

SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

Journal of the Southern Jewish Historical Society

Mark K. Bauman, *Editor*

Rachel Heimovics Braun, *Managing Editor*

Dana M. Greene, *Book Review Editor*

2008

Volume 11



Southern Jewish History

Mark K. Bauman, *Editor*

Rachel Heimovics Braun, *Managing Editor*

Dana M. Greene, *Book Review Editor*

Editorial Board

Ronald Bayor	Alan Kraut
Marcie Cohen Ferris	Adam Mendelsohn
Belinda Gergel	David Patterson
Karla Goldman	Jonathan Sarna
Dana M. Greene	Lee Shai Weissbach

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: Scott M. Langston, *President*; Leonard Rogoff, *President Elect*; Phyllis Leffler, *Secretary*; Bernard Wax, *Treasurer*; Sumner I. Levine, *Immediate Past President*. BOARD OF TRUSTEES: Les Bergen, Sandra Berman, Marni Davis, Jayne Guberman, Adam Mendelsohn, Jacqueline G. Metzel, Jean Roseman, Dale Rosengarten, Philip N. Steel, Jr., Harriet W. Stern, Ellen M. Umansky, EX-OFFICIO: Jay Tanenbaum.

For authors' guidelines, contributions, and all editorial matters, write to the Editor, *Southern Jewish History*, 2517 Hartford Dr., Ellenwood, GA 30294; email: Markkbauman@aol.com. The journal is interested in unpublished articles pertaining to the Jewish experience in the American South. Publishers who wish to submit books for review should email Dana M. Greene at greenedm@gmail.com. For journal subscriptions and advertising, write Rachel Heimovics Braun, managing editor, 954 Stonewood Lane, Maitland, FL 32751; or email: journal@jewishsouth.org; or visit www.jewishsouth.org.

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*, and *Journal of Southern History*.

Southern Jewish History acknowledges with deep appreciation grants from the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation of New York and the Gale Foundation of Beaumont, Texas.

Copyright © 2008 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, contact the editor, Mark K. Bauman, at MarkKBauman@aol.com or the managing editor, Bryan Edward Stone, at bstone@delmar.edu.

Charleston Jewry, Black Civil Rights, and Rabbi Burton Padoll

by

Allen Krause

When Burton Padoll was a young man growing up in Youngstown, Ohio, becoming a professional within the Jewish community was the last thing on his or his parents' minds. Born in 1929, Padoll's genealogy was unusual for a rabbi in that his maternal grandfather, having come from Poland, married an Irish woman from Chicago. Having been raised as a Roman Catholic, she had converted to Judaism prior to their marriage. Padoll recalls his family as "totally assimilated" and "non-practicing" and located in what he called "a totally non-Jewish world." Throughout his elementary and high school years he was "the only Jewish kid in my class." Yet, even though there was no observance of Judaism in his home, at some point during his childhood his parents joined a nearby Reform congregation, where Padoll discovered "a dimension" of his Jewishness that he had never experienced. His grammar school years were very difficult; in his words, "I took an awful lot of shit all my growing up years," being picked on as a "curly-haired Jewish sissy." As a teenager he found refuge in youth activities at the synagogue and, when so involved, felt for the first time an appreciation for being Jewish. While in high school he attended a North America Federation of Temple Youth convention at the Cincinnati campus of the Hebrew Union College that made an impression. However, even though his rabbi, Sidney Berkowitz, believed that Padoll had the potential to become a rabbi, he resisted and entered college "with no idea whatsoever" what he was going to do with his life.

Drawn to teaching and social work, he also considered going into the theater. It was almost an epiphany at the end of his freshman year at Ohio State University, when it came to him that the rabbinate combined all three of his interests—teaching, helping people, and acting. As he later recalls, he was “concerned about the God issue,” but he decided “to hell with it; why should I let something like that stand in my way?” Thus he entered the seminary very poorly equipped, especially in the Hebrew language since, as he told Dale Rosengarten and Solomon Breibart in an interview, he had “absolutely no Jewish background.” This sense of academic inadequacy remained with him throughout his career; he never felt comfortable with Hebrew, nor did he feel confident about his Jewish knowledge. He attributes his success in getting through the Hebrew Union College “not with flying colors, but with good colors,” to his ability to cram and to do well on exams. Ordained by the seminary in 1957, he ended up taking an assistant rabbi position at Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline, Massachusetts, where he spent the next five years. At the end of his first year, he went into classical analysis, which he continued until he departed in 1961. “I finished my analysis,” he said in the interview, but “it didn’t do any good.”¹

In 1961 Burton and his wife, Natalie, relocated to Charleston, where he became the rabbi of congregation Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim (Holy Congregation, The House of God, or KKBE). Padoll’s residency at KKBE spanned the height of black civil rights activity in South Carolina, ending in mid-1967, when he moved to New York City where he became the associate rabbi at Temple Shaaray Tefila. His tenure there was the shortest of his career, only two years, after which he accepted the position of rabbi at Temple Beth Shalom in Peabody, Massachusetts. This proved to be a good match, since he served Beth Shalom until 1989, when the congregation gratefully bestowed upon him the title of emeritus. Beset by health problems, Padoll then relocated to Mount Jackson, Virginia, where he and his second wife, Sheila, opened an antique store. Burton Padoll died at the age of seventy-six, on December 22, 2005.

Rabbi Burton Padoll, 1962.
*(Photo: Gift of Sheila Padoll, courtesy of Jewish Heritage Collection,
College of Charleston.)*

Since Padoll was an outspoken supporter of integration, the general belief, which he also held, was that he was forced out of KKBE mainly because of this issue.² This is not an unreasonable position, given the fact that so many Christian clergy throughout the South were summarily dismissed from their pulpits for this reason during the 1960s,³ as many believe happened also to rabbis Charles Mantinband and David Ben Ami in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Perry Nussbaum in Jackson, Mississippi, Seymour Atlas in Montgomery, Alabama, and Emmett Frank in Alexandria, Virginia.⁴ This paper will focus on Padoll's Charleston years and the role Jewish merchants played vis-à-vis the civil rights movement, and offer another explanation of why the rabbi left KKBE.

Charleston's Jewish Community

In 1806, fifty-nine years after KKBE was organized, the congregation's lay leaders, seeking qualified religious leadership, wrote a letter to the elders of the Sephardic congregation in London in which they said:

In a free and independent country . . . where civil and religious freedom go hand in hand, where no distinctions exist between the clergy of different denominations, where we are incorporated and known in law; freely tolerated; where, in short, we enjoy all the blessings of freedom in common with our fellow citizens . . . we are men, susceptible of that dignity which belongs to human nature.⁵

Thus they explained that it was very important for them "never to act politically as a religious sect but simply as Americans." In 1832 a group of "Eighty-Four Israelites" of Charleston expressed this even more forcefully in an open letter in the local newspaper, which said:

We wholly disdain any wish or intention to be represented as a peculiar community.

And . . . we discountenance the idea of selecting any individual for office . . . upon the ground that such individual belongs to a particular sect.⁶

One hundred and fifty years later much the same could be said about members of the Charleston Jewish community, who were, in many respects, not unlike their non-Jewish neighbors.

With the probable exception of those whose families had come over from eastern Europe, especially those who had fled the Polish town of Kaluszyn, there really was very little difference in the way Charleston Jews lived their lives from Charleston's Christians. Before going into detail about the similarities between the city's Jews and non-Jews, it would be useful to understand community divisions. During the formative years of those individuals who made up the Charleston Jewish community in 1960, there was, as some would call it, a virtual caste system.⁷ The Downtown Jews were composed of those like the Tobiases, the Möises, the Mordecais, and the Lazaruses, who could trace their Sephardic Charleston roots to the eighteenth century, along with those Jews whose families had come from central European countries like Germany and Austria during the nineteenth century. The Uptown Jews arrived beginning in the late nineteenth century from eastern Europe. The Downtown Jews lived in one area of the city, and almost all were affiliated with KKBE, the Reform synagogue, while the Uptown Jews were generally found in their less upscale area, and were affiliated with one of the two Orthodox synagogues, the more prestigious Brith Sholom, or Beth Israel, founded by the less acculturated Kaluszyners. In 1947 some of the Uptown Jews joined with a few families from KKBE to found Emanu-El, the city's first Conservative synagogue. A strict code prevented Downtown Jewish girls from socializing with their Uptown counterparts. The code seemed to be somewhat looser for the boys, especially when they reached high school, when boys from both groups joined the very popular AZA social club, which was affiliated with the adult B'nai B'rith. For the girls, and for the preteen boys, the most important social setting was their religious and Hebrew schools.

Outside of the synagogue schools, the main friendships that most Charleston Jewish grammar school children had were with non-Jewish neighbors. A high percentage of Jewish adults, recalling their childhood in the 1960s, could not relate any

antisemitic episodes. Quite to the contrary, they felt totally accepted by their Christian counterparts, played with them, spent time in their homes, would go to each other's places of worship, and never had a feeling of being "set apart."⁸ Curiously, this seemed to change for at least some of these people when they reached their teens. Although most of them had no problem dating non-Jewish neighbors, some of them, like Sanford Patla Olov, experienced a growing awareness that "as you grow up in a non-Jewish atmosphere . . . the realization comes . . . that the real friends are the Jewish friends." Asked "Where was that apparent to you?" he answered, "sometimes social functions, you were not invited. As their parents would invite their Christian friends. . . ." When asked whether or not he was invited into these people's homes, Olov responded, "Oh yeah, until that feeling of exclusion finally came in" in his later teens.⁹

There were other ways that Charleston's Jews blended into the non-Jewish world. Almost without exception, they were all raised in homes that employed black maids, cooks, and/or nannies. In many cases their connection with these individuals spanned decades. Like other Charlestonians of means, many if not most of them had summer residences on either Folly Island or Sullivan's Island to which they often brought these household workers. In addition, the food that their cooks prepared was, at least in the case of the Downtown Jews, hardly different from what their non-Jewish friends ate. Even those Jews who practiced some degree of kashrut often ate forbidden foods like pork and shellfish when they dined outside the home. In one rather ingenious family, the laundry room was not considered part of the house, so the children would retreat there, along with their mother, in order to enjoy a shrimp cocktail.¹⁰ The father of this same family ate bacon but saw ham as being "totally out of the question." Another person whose mother kept a kosher home was regularly taken out by his father for bacon and eggs. For the most part, Charleston's non-Orthodox Jews did not keep even a semblance of the dietary laws. They ate, as one interviewee put it "a normal American diet." The blurring of kashrut regulations by acculturating Jews of eastern European origin and dismissal of

them by Reform Jews thus reflected national Jewish norms of accommodation.

Another sign of assimilation was the heavy emphasis on playing an active role in the community. Many Charleston Jews were active in fraternal organizations (especially the Masons), many served on boards of the library, the art museum, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Salvation Army, or the United Way, and many more groups. Doris Meddin recalled that in the first year of her marriage she was active in twenty-one different organizations. Jews not only served on the boards of these organizations, they often were elected to lead them. A few even belonged to the Daughters of the American Revolution, one of the city's most prestigious organizations. In addition to doing so out of a sense of gratitude or for business reasons, Jews were active in this manner because it was expected of them. It was the southern way. If you wished to be considered part of the city's genteel elite, this is what you had to do. Understanding how important this was within the Jewish community, it is no surprise that inscribed on an honor roll plaque of women volunteers in City Hall, four of the first six listed are Jewish.¹¹

Although all the white citizens of Charleston took pride in their city's history, the Jews connected to KKBE were particularly proud of their congregation, which is known as the birthplace of Reform Judaism in America. They rightly considered the building on Hasell Street a national treasure; after all, how many other congregations in the United States offer daily tours of their sanctuary to tourists? Rich in history and tradition, many in the Reform Jewish community considered it a great honor for someone to be invited to serve the congregation as its rabbi. Thus the members of KKBE felt doubly blessed to be residents of Charleston.

