THE passing of Herbert H. Lehman was a profound loss to all who had labored with him for the welfare of the Jewish community and, indeed, to all in our country and throughout the world who had shared his concern for humanity. To a nation still mourning the untimely death of its young president, the loss of this second life, long an inspiration to the forces of enlightenment, deepened the sense of desolation and darkness that hung over those tragic days.

The nation lost more than a venerated statesman whose dedication to the cause of justice and humanity had made his name a legend throughout the world. Lehman the idealist, the man of action, the man of courage, stood as the shining symbol of America at its finest. No one more truly represented the spirit of liberty and brotherhood so deeply rooted in the history of this country than this second-generation American Jew. For traditions and teachings older than the country itself had contributed to mold his character and to fire him with the passion for social justice that illumined his entire life.

Sixty years of that life had been devoted to the service of his fellowman, crowded years of dedication and unremitting industry, marked by milestones of progress and reform. His interests had led him to vastly different areas of activity, in national and international affairs, in the government of city and state, in the realm of commerce and labor, in the world of education and philanthropy. And to each undertaking Lehman had applied himself with all the spiritual and physical resources he could command. He had followed only one line—and that was the line of his conscience from which he could not be swayed. He knew what was right, and he did it without regard for personal interest. In providing
leadership for the forces of morality in this country he was not afraid to take a lonely or unpopular stand.

Awesome to contemplate in their scope and span are the achievements of this one man, the great causes associated with him both at home and abroad. As Governor and as Senator he worked incessantly to build a better America: stabilized finances, welfare and housing programs, improvements in relief distribution, in prison conditions, are some of the solid landmarks of the Lehman administration in Albany that helped to ease the conditions of social and industrial upheaval that existed between the wars. Later, in Washington he was always to be found in the forefront of the battle to protect the rights of the individual; his often the lone voice raised in the Senate to protest against the forces of reaction.

Lehman's commitment to those in distress was not bounded by barriers of frontier, religion or race. As an early member of the Joint Distribution Committee he gave valiant service to his fellow Jews in the pogrom-ridden lands of Eastern Europe. Through JDC and its ancillary, the Agro-Joint, he was able to bring relief to millions who had suffered under Russian persecution. Lehman's work helped to rehabilitate entire communities ravaged by the First World War. Later, as Director-General of UNRRA, he undertook responsibility for a monumental life-saving operation that has no parallel in history, one that involved the welfare of 44 million people. It was a challenge Lehman found infinitely rewarding and he threw heart and soul into the job. His was undoubtedly the greatest single contribution made by any one person to the epic task of post-war rescue and rehabilitation.

When the Governor died all America, indeed all lovers of freedom, mourned with a sense of irreparable loss, but perhaps the most grievous loss of all was suffered by American Jewry. Unique was the position that Lehman held: no other Jewish leader has exercised such power over, and enjoyed such prestige within, the entire community. Lehman himself always minimized the divisions in Judaism, maintaining that the forces unifying Jewry were far stronger than the differences that held us apart. “All that I require of a Jew,” he insisted “is that he follow the basic laws, precepts and traditions of our faith. It makes no difference to me whether a man goes to a Reform, Orthodox or Conservative synagogue.” And he gave evidence of his conviction by becoming in time a member of synagogues conducted by all three groups.

Politically, Lehman could depend upon the loyal support of the community. The liberals of New York City helped to vote him into office time and time again, with increased majorities. For although in his origins
and early advantages, Lehman differed from the urban multitudes, he represented their general outlook and ideals. In essence, the values that Lehman stood for were the fundamental values of enlightened liberalism.

**JUDAISM A WAY OF LIFE**

The Lehman epoch had particular value for his fellow Jews—a proud reminder of the eternal values of the Judaic tradition. We recognized in his struggles against injustice, in his protests against man's inhumanity to man, the guiding precepts of the ancient Hebrew prophets.

These precepts, part of his spiritual heritage, were strengthened by family training and tradition. Born to wealth and status, there was developed in the young Lehman, almost from infancy, a powerful sense of responsibility towards those less fortunate. His father, Mayer Lehman, was wont to have the six-year-old child accompany him on his visits to hospitals and other missions of mercy.

That sense of commitment, translated into constructive deeds, runs like a leitmotif through the career of Herbert Lehman. His lifelong concern for the poor and the persecuted was an almost ingrained response to the ethical teachings, biblical in origin, which have been inculcated by prophet and rabbi through the centuries. Lehman was in every sense an heir to this rich legacy.

His life exemplified consistently the talmudic tradition of service for its own sake or "for the sake of heaven." He belongs not only to the great tradition of Jewish servants of mankind, but to the specifically American tradition which included in its roster the Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Sulzbergers, the Guggenheims, Julius Rosenwald, Louis Marshall, Sol M. Stroock, and a host of others, less well known, but equally dedicated.

Lehman himself, aware of the sources of the inspiration which made him the great man he became, seized many public occasions to stress how largely his sense of social responsibility stemmed from "the faith that I acquired earlier in life—faith in the fundamental ideals and traditions of Judaism." To Lehman, Judaism was always "a way of life, dictating all the actions of men, coloring all their thoughts."

Fundamental to this way of life, Lehman showed, was a perpetual concern with the basic human rights of all men. Long before these ideals became common currency amongst the nations, the Torah had laid this charge upon the Jews. He declared:

The sanctity of human life, the right of every man to certain unalienable rights, the concern for man as man, regardless of how humble his status or background—these are the ideals inherent in the Jewish faith.
Thus, to be a Jew and an heir to the great spiritual legacy of talmudic teaching was to bear a constant commitment to the service of all men. In moving terms Lehman defined his commitment in the address he gave in 1936 at the semi-centennial celebration of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America—of which he was a board member and later chairman of the board of overseers:

So long as we can live and work, each of us owes to himself, to his country and to humanity the duty to apply to each social problem the spiritual values which experience has shown are universal, immutable and eternal.

The Jew could not stand passively on the sidelines when injustice was perpetrated but was duty bound to come to the support of those victimized. On the attitude of Jewish teachings to the social evils of the day, the Governor was explicit:

Judaism stands in persistent protest against the exploitation or oppression of any human being. It insists that each man, woman and child is an incarnation of the spirit of God, is entitled to the fullest life. . . . There is a wonderful continuity in the ideals to which Israel has devoted itself through the centuries, characterized by a continuous yearning for freedom that has grown out of its own experience. For Jews speak in social terms, not as theorists, but out of the pain of countless generations who remembered the injunction to bring freedom and justice to all men, even as they themselves were brought to freedom out of Egyptian slavery.

He went on to make the observation that even as today's widely accepted principles of human rights and freedoms stemmed from rabbinic teachings, he was convinced that a study of the talmudic tradition would produce further insights meaningful to the problems of the day. What was needed, he felt, was a study of the Bible as a source of "fresh insights for living." He urged

... translating the ancient moral law into a guide post for a compelling present might reveal that not by power and might but by humility and spirituality will we build the world anew.

It was in response to these exhortations that the Seminary in 1958 established the Herbert H. Lehman Institute of Talmudic Ethics in honor of the elder statesman's 80th birthday.

Lehman took strenuous issue with those who argued that religion was a spent force and could expect to play little part in the future affairs of men. As a philosophy of life, he believed that Judaism could provide its
adherents with spiritual inspiration. On one occasion, discussing postwar political tensions and unrest, he expressed the belief that the root of many current problems was a spiritual one:

What we need at this juncture of history is a faith for living, a philosophy of life that will give us a sense of direction and serve as a guide through the confusion of our times. We need a faith that will inspire us with hope and courage against the inhumanity of the world.

This faith, if it is to capture the imagination of people, must be based on the best of the past, concerned with present-day problems, and a forward look into the future. Judaism, properly interpreted, has a vital role to play in this crisis. It can contribute towards the deepening of the world's conscience and give all of us a sense of world responsibility. It can give us the hope and faith we need so badly to face the next critical decade.

LEADERSHIP IN JEWISH COMMUNITY

Lehman bridged the gap between two generations of American Jewish leaders. He entered service as an apprentice in the footsteps of Jacob Schiff, Louis Marshall, and those other titans who graced the early years of the century, and he continued to serve side by side with succeeding generations to the last day of his life.

There is scarcely an organization within the community that did not benefit from his wisdom and wealth of experience. He sat on the boards of virtually every major Jewish educational and philanthropic institution, and despite the tremendous burden of responsibilities he constantly carried for government or political affairs, he never lost touch with the needs of his community. The list of important offices he held is almost endless. His honorary chairmanships alone constitute a roll of American Jewish community agencies: American Association for Jewish Education, American Friends of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, American Friends of the Hebrew University, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, Brandeis University, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews, Israel Bond Organization, Jewish Agency for Israel, Jewish Child Care Association, Joint Distribution Committee, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, Palestine Economic Committee, Surprise Lake Camp, Synagogue Council of America, United Israel Appeal, United Jewish Appeal, and World Organization for Rehabilitation through Training.

To the Jews in the oppressed lands of Eastern Europe, where the JDC
accomplished its memorable work, Lehman was a legend, his name synonymous with hope. Lehman, who was one of the founders, was absorbed in every aspect of its work. Had this been his sole accomplishment, it alone would have won him a place in the annals of Jewish history.

As chairman of the JDC’s Reconstruction Committee, he was the prime mover in restoring the shattered communities of Russia after the First World War. The Agro-Joint, through Lehman’s efforts, was able to free from the ghettos hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews and to help them start on new, freer lives as farmers and artisans. ORT, which set up technical and vocational schools for indigent communities in many parts of the world, was another project Lehman helped to sponsor, characteristic in its emphasis on self-help. Imperative to his mind, was the importance of re-establishing self-respect in those he helped, and in this he was mindful of the teaching of Maimonides, who enjoined that the noblest form of charity was the gift that enabled a man to regain his livelihood, and to become free from dependence upon his fellow-men.

Herbert Hoover called Lehman’s work at this time “one of the most striking feats of human engineering.”

Lehman often spoke of the inspiration he had received from those he came to succor. For the first time he was drawn into close contact with the pious Jews of Eastern Europe, and he developed a profound admiration for Orthodox Jews who, despite all vicissitudes, clung so tenaciously to their ancient values. It served to reinforce his own spirit. In 1928 he said:

If anything has made me feel the value of Jewish spirituality, it is my connection with the cultural and religious activities of the JDC.

When you know of hundreds of thousands of men and women who preferred to have money used for the development of their religious life, rather than for terribly needed food and shelter; when you see these people making tremendous sacrifices to maintain their synagogues and religious schools and to bring up their children in their ancient creed, then you realize why the Jewish people and faith have indomitably survived the storms of several thousand years.

Lehman gave ten years to the massive task of Jewish relief and rehabilitation in Europe. The work helped to broaden and mature him. It transformed the sociable, sports-loving young man into an earnest, hard-working man of action concerned with social problems and world affairs. His exposure to suffering deepened his sense of commitment until it embraced all mankind.
Director of UNRRA

His work with JDC and its ancillaries had an important direct benefit—it provided him with a unique experience in organization and planning that prepared him for the even greater responsibilities he would assume in the future, in the wake of yet another world war. As Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) Lehman held one of the most inspiring roles of humanitarian leadership to be undertaken by one man. It was under his directions that this epic task force, in an unprecedented expression of international unity, assumed the burden of restoring to productive life the human souls crushed by the Nazis. Of his services for UNRRA, which saved millions of lives and brought many millions more on the road to recovery, Lehman later wrote:

... despite its headaches, its heartaches, its frustrations, this was, bar nothing, the most rewarding experience of my life.

Lehman accepted the challenge of the UNRRA assignment in a spirit of consecration. It seemed that the whole of his previous life had been but a preparation for this mission of mercy. His temperament, his training, his distinguished record in philanthropy, all marked him as the best man for the job. Roosevelt's choice was widely applauded. The immediate reaction of the American public in December 1943, when his appointment was announced, was expressed in the comment of one well-known journalist who wrote:

No one who has known him will doubt that he is the ideal man for this important and difficult undertaking. We in New York know his management will be sound, able, patient and courageous.

He flung all his energies into the task, working unsparingly. The situation was urgent and speed was imperative. Every day hunger, cold, and weakness brought death for hundreds. Following in the wake of the Allied forces, UNRRA strove desperately to meet the demands of the devastated countries for food and supplies. As the Nazi-dominated lands were liberated the open gates of the concentration camps set free enormous numbers of helpless human beings marked by the Germans for destruction. Homeless and hopeless, these displaced persons, Jews, slave workers, war prisoners, political deportees, depended upon UNRRA for survival, and the organization grew constantly to meet its increasing responsibilities.
Lehman's job at the helm of this complex machine involved constant vigilance at many levels. He had to scrutinize the procurement of supplies, the creation of transport, the hiring of personnel, the rise and fall of the financial barometer. He had to evaluate new relief plans every day; to enlist and coordinate the work of the many voluntary agencies working with UNRRA—of which there were some thirty scattered in Germany alone; and to see that the claims of UNRRA to Lend-Lease resources and military surpluses were pressed.

An important aspect of his job was to enlist support for his mission from Americans at a time when a return to pre-war isolationism claimed many supporters. At a large rally in Central Park on "I Am an American Day," in May 1945, Lehman argued that true Americanism embraced a responsibility for less fortunate nations. He exhorted:

Are we going to allow starvation in Europe or prevent it? Are we willing to make a small sacrifice at home in order that millions abroad can regain their health and dignity?

It was an issue on which feeling ran high. Lehman, always sensitive to personal attack, continued to campaign valiantly, despite the pain of carping criticism. UNRRA faced fire from many sides; among other problems it had to cope with the hostility of the military commands, attempted pressures by foreign powers, refusal by some national relief agencies to coordinate activities, indifference or even opposition of the American public. Above all it was dominated by the increasing need for funds, to pay for food and urgent services.

In an energetic campaign to persuade Congress to pass on the appropriation for UNRRA, Lehman set himself to mobilize public sentiment. Tirelessly he addressed rallies, marshalled witnesses, canvassed his friends in the Senate and House. Enlightened opinion was on his side and he had the backing of many influential newspapers across the country. Eisenhower's strong endorsement was decisive and Congress passed the appropriation which enabled one per cent of the national income to be used to alleviate the desperate need of war-wrecked Europe.

By spring 1946, the picture in Europe had changed. Thanks to the contribution UNRRA had made, famine had been stayed, epidemics blocked, the naked clothed, the unemployed given hope and work. The agency had helped with the restoration of roads, railways, canals and ports, dispatching a vast staff of experts to advise on rehabilitation in every field. In that year alone UNRRA delivered 24 million tons of supplies to 17 nations; it had distributed more clothing than any other agency; it had conducted the largest international medical program in history.
Lehman had worked himself to the point of utter exhaustion when he left UNRRA in March 1946. By then it had virtually fulfilled the vital task of bringing life-saving relief, and Europe was ready for the second stage of its recovery in which American assistance would take the form of Marshall Plan aid. For his spectacular contribution, Lehman was showered with decorations and with tributes both by his own countrymen and by the men of other nations. A perceptive evaluation of this contribution was given by a British statesman, Philip Noel Baker:

No tougher assignment was ever faced by any one man. He has carried it through . . . but the greatest service of all has been his personal leadership—the moral authority which he has established with the governments and peoples of the world, the sense of spiritual power he has given all his colleagues in this work.

**IMMIGRATION REFORM**

Of the tragedies to which he had been witness during his UNRRA service, none had moved him so profoundly as the plight of the pitiful victims of the concentration camps, against whom all the nations had barred their doors. Upon his return to political life Lehman resumed his attack on restrictive immigration policies. In his plea that the United States extend a welcome to the peoples of all races, Lehman was expressing not only his convictions, and those of the liberal forces he represented; he was also speaking in the voice of the American tradition which, from the founding of the Republic, had provided a haven for the oppressed.

The political climate of post-war America was against him but Lehman never abandoned the fight for immigration reform. He fought against the passing of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952, denouncing it as "repugnant to every concept we call America."

Year after year he introduced his own counter-measures, suggesting rational standards for immigration quotas that would rest on worth and need. None of these measures got off the ground, but Lehman's persistence kept immigration reform a living issue.

**DEFENDER OF ISRAEL**

Lehman became a staunch defender of the State of Israel. Earlier, like many others, he had been convinced that the future of Jewry lay in the countries of the diaspora, and he had demonstrated this faith by his labors for the rehabilitation of the Russian Jewish communities at the time of the First World War.
The course of history changed his convictions. By the end of World War II he recognized the importance of Israel to the Jewish refugees. Bitterly he assailed the British policy that denied admission to these hapless victims. Movingly he put their cause:

I have visited many countries and I have seen with my own eyes the indescribably pathetic plight of the pitiful remnant of Jews which survives in Europe—a million and a half out of six million. And yet they stand before us, not as beggars pleading for crumbs of charity. They stand before us with a stirring faith and will—as brave men and women who are anxious to take their rightful place in the world.

His respect for human dignity led him to support particularly the many educational institutions which arose in Palestine and later in Israel. The Hebrew University, the Technion and the Weizmann Institute for Research at Rehovot, all benefitted from his counsel and his generosity.

For Lehman there was involved no clash of loyalty in being an American and being a Jew: he felt on the contrary that the spiritual heritage the Jewish immigrants brought to this country found its perfect soil in the atmosphere of freedom, and that freedom had been in turn enriched.

EARLY INFLUENCES

It was the promise of freedom that brought Mayer Lehman over from Bavaria in 1848. He was part of a steady stream of German Jewish immigrants who, stirred by the winds of change moving across Europe, saw in the New World the opportunity at last of being able to live free from the age old threat of persecution. Many of those immigrants settled in the South in the decades preceding the Civil War. These newcomers, with their industry, intelligence, and business skills, played an important role in the commercial development of the southern states. Some were the founders of dynasties which were to make outstanding contributions to the growth and greatness of this country.

Lehman's father and his two uncles started out as cotton traders in Montgomery, Alabama. In 1863 Mayer Lehman, well-known as a Southern patriot, was chosen by the Confederate Army to act as negotiator in an exchange of prisoners with the North.

After the Civil War, the families moved to New York and Lehman Bros. became recognized as one of the city's more important brokerage houses. The partners, who helped to organize the New York Cotton Exchange in 1871, were prominent citizens, zealous in fulfilling their obligations in civic affairs and in philanthropy.
It was into a warm, comfortable, loving family circle that Herbert H. Lehman was born, on March 28, 1878. The Lehman family formed part of a solidly established and prosperous German Jewish community, who accepted, as the obligation imposed on their position of privilege, the duties of philanthropy and public service. Both at home, and in the religious school of Temple Emanuel, that sense of social responsibility was a fundamental part of the training young Lehman received. Overriding in his upbringing was the emphasis on utter personal integrity, and his whole life serves to underline how deeply these teachings took root.

Precept and example deepened the natural sympathetic instincts of his character. Early in life they made him aware of the existence of human misery. The visits with his father to the hospital charity wards, which started when he was six years old, were followed a few years later by others to the poverty-stricken districts of the city. The scenes of squalor and suffering he witnessed strengthened his resolve to be of help. Later, recalling these early experiences, Lehman wrote:

I was shocked. How much direct effect it had on my later thinking, I don’t know, but probably a great deal.

He had barely left his teens when he was fired with enthusiasm for the great work Lillian Wald was accomplishing in the Lower East Side. He became an active member of her task force, at the Henry Street Settlement, helping to organize and run a boys group. Lehman never lost interest in the work of the Settlement, which continued to benefit from his advice and support.

It appears that his father had originally harbored plans for Herbert to be a mining engineer, for which his son professed neither talent nor inclination. Fortunately, Mayer Lehman decided to send his son to Williams College. There, after an initial period of loneliness, the boy’s open nature won him many friends and the respect of his teachers.

**BUSINESS CAREER**

After his graduation from Williams in 1899 Lehman settled unhesitatingly upon a career in business. He did not immediately choose to enter the family banking house, but decided instead to take a job as a salesman in a large textile concern. At the age of 28, through his own industry and business acumen, he had become vice president and treasurer of the business. In 1909 he became a partner in Lehman Bros. and under his leadership the banking house entered upon its most important phase of development. Widely expanding its interests, the company undertook many major
financial ventures, taking part in the development of the South by financing railroads, utilities, timber plants, and mills. In New York it helped to organize banks and trust companies, to form the great gas, ferry and traction concerns.

Lehman Bros. was among the first banking firms to undertake support of the vast mercantile houses, acting as financial agents for such stores as R. H. Macy, Gimbel Bros., Federated Department Stores, Allied Department Stores and the Interstate group. The firm retained leadership in this field, so that it could be said in 1950:

Of today's twenty largest retailing enterprises Lehman Brothers has been or is presently regarded as investment broker for more than half.

The sale of Bamberger's, in Newark, to R. H. Macy was Herbert Lehman's last important transaction as a banker before he abandoned his business pursuits to enter public life in 1929. By that time the family business was firmly established as one of the most respected in the city. Lehman Bros. had built a reputation for responsibility and constructive progress accomplished through sagacious, conscientious management.

With the family business on solid footing, Lehman could with clear conscience turn his attention to other matters. His business experience had brought many satisfactions, and he had become recognized as an authority on problems of finance and industry. He had enjoyed the excitement of negotiating complex deals, the challenge of devising programs that brought weak companies back to strength. Nevertheless, at heart he was not a businessman.

PUBLIC OFFICE

Most of all Lehman felt the urge to enter public affairs. During the First World War he had served briefly as an aide to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and in this important role he had acquitted himself with distinction, earning the DSM for his services. The war over, Lehman returned to his business career. Yet he looked back with a great deal of satisfaction to his two-and-a-half years in Washington. His stint of government work had left him with a feeling of positive accomplishment and the desire to make a further contribution.

Twelve years later, the pattern repeated itself. Lehman returned to public office, again as aide to F.D.R. Inexorably, he had been drawn into public life. Appointed by Alfred E. Smith to head a commission investigating conditions in the garment industry, he had been successful in averting a major strike: as adjudicator, his integrity and capability won
the confidence of both sides. Democratic party leadership was swift to recognize Lehman’s potential as a force for influencing voters. In 1928 Smith became a candidate for the presidency, and seeking means of increasing his support from New York, urged Roosevelt to run as Governor. The New York Democrats were in a weak position and faced with a strong Republican nominee. F.D.R. evinced a natural reluctance for the combat. Further, he argued, in the unlikely event of his election, his condition—he was then convalescing—would make it impossible for him to carry the heavy responsibilities of the Governor’s office. Thus the choice of his running mate, one who could be relied upon to bolster public support and to undertake part of the administrative burden, became a decisive factor. One man was completely qualified—Herbert Lehman. Smith lost the state and the election to Herbert Hoover, but, by a small margin, F.D.R. was elected, and Lehman with him as Lieutenant-Governor of New York. Lehman, justifying Roosevelt’s confidence, proved himself an administrator of great competence and compassion. While he knew less of the ways of politics than most elected officials, Lehman drew upon his knowledge of finance, of management, and of human problems.

Lehman’s wide business experience and his close association with labor and philanthropic groups, coupled with his prodigious energy and industry, made it possible for the Governor to delegate significant responsibilities to his lieutenant. For the first time the position became important in the administration of the state’s affairs. Lehman executed his tasks with a precision and thoroughness that won him the confidence of the legislature. To the crippled Governor he was “my good right arm.”

In 1930, both Roosevelt and Lehman were returned to office in a landslide: their record of constructive reform had worked for them. On the eve of his nomination, the New York Herald Tribune in an editorial warned the Republicans that if Lehman were named, only a man of the highest capacity could hope to defeat him. In 1928 Lehman had carried the state by 14,000. In 1930 he had a plurality of 565,000.

It followed logically in 1932, when Roosevelt became Democratic candidate for the presidency, that Herbert Lehman would succeed him as Governor. But even his supporters were astonished by his unheard-of election plurality of 849,000 votes.

The sequel of his political career in New York is history, but the achievement reads more like legend. Governor Lehman was reelected three times, serving the state as Governor for four successive terms. He remained the most successful vote-getter in New York history.

Lehman’s political prospects were most favorable when he decided to
forsake political life and to dedicate himself to the task of rehabilitating the stricken people of Europe. He returned to the political scene on the completion of his mission for UNRRA, to be twice elected United States Senator from New York.

It was a time when the country lay under the shadow of the forces of reaction. The doctrines of McCarthyism dominated the capitol and had succeeded in poisoning the minds of a large segment of the public. When valor gave way to discretion, and liberals of weaker fiber fled the scene, Lehman remained uncowed. Often his was the lone voice protesting the degradations inflicted on the human spirit. Time and time again in the Senate he waged an unequal battle. Despite the odds against him he would not give up. Nor could any question of political expediency cause him to slacken his vigilance. When adherence to principle imperiled his position, he was prepared to sacrifice the position, but not the principle.

His position on the McCarran-Walter Internal Security Act was heroic. The large body of the American public was eager to accept the bill, which they were persuaded was a powerful weapon to smash the Communist conspiracy. Lehman was one of the small band of senators who fought the bill as an invasion of civil liberties, and, of the seven voting against the bill, only he was running for reelection.

The bill came to a vote two weeks before the Democratic state convention at which Lehman would come up for nomination. Tremendous pressure was put on Lehman to vote for the bill: he was warned by party officials that a negative vote would destroy his hopes of renomination.

On the eve of the Senate vote Lehman said:

There are many citizens of my State and elsewhere who mistakenly understand—they have been so told—that the McCarran bill is an anti-communist bill. Because of this misunderstanding, some of my colleagues, whom I highly respect, will vote for the McCarran bill. The time will come when they will regret that. As for me, Mr. President, I will not compromise with my conscience. I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression which some of them hold. I shall try to clarify the issue and not to confuse it. I am going to vote against this tragic, this unfortunate, this ill-conceived legislation. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I will cast my vote to protect the liberties of our people.

Those were his words on that day in June 1950. A week later, in Syracuse, the convention unanimously, even proudly, nominated Herbert Lehman to run for reelection.
Lehman held to the same basic principles throughout the whole of his political career. Injustice in all forms was the enemy; prejudice by color or race invoked his special ire. He was a fighter. He could not be intimidated by the opposition nor silenced by considerations of political expediency. To the friends who strove to persuade him to pursue more cautious tactics, he replied with intensity:

I cannot stand above the battle. I identify myself with the victims of oppression and discrimination wherever they may be.

He worked incessantly to translate his ideals into action. Stories of Lehman’s industry have become legend. As New York’s Governor he had a working routine that lasted sixteen hours each day. In Washington his was the largest and most active working team employed by any Senator, part of the cost being borne by Lehman himself. Through the tensions of his years at UNRRA, he drove himself without respite, sustaining physical hardships that would have crushed a man of fewer years, less stalwart in spirit.

**ELDER STATESMAN**

His “retirement,” achieved only when he declined to run for reelection, was the signal for Lehman to turn with renewed enthusiasm to other numerous areas of community and civic life. Education, civil rights, party reform—these are but a few of the many causes to which he gave vigorous leadership during those latter years.

He was in his eighties when he won one of the greatest political triumphs of his career; the defeat of the old hierarchy that had long dominated the Democratic party in New York. Leading the struggle to reconstitute the party on truly democratic lines, Lehman himself worked tirelessly. The young men who worked with him during that broiling summer of 1961 recall with awe the gallant campaigner who canvassed without respite, day after day, addressing rallies and meetings throughout the city. To his influence and inspiration is largely due the victory of the reform forces.

The Rabbis tell us that the wisdom of the righteous increases with the harvest of their years. So it was with Herbert Lehman. The years, instead of diminishing, deepened and intensified his qualities of mind and heart. His influence was at its zenith—crowned with honors, in the fullness of his powers, he was actually on the point of departing for a conference with the President—when, on December 5, 1963, in his eighty-sixth year, he died suddenly. His loss was felt not only by his constituency but by millions throughout the country and around the globe. Posthumously,
there was conferred upon him The Freedom Medal, the highest civilian award in the United States.

The veneration he inspired was dramatically demonstrated at his funeral. A simple ceremony had been planned in accordance with Lehman's life-long eschewal of pomp. Yet, so great was the spontaneous outburst of grief, that the scene was one rarely witnessed in New York.

No one present on that day will ever forget how New Yorkers, in hundreds of thousands, converged upon Temple Emanuel where the funeral was to be held. Halting traffic, the crowds lined the streets for long blocks across upper Fifth Avenue. Silent and stricken with sorrow, they stood there on that cold winter day, shoulder to shoulder, people of all classes and races and faiths, come together to mourn what each of them felt as a personal loss.

Memorable and infinitely moving was this concerted expression of grief. From his first entry into public life, a rare personal relationship had existed between the Governor and the people he represented. He had served New York in many capacities; always with the complete confidence of the electorate, who knew there was no more trustworthy custodian of the public weal. As long as he chose to run, New Yorkers returned him to office, each time with increased majority.

In his latter years, as the revered Elder Statesman, particularly after his retirement from the Senate set him free to devote more time to affairs on his home ground, it was touching to witness the demonstrations of affection he evoked from his fellow citizens. As the venerable white-haired figure was recognized, striding purposefully about New York, voices from the crowd would be heard in solicitous comment, "He looks strong," proudly; or, anxiously, "He doesn't look well today." Strangers would touch his sleeve as he passed. These were expressions of affection that came straight from the heart; it was affection for one who would fight with the same intensity for the rights of the little-known individual as for the great liberal causes.

His profound interest in people and in human problems had been one of the compelling factors that drew him into public life. His preference for the title of Governor over the more honorific Senator, he once explained with a smile, lay in the implicit personal relationship it represented. As Senator Paul Douglas observed:

Lehman is kindness personified—not only to mankind in the abstract, but to mankind in particular.

Countless are the instances of his personal kindness and thoughtfulness. The Children's Zoo in Central Park, that has become one of the
greatest delights of youngsters in this city, was a gift from the Governor and his wife, a token of their special attachment to children. It was one of a series of public spirited donations on the occasion of their fiftieth wedding anniversary in April 1960. The zoo is located close to the late Governor’s New York residence, and, when the Lehmans were in town, scarcely a day passed without a visit to the zoo and a kindly word and helping hand to the many juvenile visitors who surrounded the Governor and his wife.

**HIS MARK ON PUBLIC LIFE**

The Lehman saga is the story of a Jewish immigrant’s son who rose to become a great American statesman. Yet the student who pauses to examine the characteristics of this history is apt to be disconcerted by a number of paradoxical elements. Lehman’s rise to eminence was achieved in flat contradiction to the formula for political success prescribed by the rules.

Few public servants in our time have been so universally respected, admired and trusted as was Lehman. Throughout his political career he remained New York’s “most unbeatable candidate.”

However, qualities which are usually held to be vital to a politician’s advance, were lacking in Lehman. It was said of him that he “neither looked nor talked like a politician.” In appearance he was unimposing, in personality, non-flamboyant. He eschewed the usual publicity techniques, disdained tricks. Although there were occasions, as when his strongest emotions were aroused, when he could rise to heights of eloquence, he was not a rhetorician apt to sway crowds or dazzle with his wit: he spoke in earnest tones, of matters that meant much to him, and was oftentimes accused of monotony.

Lehman’s popularity demonstrates that the electorate, which frequently permits itself to be swayed by the aura of “glamour” or by persuasive oratory, is unerring in its judgment when the rare, dedicated spirit stumbles somehow onto the political arena.

The strength of Lehman’s appeal was rooted in his character—his qualities of conviction and courage. There was about the Governor an air of sincerity that immediately inspired trust. His honesty was quite patent for all to see. His conscience remained his sole guideline and he followed his principles without regard to partisanship, or pressures. Sensitive to criticism, he was prepared to suffer unpopularity rather than compromise on what he believed to be right.

At a seminar of the Institute of Talmudic Ethics at the Seminary,
Lehman was once asked how he handled the conflict to which a democratically-elected legislator was subject, in attempting to reconcile the dictates of his own conscience with his obligations to represent the possibly opposing views of his constituency. With a characteristic twinkle, he told his questioner that he always followed his conscience, but that he had observed that its dictates were in accord with the long-range interests of the citizens of New York. If the electorate took a shorter-term view, he suggested, they could always find another representative! His constituents were apparently well satisfied; they continued to reelect him until he withdrew his name as candidate.

He risked political repercussions on many occasions when his conscience compelled him to take an unpopular stand. Frequently he was under fire from his own party, especially from the forces of Tammany who opposed him, knowing Lehman could not be bullied or "bought."

