



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-630: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Digital Collection, 1953-1996.
Series C: Speeches and Eulogies, 1953-1996.

Box
24

Folder
1

Speeches, 1966-1974.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI NATHAN A. PERILMAN
JUNE 3, 1972
REMARKS OF RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

It is a privilege which I greatly appreciate to participate in the joyous events of this hour which mark the 40th anniversary in the rabbinate of your rabbi -- Nathan Perilman.

I genuinely like Nate Perilman. I certainly respect him for those qualities of mind and heart he brings to his endeavors...his intelligence...his industry...his integrity...for his capacity to transmit his ideals forcefully articulated in the written and the spoken word and in the manner of his life.

There is little that I can add to what has been said about him and what will be said. Indeed, what can I tell you about him that you do not know so much better yourself? After all, you are his congregants and he is your rabbi. Your relationship spans the years. It is cemented by tears of joy and sorrow alike. That relationship requires no expressing, it cannot even be expressed. It can only be felt.

You ought to know, of course, and to this I can bear testimony, that his influence as a rabbi extends beyond the holy walls of Emanu-El. It is felt in many places; certainly it is felt in the councils of that larger family of Reform Congregations of which you are a cherished part and for which I am privileged to speak.

No aspect of our doing - on a regional or national level - is untouched by his creative talents. Wherever we need his help he gives it willingly and without reserve. A counseling center needs to be established - he is there to create and guide it. A relationship must be restored between a rabbi and his congregation - he is prepared to conciliate, giving hours of his all too precious time. Money is required - he is prepared to ask for it and if you think it is a burden to be asked for money try asking for it -- that burden is more onerous by far.

And so I might continue with area after area of our work. Wherever we need help he responds and whatever he undertakes to do he does exceptionally well.

I like him for one more reason still, for you see I am a kind of travelling rabbi and as such am often consigned to a pew, compelled to listen to another rabbi preach. No fate is more terrible than that - I mean for one rabbi having to listen to another rabbi even while knowing that he can do so much better himself. Not so when I listen to Nate Perilman! He practices that art of preaching with skill, he is a formidable master of that craft. His words have power, they stir the soul.

This morning was a perfect case in point. Nate's response was magnificent, was it not? Especially the peroration. I hope that someone will see to it that his remarks are published. His sentiments were well conceived and beautifully expressed. It was an exquisite poem of the pulpit.

All that I really have to say can be put succinctly...

Nathan Perilman

is the very image ideal of our profession...

what he does and what he is

give true meaning to the words:

rabbi, teacher, friend...

Now he is probably embarrassed by all this,

but this is not the time for modesty...

Jewish tradition compares modesty to a cloak

UMILVASHTO ANAVA.

God's cloak is humility.

Dov Ber of Mezeritsch commented,

humility is like a cloak, he said,

there comes a time when you must take it off.

That time has come for you, Nate,

for in the final analysis we do not praise you to exalt you..

we praise you rather to hold you aloft

as an exemplar for others

and for ourselves.

May you...together with your dear Betsy...

have many more years of life and health and

creative endeavor

for your sake

and for the sake of that cause which binds us

in sacred union.

It is a privilege which I greatly appreciate to participate in joyous events of this hour which mark the 40th anniversary in the rabbinate of your rabbi -- Nathan Peailman...

I genuinely like Nate Perilamn

I certainly respect him for those qualities of mind and heart he brings to his endeavors his intelligence his industry his integrity for his capacity to transmit his ideals forcefully articulated in the written and the spoken word and in the manner of his life...

There is little that I can add to what has been said about him and what will be said...

Indeed what can I tell you about him that you do not know so much better yourself... after all, you are his congregants and he is your rabbi...

your relationship spans the years

it is cemented by tears of joy and sorrow alike

~~it needs no expressing~~ that relationship requires no expressing

it cannot even be expressed

it can only be felt...