Nonetheless, as well-integrated and as proud as the Jewish community was, Charleston was not Camelot. Although most denied having experienced antisemitism, still, when the interviewer continued to probe, many spoke of feeling like outsiders, of not feeling completely accepted. For example, Mortie Cohen, who began by saying "I never felt that I was not wanted or

welcomed," recalled a country club incident when a Jewish friend was blackballed.¹² Dorothea Shimel Dumas remembered how her father was not put up to become a federal judge because someone in power asked, "Can't we find someone with the same ability that is not Jewish?"¹³ Mordenai Hirsch, a direct descendant of the eighteenth century Lazarus family, explained that her mother, a member of the DAR, believed being Jewish prevented her from becoming the regional president or even the president of the local chapter.¹⁴ Avram Kronsberg recounted that Thomas Tobias, whose family also had been in Charleston decades before the Revolutionary War, had been elected to the elite Carolina Yacht Club but that when Tobias proposed Rabbi Allan Tarshish for membership he was told in no uncertain terms "Don't try to bring another Jew in here." And then there was Cotillion, where children and young adults would learn the manners and proper social behavior in the context of formal dance, where the "No Jews Allowed" sign was clearly imprinted on the Jewish psyche. Maybe this is why a significant number of those interviewed as part of the Jewish Heritage Collection's Oral History Project eventually declared that their true friends were fellow Jews. Sanford Olasov put it succinctly, "As you grow up in a non-Jewish atmosphere . . . the realization comes . . . that the real friends are the Jewish friends. Even as adults, you realize that your genuine friends are not your Gentile friends." Olasov provided an example: when he was vice president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, he asked a school friend, now a Baptist minister, to give the blessing at a meeting, and the minister went on to ask the blessing "in Christ's name."¹⁵

One should not assume, based on the lack of observance of the dietary laws and involvement in non-Jewish volunteerism and in non-Jewish fraternal organizations, that the Jews of Charleston paid little or no attention to Judaism. Those in the Orthodox community were generally more religiously observant, but even the members of KKBE made their way to synagogue at least on occasion, sent their children to religious and Hebrew school, participated in Jewish organizations like B'nai B'rith or Sisterhood or the Jewish Community Center, observed key Jewish holidays,

*Synagogue Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim,
86 Hasell Street, Charleston, South Carolina.
(Photo: KKBE congregational records, courtesy of
Jewish Heritage Collection, College of Charleston.)*

and were proud to let it be known that they were Jewish. From a number of the interview transcripts it can be inferred that Charleston's Jews differed on another important front: they were apparently less likely to be dyed-in-the-wool segregationists. This is not to say they were enthusiastic integrationists; very few probably were. Indeed, the merchants of King Street, many of whom were Jewish, were not at all happy with the picketing and the loss of business. But, once the underside of the southern way of life was exposed and challenged, they seemed to be more likely to feel twinges of guilt. Mortie Cohen spoke of a black plumber in the town of St. Matthews who "was arrogant." By that he means "he didn't probably [say] sir or ma'am or move off the sidewalk when you were coming." When some of the local townspeople "beat

the living hell out of him," Cohen says "it was just the worst experience I've ever had in my life."¹⁶ Avram Kronsberg admits to having opposed civil rights when picketing broke out in 1963, but "when President Kennedy was assassinated . . . what I heard was people clapping and cheering and it made me sick to my stomach. That's when I guess this whole naiveté that I had . . . began to disappear, when I realized that I could no longer pretend that I was something that I wasn't."¹⁷ Dumas talked about a Jew who, it appears, was not at all happy about the prospect of integration. When a storm broke out one summer on Sullivan's Island and lightning struck the house of Irving Steinberg, the next day "he put out this big sign: 'God, you made a mistake. . . . You really meant to put it across the street, at Judge Waring's house, not mine.'"¹⁸ Steinberg seems less representative of Charleston Jewry than were the Jewish teenagers at Rivers High when the school was integrated in 1963. According to Sol Breibart, who taught there that year, the Jewish students "were very, very cooperative in trying to make the transition as easy as possible."¹⁹ Since memories of events that occurred over forty years ago can be both selective and inaccurate, none of this should be considered sufficient evidence to conclude that Charleston Jews in the sixties were any more likely to be receptive to integration than their non-Jewish neighbors. There is, of course, the well-known example of one of the state's most powerful Jews, Solomon Blatt, who served as speaker of the State House of Representatives for over three decades and, for most of that time, was an ardent opponent of integration, but he had so little connection to his Judaism that a Baptist and a Lutheran minister participated in his funeral service.²⁰ Conversely, in the interviews the author conducted with twenty-five southern rabbis in 1966, twenty of them rated their congregants as "basically moderate or liberal on the [African American] civil rights issue."²¹ Moderate or not, there is no question that the Jewish community was nervous about and felt threatened by what became known as the "Charleston Movement."

Civil Rights in Charleston

When Burton Padoll decided to uproot his young family and move to Charleston, he was choosing to settle in the first state to secede from the Union and the first to fire upon Union soldiers, as it was also destined to be the first to challenge the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In addition, Charleston, as historian Stephen O'Neill has written, was "a city . . . preoccupied with race throughout its history, a city that saw its very self-identity profoundly threatened" by the emerging civil rights movement.²² But, with or without the consent of Charleston's white citizens, there was serious change in the air.

One of the most important catalysts to that change was World War II. Many southern blacks had served in the military side-by-side with whites, and, when they returned at war's end, they were increasingly unready to put up with racial business as usual. A key factor in the angst of the times was the great difference in the standard of living between white and black. In 1950, the median income of African American families in Charleston County was one-third that of whites, while their percentage of unemployment was three times higher. Only 27 percent of the non-white homes had inside toilets, compared to 87 percent of white households. Those numbers showed only a modest improvement a decade later.²³

With South Carolina's whites very much aware of the ill winds that were brewing, the May 17, 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision²⁴ hit Charleston as hard as any other city in the South, and, in O'Neill's words, "caused the city's business and civic leaders, its politicians, and especially its daily paper, the *News and Courier*, [to] forcefully and prominently elevate the issue of race above all others in their attempt to defend the peninsular city." For the next two decades "every community social and political issue was overshadowed or at least strongly influenced by racial questions."²⁵ White Citizens' Councils thrived, and the sentiments they expressed were shared by an overwhelming majority of white Charlestonians.²⁶ Resistance was so great that by 1963, nine years after the *Brown* decision, South

Carolina stood with Mississippi as the only states that had not even achieved a token integration of the public schools.

The growing unrest among black Carolinians did not go unnoticed in Columbia, the state's capital. As early as 1951, Governor James F. Byrnes, in an attempt to hold off desegregation by making separate truly equal, began a school equalization policy, funded by a sales tax. In that same year, the South Carolina General Assembly established a special legislative committee, the South Carolina School Committee, to prepare the way "in the event that the Federal Courts nullify the provisions of the State's Constitution regarding the establishment of separate schools for the children of the white and colored races."²⁷ A staunch segregationist, Senator L. Marion Gressette, was appointed committee chair.

The black community also had its leaders. Some of them came from outside the state, specifically from the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). Representatives from these groups attempted to establish an organizational presence in the state in the early 1960s, but they were unable to play anything more than a supportive role to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), which, for reasons explained below, remained "the preeminent civil rights organization in South Carolina."²⁸ It was the NAACP working together with local black churches that mobilized blacks throughout the state.

In 1950, the president of the Charleston branch of the NAACP, J. Arthur Brown, a realtor and one of the more important local black leaders, launched a massive voter registration drive in Charleston County and also mounted a protracted legal campaign to desegregate the city's public parks.²⁹ In July 1955, he played an important role as the NAACP petitioned to integrate schools in Charleston, North Charleston, and the nearby suburb of Mount Pleasant. In response, the *Charleston News and Courier* published the names of the petitioners, so that the Citizens' Council members would find it easier to show their displeasure.³⁰ This intimidation, joined with the state legislature's refusal to provide

state funds to any school that obeyed the *Brown* directive, made progress on this front extremely difficult.³¹ Within a short time Brown moved on to become the state NAACP president, to be replaced by the Reverend B. J. Glover of the Emanuel AME Church, who in turn gave way to F. O. Pharr. As statewide president, Brown developed a strong relationship with Roy Wilkins, national head of the NAACP, which proved invaluable in providing financing for what is now known as "The Charleston Movement."³²

According to a census taken by the Charleston Jewish Welfare Fund, approximately 750 Jewish families resided in the city in 1962. It is safe to say that none of them was sanguine after the *Brown* decision of 1954. Being an integral part of the Charleston community, while at the same time feeling somewhat on the outside, their anxiety level rose as their city struggled with the growing expectations of the local black population. This led to the creation in early 1960 of the Jewish Community Relations Committee of Charleston (JCRC), an agency of the Jewish Welfare Fund. Three KKBE lay people were on this committee, Bernard Olov, Jeanette Felsenthal Pearlstine, and Thomas J. Tobias, who was elected the committee's first chair. The three rabbis on the committee were N. L. Rabinovitch from Orthodox Brith Sholom Beth Israel, Hillel Millgram from Conservative Emanu-El, and Allan Tarshish from Reform KKBE. At its May 16, 1960, meeting concerns were expressed regarding the Ku Klux Klan, with the minutes noting that "the Klan was going stronger in South Carolina than anywhere else in the South." There was also discussion about "negro picketing" that was taking place in Savannah, Georgia. JCRC secretary Nat Shulman was asked to "keep in touch" with the Jews of Savannah "so if such a situation should occur in Charleston, we would know how the Savannah Community handled the problem and the role played by the [Savannah] Jewish Community."³³

According to the March 20, 1961, minutes, Arthur Levin, Southern Section Regional Director of the Anti-Defamation League, brought the committee information about "the sit-in situation and school desegregation problems in Atlanta." Some of

the JCRC members attended a meeting of the Southern Jewish Community Relations Councils in Atlanta the last weekend in February, and they reported that “these problems are not *Jewish problems* [emphasis in original]; they are problems of the total community,” and, reflecting a sense of vulnerability, they cautioned that “the Jewish community would have to take their stand [only] if and when the overall community acted.” Particular concern was expressed regarding the sit-ins and boycotts, since so many Charleston Jews were merchants. A decision was made to invite Joseph Moseson, executive director of the Savannah Jewish Council, to address the committee on April 14 regarding the “sit-in situation and boycott which is presently going on in Savannah.”³⁴

To some extent this was a case of closing the barn door after the animals had fled. On the first day in April 1960, two months after Greensboro and just a month after a group of fifty black students conducted very brief sit-ins at Woolworth’s and S. H. Kress’s lunch counters on Main Street in Columbia, Charleston witnessed its first sit-in. Two dozen students from Burke High School, led by James G. Blake, senior class president and leader of the NAACP Youth Council, Harvey Gantt, and Minerva Keane, sat in at the Kress store on King Street.³⁵ Three years later, Blake and Gantt were to play much larger roles in the state’s drama of desegregation, but, in the meantime, as 1960 drew to a close, the Reverend I. DeQuincy Newman, the South Carolina field secretary for the NAACP, in anticipation of the coming Christmas season, called upon the state’s blacks to boycott all businesses that observe segregation as a matter of policy.

On the Saturday before Easter the next year, another action took place on King Street, which appears to have been the beginning of a very selective and continuous boycott of a small number of merchants and businesses.³⁶ In response, a JCRC luncheon meeting was convened on April 14 at which Joseph Moseson, director of the Savannah JCRC, spoke to the committee and to several merchants from King Street “with reference to the boycott in Savannah by the Negro community.”³⁷ The JCRC minutes of the October 30, 1961, meeting reflect the disturbances

that were now an ongoing part of the city's life. Committee member Edward Kronsberg, owner of Edwards, a five-and-dime store on King Street, reported that the boycott "was quite effective." Since ninety percent of his business at the store came from the black community, he explained that he was under great pressure to employ African American salesclerks, adding that he had actually hired two blacks to service the ice cream and popcorn counter, but this created a strong negative reaction from competitor merchants and from white customers, forcing him to "discontinue employing Negroes as clerks." Kronsberg was also asked to approach the president of the local Retail Merchants Association "as to the possibility of having them invite his counterpart from Savannah to speak on the problems that Savannah faced and how they solved those problems."

The sole topic of the February 1962 meeting, as reflected in the next available minutes, was the Sunday closing law being proposed in Columbia, while the March 18 special meeting was concerned only with a personal embroilment between N. L. Rabinovitch, rabbi of Brith Sholom Beth Israel, and I. L. (Lee) Banov.³⁸ The issue of civil rights did not resurface until March 27, and it was the new KKBE rabbi who was central to the discussion.