Nor was he afraid to stand up to the powerful figures of the day when a moral issue was at stake. It was an act of great courage on his part, at the time Roosevelt was planning to "pack" the Supreme Court, publicly to denounce the scheme: it was an act which might well have resulted in the complete severance of their relationship and the end of Lehman's political aspirations.

In Washington, the courageous fight waged by Lehman against McCarthy and McCarthyism remains one of the brightest episodes in a shabby decade of American politics. Were it not for Lehman, posterity might almost have been left to conclude that the spirit of freedom was absent from the Senate during that era.

It was said of Herbert Lehman that he became a statesman without ever passing through the intermediary stage of being a politician. He never acquired the art or the taste for the political maneuvering, for the "deals" that play such a large role in the operation of the legislature. Lehman could not bring himself to compromise on a moral issue, nor to accept a dubious course as an expedient. And, in consequence, he never became a member of the Senate's power clique. His power was not of this ephemeral kind.

Lehman's greatness is of the stuff that transcends politics—it is of the fabric that molds the mind and the character of a nation. The moral leadership exercised by this beloved figure has provided one of the greatest sources of inspiration of our day. Many are the causes Herbert Lehman labored for, both Jewish and nonsectarian. His memory will be recalled with affection and gratitude by the millions whom he served, at home and abroad. The world has been greatly enriched by his presence.
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THIS ESSAY is an effort to describe the communal aspects and institutional forms of Orthodox Judaism in the United States. For the most part, it ignores the doctrines, faith, and practices of Orthodox Jews, and barely touches upon synagogue life, which is the most meaningful expression of American Orthodoxy.

It is hoped that the reader will find here some appreciation of the vitality of American Orthodoxy. Earlier predictions of the demise of

1 I am indebted to many people who assisted me in making this essay possible. More than 40, active in a variety of Orthodox organizations, gave freely of their time for extended discussions and interviews and many lay leaders and rabbis throughout the United States responded to a mail questionnaire. A number of people read a draft of this paper. I would be remiss if I did not mention a few by name, at the same time exonerating them of any responsibility for errors of fact or for my own judgments and interpretations. The section on modern Orthodoxy was read by Rabbi Emanuel Rackman. The sections beginning with the sectarian Orthodox to the conclusion of the paper were read by Rabbi Nathan Bulman. Criticism and comments on the entire paper were forthcoming from Rabbi Aaron Lichtenstein, Dr. Marshall Sklare, and Victor Geller, without whose assistance the section on the number of Orthodox Jews could not have been written. To all of these, and to Mrs. Ruth Gould for her editorial assistance, I am deeply grateful.

In general, Hebrew has been transliterated according to the Israeli pronunciation, but Hebrew names of institutions are usually given as the institutions themselves give them. See p. 507 for abbreviations.
Orthodox Judaism in the United States have been premature, to say the least. Orthodoxy is on the upsurge. Its inner core is growing in numbers and financial strength. It is experiencing a greater sense of confidence and purpose, but its ultimate direction and form are still undetermined. An attempt is here made to pose the alternatives, at least for Orthodoxy's public posture.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ORTHODOXY

Number of Orthodox Jews

We propose to discuss Orthodoxy, as a differentiated movement among American Jews, in institutional terms. Hence we define Orthodox Jews as all Jews who are affiliated with nominally Orthodox synagogues. Alternate definitions would include Jews who view the halakhah or Jewish law as an obligatory standard for all Jews; or who behave as Orthodox Jews in ritual or halakhic terms, or who define themselves as Orthodox without regard to their behavior. There are definitional problems in the first two alternatives, although an estimate is given at a later point of the number of such observant Orthodox Jews. With respect to the number of Jews who consider themselves as Orthodox, no reliable estimates can be made because we have no quantitative study of Orthodoxy in New York City. Studies made in various communities outside New York indicate that as many as a third of the Jews who consider themselves as Orthodox are not affiliated with any congregation. On the other hand, these and other studies show that at least a third of Jews affiliated with Orthodox synagogues outside New York City consider themselves as something other than Orthodox (usually Conservative), whereas a far smaller proportion of members of Conservative synagogues consider themselves as Orthodox.


3 For example, Leonard Reissman, Profile of a Community; A Sociological Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community (New Orleans: Jewish Federation, 1958); Sidney Goldstein, The Greater Providence Jewish Community; A Population Survey (Providence: General Jewish Community, 1964); or the series of studies by Manheim Shapiro, under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee, of attitudes of Jews in Miami, Memphis, Baltimore, Kansas City, and White Plains.
When the present study was undertaken in 1964, there were no reliable estimates of the number of Jews affiliated with Orthodox synagogues in the United States. With the assistance of Victor Geller and other staff members of the Community Service Division of Yeshiva University, lists of all known Orthodox synagogues were compiled for the 40 communities outside Greater New York (New York City, Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk counties) which have 10,000 or more Jews or three or more known Orthodox synagogues. A questionnaire was sent to an Orthodox community leader, generally a practicing rabbi, in each of these communities. It listed the known Orthodox synagogues and asked the respondent to estimate the number of adult male members in each. Respondents were asked to correct the lists by removing congregations that were not at least nominally Orthodox and adding any that had been omitted, including private minyanim (conventicles) unaffiliated with organized synagogues. Thirty-three replies were received. Figures for the other seven communities were taken from local community studies (Detroit) or estimated by a staff member of the Community Service Division on the basis of his synagogue contacts. Estimates for all other known Orthodox synagogues in the United States outside New York City and the 40 major Jewish communities were made by Victor Geller. This included estimates for New York suburbs.

Estimates for New York City were arrived at somewhat differently because of the large number of Orthodox synagogues (approximately 800), about many of which little is known. Large-congregation memberships were estimated by CSD staff members most familiar with each borough. Memberships of smaller congregations in New York City were estimated by applying an arbitrary multiplier, which varied from borough to borough and neighborhood to neighborhood. In the Bronx and Queens the multiplier was 30; on the Lower East Side of Manhattan it was 100; in Brooklyn, with most of the synagogues, and particularly the small ones, it was 80.

Thus there is an estimated total of 205,640 men affiliated with the 1,603 known Orthodox synagogues in the United States.

It should be clear then that the figures given in the table are only estimates and that the margin of error is surely quite high. The method employed to make the estimates would account for formal membership only;

4 The actual number of synagogues in New York City was derived from New York City's List of Tax-exempt Properties for 1962.
5 The figure of 1,103 Orthodox synagogues, presented in the 1964 Statistical Guide for New York City, is based on estimates by the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations and is not current.
TABLE 1. NUMBER OF KNOWN ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUES AND AFFILIATED MALE WORSHIPPERS IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATE, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Synagogues</th>
<th>Male Worshippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,220(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,212(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>100,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>809(^d)</td>
<td>86,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>45,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk, and Rockland counties</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstate New York</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Synagogues</th>
<th>Male Worshippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>204,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Excluding approximately 15 synagogues in downtown business districts which are used exclusively for saying kaddish and have no regular membership or Sabbath services, or the approximately 50 synagogues which respondents judged to lie between Orthodox and Conservative; but including yeshivot known to be places of worship.

b The number of regular worshippers far exceeds the number of members, but many of the worshippers are tourists in the Miami area who are presumably affiliated with synagogues in their home towns. However, the transient character of many residents probably means that membership figures for Florida are not a good criterion for estimating the strength of the local synagogues.

c Figures for Detroit were not available. The Michigan estimate of 4,212 includes 3,977 men belonging to Orthodox synagogues in Detroit, estimated on the basis of a 1956 sample survey in Albert J. Mayer, op. cit., and 235 in the rest of the state, estimated by CSD staff members. As the AJYB went to press, data became available for 1963: Albert J. Mayer, Social and Economic Characteristics of the Detroit Jewish Community: 1963 (Detroit: Jewish Welfare Federation, December 1964). They suggest that our estimate is probably too high.

d Based on estimates derived from the 1962 List of Tax-exempt Properties.

it does not include family members or others served by the synagogue, or people who worship there only on special occasions. If it did, the figure would be much higher.

The men referred to in the table may belong to more than one Orthodox synagogue, as indicated by two studies of dual memberships. Howard Polsky found that 91 per cent of Milwaukee Jews affiliated with Orthodox congregations belonged to only one such congregation and over eight per cent to two. This means that the actual number of affiliated Orthodox Jews was only about 95 per cent of what the membership rolls would seem to indicate. In Providence, R.I. the figure was 96 per cent. It can therefore be assumed that there is some duplication of members in the figures presented, but it does not appear to be substantial.

No effort was made to estimate the number of all Orthodox Jews by applying a multiplier to the total of men. Any multiplier would have to


7 Sidney Goldstein, op. cit.
take into account factors beyond the scope of this paper, including these:

1. The average size of Orthodox families compared with the average size of all Jewish families in the United States, currently estimated at 3.3 by the research department of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

2. The age distribution of Orthodox Jews, compared with the total Jewish population.

3. The effect on fertility of the concentration of Orthodox Jews in central cities rather than suburbs.

4. The total effect of the halakhic proscription against most types of birth control, which has contributed to an average birth rate of six to seven children per Orthodox family in Williamsburg.\(^8\)

5. The greater propensity of people with children to affiliate with synagogues than single people or young married couples.

The (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations uses a multiplier of 3.5 individuals per family as the first stage in arriving at their estimate of the number of Reform Jews; the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America uses 4.5. For institutional purposes, most organizations and movements no doubt need membership estimates, but since Orthodox data are insufficient for the purpose, the effort will not be made here.

Social Characteristics

To determine the social characteristics of the nominally Orthodox Jews, we must rely almost exclusively on data originating outside New York City. Studies of various Jewish communities have included questions on synagogue affiliation or self-identification of Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and unaffiliated or unidentifying Jews.\(^9\) Respondents have often been further classified by one or more such variables as age, income, education, and occupation.

All such studies have found the nominally Orthodox to be older, of more recent immigrant origin, of lower income and occupational status, and with more limited secular education than Conservative, Reform, or unaffiliated Jews. However, no published study traces the relationship of

---


social characteristics to denomination over time. Details from a study in progress are not yet available, but it appears that the income and the educational and occupational levels of the American Orthodox Jew are rising relatively to other Jews, and that Reform is reaching into lower-middle-income levels for the first time.

**EARLY ORTHODOX COMMUNITY**

The demographic data on the social characteristics of the nominally Orthodox support the popular notion of the development of Orthodox and Conservative Judaism in the United States. According to this notion, the masses of East and Central European Jews who came to the United States between 1870 and 1924 were overwhelmingly Orthodox. Under the impact of economic necessity and cultural challenge, they changed. Some abandoned religion completely, a few became Reform. Some, however, and many more of their descendants, adjusted their religious tradition to the mores of contemporary America and evolved a form of worship and ritual that eventually became known as Conservative Judaism. Of course, many remained Orthodox. But these were the aged, the poor, and the poorly-educated, who established their early synagogues in the downtown areas of most large American cities. As the Jewish population gained in social status and new generations migrated outward and abandoned Orthodox practices, they left behind a residue of socially static Orthodox.

There is reason to challenge this notion. Unquestionably, a large group of immigrants, who conformed superficially to many Orthodox norms, were viewed as Orthodox by their "uptown" coreligionists. But a second look affords some contrary impressions. That the new immigrants founded countless small synagogues almost immediately upon arrival was not in itself evidence of religiosity. If the function of the synagogue was primarily for worship there was no need for such multiplication whereas if the primary purpose of the synagogue was to meet the social and cultural needs of small groups originating in the same European community, the multiplication is more understandable. In fact, the activity within

10 A comparison of the social characteristics of Greater New York areas where new Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform synagogues were established, or existing facilities were expanded, is being prepared by the author for future publication in AJYB.

11 The popular literature is replete with such assertions. For a scholarly study that makes this point see Howard Polsky, *op. cit.* Polsky's material is drawn from Milwaukee.

12 I am indebted to my wife, Carol Liebman, for suggesting this line of inquiry.
These new synagogues raises serious questions about their religion. The synagogues were social forums and benevolent societies adapted to the requirements of poor, unacculturated people. The oft-cited absence of decorum during the services strongly suggests that even the act of worship was perhaps a social more than a religious function, although this may have been true in Eastern Europe as well.

If the immigrants were indeed religiously motivated, the practical exigencies of strict ritual requirements would demand a mikveh, the lustration bath, before a synagogue. (For a discussion of mikveh see p. 90.) There is at least anecdotal evidence that mikvaot were scarce and inaccessible outside New York City, and sometimes even within it.

*Talmud Torah*—the study of the Jewish tradition and particularly its holy texts—and the maintenance of educational facilities certainly take halakhic precedence over the establishment of synagogues. But the new immigrants conspicuously neglected Jewish education. A survey in New York in 1908 indicated that only 28 per cent of the Jewish children between the ages of six and sixteen received even the scantiest Jewish education. Until 1915 there were only two Jewish day schools in the whole country. The immigrants flocked instead to the public schools, to night classes, and to adult-education courses, not only for vocational purposes but for general cultural advancement. The dangers to Orthodoxy of secular education must have been evident from the outset, but only since World War II have strong voices within the Orthodox camp been raised against college education, the institutionalization of secular knowledge.

The Young Israel movement in its infancy was frequently castigated as being “too modern” and hence non-Orthodox. But attempted mergers between Young Israel and neighboring Orthodox synagogues often failed not because of Young Israel’s modernity and questionable Orthodoxy, but rather because its requirement that all congregational officers be Sabbath observers could not be met by the older, more “traditional” synagogue.

The early East European immigrants came to the United States at a

---

13 There is a vast literature on this point as well. For one of the most pertinent and interesting series of essays in English see Charles S. Bernheimer, ed., *The Russian Jew in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1905).


15 Moses Rischin, *op. cit.*, and every other study of the East European Jews in the United States.
time when traditional Judaism, even in Eastern Europe, had been thoroughly shaken by Enlightenment and secularism. Even for those Orthodox who idealized religious life in Eastern Europe, the revival of traditional Judaism did not begin until the 1920s, at the end of the great wave of immigration to the United States. In fact, Agudath Israel, which represented the most traditional element in Jewish life and whose membership rose to an estimated half million in Eastern Europe, sought and failed to establish an organization in the United States in 1922 although almost all the great rabbinical leaders of Eastern Europe supported it. (Significantly, the organization did succeed in establishing a youth organization.)

There was a paucity of distinguished rabbis and scholars among the immigrants. Although an estimated 50,000 Jews immigrated from 1881 to 1885, the leading East European congregation of the time in New York had only a part-time rabbi of meager scholarship. When 26 Orthodox congregations met to choose a joint leader for New York Jewry, no American rabbi was even considered, and in 1887 the secretary to Rabbi Isaac Elhanan Spektor, the outstanding rabbinic authority of Russia, referred to American rabbinical leaders as "improper men."

Those who emigrated first can be expected to have been the least traditional, whose piety was at most what Leo Baeck called Milieu-Frömmigkeit. Willing as they were to take extended leave of family and home, they were no doubt less committed to tradition than their relatives and neighbors who came much later. When the Rabbi of Slutsk visited America and appeared at a public meeting of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations during the first wave of immigration, "he chastised the assemblage for having emigrated to this trefa [impure] land." Similarly,

18 A Yiddish story relates how a small Jewish town in East Europe raised money to send a young man to America for fear that he would otherwise have married a gentile: Isaac Metzker, "To the New World," in Irving Howe and Eliezer Greenberg, eds., A Treasury of Yiddish Stories (New York, 1958), pp. 504–15. Another writer has noted: "After all, who went to America? Overwhelmingly, it was not the elite of learning, piety, or money but the shnayders, the shusters, and the Ferdgananovim"; Milton Himmelfarb, "The Intellectual and the Rabbi," in Rabbinical Assembly of America, Proceedings, 1963, p. 124. See also Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, Life is with People (New York, 1952), pp. 260–61, and Arthur Hertzberg, "Seventy Years of Jewish Education," Judaism, October 1952, p. 361.
would-be emigrants were warned to stay home and not endanger their Judaism by such renowned rabbinic authorities as the Hafetz Hayyím, Rabbi Israel Meir Hacohen. Immigrants, often unable to separate the essential from the unessential in Judaism, would surrender an element of custom such as a beard, and then feel free to compromise everything else. Parents, brought to America by children who prepared the way, first wept for their children's violations of ritual, then adjusted. And of the older men who did go to work, most succumbed to violations of the Sabbath.

The evidence suggests an absence of religious as distinct from ethnic commitment on the part of most nominally Orthodox immigrants to the United States. Thus, the rise of Conservative Judaism and secularism in American Jewish life did not entail a decision to opt out of traditional religion. It was, rather, a decision to substitute new social and cultural mores for the older ones, which had been intermingled with certain ritual manifestations.

Of course, this discussion does an injustice to those truly religious Jews who worked to build the early mikvaot and day schools and who sought the continuation of their authentic religious tradition in the United States. The significant fact, however, is that people of this sort represented a much smaller minority than has heretofore been imagined; and even of them or their descendants, many were attracted by the nascent Conservative movement, which they felt held greater promise for modern-day religiosity.

UNCOMMITTED ORTHODOX

Two groups of Orthodox Jews will be defined and considered in this section—the residual Orthodox and the non-observant Orthodox. The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada (Agudat Ha-rabbanim) is treated together with the residual Orthodox only for clarity of presentation. The rabbis themselves obviously do not fall into this category.


Residual Orthodoxy

We shall designate as residually Orthodox those remnants of the East European immigrants who remained nominally Orthodox more out of cultural and social inertia than out of religious choice. In all likelihood they still constitute the bulk of nominally Orthodox Jews in the United States; they probably determine the social image of Orthodoxy and are doubtless responsible for the statistical picture which shows a skewed distribution on the high end of the age continuum and on the low end of the income and educational continuum. The residual Orthodox represent a dying generation. Until the Second World War their children, with few exceptions, abandoned Orthodoxy. Since 1940, however, an increasing number of these, having been afforded the opportunity for a day-school education or a certain measure of social status in modern Orthodox synagogues, have become committed and practising Orthodox Jews, or have retained at least nominal affiliation with Orthodoxy.

It would be misleading to conceptualize a communal structure for the residual Jew, whose major identification came through the local synagogue. To the extent that such a structure existed, however, it was headed by the shtot rov or chief rabbi of each community. This was particularly true outside New York City and Chicago. Cities like Newark, N.J., Boston, Mass., Philadelphia, Pa., Baltimore, Md., Cleveland and Cincinnati, O., Milwaukee, Wis., Springfield, Mass., Rock Island, Ill., and Detroit, Mich. each had one rabbi who towered over the Orthodox community; he supervised kosher slaughtering, baking, and the processing of other foods, and presided over the local Jewish court. These were Orthodox leaders par excellence. New York and Chicago never produced a shtot rov, although one effort in that direction was made when Rabbi Jacob Joseph was brought from Vilna in 1888 to serve as chief rabbi of New York. The failure to organize either of the two major Jewish cities around a single rabbinic personality could be attributed to their size, Jewish diversity, and the fact that the residual Jew was not communally oriented. Nevertheless, even in New York and Chicago there were a handful of rabbis whose names were known to Orthodox Jews and who together could make some claim to leadership in the Orthodox community. These, and the lesser rabbinic personalities who revolved about them, were organized in the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, which gradually lost its ascendancy as the position of communal rabbi declined. This decline mirrored the decline of the communal rabbi’s constituency, the residual Orthodox, who at one time probably constituted the majority of all Jews in the United States.
Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada (Agudat Ha-rabbanim)

Agudat Ha-rabbanim is the oldest organization of Orthodox rabbis in the United States. Founded in 1902, it was led for many years by Rabbi Israel Rosenberg, a leading New York rabbi and a founder of Yeshiva University. Its prestige rested on the affiliation of the leading rabbis of most Jewish communities. Its members were instrumental in founding most early day schools in the United States. At the beginning of World War I they established the Central Relief Committee, which was eventually absorbed by JDC, and during the 1920s they sponsored the visit to the United States of leading European rabbinic authorities. Today, however, little remains of Agudat Ha-rabbanim’s influence and prestige. Three factors contributed to its decline.

First, the role of the communal rabbi declined drastically as the Jew increasingly became congregationally rather than communally oriented. With Americanization and the growth of the YMHA, community centers, and Conservative, Reform, and finally even Orthodox synagogue centers (not to speak of country clubs and fraternal lodges), fewer and fewer Jews looked for an authoritative rabbinic figure to speak for the community. Most Jews looked for communal services that were essentially philanthropic rather than religious. An authoritative figure who could answer questions of religious law was no longer required, since such questions were now rarely asked.

The second factor accounting for the decline of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim stemmed from the nature of the Orthodox immigrants who began arriving in the late 1930s. If the communal rabbi received little support from the acculturated Jew, his position was not bolstered by the more aggressively Orthodox Jews who immigrated in the Nazi and postwar era from Poland, Hungary, and Germany. The new Orthodox immigrants did not relate to the existing network of American Jewish institutions and had little need and much distrust for Orthodox rabbis who served the function of Orthodoxy’s representatives in the larger Jewish community.

Agudat Ha-rabbanim members were caught, in the midst of changing Jewish identification, between the less religious left and the more religious right, and they were unable to respond. The Yiddish-speaking, often bearded rabbi—a severe and inflexible figure—was a symbol of a past generation with which the secularized, Americanized Jew had little in common. To the new immigrant and the younger, more militant Orthodox Jew, on the other hand, that rabbi was too compromising. The rashe yeshivot, the Talmud scholars who headed the yeshivot, rose to promi-
nence in this period, when the younger, more committed, observant Jew noted that the communal rabbi's talmudical scholarship could not equal that of his rosh yeshivah.

The issue which most severely damaged the image of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim type of rabbi was kosher supervision. Rightly or wrongly, an image persisted of the communal rabbi who, pressured by butchers, food processors, and slaughterers to ease kosher requirements, and plagued by the indifference of Jewish consumers, lowered his standards of supervision. The Agudat Ha-rabbanim, unlike the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, took no organizational responsibility for the supervision of its members and affiliates. Nevertheless, there was a feeling of distrust within the new Orthodox community toward many of the organization's members and hence toward the organization itself.

A third factor contributing to the organization's decline was its policy regarding new members. Members were required to have the qualification of yadin yadin, or at least be on the road to it, and this qualification demanded study beyond that offered by most American yeshivot. The reason for this policy—whether it was to maintain high standards or to serve some other purpose—is of no interest here; its result was to close the organization's ranks to most American-trained rabbis. (One large category of exceptions were the graduates of the Yeshivah Rabbi Israel Meyer Hacohen in Queens, N.Y., whose ordination includes yadin yadin.) But it was the American-trained rabbis to whom the larger, more prosperous, modern Orthodox congregations were attracted. These rabbis joined the Rabbinical Council of America, raising the status and prestige of that organization at the expense of Agudat Ha-rabbanim.

Nevertheless, Agudat Ha-rabbanim was not without resources or energy in 1964. With over 600 members and an annual budget of $25,000, it led other Orthodox groups in such activities as the successful lobbying for enactment of the New York State Sabbath Closing Law in 1963 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 65). It also sponsored 'Ezrat Torah, an organization under the leadership of one of the great scholars and saintly souls of his time, Rabbi Elijah Henkin, which was concerned with welfare assistance to needy yeshivah students and Talmud scholars, particularly in Israel.

In 1960, in an obvious reaction to the changing power distribution within American Orthodoxy, Agudat Ha-rabbanim enlarged its three-member presidium to include the two most prestigious leaders of the yeshivah world, Rabbi Aaron Kotler, rosh yeshivah of the Beth Medrash Govoha in Lakewood, and Rabbi Moses Feinstein, rosh yeshivah of
Mesivta Tifereth Jerusalem and probably the leading active posek (halakhic authority) in Jewish life. After Rabbi Kotler’s death in 1962 his position was filled by Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky, rosh yeshivah of Torah Vodaath. Significantly, then, Agudat Ha-rabbanim has responded to only one challenge—the one from the right rather than the one from the left.

Nonobservant Orthodox

Having considered the residual Orthodox, we are ready to look at the second group of uncommitted Orthodox, the nonobservant.

Their number is difficult to estimate, but they surely represent a significant proportion of all nominally Orthodox Jews. They are the Jews who are affiliated with Orthodox synagogues but have no commitment to the halakhah or even to the rituals which the residual Orthodox practice. (Studies of Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Pa., and Providence, R.I., to cite a few examples, indicate that anywhere from 25 to 60 per cent of Orthodox Jews do not even purchase kosher meat regularly.) Their social characteristics, too, are distinctly different from those of the residual Orthodox. They are not necessarily the aged, poor, or newest immigrant groups, whose adherence to ritual is often only a result of their inability or unwillingness to acculturate. On the contrary, they represent perhaps the most affluent element of Orthodoxy. Of course, in social characteristics some of the nonobservant may also be residual.

There are a variety of reasons why the nonobservant Orthodox affiliate with Orthodox institutions. Sometimes they affiliate because Orthodoxy exercises a monopoly in a city or a section of it. A survey of Kansas City, Mo., by the American Jewish Committee in 1961 provided an illustration of this. In that city the Orthodox group was heavily weighted by members of a new synagogue in a suburb which had not yet acquired either a Conservative or Reform temple. As might be expected, a very high proportion of this synagogue’s members did not consider themselves as Orthodox, and regularity of attendance was quite low. Only 40 per cent regarded themselves as Orthodox, 38 per cent as Conservative, 16 per cent as Reform, and 6 per cent as none of these. The social charac-
teristics of the sample surveyed, as indicated by place of residence and age, corresponded to those of the nonobservant Orthodox; that is, young age and high income. Only 53 per cent of the sample stated that they purchased kosher meat and only 47 per cent that they kept two sets of dishes. The Kansas City finding led Shapiro to conclude that

the choice of a particular branch of synagogue affiliation among American Jews today is rarely the product of a choice made on the basis of conscious analysis of theological or ideological philosophies. The decision is likely to be more closely related to such factors as geography, socio-economic positions and aspirations, distance from the immigrant generations, general impressions of the relative demands made by a particular branch of Judaism, relationships to parents and childhood experience, their own estimates of their own degree of commitment to what they assume Judaism to be, and many others.26

Another instance of Orthodox monopoly or near monopoly developed in New Orleans, where until 1960 there was no Conservative synagogue and the social status as well as the religious pattern of the existing Reform temples made them forbidding to many Jews.

Sometimes nonobservers are attracted to Orthodoxy by its outstanding rabbis. Some are attracted to the several Orthodox synagogues, such as Shearith Israel in New York, with distinguished historical traditions and high social status. Some join because membership fees are often lower than those of competing synagogues. Finally, there is the completely marginal Jew, who is almost indifferent about synagogue affiliation but, having been raised in an Orthodox environment, finds nostalgic satisfaction in attendance at familiar Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur services. To him, as to his coreligionist at the other end of the spectrum, Orthodoxy is "more religious" than Conservatism or Reform.

Elsewhere 27 I have indicated that there are three other forces operating today in favor of the Orthodox synagogue to counteract the more obvious anti-Orthodox trends. In fact, one can almost posit that as Conservative and Reform synagogues gain new members at the expense of Orthodoxy, countervailing forces are set in motion to restore the balance partially. These forces are religious status, small size, and community of interest.

Religious status favors Orthodoxy in an era in which religion has gained not only respectability but even intellectual recognition and some scientific assent. In a period in which affirmation of supernaturalism is no

26 Ibid., p. 8.
longer a cause for embarrassment, and where one prevailing mood among
the intellectual *avant-garde* is to stress individual and personal religious
experience of a non-rational nature, Orthodoxy finds a receptive ear.
It is a time when a Reform rabbi, writing with a tinge of envy and much
sympathy about ultra-religious hasidic groups, barely conceals his dis-
dain for his own congregants. In this atmosphere a Jew, particularly if
he is middle-class, gains a certain status among Jewishly alert groups
through affiliation with an Orthodox congregation. This status is inversely
related to the degree to which the Orthodox congregation modernizes its
service, grows in membership, and emulates the Conservative and Reform
synagogues in the variety of non-sacred activities offered to the mem-
ership.

The large size of the Conservative and Reform synagogues propels
some Jews to seek alternatives. The physical plant itself, no matter how
artfully constructed, which is intended to seat a thousand or more wor-
shippers, to educate hundreds of children, and to provide social and
recreational activities for an entire neighborhood, may be inspiring and
attractive to most people, but it will be forbidding to at least a few.

Finally, the lack of warmth and the anonymity of the large Reform
and Conservative congregations suffer by contrast with the intimate feel-
ing of community promoted by small Orthodox synagogues, independ-
etly of belief or disbelief in credal Orthodoxy.

There is one crucial difference between the residual Orthodox and
nonobservant Orthodox which gives a clue to the future. The children
of today's nonobservant Orthodox are far more likely to be drawn into
the network of intensive and superior Talmud Torahs and all-day schools
than were the children of the older residual Orthodox, who were raised
when there was little opportunity for intensive Jewish education. In the
older generation, the residual Orthodox were Jewishly better-educated
than the nonobservant, but the reverse is true of their children.

**COMMITTED ORTHODOX**

It is not possible accurately to determine the number of committed Or-
thodox—that is Jews who strive to conduct their lives within the frame-
work of the *halakhah*. Traditional Sabbath observance is a crude measure
of committed Orthodoxy, and an educated guess puts the figure of Sab-
bath observers at 200,000, or approximately four per cent of American
Jewry.  

28 These estimates were made by staff members of CSD, based on figures sup-
plied by Torah Umesorah.
Since the rest of this essay will deal with the committed Orthodox, and since even the residual and nonobservant Orthodox increasingly take their cues from that group and affiliate with their synagogues and other institutions, the word Orthodox will hereafter refer to the committed Orthodox, unless otherwise stated.

Most of the committed Orthodox are in the Greater New York area. Either by affinity or necessity they tend to be geographically clustered. The Orthodox Jew requires a variety of institutions, in addition to a synagogue, which a handful of individuals alone cannot support. He needs a mikveh, a reliable kosher butcher, and preferably a Sabbath-observing baker. A day school for his children, certainly at an elementary-school level and increasingly at a high-school level, is highly desirable if not essential.

Centers of Orthodoxy in New York are Washington Heights and the lower East Side in Manhattan; Boro Park, Crown Heights, Bensonhurst, and portions of Flatbush in Brooklyn; Far Rockaway and Kew Gardens-Forest Hills in Queens, and Spring Valley-Monsey in Rockland County. However, in none of these areas do all the Orthodox Jews constitute one community in a structural or even social sense.

The Monsey area might serve as an example. Monsey is approximately 35 miles from the heart of New York City. Most of its Orthodox residents—all of them committed—have moved there since 1956. On the whole, they are of similar income and almost all of them have had an intensive Jewish education. Within Monsey proper there are nine Orthodox synagogues serving roughly 850 regular adult male Sabbath-attending worshippers and their families.

There are two large elementary day schools, with about 300 students each, which serve the neighboring community of Spring Valley as well. One day school conducts its Jewish studies in Hebrew, the other in Yiddish. A third day school, under a hasidic rabbi, provides an old-world type of education for about 50 boys. In addition there are a few hasidic rabbis who train a handful of pupils on a private basis in their homes, providing a minimum of secular education. To complete the elementary educational picture there are a number of Talmud Torahs attached to Orthodox synagogues which serve primarily the non-Orthodox community, since the synagogue members themselves send their children to the day schools. A Yiddish-speaking high school for boys in Monsey proper was joined by a second, which moved to the vicinity in 1964; there is also a tradition-oriented Beth Jacob high school for girls. None of these educational facilities is used by the 60 to 70 families of hasidic followers of
the Skverer Rebbe, who live in the neighboring community of New Square and sponsor an educational, social, and religious network of their own. Finally, there is the Beth Medrosh Elyon, a *kolel* (school for very advanced talmudic study, usually beyond what is required for ordination) with about 160 men, which serves a national constituency but receives strong local financial support.

