

# **The Habsburgs and the Jewish Philanthropy in Jerusalem during the Crimean War (1853-6)**

Yochai Ben-Ghedalia  
Department of Jewish History  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Jerusalem, 2009

This study, which examines the power of giving, was made possible by the generous support from the Aharon Menczer Fund, by the Center for Austrian Studies at the European Forum of the Hebrew University.

I am also grateful to my mentor, Prof. Israel Bartal, Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, for his continuous guidance and support over the years.

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>		<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>The Habsburgs and the Holy City</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>The Austrian Consulate in Jerusalem and the Jews</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Jewish Powers</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Albert Cohn in Jerusalem</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b><i>Kulturkampf</i> in Jerusalem and Vienna</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>		<b>29</b>

## Preface

The Crimean war (1853-6) awakened great involvement of the European Powers in the East: England and France fought together with the Turks against the Russian troops, and Austria moved its forces toward the Danubian principalities, forcing the Tsar to withdraw his forces. The war constituted a watershed in the powers' interest in the Ottoman Empire, adding an important dimension to the 'Eastern Question'.<sup>1</sup>

Jerusalem played an important role in the war, in spite of its distance from the main arenas of fighting, and was also affected by it. Struggles between Catholics (supported by France) and Greek Orthodox (supported by Russia) over domination of the Christian Sacred Places were among the triggers - or the excuses - for the break out of the War.. The European involvement in the war in favor of the Sultan led later on to a series of legislative reforms in the Ottoman empire, enabling the Powers, among them Austria, to strengthen their grasp on the Holy City.

As for the Jewish community in Jerusalem, the War had two contradictory effects. On the one hand, it stopped the transfer of alms from Russian Jews to Palestine, leading to a humanitarian crisis. On the other hand, the Powers' interest in the city was accompanied by a similar concern on the part of affluent Jewish communities in the West. Their interest was soon translated into an unprecedented Jewish philanthropic endeavor which enjoyed European patronage and was conducted in close cooperation with the European consuls.

This research focuses on Jewish philanthropy from the Habsburg monarchy - as well as foreign philanthropic activity which enjoyed Austrian patronage - during the Crimean war. It portrays various philanthropic initiatives as well as their interrelations. Above all, it examines the role played by Jewish philanthropy in the Habsburgs' array of interests in the Orient, challenging the common perception regarding the Austrian presence in the Holy City.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the diplomatic aspects of the Crimean War see David M. Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War* (London, 1994); David Wetzel, *The Crimean War: A Diplomatic History* (Boulder, 1985).

## Chapter 1: The Habsburgs and the Holy City

The European Great Powers' involvement in the Ottoman Empire dates back to the sixteenth century, when a series of treaties, known as the Capitulations, between the European states and "the sick man on the Bosphorus," endowed the European consulates and their subjects with complete legal, financial, and religious autonomy. As for Austria, chapter 5 in the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz (1718) bestowed Austria with the right to establish consulates in any city in the Ottoman Empire where a foreign consular agency already existed.<sup>2</sup>

European interests in the Levant were mostly commercial. Therefore, consulates were opened in trade centers across the Mediterranean coast, such as Beirut, Acre and Jaffa, and central cities of commerce such as Aleppo. In spite of its religious importance, Jerusalem was neglected by the Powers due to its commercial marginality.

The Napoleonic expedition to Egypt and the Levant at the end of the eighteenth century marks the beginning of a new era in relations between Europe and the Orient. The economic dimensions were broadened into a complex network of political, commercial, religious and cultural interests. This shift of interests was followed by a dramatic change in the status of Jerusalem. The city suddenly gained importance, with Europe "rediscovering" the religious, historical, strategic, and political significance of the Holy City.

Special interest in the Palestinian arena arose in the 1830s, during the Egyptian occupation of Palestine and Syria, when Muhammad Ali, the Egyptian Pasha, led a favorable policy towards foreign interests. Later, the Powers were deeply involved in the Pasha's removal from the Levant (1840) and the restoration of Ottoman rule, with both Austrian and British diplomats and fleets playing an active role in this affair.

Starting with the establishment of the British consulate in 1839, six Western consulates were opened in Jerusalem within a single decade, the last of which was the

---

<sup>2</sup> For Austrian diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire see Arthur Breycha-Vauthier, *Oesterreich in der Levante: Geschichte und Geschichten einer alten Freundschaft* (Vienna, 1972), 11-8; Haim Goren and Yehoshua Ben-Arieh, "Catholic Austria and Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century: The Beginings," in *Austrian Presence in the Holy Land in the 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, ed. Marian Wrba (Tel Aviv, 1996), 7-9.

Austrian one, in 1849.<sup>3</sup> The resolution to found a consular agency was adopted as early as 1846, and the nomination of Vice-Consul Joseph von Pizzamano (1809-60) was approved by the Kaiser in 1847, but the revolutionary events of 1848 caused a delay in its execution.<sup>4</sup> Following difficult struggles, Pizzamano was promoted in 1852 to 'full' consul, and in 1857 received the personal rank of Consul-General as well as the title of Count.

Founding the Austrian consulate in Jerusalem had no commercial justification; it was established mainly on political and religious grounds. This is manifest in the characters of the individuals who held the post of consuls in Jerusalem. Contrary to the consular agents in the port cities - who were local merchants and the majority of whom never stood on Austrian soil - the consuls in Jerusalem were all professional diplomats, and most of them were trained in the *Orientalische Akademie* in Vienna.<sup>5</sup> Interestingly enough, almost none were professional orientalists in the scientific sense, as opposed to the many orientalist researchers among the diplomatic staffs of France, England and Prussia in Jerusalem.

Religion and politics were tightly intertwined in the complex of European interests in Jerusalem. Patronage of Christian interests was one of the main fields of competition among the Powers in Jerusalem. Russia served as patron of the Greek Orthodox, and Britain and Prussia jointly established the first Protestant Episcopate in Jerusalem. The Catholic scene was more complicated. France, the traditional defender of Latin interests in the Orient, assumed this role in Jerusalem as well, but the Habsburgs, titled for generations "Kings of Jerusalem," contested its hegemony.<sup>6</sup>

The Catholic Church had entrusted its interest in the Sacred Places of Jerusalem to the Order of The Franciscan Friars, who had held the Custody of the Holy Land since the fourteenth century. Subsequently, Commissions of the Custody were founded in various Catholic states in Europe. In Vienna, "The General Commission for the Holy Land" was established by Kaiser Ferdinand II (1578-1637) in 1633, with the aim of collecting donations and ritual objects for Christian

---

<sup>3</sup> Mordechai Eliav, ed., *Britain and the Holy Land, 1838–1914: Selected Documents from the British Consulate in Jerusalem* (Jerusalem, 1997), 15-6.

<sup>4</sup> On the history of the Austrian consulate in Jerusalem see Mordechai Eliav, "The Austrian Consulate in Jerusalem: Activities and Achievements," in Wrba, *Austrian Presence in the Holy Land*, 41-51; Mordechai Eliav and Barbara Haider, eds., *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land: Ausgewaehlte Konsulatsdokumente aus Jerusalem, 1849-1917* (Vienna, 2000), 29-93.

<sup>5</sup> Eliav, "The Austrian Consulate," 44; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 587-91.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, 29-55.

institutions in the Holy Land. The Commission was seated in the Franciscan monastery in Vienna, and all donations were sent to the Franciscan Friars in Jerusalem. As part of his anti-clerical policy, in 1784 Kaiser Joseph II (1741-90) ordered the abolishment of the Commission's activities in his territories.<sup>7</sup>

Following the renewed political interest in the Holy Land, The Commission was re-established by Kaiser Ferdinand (1793-1875) in 1843, but with an important change. The heritage of enlightened-absolutism from the Josephenian era was adjusted to the political developments of the time. The enlightened-absolutism policy, demanding domination of the state authority over the church, was given a new form. The Commission remained in the Franciscan monastery in Vienna, but its supreme supervision was given over to the Archbishop of Vienna, and the funds were restricted to purposes defined solely in Vienna. This step enhanced Austria's campaign against France as the supreme protector of Catholic interests in the Holy Land.