The New Rabbi Arrives

Burton Padoll's tenure at KKBE began on June 1, 1961. During his years in Brookline, he had been very active in the struggle for fair housing practices and frequently used the pulpit to share his prophetic views regarding civil rights.³⁹ He was horrified at what was going on in the South and felt very frustrated that he was not engaged in the struggle for black equality. Thus, when the pulpit of KKBE opened, he applied. When he came to Charleston in mid-April 1961, as a candidate for the KKBE position, he preached a sermon that at least implied where his passions lay, and which should have been the "writing on the wall" to the congregation's lay leaders. In the sermon he spoke of how Joseph adopted the local manner of dress and speech, lived at ease in an Egyptian mansion, and yet remained "insecure, unrelaxed, frightened and alarmed." Once Joseph's

Hebrew identity was discovered his fears proved to be “unfounded” and he realized that “his years of anxiety and deceit had been for naught.” Padoll continued:

[The] average American Jew . . . lives behind a barricade of artificiality and deceit for fear of . . . being discovered as what he really is . . . he too will be accepted . . . he can finally begin to put the ideals of his faith into practice for the betterment of all mankind. . . . Why is it that in a world so desperately in need of all we have to offer, we remain silent. . . . The time is long past due when we must become a live, vibrant core of the prophetic faith we represent. . . . Then can rabbi and congregant together . . . be truly indignant . . . against the unending tentacles of prejudice that threaten the security of all mankind. . . . It is not that we have no stand to take. . . . It is simply that we have continually pushed it aside for fear of endangering our position.⁴⁰

In the 1999 interview Padoll asserted that he was no pig in a poke, but that he told the representatives of the KKBE board of trustees “exactly how I felt, that I wanted to do something constructive as far as civil rights were concerned.” The memory of Sheila Padoll, his second wife, is also instructive. When asked why her husband chose to go to Charleston, she answered, “He went there because he wanted a Southern pulpit and this one, evidently, was available. He went there to make a difference in the civil rights movement. *That* was the reason he went there, because he *liked* the Northeast [emphasis in original].”⁴¹ Though some of those who were congregational leaders at the time have said in recent years that they had no idea what Padoll’s views were on civil rights prior to offering him the position, Padoll’s recollection, given his April 14 sermon and the evidence to follow, seems more persuasive.

Once Burton and Natalie Padoll settled into the congregational community, he did not hesitate to make his position on civil rights known. In a sermon delivered on December 16, 1961, while speaking of the Adolph Eichmann verdict, Padoll said “The potentiality for genocide exists in every man—yes, even in each of us who nurture and pamper our own prejudices and bigotries with . . . blatant rationalizations that they

Edwards store, 517 King Street, Charleston, South Carolina, c. 1950.

Edward Kronsberg's five-and-dime store had a mixed clientele.

*(Photo: Gift of Mickey Kronsberg Rosenblum,
courtesy of Jewish Heritage Collection, College of Charleston.)*

are either justified . . . or harmless . . . the understanding man will fight against this with every ounce of strength he owns.”⁴² At the very latest, it was on March 2, 1962, when Padoll spoke directly and clearly to the issue of integration.⁴³ In a sermon that he titled “Inter-racial Communication” he said:

[Forty-three] percent of the citizens of this community . . . are Negroes who, due to the “proud and enforced traditions” of our community find themselves in a world with separate drinking fountains and rest rooms, separate schools and hospitals, separate neighborhoods and hotels, separate restaurants and laundries and jobs and unions and wages and churches and just

about everything else! . . . They are sick unto death of the treatment they receive at the hands of their "benevolent" fellow citizens in this wonderful and beautiful city. . . . A year ago last month, when I met with the Board of Trustees of this Congregation, I explained to them that one thing I would strive to do, as your rabbi, would be to establish some lines of communication with the black community.⁴⁴ . . . Just recently . . . [a] handful of respected Charleston citizens, white and black, have finally begun to talk . . . We have requested the appointment of an official Bi-Racial Committee that could sit down and address the problems confronting our community. "What problems?" people have asked. "Charleston is a peaceful town, free of strife," we've been told. . . . But the problems . . . are about to become quite evident to all of us unless we are willing to confront the seriousness of the situation.

The March 27 minutes of the JCRC shed light on the comments in this sermon. After a brief discussion of the Rabinovitch-Banov quarrel, the committee turned to the "present race relations problem" and "the recent start of a boycott of some King Street merchants." At that point Padoll was asked to report on his efforts to help form a biracial committee. Several meetings had been held since January with leaders of the African American community.⁴⁵ He reported that the meetings were informal, and among those present were other members of the JCRC, namely its chair, Thomas Tobias,⁴⁶ and its secretary, Nat Schulman. Tobias then noted that the JCRC "has a special interest in maintaining favorable race relations, as Jewish merchants would be particularly affected by a boycott such as Savannah experienced."

Padoll then disclosed that his informal committee had decided that the mayor be asked to appoint an official biracial committee. City Attorney Morris Rosen, a member of KKBE, was approached on this matter, and Padoll reported that Rosen's reaction was that it would not be politically practical for Mayor Pro-Tem J. Palmer Gaillard to appoint such a committee "without a clear and present racial emergency, and that it would be difficult for him to get representative white citizens to serve at this time." A short time later the assistant corporation counsel for the City of Charleston, DeRosset Myers, confirmed Rosen's response. Padoll

*Charleston Movement broadside, c. 1963.
Several Jewish-owned stores are among those to be boycotted, including Berlin's,
Levy's Boys' Store, Lesser-Tanenbaum, Jack Krawcheck, and Rosalee Meyers.
(Courtesy of Avery Research Center, College of Charleston.)*

ended his report by saying that, since no further action was possible under the circumstances, the racial study group had discontinued its meetings. The very next sentence in the minutes reads: "Since then a King Street boycott has been started by the Negro community." Edward Kronsberg, a member of the JCRC, stated that his store "seems to be getting the brunt of the picketing." He continued that he was "in no position to hire Negro clerks," since "he had hired two or three Negro clerks last Easter, and serious problems arose not only with his white employees and the public reaction, but especially from other merchants making capital of his situation."⁴⁷ The March 2 "Interracial Communication" sermon quoted above should be seen in the light of the information provided by the JCRC minutes. Padoll concluded that sermon by asking his congregants to phone or write Gaillard demanding the appointment of such a committee.

On March 17, ten days before the JCRC meeting, actions on King Street escalated. This time it was not only sit-ins at lunch counters and an unobtrusive boycott of a few stores: The net was spread even wider with more merchants being picketed with the demand that they hire blacks for jobs *in the front* of the store, not only in the warehouse or stock room. The activity was deemed sufficiently significant to be covered in the next issue of *Time* magazine. Four weeks after the March 2 sermon, while the King Street boycott was still in progress, Padoll reminded his congregation, "I tried to . . . give you some information. . . . But it was as though I had written dirty words upon these sacred walls. . . . This attempt on my part produced . . . only anger, hurt and misunderstanding." Again, on April 13, he returned to the subject: "What do we do about racial and religious discrimination in our community . . . We . . . fill our lives with meaningless and distracting rituals . . . with habitual concerns over our dress and speech and food. . . . And these trivia become the *issues* [emphasis in original] of our lives . . . Amos warned us . . . to 'let justice well up as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'"⁴⁸ During the holiday of Passover one week later, Padoll asked how Jews, of all people, descendants of slaves, could deny freedom to others. On May 25 he castigated the local newspapers, the *News and*

Courier and the *Evening Post*, for their failure to provide coverage of the King Street boycott and of the fact that at least seven downtown merchants hired Negroes as clerks or cashiers "under pressure of a seven-week buying boycott."⁴⁹

Due to insufficient attendance, no JCRC meetings were held during April and May. At the June 21 gathering, a lengthy discussion took place with regard to the African American boycott situation. Kronsberg again stated that his store was being singled out by the picketers,⁵⁰ and he suggested that the Reverend Glover, pastor of Emanuel Church on Calhoun Street, was playing a leading role. He then announced that "a plan of action was being worked on at the present time about which he was not at liberty to speak."

In early May, as the picketing continued, the *Charlotte Observer* reported that "At least seven downtown merchants in Charleston have hired Negroes as clerks or cashiers under pressure of a seven-week buying boycott. It is the biggest breakthrough of Negroes into white collar jobs in the city or probably the state." To no one's great surprise, the two Charleston newspapers, the *News and Courier* and the *Evening News* took a head-in-the-sand approach and totally ignored the city's most newsworthy story. In August 1962 activist pressure elsewhere in the state resulted in the establishment of a biracial committee of eighteen whites and thirty blacks in Greenville, while in that same month eight lunch counters along with sixteen other Columbia businesses agreed to voluntarily desegregate. Behind the scenes, but on everybody's mind, was the process taking place in the courts that would decide whether or not Harvey Gantt would be the first black to integrate a South Carolina college campus. The outcome was really not in doubt. Other cases in other states had already been adjudicated.⁵¹ Facing the inevitability of school integration, as early as January Governor Ernest F. Hollings had held a press briefing in which he said, "before 1962 has passed, South Carolina's legal defenses [of segregation] will fall like a house of cards. You might as well start preparing your readers for the inevitable. We are not going to secede."⁵² In October the governor reiterated that "South Carolina must maintain law and

order, and we will not tolerate an Oxford or Little Rock in our state."⁵³ In his farewell address to the General Assembly, Hollings explained, "As determined as we are we . . . must realize the lessons of a hundred years ago, and move on for the good of South Carolina and the United States. This should be done with dignity. It must be done with law and order."⁵⁴ Hollings had already brought together a group of five influential South Carolinians to work with him quietly behind the scenes "to ensure that when and if desegregation occurred, it would do so peacefully and above all, that Clemson would not be closed as state law now mandated." This group included some of the leading businessmen of South Carolina along with Senator Edgar Brown, president pro tem of the state senate and chairman of Clemson's board of trustees, and Wayne Freeman, editor of the *Greenville News* and a member of the Gressette Committee.⁵⁵

As 1963 began, a significant omen of the stance the new governor would take was to be found at his inauguration barbecue, when over a hundred blacks were served without incident. Donald S. Russell quickly went on record, saying, "Whatever may be our opinions . . . we shall meet and solve this problem peaceably, without disorder, and with proper regard for the good name of our state and her people." With critical support from the state's leading businessmen, the Gressette Committee, and most of the state's newspapers, Harvey Gantt's presence at Clemson in February caused hardly a ripple in the normal campus routine. In one of his rare interviews, Gantt offered his own explanation: "If you can't appeal to the morals of a South Carolinian, you can appeal to his manners."⁵⁶

In the midst of all this, Padoll devoted his Yom Kippur morning sermon to the problem of segregation. Thus, on October 8, he told the people in the pews:

We live in an age and in an atmosphere where even [the] mention of the moral demands of social justice causes us alarm. It is an emotion-laden subject which we often relegate to the area of politics and say that religion should not therefore interfere. . . . [But] religion isn't simply Bible tales and explanations of historical practices. Religion encompasses . . . injustice,

immorality and sin. . . . This is Charleston, the Holy City of the South. It has had a glorious kind of past. . . . It is, however, the immediate present with which we must be concerned. . . . [What] if we, who comprise only 1% of the total population of Charleston, what if we . . . could not live in decent neighborhoods; couldn't send our children to decent schools; couldn't eat in decent restaurants; couldn't use a decent public restroom . . . couldn't take our children . . . swimming or to a public playground. . . . These restrictions, my friends are moral sins. . . . And we know that this is true. . . . We know without the slightest doubt . . . that the overall treatment of the American Negro is morally wrong and that it should be changed. . . . [This] is Yom Kippur, and we must realize that the only road to atonement is through positive action against our failures of the past. . . . [Our] silence in the face of moral responsibility is the sin of which we are accused today. . . . We have stood by as a community of "silent onlookers" even though the time has come to speak and act.

