PROJECT MUSE®

Leonard Dinnerstein (1934–2019): The Historian and His Subject

David A. Gerber

American Jewish History, Volume 105, Numbers 1/2, January/April 2021, pp. 235–245 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/804161>

Leonard Dinnerstein (1934–2019): The Historian and His Subject

David A. Gerber

The death early in 2019 of Leonard Dinnerstein marks the passing of the premier historian of American antisemitism.¹ Others might have plumbed greater depths of complexity or been more interpretively venturesome. No one, however, has so completely made the subject their own, written with greater confidence, or discovered and made extensive use of a wider range of sources than Dinnerstein did in multiple essays and reviews, two significant monographs, and the crowning work of his career, *Anti-Semitism in America* (1994).² That work remains one of only two one-volume surveys on the subject.³ Yet *Anti-Semitism in America* exposes unresolved tensions in Dinnerstein's thought, and in our understanding of American Jewish history, and by extension, our understanding of America itself.

The son of a working-class immigrant father from Belarus and a mother born of immigrant parents from Austria-Hungary, Dinnerstein grew up in the Bronx, and like many of his male Jewish contemporaries in the neighborhood in the early postwar years used higher education to leave the working class and challenge the formidable barriers to Jewish advancement. He obtained his BA from CUNY in 1955, and went on to receive a PhD in 1966 from Columbia, where he did his doctoral work under the distinguished Americanist William Leuchtenburg. It seemed

1. In light of the broader "State of the Field" essay elsewhere in this issue, references here are restricted mainly to titles touching directly on Leonard Dinnerstein's biography and published work. On Dinnerstein's life and career, see Sam Roberts, "Leonard Dinnerstein, 84, Dies; Scholar of Anti-Semitism in the U.S.," *New York Times*, January 31, 2019; Emily Langer, "Leonard Dinnerstein, Distinguished Historian of Anti-Semitism in America, Dies at 84," *Washington Post*, February 1, 2019; David M. Reimers, "In Memoriam: Leonard Dinnerstein," *Immigration and Ethnic History Newsletter*, 51 (2019), 4; and "Leonard Dinnerstein," <https://history.arizona.edu/user/leonard-dinnerstein>.

2. For a complete bibliography of his extensive work on antisemitism, as well as on American Jewish History, and American ethnic and immigration history, see <https://history.arizona.edu/user/leonard-dinnerstein>. His last published statement on the issue is Leonard Dinnerstein, "Is There A New Anti-Semitism in the United States?," *Society* 41 (2004): 53–58.

3. The other is Robert Michael, *A Concise History of American Antisemitism* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005).

logical that Dinnerstein would do a dissertation in political history, because Leuchtenburg was a large presence in that area. Besides, there was little else to American history in graduate programs at the time. But Dinnerstein found another topic quite by accident. A friend who had recently been doing research on the American Jewish Committee at the American Jewish Archives told Dinnerstein that there were boxes of unexplored manuscript materials there about the Leo Frank murder trial and its aftermath. Dinnerstein's response—"Who's Leo Frank?"—as he later remembered, reflected neither feigned ignorance nor, given how completely he became associated with Leo Frank, retrospectively-evoked irony.⁴ The Frank affair, which culminated in Frank's lynching by a small-town mob in Georgia after his death sentence was commuted by the governor, was a Jewish nightmare. It was mostly not spoken of by Jews in public. But it nonetheless was remembered for its painful lesson not to be too trusting of even the seemingly most benign diaspora spaces, such as early-twentieth-century Atlanta, where many Jews were prosperous and apparently esteemed by their respectable gentile neighbors. Besides, what Dinnerstein knew of the gentile world and Americans' attitudes toward Jews was filtered through his experiences in the Bronx and in New York City, where he was largely encapsulated in Jewishness. Dinnerstein recalled that the more he investigated the Frank trial and the precarious position of Jews in the American South, the more he became aware of the extent of antisemitism, in the South and beyond, which he had neither experienced nor imagined. Leo Frank's fate seemed no mere exceptional artifact in an otherwise glorious era of Progressive reform, as he had initially thought it to be, but a window into a much more complicated and sinister American reality.