However, the years-long tradition, combined with clever French exploitation of internal disputes between the local ecclesiastical bodies in Jerusalem, preserved Austrian inferiority in the Catholic arena. This inferiority forced Austria to adopt another strategy, filling the lacuna of guardian of Jerusalem's Jewish residents.

---

<sup>7</sup> On the Commission see Helmut Wahnout, *Das oesterreichische Hospiz in Jerusalem: Geschichte des Pilgerhauses an der Via Dolorosa* (Vienna, 2000), 13-8.

## Chapter 2: The Austrian Consulate in Jerusalem and the Jews

One of the best ways to study the character of an organization, its activities and interests, is to go through its archives, even if only to glance hastily over its files. Browsing through the archives of the Austrian consulate in Jerusalem<sup>8</sup> reveals its great involvement in the Jewish life of the city and its surroundings. Jewish issues constitute a significant portion of the archive, forming one of the finest collections of autographs from the nineteenth century Jerusalem Jewish elite and masses alike. The documents deal with various public and personal aspects of Jewish life in the city. A widow trying to execute her husband's bequest; the Jews of Hebron begging for help in defending themselves from a threatening local Sheikh; receipts for donations sent from European Jews; official copies of financial contracts; and reciprocal complaints concerning inner disputes. These manuscripts bear evidence of the days when Austria was the most dominant power in the *Yishuv* (pre-Zionist Jewish society in Palestine).

But what is it that made Austria such an important power? A glance at the demographic composition of the Jewish population in Jerusalem during the second half of the nineteenth century will shed light on this subject.<sup>9</sup>

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, Jerusalem's Jewish population was comprised almost exclusively of Oriental Jews – *Sephardim* - who were *rayas* - deprived, non-Muslim Ottoman subjects. From 1810 onwards, waves of immigrants from Europe, mostly from the Russian Empire, arrived in the city, turning East-European Jewry - *Ashkenazim* - into the majority in the *Yishuv* toward the end of the century. In the late 1840s, The Tsar denounced the immigrants' citizenships, and they had to seek protection from other European Powers.

Lacking a firm base in the local French-oriented Christian community and Church, the Austrian Vice-Consul, like his English and Prussian counterparts, sought ways to expand his influence by acquiring Jewish protégés.<sup>10</sup> The higher diplomatic ranks in Constantinople and Vienna did not approve of this step, but Pizzamano finally succeeded in convincing them.<sup>11</sup> He pointed out local Jews' importance as an

---

<sup>8</sup> Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien [HHStA], KA, Jer.

<sup>9</sup> On the social structure of the *Yishuv* see Tudor Parfitt, *The Jews in Palestine, 1800-1882* (Woodbridge, 1987), 1-38; Jeff Halper, *Between Redemption and Revival: The Jewish Yishuv of Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century* (Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford, 1991), 1-105.

<sup>10</sup> Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 55-60; Eliav, *Britain and the Holy Land*, 59-64.

<sup>11</sup> Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 115-17, 121-27, 131-34, 144-46.

anchor for the Austrian endeavor in the East, and warned of the consequences of rejecting the East-European Jews' request. The desperate Jews would ask Britain for protection, a step that would strengthen the British - and more importantly, the Protestant - influence in the city. Subsequently, as early as the 1850s, most European Jews in Jerusalem were Austrian subjects or protégés, and Habsburg was known worldwide to be the Great Power most interested in the fate of the Jews of the Orient.<sup>12</sup>

The Austrian presence among the Jews of Jerusalem had a financial aspect as well. The pious residents of the Holy City traditionally relied on donations, which arrived from Jewish communities worldwide, including the Habsburg Empire. The flow of donations from the Empire ceased towards the end of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century. The Austrian authorities prohibited export of fiscal and human resources from the Monarch, and Jewish immigrants were used to traveling to the Holy Land as pilgrims with one-way tickets only, illegally carrying money for the inhabitants of the Four Holy Cities. The Galician *maskilim* - enlightened Jews, who opposed the traditional values of Jewish society - informed the Habsburg authorities of these legal violations, and investigations were held on this matter.<sup>13</sup> These illegal donations, which became a bone of contention between the *maskilim* and the Orthodox sects, were traditionally viewed from the narrow Jewish viewpoint in Jewish historiography. However, the broader context, of the Habsburg's policy towards the Holy Land, provides us with a new perspective. The absolutist regime did not oppose emigration to Palestine and fundraising for its Jewish inhabitants due to the campaign held by the *maskilim*, but rather as part of a broader absolutist endeavor. This campaign, discussed in the previous chapter, sought to strengthen the state's power and economy, and could not afford leaks of capital through its borders. The inner disputes between *maskilim* and Orthodox sects in Galicia took place within a much larger framework.

The same may be said about the abolition of the prohibition, in 1849 in Galicia and in 1851 in other regions of the Monarchy. The permission to collect money for the pious Jews of Palestine bears distinctive similarities, in time and patterns, to the Catholic fundraising discussed in the previous chapter. As in the Christian case, the

---

<sup>12</sup> Isidore Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn* (Paris, 1878), 66.

<sup>13</sup> Rachel Manekin, "The *Maskilim* of Lemberg and the Holy Land: An Unknown Case from 1816," *Cathedra* 130 (December 2008): 31-50 [in Hebrew]; N.M. Gelber, "Jewish Immigration from Bohemia and Galicia into Eretz-Israel," *Yerushalayim* 4 (1953): 243-49 [in Hebrew].



authorities did not go back to the pre-absolutist era, and did not allow uncontrolled collection of money by itinerant alms collectors from the Holy Land.<sup>14</sup> Alms were collected only by licensed representatives of the local communities (usually the community rabbi), and were gathered and sent to Palestine by an appointed emissary, authorized by the government and the Jews of the Holy Land. Distribution of the donations was to be supervised by the consul and local Jewish leaders, in order for the money to reach the proper hands. Priority was given to causes that served Austrian interests, and the money was designated to serve the Austrian subjects and protégés among the Jews of Jerusalem. In 1851, Vice-Consul Pizzamano was asked about the issue of permitting the collection of money in the Empire for the Jews of Palestine. Pizzamano highly recommended acceptance of the request, and suggested that the money be sent in the form of Austrian goods, in order to restrict the export of currency from the monarchy. An additional gain would be the opening of new markets for Austrian products in the East.<sup>15</sup> In his proposal, the Vice-Consul meant to enhance the commercial importance of Jerusalem, as part of his personal struggle to promote the status of his consular agency to the General-Consulate with an appropriate area of authority.

As far as we know, his commercial suggestion did not receive any response, but the Jews' request, which he highly recommended, was approved. Following the Foreign Ministry's approval, the Minister of Interior, Dr. Alexander von Bach (1813-93), gave his permission, according to the fully-detailed terms, issued by the Governor of Galicia in 1849. In Galicia and Bukovina, the money was gathered in Lemberg (Lviv), and sent directly to Beirut. From there it was transferred to the consulate in Jerusalem and distributed to its Chasidic Jews (*Kolel Vohlin*), headed at the time by Israel (Abrahmovitz) Back (1797-1874), and his son Nissan (Nissim, 1815-89). In 1851, the former Russian Jews in Jerusalem (*Kolel Perushim*) appointed the Viennese wine wholesaler, Heinrich Fein, as their proxy in Austrian Lands, an appointment which was approved by Bach. In 1854, the Kaiser's moneychanger, Ignaz Deutsch (1808-81), was appointed by the *Perushim* as "President of the Holy Land" and director of fundraising in the Habsburg Empire. His appointment was later approved by Kaiser Francis Joseph (1830-1916).