He chastised the Jewish community for sitting "with our fingers . . . in our ears . . . convinced that *anonymity* is the only sensible way," comparing this behavior to the behavior of the silent masses in Germany who sat by as they saw the Holocaust unfold.⁵⁷

The pattern established in the early months of Padoll's tenure seems to have continued. Many of the themes are repeated in sermons delivered in 1963, including his concern for the inaction of the Charleston Jewish community. On February 1 he told the congregation that the most dangerous people "to the cause of freedom and right" are the people "who pretend to be humanitarians," who "vehemently deny any strain of prejudice in their make-up and then stand in opposition to human justice on the basis of some spurious legalistic rationale."⁵⁸

The pressure for change that marked 1962 did not abate as the state moved into what Maxie M. Cox called "The Year of Decision." Isolated picketing and sit-ins continued, until, on June 5, I. DeQuincy Newman announced that the NAACP would begin massive demonstrations in eight South Carolina cities, one of which was Charleston, unless serious negotiations began to solve racial differences. In anticipation of this new campaign, the

*"The Charleston Negro" poster, c. 1963.
(Courtesy of Avery Research Center, College of Charleston.)*

pastors of Charleston's activist black churches, assisted by Newman, J. Arthur Brown, and James Blake, now a nationally recognized NAACP official, had been busily preparing for a course of action consonant with the maxim of historian David R. Goldfield that southern whites tended to make concessions "only when the economic balance sheet could not withstand further disruption."⁵⁹

In Charleston disruption began on June 9 with a prayer march through downtown. On June 10, thirteen blacks sat-in at the Kress lunch counter on King Street, forcing its closure. To the shock of many, following the example set with Clemson, Thomas Waring, Jr., encouraged Charlestonians to "keep their composure for the good of both whites and Negroes," even though his two newspapers, the *Charleston News and Courier* and the *Evening Post*, were rightly known as being among "the South's noisiest advocates of segregation."⁶⁰ As Goldfield had predicted, there can be little doubt that Waring's moderate response was heavily influenced by Charleston's dependence on its \$25 million-a-year tourist trade.⁶¹

On June 13 the movement gathered steam when eight blacks, including Newman, were arrested trying to integrate the restaurant at Hotel Fort Sumter. Though the arrests of demonstrators continued, by the end of the third week in June, the lunch counters at Kress, Woolworth, and W. T. Grant had desegregated, and the leaders of the Charleston Movement returned their attention to the King Street merchants. Picketing began a week later, with blacks being urged to avoid all businesses on the street until their owners had agreed to remove all signs indicating segregation, to end racial discrimination in hiring and promotion practices, and to extend the same courtesies to black customers as were extended to whites. Thomas Waring, who continued to believe that the demonstrations were the product of outside troublemakers, nonetheless again warned against violence. In an editorial titled "Need for Patience and Tolerance," Waring wrote, "Charleston has already demonstrated a great amount of patience and tolerance. A great deal more may be required in the hot weeks ahead."⁶² Some of these King Street

stores, in many cases those owned by Jews, catered primarily to a black clientele, which meant that they were now under considerable financial pressure. Making matters worse, the National Association for the Preservation of White People (NAPWP) picketed every store that met any of the NAACP demands.

On the night of July 16 a group of five hundred black protesters gathered across the street from the *News and Courier* building. Violence broke out when one of the protesters threw a brick, which hit a policeman in the face. This brought the National Guard and the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division to the city. The next morning the *News and Courier* editorial called upon white Charlestonians to go out of their way to shop at the King Street businesses that were being picketed by blacks. That night a crowd of over one thousand gathered to hear Glover, who expressed regret for the injuries suffered by the police and firemen, but promised that the demonstrations would continue and that they would do so peacefully. On July 18, at a pretrial hearing, bail bonds for Newman and Blake were set at fifteen thousand dollars each. Although many white business leaders believed that the NAACP would soon run out of money and be forced to suspend its activities, Wilkins promised Brown that the Charleston Movement would get the funds it needed, and made good on this promise by providing forty thousand dollars as bail money.⁶³

By late July, the Charleston Movement had staged daily demonstrations for almost eight weeks and had involved fifteen thousand black Charlestonians in protests that led to more than eight hundred arrests. As picketing continued, the businesses along King Street suffered a 20 to 50 percent decline in customers. On July 23, Mayor Gaillard met with a group of approximately one hundred white merchants and found that many of them were ready to make concessions. By the end of the meeting over sixty of these merchants signed confidential statements promising the mayor that their stores either were now or would immediately be desegregated. They agreed to several of the NAACP's demands, including equal opportunities for employment for blacks; equal

pay, clothing, and promotion practices; the use of courtesy titles for all customers; the removal of segregation signs from water fountains and restrooms; the policy of serving all customers in turn; and the policy of allowing all customers to try on clothes. Fearing retaliation from white customers, these merchants, many of whom were Jewish, refused to publicly identify themselves, and the mayor agreed to keep their names confidential. Following this meeting, Gaillard met with seven of the movement leaders and informed them of the concessions. The next morning an official announcement was made informing the community regarding the merchants' compliance under the condition of anonymity, at which point Newman announced that the NAACP had called a halt to mass demonstrations, but selective picketing would continue of those stores that had not changed their policy. Newman then criticized a group of two hundred blacks who had demonstrated outside the Hotel Fort Sumter, calling this demonstration a mistake, and promising that protest groups would be kept to small numbers and that the targets would be selective. One day later, on July 26, when picketing along King Street resumed, the identities of those merchants who had agreed to lower racial barriers in their stores now became obvious, since their stores were not picketed. The NAPWP then began a counter-protest, picketing those stores that had agreed to desegregate.⁶⁴

By mid-August, as the picketing continued and businesses suffered an even more drastic shrinkage of revenues, 120 downtown merchants had agreed to desegregate. In recognition of this, on September 3, the Reverend F. O. Pharr, the new head of the Charleston NAACP chapter, announced the indefinite suspension of all demonstrations, marches, and selective buying campaigns. The mayor continued his discussions with merchants and with leaders of the Charleston Movement, which resulted on September 25 in the formation of a new biracial committee with the members' names made public. Two of the seven white members of this committee were Edward Kronsberg and Thomas Tobias. These two men had easy access to Mayor Gaillard, and had, from the beginning, been part of the process that resulted in the formation of this committee.⁶⁵

While King Street was in turmoil, Charlestonians were preparing for the integration of School District 20, which included fourteen public schools within the city limits. In accordance with a court order issued on August 22 by U. S. District Court Judge J. Robert Martin, integration was to take place with the beginning of the fall semester. Again following the example set during the integration of Clemson, the school board announced that, barring a legal reversal of the order to desegregate, the district would peacefully comply. By making this public statement of compliance and by calling on all citizens to respect their decision, the trustees of District 20 set the tone that they wanted the community to follow. Thomas Waring, whose editorials had previously called for white Charlestonians to man the ramparts in defense of school segregation, again, recognizing that the battle had been lost, now advised against open resistance and refused to call for the closure of the public schools. As Cox comments, "The bloodshed at Oxford, Mississippi, and the images of federal troops in Little Rock, Arkansas," loomed large in Waring's mind, as it did in the minds of Charleston's business community. As a result, when eleven youngsters, including Millicent Brown (J. Arthur's daughter), integrated James Simons and Memminger elementary schools and Rivers and Charleston high schools, they encountered no violence, but rather only some hostile stares and booing.⁶⁶ Charleston schools were the first public schools in South Carolina to be integrated.

As things heated up in Charleston, Burton Padoll kept the heat on at KKBE. In October he raised the issue of black activism and sarcastically asked, "How can people act this way? Why won't they allow themselves to be dealt with as inferior? They would be so much happier, so much more content." He continued:

If others . . . don't fight back, then we can ignore our own self-hatred . . . men still find themselves quite often in need of slaves in order to feel superior . . . to give them the feeling of completeness that they lack within themselves. . . . But by so exploiting one's fellowman, we lose our every chance for recovery and development. . . . Every man needs to find himself recognized as a man—not a black man or a yellow man or a

Christian man or a Jewish man—but first and foremost, as a man.⁶⁷

On Yom Kippur, 1964, in a sermon titled “The Journey Ahead,” Padoll told his congregants that “we can live together and strive together as we move forward in our own independent ways. We can understand the methods and the motivations of one another; we can respect the differences we manifest as we earnestly and sincerely move toward our destination.” A few months later, in response to the violence in Alabama and the martyrdom of Jimmie Lee Jackson, James Reeb, and Viola Liuzzo, he appealed to his people’s patriotism, saying:

The situation in Alabama—and elsewhere in the country today—is untenable in a democratic society like the one in which we live. Those individuals who would identify themselves with American democracy must begin to do something about it. And so I speak to you this evening as Americans rather than as Jews.

By mid-1965 Padoll had reached a stage of utter despair in terms of his congregation. With a sense of righteous pain reflective of his biblical heroes Amos and Jeremiah, Padoll told them that his words had fallen on deaf ears and timid, if not hard hearts: “My requests of you over these past critical years have been based primarily on your responsibilities toward your fellow man . . . but . . . many of you have refused to listen. You have said that this is not a ‘Jewish’ problem and that therefore you would not lead the way. . . . [You] already lost the chance to lead the way—it has been taken out of your hands in this community.” He went on to explain that on Tuesday (April 23) the top echelon of the community, “white and Negro” met to create the Charleston Council on Human Relations. “There were some Jews present,” he said, but only those few “who have not allowed themselves to be intimidated by the overwhelming fear of the loss of security which has dominated so many Jews of Charleston.”⁶⁸

A Parting of the Way

It is clear from the tone of Padoll’s sermons that he was unhappy with the response of many of his congregants to his prophetic pleas. In turn, it appears that some of the members of

*Detail of original typescript of Padoll's sermon, April 1965.
(Courtesy of Allen Krause.)*

the congregation were equally unhappy with the causes that their rabbi advocated. An early sign of this estrangement is reflected in a letter dated November 5, 1963, which Padoll addressed to the board of trustees. The letter relates that he had a meeting with Edwin Pearlstine, Jr., president of the KKBE Brotherhood, discussing the congregation's dinner dance, which was scheduled to take place on November 23. Padoll wrote that he voiced his approval for the dance, but requested that it not be held at the Hotel Fort Sumter because of their "announced public stand against integration." The letter continued: "We, as a Congregation

... have assumed no public stand—but as a religious institution I think that it behooves us not to lend our public support to individuals or establishments that have openly voiced segregationist positions.” Having explained this to both Pearlstine and to the Brotherhood board, Padoll apparently thought that his advice would be taken. Instead, on October 27 at the KKBE semiannual meeting, Pearlstine announced that the event’s venue was to be the Hotel Fort Sumter. The rabbi’s letter concluded: “I want this Board to know, and I want the minutes of this meeting to reflect my firm disapproval of the Brotherhood Board’s decision, the personal affront to me which I find implicit in that decision, and, of course, my refusal to participate in the affair.”⁶⁹

Edwin Pearlstine, Jr., was a formidable person to have as an opponent. His grandchildren represented the sixth generation of his family on American soil, dating back to Jacob Pearlstine who immigrated to this country prior to 1850. In addition to these credentials, Pearlstine was a successful businessman; Pearlstine Distributors Incorporated was one of the oldest and largest privately owned companies in South Carolina. Founded by Isaac M. Pearlstine in the weeks following the Civil War, Pearlstine Distributors began as a wholesaler of groceries, hardware, wine, and soda, and over time added to its list of products both domestic and imported beer. The Pearlstine family had a distinguished record of civic involvement and philanthropy. During the 1960s they were the most generous patrons of the synagogue, which is reflected by the fact that its main social hall now bears their name. In addition, as is the case in so many southern Jewish communities where members choose others within the community as spouses, the Pearlstines are related by marriage to four other prominent KKBE families: the Kareshes, the Krawchecks, the Jacobs, and the Horniks. Indirectly this also connected them to the Levkoffs, Robinsons, Ellisons, Nussbaums, Pinkussohns, Reads, and Needles. Of these only the Levkoffs were not members of KKBE in the 1960s.

By April 1965 the situation had escalated to a confrontation in which a group of lay leaders was determined to sever the congregation’s connection with Padoll. The board minutes

in February hint at this growing dissatisfaction when they noted that Dr. Leon Banov, Jr.,⁷⁰ a respected member of the greater community and the man who was to become the next president of the KKBE, was given the task of "considering the responsibilities and duties of our rabbi" so that "all will know whether or not the rabbi is performing the duties expected of him."⁷¹

Despite the opposition to Padoll by some of the congregation's leaders, when word filtered down to the members the rabbi received an outpouring of support. Letters of praise began to come in, and, most impressive, was a petition expressing "warm appreciation of the services that Rabbi Burton L. Padoll has given our congregation," noting that "We look forward with confidence to his re-election as our spiritual leader." This petition was signed by 243 individuals, representing what appears to be 137 congregational family units out of a total of about 210, reflecting that Padoll had the support of at least somewhere between 65 to 75 percent of the congregation. Bowing to this impressive response the board voted to renew his contract, but only by a vote of nine to seven.⁷²

The fact that almost half of the board of trustees was ready to act counter to the desires of about two-thirds or more of the congregation did not bode well for the future. Padoll's report to the April 1966 congregational meeting makes it clear that the issues had not disappeared. In that report he stated that, when he spoke in the community, "I speak as an individual, as a rabbi, as a representative of Judaism and as the rabbi of Beth Elohim" and though he is "always aware of the multiple responsibility" this entails, he continued "I have not permitted it to inhibit me in the nature of what I have had to say." Stating that he spoke for the vast majority in the congregation, he also noted:

[There] are some who disagree . . . and that despite their disagreement I include and involve them in the causes which I support. But this must be! If the time should come when I fail to represent you honestly on matters of principle . . . if necessary, by a vote of the membership we shall determine whether or not this congregation has been fairly represented. Depending on the

outcome of such a ballot and the strength of your convictions and/or mine on the issue . . . certain changes may have to [be] made either in whom I represent or who represents you.⁷³