The only local facilities in which almost all Orthodox Jews of Monsey are involved is a *hevra kaddisha* (burial society), the local *mikveh*, and the two local Sabbath-observing bakeries. Few communal activities involve all synagogue members or even leaders. Most of the members of one group of synagogues, predominantly American-born, college-educated, prosperous businessmen and professionals (prices of homes from $18,000 to $50,000), enroll their children in the Hebrew-speaking elementary school and then in New York City high schools, especially Yeshiva University high school. Members of a second group of synagogues, composed of a much higher percentage of foreign-born, with less secular education and of somewhat lower economic status, support the Yiddish-speaking elementary day schools and the local religious high schools. Some of these same people, however, also support the local hasidic day school, which deemphasizes secular education. Finally there is a German synagogue, many of whose members are oriented toward (the German) Adath Jeshurun of Washington Heights in New York City, and who transport their children to the day schools of that synagogue. Except for the relative absence of residual and nonobservant Orthodox and the high concentration of committed Orthodox (estimated at 30 to 35 per cent of the total Jewish community), the constellation of institutions in Monsey is similar to what it is in other Orthodox communities. The non-Orthodox of Monsey are either unaffiliated or are associated with the Conservative or Reform congregations in Spring Valley.

*Orthodoxy in the Jewish Religious Spectrum*

Before discussing the divisions within the Orthodox camp, it will be well to understand the nature of Orthodoxy within the totality of Jewish life.

Orthodoxy perceives itself as the only legitimate bearer of the Jewish tradition; to Orthodoxy this tradition is expressed almost exclusively in religious form (which is not to say that all elements of the tradition are necessarily religious in their essence). While Conservative and Reform see themselves as legitimate heirs to the Jewish tradition, neither claims to be its exclusive bearer. This distinction between Orthodoxy and the
other denominations has analytically separable consequences which only seem to operate at cross-purposes. Since neither the Reform nor the Conservative lays claim to exclusive doctrinal “truth,” they are free to cooperate with one another, with Orthodoxy, and even with secular Jewish groups; they risk only institutional losses. The doctrines of Orthodoxy, on the other hand, are more precise and are by definition beyond compromise or even the appearance of compromise. Hence Orthodoxy must be constantly on guard against appearing to surrender or water down its doctrine.

But there is a second consequence that flows from Orthodoxy’s exclusive claim to the truth and its major tenet that it is the obligation of every Jew to observe the mitzwot (religious commandments). While Conservatives and Reformists are under no obligation to do anything about the matter, the Orthodox are doctrinally obligated to encourage the observance of Jewish law here and now. In addition, the doctrine of ahavat Yisrael (love of Israel), particularly as elaborated by the late Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, chief rabbi of Palestine until his death in 1935, impels Orthodoxy to extend itself to the non-Orthodox. If non-Orthodox Jews were unorganized, the consequences of Orthodoxy’s doctrinal position would not be contradictory. It could simply undertake missions to the non-Orthodox. But when, in fact, about half of the non-Orthodox are organized in the Conservative and Reform movements, and the remainder are almost beyond reach of any religious group in Jewish life, then Orthodoxy is confronted with two mutually exclusive mandates—to promote faith and observance among non-Orthodox Jews, while giving no recognition and comfort to the only existing institutions which can reach those Jews. In practice, different groups within Orthodoxy have emphasized one mandate or the other, and most of the divisions within Orthodoxy, in practice, reflect this division. But the point to be stressed is that, with the possible exception of the Satmar hasidim (pp. 83–85), all Orthodox groups consider both mandates as binding. (The Satmar probably do, too, but feel that the obligation to promote observance is simply impractical in this day among all but a handful of Jews and that there own piety is not so secure as to justify undertaking “missions” to other Jews.) Hence, no matter how zealous the right wing may be in its stress on religious continuity, maximal observance, and condemnation of the non-Orthodox, it hesitates to characterize the non-Orthodox as beyond hope of redemption. And no matter how outgoing and conciliatory the left wing may be toward the nonobservant and the institutions of the non-
Orthodox, it is always restrained by its acceptance of the basic doctrinal principles as being beyond compromise.

Orthodoxy and the Demands of Society

The differences within Orthodoxy are best understood in the broad framework of the sociology of religion. While the concepts here developed are not directly applicable to Judaism, they are suggestive of differences among Jewish groups and serve heuristic purposes.

Students of religion, drawing their data primarily from the development of Christianity, have developed a typology of religions based on distinctions between church and sect. Following Yinger’s refinement of Troeltsch, church and sect are defined as ideal types, that is, end points on a continuum along which religious groups can be placed and compared with one another as they approach one end or the other.

The central problems to which the church-sect dichotomy is addressed are how a religious body confronts the secular world and how it provides a religious response to the personal needs of its adherents. The church “recognizes the strength of the secular world and rather than either deserting the attempt to influence it or losing its position by contradicting the secular powers directly, accepts the main elements in the social structure as proximate goods.” The major function of the church is its effort to insure social cohesion and order and to do so it must extend its ministry to everyone. As a result it must be willing to “compromise with the wide ranges of behavior that may be found in a society.”

The sect is a smaller group, arising from the inability of the church to meet some members’ needs by virtue of its very flexibility and adaptability. The sect “repudiates the compromises of the church, preferring isolation to compromise.” Hence, unlike the church, it is hostile or indifferent to the secular order. It seeks primarily to satisfy individual religious needs rather than societal ones.

It is apparent that the church-sect dichotomy is not applicable in this form to Judaism today. The typology assumes a closed society in which the religious order is confronted only by the secular order and the individual needs of its members. When Judaism represented a basically closed society, before Emancipation, the dichotomy appears to have been more applicable. Where the definition of church or sect says “society,” we can

---

29 Ibid., p. 144.
30 Ibid., p. 146.
read "Judaism" or "Jews." Thus, the early development of hasidism appears to fit the definition of sectarian growth and development.

But religious groups within Judaism today are confronted with problems of the larger Jewish society—what we may call the secular (or non-religious) institutionalized Jewish order—as well as of the non-Jewish society, and the problems of the religious denomination are not only to adapt to Jewish society and insure social cohesion and order within Judaism, but also to adapt to general society and insure cohesion and order within it. Furthermore, Judaism must meet not only the individual needs of members as they arise by virtue of Jewishness, but also those that arise by virtue of membership in the general society. An effort to solve one kind of problem frequently exacerbates another. To sum up—the Christian denomination plays a double role: vis-à-vis the social order or general society, and vis-à-vis the individual needs of its membership. To the extent that the Christian denomination stresses the solution to one order of problems it raises questions for the other. Judaism faces not two but four problems. It must meet the needs or demands of the broader society and of the narrower, Jewish society. It must meet the needs that arise from an individual’s problems in the general society and those that arise from his problems in the Jewish society.

Let us be specific about the nature of these problems as they have emerged in the United States.

1. To meet the needs of the general society, it is necessary to affirm the democratic political structure and to develop a symbolism (transcendental or not) for its transmission; to affirm the unity of all Americans and the primacy of American national interests and needs.

2. To meet the needs of the Jewish society, it is necessary to achieve unity among Jews and to maintain Jewish identification in a permissive gentile society; to maintain defenses against prejudice and discrimination.

3. To meet the individual’s needs in the general society, it is necessary to confront the problems of good and evil, of reward and punishment, and of alienation and anomie in an urban, heterogeneous society.

4. To meet the individual’s needs in Jewish society, it is necessary to interpret traditional Jewish beliefs and practices in the light of the individual’s present needs and problems.

Bearing in mind these four types of demands or needs, we can classify all Jewish organizations by the problem or combination of problems to which they have addressed themselves. Each of these classifications can, in turn, be refined according to the manner in which the problem is approached. Within any given organization there is bound to be some con-
conflict or tension over which problem should assume priority. A general theory of Jewish organizational life would have to take account of the manner in which social status, education, accommodation to the American milieu, and other such factors cut across the leadership and constituent groups of each organization, determining the perspective in which problems are viewed and solutions chosen.

Our concern here is with Orthodoxy, but first we must look briefly into the Conservative and Reform groups, which today come closer than Orthodoxy to assuming the characteristics of church rather than sect. By and large, Conservatism and Reform address themselves to problems arising from societal demands. The application is made at an individual level and to individual problems, but the context out of which the problem emerges is generally societal—social cohesion and moral order—rather than individual. Until recently, Reform was more oriented towards general societal problems and Conservatism toward those of Jewish society. This is changing somewhat as Conservatism becomes more self-conscious about its role as a church and Reform, with a longer church experience, becomes more aware of the limitations of a church in reaching its membership directly.

For an illustration of the growing emphasis on a societal-church role for Conservative Judaism, the 1962 proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly are useful. Its convention that year was devoted to the day-school movement, and the speakers stressed the reasons for developing Conservative as distinct from Orthodox day schools. One rabbi complained about the Orthodox day schools:

In many, if not most instances, school holidays in the Yeshivot are set without any consideration for the dates of public school holidays so that Yeshiva students cannot possibly meet with or join in activities with friends who attend other schools.31

A Conservative educator called for mobilizing the Jewish community in behalf of day schools by stressing 11 points, most of which emphasized the compatibility of day schools with America, democracy, and even the public-school system.32 Another rabbi, asking, "What should be distinctive about our Conservative day schools?", answered:

First, I would say, is the principle of motivation. Our motivation is not isolationism, but preparation for Jewish living in the context of general life, in America, or anywhere else in the world. . . . Not only the civic

31 Rabbinical Assembly of America, Proceedings, 1962, p. 44.
32 Ibid., pp. 54–56.
and political positions of Jews, but our understanding of the true nature of Judaism demands that we regard isolation from the general community and world culture as a goal devoutly to be shunned.\textsuperscript{33}

A third rabbi commented:

The road to further progress in this area of our educational work is still strewn with obstacles, both major and minor. Many of the laymen have yet to be convinced that a Conservative Day School is not parochial, and does not deprive its pupils of a full experience in the American milieu. Some of our own colleagues are afraid lest an expanded Day School movement weaken our opposition to federal aid to education, and tempt us into the Orthodox camp altogether.\textsuperscript{34}

And finally this proud boast of a fourth rabbi:

To be specific, from the very start of our Hillel Day School in Detroit, we paid more attention to American sancta than they do in any public school. That may be too categorical a statement, but we know that Thanksgiving day is roundly ignored in the public school. We glorify it, because it is one of the sancta of American life which can be glorified very naturally. . . . We find that it is possible to instill the best of our American holidays and integrating them with Jewish values, and conversely taking Jewish holidays like \textit{Pesah} and integrating them with American overtones. . . . There is a slight diminution of daily contact with non-Jewish children, but it can be made up for by a deliberately designed integrated program.\textsuperscript{35}

Papers delivered at the 1963 meeting of CCAR offered a striking contrast to those presented at this convention of Conservative rabbis. According to one observer, himself a Reform rabbi, it had been rumored that the 1963 convention would precipitate a theological revolution.\textsuperscript{36}

The papers were described as follows:

They focus on God where the old liberals concentrated on man. They are concerned with the authoritative claim traditional texts and traditional observance have on them. They take the concept of Halachah seriously and seek to determine what is law for them today. They do not hesitate to use religious terms which the liberals ignored or reinterpreted away, like revelation, sin, the fear of God. They, too, try to define them in a modern way but one which will not do violence to

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., pp. 61–62.
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\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 81.
their traditional Jewish intent. One might simply describe their position as seeking to take the Jewish religion with full personal seriousness but not literally.\textsuperscript{37}

Most pertinent to our argument is this comment by the pseudonymous author: "Reform rabbis are interested in theology today because they know that they have little else to offer the cultured, ethical man, and only a living relationship between God and Israel can justify the continued effort to remain Jewish."\textsuperscript{38} The point is that an intellectually significant element within Reform Judaism seeks a withdrawal from Reform's church-like, societally-oriented posture. No comparable development in Conservative Judaism is noticeable.

In contrast to Conservative and Reform Judaism, much of Orthodoxy's energy has been addressed to finding solutions within a halakhic framework for individual problems arising in contemporary life. Orthodoxy has been the least church-like of all Jewish religious groups. In part this stems from the absence (until recently) of any self-consciousness. Only recently has Orthodoxy begun to define itself as a particular movement in the United States and been brought into contact with the broader society by the accelerated acculturation of its adherents and its own institutional growth. This new confrontation has raised problems that formerly did not exist for Orthodoxy or were overlooked. Thus, Orthodox leaders have been much slower than other Jewish leaders to define their attitude toward problems of civil rights or labor.

Since 1960 much of this has changed. In 1964, speaking to a Young Israel meeting in New York, Rabbi Aaron Soloveichik, one of the leading talmudic authorities in Jewish life, delivered a major address on civil rights from a halakhic perspective. In that same year a joint conference of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, and the Social Action Committee of RCA heard a series of papers by young Orthodox rabbis on religion and labor. Such developments were a portent of serious stirrings within Orthodoxy.

Reform and Conservatism, however, still are more church-like than Orthodoxy, not only in their role in the general society but also in Jewish society. The ideologists of Conservatism resemble those of Orthodoxy in the nature of their formal commitment to \textit{halakhah} and tradition. But the practical difficulties of reconciling a corpus of law having no effective sanctions with the proclivities of modern man has resulted in varying solutions. Conservatism has increasingly, albeit slowly and often grudg-

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 480.
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ingly, found its solution in the doctrine that the *halakhah* must be molded to suit modern man's material and intellectual needs. But its left wing has long argued that the potential for change is too severely limited by the necessity to fit all changes to Jewish law. The left wing has theretofore pressed its leadership to change the law by reliance on non-legal criteria (psychology, *aggadah*, etc.). Their success on this score has been limited, but they have accepted a procedure, introduced in 1948 upon the organization of the present Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, whereby unless the law committee of RA resolves a given division by issuing a unanimous opinion, Conservative rabbis are free to uphold any contending opinion. In fact, the Conservative rabbi is bound only by his own concept of Jewish propriety in advising his membership what they can or cannot do under Jewish law. The discretion thus allowed is more abstract than real, however, since Conservative rabbis are, in fact, rarely consulted on halakhic matters. Thus, Conservative Judaism has been able to meet the Jewish societal demands of its congregants without challenging individual conduct or behavior. As one JTS professor noted in private conversation, the RA deliberates and the laity decides. The rabbis debate whether it is permitted to ride to the synagogue on the Sabbath and the laymen ride. The outcome of the Rabbinical Assembly deliberations is either a foregone conclusion or irrelevant. Thus, the Conservative movement moves closer toward our definition of a church, as indeed it must if it is to achieve universality and bring the masses of Jews under its umbrella.

Orthodoxy faces a similar problem, and some of the divisions within its camp are best understood by analyzing the different positions of Orthodox leaders and institutions as they approach the church or sect ends of the continuum. The line between the left (or church) wing of Orthodoxy and the right wing of the Conservative movement is a very thin one. In fact, it is institutional loyalty far more than ideology which separates the two groups practically, though there are other, subtle distinctions, as well.

There are two alternative explanations for the differences among the Orthodox. The first argues that the two major categories of Orthodox—modern or church Orthodox and sectarian Orthodox—differ from one another in their degree of acculturation. It is true, as we shall show, that the sectarian Orthodox tend to be of lower income, poorer secular education, and more recent immigration than the modern Orthodox. (Sociologists of religion have noted that these tend to correlate with affinity to sect rather than church among Christians as well.) But the sectarians
can boast their share of outwardly acculturated adherents; the leaders of the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists, to be discussed below, are far more sectarian than modern in terms of their concerns and orientations. And, most significantly, acculturation must be viewed as a dependent rather than an independent variable. The large number of American-born advanced yeshivah students who attend college at night to minimize interference with their talmudic studies and value their secular education only for its vocational benefits have in a sense deliberately rejected acculturation because of their sectarian tendencies, rather than being sectarian because unacculturated.

A second explanation for the differences among the Orthodox distinguishes among them along a fundamentalism-liberalism scale. It argues that the sectarian Orthodox differ from the modern or church Orthodox by virtue of their beliefs concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Torah or the Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law. Although some modern Orthodox thinkers would consider Franz Rosenzweig's position, for example, as within the framework of Orthodox belief, questions of actual dogma have not yet been broached among Orthodox leaders. When they are, as seems likely, there will be explosive consequences. Unquestionably there are Orthodox intellectuals who would like to raise the question, but with few exceptions neither they nor the fundamentalists have yet articulated exactly what they mean by Mosaic authorship or Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law. It is fair to say that the entire belief structure of American

---

39 Rosenzweig accepted the notion of a biblical Redactor, but saw the task of compiling the Bible as the human presentation of divine revelation. Rosenzweig's oft-quoted statement is that for him the symbol "R" does not stand for Redactor but for Rabbenu (our rabbi, our master).

40 In one respect the argument that the written law (the Torah) and the oral law, which constitute the basis of halakhah, were given by God to Moses at Sinai requires no elaboration. It has always been an article of faith for the Orthodox Jew, and the meaning of the words and their historical referent seems simple enough. Biblical criticism has not challenged this belief; on the contrary, biblical criticism becomes meaningful only when this article of faith is denied. But it is this very article of faith in its plain meaning which has become "preposterous" to the modern mind. (This, of course, says nothing about the truth or falsity of the doctrine. A round world once also seemed preposterous.) That segment of American Orthodoxy which lives in the orbit of the rashe yeshivot does not find such a faith preposterous. It has no severe problem in reconciling its conception of God and human experience to its faith in the divine origin of Torah. That is not so for the more acculturated Orthodox Jew. The observer is perhaps forbidden to challenge a man's belief, but he is entitled to ask whether the secularly acculturated Jew truly believes in Torah min ha-shamayim (Torah from heaven) when the entire structure of behavior and belief of that Jew seems inconsistent with this one article of faith. Inevitably efforts will be made to reinterpret the meaning of Torah min ha-shamayim in an effort to resolve the inconsistency. A variety of strategies are pos-
Orthodoxy still finds verbal expression within the bounds of a rather narrow fundamentalism. Privately, the modern Orthodox admit that they simply interpret the same words to mean different things from what they mean to the sectarian Orthodox. They have sought to keep the subject outside the area of controversy, making no serious effort, for example, to engage in biblical criticism, and thereby ruling out the development of any outstanding Orthodox biblical scholars in the United States. Modern Orthodoxy pays lip service to the notion that something ought to be done in this area and that aspects of biblical criticism can be incorporated into the Orthodox tradition, but no one is prepared to undertake or even encourage the work. It is sometimes acknowledged that some abandon Orthodoxy because their intellectual predispositions cannot be reconciled with traditional patterns of belief. But such losses, qualitatively important, are quantitatively insignificant. The main body of Orthodoxy in the United States appears at present to be doctrinally untroubled.

Institutions and Currents

Using the church-sect dichotomy, then, let us turn to a discussion of specific institutions and currents within Orthodoxy. As we noted in the introduction, little attention is given to synagogue practice, although it is really in the synagogue that the full variety of Orthodox types become evident in their pure form. At one extreme are the shtibl-type synagogues. They meet in small rooms, where bearded men cover their heads with tallitim (prayer shawls) to pray, generally unheedful of the leader of the service, their bodies swaying. Women are separated from the men by a full-length wall in the rear, punctured by several peepholes through which a few can peer. At the other extreme are the modern edifices with spacious auditoriums. Here services are conducted by a cantor whose trained voice is carried to the ends of the hall by a microphone. Men and women are seated together, and the heart of the service is the rabbi's

### Footnotes

41 The same is true of Conservative and Reform leaders among themselves with regard to the concept of revelation.

sermon. Although mixed seating and the use of a microphone on the Sabbath violate halakhah, the modern congregation considers itself as Orthodox and is in fact more likely to support many of the supracongregational institutions to be discussed below than the shtibl.

MODERN ORTHODOX

By modern Orthodox we mean those individuals and institutions among the committed Orthodox who tend toward the church end of the church-sect continuum. On the one hand, they seek to demonstrate the viability of the halakhah for contemporary life; on the other, they emphasize what they have in common with all other Jews rather than what separates them. Until recently they composed almost the entire upper-income, well-educated strata of the committed Orthodox. Many of the best-known Orthodox congregations in the United States, and most of the wealthy ones, are led by modern Orthodox rabbis.

Like the other groups within American Orthodoxy, the modern Orthodox have not produced any systematic statement of their ideology; in part, perhaps, because they shun the practical consequences of their philosophical or theological position, and in part because none has been sanctioned by eminent talmudic scholars, still acknowledged as the arbiters of ideology. To the extent, however, that the modern Orthodox have produced an ideologist, it is probably Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, although his position is not representative of all modern Orthodox Jews. He is certainly the favorite target of the Orthodox right wing, notwithstanding the private concession of at least some of its members that he has brought more people into the Orthodox fold than any other person. Rackman has published widely on halakhah, Jewish values, and contemporary life. His concern is with understanding the meaning of the halakhic injunctions in order to find contemporary applications. In the course of his efforts he has suggested what many feel to be a radical re-interpretation of the halakhah:

The Halakhah is more than texts. It is life and experience. What made the Babylonian and not the Palestinian Talmud the great guide of Jewish life in the Diaspora was not a decree or a decision but vox populi.

---

From Maimonides it would appear that it was the acceptance of the people who by custom and popular will constituted the authority. Can a Halakhic scholar lose himself in texts exclusively when the texts themselves bid him to see what practice "has become widespread among Jews," what is required socially "because of the precepts of peace," what will "keep the world aright," and many other social criteria? These standards are as much a part of the Torah as the texts themselves.\footnote{Rackman, *Sabbaths and Festivals . . .*, p. 8.}

Rackman is also prominently associated with the idea that Orthodox Jews, both individually and institutionally, must cooperate with the non-Orthodox. He is outspoken in his conviction that Orthodox rabbis should be free to associate with such groups as the New York Board of Rabbis (composed of Reform and Conservative as well as Orthodox rabbis) and that Orthodox groups should remain affiliated with the umbrella organization for all religious groups, the Synagogue Council of America.

Before considering the groups within which modern Orthodoxy is dominant, some comment on the sources of authority and unity within the Jewish community will be made. We will seek to demonstrate why the drive for unity, even within the organizations controlled by modern Orthodoxy, has been blunted in recent years, and what the Orthodox basis for unity has become.

**Authority in the Jewish Community**

There are four possible bases of authority within the Jewish community today: numbers, money, tradition, and person or charisma.

Authority of numbers is rarely exercised directly. Although organizations and institutions make some claim to authority on the basis of their numerical superiority, issues have rarely been resolved on this basis. There have been a few exceptions, the most noteworthy being the American Jewish Conference and particularly its 1943 meeting in which the sympathy of the masses of American Jews for the Zionist program was reflected in the division of votes (AJYB, 1944–45 [Vol. 46], pp. 169–70). Today almost no Jewish organization lays claim to authority within the community by virtue of its size. In part this is because no organization has a generally accepted, trustworthy membership list. More significantly, it is because no mass organization in Jewish life can even pretend to be able to mobilize its membership behind one position or another.

The most potent claim for authority in Jewish life today is exercised by money. Perhaps this was always so, but until recently the claim was exer-
cised in alliance with religious tradition. Tradition’s loss of status has resulted in the dissolution of this alliance and today those who control the purse strings, alone, usually speak for the Jewish community and decide questions within it. Although the professionals and staff members of the various organizations generally initiate policy, their authority is often determined by their access to financial resources and particularly to the few big contributors. Orthodoxy cannot accept the authority of money because it contains neither a class of large contributors nor a group of professionals with access to large contributors. In this regard, the Conservative and Reform rabbinate are in a far better, though by no means ideal, position, as they confront the “secular” Jewish institutions. The potency of money in the rest of the community, therefore, has the effect of pressuring Orthodoxy to withdraw from the community. In other words, the rule of the game in the Jewish community is that “money talks the loudest.” Because Orthodoxy only loses by these rules, there is a constant pressure from within for it to leave the game unless the rules are changed. Of course, the concessions and compromises made by the Orthodox in order to play the game become unnecessary when they withdraw from it and they then move to a more intransigent right-wing position.

Orthodoxy claims the right to preserve the unity of the Jewish community by invoking the authority of tradition and charisma. With regard to the first, it claims communal support for its essentially parochial schools on the ground that these are traditional schools which simply teach Judaism as it has always been taught (in terms of content, of course, not method). This claim to legitimacy has been challenged recently, most particularly by the Conservatives. The foregoing is not meant to imply that numbers or money have only recently become sources of authority, or that tradition has lost all its force. It does mean that the weight of the different bases of authority has changed, and that Orthodoxy’s claim to its exclusive access to this authority has been challenged.

The fourth possible source of authority in the Jewish community is that of person, or charisma. Jews in the United States have never produced a charismatic leader for the entire community, although Louis Marshall, Judah Magnes, Stephen Wise, and Abba Hillel Silver came close to being such leaders.

The only group within Jewish life which lays claim to charismatic leaders today is the Orthodox. Preeminent among these for the modern Orthodox is Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik. RCA’s claim to leadership in the general Jewish community and its belief that it ought really to exercise this leadership rest almost entirely on the fact that Rabbi Soloveitchik is
its leader. RCA members consider it enormously significant that the non-Orthodox Jewish community has accorded his opinions an increasing respect. Rabbi Soloveitchik, acknowledged by most Orthodox Jews as one of the world's leading talmudic authorities, has become increasingly active in social and political life and is quite conscious of his role as a communal leader. As the descendant of the longest extant line of gedolim, rabbis who combined talmudic and communal authority, this could hardly be otherwise.\textsuperscript{45}

On the other hand, the more right-wing yeshivah world (to be discussed below) rests its claim to authority on the leadership of the outstanding rashe yeshivot who claim the mantle of traditional as well as charismatic authority.

We turn now to those organizations in which modern Orthodoxy holds a dominant position, stressing that in none of these groups is that position exclusive.

\textit{Rabbinical Council of America (RCA)}

The Rabbinical Council of America is the largest and most influential Orthodox rabbinical body in the United States. It has 830 members, all ordained by recognized rabbinic authorities. About 600 are in the active rabbinate, and most of the rest are teachers and school administrators. About half of the active rabbis were ordained at Yeshiva University's Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS), and another 15 per cent at the Hebrew Theological College in Illinois. As noted below, both of these institutions represent a point of view different from that of other yeshivot in the United States which confer ordination. Another 20 to 25 per cent of the RCA membership come from these other American yeshivot, and the remaining few are from Europe.

A major controversy within RCA has centered on the question of its relationship with non-Orthodox rabbinical groups, particularly the affiliation of its members with the New York Board of Rabbis. In 1955, 11 rashe yeshivot, the most influential leaders of all the large academies for

\textsuperscript{45} His father, Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, was one of the great talmudic scholars in the United States in the last generation. His uncle, Reb Velvel Soloveitchik, was the gedol ha-dor (“the great man of his generation”) of the last generation in Palestine. His grandfather, Reb Hayyim of Brisk, the famous Brisker Rav, was the leading talmudic scholar of his time, and his great-grandfather, Rabbi Joseph Beer Soloveitchik, after whom he is named, was the rosh yeshivah of Volozhin, the greatest talmudic academy of its time. For a biographical sketch of Rabbi Soloveitchik and a popularization of some elements of his thought see his son-in-law's article: Aaron Lichtenstein, “Joseph Soloveitchik,” in Simon Noveck, ed., \textit{Great Jewish Thinkers of the Twentieth Century}. (Washington, 1963), pp. 281–97.
advanced talmudic study in the United States (except Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College), issued an *issur* or prohibition against Orthodox rabbis joining organizations in which non-Orthodox rabbis were officially represented. Their position was phrased in halakhic terms as a *pesak din*, a juridical decision, but has been buttressed with the practical political argument that by officially recognizing the non-Orthodox rabbi as a rabbi, Orthodoxy accorded him a status to which he was not entitled under Jewish law and which cut the ground from under its own claim as the only legitimate bearer of the Torah tradition.

RCA referred the question to its own *halakhah* committee under the chairmanship of Rabbi Soloveitchik. At the end of 1964 the committee had not yet reported, and showed no disposition to do so as long as the *status quo* was maintained within the Jewish community.

Nevertheless, the political aspects of the question were raised on numerous occasions; in all instances the forces for separation in RCA, led by Rabbi David Hollander, were defeated, although there is a growing sympathy for the values which Hollander espouses. The opponents of separation have argued that by cooperating with the non-Orthodox they are able to restrain them from public violation of *halakhah* and are in a better position to help shape policy for the whole Jewish community. They pointed to Judaism's response to the Second Ecumenical Council (p. 128) as an example of how Orthodoxy, under the leadership of Rabbi Soloveitchik, was influential in maintaining a semblance of order among most Jewish leaders and groups on behalf of a policy which all Orthodox groups favored. Besides, they suspect that the vast majority of nominally Orthodox Jews do not see any sharp distinctions between Orthodoxy and other denominations, that a policy of separation would fail of general support, and that it would jeopardize the considerable support for Orthodox institutions that comes from non-Orthodox Jews.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, they feel that RCA members do not view themselves as living in a community apart from the rest of American Jews. The Orthodox rabbi, particularly outside New York City, lives among and serves a non-observant constituency. In addition, he himself is likely to be American-born, a product of the American culture, which places a premium on compromise, sanctifies majority rule, and decries dogmatism.

With an annual budget of $80,000 for expenditures in the United States in 1964 and a separate budget of $15,000 for its newly established *Beth Din*, RCA maintains a manifold program.46 It conducts welfare

---

46 All budget figures were given to the author or to CJFWF.
activities on behalf of its members, supports a variety of projects in Israel, and publishes the distinguished quarterly, *Tradition*, and a halakhic journal in Hebrew, *Hadorom*. Its house organ, the *RCA Record*, is probably the most candid organizational bulletin circulated among any American Jewish group. The *Beth Din* is concerned with family problems, offers counseling, and is engaged in developing extensive records on Jewish marriage and divorce. Its purpose is to render authoritative decisions in areas which are either halakhically or emotionally too complex for any one rabbi to handle.

RCA looks for spiritual and, more recently, political leadership to Rabbi Soloveitchik, known affectionately to his followers as the Rov (Sefardi: Rav). One can almost distinguish a Jew's religious position by the manner in which he refers to Soloveitchik. The non-Orthodox are likely to call him Rabbi Soloveitchik; the RCA modern Orthodox call him the Rov; his own students, Rebbe; and the right wing, J.B., for the first two initials of his name.

RCA has moved to the right in recent years, though not as far to the right as its separatists would like. It has continued to concern itself with communal problems but has become increasingly outspoken and antagonistic toward other groups, both religious and secular, within Jewish life. This is a result of a number of factors. The younger rabbis, particularly those from Yeshiva University, are more right-wing today in both their practice and their communal outlook than their predecessors of a decade or more ago. Secondly, as the Orthodox community has grown in numbers and risen in income and status, the rabbi has attained greater personal security and confidence in the future of Orthodoxy and has become less compromising. Thirdly, the right wing within Orthodoxy has become more acculturated. This means that it is better able to communicate with the left wing and make an impact on it. Finally, RCA has reacted to the Conservative movement's new aggressiveness.

The Conservatives have issued challenges in domains which the Orthodox believed were by tacit consent, at least, exclusively theirs. One such domain is the supervision of *kashrut*. A second is that of day schools. Conservative development of rival day schools, which the Orthodox may deplore but can hardly consider inherently objectionable, has been accompanied by increased expectation on the part of Conservative rabbis, often supported by local Jewish federations and welfare funds, of a stronger voice in the policy making of traditional Orthodox day schools. The Conservative movement, furthermore, exercises a powerful lever in the form of finances. Most Orthodox day schools outside Metropolitan
New York are dependent on federation support or contributions from large donors, many of whom are members of Conservative synagogues. Recently, the Orthodox have found that the price they must pay for the support of Conservative rabbis has gone up, at the same time that Conservatism's own increasingly militant posture has diminished its willingness to make concessions as readily as in the past.

RCA's move to the right has had the further effect of healing somewhat the breach between its modern Orthodox and sectarian elements on such questions as the development of *halakhah*, which is only indirectly related to the controversy over communal involvement. Rackman, as we have noted, is the leading advocate of radical halakhic development, but his viewpoint is almost totally isolated. Rackman elicits a sympathetic response from his colleagues when he demands that the rabbinic leaders grapple with contemporary problems and when he criticizes them for their "ivory tower" posture. But there is less sympathy with him on what the content of the response should be. As one observer put it, "The RCA rabbi doesn't want *hetterim* [lenient rulings], he only wants a good explanation for a *pesak* [a ruling]."

*Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJC)*

Officially RCA is the rabbinical arm of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJC), the major national congregational organization of Orthodox synagogues. UOJC is best known for its *kashrut* supervision, conducted in cooperation with RCA. Almost half of its nearly $750,000 budget is for this purpose. UOJC also provides administrative and program assistance to Orthodox congregations whether or not they are affiliated with it; provides assistance to Orthodox servicemen; publishes a popular bimonthly, *Jewish Life*; sponsors a women's division and the National Conference of Synagogue Youth, which publishes some outstanding material for young people; provides office space and at least nominal sponsorship for two other organizations, Yavneh and the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (to be discussed below), and represents congregational Orthodoxy on the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the Synagogue Council of America, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and similar groups.