---

<sup>14</sup> N.M. Gelber, "Yichaq Deutsch, a Synagogue Warden [*sic*] of the Austrian Jewish Community in Eres[*sic*]-Israel," *Yerushalayim* 5 (1955): 307-18 [in Hebrew].

<sup>15</sup> *ibid*, 315; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 136-38.

Ignaz Deutsch held radical Orthodox views, opposing the less stringent Reform tendencies of the communal leadership in Vienna. His religious approach fit in with reactionary tendencies among prominent political leaders in post-1848 Vienna. Deutsch also shared his views with other Orthodox fundraising centers, opposing any attempt to change the *Yishuv's* traditional character. In his letter to the *Paquam*, the central Orthodox fundraising body for the inhabitants of the Holy Land, he even offered to use his influence in the government to prevent immigration of non-Orthodox Jews to the Holy Land.<sup>16</sup> His well-known Orthodox views played a crucial role in later episodes, to be discussed in the last chapter.

The relations between the Jews of Jerusalem and the Austrian government were of a reciprocal nature. The Jews enjoyed Western patronage, which was crucial in Muslim lands, regularly and legally receiving alms from the Austrian domains. The Habsburgs, on their part, tightened their grasp on Jerusalem, having become the Power with the greatest number of protégés in the Holy City. The relations between the sovereign and his new subjects had a religious aspect as well. The *Wiener Mittheilungen* of February 6, 1855, for example, reports a special prayer service held by the Austrian Jews of Jerusalem at the Western Wall for the Empress's health, as she had just given birth to her first child.

The Jewish Austrian presence in Jerusalem was not limited to the 'old' contexts of protection and religion. During the Crimean War, a new phase in the Austrian presence in Jerusalem had set in – the phase of Austrian Jewish Philanthropy.

---

<sup>16</sup> Correspondence books of ha'Peqidim veba-Amarkalim Amsterdam, Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem, 13: 323.

### Chapter 3: Jewish Powers

The Crimean war (1853-6) constituted one of the peaks in the European penetration of the Ottoman Empire. All the Great Powers were involved in the war, either in the battlefield or at the negotiation table. A major reason, or excuse, for the war breaking out, and undoubtedly its great achievement from the European point of view, was the amelioration of non-Muslim's civil status in the Ottoman Empire. The Tsar demanded the inclusion of Greek Orthodox - who were Ottoman subjects - under Russian patronage; the French took care of the Latin churches, monasteries and laymen; and Britain took care of the Druze and other small religious minorities. The Powers' involvement was soon echoed by similar interests in the Jewish world.

Beginning in the eighteenth century, new Jewish centers arose in Western and Central Europe, in areas devoid of Jewish presence since the late Middle Ages. Wealthy Jews, whose endeavors focused on banking and commerce, inhabited these new centers. The new communities adopted a modern life-style, and saw themselves as an integral part of the surrounding society. Each center struggled, in its unique way, for emancipation, and exhibited its patriotic feelings toward whichever empire spread its wings over it. The Crimean war was an opportunity for these communities to express their loyalty toward their empires, and to demonstrate their patronage over their co-religionists in the East. The Jews of London, Paris, Vienna and other Western centers with a Jewish presence, functioned as Great Powers in the Jewish microcosm. On the one hand, they felt responsible for their 'backward' brethren, but on the other hand, the Jewish communities of the East were just another, distant battlefield, in the fight over the hegemony in the Jewish world-politics.

European activity during the War in favor of the Jews of Zion may be examined from four perspectives. The first perspective is the **traditional** (or Orthodox) one. The *Yishuv* traditionally subsisted on donations from the Diaspora - enabling the pious Jews of Palestine to live a life of Torah study and sanctity. The eruption of the War complicated the flow of donations from Russia, and affected mainly the *Ashkenazim* from *Kolel Perushim* and *Kolel Warsaw*. Help came, at least to the *Perushim*, from a new source - the permission to collect money throughout the Habsburg Empire, as portrayed in the previous chapter.

Another perspective is the **humanitarian** one. The 'official' history of the *Yishuv* considers several letters, written by the Jews of the Four Holy Cities during January-February 1854, to be the main cause for the European philanthropic endeavor in Palestine during the War. In these letters, local Jews recounted their hazardous situation and begged for help.<sup>17</sup> Their appeal led to a fundraising drive, headed by Sir Moses Montefiore and England's chief Rabbi N.M. Adler, which was unpredictably successful, appealing to Jews and gentiles from all over Europe and the New World. Supplied with a large sum of money, Montefiore arrived in Jerusalem in July 1855, following a long journey through Europe. Nevertheless, only a small measure of this money was distributed for relief causes.

Moreover, close investigation of these early letters reveals that they were not written as a result of the war's horrors – the blocking of alms from Russia and the high inflation affecting the prices of basic goods – but rather due to a series of natural disasters. The fact that several months had passed between the arrival of the letters in Europe and Montefiore and Adler's public appeal in May, raises the question as to what happened in the meantime.

Again, closer investigation of the events reveals that the response to provide relief for the humanitarian disaster was preceded by earlier organizations that belong to the third sphere of philanthropic activity: the **diplomatic** route. Campaigns for improving the civil status of the Ottoman Empire Jews were part of the all-European enterprise in the East. In 1840, during the diplomatic and military crisis accompanying the end of Egyptian occupation of the Levant, a united mission of prominent Jews from France and England came to Alexandria, on behalf of the Jews of Damascus. A local blood-libel against the Jews of this distant city awakened unprecedented campaigns among the Jews of the Occident. The double-headed mission, led by Moses Montefiore and Adolphe Crémieux, did not limit its efforts to the acquittal of the Syrian Jews, but also fought for the civil status of their brethren.<sup>18</sup>

The same may be said of Jewish philanthropy during the Crimean War. The Jewish 'powers' followed the 'real' Powers' efforts, and demanded that civil rights be granted to Jewish residents of the Ottoman Empire. The diplomatic campaign

---

<sup>17</sup> A. Scischa, "The Saga of 1855: A Study in Depth," in *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, ed. Sonia and V.D. Lipman (Oxford, 1985), 269; N.M. Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen and his visit to Jerusalem," *Jerusalem* 2 (1949): 177 [in Hebrew].

<sup>18</sup> On this affair see Jonathan Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder", Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (Cambridge 1997).

preceded the humanitarian initiatives. As early as December 1853,<sup>19</sup> a few months before England and France joined Turkey and declared war on Russia, the Jewish leadership in the West commenced its diplomatic lobbying. As with the Damascus Affair of 1840, the campaign began as a joint activity of the Jewish centers of London and Paris. The Central Consistory in France and the local branch of the House of Rothschild wrote to Louis Napoleon and the Sublime Porte; while in England, the Board of Deputies and the local Rothschilds made their own appeals to the British Foreign Secretary, Earl of Clarendon, and Montefiore announced that it was his intention to travel to Constantinople to meet with the Sultan. All the petitions were of the same nature, demanding the civil status of the Ottoman Jews be equal to the Christian residents of the Empire in any future legislation. In response, officials in London and Constantinople wrote to Jewish representatives, promising them that there would be no discrimination whatsoever against the Jews, and that the new legislation would relate to 'non-Muslims' and not specifically to Christians.<sup>20</sup>

The two centers' activities were tightly collaborated, and the Jewish press, the power of the media, played a significant role. The Jewish newspapers in England and France, and of no lesser importance - in the German-speaking sphere - covered the diplomatic activity and encouraged it. The Jewish press played an even more important role here, by creating and enhancing awareness of the existence of great Jewish powers.