Having thrown down the gauntlet it did not take long before the temple's leadership picked it up. Beginning February 15, 1967, and continuing through March 4, a series of letters were written by congregants to the attention of the board, to board secretary Henry Freudenberg⁷⁴ or board president Dr. Leon Banov, Jr. Much more strident than the letters written in 1965, many of these expressed dismay that the board should even be considering not offering Padoll a new contract. One letter ends with the admonition that "the Board of Trustees, which represents the entire congregation, [should] do its utmost to prevail upon Rabbi Padoll to remain here." Another asks "Would the 'Board' consider an open Board meeting where members, pro & con may express themselves?" A third argued that "15 members do not know the feeling of the rest of our congregation."⁷⁵ Other letters expressed not only dismay but also anger that the board was betraying the congregation's trust:

We understand that the Board of Trustees of the Congregation has apparently ruled out and is unwilling to retain the services of our outstanding and devoted Rabbi, Burton Padoll. . . . We are emphatically in favor of everything possible to encourage Rabbi Padoll to remain on, and we look to the Board of Trustees to keep faith with the members of the Congregation and consider our wishes.⁷⁶

Why has it become necessary to beg and plead with a Synagogue Board to retain an outstandingly bright and vibrant young Rabbi? Why is it not enough that a Rabbi satisfy the majority of his Congregation?⁷⁷

A total of thirty-four such letters of support were received, representing between thirty-seven and forty family units. In contrast, only nine letters were written in opposition to Padoll, of which three were written by a husband and wife, Marion and Ruth Hornik, and one by Lee Banov, a cousin of board president Leon Banov, Jr. The Banov letter begins:

It has come to my attention that a group of members are bombarding the Board of Trustees of The Congregation with letters to make it appear that a preponderance of the membership would like to have the incumbent rabbi remain in the pulpit of the congregation. I do not believe the majority want the present incumbent to remain but rather that a large and evident majority believe the congregation would be better off to make a change. . . . The Board should not be swayed by a volley of letters from either side of the matter.⁷⁸

Telling is a short handwritten note that Leon Banov, Jr., wrote to Henry Freudenberg: "'Tis fashionable for members of the John Burt Society to write letters."⁷⁹

The end of the matter came with a letter written by Padoll to the congregation, dated March 10, 1967:

What I have to say to you in this letter is somewhat premature. However, due to the confusion and misunderstanding that has developed over the past several weeks, the Board of Trustees has urged me to write it.

At the January meeting of the Board, I expressed the fact that I was in the process of seeking another pulpit but that I had no immediate prospects. Again, at the meeting of March 7, this week, I confirmed my continued interest in effecting a change. I explained that I am still unable to give any definitive answer regarding the immediate future, but I hope that the process will not be too lengthy.

I therefore did not ask the Board for a new contract—nor was I in a position to submit my resignation now. Rather, I simply requested a continuation of my present contract until such time as my placement situation is resolved. When such time arrives, which may still be many months, I will officially resign and give the Congregation notice. The Board complied with my request.

Beyond this, it seems essential to me that I make a few additional remarks. First, I am painfully aware of the negative attitudes towards me that exist within the congregation. Although they have not influenced my ultimate decision, with all my heart I wish they were not so.

At the same time, I am gratefully aware of the strong positive feelings regarding my ministry which are shared by so many in

Beth Elohim. . . . They, more than anything, have made my decision a difficult one. . . . I have accomplished much of what I set out to do, and for this I feel good. At no other time during these past six years could I have honestly and completely made that statement. At this stage of my career, however, I feel a growing sense of responsibility toward my family and myself in terms of financial security and further growth and progress. It is for these reasons alone that I seek a change in congregations.⁸⁰

On July 27, 1967, Padoll submitted his formal resignation to board president Gordan B. Stine, announcing that he had accepted a position as the associate rabbi of Temple Shaaray Tefila in New York City.

What Caused Burton Padoll's Departure from Charleston?

His Strengths

Although it is tempting to attribute Padoll's difficulties at KKBE to his civil rights activism, there were other factors that contributed to his relatively brief tenure in Charleston, especially given his impressive strengths as a rabbi.

The numerous letters of support sent to the board in 1965 and 1967 clearly reveal certain themes. The first is his obvious skill as a teacher and preacher. Very common is praise of his "keen intellect" and his wealth of knowledge. Equally prominent is appreciation for his sermons, which "show much thoughtful preparation and brilliance" and which are "beautiful and deeply arousing."⁸¹ There is likewise gratitude for his stimulating discussion groups, educational seminars, and book reviews. "I have never enjoyed lectures as much as those delivered by him," Mary Singer wrote in 1967, while Marian Slotin, also in 1967, pointed out, "[When] for over four years Rabbi Padoll draws thirty-five to fifty women each month and has them reading pertinent books of the day . . . I feel that he is reaching a good percentage of the congregation, aside from the excellent sermons he gives us from the pulpit."⁸² One of his critics said much the same thing but with a negative spin: "He had a tight group that studied with him—his 'groupies';" while another

one of his opponents noted that “His sermons were thought provoking.”⁸³

Padoll’s skills in teaching were not limited to the adults in the KKBE community. He was at least equally talented in reaching the youth, especially those of high school age. Even members who wanted to sever the rabbi’s ties with the congregation admitted that he had good rapport with the teenagers.⁸⁴ “Burton Padoll . . . has inspired so many of our young people,” wrote one, while another said, “I have been assistant advisor to the Temple Youth Group for the past three years and I know that the young people have a great deal of respect for Rabbi Padoll. He is always available to listen to them and advise them.”⁸⁵ Among his strongest supporters were the teens themselves, some of whom wrote letters to the board asking that his contract be renewed. Most impressive was a letter from David Furchgott, a member of the KKBE youth group and president of the Southeast Federation of Temple Youth (SEFTY), the division of the National Federation of Temple Youth that encompassed Reform youth groups in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Furchgott wrote that Rabbi Padoll “is one of the most highly valued advisors in SEFTY, and is well-known and liked by teenagers both in our congregation and the others. . . . I implore you to carefully consider your decision tonight for the benefit of those who, in the future, will be entrusted with the leadership of this congregation.”⁸⁶

One of the reasons why Padoll was so effective with the teens was that he connected to the natural rebelliousness of adolescents in relation to the world their parents’ generation had created. David Furchgott was struck by the rabbi’s willingness to dialogue on controversial issues: “[All the youth-group] programs—they weren’t all centered on civil rights issues but they were centered on human rights in general, and on a range of social issues. Sometimes to the chagrin, I think, of some of the adults in the temple. At least that was the message that was indirectly coming through, and that was certainly the message that I got about why he was sort of being ‘called on the carpet.’”⁸⁷ Barbara Karesh Stender, who was in Padoll’s confirmation class, remembered,

Solomon Breibart and Burton Padoll, Charleston, 2000.

*(Photo: Gift of Dale Rosengarten, courtesy Jewish Heritage Collection,
College of Charleston.)*

“We could ask any question we wanted and he would give us a straight answer—he was very honest. His openness and honesty are a lifelong memory for me.”⁸⁸ Carolee Fox, one of the volunteer teachers in the religious school, captured this when she wrote in 1967 that the young people are “enthusiastic” about their classes

with the rabbi because “he has brought controversial issues out in the open with no pussy footing.”⁸⁹

His Weaknesses

Given Burton Padoll’s acumen as a preacher and teacher, and his considerable talent connecting with the teens in the congregation, was his outspokenness on controversial issues sufficient cause for him to be pressured to look for another pulpit? On this, there are grounds for reasonable doubt.

First, with all of his many fine attributes and skills, Padoll had a personality that rubbed at least some congregants the wrong way in that he did not suffer gladly those he considered to be fools.⁹⁰ Some people saw in him a self-righteous attitude, similar to the biblical prophets, which created in them, as it had in those being chastised by the prophets, a defensive response. His widow, Sheila Andelman Padoll, who served as his congregation’s president in Peabody prior to developing her personal relationship with Padoll, confirmed this when she spoke with the author.

ANDELMAN PADOLL: [He] was not afraid of taking an unpopular position. It didn’t bother him what the congregation thought; if that’s what he felt, he would take that position.

KRAUSE: So the Charleston experience did not in any way impact that?

ANDELMAN PADOLL: No, no. He believed in what he wanted to believe in—that was what he felt. And you couldn’t say as a [congregation] president, “I don’t think you should say this.” That would make him even say it more. . . . He was stubborn.

KRAUSE: Could that possibly have been one of the problems in Charleston?

ANDELMAN PADOLL: Might have been. . . . He was at times difficult, and you had to be a strong person to argue with him, because he could get very moody. . . . He was a very honest person. There was no subterfuge with him. He was honest, maybe too honest at times, and he was a very ethical person.⁹¹

Padoll himself later acknowledged much of this. In the 1999 interview he recalled, "I was like a bull in a china shop when I got here. I mean I was really messianic, and they weren't ready for messianism at that stage of the game." Later on in the interview, when Breibart suggested that "it probably would have made a big difference [if you had] handled yourself a little more diplomatically at first," Padoll's immediate response was, "Oh sure, no question."⁹²

Compounding the problem for the rabbi was the relationship between his first wife, Natalie, and congregants. Charleston, being a southern city, had certain expectations regarding social graces and adherence to the code of southern hospitality, which, it could be argued, stood even higher in the pantheon of revealed law than some of the Ten Commandments. As Barbara Karesh Stender recalled: "The people in Charleston often say the socially correct thing rather than what they really think."⁹³ Not only was this behavior difficult for Padoll, it was equally problematic for the *rebbetzin*. A key transgression occurred midway in their stay in the community, important enough to be remembered and recounted by more than one source. The Padoll's second child, Melissa (Missy), was born in 1964, and, in accordance with tradition, the women of the congregation wished to graciously welcome the child and be helpful to her mother. Mordenai Hirsch, daughter of the beloved Jacob Raisin, who served KKBE as rabbi from 1915 to 1944, made one of these welcoming calls. When early on in our interview I asked her, "Was there any issue that you can remember that was controversial about Rabbi Padoll?" she answered, "His wife was kind of anti-social. When their child was born and I came over to their house with a present, she came out on the front porch and closed the door behind her and said that we can't go inside lest we disturb the baby. I don't think she was particularly well-liked within the congregation."⁹⁴ Freudenberg raised the same issue when I spoke with him: "He had a wife—I can't remember her name right now—she wanted her privacy. Rabbi Padoll was perfectly happy with the KKBE parsonage, but she wasn't. She put a sign on the door after she came home from the hospital with the baby saying 'No Visitors.' That went over

like a lead balloon."⁹⁵ Breibart, one of the Padolls' closest friends during and after their stay in Charleston, confirmed that Natalie was "not an outgoing kind of person,"⁹⁶ and Sanford Seltzer, one of Padoll's closest friends in the rabbinate, when asked whether civil rights advocacy was the main reason for Padoll's problems in Charleston, responded, "Bert [*sic*] certainly was no shrinking violet and expressed himself openly and forthrightly about the matter as he did with everything . . . Certainly, as you commented, his first wife, Natalie, was another factor. She disliked living there intensely and made no bones about it publicly."⁹⁷

The picture that emerges from the interviews and the archival materials is that there was a minority of the congregation, many of whom were among its leaders, who felt excluded from the circle of people whom the Padolls chose as friends, and that this was an important part of the opposition to his continued tenure at KKBE. Surely Natalie Padoll's coldness to them was an element of this, but Burt Padoll's personality was at least equally a part of the equation. Breibart's response to questioning along these lines provides persuasive support for this reasoning.

KRAUSE: What was the response of the synagogue leaders and of the congregation as a whole to the civil rights activities once they saw that Rabbi Padoll was involved in them?

BREIBART: I don't recall that there was any particular reaction. If there was reaction, it was reaction among themselves. It didn't get out into the open.

KRAUSE: So this was not a synagogue-wide issue. There were a few people or a small group that was upset?

BREIBART: Yes, as long as he didn't step on too many toes he could get by with it, but as I said, the thing that drove him away was the personal animosity of a certain group of people who kept after him. . . .

KRAUSE: Are you suggesting that this personal animosity was less based on his civil rights activity and more based on personal items?

BREIBART: That is what I'm saying. . . .

KRAUSE: [Burton Padoll] says in his interview [with Dale Rosengarten and Breibart, on October 21, 1999] that they wanted him to socialize, he and his wife to socialize with them, and he told them that he wasn't interested in socializing with them. Would he have spoken that bluntly? . . .