At the time, only a handful of historians, principally Oscar Handlin and John Higham, had addressed American antisemitism directly, while others, such as Richard Hofstadter, approached it obliquely when debating the nature of agrarian Populism. Even Higham, whose work on the subject was the most advanced in terms of theorization, never did a full-length interpretive study, only a handful of essays. In contrast to American behavioral scientists, who understood antisemitism as evidence of psychopathology, American historians did not take it seriously.⁵ Only

4. Roberts, "Leonard Dinnerstein, 84, Dies; Scholar of Anti-Semitism in the U.S."

5. The culmination of that literature was Theodore Adorno, et al., *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950). A brief discussion of this interpretive trend from the standpoint of American, as opposed to European, culture and ideology can be found in John Higham, "Anti-Semitism and American Culture," in *Send These to Me: Jews and Other Immigrants in Urban America* (New York: Atheneum, 1975), 174-7.

a handful of books and notable essays marked its historical existence. John Higham's 1966 observation that "no decisive event, no deep crisis, no powerful social movement, no great individual is associated primarily with anti-Semitism" in America, probably passed for the consensus at the time.⁶ Where antisemitism was found here and there in the historical record, it was thought greatly limited in time and space, and to marginal classes of the population, such as small farmers trying to resist the industrialization of agriculture. Because it seemed to be rapidly receding in the immediate post-World War II decades, as Higham and others noted, antisemitism seemed even less worth pursuing as a subject for systematic inquiry.⁷ American antisemitism remained largely unexplored territory, as did its effects on the culture and psychology of American Jews over the centuries of their residence in North America.

Dinnerstein had found his subject, one that existed outside the dominant political institutional histories of the time. In his book on the Frank affair, he made an original and powerful case for looking at the social history of American Jews not in terms of the founding of synagogues and institutions, but of the individual and group interactions in daily life, as well as under extraordinary circumstances.⁸ It is easy to overlook the boldness of his choices at that time. Opting for Jewish history was an assertion of an identity that was not necessarily in his interest in that pre-multicultural era in American academia. There had been substantial antisemitism in universities and colleges, and certainly in the discipline of history, in the prewar era.⁹ A safer path to becoming an Americanist would have been to examine some aspect, especially more or less hagiographically, of the nation's dominant Anglo-American elites. Dinnerstein's interest in social history, as well as his choice of a Jewish subject, made him unusually visible and vulnerable. In his work, you were more likely to find Jews among everyday people, leading ordinary lives; that was what interested him. Even when he wrote on Jewish elites, as he did in the Frank book, he more often focused on the local leaders of relatively obscure communities than on the sort of individuals—the Brandeises, Baruchs, Frankfurters, and Morgenthau—who operated at

6. John Higham, ed., "American Anti-Semitism Historically Reconsidered," in *Jews in the Mind of America*, Charles Herbert Stember, et al. (New York: Basic Books, 1966), 237.

7. Higham, "Anti-Semitism and American Culture," 177.

8. Leonard Dinnerstein, *The Leo Frank Case* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968). The book was reissued in 1987 by Columbia University Press, and a revised edition was published by the University of Georgia Press in 2008.

9. Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 172–4, 338–41, 365–6.

a national level, and drew attention in the political histories of the time. We should recognize these choices for the acts of intellectual courage and creativity that they were at the time.

In his work on Frank and in his later work on southern and eventually on all American Jews, he was especially interested in the nagging tension between elite strategies for confronting antisemitism and their desire to be accepted. Nothing seemed more curious to Dinnerstein, as Clive Webb astutely noted in a retrospective essay on Dinnerstein's work on southern Jewry, than the overdetermined gentility of the official face of local southern Jewish communal leaders—the shopkeepers, synagogue presidents, rabbis, and elected officials—with their politeness and benign blandness. Moreover, there was their aversion to drawing public attention to themselves, perhaps in fear of courting a violent reaction, or one that would be bad for business, by taking controversial stands on racist violence and segregation, to which many southern Jews objected strongly in private. He soon concluded that southern Jewry was an exaggerated version of American Jewry in this regard: for many decades, Jews were ever cautious and circumspect about fighting back against antisemitic discrimination and insults, because of fears of calling attention to themselves and being deemed “pushy.” To be “pushy” was to add credibility to those who argued that any sort of public posture by Jews as a group, even in self-defense, was really a quest of power and domination.¹⁰

Hence, Jews sought gentile allies to be their public advocates while they attempted to remain out of public view. Dinnerstein also saw this cautious, indirect approach in the post-World War II efforts of American Jewish leaders to aid the surviving remnant of European Jewry.

