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Book-binder.	48	1	2	51
Paper-box-maker.	17	No	1	18

[Miscellaneous.]

None.	548	65	152	765
House-wife.	165	190	180	535
Merchant.	384	11	27	422
Clerk.	469	14	54	537
Laborer.	318	1	13	332
Sailor.	1	No	No	1
Miller.	30	1	1	32
Farmer.	46	1	6	53
[Gardener].	11	No	2	13
Barber.	31	3	1	35
Wig-maker.	9	No	No	9
Typographer.	9	"	"	9
Printer.	13	1	1	15
[Lithographer].	8	No	No	8
Mattress-maker.	2	No	1	3
Soap-maker.	16	"	1	17
Tobacco-worker.	19	1	2	22
Pocket-book-maker.	7	1	1	9
Purse-maker.	2	No	No	2
Rope-maker.	9	"	"	9
Button-maker.	2	"	"	2
Candle-maker.	1	"	"	1
Oil-worker.	1	"	"	1
Comb-maker.	4	"	"	4
Suit-case-maker.	6	"	"	6
Drummer.	2	"	"	2
Pottage-worker.	1	"	"	1

[Jewelry.]

Watchmaker.	41	"	6	47
[Jeweler].	15	"	1	16
Engraver.	7	"	1	7 [8]
Diamond-polisher.	1	"	1	1 [2]

Statistics of Principal Trades

Trade.	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Shoemaker.	417	10	36	463
Tailor.	483	41	76	600
Butcher.	187	4	11	202
Tinner.	108	5	1	114
Painter.	124 [125]	5 [4]	17	146
Black-smith.	120	2	5	127
Lock-smith.	169	7	7	183
Merchant.	384	11	27	422
Clerk.	469	14	54	537
Laborer.	318	1	13	332
Carpenter.	373	16	29	418
Shoe-upperer.	162	2	2	166
Dressmaker.	169	74	100	343
Baker.	125	6	11	143
Tanner.	129	1	2	132

[Unskilled]

None.	548	65	152	765
Housewife.	165	190	180	535

Total of Trades	134 [133]
Total of Direct Cases	5,693 [5702]
Total of Reunion Cases	479
Total of Courtesy Cases	813
Grand Total	6,985 [6,994]

STATISTICS OF AGES

Children Under 15.

	Direct.	Reunion.	Courtesy.	Total.
Male.	160	254	246	660
Female.	163	232	216	611
Total.	323	486	462	1,271

15-30 Inclusive.

Male.	1,376	86	215	1,677
Female.	204	105	158	467
Total.	1,580	191	373	2,144

31-35 Inclusive.

Male.	3,039	58	145	3,242
Female.	240	152	150	542
Total.	3,279	210	295	3,784

36-45 Inclusive.

Male.	844	28	48	920
Female.	44	65	57	166
Total.	888	93	105	1086

46 and Over.

Male.	35	8	29	72
Female.	10	16	24	50
Total.	45	24	53	122

Grand Total of Direct Bureau Removals	6,115
Grand Total of Reunion with Previous Removals.	1,004
Grand Total of Courtesy Cases	1,288
Grand Total of Removals	8,407

-oOo-

Letter from "Secretary" [David Bressler], April 13, 1914

April 13th, 1914.

A meeting of the Galveston Committee was held on April 9th, at the [New York] residence of the Chairman, Mr. Jacob S. Schiff. There were present all the New York members of the Committee, with the exception of Mr. Felix Warburg, who sent his excuses.

The Chairman stated the purpose of the meeting and in the discussion which ensued the following was brought out: that the Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau of Galveston had been organized to influence the deflection of the stream of Jewish immigration from the Northern seaports to the territory west of the Mississippi, with Galveston as the port of entry; that since its formation the Bureau had handled and distributed between 8000 and 9000 people consisting of men, women and children, at a cost of, approximately, \$235,000; that after an existence of seven years, five of which might be called the active years, the volume of Jewish immigration to Galveston had not increased appreciably over the period before the formation of the bureau, and that at no time since its history had the yearly numbers coming to Galveston exceeded 3% of the total Jewish immigration for any one year; that two factors were mainly responsible for the failure of Galveston becoming popular as a port of entry:

- 1: The wholly inadequate steamship facilities between Europe and Galveston, and
- 2: The unduly severe enforcement of the Immigration Laws and Regulations with regard to the admission of immigrants.