This awareness was given expression not only in the diplomatic route, but also into the fourth sphere. Montefiore, like other philanthropic entrepreneurs who will be discussed in the coming chapters, invested most of his energy and resources in a new mode of relief, previously almost unknown in the *Yishuv*: **philanthropy**. The philanthropic project embraced strategies, aims and attitudes which differed from those of the traditional financial support pattern. Whereas the traditional pattern concentrated on supporting individuals, the philanthropic approach founded public institutions. The philanthropic institutions ranged from hospitals, pharmacies, well-baby clinics and welfare institutions to schools, vocational education and industry. Unlike the traditional and Orthodox approaches, this modern philanthropy did not seek to preserve the traditional values and life-style of the *Yishuv*, but rather to modernize and 'repair' it. Diaspora Jews commonly perceived their brethren in the

---

<sup>19</sup> Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen," 176.

<sup>20</sup> Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 47-9.

Holy City as an avant-garde of holiness and piety, while Europeanized philanthropists viewed their oriental co-religionists patronizingly.

The last two spheres - diplomacy and philanthropy - served, in different ways, a greater Jewish Occidental project: to Europeanize the Jews of the East. From their new position, the European Jewish 'powers' tried to lead their 'backward' brethren through the same process they had gone through just a few years earlier. The two intertwined methods were: bringing the Jews closer to Europe (enlightenment and acculturation, i.e. philanthropy), or Europe closer to the Jews (emancipation, i.e. diplomacy). However, the real subjects of this campaign were not the Jews of Jerusalem or the Orient, but rather the European Jews themselves. Lacking territory, central-governance or any 'national' expression of intra-diaspora collectivity, philanthropy played a central role in the Jews' world-politics, labeling philanthropists (persons and communities) as Jewish powers. The *empowerment* of Jewish centers in the West was the final stage in their struggle to become an integral part of Europe. Hence their relationship with the Great Powers, in this case the Habsburgs, may be seen in a new light.

## Chapter 4: Albert Cohn in Jerusalem

Following the French declaration of war on Russia, and the antecedent negotiations with Turkey regarding the civil rights of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire, the Central Consistory of French Jews sought the means to improve the civil, cultural and physical situation of the Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The catalyst for this awakening was a series of articles in the Jewish press, mainly by Ludwig Philipsohn, the editor of the most prominent Jewish newspaper – *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*. Philipsohn began his endeavors on behalf of the Jews in the East in the early 1840s, and held several campaigns and fundraising drives to benefit them.<sup>21</sup> He believed that Occidental Jews had the mission of civilizing the Oriental Jews. Philipsohn favored the philanthropic strategy over the diplomatic one. He believed in education: occupational education for the incorrigible older generation, and a thorough tutoring process for the younger generation. He opposed the diplomatic route, as he perceived it to be an easy, non-systematic way of 'repairing' the Jews of the Orient. Aware of his failure to realize his visions in the East over the years, due to Orthodox opposition and Occidental indifference, Philipsohn used his newspaper to call for bringing promising youngsters from the Orient to Europe. The youngsters would be educated there and spread the gospel of the enlightenment upon their return. Philipsohn encouraged a united enterprise by all Jewish centers in the West, using his newspaper as his main venue,, as well as personal letters to prominent leaders, and journeys to the Jewish centers of Western Europe.

After several postponements, the Central Consistory adopted some of Philipsohn's suggestions.<sup>22</sup> As opposed to Montefiore's humanitarian appeal, which was considered a short-term solution, the Consistory sought a long-term solution to thoroughly cure the *Yishuv's* maladies, and therefore decided to consult other Western Jewish centers about ways to lead Oriental Jews towards modernity. They decided a mission should be sent to Jerusalem to offer remedies for the local ailments, in addition to immediately bringing youngsters from the East to Europe, in order to endow them with a Western education. As shown in the previous chapter, the Consistory did not abandon the diplomatic route either.

---

<sup>21</sup> Mordechai Eliav, *Love of Zion and Men of Hod: German Jewry and the Settlement of Eretz-Israel in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century* (Tel-Aviv, 1970), 171-83 [in Hebrew].

<sup>22</sup> Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 51-5.

Dr. Albert Cohn (1814-77) was chosen to carry out the mission to the East. Cohn was born in Presburg (Bratislava), then part of the Habsburg Empire, into a traditional family. He traveled to Vienna as a young boy to receive a secular education. Due to his Jewish origin, he was prevented from studying anything other than medicine in the university, and decided to embark on Semitic studies privately. He became close to Baron Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856), one of the leading figures in research of the Orient in nineteenth century Austria, and also served informally as a Hebrew teacher in a local Protestant seminary. Hammer-Purgstall advised Cohn to leave for Paris in 1836 in order to enhance and formalize his Oriental education.<sup>23</sup>

In Paris, Cohn studied with the prominent Orientalists of the time, and served as a personal tutor to the local Rothschild's children. He soon became the family almoner, and director of the Jewish Relief Committee of Paris, the *comité de bienfaisance*. In this post, Cohn re-established the charity activities of Parisian Jewry, while lending them a modern philanthropic character. During the 1840s, he traveled twice to Algeria, where he suggested ways to improve the community system. His report was submitted to King Louis Philippe (1773-1850), and constituted an important step in assimilating the local Algerian Jews into the French Jewish community. His philanthropic experience, combined with his Orientalist training and practice, made him the right person for the Palestinian mission. His close relations with the Rothschilds, who were prominent members of the Consistory and well-known philanthropists, underscored his qualifications.

Cohn's mission was not limited to exploring and reporting. According to write-ups from those days in the Jewish press, Cohn was to start a similar network of philanthropic institutions in Jerusalem, quite similar to the one he nurtured throughout the years in Paris. In Jerusalem, "the capital of the Jews of the Orient", he was also to establish a newspaper that would disseminate enlightenment, and alter their religious and ethical tendencies. His patrons, the Parisian Rothschilds, had furnished him with an impressive amount of money, and almost everything was ready for the establishment of a Jewish French colony in Jerusalem.

---

<sup>23</sup> On Cohn see his autobiographical letters, published in *l'Univers Israélite*, 20-1 (1864-66); his French-oriented biography by Isidore Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*; and his Austro-Hungarian-oriented biography by Ignaz Reich, *Beth El: Ehrentempel verdienter ungar. Israeliten*, (Pesth, 1868<sup>2</sup>), 1:80-105.



Cohn, however, did not turn southward to Marseille, the main French port in the Mediterranean and its gate to North Africa and the Orient, but rather headed eastward, back to Vienna, on the same day, June 11, that he had left the Habsburg Empire eighteen years earlier. In Vienna he had an interview with Kaiser Francis Joseph, as well as meeting Bach, the Minister of Interior, and the Foreign Minister, Graf Karl Ferdinand von Buol-Schauenstein (1797-1865), who provided him with official recommendation letters to all the Austrian consular delegations in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>24</sup>

Equipped with these recommendations, Cohn left Trieste, the Austrian nautical exit to the Mediterranean, for Alexandria, and from there he sailed to Jaffa. In Jaffa, he was received by delegations representing the various factions of Jerusalem Jews. The reception became even more elaborate as they approached the city (July 9, 1854). Cohn stayed in the city for three short weeks, residing at the former *Sephardic* Talmud Torah (Jewish religious primary school) building, which had closed down shortly beforehand for financial reasons. Despite his brief stay, Cohn managed to start a large network of health, education and relief institutions. He rented the house in which he had stayed to open a hospital named for the Rothschild's father. In addition, he founded a charity service for the benefit of new mothers, similar to the one he had established in Paris, carrying the name of Betty de-Rothschild. In the field of education, Cohn established a vocational school for boys and a finishing school for girls, while in the field of charity he founded a bread distribution service, with his wife Matilda as its patron, and a free-of-interest loan service.<sup>25</sup> This institutional network was upgraded following Gustav de-Rothschild's visit that same year, and Cohn's visit later that year. A few of the institutions were even endowed with a solid fund to secure their existence for a long period of time. Other institutions, however, ceased to exist, closing down even before Cohn's second visit to Jerusalem in 1856.<sup>26</sup>

The 'national' identity of the Jerusalem institutions Cohn established may seem puzzling to the contemporary reader. Cohn, a man of the Jewish-French center, sent to Jerusalem by the Consistory thanks to his experience in France and Algeria, was supposedly French through and through. The Jerusalem network was a duplicate of

---

<sup>24</sup> Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen," 178, 186; Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 66.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.*, 68-76; Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen," 186-88; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 157-159; Hayim Eliezer Hausdorf, *Selig Hausdorf* (Jerusalem, 1906), 17-20 [in Hebrew].