You ought to know of course...

and to this I can give testimony...

that his influence as a rabbi extends beyond the holy walls of Emanuel...

it is felt in many places...

certainly in the councils of that larger family of reform congregations

of which you are a cherished part

and for whom I am privileged to speak

which

THIS MORNING WAS A PERFECT CASE IN
... POINT

NATE'S RESPONSE WAS MAGNIFICENT WAS IT NOT
ESPECIALLY THE PERORATION

I HOPE SOMEONE HERE WILL SEE TO IT

THAT HIS REMARKS WILL BE PUBLISHED
HIS THOUGHTS WERE WELL CONCOINED

... + BEAUTIFULLY EXPRESSED

AN EXQUISITE POEM OF THE POLIT

No aspect of our doing - on a reg or natlt level -
is untouched by his creative talents

Wherever we need his help
he gives it willingly and without reserve

a counselling center needs to be established -
he is there to create and guide it...

a relationship must be restored between a
rabbi and his congregation --
he is prepared to conciliate giving hours on
end of his all to precious time...

Money is required...

he is prepared to give and ask for it
and if you think it is a burden to be asked ^{for money}
try asking for it ~~can~~
that burden is more onerous by far

And so I might continue with area after area of our
work...

^{help}
whenever we need his he responds ^{exceptionally}
and whatever he undertakes to do he does well...

I like him for one more reason still, ^{for you see}
I am a kind of travelling rabbi ^{and as such}
often consigned to a pew ^{another}
compelled to listen to ^{more terrible} another rabbi preach.
no fate is ~~worse~~ ^{more terrible} than that

I mean for one rabbi having to listen to another
rabbi even while knowing that he can do so much
better himself...

not so when I listen to Nate Perilman...
he practices the art of preaching with consummate
skill ^{formidable} ^{there}
he is a master of his craft
his words have power
they stir the soul

INSERT A

~~TOM BAGL RABBI~~

ALL THAT I REALLY HAVE TO SAY CAN
~~be put succinctly~~ BE PUT SUCCINCTLY...
~~xxxxxxx~~, Nathan Perilman
he is the image ideal of our profession...
what he does and what he is
give true meaning to the words:
rabbi, teacher, friend...

NOT

He is probably embaraaessed by all this
but this is not time for modesty...
Jewish tardition compares modsty to a cloak
UMILVASHTO ANAVA
God's cloak is humility
Dov Ber of Mezeritsch commented
Humility is like a colak, he said
there comes a time when you must take it off

That time has come for you, Nate
for in the final analysis we do not praise you to
exalt you...
we praise you to hold you aloft
as an exemplar for others
and for ourselves...

May you...together with your dear Betsy...
have many more years of life and health and
creative endeavor
for your sake
and for the sake of that cause which ^{binds} ~~unites~~ us
in sacred union,

Insert A

This morning was a perfect case in point.
Nate's response was magnificent, was it not?
Especially the peroration.
I hope that someone will see to it that his remarks
are published.
His sentiments were well conceived and beautifully
expressed.
It was an exquisite poem of the pulpit

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER, REMARKS TO NFTB BOARD
APRIL 19, 1972 - BOSTON, MASS.

I am glad to be here also because it gives me the opportunity to wish you a nesiah tovah, a pleasant journey, as you begin your study mission to Israel. It is good that you embark on this venture...good that you add still another link to that precious chain of faith which binds us as a religious community to the people and the land of Israel.

Reform Judaism's programs in Israel are burgeoning, as you may know, Our youth activities there have tripled in the last two years alone. The UAHC has undertaken to build a major educational center in Jerusalem. The World Union for Progressive Judaism will soon move its headquarters to the City of David.

These events do not represent a radical re-direction in our ideology and consequent activity. They are the consequence of forces which had their genesis in the long ago. A hundred years ago, perhaps, Reform Jews were still so enthralled by the vision of the universal ideal that they failed to recognize the just demands of the particular. But World War I altered all that, and since then we have been in the vanguard of those who fought for the establishment of Israel. Israel might not have come to be without the American Jewish community, and the American Jewish community's effort would have suffered greatly and would suffer still were it not for those countless Reform Jews who labored and labor in Israel's behalf and for whom names like Silver and Brickner, Wise and Heller can serve as a shining symbol.

All the more's the pity that old stereotypes still persist... they fade away more slowly than do old soldiers. Here and there, as you move about the country, your identity as a Reform Jew will still be greeted with a leer and sneer. What is worse, some efforts are afoot to read us out of the Jewish people in its entirety.