As to the first factor, namely; the inadequate steamship facilities and the conditions of travel, it was pointed out that they were such as to discourage any considerable volume from availing themselves of the

Galveston route. The journey between Bremen and Galveston is generally of three weeks' duration, and often longer. While the sponsors of the movement were, at its inception, fully cognizant of the fact that the then existing steamship facilities were inadequate, it was hoped at the time that with proper representations to the Companies engaged in Trans-Atlantic Travel, they could be made to realize in due time the advantage of faster and better steamship service between European ports and Galveston. Despite attempts in this direction by the Committee and of personal effort of the Chairmen himself, the service remained unchanged. In addition, the treatment on board the steamer in the steerage had been complained of time after time and has resulted as a further deterrent to taking passage to Galveston.

As to the second factor, namely: the unduly severe enforcement of the Immigration Laws and Regulations at the Port of Galveston, it was shown that whereas the number of exclusions and deportations from the northern ports averaged from .6% to 1.1% (fiscal year ending June 30th, 1913), at the port of Galveston it was 4.3%; that whereas the percentage of exclusions and deportations of Jewish immigrants from all ports was 1.21% (the same period) from Galveston it was 2.75%; that since July 1st, 1913, an ever severer and more rigorous enforcement had been inaugurated, as shown by the fact that for the calendar year 1913 the percentage of Jewish exclusions from Galveston had jumped to 4.99% and for the first quarter 1914 it was 5.87%. It was further pointed out that there were instances of immigrants excluded at Galveston who experienced no difficulty subsequently in gaining admission at a northern port. (This information came from both Mr. Zangwill and Mr. Jochelmann of the ITO in recent communications from them, in which they deplored the harsh and unfair treatment of the immigrants by the Galveston Immigration officials, stating (see Mr. Jochelmann's letter March 16th, 1914) that "unless the amazing and wholly unjustified conduct of the Immigration officials at Galveston gives place to a fairer and more tolerant enforcement of the law, the 'movement' must fail of its purpose". Continuing, the letter says: "Among the emigrant population, itself, the harsh treatment at Galveston has become a by-word, so that now, in describing a particularly inquisitorial proceeding, one often hears, 'they examine just like at Galveston'").

The Chairman expressed the opinion that the two factors above stated constituted an insurmountable handicap to the realization of the

purpose for which the movement was started. That because of these handicaps, no deflection of Jewish immigration in any appreciable volume had been accomplished.

The Chairman, in summing up the situation, repeated emphatically what had been brought out upon many previous occasions, namely that the placement of the Jewish immigrants by the Galveston Bureau had been attended with gratifying success; that insofar as the welfare of the immigrants in and by itself was concerned, the money expended by the Bureau, since its inception, had been thoroughly justified; that within the limitation of the comparatively small number of immigrants handled by the Bureau, their successful settlement in the interior had already attracted, and would undoubtedly continue to attract a number of their dependents and friends who otherwise would have come to, and remained in one of the ports of the Atlantic seaboard.

Continuing, the Chairman questioned, however, if, in view of the failure to more nearly approximate the original purpose of the movement, namely: the deflection of the stream of Jewish immigration from the larger eastern ports of entry, the time had not come to discontinue the Galveston Bureau. He pointed out that at no time had our Committee or the ITO Committee cooperating in the movement felt satisfied with its progress; that on the one hand we had constantly expressed our dissatisfaction with the small numbers coming to Galveston, and on the other hand the ITO had uniformly called attention to the serious obstacle to the realization of the project presented by the wholly unfavorable existing steamship facilities, and more latterly, to the additional handicap created by the unduly severe enforcement of the Immigration Laws at Galveston.