Bronx Jews were not reluctant to assert themselves, and such reluctance was certainly not reflected in Dinnerstein's own personal discursive style, as I saw when he presented his ideas at professional meetings. Nor certainly was the Dinnerstein I knew reluctant to express himself when I was briefly his editor for a very smart essay he wrote on the antisemitic riots that accompanied the 1902 funeral of Rabbi Jacob Joseph. We had the usual give-and-take between author and editor/critic. Dinnerstein was an articulate defender of his ideas, and while he had the proper academic manners, he had an admirable tendency, learned growing up among argumentative Jews in the Bronx, to insist on calling things by their real names.¹¹

10. Clive Webb, “‘What Was on Your Mind Was on Your Tongue’: A Profile of Leonard Dinnerstein,” *Southern Jewish History*, 7 (2004): 35–6.

11. Leonard Dinnerstein, “The Funeral of Rabbi Jacob Joseph,” in *Anti-Semitism in American History*, ed. David A. Gerber (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 275–301.

Published in 1968, his book on Leo Frank has remarkably never been out of print. There is good reason for the book's staying power, beyond even the drama of the possible rape and the murder of young Mary Phagan, the courtroom exchanges between the public prosecutor and Frank's defense attorneys, the backstory of police incompetence and press sensationalism, Frank's terrible fate at the hands of a mob, and the debate about Frank's guilt, which continues to this day. The book is an excellent and precocious example of the historians' craft, in which the young author has tight control of his materials and moves at a careful but dramatic pace through a story with multiple and competing meanings. It demonstrates a familiarity with time and place that is the mark of compelling social history. It also shows sensitivity to gender and sexuality in its framing of the popularly conceived meanings of Mary Phagan's violent death to a degree that was unusual at a time when second wave feminism and women's history had only recently begun to make their profound impact on academic historians.¹² Though Dinnerstein never doubted Frank's innocence, the book is characterized by measured judgments, carefully concluded, and economically stated. Although defenders of the little people of the South continue to this day to take potshots at Dinnerstein for his conclusions about the poor quality of justice administered in the courts and in the backcountry of the Deep South. Their revealing talk of "Jewish subversion" of truth in telling the Frank story adds a peculiar, if latter day, credibility to Dinnerstein's analysis of the centrality of antisemitism in the story.¹³

The Leo Frank book is one of the two monographic works of original research that Dinnerstein accomplished. The other, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust* (1982), a study of American domestic and international politics in connection with both Jewish and non-Jewish refugees in the early postwar period, is his crowning achievement as a research scholar.¹⁴ It is the product of years of archival research in a wide variety of state archives, NGO and advocacy organization records,

12. Cf., Nancy MacLean, "The Leo Frank Case Reconsidered: Gender and Sexual Politics in the Making of Reactionary Populism," *Journal of American History*, 78 (1991): 917–48. MacLean's excellent essay places gender and sexual politics at the center of her analysis, and in so doing, ties together class, ethnic, race, and religious expressions of antisemitism at the time of the Frank trial. Her vocabulary is that of post-second wave feminist theory and women's history, but the arguments and conclusions are much like Dinnerstein's a generation before.

13. Kevin Alfred Strom, "Jewish Subversion of History: Leonard Dinnerstein, Part I," *American Dissident Voices*, 28 April 2018, www.Kenvinalfredstrom.com/2018/04/j-s-o-b-l-d-part-1.

14. Leonard Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).

and the public and private papers of American political leaders. Some of these collections were newly opened at the time he was doing his research. The book displays a number of the skills that make for excellence in historical writing about political processes in a democratic society: the seamless blending of analysis at micro, meso, and macro levels of relevant events, centers of power, and political leadership; taut narrative construction; broad contextualization; and balanced judgment, even in confronting the insistent antisemitism that influenced the drafting of postwar refugee legislation.