<sup>26</sup> Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 179-180.

Cohn's patterns of activity in Paris, many of them even carrying the names of their original Parisian counterparts. The institutions Cohn established were commonly perceived as French achievements, as was clearly expressed in the press of those days.<sup>27</sup>

Despite all of this, these institutions were established at the Austrian Kaiser's recommendation and closely accompanied by the Austrian consul in Jerusalem and not by his French counterpart. The Austrian support was even more obvious during Cohn's journey back to Europe through Constantinople, where he made diplomatic efforts to improve the Jews' civil status, again closely accompanied by the Austrian diplomatic personnel in the Ottoman capital.<sup>28</sup> Cohn's first stop upon his return to Europe was Vienna, where he merited another interview by the Kaiser and a meeting with his senior ministers, conversations which led to the Kaiser's consent to protect the institutions Cohn established in the East, granting them formal Austrian approval.<sup>29</sup> The Austrian support was evident on each and every level: from the Kaiser and his senior ministers down to the Internuncio in Constantinople and the consul in Jerusalem. During Cohn's return through Vienna, the 'Austrianness' of the institutions received a boost in the Jewish arena as well, following his meeting with the leaders of the Viennese Jewish community, and his Sabbath sermon at the local synagogue.<sup>30</sup>

The 'national' dissonance can be understood from various angles, such as the complexities of the various powers' diplomatic interests, the intricacy of identities manifest in the Rothschild House, and the personal identity of Cohn himself.

In the diplomatic arena, France was not interested in extending its complex network of protection to Jewish causes as well.<sup>31</sup> In Jerusalem, the French consul enjoyed a stable infra-structure of Christian institutions and local Catholic subjects (as well as some North African Jews), and had no reason to broaden it – in complete opposition to the interests of the Austrian consulate described above. In reports from that period, as well as the writings of later historians, the Powers' policies are explained in the context of anti- and philo-Semitism. Following the Damascus Affair,

---

<sup>27</sup> For a description of the perception of world-politics of Jewish Philanthropy by contemporary Jewish public opinion and press, see Ludwig August Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1858), 1:10.

<sup>28</sup> Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen," 183-85, 188-190, 192-94; Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 78-83.

<sup>29</sup> Gelber, "Dr. Albert Cohen," 184-185, 195; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 162-65; Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 83-4.

<sup>30</sup> Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 84.

<sup>31</sup> Parfitt, *The Jews in Palestine*, 130-31.

the flames of which were fanned by the local French consul, and extinguished with the active assistance of the Austrian diplomatic alignment in the East, there has been a tendency to label the French diplomatic staff as 'anti-Semitic', and all Austrians as righteous gentiles.<sup>32</sup> This approach does not seem to sufficiently explain the phenomenon. Apart from the change of government and policy which took place in France and in the Habsburg Empire since 1840, a close examination of the Damascus events finds the attitude of the Austrian consul in Damascus to be problematic.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, the attitude of the French consuls towards their Jewish protégés in Jerusalem was quite positive.<sup>34</sup> The same may be said of the patronage the French diplomatic representatives throughout the Ottoman Empire granted Alliance Institutions beginning in the 1860s.<sup>35</sup> If we are to broaden the scope of French diplomatic interests beyond the walls of Jerusalem, we should do so regarding the French policy concerning Jews' status in conquered Algeria, and in the other North African French dominion states. The French policy towards the Jews of Muslim countries was very reserved, which had a direct influence on the attitude of the consulate in Jerusalem towards the Jews arriving from North Africa.<sup>36</sup>

Examination of Cohn's patrons – the Parisian Rothschild House - sheds new light on the complexity of the institutions' identity. In contrast to Moses Montefiore, whose British identity was clear-cut, the national affiliation of the Rothschilds was much more complicated. On the one hand, James de-Rothschild served as Austrian consul in the French capital, while on the other hand, his sons, Alphonse (1827-1905) and Gustave (1829-1911) - and later on the youngest son, Edmond (1845-1934) - whose involvement in philanthropic activity was very significant, were undoubtedly French. The boys were very active in the consistorial network, and the French identity of the House was further emphasized following the 1848 events.<sup>37</sup> The Rothschild House was regularly accused in the ultramontane press in France, and in the foreign press as well, of being cosmopolitan, and apparently rightly so, to some extent. The

---

<sup>32</sup> Schischa, "The Saga," 330; Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 66; Parfitt, *The Jews in Palestine*, 154-57.

<sup>33</sup> Frankel, *The Damascus Affair*, 86-105.

<sup>34</sup> Parfitt, *The Jews in Palestine*, 131-58.

<sup>35</sup> Eli Bar-Chen, *Weder Asiaten noch Orientalen: internationale juedische organisationen und die Europaeisierung "rueckstaediger" Juden* (Wuerzburg, 2005), 103-15.

<sup>36</sup> Simon Schwarzfuchs, "The French Consulate in Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century and the French Protected Jews," *Shalem* 8 (2008): 478-573 [in Hebrew].

<sup>37</sup> Michael Graetz, *The Jews in Nineteenth-Century France: From the French Revolution to the Alliance Israélite Universelle*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Stanford, 1996), 79-109.

Rothschild brothers, whose contacts encompassed many states, were managing the complex interests of their family and broader Jewish interests. These interests more than once overshadowed the political interests of the powers in which they each resided. In addition, members from various branches of the family throughout Europe were appointed as patrons of the Rothschild institutions in Jerusalem,<sup>38</sup> so, at times, the institutions carried triple national identity. With time, some took on new national identities. An instructive example is the second transformation of the girls' school, as the institution named for Evelina de-Rothschilds (starting in 1867), which, in time, became clearly affiliated with English Jewry.

In spite of all these macro-associations, it seems Albert Cohn's personal status had the greatest influence on the national affiliation of the institutions he established. As prosaic as it may sound, Cohn had Austrian citizenship, and as such he had to merit the recommendation of the Habsburg administration to embark on his mission to the Ottoman Empire. This was a formal, vital consideration, which later was appended to other macro-considerations. However, we are not merely dealing with formal status. Cohn's identity was, in many respects, split. He spent his formative years in the Habsburg's capital as a peasant boy who arrived at the metropolis: a Jewish youth from Presburg who won the privilege of entering Vienna's halls of enlightenment - but who gained personal and academic freedom only upon arriving at the City of Lights. Many years passed before that boy shed his Austrian citizenship and adopt the French one. This occurred only in 1862,<sup>39</sup> after twenty-five years of residence in Paris, and over twenty years of public activity, which unmistakably affiliated him with French Jewry. In his autobiographical letters, Cohn makes a point of mentioning his Alsatian roots and telling the story of his forefathers having been expelled to Moravia, an expulsion that even Cohn's early biographer referred to as historically problematic,<sup>40</sup> but which nevertheless was very important to the emigrant from the periphery, who always sought his roots in the center.

The 'national' identity of Cohn's institutions points to the complexity of affiliations in the Jewish and general nineteenth century experience. As opposed to the relatively defined post-World War I European identities, the national affiliation of various personages and entities was more elusive in the pre-nation-state era. What

---

<sup>38</sup> Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 71-6.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, 169-70.