BREIBART: Yes, he would have. . . . He wasn't one to socialize if he didn't like somebody; he didn't socialize with them. We were very friendly with him. The Tobias's were very friendly with him. We would be at each other's houses and so on. . . .

KRAUSE: Do you think that Rabbi Padoll, if he would have been a little more politic in the way he dealt with some of these people, would have been able to stay here as long as he wanted? . . .

BREIBART: Knowing Burt, he couldn't be politic [laughing], but yeah. . . . I was in my forties soon to be fifties. Those of us in that category, we liked him. We liked him very much. He would come to parties if you invited him to come to the parties. His wife now, his wife was a little bit different, but she would go, she would go along with him. . . .

KRAUSE: So it wasn't his civil rights activism, which is the major [question interrupted by Breibart's response.]

BREIBART: No – that might have been a part, but just a small part of it.

In the 1999 interview Padoll said: "These people in leadership positions, like the Bernstein boys (Manning and Charles) and Gordan Stine and Henry Freudenberg, all of whom were segregationist⁹⁸ wanted me and my wife to socialize with them and were very offended that we didn't do so and they really couldn't understand it. They felt that was part of my job as the rabbi, was to socialize with them. I told them to go to hell. I mean basically just like that. That did not endear me to them." The fact that Padoll's opponents said much the same thing as Breibart lends credence to his analysis.⁹⁹ When, in February 1965, Leon Banov, Jr., was asked by KKBE President Bernard J. Olasov, to find out for the board "the responsibilities and duties of our rabbi," his

report, delivered at the May 1965 board meeting, included the following:

The Rabbi's pastoral duties . . . are most apt to produce the largest variety of expressions of approval or disapproval . . . he should win friends and influence people for the congregation. . . . Members desire and would like the Rabbi to visit them at home and, in turn, would like the Rabbi to invite them to his home. The Rabbi should be a diplomat, display tact, exhibit friendliness and understanding. . . . He should be polite enough to make each of us feel that he is interested in us. [Politeness and courtesy were mentioned again and again by those writing in.]

Ruth Hornik, in one of her two letters to the board in 1967 wrote:

[Our] beloved and venerable Synagogue deserves . . . one who is not only a teacher but a person of spirituality, warmth and friendliness, humility, and, above all, one who sincerely cares about the members of his congregation. It is all very well to give a good book review . . . but that part doesn't . . . constitute the most important part of a rabbi's duties. I think he should get to know his congregation, not just a group whom he favors. . . . Maybe it is an old fashioned idea to regard a rabbi as a real friend.

Her husband, Marion Hornik, added in his letter: "Pulpit presence, interest in TYG [the Temple Youth Group], and community work are the qualities one expects in *all* rabbis, but the ability to get along with his Officers, Board, and all of his Congregation, and the possession of a genuine warmth of personality mark the above average spiritual leader. I join many of our Congregation in the hope that the Board will secure such a man for us." Similar sentiments were expressed by Ella Kaufman: "[Since] we all contribute to his salary, he should be Rabbi to the entire congregation, instead of a few of his selected friends." Finally, Lee Banov wrote in his letter addressed to the board of trustees: "the incumbent has no inclination towards pastoral duties, lacks the personality that would bring him into a closeness with the membership . . . and instead has the sort of attitude that

clashes with those he ought to inspire to work with him. This has been apparent since his arrival."¹⁰⁰

In 1999 Padoll talked about the great animosity toward him that was exhibited by some members of the congregation. He particularly mentioned Leon Banov, Jr.,¹⁰¹ president in 1967, who was "out for my ass morning, noon and night. He would tell patients in his office about me . . . and say, 'This is what my rabbi is like. He is psychotic. . . . [It] had reached a point where I had considered suing him.'" Breibart mentioned Freudenberg and Stine¹⁰² as two of the leaders of the group aiming to push Padoll out of KKBE, and then spoke of Leon Banov, Jr.

I grew up with Leon and from the way he handled Burt and so on, we were very close to the Banovs. We used to exchange visits on holidays and so on—but this turned us off . . . have you ever heard it described how they met with him one night at a place on Folly Beach, and what they did, they told him, how they treated him, I wondered how he stayed there really even a few months or so after that. They were really horrible to him, horrible. He never got over it . . . If we mentioned anything to him in future years, he remembered that. . . . He didn't bring it up on his own, of course.¹⁰³

Freudenberg's and Charles Bernstein's versions of that evening differed:

When Gordan [Stine] and I saw how the congregation was dissatisfied, one summer day Gordan and I picked up Burt Padoll and drove out to Folly Beach and told Burt it was time to move on and he agreed.¹⁰⁴

When his contract came up for renewal there was a huge split in the congregation. Very influential in the decision were Henry Freudenberg, Gordan Stine, and myself. We took Rabbi Padoll out for an evening and asked him why he became a rabbi. He said that he liked teaching and liked to write. We were struck by the fact that his responses made no mention of his having a "calling."¹⁰⁵

When asked the key reason for opposition to Padoll, Charles Bernstein is the only person to mention his vocal opposition to the Vietnam War:

He became very controversial—he was very outspoken against the Viet Nam War. That created a number of problems, since we have many members who were World War II and Korean veterans. This happened about midway through his tenure. In one sermon he attacked the Citadel, and a major KKBE donor [Milton Pearlstine] was a graduate of the Citadel. He got up and walked out in the middle of the sermon, and swore that he wouldn't set foot in the synagogue until Padoll was gone. He was one of the ten most respected individuals in the city. He maintained his financial support, however. Many people felt that Rabbi Padoll's stance reflected poorly on the Jewish community.

The fact that nobody else raised this issue¹⁰⁶ makes it suspect as an important reason for the opposition to Padoll. What is instructive, however, is Bernstein's view as to whether civil rights advocacy was the main complaint of those who worked against the rabbi:

Rabbi Padoll also took a very strong position on the issue of civil rights. Many of us were not in favor of being as strong as he was. I don't think there was anybody in the congregation opposed to the civil rights movement, but it was an issue of how he was approaching it. Had Burt approached it differently, he could have gotten away with it. The Jews in Charleston have a history of active involvement in all aspects of the city, political and financial, and there were marches in town, martial law imposed for a while, and that made it a more sensitive issue. In my recollection, there was not any support for the civil rights movement from local clergy at that time. My personal opinion is that . . . the civil rights issue would not have been a real problem. It was an issue, but it was not *the* issue [emphasis in original].

Anita Moise Rosenberg's take was similar:

The segregation/integration issue wasn't a big issue when compared with what was happening in our temple—compared

with the more internal issues. In fact, I don't remember him being involved in that issue at all.

As was Freudenberg's:

His sermons were thought-provoking and controversial but people didn't want to hear it all the time. Had he done it slower, maybe they would have accepted it more. And his wife didn't endear herself to anyone. He was truly outstanding—he was young, he was energetic, he got things accomplished—but he wore out his welcome.

Charleston and Hattiesburg: When the Method Becomes the Message

It was not easy in the South of the 1960s for rabbis to take up the cause of integration, even if it was only within the confines of their congregation. Yet, Charles Mantinband served as rabbi of Temple B'nai Israel in Hattiesburg from 1952 to 1962, during which time he spoke openly in the outside community against segregation, was a member of the NAACP, and served as the head of the Mississippi branch of the blatantly pro-integration Southern Regional Council.

How did Mantinband survive in such a hostile atmosphere? The answer, I believe, is because he was a charming human being, gentle and loving, who served the pastoral needs of his congregation and even the non-Jewish community throughout his tenure in Hattiesburg. In Mantinband's words:

Actually if you live in a town long enough you get to know everybody. If you get to know everybody, you're given the opportunity to befriend everybody, and if after ten years or more you have gotten this fellow a job, and this fellow you visited when he was in the hospital, and this person you were able to get a scholarship for his child, and this person you did him a favor and served on a committee with him, and he learned how human you are and all the rest of it, they'll say, "Well now, this fellow is out of step, and he's ahead of his times, and he's crazy, and we don't like what he says, but don't you touch him, he's my friend, and I like him." Whatever the case may be, I stayed a long time.¹⁰⁷

In many ways, Burton Padoll had a hard act to follow when he arrived in Charleston. Mordenai Hirsch on a number of occasions emphasized how her father, Jacob Raisin, one of Padoll's predecessors, "got along with everybody. He never said anything, found anything bad with anybody, and so he was very much loved down here. . . . He was a very gentle person."¹⁰⁸ Though one might expect such words from a loving daughter, they are corroborated by the legacy of good will that has remained in the community memory. Indeed, it is hard to imagine that one could be over three decades in one pulpit without being well-liked by the congregation and at least most of its leaders. A clear benefit to Raisin's rabbinate was the fact that he married Jane Lazarus, one of whose ancestors was a founder of the congregation. Not only did she have roots, she was an active member of the Charleston community and was a helpful partner in her husband's rabbinate.

Allan Tarshish had a rough time initially when he assumed the KKBE pulpit in 1947. The aspect that made him controversial was his membership in the American Council for Judaism, an anti-Zionist organization. Dottie Dumas was appalled when, on the Friday night when Israel had been declared a state,¹⁰⁹ she went to services and "not one word was mentioned about the establishment of the state of Israel." She was so angry that her family moved over to congregation Emanu-El.¹¹⁰ But, understanding the mood of the community, Tarshish quickly moderated his position, and it became a non-issue. He also was a man with good people skills and with a wife who fitted nicely into Charleston society. When he left after thirteen years he did so entirely of his own volition, mainly to seek a higher income in a northern congregation.

Surely it would be incorrect to dismiss out of hand the role that Padoll's civil rights advocacy played in his falling out of grace with some of the powerful members of KKBE, but it would also be wrong to ignore the human elements that are so essential to a rabbi's success in any congregation at any time. The evidence seems to be in accord with his friend Rabbi Sanford Seltzer's sense that "while his advocacy of civil rights may have been an issue for

*Padoll accepting congratulations upon receiving his doctorate from
Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion,
Cincinnati, 1982.
(Courtesy of Sheila Andelman Padoll.)*

some people, I don't believe it was the basic cause for his departure."¹¹¹

When discussing the Uptown and Downtown Jews, Avram Kronsberg said something relevant to understanding what I believe was a major factor in Padoll's problems in Charleston. Speaking about the Kaluszyners, a local group of eastern Europeans, Kronsberg said that they "didn't have the manners and didn't understand the city of Charleston and didn't play the game. Didn't even know that there was a game to play."¹¹²

In his doctoral thesis Maxie M. Cox asks why white South Carolinians, who were no less opponents of integration than the whites in Mississippi and Alabama, were able to avoid the "violence and disorder which plagued other Southern states dealing with the same difficult issue?"¹¹³ Cox found that one of the reasons was that the political leaders of the state like Hollings, Gressette, and Russell, whose pro-segregation credentials were impeccable, made it clear that violence would not be tolerated. Furthermore the state's press, even those like Charleston's "bible of the segregationists," fell in line with what their political leaders advocated. They did this for a very good reason. They knew, as did the state's business leaders, that violence would wreak havoc with South Carolina's economy. All of these are undoubtedly true, but possibly the most important reason was an intangible one: the sense of good manners that was so embedded into the Carolinian concept of honor. The politicians, editorial writers, and businessmen invariably said we must do this to maintain "the dignity of our state," or, in the words of Governor Russell, we must do so "with proper regard for the good name of our state." Harvey Gantt was not joking when he said, "If you can't appeal to the morals of a South Carolinian, you can appeal to his manners."