A motion, therefore, was duly made, seconded and unanimously carried,

1: That the Galveston Bureau be discontinued after September 30th, 1914.

2: That the usual provisions be made for all those coming to Galveston until that time.

3: That with regard to the wives and children of Bureau removals previous to June 1st, 1914, our agreement in meritorious cases to

pay one half their fare from Galveston to destination remain in force until December 31st, 1914.

The Secretary was instructed to notify Mr. Zangwill in a comprehensive letter of the foregoing, and likewise send due notice to our Galveston Manager, Mr. Epstein.

The Chairman appointed Messrs. Sulzberger, Arkush and Bressler, a Committee of Three, to prepare a statement for the press to be released at their discretion.

Meeting then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Secretary.

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

*(Courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center
of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.)*

NOTES

¹ Both items are included in the Henry Cohen Papers, MS Collection 263, Box 1, Folder 4, Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati (AJA). I am indebted to the AJA, and especially to Dr. Gary Zola, the archive's director, and Joe Weber, associate archivist, for permission to reproduce these documents in their entirety.

² Bernard Marinbach, *Galveston: Ellis Island of the West* (Albany, NY, 1983). For articles and chapters see, for example, Gary Dean Best, "Jacob H. Schiff's Galveston Movement: An Experiment in Immigration Deflection, 1907–1914," *American Jewish Archives* 30 (April 1978): 43–79; John Livingston, "The Industrial Removal Office, the Galveston Project, and the Denver Jewish Community," *American Jewish History* 68 (June 1979): 434–458; Henry Cohen II, "'The Man Who Stayed in Texas': Galveston's Rabbi Henry Cohen, a Memoir," in *Lone Stars of David*, ed. Hollace Ava Weiner and Kenneth D. Roseman (Waltham, MA, 2007), 78–92; Bryan Edward Stone, *The Chosen Folks: Jews on the Frontiers of Texas* (Austin, TX, 2010), 81–93. General histories of American Jewry that mention the Galveston Plan include Howard M. Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America* (New York, 1992) and Hasia R. Diner, *The Jews of the United States, 1654–2000* (Berkeley, CA, 2004). The film is Cynthia and Allen Mondell, *West of Hester Street* (Dallas, 1983); the exhibit is *Forgotten Gateway: Coming to America Through Galveston Island, 1846–1924*, curated by Suzanne Seriff, which originated at the Bullock Texas State History Museum in Austin in 2009 and continues to travel. Humanities Texas: Exhibitions, accessed December 27, 2017, <http://www.humanitiestexas.org/exhibitions/list/by-title/forgotten-gateway-coming-america-through-galveston-island>; see also Bryan Edward Stone, "Exhibit Review: *Forgotten Gateway: Coming to America through Galveston Island, 1846–1924*," *Southern Jewish History* 12 (2009): 264–67.

³ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 161–65.

⁴ Alexander Z. Gurwitz, *Memories of Two Generations*, trans. Amram Prero, ed. Bryan Edward Stone (Tuscaloosa, AL, 2016), 275–95.

⁵ A recent online article looks into the lives of a few individual Galveston immigrants: Rachel Siegel, "When Yiddish Became Y'all," *These Fifty States*, June 7, 2017, accessed December 31, 2017, <http://thesefiftystates.org/when-yiddish-became-yall/>.

⁶ Diner, *Jews of the United States*, 88, 105.

⁷ Diner, *Jews of the United States*, 186; Marinbach, *Galveston*, 3. See also Hollace Ava Weiner, "Removal Approval: The Industrial Removal Office Experience in Fort Worth, Texas," *Southern Jewish History* 4 (2001): 1–44.

⁸ For detail on Schiff's selection of Galveston as a point of entry, see Marinbach, *Galveston*, 12; Stone, *Chosen Folks*, 85–86.

⁹ Jacob Schiff to Israel Zangwill, October 25, 1906, in Cyrus Adler, *Jacob H. Schiff: His Life and Letters* (New York, 1928), 2:99.