Though little acknowledged as a landmark in immigration historiography, this work should be recognized for pioneering the dramatic late-twentieth-century shift in immigration historiography from experiential histories of immigrant resettlement and assimilation to critical policy and legal studies addressing the strong nativist and racist foundations frequently underlying the politics of immigration. Assumptions made in the contemporary historical literature of American immigration and ethnicity discourage recognition of Dinnerstein's pioneering work. The literature today more or less contends that Jews—a few bumps in the road aside—proceeded easily over three generations to assimilate as privileged white people, and that they have been irrevocably accepted as such by their gentile neighbors¹⁵ Dinnerstein's book exposes the raw underbelly of the self-congratulatory legend of America as the mother of exiles" for Europeans. The targets of racialization in his study are people otherwise thought by most contemporary historians to be *white*. It is also a profound statement of the suffering that may eventuate from indifference to the plight of refugees. As such, it speaks directly to contemporary events in southern Europe and on the United States southwestern border.

While Dinnerstein makes a good case for his argument that the 1948 Immigration Act, analysis of which is at the heart of the book, is the most intentionally antisemitic piece of federal legislation in the nation's

15. The contemporary literature tends to flatten out the history of "white ethnics," both Jews and others. Still, such works can be accomplished with subtlety as in Karen Brodtkin, *How the Jews Became White Folk and What that Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998), as well as without subtlety, as in Paul Spickard, *Almost All Aliens: Immigration, Race, and Colonialism in American History and Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2007). For works that address American Jewish acculturation with a great deal more attention to complexity, see Michael Alexander, *Jazz Age Jews* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Gil Ribak, *Gentile New York: The Images of Non-Jews among Jewish Immigrants*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2012); Kirsten Fermaglich, *A Rosenberg by Any Other Name: A History of Jewish Name-Changing in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2018).

history, this is not what he set out to demonstrate. The book seems to have been conceived as an examination of the plight of postwar displaced persons (the seventy-five percent who were gentiles displaced by the war or fleeing the advance of Soviet power into eastern and central Europe, and the twenty-five percent who were Jewish survivors), who could not return to their prewar homes. It ultimately came to center on the efforts of the United States and United Kingdom to find solutions especially to the problems of Jewish DPs, and the work of American Jews on behalf of refugee resettlement, whether in Palestine or in the United States, a subject of division between Zionists and anti-Zionists.¹⁶

To be sure, Dinnerstein was aware at the start of his research that antisemitism, which registered high in public opinion polls at the time, would be a factor influencing American law and policy. But the extent of antisemitism in places where it might not have been anticipated was apparently revelatory to him: in the upper reaches of the American political elite, as well as in the American military, officer elite and rank and file alike, which administered DP camps across western and central Europe and sometimes created miserable conditions reminiscent of German wartime concentration camps. One might have expected such antisemitism among such racist southern demagogues as Senator Theodore Bilbo of Mississippi, but Dinnerstein found it among northerners and westerners like Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, the powerful chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee. McCarran and his allies in Congress favored the admission of displaced Christians. (A substantial number of these refugees, such as people from the Baltic republics and Ukraine, had fought for Germany, provided support for rounding up Jews, and staffed death and concentration camps. They could not return to territory controlled by the Soviet Union.) Alongside a preference for populations with experience in agriculture, this bias for Christian refugees fundamentally shaped the 1948 legislation. By 1950, when the law was redrafted to be more accommodating to Jews, Israel had been established and provided a safety valve for Jewish refugees still in displaced persons camps. Much of what Dinnerstein relates is a sad, infuriating story, but he brings notable balance to his evaluation. He makes the point that the military was hardly practiced in social work, and that many of the traumatized Jews it dealt with in displaced persons camps were not easily accommodated.¹⁷ He contends, too, that the debates of the late 1940s led gradually to a feeling of national responsibility for refugees, and

16. See, Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, x, where Dinnerstein describes his findings as “shocking” to him.

17. Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, 12–3, 52, 56–7, 64, 66, 265–6.

recognition of the need for a refugee policy that dealt with masses of people rather than the occasional, often high-profile, individual asylum seeker. Precedents were set, Dinnerstein believes, that would serve major humanitarian purposes in the subsequent cases of Hungarians, Cubans, Laotians, and Vietnamese, all of whom the United States resettled in large numbers and on generous terms. While he recognized that Cold War propaganda and strategies helped to propel American generosity toward those later refugees, Dinnerstein does speak hopefully of “the bedrock of humanitarianism in the United States” that somehow prevailed in the late 1940s, even if its impact was unevenly spread among the peoples needing assistance, and even if it hardly represented a strong public consensus.¹⁸

As he did in his analysis of the Frank case, Dinnerstein noted attempts to use high-profile, highly respectable gentile surrogates and allies, such as Christian clergy and denominational officials, as lobbyists and media advocates. Once again, Jews feared a negative response to the exertion of whatever power they possessed. Despite their other differences, the American Jewish Committee and the American Council for Judaism were united in this strategic calculation. Not only did they attempt to minimize the numbers of Jews among the displaced persons, but they created an organization, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, which was carefully named to mask Jewish participation. Moreover, they attempted to fill it with non-Jews of impeccable respectability. They especially sought prominent Protestant leaders, such as the refugee advocate Rev. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ of America, and the prominent Ohio Republican Charles P. Taft, who was then president of that organization, as well as the support of a powerful Catholic cleric, Los Angeles Catholic Archbishop J. Francis McIntyre. They also made allies of denominational organizations, such as the Catholic War Veterans and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Catholics had their own interests to further in this issue because the majority of displaced persons were Catholics. In some cases Jewish efforts won little more than a general endorsement of good will toward all displaced persons without explicit support for Jewish refugees.¹⁹

Dinnerstein’s analysis of the hopeful efforts to recruit such support and the positive response of some gentile elites and organizations seemed sometimes to contradict his interpretation of Christian antisemitism. This

18. Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, 270–1.

19. Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, 122, 126–127, 139–131.

tension was also noted in some reviews of *Anti-Semitism in America*.²⁰ At the start of his survey, Dinnerstein stated emphatically that “Christian viewpoints underlie American antisemitism. No matter what other factors or forces may have been in play at any given time the basis for prejudice toward Jews in the United States and in the colonial era before it, must be Christian teachings.”²¹ In the face of criticism, he never backed down from this position, which he reiterated in 2004 in his last written statement on the character and the durability of American antisemitism.²² Dinnerstein was too thorough a historian to fail to take note of secular sources of antisemitism. He analyzed the impact of early-twentieth-century racial science and eugenics. He understood the resentment felt by old elites and many ordinary gentile artisans and farmers of Jewish social and economic mobility amidst the disorganizing forces of modernization. He noted, too, the fear of the economic power wielded by Jewish bankers, even if they formed a minority within the finance capital establishment. He knew as well of the resentments of the cultural authority of the Jewish film producers who helped to create a Hollywood film industry that often challenged traditional manners and morals. But he never saw antisemitism as a powerful ideology in its own right, joined to and surpassing over time the ancient Christian myths of deicide.

Though Dinnerstein would continue to insist on the Christian roots of American antisemitism, the argument remains weak, both as a statement about the constitutional and institutional structure of the American polity, and as a statement about the secular influence of Christianity. Constitutional guarantees of separation of church and state, and of freedom of religion have meant that Jews faced few legal obstacles to full citizenship.²³

20. See the incisive reviews by Till van Rahden, *American Jewish History* 83, no. 4 (1995): 507–11; Jack Wertheimer, *Commentary*, 100 (1995): 58–60; Stephen Whitfield, “The Longest Hatred,” *Reviews in American History* 23, no. 2 (1995), 364–69.

21. Leoard Dinnerstein, *Anti-Semitism in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), ix.

22. Dinnerstein, “Is There a New Anti-Semitism in America?,” 56.

23. See Stanley F. Chyet, “The Political Rights of Jews in the United States, 1776–1840,” *American Jewish Archives*, 10 (1958): 14–75; Morton Borden, *Jews, Turks, and Infidels* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); Leonard Levy, *The Establishment Clause: Religion and The First Amendment* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994, second edition, revised); Ronald B. Flowers, *That Godless Court: Supreme Court Decisions on Church-State Relations* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005); Steven Waldman, *Founding Faith: How Our Founding Fathers Forged a Radical New Approach to Religious Liberty* (New York: Random House, 2008).