Cox argues that Gantt was the perfect one to break the color barrier, since even strong supporters of segregation perceived him to be mild-mannered and in no way inflammatory; he was "just like any other South Carolina student who wanted to get a good education." Gantt was very careful to keep a low profile and not to flaunt his victory. For the same reason, unlike in other southern

states, it was not CORE or SNCC or even the SCLC of Martin Luther King, Jr., that led the integration fight in South Carolina, but rather the staid and familiar NAACP. Although protectors of the old system branded the NAACP as a Communist organization, the fact was that its leaders, for their time and place, were moderates, realists willing to make compromises and to allow the whites on the other side to save face. It was the South Carolina way.¹¹⁴

A good illustration of this civility can be found in a resolution adopted on June 10, 1963, by the city council of the city of Anderson, South Carolina, which reads:

WHEREAS, the citizens of Anderson have enjoyed harmonious race relations over a number of years, and

WHEREAS, the Anderson Chamber of Commerce, the Anderson Ministerial Association, the Anderson Merchants' Association, and the Anderson Junior Chamber of Commerce, representing more than 1200 of the leading citizens of Anderson, recognizing the necessity for immediate action in order that our harmonious relationships shall continue, and that the City of Anderson shall continue to prosper and grow, makes the following recommendations:

1. That the city ordinance, already invalidated by the Supreme Court, prohibiting the serving of meals to white and Negro persons be repealed.
2. That local Negro citizens be allowed the use of the Recreation Center building for special events and special programs they may plan. It is understood, of course, that they would make application in the usual manner for the use of this facility.
3. That Council give immediate consideration to the employment of Negro policemen.
4. That the City Council of the City of Anderson sanction the organization of a bi-racial committee to make such studies and further recommendations to Anderson City Council as they, in their discretion, deem advisable.¹¹⁵

Although the concept of southern manners was not exclusive to South Carolina, the state was unique in the way it applied this

concept to integration. It would be difficult to find another southern state where the governors acted as did Hollings and Russell; where the press, though overwhelmingly segregationist, was so moderate in its response to integration when the state's editors perceived integration as inevitable;¹¹⁶ where business was so consistently mobilized into vocal opposition to violence; and, where there was so little violence during the 1960s. In fact, the only significant bloodshed that occurred in South Carolina during that decade took place in Orangeburg on February 2, 1968, long after the rest of the state had moved grudgingly but peacefully down the road to compliance with the need to integrate.¹¹⁷

Burton Padoll does not seem to have understood the importance of the system that Gantt called "manners," or, if he did understand it, he refused to buy into it. Mantinband, who served in the much more difficult venue of Hattiesburg, did understand it. In 1966 he told this author that he had made a vow to himself that he "would never sit in the presence of bigotry and hear it uttered . . . that I would not voice a contrary opinion and make my opposition felt and heard and known. I wouldn't be histrionic about it. . . . I wouldn't try to make a speech. . . . I just would register . . . what my religion compels me to think, and feel, and be, and how it makes me behave." He said also that it was important to have a sense of humor, and to use it, gently, as a way of deflating his antagonists. And, although Mantinband was active in many civil rights organizations, he very rarely used the pulpit as a platform in his fight against bigotry.¹¹⁸

Burton Padoll entered Charleston and hit the ground running, making impassioned pleas from the pulpit, acting, as he later realized, like "a bull in a china shop." In every good way, Padoll was a true reincarnation of his biblical heroes, men like Amos and Jeremiah. They too would have been forced out of town if they had come to Charleston.

NOTES

The author wishes to thank Dale Rosengarten, Solomon Breitbart, and Sheila Padoll, who made available to him much of the biographical material, and Melissa (Missy) Padoll, for providing many of her father's sermons..

¹ Burton Padoll, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Solomon Breitbart, October 21, 1999, #T(a).Cha.1999.10.224., Jewish Heritage Collection, Addlestone Library, College of Charleston (hereafter cited as JHC-CC).

² Theodore Rosengarten and Dale Rosengarten, eds., *A Portion of the People: Three Hundred Years of Southern Jewish Life* (University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, SC, 2002), 36.

³ James W. Silver, "Mississippi: The Closed Society," *The Journal of Southern History*, 30 (February 1964): 17.

⁴ See, for example, Clive Webb, "Big Struggle in a Small Town," and Gary Phillip Zola "What Price Amos? Perry Nussbaum's Career in Jackson, Mississippi," in *The Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights, 1880s to 1990s*, ed by Mark K. Bauman and Berkley Kalin (Tuscaloosa, 1997), 228 and 256; "Biographical/Historical Sketch," Rabbi Charles Mantinband Papers, 1931-1997, McCain Library and Archives, The University of Southern Mississippi, Manuscript Collection, M327; "Ousted Rabbi in South Rips Jewish Bodies Over Rights," *National Jewish Post and Opinion*, January 1, 1965, 1; Vida Goldgar, "Tale of Two Mississippi Rabbis," *The Southern Israelite*, December 25, 1964; Harry L. Golden, "A Rabbi in Montgomery," *Congress Weekly* 24 (May 13, 1957): 8-9 and 24 (June 17, 1957): 14. The most comprehensive treatment of this subject can be found in Adam Mendelsohn, "Two Far South: Rabbinical Responses to Apartheid and Segregation in South Africa and the American South," *Southern Jewish History* 6 (2003): 63-132.

⁵ Charles Reznikoff, *The Jews of Charleston: A History of an American Jewish Community* (Philadelphia, 1950), 100.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 101.

⁷ See, for example, interview transcripts of Saul Krawcheck, #T(d).Cha.1995.07.027. p. 9 and Judge Klyde Robinson #T(d).Cha.1997.09.166. p. 49, JHC-CC.

⁸ This was not as true for the children who attended the Orthodox synagogues, whose social life tended to be more parochial.

⁹ Sanford Patla Olasov, interview conducted by Michael S. Grossman, February 25, 1997, (MSG) #T(a).Cha.1997.02.125. JHC-CC.

¹⁰ As described by Avram Kronsberg. Avram and Edward Kronsberg, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten, April 11, 2001. (DR) #T(d).Cha.2001.04.255, JHC-CC. Another interviewee, when she heard that Rosengarten was from McClellanville, immediately responded: "The crab meat and the shrimp [in McClellanville] are wonderful! The crab meat is wonderful!" Dorothea ("Dottie") Shimmel Dumas, interview conducted by

Dale Rosengarten, Constance Ackerman and Michael S. Grossman, January 2, 1997 (DR, MSG, CA) #T(a,d).Cha.1997.01.108; JHC-CC.

¹¹ Doris Meddin, recorded on January 25, 1997, in Charleston, South Carolina as panelist during the fourth annual meeting of the Jewish Historical Society of South Carolina, held in conjunction with Emanu-El's 50th Anniversary, #T(a).Cha.1997.01.112.

¹² Mordecai ("Mortie") Cohen, with Dorothy Idalin Gelson Cohen and Morris David Rosen, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Robert Rosen, March 5, 1995 (DR, RoR) #T(v).Cha.1995.03.012, JHC-CC.

¹³ Dorothea ("Dottie") Shimel Dumas, Renée Shimel Frisch and Jennie Shimel Ackerman, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten, Constance Ackerman and Michael S. Grossman, January 2, 1997 (DR, MSG, CA) #T(a,d).Cha.1997.01.108, JHC-CC.

¹⁴ Mordenai Raisin Hirsch with Rachel Marla Raisin, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten, July 16, 1996 (DR) #T(a,d).Cha.1996.07.083, JHC-CC.

¹⁵ Olasov interview, February 25, 1997.

¹⁶ Mordecai (Mortie) Cohen and Dorothy Idalin Gelson Cohen, interviews conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Michael S. Grossman, June 13, 1997, (DR, MSG) #T(d).Cha.1997.06.153, JHC-CC.

¹⁷ Avram Kronsberg. Kronsberg interview, April 11, 2001.

¹⁸ Dumas, Frisch, and Ackerman interview, January 2, 1997. U.S. District Court Judge J. Waties Waring, an eighth generation Charlestonian, was the first jurist in modern times to declare segregated schooling "inequality per se." Waring also outlawed South Carolina's white primary. See Cynthia Stokes Brown, *Refusing Racism: White Allies and the Struggle for Civil Rights* (New York, 2002), Chapter 3, and Tinsley E. Yarbrough, *A Passion for Justice: J. Waties Waring and Civil Rights* (New York, 2001).

¹⁹ Solomon Breitbart, interview conducted by author, May 24, 2005.

²⁰ See <http://www.scstatehouse.net/studentpage/sblatt.htm> (accessed May 13, 2008). For more on Blatt see Clive Webb, *Fight Against Fear* (Athens, GA, 2001), 117-122.

²¹ Allen Krause, "The Southern Rabbi and Civil Rights" (master's thesis, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, 1966).

²² Stephen O'Neill, "From the Shadow of Slavery: The Civil Rights Years in Charleston" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1994), 2, 90.

²³ From the testimony of Dr. Orville Vernon Burton to the Court in the case of *Moultrie v. Charleston County Council*, C.A. (No. 9 -01 562 11), November 14, 2003 (revised November 22, 2003).

²⁴ In 1947, some black parents in Clarendon County, SC, unhappy with the lack of school buses for their children, brought suit in U.S. District Court (*Levi Pearson v. County Board of Education*) asking for equal treatment for black children by the school district. Although their case was dismissed on a technicality, Judge J. Waties Waring urged the young NAACP lawyer, Thurgood Marshall, to seek not equality of schools but rather total integration. That case (*Briggs v. Elliot*) was filed in 1950. When the Supreme Court was

asked to decide re: *Oliver L. Brown et al. v. the Board of Education of Topeka (KS) et al.*, it bundled with that case three others, including the Clarendon County one.

²⁵ O'Neill, "From the Shadow of Slavery," 90.

²⁶ William D. Smyth, "Segregation in Charleston in the 1950s: A Decade of Transition," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 110-111; Minutes, County Board of Education, May 24, 1956, exhibit in *U.S. and Richard Ganaway, et al. v. Charleston County*, as cited by Burton, *Moultrie v. Charleston County Council*, 34; O'Neill, "From the Shadow of Slavery," 152, 154-156, 158, 166.

²⁷ Maxie Myron Cox, Jr., 1963 – *The Year of Decision: Desegregation in South Carolina* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1996), 7-8.

²⁸ R. Scott Baker, *Paradoxes of Desegregation: African-American Struggles for Educational Equity in Charleston, South Carolina, 1926 - 1972* (Columbia, SC, August 15, 2006), 150.

²⁹ African American leadership, realizing the importance of political power, had begun to exert pressure in 1954 to gain representation on the city council and other local governing bodies. This, of course, was a lost cause so long as only a small minority of their constituency was part of the electorate. Understanding the need, in 1957 activists Esau Jenkins and Bernice Robinson established five citizenship schools in Charleston County, meant to prepare African American adults to successfully register to vote. See Peter F. Lau, *Democracy Rising: South Carolina and the Fight for Black Equality Since 1865* (Lexington, KY, 2006), 219-220; O'Neill, "From the Shadow of Slavery," 169; Smyth, "Segregation in Charleston in the 1950s," 122.

³⁰ O'Neill, "From the Shadow of Slavery," 198.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 152, 154-156, 158, 166.

³² Baker, *Paradoxes of Desegregation*, 150, 153.

³³ JCRC Minutes, May 16, 1960. B2, F5, MSS 1020, JHC-CC.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ John W. Meffert, et al., *Black America Series: Charleston South Carolina* (Charleston, SC, July, 2000), 11. Also see Smyth, "Segregation in Charleston in the 1950s," 121.

³⁶ Unlike some other southern cities, where Jewish stores were selected as the early targets of such picketing, there is little in the JCRC minutes or in the interviews that would suggest that Jewish merchants were being chosen based on their religion. Rather, the January 16, 1961, minutes state: "One of the important things with which all of us came away from this meeting [in Atlanta] was that both these problems are not *Jewish* problems; they are problems of the whole community, and that those of the Jewish community would have to take their stand if and when the overall community acted. In so far as the sit-in and boycott situation, this was most acute at the moment because of the fact that so many of our people are merchants." There were so many stores on this main business street owned by Jews that it was called "Little Jerusalem." JCRC Minutes, MSS 1020, B2, F6, JHC-CC.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ I. L. [Isadore Lee] Banov accused N. L. Rabinovitch, rabbi of the Orthodox congregation, of having called him "a renegade Jew" on Saturday morning, March 3, in the

presence of a large congregation that included some of Banov's relatives. In a letter to Alvin L. Rittenberg, president of Brith Sholom Beth Israel, Lee Banov wrote, "While no mention was made of my name the remarks were made in such a way *as to unmistakably identify the subject* [emphasis in original]." Banov threatened legal action if a public retraction was not made; Rabinovitch countered by saying he would not hesitate to sue for false accusations. The JCRC, supported by Alvin Rittenberg, president of Brith Sholom Beth Israel, urged the rabbi to "state from the pulpit that he had used a poor choice of word in 'renegade,' without compromising his feelings or his conscience." There is no further discussion of this in subsequent minutes. JCRC Minutes, February 2 and March 18, 1962. MSS 1020, B2, F6, JHC-CC.

³⁹ A number of sermons from his Brookline rabbinate support this fact. Burton Padoll, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Solomon Breitbart, October 21, 1999, #T(a).Cha.1999.10.224, JHC-CC. Much of the information on Padoll's formative years is based on this interview transcript.

⁴⁰ "Charleston, South Carolina," April 14, 1961.

⁴¹ Sheila Andelman Padoll, interview conducted by author, June 4, 2005.

⁴² "The Eichman [*sic*] Verdict," December 16, 1961.

⁴³ Although Padoll was conscientious about keeping copies of his sermons, there are many weeks for which we have no evidence of what he said from the pulpit.