<sup>40</sup> Loeb, *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*, 1-2.

was Cohn's identity – Jewish? Hungarian? (and today we would ask, Slovakian?) Or French? And how does he differ from his patron, James de-Rothschild, who served as consul of one power in the capital of another, while writing his letters to his brothers' palaces throughout the continent in the traditional Juedisch-Deutsch? And Pizzamano, the Austrian consul in Jerusalem, of a Venetian noble family with Bohemian roots<sup>41</sup> – how does he differ from Cohn?

This jumble of identities portrays the relations between Austria and the Holy Land in a more complex light. In the next chapter, we will delve into another aspect of this phenomenon, this time within the heart of Jewish activity from Vienna in the Holy Land.

---

<sup>41</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2:17.

## Chapter 5: *Kulturkampf* in Jerusalem and Vienna<sup>42</sup>

Among the celebrations marking the occasion of Kaiser Francis Joseph's twenty-fifth birthday (August 18, 1855), two took place in very separate, and distinct, venues. The Austrian consul in Jerusalem, Count Joseph von Pizzamano, marked the day by hoisting the Austrian flag over his country house in Bethlehem. The British consul James Finn (1806-72) described the shocking effect this unprecedented patriotic act had on the local residents:

This created an immense sensation in Bethlehem, chiefly among the Christians. The old French party among the Roman Catholics were disgusted – but many were ready to worship the rising sun of Austria seeing that that country was coming out in the character of a second Protector of Christians in the East. ... The peasantry, mostly Christians, enjoyed the fun; guns were fired all day long, Sunday though it was; women screamed their songs of triumph, and there were bonfires at night. ... The Moslems were convinced that strange times had come upon them when foreign flags could be unfurled by Christians.<sup>43</sup>

Thousands of miles away, Elise Herz (1788-1868), a Bohemian-oriented Jewish philanthropist from Vienna, presented the Kaiser with a gift of her own: a *Kinderbewahranstalt* (a children's day center and school) for Jewish children in Jerusalem. In a letter addressed to the board of the Jewish community of Vienna, she patriotically declared an aim of the proposed institute, to be named for her late father, the noble Simon von Laemel (1766-1845): the education of the children of the local Austrian subjects to become better citizens.<sup>44</sup>

As demonstrated in previous chapters, both of these events belong in the larger context of Austrian interests in the Holy Land. Austrian diplomatic efforts and

---

<sup>42</sup> This chapter is based mainly on my article: "'To Worship the Rising Sun of Austria!' Ludwig August Frankl's Mission to Jerusalem (1856)," *Europa Orientalis*, 6 (2008), pp. 101-11.

<sup>43</sup> James Finn, *Stirring Times, or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856*, 2 vols. (London, 1878), 2:382–83. The incident is also described in Finn's report to George William Frederick Villiers, Earl of Clarendon, 20 August 1855, cited in Eliav, *Britain and the Holy Land*, 178–79; and in Pizzamano's report to the Austrian Foreign Minister Karl Ferdinand Graf Buol-Schauenstein, 25 August 1855, cited in Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 165–68.

<sup>44</sup> Elise Herz to the Board of the Viennese Jewish Community, 18 August 1855, Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem [CAHJP], A/W 376a; and partially cited in Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 1:1–6.

European Jewish philanthropy moved in two overlapping spheres, jointly forming the Austrian presence in the Holy Land.

\*\*\*

Herz was probably influenced by Albert Cohn, who passed through Vienna on his way back from Jerusalem. In addition to his meetings with the Kaiser and the ministers of the Interior and Foreign Affairs, Cohn had the honor of delivering a sermon at the local synagogue, and meeting with prominent figures in the community. Cohn also regularly and frequently corresponded with Herz and other figures who were involved in this initiative, prior to her announcement and during the project's execution.<sup>45</sup>

Following Herz's request, the Viennese Jewish community applied for government protection for the institute. Perceived as representing the interests of the Austrian Monarchy in the Holy Land, the institute was granted the expected imperial patronage. Also accepted was Herz's additional request that the Jewish community dispatch its secretary, the poet Ludwig August Frankl (1810–94), to Jerusalem to oversee the institution's establishment.

Frankl took a long journey, through Greece, Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria and Lebanon. In Constantinople he held several meetings with high officials, who treated him nicely due to the dozens of recommendations he brought with him from Vienna. He reached Jerusalem on May 28, 1856, prepared to fulfill his mission enthusiastically. However, upon his arrival he encountered harsh opposition from the institution's clientele-to-be: the local *Ashkenazim*, many of whom were Austrian subjects or protégés. Alarmed by reforms in traditional Jewish education and religion, they sought to block Frankl's plans by means of demonstrations, threats, and even a religious ban (*herem*). Support for the institution came, however, from the local Oriental Jews, who embraced the project. This transformed the institution from what was originally envisioned as a modern educational-philanthropic institute into a traditional Oriental school under European administrative supervision.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Vienna, L.A. Frankl's archive.

<sup>46</sup> On this affair, see Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 1:1–20; 2:11–187, 288–301, 489–98, 504–16; Patrick Beaton, *The Jews in the East* [abridged English translation of Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*], 2 vols. (London, 1859), 2:1–129; Yochai Ben-Ghedalia, "The Laemel Institute Polemic: Revisited" (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2006) [in Hebrew]; N.M. Gelber, "On the History of the Founding of the Laemel School in Jerusalem," *Yerushalayim* 1 (1948): 95–108, 199–219 [in Hebrew]; Nikolaus Vielmetti, "Der Wiener Juedische Publizist Ludwig August Frankl und die Begruendung der Laemelschule in Jerusalem 1856," *Jahrbuch des Instituts fuer Deutsche Geschichte* 4 (1975): 167–204.

The Laemel Institute episode constitutes a watershed in the struggle between innovators and traditionalists and between *Ashkenazim* and *Sephardim* within Jerusalem's Jewish community, and in the development of modern education in Palestine. Here I will focus on two facets of the story: the Laemel polemic as a reflection of the tension between liberals and reactionaries in the Jewish community in Vienna, and post-1848 Austria as a whole, and its role in the Austrian penetration into the Holy Land.

One of the Laemel affair's most puzzling aspects is Pizzamano's high level of involvement both in founding the school and in the accompanying polemic. Among the steps taken by Pizzamano, we must mention his provision of full consular protection for Frankl, which included accompanying Frankl on his visit to the Pasha of Jerusalem<sup>47</sup> and the offer of an official consular servant – *kawass* – as Frankl's personal bodyguard.<sup>48</sup> Pizzamano also took part in all the arrangements for the opening of the institute, and the school was inaugurated in an official Austrian ceremony. The building was decorated with red and white banners, and a picture of the Kaiser was on display in the main hall. Official invitations were sent to the Jerusalem elite, including the Pasha and the foreign consuls, who attended the ceremony.<sup>49</sup>

But Pizzamano's involvement went even farther: he backed Frankl's struggle against his Orthodox opponents in Jerusalem. The consul intervened in this internal Jewish dispute, even jailing some of the demonstrators under his protection, demanding the community leadership restrain the opposition.<sup>50</sup>

Pizzamano's in-depth involvement is even more surprising given the partial withdrawal of the promised governmental protection for the institute following the revelation of Frankl's liberal past. Information on Frankl's role in the revolution of March 1848 was forwarded to the Austrian consuls via the Internuncio in Constantinople, in a classified document, which also ordered them to provide Frankl with minimal help only.<sup>51</sup> Not only was his literary weekly, *Sonntagsblätter*, an

---

<sup>47</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2: 31-35; Beaton, *Jews in the East*, 2:13-16.

<sup>48</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2:88.

<sup>49</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2:163-68; Beaton, *Jews in the East*, 2:113-14. For the wording of the invitation, see Pizzamano to the foreign consuls in Jerusalem, 26 June 1856, HHStA, KA, Jer. K 2, p. 543; also cited in Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 170-71.