To say that the United States is a “Christian country” is to make a demographic observation or a general cultural observation, not a statement about the country’s formal structural character or civic creed.

The question then becomes, what authority Christianity, and especially the foundational evangelical Protestantism of the native stock American population, has had to define the terms of American cultural practices and group interactions? The answer surely is, “Enormous,” and if we seek the root of the much-disputed claim of American exceptionalism we could well start with that observation. But this is a different observation from another that holds that Christianity is the ultimate source of all the difficulties Jews have experienced with acceptance and integration into the American mainstream. As Dinnerstein’s most persistent critic, Stephen Whitfield, has rightly insisted, it is not as if there is one Christianity in the United States, and hence one position among American Christians on Jews.²⁴ In 2015, there were fully twenty-three Christian denomination with more than one million members.²⁵ Countless others, of course, have fewer members. Without established churches given political legitimacy and public resources, the United States has been a breeding ground for Christian sectarianism, which has spanned considerable creedal ground. Within and among those denominations, American Christians have viewed Jews in many and complex ways. After all, Jews do pose a theological and historical puzzle and doctrinal challenge for Christianity—one that is rendered yet more complicated by interactions between Christians and Jews in ordinary social life.²⁶ Blanket judgments about Christianity’s understanding of the Jews are disrupted by the breadth of the responses of American Christians, from the philosemitism of Martin Luther King, Jr. to the raging antisemitism of Rev. Gerald L.K. Smith and Father Charles Coughlin. And then there are the ambivalent, unstable, or unrationalized opinions in between.²⁷ This difficulty shows up, for example, in Dinnerstein’s telling analysis tracing Black antisemitism to the influence of slave preaching about Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion, without a balanced acknowledgement of Black adoption of the Exodus story of emancipation from slavery as their own. It is not as if an ensuing century-and-a-half of social interactions between African

24. Stephen Whitfield, “The Longest Hatred,” 367–369.

25. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity-in-the-United-States>, accessed June 27, 2019.

26. Jonathan D. Sarna, “The ‘Mythical Jew’ and the ‘Jew Next Door’ in Nineteenth Century America,” in *Anti-Semitism in American History*, ed., Gerber, pp.57–78.

27. See, for example, Albert Lindemann, *The Jew Accused: Three Antisemitic Affairs* (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank), 1984–1915 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Americans and Jews—as employers, landlords, storeowners, and a host of other roles tied up in a hierarchical system of white dominance—failed to create other bases for Black antisemitism. In instances like these, Dinnerstein’s strategy is to acknowledge contradictions, probably in the hope of warding off criticism, without really seeking to explain them.²⁸

Dinnerstein strongly maintained a rhetorical position founded on the Christian origins of American antisemitism and its continuing explanatory authority over time. He maintained it even as he excelled in identifying and analyzing the efforts of Jews to find Christian allies, including Christian clergy and denominational officials, to defend themselves and advance their interests when they have felt ill at ease about being too prominent in the public sphere. Perhaps, paradoxically, we owe Dinnerstein a great deal for bringing to light this debate about the character of American antisemitism and Jewish responses to it. The welfare of Jews in a pluralistic diaspora setting such as the United States depends to a great extent on understanding the non-Jews they live among, in all their diversity and confusion about Jews and about themselves.

28. Leonard Dinnerstein, “The Origins of Black Anti-Semitism,” *American Jewish Archives* 38 (1986): 113–22; Stephen Whitfield, “A Critique of Leonard Dinnerstein’s ‘The Origins of Black Anti-Semitism,’” *American Jewish Archives* 39 (1987): 113–22. In *Anti-Semitism in America*, 197, Dinnerstein identified Christianity as “the basis of Black antisemitism,” and discussed that for two pages before embarking on twenty-two-page discussion of various secular political and social sources of conflict.