⁴⁴ This comment, made so early in his KKBE tenure, reinforces Padoll's later assertion that the Board of Trustees knew his position when they hired him.

⁴⁵ In the 1999 interview Padoll speaks of his connections with Father Henry Grant, a black Episcopal priest who "ran a youth center for the Diocese in downtown Charleston." He does not mention any other black minister in the interview and none appear in his papers presently available.

⁴⁶ Tobias could trace his Charleston roots back to the first half of the eighteenth century when his ancestor Joseph Tobias served as the first president, or *parnas*, of the newly-founded KKBE. He thus represented one of the elite Jewish families in Charleston.

⁴⁷ JCRC Minutes, March 22, 1962. MSS 1020, B2, F6, JHC-CC.

⁴⁸ "Foolish Thoughts in April," April 6, 1962; "Knock on Wood," April 13, 1962.

⁴⁹ "Shabbos Chol HaMoed Pesach," April 20, 1962; "Our Freedoms and Their Responsibilities," May 25, 1962.

⁵⁰ He gives no reason why. It seems reasonable to conjecture that it was because he had a large African American clientele, he had already hired African American salespeople whom he then removed under pressure, and because his store was one of the more successful ones in the city. Kronsberg's store produced sufficient income so that he was able to give a million dollars to the state of Israel in the mid 70s. Kronsberg interview, April 11, 2001.

⁵¹ The most important, of course, was James Meredith's court-ordered enrollment at the University of Mississippi on September 30, 1962. Four years earlier nine black youngsters

broke the color barrier at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, as a result of court intervention. In both cases troops had to be called in to deal with mobs of angry protesters.

⁵² Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 18.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 11–12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 15–17.

⁵⁶ Jack Bass and Walter Devries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics: Social Change and Political Consequence since 1945* (New York, 1976), 258.

⁵⁷ “The Racial Crisis: North and South,” October 8, 1962.

⁵⁸ “Gantt Takes Clemson!” February 1, 1963. In the light of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s, “Letter from a Birmingham Jail,” written two months later, this appears even more relevant.

⁵⁹ Baker, *Paradoxes of Desegregation*, 150.

⁶⁰ “The Paper Curtain,” *Time*, May 25, 1962. The Charleston *News and Courier* was called by Judge J. Waties Waring, the uncle of editor Thomas Waring, the “bible of the supremacists,”

⁶¹ Baker, *Paradoxes of Desegregation*, 151.

⁶² Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 403.

⁶³ Baker, *Paradoxes of Desegregation*, 152.

⁶⁴ Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 416.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 392–421.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 170–174.

⁶⁷ “The Slavery Complex,” October [n.d.], 1963.

⁶⁸ “Strange Fire in Alabama,” April 26, 1965.

⁶⁹ MSS 1047, B6, F3, JHC-CC.

⁷⁰ Dr. Banov, Jr., (1914–2002), a proctologist, was the son of Dr. Leon Banov, the public health officer for Charleston City and County for nearly fifty years. Leon Banov, Jr., and I. Lee Banov (1905–1985), first mentioned above on page 15, were second cousins.

⁷¹ MSS 1047, B6, F3, JHC-CC.

⁷² MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁷³ Though Padoll says “by a vote of the membership” the fact was that the board of trustees had the power to hire and fire without consultation with the members.

⁷⁴ Freudenberg, a graduate of the Citadel, served as president or chair of a number of Charleston organizations, including Congregation Beth Elohim, the Sertoma Club, the Hebrew Benevolent Society, and the Hebrew Orphan Society. He received a number of military awards, including a medal for service in the Korean War and the Meritorious Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters. His wife was Maxine Triest Freudenberg.

⁷⁵ Dora Rubin to Dr. Leon Banov, Jr., February 19, 1967; Hannah and Samuel Brown to Banov, February 19, 1967; Bea Cohen to Banov, February 19, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁷⁶ Harold and Lillian Jacobs to board of trustees, February 19, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁷⁷ Claire Dumas to Henry Freudenberg, March 7, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁷⁸ Lee Banov to board of trustees, March 1, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁷⁹ Banov is thus connecting Padoll's supporters with a group that was anathema in the Charleston Jewish Community, the right-wing John Birch Society, whose arrival in town was a matter of concern reflected in the October 30, 1961 minutes of the JCRC. MSS 1020, JHC-CC. Lee Banov to Henry Freudenberg, March 4, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁸⁰ MSS 1047, B7, F3, JHC-CC.

⁸¹ Dutch and Mortie Cohen to board of trustees, February 18, 1967 and Jerry and Mary Ridel to board of trustees, February, [n.d.] 1967. The Cohens, who preferred a more traditional liturgy, joined the Conservative congregation, Emanu-El, but maintained an associate membership with KKBE because their children liked Padoll "so much and so did we." See note 88, below.

⁸² Mary Singer to Henry Freudenberg, February 21, 1967, and Marian Slotin to Henry Freudenberg, February 17, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁸³ Anita Moise Rosenberg, interview conducted by author, June 8, 2006. Henry Freudenberg, interview conducted by author, June 8, 2006.

⁸⁴ E.g., Charles Bernstein, interview conducted by author, June 8, 2006, and Marion Hornik to Henry Freudenberg, February 28, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁸⁵ Nancee and Alan Rubin to Henry Freudenberg, February 17, 1967, and Yetta Rosen to Henry Freudenberg, February 21, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁸⁶ David Furchgott to board of trustees, no date but placed in the folder with letters and petitions sent in February, 1965. MSS 1047, B46 F10, JHC-CC.

⁸⁷ David Furchgott, interview conducted by author, July 26, 2006. Furchgott's father, Max, was also one of Padoll's fans. He told Dale Rosengarten, "He was on to what was really happening in the world." Max Furchgott, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Dale LeRoy Dreyfoos, July 14, 1995. (DR) #T(d,v).Cha.1995.07.033, JHC-CC.

⁸⁸ Barbara Karesh Stender, interview conducted by author, June 8, 2006. Dorothy (Dutch) Cohen remembered with approval the time when her son and Robert Rosen professed that they did not believe in God, so their parents "sent them to Rabbi Padoll . . . and they came back and they said, 'Oh, he believes just like we do.' So we didn't get very far. He did a good job because he sold them what they would buy." Dorothy (Dutch) Cohen, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten and Robert Rosen, June 13, 1997 (DR, MSG) #T(d).Cha.1997.06.153, JHC-CC.

⁸⁹ Carolee R. Fox to Henry Freudenberg, February 19, 1967. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

⁹⁰ In addition, there were some who perceived him to be cold and unfriendly. David Furchgott, one of his most ardent supporters as a teenager, illuminated this when he told me, "before I got married—maybe 17 years ago, I heard that he was living near here, near Washington, out on the Virginia-West Virginia border, and I went out one time with my then fiancée to visit with him. . . . I went out with sort of the idea in mind that if anybody was going to marry me . . . he was somebody that I had very fond memories of. . . . I thought maybe that Burt Padoll would be the perfect person to marry us, but I didn't say that to him—I decided to introduce him to this woman and spend a little bit of an

afternoon and I didn't really feel like I connected real well with him, so I just kind of let it sit. . . . I found it hard to find things to talk to him about, which was a surprise because he was such a strong influence on me when I was younger." Padoll seemed to have an easier time relating to teens than he did to many adults. David Furchgott interview, July 26, 2006.

⁹¹ Sheila Andelman Padoll interview, June 4, 2005. In a letter of support sent to the board of trustees in 1967, Jack and Shifra Rosen said: "where will we seek to find a man, a teacher, of such out-spoken honesty, that this calling a 'spade a spade' is the only justifiable criticism?" Letter to Henry Freudenberg, February 28, 1967, MSS 1047, JHC-CC. Freudenberg, one of his staunchest opponents, said the same thing from the other perspective: "Burt Padoll was an ultra, ultra liberal and he tried to push that down everybody's throat." Freudenberg interview, June 8, 2006.

⁹² Burton L. Padoll interview, October 21, 1999.

⁹³ Stender interview, June 8, 2006. Edward Kronsberg supported this when he told Rosengarten: "the newer [Jewish] families, they just don't have respect. . . . [There's] not that same courtesy. Everybody is just in your face and blunt. . . . The rules are you be courteous . . . certain things aren't said to people." Kronsberg interview, April 11, 2001.

⁹⁴ Mordenai Raisin Hirsch interview conducted by author, June 8, 2006.

⁹⁵ Freudenberg interview, June 8, 2006.

⁹⁶ Breibart interview, May 24, 2005. Most telling was the fact that none of the individuals I interviewed, not even Breibart, could remember the first name of Natalie Padoll. With Breibart it was an incidental comment: "Missy was born after they were here, and, in fact, when Burt took, *I can't recall his wife's name right off hand now* [emphasis added], took his wife to the hospital with Missy, Billy stayed at my house." When I asked Charles Bernstein about her, his response was, "I don't remember his wife at all—I can't even remember her name," while Henry Freudenberg said in passing, "He had a wife—I can't remember her name right now—she wanted her privacy."

⁹⁷ Sanford Seltzer to author, June 9, 2005. When asked about Natalie Padoll, David Furchgott responded, "I can only sort of remember her in comparison to [the wife of] Rabbi Tarshish, who was there before, and I think she was probably less involved and a little bit more stand-offish."

⁹⁸ This might have been true, but it does not appear to have been the crucial factor, given the words of Seltzer and especially his friend, Breibart, who maintained a friendship with him until Padoll's death, visiting him on trips north. Padoll could have continued his social activism and not have been forced out by the board if he would have made an effort to maintain good relations with its members.

⁹⁹ It is also instructive that in the March 7, 1957, congregational minutes, a Mr. Hirschmann (probably Jerold Hirschmann), who was treasurer of the congregation, "expressed his opposition to any address to a Negro group by the Rabbi [Allan Tarshish] in his official capacity [he was probably speaking at one or more of the black colleges in and around Charleston]. After some discussion, the board expressed the sentiment that "the Rabbi as an individual has the right to speak wherever he wishes and should not be

restricted in this in any way.” At the next board meeting, on April 4, Hirschmann resigned from his board position. In other words, the board at that time was supportive of the rabbi engaging in outreach to the black community, which is what Padoll was doing not too many years later. MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

¹⁰⁰ MSS 1047, JHC-CC.

¹⁰¹ In 1994 Senator Ernest F. Hollings, native Charlestonian and past governor of South Carolina, placed in the public record praise of Banov on the occasion of his fiftieth wedding anniversary. Hollings notes Banov’s many contributions to the Charleston community “which have touched the lives of many thousands of others in Charleston.”

¹⁰² Gordan Stine, a Doctor of Dental Surgery, was instrumental in the chartering of the Medical University of South Carolina, located in Charleston. The dental library at that university bears his name.

¹⁰³ Breibart interview, May 24, 2005. There is good reason to believe that Breibart is wrong in inferring that Banov was with Bernstein, Freudenberg, and Stine when they took Padoll out to Folly Beach.

¹⁰⁴ Freudenberg interview, June 8, 2006.

¹⁰⁵ Bernstein interview, June 8, 2006.

¹⁰⁶ To the contrary, this is the interchange during the Freudenberg interview:

Q: Do you recall him speaking about the Viet Nam War?

A: I don’t remember any Viet Nam controversy.

¹⁰⁷ Charles Mantinband, interview conducted by author, June 24, 1966.

¹⁰⁸ Mordenai Raisin Hirsch with Rachel Marla Raisin, interview conducted by Dale Rosengarten. (DR) #T(a,d).Cha.1996.07.083, JHC-CC.

¹⁰⁹ May 14, 1948.

¹¹⁰ Dumas, Frisch, Ackerman interview, January 2, 1997.

¹¹¹ Seltzer to author, June 9, 2005.

¹¹² Kronsberg interview, April 11, 2001.

¹¹³ Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 468.

¹¹⁴ Robert Botsch, professor of political science at the University of South Carolina, Aiken, wrote about NAACP Field Secretary I. DeQuincy Newman: “Newman was a gentlemanly diplomat,” who “knew when to push and how far to push,” and “understood that good manners is at the heart of doing business in South Carolina.” <http://www.usca.edu/aasc/newman.htm> (accessed February 19, 2008).

¹¹⁵ Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 500.

¹¹⁶ See, for example, Susan Weill, *In a Madhouse’s Din: Civil Rights Coverage by Mississippi’s Daily Press, 1948–1968* (Westport, CT, 2002).

¹¹⁷ Cox, 1963 – *The Year of Decision*, 432–445.

¹¹⁸ Krause, “The Southern Rabbi and Civil Rights,” 155, 159.