The forum for the controversy over Orthodox participation in non-Orthodox roof organizations has shifted in the last two years from RCA, where the separatists have been defeated, to UOJC. At its 1964 convention a resolution by the separatists was defeated, but on the ground that withdrawal would be unwarranted unless a roof organization for
all Orthodox groups was first established. Toward this end, Orthodox organizations like RCA, the Religious Zionists of America, the Rabbinical Alliance of America, and Agudath Israel were invited to submit position papers on their conditions for entering a unified Orthodox organization. Agudath Israel, whose position probably best reflects that of the sectarian Orthodox, stipulated two conditions for its participation: that all members of the proposed organization withdraw from anything more than *ad hoc* participation in non-Orthodox roof organizations, and that a council of Torah authorities, composed essentially of Agudath Israel leaders, be the arbiters of the new organization. It was unlikely that the modern Orthodox would meet either of these conditions.

For many years UOJC was led by a young, Americanized, modern Orthodox element without any real constituent base among the mass of Yiddish-speaking, immigrant synagogue members. In the past decade a closer relationship has developed between Orthodox synagogues and the parent synagogue body, and UOJC has grown considerably. This is because the synagogue leadership has become more acculturated; the UOJC leadership has moved to the right, away from modernism, and the success of Conservative and Reform parent congregational bodies, as well as of Young Israel, has shown the importance of a united Orthodox synagogue body. None the less, UOJC is still not as representative of Orthodox congregations as the United Synagogue is of Conservative, or UAHC of Reform, congregations.

UOJC refuses to reveal the number of its member congregations because, they say, their definition of membership is somewhat ambiguous. Congregations whose dues are in arrears are still considered as members. UOJC has at various times claimed to serve, without regard to affiliation, 3,100 Orthodox congregations, but according to our own estimates (p. 24) there are probably no more than 1,700 synagogues in the United States which even consider themselves as Orthodox. It also claims that as the spokesman for all Orthodoxy it speaks for the 3 million Jews who, they estimate, are affiliated with the 3,100 Orthodox congregations which, they say, exist in the United States and Canada. (According to one UOJC official, there are actually 4.2 million Orthodox Jews in the United States, since by his definition all Jews who are not Conservative, Reform, or atheist are Orthodox.)

UOJC congregations range from those with mixed seating to those which go beyond the letter of the law in observing halakhic standards. Individual members include Jews from all walks of life and with a variety of opinions. Conscious of its hybrid membership and anxious not to
offend any group within it, UOJC has avoided policy formulation in areas of controversy affecting internal Orthodox Jewish life and has turned much of its attention toward the broader Jewish society and the general society. Thus its resolution of 1962, repudiating its long-standing opposition to Federal aid to education, can be taken to mean that the consensus that once existed in opposition to Federal aid is no longer present.

The changing temper within the Orthodox community—the increased emphasis on halakhic observance—is reflected within UOJC. Thus, whereas status once accrued to the leaders and rabbis of congregations without mehitzot (barriers separating the men’s and women’s sections of synagogues), and a certain contempt was evident toward those “old-fashioned” congregations which still had mehitzot or even separate seating for men and women, the situation today is reversed. Since 1955, according to a spokesman for UOJC, some 30 synagogues which formerly had mixed seating have installed mehitzot, the first break in a trend which had been moving in the opposite direction since the 19th century.

Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (AOJS)

Although affiliated with UOJC, the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (AOJS), sponsors of the quarterly Intercom, does not belong under the rubric of modern Orthodox. It is far less oriented toward problems of Jewish society and hardly at all to problems of the general society. It is rather concerned with problems arising out of the individual Orthodox Jew’s role in the secular and scientific world. In 1964 it claimed approximately 500 members and 12 local chapters in the United States and Canada. The overwhelming majority of its members, according to its 1962 directory, are natural scientists with universities or large corporations, rather than social scientists, whom the organization has also been anxious to attract.

AOJS is preoccupied with the problem of secular education. It has never thought it appropriate to adopt a position on some of the moral issues confronting American society or American scientists as a result of the new technology and its uses, but hardly a national meeting passes in which some discussion, and usually a major address, is not devoted to the subject of the study of science or secular education in the light of the halakhah. It is as if the membership had to keep reassuring itself or others that their vocation is a proper one for Orthodox Jews.

Members of AOJS include some distinguished intellects, but the organization has exhibited little critical concern with the nature of Amer-
ican or Jewish life. In general, the natural sciences have attracted more Orthodox Jewish graduate students than the social sciences or humanities. This may be because they offer preparation for more lucrative and prestigious professions today, or because they raise fewer critical problems for Orthodox Jews. It is not difficult to dichotomize religious belief and scientific work, whereas the very assumptions of the social sciences are often thought to run counter to traditional Orthodox views. Whatever the reason, AOJS reflects the special concerns of the natural scientist and has failed to attract to its ranks the growing number of Orthodox Jews in the social sciences and the humanities who might be expected to adopt a broader and more critical approach to Jewish and general affairs.

Yavneh, National Religious Jewish Students' Association

In contrast to AOJS, Yavneh, one of the two national Orthodox collegiate bodies, exhibits great intellectual ferment and general communal concern. Founded in 1960, Yavneh had close to a thousand paid members in over 40 chapters in American colleges and universities by 1964. The founders of Yavneh were largely Yeshiva High School graduates who were dissatisfied with the complacency and lack of intellectual excitement in the Jewish community generally, and Orthodoxy particularly. A generation earlier most of them would no doubt have abandoned Orthodoxy completely. In the 1960s they chose instead to create a subcommunity within the Orthodox world that affirms the Jewish tradition but is concerned with its application to contemporary social and political problems.

Yavneh's founders were soon joined by a more conservative group of students who sought to move the organization along more traditional lines, both programmatically and organizationally; they favored, for example, abolishing mixed-swimming weekends. Yavneh chapters are usually dominated by one group or the other. All chapters, however, have attracted students from non-Orthodox homes who find in the high level of Yavneh's programs an alternative to accepting the deficiencies of the Jewish and general communities. On many campuses Yavneh has come into conflict with local Hillel groups because of its unwillingness to accept the latitudinarian status quo.

Although Yavneh has a higher proportion of non-Orthodox members than AOJS—as high as 25 per cent, according to some members—it is by no means non-observant. Notwithstanding their eagerness to explore the ramifications of the halakhah, Yavneh members share a commitment to it. Of the many seminars and classes sponsored by the organization on campuses, at national meetings, and at its special study program in Israel,
Talmud study sessions are the most popular. Yavneh’s attitude is that regardless of private individual practices, halakhah must continue to be the public standard at least. This halakhic commitment is interesting because it may portend a future direction for American Orthodoxy. Unlike left-wing Orthodoxy, it does not call for radical reinterpretation of halakhah. Unlike the right, it does not demand that every Jew live his life in accordance with the halakhic prescriptions of the rabbinical authorities. Rather, it calls for an understanding of what the halakhah is and then a decision by the individual. In many respects this is a revolutionary outlook for an Orthodox organization, Rosenzweigian in its implication that the ultimate criterion for an individual’s observance is his own judgment.

Besides its halakhic commitment, there is almost an obsession with pure intellectual activity in Yavneh. Thus, when one chapter found that many of the youth attracted to its Saturday-night discussion group came primarily for social purposes, it abolished the activity. At its 1964 national convention in New York a guest speaker, a prominent professor of philosophy and an Orthodox Jew, chose to lecture in untechnical language in the hope of making himself widely understood. An observer commented later that the speaker would have been better received had he spoken above the heads of most of the students present—they would have appreciated the compliment.

National Council of Young Israel

The Young Israel movement, with 95 synagogues and approximately 23,000 affiliated families, may be the largest single organization in American Orthodoxy. There are probably more families affiliated with the member synagogues of UOJC, but the relationship between UOJC’s leadership and the members of its congregations is still so tenuous that it would be unreasonable to compare it with Young Israel, a large proportion of whose members identify closely with the movement and a few of whom are more intensely committed to the national movement than they are to their own synagogues. This is not to suggest that all or even most member families in the Young Israel are Orthodox in their personal behavior. But there is no question as to where the direction of the organization lies. In fact, only Sabbath observers are permitted to hold office in a Young Israel congregation, and synagogues remove their mehitzot only at the price of their charters.

Young Israel was formed in 1912 by a handful of Orthodox Americanized youth who felt themselves a part of American society, rejected
many of the folkways and practices of their parents, but wished to remain Orthodox. At first the movement was nurtured intellectually by some Jewish Theological Seminary faculty members, who saw in it a hope for American Orthodoxy. As Young Israel grew, however, it dissociated itself from the nascent Conservative movement, while the Seminary became more involved with it. By the 1920s Young Israel and the Seminary had drifted apart.

Until World War II, Young Israel was a lay movement, dominated by a lay leadership. It was led by native-born, middle-class, college-educated Orthodox Jews, who in their own rather disorganized fashion stood as a bridge between Orthodoxy and the rest of the Jewish community. With modern facilities, stress on decorum in worship, and an attractive social program, Young Israel brought thousands of Jewish young people into the synagogue, many of whom were encouraged to enroll in intensive study courses or to enter yeshivot. (Ironically, some of them emerged from the yeshivot only to condemn Young Israel for not being sufficiently Orthodox.)

As late as World War II, Young Israel was looked upon as the least observant Orthodox group. This misconception was partly due to ignorance. In part, however, it reflected an awareness of Young Israel's deviations from Orthodoxy. In developing an attractive social program, for example, Young Israel had closed its eyes to such activities as mixed dancing, which few rabbinic authorities would sanction. Its lay leadership, which was not yeshivah-trained, refused to defer to an Orthodox rabbinate who, they felt, lacked secular training, sophistication, and community status comparable to theirs. Being church-oriented, it tended to lay less stress on matters of individual observance and more on Orthodoxy's role in the Jewish community.

Young Israel was among the first Orthodox organizations to seek to raise the level and dignity of kashrut supervision, to work with the American chaplaincy, and to lend support to Zionism, youth, and collegiate work. Its semimonthly Young Israel Viewpoint was, until it ran into financial difficulty and some conflicts of personalities in 1964, one of the best English-language Jewish newspapers in the United States.

Since World War II the nature of the Young Israel movement has changed. In the first place, the lay leadership has been challenged by the Council of Young Israel Rabbis, the rabbinical organization of Young Israel congregational rabbis. Native-born and acculturated, with increased sophistication and, most importantly, time and information, the postwar rabbi was able to compete with the lay leader. The very growth of the
movement had created a need for greater professionalism. In addition, the expansion of membership brought a larger number of marginal affiliates, who recognized the rabbi, rather than the lay leader, as a legitimate spokesman for Jewish religious values. With increasing power at the congregational level, the rabbis were in a position to determine the effectiveness of the national program, and their cooperation became essential. As the locus of money shifted to the congregation, the layman, who viewed himself as part of a national movement seeking a national impact, was replaced by the rabbi, whose interests were more local, and status accrued to the rabbi of the largest, wealthiest, and most observant synagogue.

Another factor accounting for the changes in Young Israel has been the general move to the right within Orthodoxy—the intensification of demands for halakhic observance, which means, almost by definition, the ascendancy of the Orthodox rabbi as the halakhic authority of the congregation. This has particular significance in the case of the Young Israel rabbi, who is not typical of most Orthodox American rabbis, either European-trained or the products of Yeshiva University. The European rabbi is often disadvantaged by his lack of acculturation, and even when he fancies himself as a communal or chief rabbi, he is conscious of his utter dependence on lay approval. Yeshiva University graduates are not all of the same mold; but at least until recently they tended to be church-oriented, communally involved, and very much aware of the necessity for compromise. Rabbis ordained by other American yeshivot, like Torah Vodaath, Rabbi Chaim Berlin, and Rabbi Jacob Joseph, on the other hand, reject the Yeshiva University model. These Americanized, non-Yeshiva University graduates tend to be more aggressive and less compromising. About half of Young Israel’s congregational rabbis are just such men; only 43 per cent are from Yeshiva University. In the borough of Queens, in New York, for example, there are 56 nominally Orthodox synagogues with 75 or more members. Fifty-five per cent of these synagogues are served by Yeshiva University rabbis. By contrast, of the nine Young Israel synagogues in Queens, only three, or 33 per cent, have Yeshiva University rabbis.

The general move to the right was perhaps more pronounced in Young Israel than elsewhere because of the influence of Dr. Samson Weiss, who served as national director of that organization from 1945 to 1956, when he moved to UOJC. It is best illustrated by the changing emphasis in Young Israel programs. The current topic of debate is whether the movement should halt its expansion efforts and concentrate instead on raising
its level of education and observance. The movement has increasingly looked toward the rashe yeshivot of the right-wing yeshivot for leadership. Its national director, Rabbi Ephraim Sturm, addressing the 1963 convention, urged a united Orthodox front which would look to the gedole Torah, the heads of the various yeshivot, for direction, and be bound by their decisions not only on purely halakhic matters, but also on nonlegal matters. In recent years one synagogue has gone so far as to abolish the practice of calling to the Torah on Saturday mornings in its main sanctuary, those who do not observe the Sabbath.

Nevertheless, Young Israel has not lost its old character entirely. It still elicits a loyalty from its membership which transcends congregational attachment. Nor has the Council of Young Israel Rabbis been entirely successful in transforming many quasi-official practices. Contrary to the Council's official policy, for example, many congregations sponsor, at least unofficially, mixed dancing. Finally, changes within the adult group appear to have had little impact on the youth. The Intercollegiate Council of Young Adults, with about 1,000 members, has, in contrast to Yavneh, continued to be an essentially social organization, notwithstanding its joint efforts with Yavneh to sponsor kosher facilities on a few college campuses.

Religious Zionists of America (RZA)

The Religious Zionists of America came into being as the result of a merger in 1957 of the two Orthodox Zionist adult male groups in the United States—Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi. The women's organization of each group, as well as their respective youth groups, Mizrachi Hatzair and Bnei Akiva, have remained separate.

There are no reliable RZA membership figures. Figures of 30,000 and higher are quoted by official representatives, but other observers estimate the number at under 20,000. The organization's budget is in the neighborhood of $250,000, of which about $25,000 goes to the National Council for Torah Education (Wa'ad Ha-hinnukh Ha-torani).

RZA attracts an Orthodox Jew similar to the Young Israel members, and there is a large overlapping membership. Its most active officers and members are themselves rabbis but they play little role in the organization as rabbis. Spiritually, RZA looks to Rabbi Soloveitchik for leadership, and, as in the RCA, his influence has increased in recent years as he has become more outspoken on contemporary issues. A measure of his influence in RZA is that although many of its leaders were embar-
rassed by his criticisms in 1963 of the State of Israel on the missionary question, none publicly expressed his misgivings.

RZA gives political, social, and philanthropic support to Israel and to the Israeli National Religious party, with which it is affiliated. It also engages in Zionist activities in the United States and publishes a monthly magazine *Jewish Horizon* on contemporary topics, a Yiddish monthly *Mizrachi Weg*, and a Hebrew-language journal *Or Hamizrach*.

The National Council for Torah Education, which publishes two semi-annual journals, *Bitaon Chemed* in Hebrew and *Yeshiva Education* in English, is one of the two major national organizations involved in Orthodox education. The council organizes and serves day schools and Talmud Torahs. It provides a variety of educational services, assistance in teacher placement, and sponsorship of the National Association for Orthodox Education. Its stress is on Israel, Zionism, and the study of Hebrew, and it is identified with a positive approach toward secular education.

It is not clear how many day schools are actually affiliated with the National Council. It claims to have been instrumental in organizing 85, but credit is often difficult to establish. Certainly, not all of those 85 day schools are affiliated with the National Council, but the parent body does not confine its services to affiliated schools. Whatever the number of affiliates, they are fewer than those of Torah Umesorah, the other national educational agency to be discussed below.

**Yeshiva University**

The one institution most prominently identified with modern Orthodoxy is Yeshiva University. Indeed, the very growth of the university bespeaks the increasing concern of Orthodoxy with problems of the non-Orthodox community, both Jewish and non-Jewish. Beginning as the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS), Yeshiva University has developed or acquired 17 schools and divisions, including a new West Coast center in Los Angeles. This tremendous growth has occurred since 1940 under the leadership of its president, Samuel Belkin, who has remained singularly exempt from the public criticism directed against Yeshiva University by many in the Orthodox world. The university engages in a host of activities, including sponsorship of three Jewish periodicals and a semi-scholarly series of monographs in Judaica, "Studies in Torah Judaism." Among its other divisions are a Hebrew Teachers Institute for men and another for women, a liberal-arts college for men and one for women, graduate schools of education, social work, and science,
and a medical school. The relation of some of its divisions to Orthodoxy has, at best, become tenuous. Interestingly, however, the brunt of the right-wing Orthodox attack against the institution has not been against the secular divisions but rather against the college and the Jewish divisions associated with it.

Students at the all-male college (we are not discussing Stern College for Women) are required, in addition to their regular college program, to enrol in one of three Jewish study programs; RIETS, with almost exclusive stress on Talmud and preparation for entering the three-year semikhah (ordination) program upon completion of undergraduate studies; the Teachers Institute for Men, with heavy stress on Talmud but a varied curriculum of Bible, history, literature, etc., all taught in Hebrew, and a Jewish-studies program for students with little or no background in Jewish studies.

The last program has been the most dramatically successful. In 1964, in its ninth year, it admitted 100 freshmen (the men's college has a total of about 750 students). The program is adapted to the needs of the students, most of whom are from non-Orthodox homes. It is led by a group of sympathetic and dedicated teachers, who produce, at the end of four years, reasonably well-educated (certainly by American Jewish standards), observant, committed Jews. Some graduates continue their studies in Hebrew and Talmud, transferring to RIETS or going on for further study in Israel. Even the severest critics of Yeshiva University have acclaimed the remarkable success of this program and are inclined to concede that no other institution within Orthodoxy is equipped to do a comparable job. The program's impact on American communities is only beginning to be felt, but inevitably its graduates will assume positions of responsibility. (In contrast to the Jewish-studies program is the Lubavitcher movement, which has also achieved a measure of success in winning youth to Orthodoxy but finds that these converts are often unable to reintegrate themselves effectively in the community from which they came.)

Contrary to popular opinion in the Orthodox world, neither the college nor RIETS espouses any particular philosophy or point of view within the Orthodox spectrum of opinion. RIETS, in particular, is almost a microcosm of the committed Orthodox world and includes among its instructors some who are out of sympathy with secular education. Both the strength and weakness of the institution, no doubt, derive from this eclectic philosophic attitude. Within its walls the whole constellation of Orthodox ideologies contend. It is probably true, however, that were
Yeshiva University to impose a definite direction, it would have the most profound repercussions within the Orthodox world. There are close to 1,000 Yeshiva University rabbinic alumni; 33 rabbis were graduated in 1963, and 28 in 1964. In 1964, 373 graduates held pulpits in nominally Orthodox congregations, 95 were in Jewish education, 65 in Jewish communal work, and 69 on the university's faculty and administrative staff. In addition, a large number of graduates of the Hebrew Teachers Institutes (for both men and women) served the Jewish community in educational and administrative positions.

As in RCA and RZA, the preeminent personality at Yeshiva University is Rabbi Soloveitchik, who teaches Talmud. At the university, however, his leadership in communal matters is not necessarily accepted by the other Talmud instructors, many of whom have also achieved eminence in the world of Talmud learning. Besides, President Belkin, a scholar in his own right, stands forth as an independent personality. Belkin, however, has been elevated above controversy in recent years and the students' image of him is somewhat hazy.

In addition to its purely educational functions, the university plays a major role in the Jewish community through its Community Service Division. The division is responsible for rabbinic and teacher placement, conducts adult-education and extension courses, provides educational services to many Talmud Torahs and youth groups, sponsors seminars for teenagers throughout the United States, and has had a hand, together with the Rabbinic Alumni Association, in sponsoring Camp Morasha, a summer camp which opened in 1964, patterned on the Conservative Ramah camps but with an Orthodox orientation.

Powered by a large staff of experienced professionals, CSD has become increasingly important as a source of information and assistance for other Orthodox bodies. Its placement activities, in particular, have so strengthened the Rabbinic Alumni that rabbis from other Orthodox yeshivot have sought (and been granted) associate membership in that association.

Although CSD places rabbis in non-Orthodox congregations, it draws the line at those affiliated with either the Conservative or Reform movement. It also has a relatively new policy of not placing rabbis in congregations which have lowered their standards of Orthodoxy. This is subject to differing interpretations. Although CSD's prominence made it the target of attack for alleged lack of Orthodox standards, few people contend that other yeshivot have higher standards for placing graduates. The point is made, however, that Yeshiva University, unlike other Or-
thodox institutions, operates from a position of prestige and financial strength, and therefore has no need to compromise. Of course, these are relative terms. With an annual operating budget of almost $30 million, a capital-fund budget of $65 million, and a deficit of $10 million, Yeshiva administrators are not always certain they can negotiate from a position of strength. CSD justifies placing rabbis in synagogues which do not conform to Orthodox standards not only as expedient but also as the only real means of bringing Jews back to Orthodoxy. It can also point to the fact that in the last few years its standards have become far more explicit and tighter than they ever were in the past, although they are still not satisfactory to a significant group of Orthodox leaders.

There are a number of people on the faculty and in the administration who are critical of Yeshiva University for other reasons. They complain about a certain intellectual complacency, an absence of thought and purpose. They feel that Yeshiva has failed not so much in providing religious standards as in providing intellectual standards. They contend that Yeshiva at times lacks a degree of Jewish and Orthodox self-respect—that there is evidence that Jewish studies and Jewish scholars are not accorded the support and distinction they deserve. The college, in particular, is criticized for not introducing courses with more specifically Jewish content; of having excessive pride in the number of its graduates who win awards, prizes, and fellowships to other graduate schools (the proportion is indeed phenomenally high), and of not taking sufficient interest in those who wish to specialize in Jewish scholarship. Nevertheless, this group of generally young and aggressive personnel remain loyal to the university as the single greatest hope for a resurgence of tradition and, indeed, the survival of American Judaism.

**Hebrew Theological College (Jewish University of America)**

The Hebrew Theological College, in Skokie, near Chicago, Ill., resembles Yeshiva University in many respects, although it is much smaller and its impact more regional. Established in 1921, it has ordained a total of 335 rabbis, of whom an estimated 185 are in the practicing rabbinate. However, its rabbinical program has declined in the last decade, and in 1963 only 8 rabbis were ordained and 11 teachers certified. The college has a secular division attached to it and is currently in the midst of a $5-million capital-expansion effort. Its 1964 budget was slightly over $500,000.
Sephardi Community

There are an estimated 25,000 Sephardim and 63 known Sephardi congregations—congregations which do not follow the Ashkenazi form of worship or are not of Ashkenazi descent—in the United States. They are largely of Spanish and Portuguese, Syrian, Greek, Egyptian, North African, and Yugoslav origin.

The Spanish and Portuguese, whose origin in the United States predates that of all other American Jews, are the most prestigious, and the leading Sephardi congregation is the famous Spanish and Portuguese Shearith Israel of New York. In 1963 the chief rabbi or Hakham of the Sephardi community of the British Commonwealth, Rabbi Solomon Gaon, was also made a rabbi of Shearith Israel, and given the responsibility for the school and authority in all matters of religious law.

Unlike the members of the large Spanish and Portuguese congregations, like Shearith Israel and Mikveh Israel of Philadelphia, Pa., those of most other Sephardi congregations are predominantly first-generation Americans. All Sephardi congregations appear to share a strong sub-ethnic commitment to their form of worship (which differs from one group of congregations to the other), and a relative neglect of private ritual observance. (Thus, even the lay leadership of the Sephardi congregations tend to be quite lax in their religious practice. However, this has in no way affected the intensity of their desire to retain the traditional Sephardi public ritual.) The Syrians, with eight congregations in the Bensonhurst section of Brooklyn, constitute one such self-sufficient community under the leadership of their chief rabbi, Jacob Kassin. Under the initiative of Shearith Israel and its present rabbi emeritus, David de Sola Pool, a Union of Sephardic Congregations was created in 1927, but with Rabbi Pool's retirement in 1956 the organization declined. The possibility of its revitalization rests on the development of more widespread acceptance of Rabbi Gaon as spiritual leader for all Sephardi congregations in the United States.

As a minority within the American Jewish community, the Sephardi congregations face the problems of cultural dilution. Without facilities to train their own rabbis, and more importantly their own hazzanim (leaders of the religious service), they face danger of extinction. In 1962 they turned to Yeshiva University, which initiated a program (financed by the Sephardi community) to train religious leaders for them. (Ner Israel in Baltimore and the Mirrer Yeshiva in Brooklyn have also attracted some Sephardi students.) The Yeshiva University program is under the official
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direction of Rabbi Gaon. Its success depends to a large extent on its ability to recruit college-age students from within the Sephardi community.

SECTARIANS

Jewish sectarianism, unlike that of many Protestant groups, results not from the beliefs of the membership but mostly from a differing strategy as to the best way of maintaining the tradition. Thus, an organization such as Agudath Israel, which is essentially a sectarian group in the United States, was deeply involved in problems and activities of a Jewish and even a general political nature in Eastern Europe. In the United States, on the other hand, they have felt that communal participation with other Jewish groups would perforce involve a recognition of the legitimacy of non-Orthodox religious groups and institutions.

With few exceptions, the sectarian camp is of lower income, poorer education, and more recent immigration than the modern Orthodox. The world of sectarian Orthodoxy is preeminently a yeshivah world, and its leaders are the *rashe yeshivot* and a few prominent hasidic rebbes. It is a mistake to think, as many even within Orthodoxy do, that the Orthodox world which has been created in this country is a replica of the European or even East European one. In fact, the *rashe yeshivot* have achieved a degree of authority in this country unparalleled in Eastern Europe, in good part because there is no counterweight to this authority here in the *shrot rov* or communal rabbi, as there was in Europe.

The years before and immediately after the Second World War brought to the United States an influx of Orthodox immigrants far more militant than those who had come earlier. They found in this country an Orthodox community largely composed of residual Orthodox and under the ostensibly leadership of communal rabbis who seemed to be in despair about
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the future of Orthodoxy and convinced of the necessity for compromise. They found institutions such as kashrut in the hands of people whom they considered as unreliable or careless. They found a bare handful of day schools and a Yeshiva University or RCA ready to accommodate themselves to secular culture. They found almost no institutions with total commitment to the Torah life which had been their world.

They began by creating their own institutions or taking over the few existing ones which they found acceptable. The first step was the creation and expansion of yeshivot.

In 1941 Rabbi Aaron Kotler, rosh yeshivah of Kletzk in Polish Lithuania, famous as a Talmud scholar and Orthodox leader, arrived in the United States intending to spend a short time here and then move on to Palestine. A handful of Orthodox Jews persuaded him to stay in the United States to build Torah institutions. Reb Aharon, as he was known in the Orthodox world, assembled 20 students, mostly graduates of American yeshivot, many already ordained as rabbis, and established the Beth Medrash Govoha of America, in Lakewood, N.J., now also known as the Rabbi Aaron Kotler Institute for Advanced Learning (the first kolel in the United States). His choice of site was a deliberate attempt to isolate his students from American life and facilitate total concentration on the study of Talmud. Within a few years he was joined by some former students from Europe; by 1946 registration had risen to 100, and by 1964 to over 200.

Reb Aharon’s conviction was that Torah could grow and be “experienced” in America only through lernen (“learning”—in the parlance of the Orthodox world, studying Talmud). According to one of Reb Aharon’s former students, only “sharing the experience of the halakhic process could enable the Jew to understand the heartbeat of Judaism.” The student at Lakewood lived on a small subvention from the yeshivah and whatever other financial help he got from his family or wife. Students sat and learned for as long as they wished. When they felt ready to leave the yeshivah, they left. By 1964, 90 of its former students were teachers of Talmud, 21 were school administrators, and 42 were practicing rabbis.

Reb Aharon, himself, did not confine his activity to Lakewood. He engaged in a multitude of activities where his point of view gained recognition. He served as a rosh yeshivah in Israel, became the head of Chinuch Atzmai (Hinnukh ‘Atzmai the independent, religious, Agudath Israel-oriented school system in Israel) upon its founding in 1952, leader of

---

48 For a biographical sketch see Alex J. Goldman, Giants of Faith; Great American Rabbis (New York, 1964), pp. 257–73.
Agudath Israel in 1952, and chairman of the rabbinical administrative board of Torah Umesorah, the National Society for Hebrew Day Schools in the United States, in 1945. Though (interestingly enough) a poor fund raiser in contrast to some other rashe yeshivot, Reb Aharon elicited tremendous passion and dedication from those who came in contact with him. He brooked no compromise, nor did he ever question or seem to doubt his own path. He was a preeminently charismatic leader.

The influence of Reb Aharon and like thinkers extended to the higher yeshivot in the United States, except for Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. Thus, older institutions like Yeshivah Torah Vodaath, with its own famous menahel (principal) Shragai Mendlowitz, or Yeshivah Rabbi Chaim Berlin under Rabbi Isaac Hutner, were caught up in the emphasis on lernen and separatism. In 1944 Rabbi Mendlowitz founded the Beth Medrash Elyon in Monsey, N.Y., at first called Esh Dat ("Fire of Religion"), as a pilot institute for training Jewish educators to found and staff the day-school movement. Within a short period the original idea was abandoned and the institution was reorganized to make it similar to the one in Lakewood.

**Advanced Yeshivot**

At the heart of the sectarian Orthodox world are all the post-high-school yeshivot except Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. There are today approximately 4,000 men studying Talmud intensively at yeshivot on a post-high-school level. Of these, about 825 or 20 per cent were at Yeshiva University or the Hebrew Theological College. According to the latest available figures from the 31 higher yeshivot in the United States, more than 250 graduates were ordained annually (not all 31 yeshivot give ordination); about 15 per cent of ordinations were from Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. About 600 of all post-high-school students were older than 24; and many of them were married. Many were organized in kolelim, which permitted them to spend the entire day studying Talmud while receiving a subvention of about $50 a week from the yeshivah. Most of the students in the kolelim have already been ordained or have no intention of obtaining a rabbinical degree which, in fact, has a practical value only for purposes of becoming a practicing rabbi. (Many European rashe
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49 Now known as Rabbi Mendlowitz, the former principal of Torah Vodaath used to refuse to use the title of Rav. His stress on the importance of Hebrew grammar and of pedagogy made him a unique figure in the yeshivah world.

50 Figures are either from interviews or as submitted to CJFWF. All figures were for 1963–64 or later. See the Appendix.
yeshivot never had semikhah, which is simply a certificate attesting one's competence to decide questions of Jewish law. A scholar of renown needed no such certificate.) The very process of learning Talmud is a raison d'être and way of life to these men, who eventually will become rashe yeshivot and teachers of Talmud.

Graduates of the sectarian yeshivot provide the major source of staff for the day-school movement. Many of these graduates, including those with ordination, avoid the rabbinate because they neither wish nor are able to serve predominantly non-observant Orthodox memberships. By choice and absence of alternative they enter the less prestigious and more poorly paid field of Jewish education. Students from Lakewood itself have established five institutions of intensive Jewish learning at the high-school level in different parts of the United States.

Yeshivah graduates who enter Jewish education frequently supplement their talmudic training at college evening sessions, and some even take graduate courses in education. But contrary to their hopes and expectations, many of them are unprepared for the world they enter. Outside the walls of the yeshivah they meet new problems of both a secular and Jewish nature. Furthermore, there is no organization that speaks in their idiom, capable of providing help and direction for them. They continue to regard lernen as the highest end, but have no direction in living life short of that end. Of course this is a problem for all yeshivah graduates, not only those who choose Jewish education as their vocation. As true sectarians, they reject the communal Orthodox institutions surrounding them; their only source of leadership and guidance remains their rosh yeshivah.