<sup>50</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2:87-88, 151-55; Beaton, *Jews in the East*, 2:105-7.

<sup>51</sup> The foreign ministry to Anton Freiherr Baron Prokesch von Osten, the Austrian Internuncio in Constantinople, 21 February 1856, HHStA, AR, F 53, 4, p. 229, also cited in Gelber, "History of the Founding of the Laemel School," 199; the foreign ministry to the consulates general in Alexandria and



important liberal organ, closed down by the government during the Revolution, but half a million copies of his poem *Die Universität* were published and set to dozens of melodies. The poem echoed the liberal ideas of the day. A member of the Students' Legion, Frankl was wounded in the riots, and was later sentenced to exile. This punishment was cancelled at the Jewish community's request.<sup>52</sup>

Pizzamano even paid a personal price for his support. A booklet printed by the above-mentioned Ignaz Deutsch, the imperial moneychanger and the high commissioner of traditional fundraising in the Monarch, accused him of supporting religious and educational reforms, in opposition to reactionary governmental policy.<sup>53</sup>

The origins of the confrontation between Deutsch and Frankl preceded the founding of the institute. Deutsch, who was one of the leaders of the Orthodox minority of Viennese Jewry, frowned upon the trends of (moderate) reform within the Jewish community in Vienna. He viewed the founding of the Laemel Institute in Jerusalem by the secretary of the community as an attempt of the Viennese community to broaden the influence of the religious reforms on the Jews of the Holy City. In his view, shared by other Orthodox leaders, Jerusalem was a last outpost of traditional Jewish piety.

Deutsch's conservatism exceeded the narrow frameworks of Jewish Orthodoxy's campaigns against enlightened Judaism. His efforts to maintain the traditional character of Jerusalem Jewry were just one aspect of his ultra-Orthodoxy - and not the only one in the Jewish context. Deutsch served as representative of the Jerusalem *Perushim*, the disciples of Rabbi Elijah from Vilna, who opposed the virtuous *Chasidic* movement in Europe. The *Perushim* were former Russian subjects who came under the protectorate of western European states in the Ottoman Empire. In Jerusalem many of them became Austrian protégés. Deutsch represented their interests in Austria, their new empire, but was reluctant to do so for the native

---

Beirut, 21 February 1856, HHStA, AR, F 53, 4, p. 230, also cited in Gelber, "History of the Founding of the Laemel School," 200; the consul general in Beirut Peter von Weckbecker to Pizzamano, 24 March 1856, HHStA, KA, Jer. K 2, p. 487.

<sup>52</sup> "Frankl, Ludwig August, Ritter von Hochwart", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols. (London and New York, 1901-5): 5:495.

<sup>53</sup> Ignaz Deutsch, *Denkschrift ueber die beabsichtigte Einfuehrung europaeisch-moderner Institutionen und Reformen unter den Juden in Palaestina, Gerichtet von dem K.K. Oesterreichischen Consul zu Jerusalem* (Vienna, 1856). The booklet was based on a letter of complaint addressed to the foreign ministry: Ignaz Deutsch to the foreign ministry, 17 July 1856, HHStA, KA, Jer. K 2, pp. 572-79. On Deutsch's campaign against the Laemel institute, see also N.M Gelber, *Aus zwei Jahrhunderten* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1924) 151-155; idem, "History of the Founding of the Laemel School," 99-106, 201-15; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 180-83; Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 1:11, 2:504-12; Ben-Ghedalia, "Laemel Polemic," 31-36, 100-103, 110-28.

Habsburgs – the *Chasidim*, who were Austrian subjects, a higher status of citizenship than the protégés. This led to unending struggles among Deutsch, the *Perushim*, the *Chasidim* and the Austrian consul in Jerusalem. From late sources we learn that Deutsch's antagonism towards the *Chasidim* had ramifications not only in the Palestinian arena,<sup>54</sup> and it may be assumed that it was part of his reactionary world-view.

The controversy between Deutsch and Frankl exceeded inter-Jewish issues. Deutsch was very close with key figures in post-1848 reactionary Vienna, and especially with Bach. The many memoranda he sent the Kaiser and other senior government personages portray a man of solid conservative opinions, expressed also on various 'non-Jewish' topics - the national movements in the Balkan, for instance.<sup>55</sup> Frankl, on the other hand, belonged to Vienna's liberals, albeit much less active in this arena since 1849. In his memorandum, Deutsch enjoyed recalling the extreme difference between Frankl and himself. He interpreted Pizzamano's taking Frankl's side as a dangerous reformatory tendency of a senior diplomatic representative in an Empire which was very sensitive to reform tendencies.

The confrontation between Frankl and Deutsch also held clearly financial aspects. Deutsch served as director of the fundraising alignment in the traditional route to the Holy Land in the Habsburg Empire. The establishment of the Laemel Institute by the community in Vienna posed a financial and ideological alternative to the Orthodox fundraising mechanism. The founding of the institution was accompanied by a widespread campaign in the Jewish press, which led to an appeal in favor of establishing the institute.<sup>56</sup> The consul's involvement in the affair in this context had additional meaning: Pizzamano, who at the time supported Deutsch's request to renew the fundraising drive in the Habsburgian Empire for the Holy Land, became weary of Deutsch's domination, which also led to a police inquiry against Deutsch during the Laemel affair.<sup>57</sup>

Deutsch's struggle did not end with the memorandum he published. Earlier, he had tried to prevent Herz and Frankl from realizing their plan, recruiting the Jerusalem *Perushim* to the stern struggle against Frankl, and indirectly against the

---

<sup>54</sup> Akiva Joseph Schlesinger, *The Book of the Society for the Restoration of the Crown to Its former Glory with [the Book of] the Alliance of the Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 1955<sup>2</sup>), 2.

<sup>55</sup> CAHJP, P83, K55; K57.

<sup>56</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 1:9-13.

<sup>57</sup> Gelber, "Yichaq Deutsch," 312-3, 317-8.

consul as well.<sup>58</sup> Even after the institute's establishment, Deutsch did not quit his attempts to harm it by turning to other Jewish centers, and the affair even reached the point where the Austrian Foreign Ministry's intervened on the matter.<sup>59</sup>

Pizzamano's intense involvement in this affair becomes understandable when we examine the Laemel polemic through the lens of Austrian activity in the Holy Land. As mentioned earlier, patronage of Christian interests was one main point of competition among the Powers in Jerusalem. The British consul Finn ascribes the above-mentioned hoisting of the Austrian flag to this rivalry:

The explanation of the steps taken by the Austrian consul in Bethlehem, lay in the fact that he and the party whom he represented were furious at the French supremacy (in Europe as well as in Palestine), and hoped to give it a check in the Holy Land, by the counterbalancing effect of Austrian influence.<sup>60</sup>

One step taken to strengthen its hold in the Holy City was the 1852 decision by the Austrian consul, in collaboration with the Franciscan Order in Jerusalem and the General Commission for the Holy Land in Vienna, to found a Catholic Hospital in Jerusalem. This project met with harsh opposition from the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, France, and the Vatican, and it became a pilgrims' house: the Austrian Hospice on the Via Dolorosa. But that was by no means the final station on the Austrian consul's path of suffering. The various complications he encountered are amply described in Helmut Wohnout's book about the Hospice. Not only was its construction delayed for four years, but even after its completion in 1858, another five years would pass before it began to function.<sup>61</sup>

The Hospice's initial lack of success, namely, Pizzamano's failure to make an Austrian impact on Jerusalem, explains his enthusiastic participation in the Laemel polemic. At the time of the school's founding, Pizzamano, whom, according to Finn, "never hesitates to speak disparagingly of French promises, French exaggeration ...

---

<sup>58</sup> Ben-Ghedalia, "Laemel Polemic," 31–36.

<sup>59</sup> Gelber, History of the Founding of the Laemel School," 213–5; Eliav and Haider, *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land*, 180–83.