¹⁰ Jacob Schiff to Israel Zangwill, November 21, 1905, quoted in Best, "Jacob H. Schiff's Galveston Movement," 46.

¹¹ Jacob Schiff to Israel Zangwill, August 24, 1906, in Adler, *Jacob H. Schiff*, 2:97.

¹² Jacob Schiff to Henry Cohen, January 8, 1907, Cohen Papers, Coll. 263, Box 1, Folder 4, AJA.

¹³ Jacob Schiff to the manager of the Transcontinental Passenger Association at Chicago, December 22, 1909, in Adler, *Schiff*, 2:105.

¹⁴ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 18–19.

¹⁵ Letter signed “Secretary” [David Bressler], April 13, 1914, Cohen Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, AJA.

¹⁶ Letter signed “Secretary.”

¹⁷ Letter signed “Secretary.” See also Marinbach, *Galveston*, 173–74.

¹⁸ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 60. Marinbach reports that the medical examiner in Galveston when the program began, Dr. Corput, had been overheard “making anti-Semitic remarks” and vowing to “make it as difficult as possible for Jewish immigrants to enter.” The inspector in charge of the Galveston station, Alfred Hampton, was notoriously severe and was, Marinbach writes, “out to make a name for himself as a vigorous enforcer of the immigration statutes.” For more on Hampton’s actions, see Best, “Schiff’s Galveston Movement,” 60–63.

¹⁹ Letter signed “Secretary.”

²⁰ Letter signed “Secretary.”

²¹ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 172. This average means that 486 immigrants arrived in 1914 by April 1. Added to the figures provided in “Statistics of Jewish Immigration” through 1913, this brings the grand total of Galveston immigrants as of that date to 8,893. No data is immediately available for the subsequent months before the termination of the effort in September 1914.

²² “Guide to the Records of the Jewish Immigrant Information Bureau (Galveston, Tex.). Galveston immigration plan records, undated, 1901–1920,” American Jewish Historical Society, accessed December 30, 2017, <http://digifindingaids.cjh.org/?pID=109182>. The AJHS website includes digital scans of everything in the JIIB collection.

²³ The data in this and all other tables is derived from “Statistics of Jewish Immigrants Who Arrived at the Port of Galveston, Texas, During the Years 1907–1913 Inclusive, Handled by Jewish Immigrants Information Bureau of Galveston, Texas [1914],” Henry Cohen Papers, AJA.

²⁴ This is the correct total for the figures above it, but it does not align with the grand total provided in the original document and in Table 1. The error is most likely in the figures provided for some cities, but it is impossible to know which ones.

²⁵ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 11.

²⁶ Regions are defined according to the U.S. Census Bureau, “Census Regions and Divisions of the United States,” accessed February 4, 2018, http://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf.

²⁷ The groupings by type of work provided in the document are haphazard and hard to explain. It is unclear, for example, why the document’s author chose to list shinglemakers in a separate category from glaziers and plasterers, or why they placed dentists, musicians, and teachers together in a single group. In the absence of informative labels in the original, I have devised titles to designate each type of work based on my estimate of what each group has in common, but these are imprecise at best.

²⁸ Marinbach, *Galveston*, 11.

²⁹ I am unable to determine whether the average Galveston immigrant resembled the average Jewish immigrant to the United States at large, as I have been unable to locate previous statistical studies that provide information on broader patterns.

³⁰ Letter signed "Secretary."

³¹ This total is correct, and the Colorado total of 284 matches the corresponding figure in the state distribution table. It is not, however, an accurate sum of the figures in the rows above, which suggests that some Colorado city data was incorrectly reported or incorrectly added.

³² The totals in this row are correct, and the Texas total of 2,144 matches the figure in the state distribution table. They are not, however, accurate sums of the figures in the rows above, which suggests that some Texas city data was incorrectly reported or incorrectly added.

³³ The five boroughs of New York City were consolidated in 1898, fifteen years before these tables were produced, so it is unclear why the JIIB opted to treat Brooklyn as a separate entity from New York. I have combined them in my calculations.