Some yeshivah graduates do, of course, enter the rabbinate. This is a most dangerous course for a sectarian, and each has to make his own compromise with the world. A small proportion serve Reform congregations; more serve Conservative congregations, usually the smaller, less successful ones, which pay the smaller salaries. Of the majority who serve Orthodox congregations some make their peace with modern Orthodoxy, join RCA, associate themselves with the Yeshiva University Rabbinic Alumni, and are indistinguishable from Yeshiva University graduates. A few have chosen to remain isolated from the larger camp of Orthodox rabbis and are organized in the Iggud Ha-rabbanim (Rabbinical Alliance of America), to be discussed below.

We can consider now the institutions of the yeshivah or sectarian world, bearing in mind that the most sectarian (exclusive of the hasidim) are the least organized and simply continue to revolve in the orbit of their
rashe yeshivot. We should also note that even the sectarian organizations' involvement in communal activity is not at all a reflection of the rank and file's interests or wishes.

*K'hal Adath Jeshurun (Breuer Community)*

Much of the preceding discussion does not apply to K'hal Adath Jeshurun. The Breuer community, in Washington Heights, named for its rabbinic leader, represents the continuation in the United States of the separatist Orthodox community in Frankfurt established in 1849 and led by Samson Raphael Hirsch after 1851. The establishment of Hirsch's separatist community is a fascinating story but not of direct concern here. The New York community, established in 1940, now has over 700 affiliated families and 1,300 adult members, mostly of German origin, and provides a day school, high school, and advanced classes in Talmud for its graduates, who, in the German tradition, are encouraged to attend college. The community sponsors a mikveh and provides rabbinical supervision for a host of butchers, bakers, and other food processors in the area. The leadership has maintained the strong anti-Zionism of the German period and is publicly identified with Agudath Israel.

Unlike the East Europeans, the German Orthodox separatists had already made a successful accommodation to western culture before emigrating to the new world; secular education was, indeed, a positive good in the Hirschian philosophy of Judaism. The leaders of the Breuer community might well have expected that, as the most acculturated and economically comfortable but also strictly observant and rigidly disciplined Orthodox institution in the United States, their point of view would sweep American Orthodoxy. Instead, although the community has been quite successful in establishing its own institutions, it has won few converts to its particular ideological position of both communal separatism and a positive acceptance of secular culture. On the contrary, it is on the defensive against the more parochial elements of Orthodoxy.

In part, of course, this is a result of its own decision. As a tiny minority in this country it was faced with the choice of identifying itself communally with Yeshiva University, its neighbor in Washington Heights, and the world of modern Orthodoxy, or with the European yeshivah world with which it had been aligned in Europe. It chose the latter. But in Europe, boundaries and distances separated the followers of Hirsch from the world of the Mirrer or Telshe yeshivot, where secular education was dis-
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couraged. Even so, there were signs just before the Nazi period that some of the best talent was attracted away from Germany by these and other Lithuanian-type yeshivot. In the United States this continues to be the problem. The Breuer community is forced to look outside its own ranks for educational staff, and some of its teachers and administrators have a negative attitude toward secular education. Its institutions are the envy of the Orthodox world, but its future as a doctrinal community is problematical. According to some observers, the Hirschian philosophy is repeated more by rote than understanding. Having lost the Hirschian faculty for Orthodox self-criticism, the Breuer community finds itself increasingly overwhelmed by the fervor of the yeshivah world, despite some inroads by modern Orthodoxy.

*National Society for Hebrew Day Schools (Torah Umesorah)*

Torah Umesorah is the largest national body serving Orthodox day schools. With an active affiliated membership of some 100 schools, the organization claims to serve all Orthodox day schools without regard to affiliation. Approximately 150 principals are associated with its National Conference of Yeshiva Principals and almost 100 local PTA's are affiliated with its National Association of Hebrew Day School Parent-Teachers Associations. Torah Umesorah’s annual budget is over $150,000. It publishes *Olomeinu*, a children’s magazine; *The Jewish Parent; Hamenahel*, a journal for principals, and various bulletins and newsletters.

Although Torah Umesorah is staffed by one of the most competent groups of professionals in the Orthodox world, it is, nevertheless, a small body, which must operate within a framework created by rashe yeshivot who are somewhat disengaged from contemporary problems, a lay group of officials who tend to be rather uncritical, and a corps of teachers many of whom are untrained. A rabbinical administrative board, composed almost entirely of rashe yeshivot; officially dictates Torah Umesorah policy. The board was formerly led by Rabbi Aaron Kotler; since 1962 Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky of Torah Vodaath has been chairman.

An insight into the composition of the lay leadership of Torah Umesorah is made possible by an analysis of its annual awards. Of the 19 awards given to lay leaders in 1963, 18 went to Americans. Of these, nine lived in New York City, and nine outside the city. Of those from New York, seven were contributors to the Lakewood Yeshiva, and/or Chinuch Atzmai, and/or the Beth Jacob schools (a network of girls’ schools with an Agudath Israel orientation). Only one award winner was a contributor to or participant in communally-oriented activities. Of the
nine award recipients outside New York, only one was a contributor to the Orthodox institutions indicated above, and eight were contributors to or participants in such communally-oriented activities as Zionist, Israeli, and UJA causes, local communal groups, and UOJC. Notwithstanding the distribution of awards between New York City and "out of town," control of the New York-centered organization is naturally in the hands of a New York or New York-oriented leadership.

In an attempt to raise the technical and ideological level of Hebrew educators, Torah Umesorah instituted teacher-training programs at Ner Israel in Baltimore in 1961 and at Torah Vodaath and Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem in New York City in 1962 and 1964, respectively, and has cooperated with a training program of the Telshe yeshivah in Cleveland since 1964.

According to Torah Umesorah, there were in 1964 about 300 Orthodox day schools with 56,000 pupils in the United States and Canada. Some day schools had only a few grades, and a few only a kindergarten. According to data compiled by Alvin Schiff of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, there were 257 Orthodox day schools in the United States in 1963, of which 132 were in Greater New York (97 elementary schools and 35 high schools) and 125 outside (94 elementary schools and 31 high schools). Figures given in this article are based upon Dr. Schiff's study, but in any case the number of day schools continues to grow. In 1935 there had been 16 day schools in New York and one in Baltimore; in 1944, 33 and 12, and in 1948 there were 56 and 55.

A number of New York City schools are in neighborhoods of declining Jewish population. This has constricted enrolment and created severe financial problems. In many day schools outside New York, too, the financial problem is critical. Often this is the consequence of inadequate community support. Sometimes the Orthodox financial base is too narrow to support the schools independently, and the wider Jewish community, as represented by federations and non-Orthodox rabbis, often demands too great a voice in school policy to make its support acceptable. The situation differs from one community to another. In many areas, as long as the secular department of the day school functions well, community support is forthcoming. But where the Orthodox base of a com-

52 I am indebted to Dr. Schiff for permission to see a draft of his forthcoming book, The Jewish Day School in the United States, to be published by the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

53 This situation may change with the growing antagonism of Conservative leaders toward the ideology of the Orthodox day schools, but to date the Conservatives themselves have been handicapped by their own rabbis' unwillingness to
munity is quite small, day schools find difficulty in pursuing a policy of intensive Orthodoxy within the institutions’ walls while projecting the image of a broad Jewish communal institution deserving of non-Orthodox support from without. In addition, while the non-Orthodox parent may be indifferent to the ideological content of the day-school program, he is not indifferent to the general personality, characteristics, and attitudes of the day-school Hebrew teacher, who is himself often the product of an “other-worldly” environment and a yeshivah where secular education was downgraded.

Of course, not all Orthodox day schools are within the orbit of Torah Umesorah, nor are they all of the same type. There are 28 hasidic day schools... found mostly in the well populated areas of New York City—notably Williamsburg and Crown Heights and Boro Park to a lesser extent—now predominantly inhabited by followers of the leading Hasidic “Rebbeyim”. The major emphasis in these schools is upon preserving the distinct philosophy and way of living of the Hassidic group to which the pupils belong. Personal piety, with the particular and unique manner of observance of the Hassidic sect, is stressed. Attention to general studies is secondary. Generally, these are studied only until the end of the compulsory school age.54

Within New York City, the language of instruction carries definite ideological overtones. Schools which stress Yiddish are primarily designed to prepare boys for advanced Talmud study, because Yiddish is generally the language of instruction in the advanced yeshivot. In addition, Rabbi Kotler is reported to have had particularly strong feelings for Yiddish and to have urged principals to abandon the use of Hebrew and substitute Yiddish instead. There are 31 elementary, non-hasidic, Yiddish-speaking schools in New York City and 19 such high schools, or a total of 50 Orthodox Yiddish day schools. The schools whose Jewish studies are in Hebrew are more likely to be of the modern Orthodox type, placing greater emphasis on Israel and some modern Hebrew literature. The current tendency is toward the use of the Sephardi (or rather, Israeli) pronunciation, although those traditional yeshivot which use He-

54 Joseph Kaminetsky, “Evaluating the Program and Effectiveness of the All-Day Jewish School,” Jewish Education, Winter 1956–1957, p. 41. Part of the material in this section is drawn from the same article by Torah Umesorah’s national director.
brew as a language of instruction, such as the Beth Jacob schools for girls, teach the Ashkenazi pronunciation. There are 41 Hebrew-speaking Orthodox elementary schools in New York and 11 such high schools, for a total of 52 Orthodox Hebrew day schools. (Two elementary schools and one high school teach Jewish studies in English.) Of the 50 Yiddish-speaking schools in New York City, only two are coeducational, in keeping with the policy of such groups as Torah Umesorah’s rabbinical administrative board and the rashe yeshivot to segregate boys and girls after the fourth grade. (None of the 28 hasidic schools is coeducational.) Of the 52 Hebrew-speaking schools, 33 are coeducational, reflecting their more liberal outlook. It is fair to say that not quite half the New York City day schools are outside the orbit of the rashe yeshivot or the Hasidim.

Outside New York City, the division between Yiddish and Hebrew or coeducational and segregated schools is less meaningful, since there is no base of Yiddish-speaking parents, and segregating the sexes means, besides, to increase the financial burden of these generally smaller schools (average pupil enrolment 146, against 346 in New York). Thus, there are only 18 Yiddish-speaking schools outside New York City, and only 30 schools that are not coeducational.

Day-school enrolment as a percentage of total Jewish-school enrolment has grown steadily from two per cent in 1935 to nine per cent in 1964, and in Greater New York from seven per cent to 29 per cent. There is evidence, however, that day-school growth, measured as a percentage of total Jewish-school enrolment, is leveling off. There have been recent indications of a rise in high-school enrolment as a percentage of total day-school enrolment, at least in areas of large Jewish concentration. In other words, there has been no percentage increase in the number of children enrolled in day schools, but a greater percentage of elementary day-school graduates go on to Orthodox high schools. In Greater New York high-school enrolment, as a percentage of total day-school enrolment, has climbed from 14 per cent in 1956-57 to 22 per cent in 1963-64. While elementary-school enrolment barely grew in these years, even in absolute terms, high-school enrolment increased from 5,186 to 9,076, or 75 per cent. In no year was the increase less than 10 per cent.

Rabbinical Alliance of America (RAA; Iggud Ha-rabbanim)

The Rabbinical Alliance of America, founded in 1944, is composed of graduates of sectarian American yeshivot who were unwilling to affiliate with the Yeshiva University-dominated RCA and either were excluded from membership in the Agudat Ha-rabbanim by its semikhah require-
ments, or themselves rejected the Agudat Ha-rabbanim image. The first members of RAA were primarily from Torah Vodaath (with a few from Rabbi Jacob Joseph) and to this day placement for RAA rabbis is handled through Torah Vodaath under an arrangement reached in 1957-58, when RAA cut its formal ties with the yeshivah. Currently the membership numbers around 250, of whom about 100 are in the practicing rabbinate and most of the rest in Jewish education. Many of the practicing rabbis also teach part-time.

Structurally the organization is weak. It exists more because of dissatisfaction with the two other Orthodox rabbinic organizations than through any positive program of its own. It issues an occasional periodical, Perspective. Without a purposeful ideology and unable to compete with RCA in benefits or prestige, RAA is experiencing some difficulty. Its position has been further shaken by RCA's move to the right, but RAA still differentiates itself from that organization by its adherence to the separatist issur of the rashe yeshivot and its refusal to cooperate in mixed bodies of Conservative and Reform rabbis. Nevertheless, almost half the practicing rabbis in RAA are also affiliated with RCA. Spiritually the RAA is in the camp of the rashe yeshivot.

Agudath Israel

Agudath Israel was organized in the United States in 1939 as part of a worldwide movement, founded in Europe in 1912, which represented the largest organized force in the European Orthodox world before the Nazi period.

The widespread neglect of Agudah's growth in Europe by Jewish scholars has resulted, according to Agudah spokesmen, in a distortion of both the Agudah's position and of modern Jewish history. Historians and observers, particularly in the United States, have written from a viewpoint which regards modern Jewish history as an almost unbroken process of declining Orthodoxy and rising secularism, socialism, and Zionism. Such a perspective ruled out Orthodoxy as a subject of serious consideration, holding it to be bankrupt. Agudath Israel, on the other hand, without denying the tremendous inroads made by the non-Orthodox, contends that in the 1920s a counterrevolution began to take place in European Jewish life which was ended by the Nazi holocaust. That contemporary scholars have not even considered this claim may well be a reflection of their own biases and prejudices.55

55 Although there is undoubtedly a paucity of data regarding the Orthodox by comparison with such groups as the Bundists, the YIVO archives in New York City
In the light of its history, one might well ask why the organization has not become a more potent force among the Orthodox in the United States. The number of members is difficult to estimate, but undoubtedly falls below 20,000, many of whom are indifferent to Agudist ideology but become members automatically by virtue of their affiliation with Agudath Israel synagogues.

All observers are of the opinion that Agudah sympathizers and potential members outnumber those presently enrolled in the organization. There are a number of reasons why the organization has not been able to reach them. First of all, Agudah arrived relatively late in the United States. An effort to establish the organization in 1922 had failed. However, the Zeirei Agudath Israel (Agudah youth) predated the parent body. It was established in 1921, and by 1940 had seven flourishing chapters in New York City, one in Philadelphia, and one in Baltimore. Much of the potential leadership talent did not join the parent organization until 1949, when the adult group forced a resolution requiring that no one above the age of 28 or married could remain affiliated with the youth organization. The adult body, however, was never able to develop the élan and social program that were so attractive to the youth.

A second and more important reason for Agudah's weakness stems from the depoliticalization and sectarianism of the yeshivot. Reb Aharon and the other rashe yeshivot who were leaders in Agudah trained a younger generation to value only one activity, lernen. The result was a devaluation of and contempt for political and societal activity in the Jewish community. Thus, the yeshivah students who might have formed the nucleus for a revitalized Agudah never joined the organization; nor has the organization ever become an active communal force. Its youth organization, now firmly under the control of the parent organization, avoids controversial topics of communal concern within the Orthodox community and confines its local activities to lernen. This, however, is hardly

have an abundance of source material on the subject, much of which is simply ignored. In 1937 there were 192,000 students in Jewish schools in Poland, including vocational, Hebrew-Polish, Zionist, Yiddishist, Labor Zionist, Mizrahi, and Agudath Israel schools. (See Miriam Eisenstein, Jewish Schools in Poland, 1919-1939 [New York 1950], p. 96.) Of these, 85,000 were in Agudah schools and 15,000 more were in yeshivot. Furthermore, Agudah schools were the most rapidly growing of all Jewish schools. Nevertheless, Eisenstein devotes some 70 per cent of her study to the Yiddish and Zionist schools and only about ten per cent in a chapter titled "The Ultraorthodox and Orthodox Schools," to Agudath Israel schools.

an attractive program to young people who spend most of their time in a yeshivah where the level of lernen is likely to be as high if not higher.

In an effort to reach the new generation of yeshivah graduates and educate them politically, Agudah undertook in 1963 the publication of an English-language monthly, Jewish Observer. It is significant that Yiddish was no longer felt to be an adequate medium of communication for this world. (Agudah has published a Yiddish monthly, Dos Yiddishe Vort, since 1952). Jewish Observer has had limited success. It has either failed or refused to enlist writers who might have aired controversial issues from which a positive Agudist position could emerge. The journal has with one exception avoided any discussion that might be offensive to any group within Agudah, and it even failed to report the sharp differences which emerged at the Kenesiyah gedolah, the international convention of Agudath Israel held in Jerusalem in 1964.

At the head of Agudath Israel stands the Mo'etset gedole ha-Torah (the Council of Torah Authorities) formerly led by Rabbi Kotler and, since 1962, by Rabbi Moses Feinstein. The extent to which the Mo'etsah actually makes policy for Agudah, at least in the United States, is problematical. Officially, all controversial questions on issues of a public character, whether of a halakhic or non-halakhic nature, are decided by that body. Groups both to the left and the right of Agudah charge that the Mo'etsah is simply a front for the professional and lay leadership—that the rabbinic sages are so removed from practical affairs that they permit themselves to be led by others. This is probably an injustice to the rabbinical leadership. It is inconceivable that men who individually spend hours deciding matters of halakhic minutiae would be indifferent to questions which they feel are of national and even international concern. What is more likely, however, is the opposite, at least in the United States. The Mo'etsah is handicapped by the absence of controversy. It can respond only to problems that are raised. It can act effectively only in the context of a dialogue in which its wisdom is confronted with practical exigencies and demands of the hour—in which its decisions must be weighed by practical consequences. Agudah, in the United States, has been a sectarian organization which has not challenged its own leadership and consequently has not obtained a measure of response.

Po'ale Agudath Israel (Workers of Agudath Israel)

The American section of Po'ale Agudath Israel, which exists as an independent political party in Israel, has never been an effective competitor to Agudath Israel in the United States. Its pro-Israel sympathies and
positive social program might have captured the more energetic and youthful Agudists, but the organization has lacked the sanction of the rashe yeshivot. It has remained a small group in the United States, oriented primarily to its parent body in Israel.

**Hasidim**

As noted above, the original Hasidim represented a sectarian element in Jewish life. A variety of factors contributed to the rise of hasidism in the 18th century, but a discussion of its early period and its doctrines and religious expressions lies beyond the scope of this paper. We note only that the enmity between the Hasidim and the Lithuanian mitnaggedim was quite bitter. The Hasidim, with their particular doctrinal stresses and their original deemphasis on talmudic learning, were considered by many to lie perilously close to the outer limits of normative Judaism.

The rise of the Enlightenment, Jewish socialism, and secular Zionism occasioned a reinterpretation by the mitnaggedim of hasidic behavior as an aspect of piety rather than rebellion. By the 20th century there were strong ties between the Hasidim and mitnaggedim which resulted, finally, in the joint participation of many of their leaders in Agudath Israel.

In the United States a further blurring of ideological differences between Hasidim and mitnaggedim has occurred because most Hasidim retain little that makes them doctrinally unique among ultra-pious Jews. Although they cling tenaciously to some of their special customs and generally retain their traditional European dress, with few exceptions they cannot be distinguished ideologically from the rashe yeshivot. The one constant that remains is the notion of the rebbe or hasidic leader, to whom the followers attribute extraordinary qualities and around whom they cluster.

**Habad, the Lubavitcher Movement**

The best-known Hasidim are, of course, the followers of the Lubavitcher Rebbe.\(^{57}\) It is impossible to estimate their number because, unlike

\(^{57}\) A sympathetic portrayal of the Lubavitcher movement and a description of their rebe and his followers is presented by a Reform rabbi in two articles: Herbert Weiner, "The Lubavitcher Movement," *Commentary*, March and April 1957. Descriptions of other hasidic groups in the United States and Israel, which attempt to capture the essence of their religious meaning and attraction, are found in other articles by Weiner. See, for example, his "Dead Hasidim," *ibid.*, March and May 1961 and "Braslav in Brooklyn," *Judaism*, Summer 1964. There is a vast literature on Hasidism and the Lubavitcher movement in particular by both observers and followers. See for example publications of their former Rebbe, Joseph I. Schneersohn, *Some Aspects of Chabad Chassidism* (New York, 1944) and *Outlines of the Social and Communal Work of Chassidism* (New York, 1953).
other hasidic groups, they are not concentrated in any one area, organ-
ized formally, or affiliated with any one institution. The Lubavitcher
movement is in many respects the least sectarian of Orthodox groups al-
though doctrinally it is among the most faithful of all hasidic groups, to
the tenets of its founders. (It is also the most doctrinally sophisticated
and intellectually organized of all hasidic groups.) Its unique texts are
taught in its advanced yeshivot or in private groups, together with the
standard sacred religious texts shared by all Orthodox Jews.

The relationship of its followers to the Lubavitcher movement may
best be described as one of concentric circles around the Lubavitcher
Rebbe, Rabbi Menahem Mendel Schneersohn, with the inner circle lo-
cated predominantly, but not exclusively, in the Crown Heights section
of Brooklyn, where the Rebbe lives and the headquarters of the move-
ment is located.

Unlike other hasidic groups, the Lubavitcher have friends and sympa-
thizers, estimated by some members of the movement to be as many as
150,000, who far outnumber the immediate coterie of followers. The
overwhelming majority are said to be non-Orthodox. Many Jews seek
the Rebbe's advice on personal matters and accept him as a religious
guide, and he sees an estimated 3,000 people a year for personal inter-
views averaging 10 to 15 minutes in length.

There are 14 Lubavitcher day schools throughout the United States,
besides the Central Lubavitcher Yeshiva and the Beth Rivka school for
girls in New York. The total number of students in all Lubavitcher
schools is about 4,000.

Outside New York City students are often from families who have
little interest or concern for Orthodoxy, much less hasidic doctrine, but
are attracted by the negligible tuition rates and the custodial function
performed by the school. On the other hand, many followers of Habad,
within and outside the city, whose homes are not close to the schools,
make no particular effort to enrol their children.

The phenomenon of non-Orthodox Hasidim (President Zalman Shazar
of Israel is the outstanding example) is troublesome to many in the
Orthodox camp. They wonder how a presumably ultra-Orthodox leader
can find such affinity with and arouse such sympathy among unobservant
Jews, and whether he has not in fact compromised some essential de-
mands of Orthodoxy in order to attract this great following. The Luba-
vitcher movement, however, can only be understood on its own terms,
and it does in fact stand outside the Orthodox camp in many respects.
The movement does not recognize political or religious distinctions within Judaism. It has refused to cooperate formally with any identifiable organization or institution. It recognizes only two types of Jew, the fully observant and devout Lubavitcher Jew and the potentially devout and observant Lubavitcher Jew. This statement is often cited as a charming aphorism. In fact, it has tremendous social and political consequences. In every Jew, it is claimed, a spark of the holy can be found. The function of the Lubavitcher emissaries who are sent all over the world is to find that spark in each Jew and kindle it. From the performance of even a minor mitzvah, they argue, greater observance may follow. Thus, every Jew is recognized as sacred, but no Jew and certainly no institution outside the Lubavitcher movement is totally pure. Consequently the Lubavitcher movement can make use of allies for particular purposes without compromising its position. It can follow a policy of expediency because it never confers legitimacy on those with whom it cooperates.

One result is that sympathy for the Lubavitcher movement generally declines the further along the continuum of Orthodoxy one moves. The militantly Orthodox are continually disappointed by the independent policy which the movement pursues. This is partly due to the fact that the rashe yeshivot are from the tradition of the mitnaggedim who once bitterly opposed Hasidism and viewed its doctrines as heretical. Since the Lubavitcher are the most doctrinally faithful Hasidim, they would naturally encounter the greatest opposition. But in larger part, the antagonism is a result of the fact that Lubavitcher sectarianism is very different from other Orthodox sectarianism.

Judgment as to the success of the Lubavitcher movement depends on one's vantage point. It is indisputable that many Jews, previously untouched by Judaism, received their first appreciation of their religious faith through the missionary activity of Lubavitcher emissaries. Almost every week students from colleges all over the United States, totally removed from Judaism, visit the Central Lubavitcher Yeshiva in New York City under the prompting of a Lubavitcher representative who visited their campus. But some Orthodox observers question how many of these students who thus visit the yeshivah or pray with an etrog and lulav at the urging of a Lubavitcher representative, whom they encounter by chance on the street, in school, or in a hospital, are genuinely affected by their experience. Despite pride in its intellectual foundation, the Lubavitcher appeal today is almost exclusively emotional. More than any group in Orthodox and Jewish life, the movement offers solutions to
individual problems arising not only from the Jewish condition but from man's societal condition.

The strength of the Lubavitcher movement outside the United States is also impossible to ascertain. It is believed to have the only effective Jewish organization in the Soviet Union. Before Young Israel undertook a public campaign on behalf of Soviet Jewry, its leaders consulted the Lubavitcher Rebbe because of his acknowledged expertness on Soviet Jewry. When the question arose in 1964 whether the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry should undertake public demonstrations, many yeshivah youth, following the lead of Agudath Israel, argued that such activity would only provoke retaliation in the Soviet Union against the Jews. The student leaders consulted experts from Columbia University's Russian Institute on the point, but a decisive factor leading many students, at least at Yeshiva University, to join the demonstration was that the Rebbe did not express his disapproval.

The Rebbe continues to be accorded a certain universal deference within Orthodoxy that no other leader enjoys. When his mother died in 1964, both the Satmar Rebbe and Rabbi Soloveitchik were among those who came to "comfort the mourner." Few Orthodox Jews would expect the Lubavitcher Rebbe to do likewise in similar circumstances.

Despite the tremendous authority of the Rebbe, the Lubavitcher organization is administratively decentralized. The present Rebbe is the son-in-law of his predecessor Rabbi Joseph Schneersohn. Rabbi Schneersohn's other son-in-law, Rabbi Shemariah Gourary, exercises almost independent control of the school system. Other Lubavitcher activities, such as its publications department and youth program, are also relatively independent of one another. It is not clear to the writer whether this is by chance or design.

Klausenberger, Wischnitzer, and Other Hasidim

In addition to the Lubavitcher movement and the rebbes in the Satmar's orbit, to be discussed in the following section, there are two prominent hasidic groups which retain a strong measure of independence. The Klausenberger Hasidim, from Rumania, who still number between 200 and 300 families in the United States, have been leaving this country in growing numbers to follow their Rebbe to Israel, where he has established his own village. The Wischnitzer Rebbe, from Rumania, who has also established a center in Israel, participates in activities of Agudath Israel, with which his approximately 250 families in the United States are generally aligned. Other hasidic rebbes with followings that are
ideologically associated with Agudath Israel include the Bostoner, who went from Poland to Palestine and finally to New York, the Navominskier from Poland, and the Boyoner, Kapitshinitzer, and Bluzhever from Galicia.

**Satmar Hasidim and Their Allies**

The Satmar community is of Hungarian origin and is the most sectarian of all Orthodox groups in the United States. By the 19th century Hungarian Orthodox Jews had gained a reputation as the most zealous opponents of the non-Orthodox and as sponsors of a school system which introduced more intensive study of Talmud, and at an earlier age, than even the traditional Lithuanian-\textit{mitnagged} yeshivot. The community is governed by the Satmar Rebbe, Rabbi Joel Teitelbaum, head of the Central Rabbinical Congress and leader of religious and political communities which are not identical.

As rov of the religious \textit{kehilla} (community), Rabbi Teitelbaum is final arbiter in all matters of religious law. The \textit{kehilla} numbers about 1,200 families, located primarily in Williamsburg, with smaller branches in Boro Park and Crown Heights (all in Brooklyn).\footnote{There is no study on Satmar Hasidim \textit{per se}. For general studies of Hasidim in Williamsburg, much of which is applicable to the Satmar Hasidim, see George Kranzler, \textit{op. cit.;} Solomon Poll, \textit{op. cit.,} and Michael Cohn, ed., \textit{The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg, Brooklyn,} (New York: Brooklyn Childrens Museum, Occasional Papers in Cultural History, No. 4 [1963]).} Many of these families lost their rebbes to the Nazis and turned to the Satmar Rebbe when they came to the United States. The \textit{kehilla} provides a full complement of religious and social services to its members, including welfare institutions, schools, \textit{mikvaot}, bakeries, supervision over a variety of processed foods, and, informally, insurance and even pensions. It requires a high degree of religious conformity from its adherents, extending even to matters of dress.

The Satmar schools provide the most intensive Talmud training of all Orthodox day schools. Students begin their Jewish schooling at the age of three or four, and emphasis is on the amount of material covered. There are presently 3,500 boys and girls in the Satmar schools. Of these, some 2,200 are in the Williamsburg center.

As rebbe, political or societal arbiter, the Satmar's influence extends to a number of smaller hasidic groups of Hungarian origin, each with its own rov. These include such groups as the Tzelehmer, Szegeder, and Puper. The total, together with the Satmar's own \textit{kehilla}, is conserva-
tively estimated at 5,000 families.\footnote{The lowest figure was provided by a Satmar representative. Among those interviewed for this report the Satmar group was the only one whose own membership and school-enrolment estimates were lower than those hazarded by rival observers.} The Satmar Rebbe is also recognized as religious leader of the ultrasectarian Netore Karta of Jerusalem (AJYB, 1958 [Vol. 59], pp. 387–88) who number under 200 families.

The Satmar Rebbe is the leading advocate of isolation of the Orthodox and intensification of religious observance within the community of the faithful. Unlike other hasidic groups, the Satmar do not seek converts from among other Jews. The Rebbe is a strong opponent of the State of Israel and cooperation of any kind with the authorities in Israel. The pages of Der Yid, the Yiddish weekly of the community, reserves some of its bitterest attacks for Agudath Israel, which, they feel, has compromised its religious principles by acknowledging the State of Israel, joining the government at one point, and developing a network of schools which, though independent of the Israeli authorities, is under their partial supervision and receives some 85 per cent of its funds from them. The Satmar community is well-disciplined, and the word of the Rebbe is almost always authoritative, although he has refused to render opinions on some matters and has thereby opened the way to various interpretations.

On rare occasions he has even been frustrated by his community. He has, for example, long been seeking a tract of land outside of Williamsburg sufficiently large to accommodate his community. According to some observers, he has been prevented from doing so not only by technical difficulties but also by the unwillingness of the entire community to leave Williamsburg. A few years ago a mirror in his home was broken by some zealots who felt it unbecoming for a rebbe’s wife to use a mirror. Granted that the act had little support, it nevertheless indicated that even among the most ultra-Orthodox there were varying opinions about religious propriety.

The long-range impact of the Satmar community should not be minimized. Standing outside the mainstream of the communications network of even the Orthodox Jewish community, isolated from almost all Orthodox groups, it is easily ignored except when it erupts in some demonstration, such as picketing the Israeli consulate, which brings it to the public’s attention. With 5,000 families averaging perhaps seven or eight, the Satmar community today numbers between 35,000 and 40,000 individuals.

Although its attitude toward secular education is negative, some degree
of acculturation is inevitable. The community has recently opened lines of communication with some personalities in Agudat Ha-rabbanim and invited Rabbi Moses Feinstein to a conference of its rabbinic body. The Satmar Rebbe was one of the half-dozen prominent sectarian leaders who delivered a eulogy at the funeral of Rabbi Kotler, while Rabbi Soloveitchik, who also attended, was not asked to speak. Der Yid is now distributed more widely than ever before in the yeshivah world, in an obvious effort to win the sympathy of that community. If the kehillah is successful in retaining the enthusiasm of its youth, it will inevitably play a more prominent role in Jewish life, and increasing numbers of Jewish leaders will have to reckon with the Satmar Rebbe.

LEADERSHIP

Orthodox institutions, as essentially religious organizations, “must rely predominantly on normative powers [as distinct from coercive or remunerative powers] to attain both acceptance of their directives and the means required for their operation.” 60 Religious authority has been traditionally exercised charismatically. That is, the religious leader has been one able to “exercise diffuse and intense influence over the normative orientations of the actors.” 61 But according to the value system and traditional expectations of Orthodox Jews, charisma can inhere only in a Talmud scholar. Talmud scholarship is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the exercise of maximum religious leadership or for becoming a gadol (plural, gedolim). The nature of the gedolim has been defined as follows:

In Jewish life we rely completely on the collective conscience of the people that it will intuitively recognize its leaders and accept their teachings. There surely was no formal vote that thrust the Chofetz Chaim or Reb Chaim Ozer into world leadership. They emerged naturally.