<sup>60</sup> Finn, *Stirring Times*, 383.

<sup>61</sup> Wohnout, *Oesterreichische Hospiz*, 25–47; idem, "...Austria will thus have a home by the Saviour's Grave...": The Austrian Pilgrims' House From Its Foundations to World War One," in Wrba, *Austrian Presence*, 25–33.

and boasts that his Empire advances more securely, by deeds not by words,"<sup>62</sup> had made no concrete gains in Jerusalem. It is at this juncture that the Laemel Institute, a small elementary school, providing education, food, and clothing for a mere forty poor Jewish children, came into play. It was not only the first modern Jewish elementary school in Palestine, but also the first Austrian institution in the Holy Land. In the Christian sphere, the Austrian Hospice, after years of planning, was still in the groundbreaking stage,<sup>63</sup> while in the Jewish arena, the institutions founded by Albert Cohn in 1854 were French-oriented, and gained Austrian protection only post-factum. Hence, Pizzamano saw the Laemel Institute as an opportunity to fulfill his ambition to make Austria a significant power in Jerusalem, and achieve vital gains for Austrian interests in the Ottoman Empire at the conclusion of the Crimean War – through tight collaboration with the Jewish Power of Philanthropy.

---

<sup>62</sup> Finn to the Earl of Clarendon, 3 August 1855, cited in Eliav, *Britain and the Holy Land*, 177.

<sup>63</sup> Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, 2:224-25; Beaton, *Jews in the East*, 2:167-68.

## **Bibliography:**

### **Archives:**

Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem.

Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem.

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna.

Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Vienna.

### **Newspapers:**

Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums.

Archives Israélites.

The Jewish Chronicle.

l'Univers Israélite.

Wiener Mittheilungen.

Wiener Zeitung.

### **Primary Sources:**

Beaton, Patrick. *The Jews in the East*. London, 1859.

Deutsch, Ignaz. *Denkschrift ueber die beabsichtigte Einfuehrung europaeisch-moderner Institutionen und Reformen unter den Juden in Palaestina, Gerichtet von dem K.K. Oesterreichischen Consul zu Jerusalem*. Vienna, 1856.

Eliav, Mordechai ed. *Britain and the Holy Land, 1838–1914: Selected Documents from the British Consulate in Jerusalem*. Jerusalem, 1997.

idem and Haider, Barbara, eds. *Oesterreich und das Heilige Land: Ausgewaehlte Konsulatsdokumente aus Jerusalem, 1849-1917*. Vienna, 2000.

Finn, James. *Stirring Times, or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856*. London, 1878.

Frankl, Ludwig August. *Nach Jerusalem*. Leipzig, 1858.

Hyamson, Albert M. ed. *The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews in Palestine*. London, 1939-1941.

Loewe, Louis ed. *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*. London, 1890.

Neumann, Bernhard. *Die heilige Stadt und deren Bewohner in ihren naturhistoriscen, culturgeschichtlichen, sozialen und medicinischen Verhaeltnisen*. Hamburg, 1877.

## Research:

- Bar-Chen, Eli. *Weder Asiaten noch Orientalen: internationale juedische organisationen und die Europaeisierung "rueckstandiger" Juden*. Wuerzburg, 2005.
- Ben-Ghedalia, Yochai. "The Laemel Institute Polemic: Revisited" (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2006) [in Hebrew].
- idem. "'To Worship the Rising Sun of Austria:' Ludwig August Frankl's Mission to Jerusalem (1856)." *Europa Orientalis* 6 (2008):101-11.
- Breycha-Vauthier, Arthur. *Oesterreich in der Levante: Geschichte und Geschichten einer alten Freundschaft*. Vienna, 1972.
- Eliav, Mordechai. *Love of Zion and Men of Hod: German Jewry and the Settlement of Eretz-Israel in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century*. Tel-Aviv, 1970 [in Hebrew].
- Ferguson, Niall, *The House of Rothschild*. New York, 1998-9.
- Frankel, Jonathan. "An Historical Oversight: The Austrian Consul-General and the Damascus Blood Libel (with the Laurin-Rothschild Correspondence, 1840)." In *Jewish History: Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*, eds. Rapoport-Albert, Ada and Zipperstein, Steven J., 285-317. London, 1988.
- idem. *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder", Politics, and the Jews in 1840*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Frisch, Ephraim. *An Historical Survey of Jewish Philanthropy: From the Earliest Times to the Nineteenth Century*. New York, 1969.
- Gelber, N.M.. *Aus zwei Jahrhunderten*. Wien, 1924.
- idem. "Dr. Albert Cohen and his visit to Jerusalem." *Jerusalem* 2 (1949): 175-195 [in Hebrew].
- idem. "Jewish Immigration from Bohemia and Galicia into Eretz-Israel." *Yerushalayim* 4 (1953): 243-51 [in Hebrew].
- idem. "On the History of the Founding of the Laemel School in Jerusalem." *Yerushalayim* 1 (1948): 95–108, 199–219 [in Hebrew].
- idem. "Yichaq Deutsch, a Synagogue Warden [sic] of the Austrian Jewish Community in Eres[sic]-Israel." *Yerushalayim* 5 (1955): 307-18 [in Hebrew].
- Goldfrank, David M.. *The Origins of the Crimean War*. London, 1994.
- Graetz, Michael. *The Jews in Nineteenth-Century France: From the French Revolution to the Alliance Israélite Universelle*. Translated by Jane Marie Todd. Stanford, 1996.

- Green, Abigail, "Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore: Religion, Nationhood, and International Philanthropy in the Nineteenth Century." *American Historical Review* 110,3 (June 2005): 631-658.
- Halper, Jeff. *Between Redemption and Revival: The Jewish Yishuv of Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century*. Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford, 1991.
- Hausdorf, Hayim Eliezer. *Selig Hausdorf*. Jerusalem, 1906 [in Hebrew].
- Lipman, Sonia and Vivian D., eds. *The Century of Moses Montefiore*. Oxford, 1985.
- Loeb, Isidore. *Biographie d'Albert Cohn*. Paris, 1878.
- Manekin, Rachel. "The *Maskilim* of Lemberg and the Holy Land: An Unknown Case from 1816." *Cathedra* 130 (December 2008): 31-50 [in Hebrew].
- Parfitt, Tudor. *The Jews in Palestine, 1800-1882*. Woodbridge, 1987.
- Penslar, Derek J.. *Shylock's Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe*. Berkeley, 2001.
- Reich, Ignaz. *Beth El: Ehrentempel verdienter ungar. Israeliten*. Vol. 1. Pesth, 1868<sup>2</sup>.
- Schlesinger, Akiva Joseph. *The Book of the Society for the Restoration of the Crown to Its former Glory with [the Book of] the Alliance of the Hebrew*. Jerusalem, 1955<sup>2</sup>.
- Schwarzfuchs, Simon. "The French Consulate in Jerusalem in the Nineteenth Century and the French Protected Jews." *Shalem* 8 (2008): 478-573 [in Hebrew].
- Troen, Selwyn Ilan and Pinkus, Benjamin, eds. *Organizing Rescue: National Jewish Solidarity in the Modern Period*. London, 1991.
- Vielmetti, Nikolaus. "Der Wiener Juedische Publizist Ludwig August Frankl und die Begrueundung der Laemelschule in Jerusalem 1856." *Jahrbuch des Instituts fuer Deutsche Geschichte* 4 (1975): 167–204.
- Wetzel, David. *The Crimean War: A Diplomatic History*. Boulder, 1985.
- Wohnout, Helmut. *Das oesterreichische Hospiz in Jerusalem: Geschichte des Pilgerhauses an der Via Dolorosa*. Vienna, 2000.
- Wrba, Marian ed. *Austrian Presence in the Holy Land in the 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. Tel Aviv, 1996.