There may be many [who] are recognized Torah scholars and yet they don’t attain this wide acclaim. There is some ingredient, that transcends scholarship alone or piety alone—that makes one a Godol. Obviously, these qualities of knowledge, erudition, and piety are basic. But, over and above these there is another that is crucial and that is what we generally describe as “Daas Torah.” . . . It assumes a special endowment or capacity to penetrate objective reality, recognize the

61 Ibid., p. 203.
facts as they "really" are, and apply the pertinent Halachic principles. It is a form of "Ruach Hakodesh," as it were, which borders if only remotely on the periphery of prophecy. . . . More often than not, the astute and knowledgeable community workers will see things differently and stand aghast with bewilderment at the action proposed by the "Godol." It is at this point that one is confronted with demonstrating faith in "Gedolim" and subduing his own alleged acumen in behalf of the Godol's judgment of the facts. 62

The notion of gedolim is, however, becoming increasingly institutionalized, at least for the sectarian Orthodox camp. Its first formal manifestation was in the establishment by Agudath Israel of its worldwide Mo'etset Gedole Ha-torah (Council of Torah Authorities). Rabbi Aaron Kotler, until he died in 1962, was the preeminent gedol ha-dor (gadol of the generation) for the yeshivah world. The fact that he also led the Mo'etsah did not add to his luster. Many, even in the Mizrachi camp or in the ultra-sectarian hasidic camp to the right of Agudath Israel, recognized his eminence. Besides serving as chairman of the Mo'etsah, he was chairman of Torah Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board and head of Chinuch Atzmai.

With Reb Aharon's death, the vacant posts had to be filled, putting the unity of the right-wing Orthodox world to the test. In the absence of a personality comparable to Reb Aharon's, would the successors to his offices inherit authority equal to or approximating his? Would, in other words, Reb Aharon's charisma of person pass to charisma of office? Could there be "routinized charisma," so essential to organizational equilibrium, at least among religious groups?

There are three potential successors to Reb Aharon's authority among the American rashe yeshivot. (Only rashe yeshivot would be eligible since only they possess the necessary qualification of Talmud scholarship.) The most prominent candidate is Rabbi Moses Feinstein, rosh yeshivah of Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem, who was elected chairman of the Mo'etsah and head of Chinuch Atzmai in 1962, but only vice-chairman of Torah's Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board. He is also one of five members of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim's presidium. Reb Mosheh is, as we noted, the leading posek (halakhic authority) of his generation. Within the world of authoritative posekim he is also the most lenient. His decisions, in fact, have bordered on the radical in departure from halakhic precedents to meet contemporary needs. However, greatness as

a posek has never by itself entitled a scholar to the highest reverence in the traditional world. Reb Mosheh is a retiring, modest, unassuming person, who, while acknowledging his role as a leader of Orthodox Judaism, none the less, unlike Reb Aharon, seeks a strong consensus on political and social questions (in contrast to religious-ritual-ethical questions) before acting.

The second outstanding rosh yeshivah is Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky of Torah Vodaath, chairman of Torah Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board and a member of the Mo'etsah. He is also a member of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim's presidium and rose to prominence in recent years after the death of Rabbi Mendlowitz, the menahel of Torah Vodaath, in 1948. In a sense Rabbi Kamenetzky was pushed forward to fill the leadership post which Rabbi Mendlowitz had already endowed with a degree of charismatic authority. There are few people today, outside Torah Vodaath, who feel that he could indeed unite the other rashe yeshivot and the Orthodox world around his personality or office.

Finally there is the iconoclast of the yeshivah world, Rabbi Isaac Hutner, rosh yeshivah of Chaim Berlin. Rav Hutner's authority over his own students is unique even for a rosh yeshivah. He remained in the shadow of Orthodox leadership until after Reb Aharon's death, when he emerged as a forceful spokesman on a number of issues. The hierarchical relationship between himself and the other rashe yeshivot has not yet been clarified, but Rabbi Hutner has adopted positions on some issues contrary to theirs. He disagreed with them, for example, on the handling of the missionary situation in Israel, the controversy between the Israeli and American Youth Pe'ilim (activists), and the question of secular education.

There is a younger, predominantly American-born group of rashe yeshivot who will be assuming positions of greater authority in a few years. Torah Umesorah has given them some expression in a newly formed group called mishnim (deputies), which takes a somewhat active role in areas of less than crucial policy importance. Its members are becoming increasingly well known in the Orthodox world, but whether they develop sufficient independence of thought or personality to capture the admiration of the modern Orthodox as well as the sectarians remains to be seen.

The characteristics of leadership in the modern Orthodox camp are similar to those of the sectarian Orthodox. The modern Orthodox counterpart to Reb Aharon is Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik (the Rov), and as long as the Rov remains active he will maintain his dominant
positions in such organizations as RCA, RZA, Yeshiva University Rabbinic Alumni, and to a lesser extent UOJC. The future leader of the modern Orthodox world is likely to be Rabbi Soloveitchik’s successor to the chairmanship of RCA’s halakhah commission, an office which the rabbi is endowing with charismatic authority. At one time Rabbi Soloveitchik might have achieved a comparable role as spiritual mentor in Young Israel, but he rejected their overtures. (Significantly, his brother, Rabbi Aaron Soloveichik, also a renowned Talmudic scholar, has come closer to the Young Israel recently and may possibly emerge as their religious authority. On the other hand, there is great reverence for Rabbi Hutner in the Young Israel movement and particularly in the Council of Young Israel rabbis.)

Unlike Reb Aharon, the Rov assumed his leadership position only gradually. Indeed, the sectarians often charge that he never really became a leader, but is simply a front for the modern Orthodox. If that was true at one time, it certainly is no longer so, although he has been thought to change his mind on enough issues to introduce a measure of uncertainty among his own followers as to where he stands on a number of matters.

To call the Rov the leader of modern Orthodoxy is not to imply that he is always comfortable in that camp or happy with that designation. Nevertheless, his position is sharply differentiated from the sectarian rashe yeshivot by his positive affirmation of many elements in Western civilization (he holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Berlin) and his willingness to operate in a modern Orthodox framework. But the Rov is also part of the traditional yeshivah world. Indeed, in recent years he has moved to the right and has become more outspoken in his criticism of certain aspects of life in Israel, in his own halakhic interpretations, and in his attitude toward rabbis serving synagogues with mixed seating. The Rov may be the leader of modern Orthodoxy, but he is not really modern Orthodox. Modern Orthodoxy has yet to produce a leader from its own ranks because it still continues to acknowledge mastery of the Talmud as a qualification for leadership and yet has refused to endorse, even at Yeshiva University, a restructuring of talmudic education that would encourage bright, inquisitive minds which lack the fundamentalist positions of the rashe yeshivot to undertake the many years of dedicated and arduous learning required to become a talmudic authority.

Day-to-day leadership of Orthodox organizations has been assumed by professionals, almost all of whom are rabbis. The role of the professional
is growing in importance, but the tremendous charismatic authority invested in the spiritual leader has contained the professional's image and often constrained his initiative.

The lay leader is left in a rather unfortunate position. He commands neither the prestige of the talmudic scholar nor the time and information of the professional. No one within the Orthodox camp really regards him very highly or takes him very seriously. Even among laymen (that is, nonprofessionals), possession of rabbinic ordination, or at least extensive Jewish education, is increasingly becoming a ticket of admission to the councils of decision making.

The only other premium is that placed on the money the layman contributes or raises, but any effort to dictate how the money should be used is resisted. However, as long as the Orthodox community contains only few men of really substantial wealth, it is inevitable that these will occupy positions of status and prestige. On the other hand the growth of yeshivot means that Orthodoxy is producing a growing number of Jewishly educated laymen, many of whom acquire a good secular education and economically comfortable positions. This group is only beginning to make an impact on both the Orthodox and non-Orthodox Jewish community. It seems inevitable that they will play a more prominent role in all aspects of Jewish life.

DIRECTIONS AND TENDENCIES

In essence, contemporary American Orthodoxy or at least committed Orthodoxy, whence springs the leadership and direction of the community, is characterized by the growth of institutions whose origins and spirit are sectarian and who are reacting against the church-like direction of Orthodoxy in its pre-World War II period. Orthodoxy, in truth, might have been characterized in that earlier period as simply lower-class Conservative Judaism. That this is no longer the case is due to changes in both Conservatism and Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy today is defining its role in particular and differentiated terms and more than ever before sees itself as isolated from other Jews. The result has been an increased sympathy for its own sectarian wing. But the sectarians themselves have not withstood all change. As one sociologist has written, if a sect is to influ-

63 One of the few Orthodox leaders who would augment the role of the laymen and argues that non-halakhic policy decisions should be made by the practicing rabbinate and lay leadership, together with the "masters of halakhah," is Yeshiva University's president: Samuel Belkin, Essays in Traditional Jewish Thought (New York, 1956), pp. 150-51.
ence the world to change, "it must itself acquire or accept the characteristics of this world to a degree sufficient to accomplish this goal." It must become "of this world" and in the process it changes its definitions of what is or is not acceptable. Thus, the sectarian institutions themselves are beginning to move in a church-like direction. Strident opposition to Israel among all but the Satmar Hasidim is a thing of the past. Coeducational day schools outside New York are formally disapproved of and tacitly accepted even by the rashe yeshivot. Yiddish, which Reb Aharon stressed as a vehicle for maintaining tradition, has been deemphasized ever since his death.

On the other hand, the entire community is more rigid in its halakhic observance. Mixed dancing, once practiced even among Agudath Israel youth, is a thing of the past in most committed Orthodox groups. The formalistic requirements of "feminine modesty," such as covering the hair, are stressed far more than ever before. Observance of the laws of "family purity" and mikveh, which once seemed to be on the verge of total desuetude, are rising.65 There are 177 public mikvaot in the United States—36 in the Greater New York area alone—and a number of private ones. There is even a Spero Foundation, which assists communities planning to build mikvaot with architectural plans, specifications, and suggestions. But, if ritually the community is more observant, even the most sectarian groups are becoming church-like or communally oriented in the problems they take cognizance of and their means of solution.66

Both camps, the modern Orthodox and sectarians, are growing, but the basic sources of their new-found strength are different. For the sectarians it is the young yeshivah graduates now at home in at least the superficial aspects of American culture and committed to tradition and the rashe yeshivot. They need not adjust completely to America because they are sufficiently well acquainted with it to be able to reject many of

65 The observance of mikveh, which requires that a married woman go to a lustral bath a week (generally) after menstruation, before which she is prohibited from having marital relations, is the best single measure for determining who is a committed Orthodox Jew. To the uncommitted, it is inconceivable that so personal a matter should be subject to ritual regulation. To the committed, it is inconceivable that an aspect of life so important as marital relations should not be subject to halakhic regulation.
66 One example can be found in the pages of the Jewish Press, an Orthodox weekly whose editorial position is akin to the sectarian yeshivah world but whose pages devote an increasing proportion of space to news and features of general Jewish interest.
its manifestations. For the modern Orthodox it is the ba'ale-teshuvah, the penitents who were raised in nonobservant homes but find in Orthodoxy an emotional or intellectual fulfillment. The first group lacks the intellectual-philosophical perspective to broaden its appeal, but while it may not expand, it will survive. The second lacks halakhic leadership and sanction for much that it reads into Orthodoxy; it lives in a half-pagan, half-halakhic world, and the personal problems of its members are more serious.

A characteristic difference between religious life today and a few years ago, particularly among the modern Orthodox, is that problems have become far more personal. In other words, the personal significance of religion has assumed increased importance over its communal significance. This has fostered increased interest in sectarianism among the ostensibly modern Orthodox, as has the right wing’s courage, conviction, and sincerity. Modern Orthodoxy’s appeal is dulled by the lingering suspicion of its adherents that they themselves have suffered a loss for living in a half-pagan world.

Many Orthodox Jews have been personally as well as intellectually and emotionally alienated from the non-Orthodox world through employment discrimination. Instances of observant Jews who have been denied employment in Jewish federation-supported institutions or national Jewish organizations because they are Sabbath and holiday observers are legion. And even on a more personal level, Orthodox Jews have often suffered the effects of discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping by some non-Orthodox Jews who are prominent in Jewish educational, cultural, and communal life. Many of these Jewish leaders, themselves reared in Orthodox homes, abandoned their Orthodoxy because they believed it held no future for Judaism. The upsurge of Orthodoxy among young people bewilders them and makes them resentful. But the Orthodox who suffer at their hands are not inclined to be tolerant. Since it is the modern Orthodox who are most likely to encounter this type of discrimination, a reaction is inevitable.

Relative prosperity, a sense of alienation from other Jews, and increased concern for halakhic observance serve to unite the different groups within the Orthodox camp. But that very unity has dulled Orthodoxy’s critical sense, and there is a dearth of systematic criticism to be found, even at Yeshiva University, the most likely arena. A few young faculty discussion groups meet for “lofty” intellectual purposes, but as yet their point of view has found no forceful expression. Observers note that the student body itself tends to be more right-wing than ever in the past. Jewish scholarship per se, which might have served as a critical
tool, is only beginning to grow within Orthodoxy and still encounters fierce opposition even at Yeshiva University. Talmud study, which is as much a religious as an intellectual experience, is no substitute; it serves to awaken an awareness of tradition and a passion for religion, but not a critical faculty for the social and religious condition of Judaism in the modern world. The pages of Tradition have served as vehicles of criticism of the non-Orthodox Jewish world, particularly of Jewish scholarship, but even it has so far failed to develop a characteristic Orthodox response to contemporary problems, and it has ignored self-criticism. A new journal by a few students at Yeshiva University, Gesher, was intended to fill the gap, but its first two annual issues, in 1963 and 1964, fell short of the mark.

*   *   *

The only remaining vestige of Jewish passion in America resides in the Orthodox community, and it is passion and dedication, not psychoanalytic studies of divorce, which will stem the tide of intermarriage. It is significant that the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, the only spontaneous movement concerned with Soviet Jews, is directed and led primarily by Orthodox youth, as is the only other college group recently to show signs of dynamic movement and growth, Yavneh. Whether the Orthodox community as such, however, can generate sufficient force to meet the intellectual stirrings and emotional quests in the American Jewish world remains to be seen. The non-Orthodox intellectual is not ready yet to embrace Torah and halakhah in their entirety.

But two things have changed. First, the old antagonisms to the world of Orthodoxy are gone from many intellectuals furthest removed from Orthodox life. Secondly, there is a recognition and admiration for Orthodoxy as the only group which today contains within it a strength and will to live that may yet nourish all the Jewish world.
## APPENDIX

### KNOWN YESHIVOT PROVIDING INTENSIVE, POST-HIGH-SCHOOL \(^a\) TALMUDIC STUDY IN THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year founded (^b)</th>
<th>Enrollment (^c)</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Present Rosh Yeshivah</th>
<th>Antecedent Yeshivah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>694 (^d)</td>
<td>R. Judah David Bernstein</td>
<td>R. Samuel Belkin (^e)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik</td>
<td>R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish University of America-Hebrew</td>
<td>Skokie, Ill.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>132 (^f)</td>
<td>R. Saul Silber</td>
<td>R. Simon Kramer (^g)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Mordecai Rogow</td>
<td>R. Mordecai Rogow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Selig Starr</td>
<td>R. Selig Starr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesifta Tifereth</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>about 1925</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td>R. Moses Feinstein</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td>R. Moses Feinstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavne Hebrew Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>R. Nahum Shapiro</td>
<td>R. Bezalel Kaden</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Torah Vodaath</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>R. Shragai Mendlowitz</td>
<td>R. Jacob Kamenetzky</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Ner Israel</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>200 (^h)</td>
<td>R. Jacob Ruderman</td>
<td>R. Jacob Ruderman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Post-high-school study

\(^b\) Year founded

\(^c\) Enrollment

\(^d\) Enrollment

\(^e\) Samuel Belkin

\(^f\) Enrollment

\(^g\) Simon Kramer

\(^h\) Enrollment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Present Rosh Yeshivah</th>
<th>Antecedent Yeshivah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America (Yeshivah Rabbi Israel Meyer Hacohen)</td>
<td>Queens, N.Y.</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>R. David Leibowitz</td>
<td>R. Enoch Leibowitz</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Arugath Habosem</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R. Levi Isaac Grunwald</td>
<td>R. Levi Isaac Grunwald</td>
<td>Arugath Habosem (Deutschkreuz, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Chaim Berlin Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R. Isaac Hutner</td>
<td>R. Isaac Hutner</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Yeshivah Tomchei Tmimim Lubavitch</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>R. Joseph Schneerson</td>
<td>R. Isaac Pekarsky Mordecai Mentlik</td>
<td>Lubavitcher Yeshivah (Otwock, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Yeshivah Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R. Abraham Joffen</td>
<td>R. Abraham Joffen</td>
<td>Beth Joseph Yeshivah (Bialystok, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telshe</td>
<td>Wickliffe, Ohio</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>R. Hayyim Katz</td>
<td>R. Mordecai Gifter Baruch Sorotskin</td>
<td>Yeshivah Etz Chaim of Telshe (Telšiai, Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary Yeshivath Chachmey Lublin</td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>R. Mosheh Rothenberg</td>
<td>R. Mosheh Rothenberg</td>
<td>Lublin Yeshivah (Lublin, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Postgraduate Debt</td>
<td>Rector 1</td>
<td>Rector 2</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of America</td>
<td>Lakewood, N.J.</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>R. Aaron Kotler</td>
<td>R. Shneur Kotler</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Kletzk (Kletsk, U.S.S.R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Chofetz Chaim of Radun</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>R. Mendel Zaks</td>
<td>R. Mendel Zaks</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Radun (Radun, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Ch'san Sofer</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R. Samuel Ehrenfeld</td>
<td>R. Gedaliah Schorr, R. Samuel Ehrenfeld</td>
<td>Yeshivah Ch'san Sofer (Mattersdorf, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>R. Abraham Kalmanowitz</td>
<td>R. Samuel Birnbaum</td>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah (Mir, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Farm Settlement</td>
<td>Mount Kisco, N.Y.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>R. Michael Dov Weissmandel</td>
<td>R. Solomon Ungar</td>
<td>Nitra Yeshivah (Nitra, Czechoslovakia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Talmudical Academy Torah V'Yirah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>R. Joel Teitelbaum</td>
<td>R. Joseph Meisels, R. Simeon Posen</td>
<td>Satmar Yeshivah (Szatmár, Hungary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Bet Ha-talmid</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>R. Arieh Leb Malin</td>
<td>R. Hayyim Wysokier</td>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah (Mir, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year founded</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Present Rosh Yeshivah</td>
<td>Antecedent Yeshivah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Jacob Joseph School and Mesiffa</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>R. Mendel Kravitz</td>
<td>R. Mendel Kravitz</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Karlen-Stolin</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R. Jochanan Perlow</td>
<td>R. Abraham Trup</td>
<td>Karlen-Stolin Yeshivah (Stolin, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Be'er Shmuel</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>R. Joseph Horowitz</td>
<td>R. Moses Horowitz</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Hunsdorf (Huncovce, Czechoslovakia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Dov Schwartzman</td>
<td>R. Elya Svei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Eretz Yisrael</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R. Judah Gershuni</td>
<td>R. Judah Gershuni</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Rector 1</td>
<td>Rector 2</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamminetzer Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>R. Levi</td>
<td>R. Levi</td>
<td>Kamminetzer Yeshivah (Kamieniec, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Bet Torah</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R. Mordecai</td>
<td>R. Mordecai</td>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of Lakewood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis Rabbinical College</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>R. Samuel</td>
<td>R. Samuel</td>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of Lakewood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Zichron Tzvi</td>
<td>Woodridge, N.Y.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R. Levi</td>
<td>R. Levi</td>
<td>Kamminetzer Yeshivah (Brooklyn, N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The yeshivot listed here may have an elementary and/or high-school division as well. Data in the Appendix are only for the post-high-school division, where students may spend anywhere from two or three hours to a full day. This appendix is not exhaustive. There are undoubtedly other yeshivot which were inadvertently omitted. In addition, there are post-high-school students studying Talmud privately or in small groups. This refers to the year in which the post-high-school division was established. Sources are either CJFWF reports or information obtained directly from each yeshivah.
- Unless otherwise noted, these are the latest enrolment figures as submitted by each yeshivah to CJFWF and published in its 1964 reports.
- Includes the post-high-school enrolment in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary and 229 students in the Teachers Institute for Men.
- Every instructor in Talmud in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary is called a rosh yeshiva. Officially Dr. Belkin, a former instructor in Talmud and now president of the University, gives the semikhah (ordination) and is the THE rosh yeshiva. Most people outside of Yeshiva University think of Rabbi Soloveitchik as THE rosh yeshiva.
- Includes 11 students in the Teachers Institute.
- There is no rosh yeshivah. Dr. Kramer is the president, Rabbi Rogow lectures to the senior class, and Rabbi Starr has the class beneath him.
- Figure supplied by a representative of the yeshivah.
- Figure by observers.
On November 20, 1964, the assembled Fathers of the Ecumenical Council, then concluding its third session in Rome, adopted, by a vote of 1,770 to 185, a statement on the attitude of the Roman Catholic church toward the Jews and Judaism. This statement was part of a larger declaration on the church's attitude toward non-Christian religions, including Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism; the omnibus declaration was approved by a vote of 1,651 in favor, 99 opposed, and 242 in favor with reservations.

That aspect of the declaration dealing with Jews stated (in unofficial English translation of the Latin text):

With a grateful heart, the church of Christ acknowledges that, according to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her election were already among the Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets. She professes that all who believe in Christ—Abraham's sons according to faith—were included in the same Patriarch's call, likewise that her salvation is typically foreshadowed by the chosen people's exodus from the land of bondage.

The church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revelation of the Old Testament from the people with whom God in His ineffable mercy concluded the former covenant. Nor can she forget that she feeds upon the root of that cultivated olive tree into which the wild shoots of the gentiles have been grafted (cf. Rom. 2:17-24). Indeed, the church believes that by His cross Christ Our Peace reconciled Jews and gentiles, making both one (cf. Ephes. 2:14-16).
The church keeps ever in mind the words of the Apostle about his kinsmen; theirs is the sonship “and the glory and the covenants and legislation and the worship and the promises; who have their fathers and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:4-5), the Son of Mary the Virgin (Rom. 9:4-5). No less does she recall that the Apostles, the church’s mainstay and pillars, as well as most of the early Disciples who proclaimed Christ’s gospel to the world, sprang from the Jewish people.

Even though a large part of the Jews did not accept the Gospel, they remain most dear to God for the sake of the Patriarchs. This is the witness of the Apostle, as is the utterance that God's gift and call are irrevocable.

In company with the Prophets and the same Apostle, the church awaits that day, known to God alone, on which all peoples will address the Lord in a single voice and “serve him shoulder to shoulder” (Zeph. 3:9; Is. 66; Ps. 65(66):4,5; Rom. 11:11-32).

All Persecution Condemned

Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is of such magnitude, this sacred synod wants to support and recommend their mutual knowledge and respect, a knowledge and respect that are the fruit, above all, of Biblical and theological studies as well as of fraternal dialogues. Moreover, this synod, in her rejection of injustice of whatever kind and wherever inflicted upon men, remains mindful of that common patrimony and so deplores, indeed condemns, hatred and persecution of Jews, whether they arose in former or in our own days.

May, then, all see to it that in their catechetical work or in their preaching of the word of God they do not teach anything that could give rise to hatred or contempt of Jews in the hearts of Christians.

May they never present the Jewish people as one rejected, cursed or guilty of deicide.

All that happened to Christ in His passion cannot be attributed to the whole people then alive, much less to those of today. Besides, the church held and holds that Christ underwent His passion and death freely, because of the sins of all men and out of infinite love.

It is, therefore, the burden of Christian preaching to proclaim the cross of Christ as the sign of God’s all-embracing love and as the fountain from which every grace flows.

From the overwhelming vote in its favor, future generations might conclude that the declaration was a routine matter, both substantively and procedurally. In fact, it was from the outset a highly-charged matter which became one of several key issues dramatizing the split between liberal and conservative viewpoints within Roman Catholicism and the
fierce struggle for control between forces representing these viewpoints at the council. Like some of the other controversial subjects on which there was sharp division between a majority of the bishops and a small, but powerful and influential minority, it was subjected to various procedural delays and other tactics designed to prevent it from coming to a vote. Furthermore, the statement on the Jews became involved with political considerations never intended by its authors and the object of intensive diplomatic representations and political pressures.

During the course of its various formulations, it became something of a bone of contention within the Jewish community as well. There was openly-expressed disagreement both as to the intentions and value of the declaration and as to the role, if any, that Jews should play with regard to it, and to the Ecumenical Council generally. On the latter point there was a broad range of opinion, planning, and action among various Jewish religious and communal organizations and representative spokesmen. Some organizations and individuals related themselves to the Ecumenical Council in varying ways, including the preparation of special materials, and correspondence and meetings with Catholic prelates in the United States and abroad. This article is written primarily from an American angle of vision.

Catholic-Jewish Relations: The Background

While the declaration in question was essentially a statement of attitude whose effective implementation would require specific directives and in some parts of the world would need to be undergirded by sustained educational and disciplinary measures, it was immediately seen as a symbol of fundamental change within the Roman Catholic church. Its supporters claimed that it did not enunciate any new doctrine, but that it did remove—in the words of America magazine—the source of a “ghastly ambiguity.” Many Jews believed that, new doctrine or not, the authoritative removal of a tradition depicting them as deicides, cursed by God and doomed to punishment in each succeeding generation, would do away with one of the deeply-rooted sources of antisemitism; for the charge had been used to justify many of the hostile policies of the church and of Christian rulers toward Jews throughout history.

The fact that Christianity had its historical beginnings as an argument within Judaism, and that the early church felt compelled to define itself in contradistinction or opposition to the mother faith, indelibly colored the relationship between the two from that time on. The earliest Christians were not anti-Jewish as we understand that term today; most were
themselves Jews, disappointed or angry that the overwhelming majority of the Jewish community, including its religious leaders, rejected their claim that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and fearful that the small group of faithful followers would be swallowed up by the synagogue. To the great misfortune of future generations, many of their bitter denunciations were canonized into the sacred scripture of Christianity and elaborated upon with particular vehemence by the early Church Fathers. And fear of the competitive power or appeal of “the synagogue” persisted as an idée fixe in Christianity even after it had become the dominant religion of the West. The ability to perceive a small, powerless, and persecuted minority as an all-powerful conspiracy is common in the psychology of prejudice, but in the case of the Jews this was reinforced—in effect sanctified—by religious tradition. As one Protestant scholar has summed up the process:

The doctrine of the impartial and universal judgment of God was transformed into a particular and irrevocable curse on Jews; the inclusion of the Gentiles into the chosen people became an inclusion of Gentiles to the exclusion of the Jews; what had once been an internal conflict within Judaism was externalized as a conflict between Jews and Gentiles.2

The first restrictive measures against Jews, like the first separatist rulings of the Christian faith—such as changing the day of Sabbath to Sunday and fixing the date of Easter independently of Passover—were probably inspired by a desire to protect the faith of the Christian and maintain its distinctiveness from the parent religion. But what started out as protection for the Christian soon became a policy of harassment of the Jews. The initial hostility compounded by the “stubborn” refusal of Jews to convert, hardened into legislation which increasingly cut the Jews off from normal social and economic life and made outcasts of them. The official church view regarding the Jews, as it developed over the years, was that they should not be killed, because they provided a living witness

1 E.g., “For... you crucified him, the only spotless and righteous man...” (Justin Martyr); “Since their deicide, the Jews have been blinded, can no longer lead anyone at all” (Eusebius); “Murderers of the Lord, assassins of the prophets” (St. Gregory of Nyssa); “God has forsaken the Jews. They have denied the Father, crucified the Son... their synagogue is the house of demons and idolatry... you should turn away from them as from a pest and a plague of the human race” (St. John Chrysostom); “The Jews, they seize him... The Jews, they bind him, they crown him with thorns, they spit upon him, they flagellate him, they heap insults upon him, they hang him from the wood, they pierce his flesh with their spears” (St. Augustine).

to the truth of Christian history; but that they were to live in degradation, because they had crucified and rejected the Lord—be a witness to the curse of God which they had brought down upon themselves:

... a curse which entered into their very bowels, like water, and into their bones like oil: cursed also in the cities, and cursed in the fields: cursed in their going in, and cursed in their going out: cursed the fruit of their wombs and of their lands and of their flocks. ... 3

Not content to declare the curse on the Jews, the church frequently chose to act it out. "Whenever ecclesiastics . . . wrote about the 'insolence' of the Jews," remarked one observer, "it is safe to assume that the civil powers were treating them as human beings. . . . Jewish prosperity anywhere was regarded by the Papacy as contrary to Holy Writ and a menace to Christendom." 4 Efforts to reconcile tolerance and subjugation define the boundaries of church legislation (which, for much of Christian history, meant civil legislation as well) regarding the Jews.

On the one hand, the Jews were subjected to humiliating, restrictive legislation: forbidden to appear on the streets during Easter (councils of Orleans, 538 and 545); forbidden to officiate as judges (council of Mâcon, 581). These enactments were made by regional church councils and not universally enforced; but the Fourth Lateran council, beginning in 1215, gave church-wide endorsement to these and other degrading measures, including the order that Jews must wear a distinctive badge on their clothing. Later rulings outlawed the Talmud, authorized the ghetto, affirmed the validity of forced sermons intended to lead to baptism, and denied Jews admission to the universities.

On the other hand, the medieval popes also protected the Jews and condemned violence against them. Pope Calixtus II in 1120 issued an edict, reissued in 1199 by Pope Innocent as the *Constitutio pro Judaeis*, which prohibited the killing of Jews, the use of violence to force baptism, and the desecration of Jewish cemeteries. (This charter of liberties was to apply only to "those Jews who have not presumed to plot against the Christian faith.") Gregory IX protested vigorously against the slaughter of Jews by crusaders in France. In 1247 Innocent IV sent two vehement letters of protest to the archbishop of Vienne (France), condemning the brutal torture and slaughter of Jews following a ritual-murder charge, and commanding that the instigators be restrained and the stolen property restored.


4 Ibid., pp. 34–35.
It is perhaps a petty point that the archbishop of Vienne ignored the latter order, but it illuminates the larger problem: the church was seldom able to prevent the hatred it inculcated from being translated into the violent slaughter it deplored. If the popes and councils insisted on punishment with preservation, the masses (and sometimes the magnates) of Europe did not always make such fine theological distinctions. Thus, from the crusades to the 20th century, from accusations of ritual murder and well-poisoning to charges of international conspiracy, from the auto-da-fé to Auschwitz, the Jewish people remained the outcasts and the primary scapegoat of Christendom. Certainly, the institutions of Christianity cannot be held accountable for the entire record of persecution, expulsion, and slaughter, particularly for the racist ideology of the Nazis. But whatever the multiple and complex causes of antisemitism, it was fed by a tradition of religious teaching which cut the Jews off from the rest of mankind, depicted them as inherently base and evil—the "synagogue of Satan"—and viewed their sufferings as punishment visited upon them by a just God.

Religious animosity toward the Jews was compounded by the fact that, from the 18th-century Enlightenment on, Jews and the clergy of the established religions generally found themselves on opposite sides of the political fence in Europe. The church, much of whose secular power had been broken by the French Revolution, was suspicious of Enlightenment and liberalism, and tended to ally itself with the enemies of the French Revolution. The Jews, hoping for entry into secular society after centuries of exclusion and segregation in Christendom, supported the forces of Enlightenment and liberalism. An older image of the observant Jew as the enemy of Christ was overlaid with the newer image of the secular Jew as conspirator against the church. (At the Ecumenical Council, Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini of Sicily asserted that the Jews should declare their affection for the church, rather than vice versa, since—he said—the Talmud included passages offensive to Christians, and the Jews have supported Freemasonry, which the church has condemned.)

There were periods when Jewish communities lived in peace with their Christian neighbors and on relatively friendly terms with the clergy. And while the church sometimes supported antisemitism, as in the Dreyfus case, it also spoke out against it, as in Pius XI's famous dictum of 1938, declaring antisemitism "a repugnant movement in which we Christians can have no part." Still, the religious teaching and preaching which depicted the Jews as accursed, debased, and doomed to perpetual servitude
—a tradition which Jules Isaac termed “the teaching of contempt”\(^5\)—remained in the mainstream of Christian thought.

**Developments Since World War II**

Dramatic changes in the Roman Catholic church within the last two decades have been noted by many observers. Liberal and conservative factions struggle for predominance in an institution formerly thought to be monolithic. The liberals, including theologians, intellectuals, and prelates from either newly-emerging nations or countries with a pluralist and democratic tradition, have publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the “Roman” mentality of the Curia, and have spearheaded the thrust for collegiality, liturgical reform, recognition of the inherent right of religious liberty, and expanded dialogue with other religious groups. This ferment has itself come about as a result of many causes: the World War II defeat of fascist regimes with which the church had established concordats (Italy, Germany); the loss of Catholic countries to the Soviet sphere (Poland, Hungary, Lithuania); the growing threat of a militantly atheistic Communism; rapid social and technological change; the positive experience of the church in the United States, where—with separation of church and state—it had grown and flourished. This article is confined to one specific aspect of change within the Catholic church: the reexamination and revision of its thinking and teaching regarding Jews and Judaism.

Here again, the reasons are varied. Both internal trends, such as the Biblical Renewal movement, and external events, such as the foundation of the State of Israel, affected Christian thinking about Jews. The Biblical Renewal movement, which emphasized the continuity between Old and New Testaments, brought increased respect and understanding of the Jewish heritage of Christianity. The emergence of the State of Israel shattered stereotypes about the Jews. But first and foremost was the traumatic impact on men’s minds and feelings of the tragic fate of European Jewry during the Hitler era. The reality of that fate could not be denied: in the heart of civilized Europe, in the middle of the 20th century, a group of men had drawn up a plan to wipe an entire people from the earth by systematically rounding them up, transporting them through an intricate network of trains, buses, and trucks to designated death factories, and murdering them to the last man, woman, and child. Further, the success of the plan depended upon the indifference, acquiescence, or active cooperation of great numbers of people. For thinking Christians, the un-

---

avoidable question was, “How could this have happened in nations of Christian tradition?” However pagan, racist, and inherently anti-Christian the antisemitism of Nazi ideology, it fed on themes and attitudes promulgated through centuries of Christian teaching. To overcome antisemitism, acknowledged by major Christian church groups to be a sin against God and man, the distorted teachings must be confronted and revised.

Obviously, the revisions could come only from Christians themselves, out of their own conviction and their own initiative. But the preliminary task of stimulating widespread awareness of the problem, of illustrating and analyzing distortions and bias, fell to Christians and Jews alike. Britons like the scholarly Anglican clergyman James Parkes and the lay Catholic author Malcolm Hay called attention to traditional Christian antisemitism. The distinguished French-Jewish historian, Jules Isaac, made a profound impact in Europe, particularly in France, with the publication of his *Jésus et Israël* in 1948, and he continued to wage an intellectual struggle against the “teaching of contempt” until his death in 1963. (His subsequent efforts included additional books and lectures, personal audiences with Pius XII in 1949 and John XXIII in 1960, and active leadership in *L’Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne*, the French interfaith organization.)

In 1947, at the little Swiss town of Seelisberg, Catholic and Protestant representatives met together with Jews and proposed guidelines as a practical basis for Christian teaching. Known as the Ten Points of Seelisberg, and drawing heavily upon Jules Isaac’s suggestions, these proposals, dealing “with the need to emphasize the close bonds which exist between Judaism and Christianity, to present the Passion story in such a way as not to arouse animosity against the Jew, and to eliminate from Christian teaching and preaching the idea that the Jewish people are under a curse,” were urged upon the churches together with some practical suggestions.

Investigations of the contents of religious textbooks provided actual examples of distortion and prejudice. Studies by Protestants of their own religious-school materials, initiated by the American Jewish Committee and the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the 1930s at Drew Theological Seminary and in the 1950s at Yale Divinity School, and
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6 Isaac identified three major themes in the “teaching of contempt”: that the dispersion of the Jews was a providential punishment for the Crucifixion; that Judaism was degenerate in the time of Jesus, and that the Jews were guilty of the crime of deicide. He argued that these themes were historically and scripturally inaccurate.


8 Bernhard E. Olson, *op. cit.*
a similar study of Catholic parochial-school textbooks\(^9\) undertaken at the Jesuit St. Louis University with the Committee's encouragement, furnished significant data and suggestions for improving these materials. A study of French Catholic textbooks, undertaken by a French priest,\(^10\) called attention to similar problems, and stimulated subsequent revisions.

An article by a prominent priest, in the Brazilian counterpart to the American Jewish Committee's *Commentary*, pointed to omissions and faulty generalizations regarding Jews in Brazilian textbooks and missals.\(^11\)

On the highest levels in the Catholic church there were several positive developments. In 1949 Pius XII authorized *pro perfidis Judaeis* in the Good Friday prayer for the Jews, to be translated into the vernacular as "unfaithful" or "unbelieving." (Actually, the Latin phrase has that meaning, but it had been too frequently translated as "perfidious" in the vernacular.) In 1959 John XXIII did away with the word altogether, both in Latin and in the vernacular. He also did away with two other prejudicial sentences, one in the Act of Consecration to the Sacred Heart, recited every first Friday, and the other in the ritual of baptism of converts.

Such changes were encouraging, but progress was still patchy and unequal, varying from country to country—indeed, from region to region. Even those Catholics most active in efforts to purify religious teaching and foster improved understanding between Christians and Jews felt that progress would remain piecemeal unless definitive approval and encouragement were to come from the highest levels of the church, preferably in the form of an official declaration. It was Pope John who gave these hopes the prospect of realization.

Obviously, Pope John did not create the forces of renewal within the church, but he personified them to an extraordinary degree. He gave voice and direction to those seeking an *aggiornamento* (literally, updating) of the church, and he is said to have explained this term to a visitor who asked its meaning by going to the nearest window, opening it wide, and letting in the fresh air. In his very person, as much as by his public statements, he gave his blessing to the expanding dialogue with non-Catholics. When he announced the summoning of an Ecumenical Council and spoke of a renewal that would restore "the simple and pure lines that the face of the church of Jesus had at its birth" it seemed to many a

---


historic opportunity for the Catholic church formally and authoritatively to clarify its attitudes toward Jews and Judaism: to show that it repudiated, once and for all, that part of its tradition whereby Jews had been segregated, degraded, charged with wicked crimes, and valued only as potential converts; and to lift those tensions between Christian and Jew that had engendered hostility and bitterness across the centuries. The time was ripe.

While the preparatory commissions for the Ecumenical Council were going about their work, the nightmarish details of the Nazi genocide against the Jews were being vividly recalled by the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem. The moral questions posed by the revelations of the Eichmann trial were not ignored by religious spokesmen. While the American Catholic press tended, by and large, to ignore the long history of Christian antisemitism when discussing the phenomenon of Nazi antisemitism and to emphasize the aid and assistance given to Jews by Catholics there were also moving and self-critical responses. *Commonweal* editor James O'Gara (May 12, 1961) asked:

> Could the Nazi horror have sprung full-blown out of nowhere, without centuries of anti-Semitism to nourish it and give it strength in secret? And when the dark shadow of Nazism appeared over Germany, was the Christian response to this evil even remotely adequate? To my mind, the painful answer to both questions has to be no.

The *Catholic Sentinel* (Portland, Ore., April 20, 1961) pointed out:

> Anti-Semitism was not confined to Nazi Germany, or limited to the time that Adolf Hitler ruled the Third Reich. Persecution of the Jews is a black mark on the history of Christendom.

And the *Catholic Star Herald* (Camden, N.J., December 15, 1961) commented:

> ... let us recognize the duty to wash away any traces of anti-Semitism in the hearts of the young. A future generation may forget such incredible cruelties if we are not at pains to instruct them in love for our Jewish brethren.

**Preparatory Stages and Early Jewish Involvement**

As the church girded itself in preparation for Vatican II, it soon became evident that the key figure with regard to any position concerning

---

the Jews would be Augustin Cardinal Bea, named by John XXIII as head of a special Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. (The secretariat was elevated to the status of commission in October, 1962). The cardinal, an octogenarian, a Jesuit, a Bible scholar, a figure of great personal prestige and influence, proved from the outset to be one of the most articulate and effective architects of renewal and reform within the church—a symbol of the ecumenical spirit. That Cardinal Bea was entrusted with seeking contacts, advancing dialogue, and improving relations with non-Catholic Christians was itself a radical departure from the Curia’s mentality, which saw conversion as the only justification for any conversation. But it soon became known that Cardinal Bea had been entrusted with even wider responsibilities, that he and his secretariat had been authorized (later, Cardinal Bea was to state he had been expressly requested) by Pope John to draft a statement regarding Catholic-Jewish relations, and to seek representative Jewish viewpoints. The way was open for communication and exchange of views with Jewish institutions.

Such communication took various forms. Substantial documentation in specific areas of scholarship was provided by the American Jewish Committee. Its concern centered on Catholic teaching about Jews and Judaism in the broadest sense (textbooks, liturgy, sermons, films, etc.) and the desirability of a forceful repudiation of the deicide charge against Jews. These questions had been highlighted through a protracted (November 1960—August 1961) symposium on Christian teaching concerning Jews in *Evidences*, American Jewish Committee’s French-language periodical, which included articles by eminent Protestant and Catholic scholars.

On July 13, 1961, over a year before the opening of the Council’s first session, the American Jewish Committee submitted to Cardinal Bea, by prior agreement, the first of several comprehensive memoranda. Entitled “The Image of the Jew in Catholic Teaching,” the 32-page document identified and illustrated slanderous interpretations, oversimplifications and sweeping statements, unjust or inaccurate comparisons, invidious use of language, and significant omissions in American Catholic textbooks, and cited existing Catholic sources that could serve as correctives. The memorandum did not raise questions on a theological level, but stressed the human-relations implications of various references to Jews. It was submitted after consultation with Jewish scholars representing Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform viewpoints.

On November 17, 1961, a second memorandum, “Anti-Jewish Elements in Catholic Liturgy,” prepared for the Committee by an eminent
Jewish scholar, was submitted to Cardinal Bea's secretariat. The document acknowledged recent deletion of anti-Jewish passages in the liturgy of the church, but noted that the concept of Jews as deicides still figured in certain liturgical passages, in popular and scholarly commentaries on the liturgy, and in homiletic literature.

In December 1961, Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America met Cardinal Bea in Rome, and one of the outcomes of the meeting was an invitation to submit suggestions for positive Ecumenical Council action to improve Catholic-Jewish relations. In May 1962, he submitted a memorandum, prepared in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, recommending rejection of the deicide charge, recognition of Jews as Jews (rather than as potential converts), promotion of scholarly and civic cooperation, and the creation of church agencies to help overcome religious prejudice.

In March 1962, a memorandum was sent to Pope John, urging the elimination of anti-Jewish references from Catholic texts, liturgies, inscriptions and pictorial representations. Signed by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the World Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO) and president of the World Jewish Congress, and Label Katz, co-chairman of COJO and president of B'nai B'rith, it was endorsed by all the constituent members of COJO with the exception of the British Board of Deputies. The memorandum charged that allegations of ritual crimes by Jews were perpetrated in inscriptions, pictorial representations, and commemorative services.

Voices opposed to Catholic-Jewish rapprochement were also heard at this early stage from two major sources which were to continue massive efforts to prevent Council action: the Arab nations and a group of ultra-conservative officials of the Curia. Gamal Abdul Nasser's Voice of the Arabs broadcast on November 7, 1963 that there was "a world Zionist plot to capitalize on the Vatican Council to further the oppression of the Palestinian refugees," and Arab states made representations against the creation of any special "under-secretariat for the Jews," when rumors to this effect appeared in Italian papers. Arab opposition was double-barreled, coming from both governments and Roman Catholic prelates in Arab nations who warned of possible reprisals against Catholics in Arab states. Theological opposition from conservative sources was re-

flected in an article by Giacomo Lauri Volpi which appeared in *Osservatore Romano* (the quasi-official Vatican paper) on March 8, 1961, describing the Roman emperor Titus, who destroyed the Second Temple, as possibly the "executor of a supernatural will," who knew that the "Jewish people had stained themselves with a horrible crime deserving of expiation."

This early opposition was successfully withstood by Cardinal Bea and his secretariat, reportedly with the active support of Pope John. Other developments also seemed to foster an encouraging atmosphere for growing Christian-Jewish rapport. A forceful denunciation of antisemitism issued in December 1961 by the World Council of Churches, embracing over 200 Protestant and Orthodox denominations, could not escape notice by Catholics. Besides condemning antisemitism as a "sin against God and man," the World Council cautioned: "In Christian teaching the historic events which led to the Crucifixion should not be so presented as to fasten upon the Jewish people of today responsibilities which belong to our corporate humanity and not to one race or community."

A month later, in January 1962, Cardinal Bea presided at an unprecedented event in Rome: an agape—a feast of fraternal love—in which representatives of 16 different faiths, including Jews, took part. The cardinal declared it was "the primordial duty of all groups of mankind to unite to overcome the hatreds of the past."

By the spring of 1962 Cardinal Bea's secretariat had prepared a draft statement on the Catholic attitude toward Jews and Judaism, and intended to introduce this document during the first session of the Council, with Pope John's blessing. However there occurred an incident which enabled the opposition to prevent consideration of the document during that session—and, indeed during the lifetime of Pope John. The incident centered on the question of Jewish observers at the Council.

Jewish representation at the Ecumenical Council had not been a matter of strenuous public debate. If Cardinal Bea's secretariat had considered it, no affirmative decision had been made. Jewish religious groups were opposed. The American Jewish Committee had communicated its view that there should be no Jewish observers at the Council unless other non-Christian religions were invited. On June 12 Dr. Nahum Goldmann of the World Jewish Congress announced that Dr. Hayyim Wardi, an Israeli government official, would attend the Council as an unofficial observer.
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14 Chief Rabbi Elio Toaff of Rome; Sergio Piperno, president of the Union of Italian Jewish communities; Mario Disegni, of the Roman Jewish community, and Zachariah Shuster, European director of the American Jewish Committee.
and representative of WJC, and that he had received a leave of absence from his government for that purpose. Although there were Jewish protests (the Rabbinical Council of America expressed "grave alarm" at WJC's efforts to seek representation) and Dr. Goldmann later (August 1) claimed his earlier announcement had been misrepresented, the damage was done. Arab states protested vehemently, charging that Israel was deviously seeking political involvement in a religious gathering. Conservative elements opposed to the work of Cardinal Bea's secretariat, which was also preparing a draft statement on religious liberty, seized upon this incident as proof that Christian-Jewish relations had become hopelessly politicalized. The commission of the Council charged with determining the agenda omitted both the statement on the Jews and the statement on religious liberty (the latter for different reasons).

Whether, in fact, the Wardi incident was the sole reason for shelving the declaration on the Jews, or whether the conservative opposition might have been able to prevent its consideration in any case, is a speculative question. There was ample evidence that the opposition to any favorable statement regarding the Jews was intense, and that such opposition had access to extraordinary channels of distribution. Thus, a few days before the session ended, every prelate found in his box a privately-printed 900-page volume, *Il Complotto contro la Chiesa* ("The Plot Against the Church"), filled with the most primitive antisemitism. The volume charged that there was a Jewish fifth column among the Catholic clergy plotting against the church, and even justified Hitler's acts against the Jews. No one knew how the book was distributed to the Council Fathers, and it reportedly produced little effect other than indignation. But it showed to what lengths the opposition was prepared to go.

The first session of Vatican Council II (October 11 to December 8, 1962) closed without official consideration of religious liberty or Catholic-Jewish relations. And in November Pope John suffered the first severe attack of the malady that six months later was to bring about his death.

While no great accomplishments appeared to emerge from the first session, and most of the arguments seemed procedural, the fundamental lines of conflict emerged early. The conservative forces, long entrenched
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15 This attack was obviously directed at a few priests associated with Cardinal Bea's commission who were converts from Judaism and who played some role in the drafting of the declaration, such as Msgr. John Oesterreicher and Father Gregory Baum, both of whom have written widely on the matter of Jewish-Christian relations.
in Rome, self-assured, accustomed to giving instructions to the bishops through the Curia, expected to be able to dominate the Council. The bishops coming from lands across the earth did not really know each other, nor as yet their collective will. But from the first vote they broke the bonds the Curia had sought to impose, refusing the Curia-sponsored commissions and sending several schemata back to commissions for redrafting. Having routed the conservative forces in one vote after another, the progressive elements left Rome at the session's close optimistic and enthusiastic, certain the Council was riding the winds of change. Key issues on which the future battle would be joined, it was clear to both sides, were the collegial powers of the bishops, the schema on the church and the modern world (dealing with such questions as birth control and nuclear warfare), religious liberty, and a declaration on the Jews—a declaration whose fate would now be more closely linked to the general struggle within the Council. The latter two statements, at Pope John's instruction, were attached to Cardinal Bea's schema on ecumenism, for consideration at the next session.

Developments between Sessions

In March 1963, Cardinal Bea visited the United States to lecture at Harvard University on the subject of Christian unity. Subsequently he was honored at an interfaith agapé in New York devoted to the theme of "Civic Unity under God." Cardinal Bea used that occasion—attended and addressed by such personalities as U Thant, Zafrulla Khan, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Henry Luce, Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Greek Orthodox Archbishop Iakovos and Rabbi Heschel—to issue an affirmative statement in support of freedom of conscience.

Cardinal Bea's visit was also the occasion of an unpublicized and unprecedented meeting with a group of Jewish religious leaders, which was held at the American Jewish Committee on March 31. The Jewish participants represented Orthodox, Conservative and Reform viewpoints, but each attended in a personal capacity.16 In responding to a series of prepared questions regarding the prospects for Council action on a Jewish declaration, the cardinal declared that the events of the Passion could not be charged against Jewry as a whole; that it was possible, and indeed necessary, to give the right interpretation to dogma to clarify the true

16 Rabbis Louis Finkelstein, Theodore Friedman, Abraham J. Heschel, Joseph H. Lookstein, Julius Mark, Albert Minda, plus several officers and staff members of the American Jewish Committee.
sense intended by the writers of the New Testament; that there was a need for interreligious communication and cooperation, and that his views were endorsed by Pope John.

Two months later John XXIII was dead. His death, on June 3, 1963, was mourned by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. In his brief pontificate of four and one-half years, he had infused the church with a new spirit and had evoked an exceptionally sympathetic response in the non-Catholic world; he was, as Léon Cardinal Suenens of Malines-Brussels described him, "the pope of dialogue." The election of Giovanni Battista Cardinal Montini of Milan to the papacy on June 21 did not come as a great surprise, but it left many questions unanswered. A close friend and associate of John, Cardinal Montini was expected to follow in his predecessor's footsteps. His prompt announcement as Pope Paul VI that he would continue the Ecumenical Council, and at the unexpectedly early date of September 29, was seen as reassuring by those interested in the progress of aggiornamento.

On the specific question of the Jewish declaration, however, pessimistic voices were heard. In June a much-respected Catholic theologian, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., declared at the convention of the National Community Relations Advisory Council that a declaration on Catholic-Jewish relations had been prepared for the first session of the Council but not introduced because of Arab pressure. He also predicted that the Council would continue to avoid the issue. (There was a rapid denial from sources in Rome and Father Weigel declared himself happy to stand corrected.)

Meanwhile a totally unexpected development, which would strain Catholic-Jewish dialogue over the next year or more, exploded on the scene. On February 20, 1963, a play entitled Der Stellvertreter (variously translated as "The Vicar," "The Representative," "The Deputy") opened in a Berlin theater. Written by a young German Protestant named Rolf Hochhuth, the play was a stinging and bitter indictment of the late Pope Pius XII for his failure to protest, publicly and officially, against the mass murder of Jews under Hitler. The pope was depicted as a cold and calculating figure, more interested in protecting the financial and institutional interests of the church than in his moral responsibility as the Vicar of Christ on earth.

The play launched a furious controversy, and its opening in several European cities was accompanied by riots or other disturbances. No less a personage than the present pope commented. In an article written before his election to the papacy but published soon afterwards in the
British Catholic *Tablet* (June 29) Cardinal Montini defended Pius XII as a pope who tried “so far as he could, fully and courageously to carry out the mission entrusted to him,” and accused the author of “an inadequate grasp of psychological, political and historical realities.”

Passionate as was the controversy aroused by *The Deputy*, in Europe it did not become a Catholic-Jewish issue. In the United States, however, it began to take on the overtones of interreligious conflict. In New York City, Jews are prominently associated with the theater, and the first announced producer, Billy Rose (who later withdrew), and director, Herman Shumlin, were Jews. Thus there was pressure from some Catholic sources (notably *America*, a national weekly published by the Jesuits) 17 for Jewish organizations to repudiate the play and come to the defense of Pius XII’s memory. Most Jewish organizations refrained from comment on the play, except as a civil-liberties issue.

*The Deputy* turned out to be a greater occasion for comment and controversy in the American religious press before it opened than after. It opened in New York on February 26, 1964, to mixed reviews, and in the ensuing months rapidly waned as a source of friction. In the United States, as in Europe, comments on the merits of the play did not run strictly along religious lines. Some Protestants and Jews criticized it as drama and as history, and several Catholics, while taking exception to the portrait of Pius XII, nevertheless said the author had performed a service by raising critical issues of conscience too often evaded.

How the Hochhuth play affected the fate of the Ecumenical Council declaration on the Jews is questionable. Very possibly it made no difference at all. Those who supported the declaration may have been strengthened in their resolve by the self-critical reactions of Catholics and Protestants alike. Those opposed may have claimed that the Hochhuth play was a reason for delaying or sidetracking the declaration, lest it appear that the church felt the need to defend itself against the charges of the author.

An occasional insinuation that the Jewish declaration was somehow related to the play was effectively disposed of by Catholic and Jewish spokesmen who pointed out that the declaration had its beginnings long before *Der Stellvertreter* made its first appearance in Berlin.

17 Questioned why Jewish leaders had not spoken out in protest against the play, Msgr. John Oesterreicher wrote in the November 9, 1963 issue, “In the end, the Jewish human-relations agencies will have to speak out against *The Deputy* in unmistakable terms. Otherwise they will defeat their own purpose.”
Second Session

The second session of the Ecumenical Council opened in Rome on September 29, 1963. Though no official report had been made by Council authorities, it was widely rumored that a statement on Catholic-Jewish relations had been prepared. Then, on October 17, the New York Times reported that the draft resolution—part of the schema on ecumenism—would acknowledge the Jewish roots of the church, reject the idea that the Jews were exclusively or collectively guilty for the death of Jesus, and would vigorously condemn antisemitism.

The story reportedly stimulated strenuous protests from conservative elements and from prelates from Arab countries. Nevertheless, the draft document was printed and distributed to the Council Fathers on November 8, as chapter 4 of the draft schema on ecumenism. The text was not publicly released, but an official Vatican communiqué summarized its main points:

—A deep bond ties the church to the chosen people of the Old Testament. The church has its roots in the covenant made by God with Abraham and his descendants.

—The responsibility for Christ’s death falls upon sinful mankind and not upon the Jews. “Therefore, it is unjust to accuse this people of deicide or to consider it cursed of God.”

—There is no scriptural justification for disdain, hatred, or persecution of Jews. Preachers and teachers are admonished never to present “a contrary opinion,” and are urged to promote mutual understanding and esteem.

The communiqué firmly disclaimed any political intent, stressing that the declaration was neither pro-Zionist nor anti-Zionist, and rejecting “any use of the text to support partisan discussions or particular political claims” as wholly contrary to the framers’ intention. The document was distributed at that time, Father Thomas F. Stransky, O.S.P., an American member of Cardinal Bea’s staff told newsmen at a briefing session, “because some misunderstanding (regarding its purely religious nature) had appeared in the Arab press.”

The announcement on November 19 that Cardinal Bea would introduce chapter 4 of the schema on ecumenism and Bishop Emile de Smedt of Bruges chapter 5 (a statement affirming religious liberty) was greeted with great enthusiasm within the Council. Observers reported that this announcement generated more spontaneous applause than had been heard theretofore. Cardinal Bea declared that he had prepared a state-
ment on the Jews by the "express command" of the late Pope John. He pointed out that "there is no national nor political question here . . . There is only treatment of a purely religious question." He stressed the content of the declaration as summarized above, and stated that the declaration was necessary in the light of the violent and criminal persecution of Jews which had taken place during the Nazi era. Since the Nazi propaganda might have an unfortunate effect on faithful Catholics, it was important to root out any ideas remaining through the influence of that propaganda. He declared that neither the Jews of our time nor even all the Jews at the time of Jesus could be accused of the crimes committed against him, and ended with a plea that the church follow "the example of burning charity of the Lord Himself upon the Cross."

The draft statements on religious liberty and on the Jews were widely noted in the American Catholic press, and there were many affirmative editorial comments on the Jewish declaration. The introduction of chapter 4 also evoked positive responses from spokesmen for Jewish religious and community organizations and from the Jewish press.

Nevertheless, it was apparent that there was strong opposition to both declarations within the Council. The Oriental prelates were unanimously opposed to the statement on the Jews. Some bishops, while not opposed to a declaration on relationships with Jews, felt such a declaration must also refer to Moslems, Buddhists, and other non-Christians. There were prelates indifferent to the Jewish question, but strongly opposed to the statement on religious liberty for fear it would be used to undermine the authority of the church and encourage indifferentism or Communism. The ultra-conservatives were opposed to both.

As in the first session, so during the second also, an antisemitic publication was privately distributed to the Council Fathers. *Gli Ebrei e il Concilio alla luce della Sacra Scrittura e della Tradizione* ("The Jews and the Council in the Light of Scripture and Tradition") by a pseudonymous Bernardus, cited authoritative Catholic sources supporting the deicide charge against Jews, proclaimed that Jews could only wipe out the curse upon them by converting to Christianity, and insisted that efforts to change the traditional view were the result of a conspiracy in the Council by Jews and Freemasons working on behalf of Communism.

While those opposed to chapters 4 and 5 were in the minority, they nevertheless exercised powerful control. Indeed, they successfully maneuvered to detach these chapters from the schema. On November 21 the Council moderators suddenly announced that there would be an immediate vote on acceptance of chapters 1–3 as a basis for discussion. The
secretary general added that voting on chapters 4 and 5 would take place “in a few days.” The days came and went, and the Council’s second session ended on December 4 without an opportunity for the Council Fathers to vote, in principle, on either chapter. (A vote of acceptance in principle meant that the present text would be the basis for debate. The lack of such a vote meant that both draft statements were again open to revision, including scrutiny by the Theological Commission and the Central Coordinating Commission, headed respectively by Cardinals Ottaviani and Cicognani, both leaders of the conservatives.)

Despite Cardinal Bea’s assurance that “what is put off is not put away,” and despite Pope Paul’s dramatic announcement of his forthcoming pilgrimage to the Holy Land, there was a widespread, if muted, discontent among the liberals at the outcome of the second session. Paul’s trip to the Holy Land and his meeting with Patriarch Athenagoras of the Greek Orthodox Church were unprecedented and newsworthy events, but the widespread publicity and enthusiasm they evoked did not prevent Catholic observers and commentators from asking what had gone wrong at the Ecumenical Council.

**Reaction in the United States**

In the United States the question was asked openly in the Catholic press by several journalists who had covered the Council. Msgr. James Tucek, official correspondent for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, wrote that the fate of the chapters on religious freedom and the Jews was “one of the mysteries of the second session” and that “something had happened behind the scenes.” The explanation that the two chapters had not been submitted to a vote because of lack of time was “not convincing, especially in view of the fact that this same day’s assembly closed a half hour earlier than usual.”

Many other Catholic observers expressed disappointment at the outcome of the second session, and the fact that a small minority among the bishops appeared to have thwarted the will of the majority. A few commentators suggested that political and economic considerations underlay the liberal-conservative clash within the church. Gary MacEoin, a syndicated columnist, wrote that some bishops might balk at reform of the Curia because it would mean “the dismantling of the economic empire which is a big part of the Curia’s power structure,” and a prominent Catholic author, Michael Novak, suggested that the commitment of Vatican funds in Italian industry, and the fear of nationalization of some industries which might result from the shift to a left-center coalition in
Italian politics, could not be ignored in discussing positions at the Ecumenical Council.

Others commenting on the second session asked why the American bishops had not assumed greater leadership in pressing for the positions they supported. Unlike some other groups, they had not lobbied in support of chapters 4 and 5, although the American hierarchy generally favored them.

If the American hierarchy had not marshalled its collective strength during the second session, however, it began to speak out firmly and forthrightly in the months that followed. Expectations that religious liberty and the declaration on the Jews would be approved at the third session were voiced by American prelates on numerous occasions, and in some cases Jewish meetings provided the forum for such statements.

Albert Cardinal Meyer, addressing a group of Protestant ministers at the Chicago Theological Seminary in January 1964, stated that “the ecumenical movement cannot be securely founded until a clear statement on religious liberty is fully developed.” Richard Cardinal Cushing, speaking at St. Peter’s College in February, declared that without a Vatican Council endorsement of religious liberty the ecumenical movement would “fall on its face.” Archbishop Robert Lucey stated in San Antonio in March that “the American hierarchy should take the lead to procure adoption” of a decree proclaiming freedom of religion. Bishop Robert E. Tracy of Louisiana wrote in an article published in several Catholic journals in January, “I do not believe that even the best-contrived obstructionism can keep considerations on the church, the bishops, ecumenism, the Jews, and religious liberty from coming to a vote on the floor at the next session.”

Speaking before a meeting sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League and the Federation of Jewish Agencies in Philadelphia in March, Archbishop John J. Krol said that the statement pending before the Council “should help to eliminate future attempts to pervert the Gospel of love into a Gospel of hatred.” Archbishop Krol declared that the Gospel account of the Crucifixion had been distorted and used “as a pretext for persecuting the Jews,” but that the New Testament gives “no basis for hate and anti-Jewish feeling.” Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit predicted approval of the chapters on religious freedom and Christian-Jewish relations at the third session of the Council. So did Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh.

A powerful condemnation of antisemitism was made by Cardinal Spellman at the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee in
April 1964. Cardinal Spellman stated that antisemitism “can never find a basis in the Catholic religion” and that it was “simply absurd to maintain that there is some kind of continuing guilt which is transferred to any group and which rests upon them as a curse which they must suffer.”

There were also initiatives from the Jewish side. In March 1964 a B’nai B’rith delegation of three met with Pope Paul VI and communicated the “profound interest” of the Jewish community in the proposed declaration on religious freedom and Catholic-Jewish relations. In May reports were received from Rome that the draft decree on Jews had been watered down, and that the specific repudiation of the deicide charge had been eliminated. On May 30, an American Jewish Committee delegation of six met with Pope Paul VI. In a statement subsequently published in the Vatican paper, Osservatore Romano (May 31, 1964), and picked up by the Catholic press in many parts of the world, the Pope expressed his hope that ethnic differences “should never be for you, or for any other ethnic group, a reason for undergoing any diminution in your human rights,” and firmly disassociated himself from the “political question” (understood as reference to the State of Israel). Discussing the religious aspect, the Pope declared his “particular consideration for the Jewish religious tradition with which Christianity is so intimately linked” and strongly deplored “the horrible ordeals of which the Jews have been the victims in recent years.” He declined, however, to comment specifically on the deicide question, except to say that he had read Cardinal Spellman’s address and that Cardinal Spellman had spoken his sentiments.

Also in May, Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee and Joseph Lichten of the Anti-Defamation League were invited to speak before the Catholic Press Association in Pittsburgh. Both addressed themselves to the importance of a clear and forthright Ecumencial Council statement specifically repudiating the deicide charge. The Catholic press responded to these concerns with a strong outpouring of editorial opinion; over the next months, diocesan newspapers and other Catholic journals made editorial appeals in behalf of a strong Jewish declaration.
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18 Label Katz, international president; Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president, and Saul E. Joffes, secretary-general.
19 Morris B. Abram, president; Ralph Friedman, chairman of the executive board; Philip E. Hoffman, chairman of the board of governors; Zachariah Shuster, director of the European office; John Slawson, executive vice president; Mrs. Leonard M. Sperry, member of the executive board.
There were some comments from the Protestant side as well. In an “open letter” to the American Catholic bishops, in Commonweal on June 26, 1964, and in a similar article in Look magazine on October 6, 1964, Robert McAfee Brown, a Protestant theologian and delegate-observer to the second session of the Council for the World Presbyterian Alliance, urged “vigorous advocacy” of the statement on religious liberty and stressed the “urgency” of a statement on the Jews which would condemn both antisemitism and “any notion of the Jews as a deicide race.” Failure to adopt a statement on the Jews that would not contain both of these crucial emphases, he wrote, “would be a bitter blow indeed to the non-Catholic world.”

The blow, however, was half-struck already. Rumors that the draft declaration on the Jews had been watered down were reported in the New York Times on June 12. On August 25 Joseph Cardinal Ritter confirmed that the condemnation of the deicide charge against Jews had not been retained in the revised draft. Moreover, on September 3, the New York Herald Tribune published an unauthorized version of the text of the revised draft, which differed from Cardinal Bea’s earlier version in several other critical particulars. In addition to avoiding the term “deicide”—and thus the rejection of this term as applied to the Jewish people—the new document contained what seemed to many Jews a clear call to conversion:

It is also worth remembering that the union of the Jewish people with the church is a part of the Christian hope. Accordingly, and following the teaching of the apostle Paul (cf. Rom. 11:25), the church expects

20 It should be noted that Protestant groups were clarifying their own theological perspective on the Jews during this same period. In Løgumkloster, Denmark, in April and May 1964, the Lutheran World Federation’s Department of World Mission denounced antisemitism as “spiritual suicide” and urged the member churches of the federation to examine their publications and remove and oppose false generalizations about Jews: “Especially reprehensible are the notions that Jews, rather than all mankind, are responsible for the death of Jesus the Christ and that God has for this reason rejected His covenant people.”

In June the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA also passed a resolution branding antisemitism, “no matter what its origin, as absolutely irreconcilable with the profession and practice of the Christian faith” and recalling the World Council of Churches’ statement in 1961 that “the historic events which led to the Crucifixion should not be so presented as to fasten upon the Jewish people of today responsibilities which belong to our corporate humanity and not to one race or community.”

Similarly, in November 1964, the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, in a strong unanimous statement, called the deicide charge against the Jewish people “a tragic misunderstanding of the inner significance of the Crucifixion.”
in unshakeable faith and with ardent desire the entrance of that people into the fullness of the people of God established by Christ.

Everyone should be careful, therefore, not to expose the Jewish people as a rejected nation, be it in catechetical tuition, in preaching of God’s word or in worldly conversation, nor should anything else be said or done which may alienate the minds of men from the Jews. Equally, all should be on their guard not to impute to the Jews of our time that which was perpetrated in the Passion of Christ.

While the original version had stated that neither the Jewish people of today nor the Jewish people of the time of Jesus could be held accountable for the Crucifixion, the revised draft spoke only of the Jews of today, thus leaving open the question of collective guilt in earlier times. Perhaps most objectionable from the Jewish viewpoint, however, was the “therefore”—that is, the implication that respect for Jews was motivated only by missionary interest, and contingent upon Jewish conversion. Predictably, there were immediate negative responses from Jewish sources.21

Third Session

When the third session of the Council opened on September 16, it was evident that prelates supporting a stronger statement on the Jews would fight to get it on the floor of the Council. Archbishop John C. Heenan of Westminster, Primate of Great Britain, publicly expressed astonishment that the text had been changed without the knowledge of the commission charged with its preparation. On September 16, 170 out of 240 American bishops, meeting in Rome, said they would press for a declaration on religious liberty and a stronger declaration on the Jews. Editorial support was also forthcoming. America (Sept. 19, 1964) commented:

The passages that seem to have disturbed Jewish commentators most, however, referred to Christian hope for the eventual approach of the Jewish people to a full gathering of the People of God. Here, regrettably, the translation in the press imparts to these carefully phrased statements a tone that understandably might cause a Jewish reader to question the sincerity of the document’s earlier insistence on promoting “mutual understanding and esteem between Catholics and Jews through theological research and brotherly conversations.” It may well be that this controversial passage will also meet with sharp questioning in the Council.

21 A description of Jewish reactions to the Ecumenical Council and the internal debate within the Jewish community may be found in the final section of this article.
Similarly, the Providence Visitor, a diocesan weekly, editorialized, (Sept. 25, 1964):

The failure of the new draft to restrict the absolution from the deicide charge to only the Jewish people of today leaves room for the belief that the Jews as a people in the past were the guilty ones. And yet we know by faith, and from the Scripture, that Christ walked freely to his death. . . . The Jews, despite all, have been employed as a handy scapegoat for us to unload our part of the guilt in the death of Christ by casting it on someone else.

And the Protestant Christian Century commented (Sept. 23, 1964) that the changed draft

. . . is not adequate atonement for the crimes Christians have committed against Jews and defended with the charge that Jews are God-killers. The first business of the church is not to evangelize the Jews but to repent of its sins against them.

The Jewish declaration, introduced on September 25, came up for debate on September 28 and 29. Predictably, it was opposed by prelates from Arab nations. Ignace Cardinal Tappouni, Syrian-Rite patriarch of Antioch, speaking also in the name of four other Oriental prelates, declared that adoption of the document would create “the most serious difficulties for the hierarchy and the Roman Catholic faithful in many localities,” because of the hostility of the Arab world to such a declaration.

But the sentiment of the great majority of Council Fathers was clear. The most frequent and energetic demand to be heard during 35 interventions was for the restoration of those aspects of the original text which dealt with the relationship of the Jewish people to the death of Jesus and the specific, unambiguous condemnation of antisemitic movements. A forthright appeal for justice echoed repeatedly in the Basilica of St. Peter’s. The statement must be made “more positive, less timid, more charitable,” declared Cardinal Cushing. “There is no Christian rationale —neither theological nor historical—for any inequity, hatred or persecution of our Jewish brothers. . . . If not many Christian voices were lifted in recent years against the great injustices, yet let our voices humbly cry out now.” “The Jews expect from us, first of all, words of justice,” said French Bishop Leon Elchinger of Strasbourg. It cannot be denied, he said, that in this century and past centuries as well, sons of the church—

22 Coptic-Rite Patriarch Sidarouss of Alexandria, Melkite-Rite Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch, Chaldean-Rite Patriarch Paul II Cheikho of Babylon, and Armenian-Rite Patriarch Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian of Cilicia.
not infrequently in the name of the church—committed crimes against
the Jews. "Why should we not find in the spirit of the Gospel the courage
to ask for forgiveness in the name of so many Christians for so many
serious injustices?" Bishop Sergio Méndez Arceo of Cuernavaca, Mexico,
and Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle of Washington, D.C., urged that the
church not only condemn antisemitism, but also expressly deplore and
interdict all persecutions, especially those of Christian origin. Arch-
bishops Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn, Germany, Franjo Seper of Zagreb,
Yugoslavia, and Bishop Jules Daem of Antwerp, Belgium, agreed that
the only effective way to deprive persecutions and discriminations of their
theoretical basis was for the Council to make the joint heritage of Re-v-
elation with Israel unmistakably clear. Franziskus Cardinal Koenig of
Vienna asked why the revised text, in condemning persecution of the
Jews, omitted the words "formerly or in our own times" which had ap-
peared in the original.

A majority of the Council Fathers who spoke urged either a return
to the original text or the addition to the present text of an express rejec-
tion by the Council of the deicide charge. American Cardinals Cushing,
Meyer, and Ritter were especially vigorous in this demand, as were
Cardinals Joseph Frings of Cologne, Achille Liénart of Lille, Giacamo
Lercaro of Bologna, Paul-Emile Léger of Montreal and König; Arch-
bishops Seper, Philip Pocock of Toronto, and Heenan; Bishops Elchinger,
Méndez-Arceo and Pieter Nierman of Groningen (on behalf of the
Dutch Episcopate), and Stephen Leven of San Antonio, Texas. Arch-
bishop Heenan and Bishop Leven were particularly forthright. The orig-
inal text, stated Archbishop Heenan, had become known everywhere. If,
after a full-scale debate, the rejection of the deicide charge were dropped,
it would seem that the church was still convinced that the Jews were
deicides. "I humbly plead," he concluded, "that this Declaration of ours
shall openly proclaim that the Jewish people as such is not guilty of the
death of our Lord."

Replying to the suggestion that the statement on deicide had been sur-
pressed because of the word "deicide" is philosophically and theologi-
cally absurd, Bishop Leven declared, "We are not dealing here with some
philosophical entity, but with a word of infamy and execration which was
invented by Christians and used to blame and persecute the Jews. For
many centuries, and even in our own, Christians have hurled this word

23 Cardinal Spellman was hospitalized in New York at this time, but he had pri-
vately communicated his support of a strengthened declaration, and expended his
efforts on behalf of it.
against Jews and because of it they have justified every kind of horrible excess and even their slaughter... We must tear this word out of the Christian vocabulary so that it may never again be used against the Jews."

As for the formulation of the church's aspiration regarding Jewish conversion, several speakers wanted it rewritten. "The paragraph on the conversion of Jews must be changed, and less offensive wording must be chosen to express the hope of the union of all mankind," said Cardinal Ritter. Archbishop O'Boyle said that the passage in question "brought to the minds of many Jews the memories of past persecutions, forced conversions and forced rejection of their faith... There should be no hint of pressure or of the means that would disrupt fruitful dialogue between the Church and the Jewish people."

(Several Fathers from Asian and African countries urged that the declaration be enlarged to include reference to Hinduism, Buddhism and even paganism.)

With such a mandate behind it, Cardinal Bea's commission was now free to rewrite the document in its original spirit. The opposition intensified its efforts to block action. On September 30, speaking before leaders of the Eastern-Rite communities in Damascus, Syrian Premier Salah el-Bitar assailed the draft statement, and asked the heads of the Catholic communities to urge Pope Paul to thwart the attempt to exonerate the Jews from deicide. Al-Baath, the official newspaper of Syria's ruling party, said the Syrian government would bring the issue before a conference of neutralist heads of state in Cairo in order to enlist wider opposition to the proposed declaration. Other diplomatic interventions also took place, reportedly from President Sukarno of Indonesia and Nasser's plenipotentiary ambassador, made directly to Pope Paul. Once again, antisemitic pamphlets were circulated among the bishops, charging that the Jews had masterminded the declaration and that Cardinal Bea was himself Jewish. In addition, last-ditch attempts to block progress were made by the conservative minority within the Council who were disturbed by the general direction the Council was taking and for whom the document on the Jews was just another example of a dangerous departure from established tradition, with the declaration on religious liberty even more threatening.

On October 9 a letter came to Cardinal Bea from the secretary general of the Council, Archbishop Pericle Felici, acting, he said, on behalf of high authority, announcing the appointment of new mixed commissions to review both the document on religious liberty and that on the Jews. This maneuver was seen as an attempt to delay or prevent Council
action despite the will of the majority, and the progressives responded with immediate action. A group of the leading progressive cardinals drew up a petition to Pope Paul firmly protesting the violation of conciliar independence. They charged that the conservatives were attempting to cut the Jewish document to one insignificant paragraph, to rewrite the declaration on religious liberty, to weaken the statement that the bishops share in the full authority of the church, and to bring the Council to a close before such controversial topics as birth control and nuclear weapons could be discussed.

Pope Paul supported the progressive cardinals on this occasion. Gaston Cruzat, head of the press office of the Latin American episcopate, announced that the Pope had expressed support for the progressives on all four points.

The document that was finally issued by Cardinal Bea’s commission and distributed to the Council Fathers was entitled “The Relationship of the Church to non-Christian Religions” and dealt with Moslems, Buddhists and Hindus, as well as with Jews. The section devoted to Jews was even stronger than the initial draft decree of November 8, 1963. The specific repudiation of the deicide accusation had been restored. The implication that respect and esteem for Jews was contingent upon their conversion had been replaced by an expectation of “that day, known to God alone, on which all people will address the Lord in a single voice and serve Him shoulder to shoulder.” It denounced hatred and persecution of Jews, and recommended mutual respect and fraternal dialogue.

The vote on the religious liberty declaration was set for November 19 and on the new text regarding Jews and other non-Christians for November 20. On November 19 Eugene Cardinal Tisserant announced in the name of the Council presidency that no vote would be taken on the religious-liberty document since certain Fathers had requested more time to read the new version. This announcement set off a serious disturbance on the floor of the Council. In less than a half hour more than 800 bishops, their number later increased to 1,400, signed a petition requesting the Pope “urgently, more urgently, most urgently” to change the decision of the presidency. Pope Paul refused to set aside that decision, but he promised that religious liberty would be the first order of business at the next session of the Council. It was in an atmosphere of tension and resentment that on the following day the long-awaited text on the Jews —now part of a more comprehensive declaration dealing with the Catholic attitude toward all non-Christians—came up for a vote after three years of struggle and procedural and political opposition. It passed with
the overwhelming margin noted above, and more than one commentator has suggested that the conservative minority might have maneuvered to delay it, too, if not for its reluctance to risk a repetition of the openly-expressed resentment over the postponement of the vote on religious liberty.

Debate within the Jewish Community

As previously noted, the declaration on the Jews, in its various formulations and through its ups and downs within the Council, stirred up a spirited debate within the Jewish community. There were two basic questions: the declaration itself and the role of Jews in relation to it.

As for the declaration itself, did it spring from a moral impulse to correct the failures of the past and purify the church's relationship to Jews, or was it an expediency, an easy way of glossing over centuries of abuse without accepting responsibility? Was the declaration intended to create respect and esteem for the continuing Jewish people, or to encourage their conversion? Was our generation witnessing a sincere effort by the church to overcome a long tradition of prejudice, or was it trying to pretend that the tradition had never existed?

Sharp differences of opinion regarding the intentions of the document and the motivations of the church were not immediately apparent. When the first announcements were made in the fall of 1963 that the Ecumenical Council would consider a document repudiating the deicide charge against Jews, the information was publicly welcomed by major Jewish organizations and criticized by none. There were a few dissenting individual voices, such as Rabbi Harry Essrig of Temple Emanuel in Grand Rapids, Mich., who called the document "too little and too late" and described it as "a sop to the rising intelligence of mankind," but such critical responses were exceptional at this early stage. Affirmative reactions were more characteristic, and expressions of gratification came from many Jewish spokesmen, including A. M. Sonnabend of the American Jewish Committee, Dore Schary of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), Nahum Goldmann of the World Jewish Congress (WJC), Rabbi Theodore Friedman of the Rabbinical Assembly, and Elio Toaff, chief rabbi of Rome. It was hailed by the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds.

But when the second session of Vatican Council II ended with no action on the declaration, criticism was more common. Behind this criticism could be sensed a mistrust of the church's motives, a suspicion that theological dialogue was the honeyed approach to conversion, and simple resentment over the prospect of some 2,500 bishops debating the extent of
Jewish culpability in the death of Jesus. Before the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA) in February 1964, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, a leading spokesman for Orthodox Jewry, attacked the proposed declaration as "nothing more or less than evangelical propaganda." He also discouraged religious dialogue with Catholics. Others charged that the "absolving" of Jews from a crime that they never committed was condescending.

At a National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) meeting in July, (Orthodox) Rabbi Shubert Spero charged that the declaration was calculated to absolve the Jew "of some mythical guilt without the majority religion accepting any responsibility for the historic suffering and agony of the Jewish people." Remarked another rabbi "I don't feel that I have to be exonerated. I didn't crucify anyone."

With the publication of the revised text on September 3, when it became clear that the repudiation of the deicide charge had been omitted and the statement containing what Jews considered a conversionary appeal inserted, the document came under additional attack, this time including Jewish sources which had previously welcomed the declaration and which had, in various degrees, worked cooperatively with Catholic authorities here and abroad. Such spokesmen argued that Jews could not welcome a document which did not recognize the validity and integrity of Judaism, not merely as the mother faith of Christianity, but in its own right. Thus, Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, stated with regard to the expectation of Jewish conversion "inevitably such an appeal must be rejected by Jews, for any declaration, no matter how well intended, whose effect would mean the dissolution of the Jewish people as such and the elimination of Judaism as a religion will be received with resentment by Jews throughout the world."

Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, writing in *Jewish Spectator* (January 1965), stated that dialogue based on the expectation or desire of Jewish conversion was "unthinkable" and that it was tragic for the church to forget that "throughout the centuries it manifested 'its unshakeable faith, its ardent desire and its expectation' regarding the Jewish people by means of unspeakable atrocities against our forebears."

Rabbi Heschel described the revised draft as "spiritual fratricide" and said that he would rather go to Auschwitz if faced with the alternative of conversion or death—a reaction, which, according to Catholic journalist John Cogley, "struck even the most 'progressive' Council Fathers as somewhat extreme." Joseph Lichten of the ADL, then in Europe, commented that the chief objection to the revised draft was that "it fails to
state clearly that the Jews are not guilty of deicide,” and foresaw an “un-
happy result” if the present draft were adopted.

While it is true that there was some Jewish criticism of the declaration, the Ecumenical Council, and the church, it is also true that Jewish leaders reserved much of their criticism for one another. Jewish debate on the question of the role of Jews in relation to the declaration, and to the Catholic church in general, was passionate and at times acrimonious, and revealed basic differences in philosophy and policy.

The convening of an Ecumenical Council, so dramatically announced by Pope John in January 1959, shortly after his election to the papacy, was seen by many Catholics and Jews as a historic opportunity for the church to set its house in order regarding the Jews. Antisemitism had been condemned before, but here was the possibility for the church officially and authoritatively to repudiate the traditional interpretations of Catholic doctrine which have stimulated or rationalized persecution of Jews across the centuries: foremost among them, the notion of the Jews as a deicide race.

Obviously, such an action would be welcomed by all Jews. But, some felt, the Ecumenical Council being a totally Catholic internal affair, Jews should seek no relationship or involvement with it. Antisemitism, the argument went, is a Christian problem, and both the initiative and the means for overcoming it should come from the Christian community. It would be unseemly and undignified for Jews to plead in their own behalf. Others, particularly Jews associated with organizations which had over the years built up sustained, cooperative relationships in the Catholic community and had actively promoted interfaith dialogue, felt that Jews had not only the right, but also the responsibility to pursue certain aims. Antisemitism might be a Christian problem, they reasoned, just as anti-Negro prejudice is a white problem; but Jews, after all, were its victims and must advocate their own cause, just as American Negroes had taken the lead in the struggle for racial justice. In so far as antisemitism found sanction in Christian teachings about Jews, it was a problem of direct concern to Jews. In so far as the Ecumenical Council might put an end to such teachings, that was a legitimate goal to pursue. Obviously, certain initiatives would have to come from the Christian side, but Jews could and should point to the problems, appeal to the conscience of Christian leaders, and communicate their hopes for effective Council action.

Accordingly, some Jewish organizations devoted substantial time and energy to this end, publicly—in books, studies, articles, and radio and
television programs; by raising the issue before a whole variety of Church-related groups, or by providing forums for authoritative Catholic spokesmen to express their views—and privately, through correspondence and unpublicized meetings with Catholic leaders here and abroad.

The American Jewish Committee and the ADL were perhaps most heavily committed to this kind of program, but B'nai B'rith, WJC, and the World Conference of Jewish Organizations all, at one time or another and in diverse ways, became involved.

The American Jewish Committee not only submitted research memoranda on Catholic teaching and liturgy regarding Jews to Cardinal Bea's secretariat, and arranged for the confidential meeting of Jewish leaders with Cardinal Bea, as previously described, it also maintained communication with various Catholic prelates and experts. Articles by its European director, Zachariah Shuster, and its interreligious-affairs director, Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, dealing with various aspects of the deicide charge, appeared in scholarly and popular publications. Particularly noteworthy was Mr. Shuster's participation in a symposium (London Observer, August 11, 1963) in which Lady Barbara Ward Jackson presented a Catholic point of view. Rabbi Tanenbaum and Mr. Shuster were present in Rome during parts of the Council's sessions and conferred with Catholic authorities. In the summer of 1964 an American Jewish Committee delegation visited Latin America and met with several cardinals and bishops with regard to the pending declaration. The Anti-Defamation League was also actively involved in discussions with Catholic prelates and its representative, Joseph Lichten, was present in Rome during two of the Council's sessions. A summary of an ADL-sponsored survey indicating some relationship between antisemitism and the deicide charge was reprinted by the Dutch Documentation Center of the Council and widely distributed. Both the American Jewish Committee and ADL carried on extensive interfaith activity. Many of these programs, such as ADL-sponsored institutes on Catholic-Jewish relations and AJC-sponsored conferences on religious textbooks, provided the occasion for an exploration of Catholic teachings about Jews, and these events were frequently noted in the religious press, and used as the basis for constructive editorial comment.

The European representative of B'nai B'rith, E. L. Ehrlich, was also in communication with various Catholic prelates, as was Gerhart Riegner of the WJC, and Fritz Becker, the director of its Rome office.

Synagogal and rabbinical groups eschewed any organizational relationship with the Council, as did NCRAC; but a number of rabbis and com-
munity-relations professionals in America, Europe, and Latin America communicated with members of the Catholic hierarchy, exchanged views with Catholic friends and colleagues, and wrote or spoke out on the subject in their individual capacities. Some Jewish laymen were similarly active.

Since key Jewish religious leaders, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, had been kept informed regarding the activities and efforts of the various communal agencies and had frequently been consulted in the preparation of specialized documents, there appeared to be a consensus within the Jewish community regarding the usefulness of these efforts. However, in the summer of 1964, when it appeared that the declaration had been emasculated, tempers began to fray and some Jewish organizations expressed open criticism not only of the draft declaration, but also of Jewish efforts on behalf of it. Officers of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), RCA, and WJC attacked “pressure” tactics on behalf of the declaration. CCAR was reported (New York Times, June 21, 1964) to have expressed a consensus that the Vatican statement was a Christian problem and Jews need not press for its adoption. Its president, Rabbi Leon Feuer, said in a presidential report that an “obsequious appeal for a statement by the Ecumenical Council can only be revolting to the Jewish spirit and an insult to the memory of Jewish martyrdom.” Later, in an interview reported in the New York Times, he criticized Jewish secular groups for “undignified pressure.”

In June, Orthodox rabbis assailed lay Jewish groups for having involved themselves on behalf of the proposed declaration. Rabbi Abraham avRutick, president of RCA, and Rabbi Israel Klavan, executive secretary, argued that such groups were concerning themselves with questions of theology, in which they had no competence.

Similarly, before WJC in Jerusalem in July, Nahum Goldmann, criticized Jewish “pressure” on the Vatican and stated that “Jews as a people should maintain a position of self-respect and dignity and not try to raise the issue with too much intensity.” (To whom these stricture were addressed was not entirely clear, inasmuch as Dr. Goldmann himself had been involved in several approaches to the Vatican. Civiltà Cattolica, the leading Jesuit publication in Rome, recalled Dr. Goldmann’s visit to Cardinal Bea, and the memorandum submitted to Cardinal Bea by Dr. Goldmann and Label Katz.) There were similar criticisms (not unanimous) before NCRAC in July, which reported “an extensive feeling . . . that the overtures made by some Jewish groups toward the church for a statement on Catholic-Jewish relations have been excessive and unbe-
coming." *Viewpoint*, the periodical of the (Orthodox) National Council of Young Israel, commented tartly on July 19: "With all the Jewish secular leaders vying for audiences with the Pope, the Vatican must be subject to a virtual traffic jam."

Since the American Jewish Committee, whose delegation had recently met with the Pope, was the obvious target of some of these attacks—indeed, was so named by Rabbi Israel Miller of RCA—its president, Morris B. Abram, replied in a public statement that its activities in Catholic-Jewish relations were based on intergroup-relations considerations, not theology, and that where theological matters were involved it had consulted eminent Jewish theologians.

Jewish efforts on behalf of the Ecumenical Council declaration had their defenders as well as their detractors. Rabbi Jacob Neusner, writing in the Connecticut *Jewish Ledger* on November 19, said there was "nothing to condemn and much to praise, in the dignified and well-informed efforts" to do away with the deicide charge. He went on to state:

> With a sad heart we have seen vilification of meaningful and honest efforts to secure the good name of Jewry and Judaism among a vast and influential segment of mankind. . . . We continue to hope that these efforts will bear fruit, and we continue to feel deep gratitude for the devotion of the men and institutions who currently labor for Israel’s welfare despite Israel’s complaint.

Despite differences of opinion and cross-criticism within the Jewish community, there was still considerable sentiment in the Jewish community that a strong declaration without evangelical connotations would be of great value, and that Jewish organizations should agree on a joint statement expressing a representative viewpoint. Accordingly, 14 major Jewish organizations joined, on Oct. 6, in issuing the following "Statement to the Jewish Community":

> Throughout our history we Jews have been the bearers of a distinctive religious commitment. No matter how great the pressures, no sacrifice has been too great for us to maintain our unique religious character.

> A concern with the common destiny of all men is deeply rooted in our spiritual heritage. We, therefore, note with satisfaction the develop-

---

ment of increasingly harmonious relationships among the great faiths that have engendered common positions and actions on vital humanitarian issues. The ever increasing contact between peoples in the modern world has created new dimensions in human relations which Jews have welcomed and in which they have fully participated. Yet today, no less than in the past, the Jew remains steadfast in his historic commitment, determined to preserve his faith and heritage.

The Ecumenical Council currently meeting in Rome is a convocation of the religious leadership of the Catholic church, concerned with the problems of Christian unity and the definition of Catholic religious doctrine. It would, therefore, be improper for the Jewish community which is not a part of Christianity or its ecumenical movement to offer suggestions concerning religious doctrine to this Council. However, it is our hope, that this Council will further harmonious relationships among the religions of the world to seek solutions to the problems of mankind.

All men of good will are encouraged by the concern of this Council with the fact that certain teachings of the church have been used at times as a source of antisemitism. It is to be hoped that the final determination of the Council will contribute to the effective elimination of antisemitism and all sources of bigotry and prejudice and will lead to better understanding amongst all peoples.

The declaration as finally voted at the Ecumenical Council, with the objectionable passage changed and the deicide accusation firmly rejected, was welcomed by the same organizations. When the Council Fathers have voted its promulgation, they declared in a joint statement, “the Catholic church will have made a historic contribution to the advancement of harmonious relations among the peoples of the great faiths.” The statement went on to “reiterate our belief in the distinctive role of Judaism as a separate faith community in making its contributions to the achievements of the common goals of humanity.” The declaration was also welcomed by President Zalman Shazar of Israel. Receiving a delegation of archbishops and bishops from Africa, Asia, and South America, he stated that “all honor is due to the Ecumenical Council” for having voted “the daring and purifying pronouncement that explicitly forbids hatred of the Jews and abrogates that ancient accusation for which there is no ground in fact, but which has drenched my people’s history with blood.”

Acclaim was not unanimous among Jews. Rabbi Emanuel Rackman of Yeshiva University stated in November that there could be no worthy discussion (with the Catholic church) until Jews were regarded as equals; but while the declaration speaks of a common patrimony, “not once does
it accord Judaism recognition as an equal..." Leo Pfeffer, special counsel to AJCongress, dismissed the declaration as “not an act for the preservation of the Jews, but for the preservation of the Catholic church.”

The Future of the Declaration

The declaration, although accepted in principle, continues to be the target of a sustained campaign by Arab nations to prevent its final adoption. The Vatican correspondent of the Roman news magazine, Il Punto, (quoted in London Jewish Chronicle, January 22, 1965) reported that President Charles Helou of Lebanon, the only Christian Arab head of state and a former ambassador to the Holy See, had been charged by the Arab League with expressing officially the opposition of Arab leaders to the Jewish document, and that Arab diplomatic circles did not exclude a visit to the Vatican by President Nasser of Egypt. The Arab governments have also communicated their views to papal nuncios and asked Catholic and other Christian leaders in their various countries to communicate their opposition to the declaration to Pope Paul.

Patriarch Kyrillos VI of Alexandria, head of the Coptic Orthodox church in Egypt, branded the Council’s preliminary approval of the declaration “an imperialistic plot that has nothing to do with religion” and went on to say: “The Holy Bible convicted the Jews and their children of Christ’s crucifixion and to absolve them of that crime would be open to refutation of the Bible.” (Religious News Service, New York, November 20, 1964.) The patriarch extended invitations to patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Coptic Orthodox churches in Ethiopia, Sudan, Jordan, and other Arab countries to attend a summit conference to register disapproval of the declaration. The Greek radio reported that Greek Orthodox Patriarch Chrisophorus of Alexandria also strongly protested the draft declaration (Religious News Service, December 4, 1964).

In an article which appeared in all Jordanian newspapers on November 23, 1964, a leader of a Protestant church in Amman called on Jordanian Catholics to boycott services held in churches belonging to various monasteries and to say their prayers at home in Arabic “in order to force the Vatican to cancel its decision absolving Jews.” A meeting of Jordanian Christian notables sent a cable to the Pope asking that the declaration be dropped from the agenda of next year’s session of the Council (Religious News Service, November 20, 1964). A Syrian government news bulletin reported that Chaldean-Rite Bishop Stéphane Bello of Aleppo has dispatched “tens of telegrams” to the Vatican in protest (Providence Visitor, October 9, 1964).
Despite repeated public assurances from Cardinal Bea and others that
the purpose of the declaration is purely religious, Arab leaders continue
to claim it to be Zionist-inspired and part of a plot "to mobilize world
Catholic opinion against the Arabs for reigniting the Palestinian ques-
tion," in the words of Syrian Premier Salah el-Bitar. (Providence Visitor,
October 9, 1964.)

A final observation might be made regarding the extent and intensity
of Arab efforts to prevent and then to overturn that section of the decla-
ration which deals with Catholic-Jewish relations. When the late Father
Gustave Weigel announced in June 1963 that the proposed Jewish decla-
roration had been sidetracked at the Ecumenical Council because of Arab
opposition, the Arab Information Center was quick to issue a disclaimer.
Saadat Hasan, chief of press and public liaison of the Arab Information
Center, stated that the Arab nations would welcome "a clear and forth-
right statement by the Ecumenical Council on antisemitism." Arabs
make a distinction between Judaism and Jews on the one hand and Zion-
ism and Israel on the other, he declared, and are anti-Zionist but not
anti-Jewish. Yet by October 1964 Arab political opposition to the Jewish
declaration had led Moslem government officials into Christian theologi-
cal debate, and a Syrian government radio broadcast (as reported by the
National Catholic Welfare Conference) declared: "When the Jews dipped
their hands into the innocent blood of Jesus Christ they were in fact try-
ing to assassinate Christ's principles and teachings" (Providence Visitor,
October 9, 1964).

Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch issued a communiqué intend-
ing to reassure the Arab world that the declaration was not, in any sense,
a political document. Referring to the Arab press response as an "orches-
trated uproar," the patriarch stated that the declaration "is a purely re-
ligious statement, which pertains to the position of the Catholic Church
toward the non-Christian religions." He cautioned Arab critics of the
declaration to differentiate clearly between Judaism as a religion and
Zionism as a political movement. This effort to pacify Arab hostility,
however, was marred by some hostilities of its own. The patriarch said
that "there certainly remains on the forehead of the Jewish people, as
long as it is far from Christ the Redeemer, what the prophets of the Old
Testament prophesied: a stain of shame. But this stain of shame does not
constitute a personal crime . . ."; he continued that "because of their pro-
paganda skill, the media which are in their hands and under their in-
fluence, the Jews can clothe reality as they wish. They exploit the least
word that is said to serve their political interests"; and he concluded by
alleging that the great majority of the Council, and notably the American prelates, voted for the declaration for personal reasons and interests: “The personal reasons are dictated by a sentiment of pity due to the massacre of millions of Jews by Nazism and the interest is due to the fact that the great number of Americans have commercial interests with Jews.”

(Replying to this communiqué, Msgr. George Higgins, director of the Social Action Commission of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, wrote in January 1965 that the theological accusation “did not reflect the spirit or the tone of the Council’s declaration and most certainly would have been rejected by the Fathers if it had been put to a vote on the floor of the Council.” He also said that Jews would legitimately resent the inference regarding their propaganda skill and influence, and that the motives attributed to the vote of the American prelates were “demonstrably unfair to the American bishops and, however unintentionally, . . . calculated . . . to fan the flames of anti-Semitism. . . .”)

The interest of the Arab world in the charge of deicide against Jews cannot be attributed to religious concern: the question is of little or no consequence to Islam. The Arab opposition to any statement expressing esteem or affection for Jews, suggesting a special relationship between Christianity and the Jewish people, deploring specific acts of persecution against Jews, and removing a theological basis of antisemitism is politically motivated, and this opposition has been carried out on the highest political and diplomatic levels. Whether the Catholic church will respond to these pressures, and in what ways it may respond, are questions which will affect not only the ultimate disposition of the declaration but also the future of Catholic-Jewish relations.

Cardinal Bea, in a statement published in Osservatore Romano on November 30, cautioned against “arbitrary and twisted” interpretations of the declaration. “This is a religious question in which the Council aims at nothing else but the promotion of peace everywhere; it hopes that a religious matter will not be misused in order to justify political discrimination and prejudices.”