Even while I speak, representatives of Israel's religious party are pressing the Knesset for a revision of the Law of Return which would limit admission to Israel only to those Jews who are Jews "according to the halachah," - - that is to say, non-Jews who were converted to Judaism by Reform or Conservative rabbis are not to be admitted. In the view of the Israeli rabbinic establishment, neither they, nor their children, nor their children's children even unto the thousandth generation. And this, despite the fact that such converts consider themselves Jews, that they live as Jews, that they rear their children as Jews and that they want to give crowning expression to their Jewishness by choosing aliyah to Israel, determined to share that community's fate.

What a fearsome step to consider! What a serious threat to the essential unity of our people!

Consider, if you will, its consequences on the American Jewish scene. Here, non-Orthodox Jews represent the overwhelming majority. We work together, Jews of every stripe -- the Reform and the Orthodox, the Conservative and the secular,--in the fullest of harmony and with mutual respect for our ideological diversities. No one reads anyone out of the fold here. Now we are told that there are limits to our unity and degrees to the rights we hold as Jews.

Let no one be deluded by pious references to halachah. Halachah is not at stake here, for even if non-Orthodox rabbis observed its minutiae in the ceremonies of conversion, their converts would still be unacceptable to Israel's established rabbinate. Nor is Orthodoxy at stake for that matter, since the official seal of approval is not automatically extended to every musmach (graduate) of an American yeshivah (seminary), however devout its head. The franchise of the Israeli rabbinate is sparingly extended. That is what is at stake here, a franchise, the extension of monopoly, political power.

I hope that the government of Israel will not allow itself to become the cat's-paw of a willful minority, an unwitting tool in the hands of those who cry "Jewish unity" but who risk it in order to consolidate their economic interest and political sway.

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER
Banquet Address
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE EDUCATORS
Thirteenth Annual Convention
December 28, 1967

THE CHALLENGE OF PROTESTING YOUTH

This is my swan song as far as the National Association of Temple Educators is concerned; it is the last time that I stand before you as the Director of the Commission on Jewish Education.

I leave with the assurance that the leadership of Reform Jewish education is in good hands. Jack Spiro is an exceedingly capable young man, bringing many extraordinary qualities of mind and heart to his endeavors: knowledge, integrity, intelligence, the determination to advance the cause of Jewish education, and the ability to do so. Nor does he stand alone; he is surrounded by strong and able men who are willing to share his burden and to sustain him: the young and brilliant Director of Camp Education, Rabbi Widom; the old-new Director of Adult Education, Rabbi Bemporad, whose knowledge and percipience continue to fill us with awe; and, acharon acharon chaviv, Abe Segal, knowledgeable, wise, sensitive, a Jewish educator second to none.

Can we really dream for more? All we need do is ask their health and strength so that the good promise of their investiture will find fulfillment during the years ahead.

Now I am not only a has-been, completely out-of-date and season. My fate and yours is worse than that, for I am also a surrogate, a substitute, a filler-inner, the understudy who has a chance to take center stage only because the star is indisposed. Dr. Eisendrath promised to be here; he meant to be here; his duties dictated otherwise. As you may know, he is about to embark on a mission of peace, together with leading clergymen of other faiths, which will take him on a round-the-world journey scheduled to begin just a few days hence. He asked that I read you this message, which he addressed to Cel Singer and through her to you:

"Dear Cel,

Please convey my deepfelt regret to the men and women of NATE for my failure to be with you as promised. Be assured that only the most pressing duties keep me from honoring my obligation and sharing your simcha. I am really embarrassed about it all, embarrassed by my inability to be with you not only now but all these many years.

"I feel very much like a wayward father who deserts his offspring just after the bris and even lacks the decency to return for the Bar Mitzvah celebration.

"The child is a child no more. It has grown to robust manhood, not only in physical size, but in mind and spirit too. Your contributions toward the advancement of our mutual cause are many. The exacting standards of education which you have established and maintained have served to deepen the religious instruction program of our congregations. The fruit of your creative genius -- your research projects, your curricula, your syllabi and texts -- have immeasurably enlarged our arsenal of resources in the struggle against Jewish illiteracy, in

ever increasing number, your members are assuming positions of leadership in the wider areas of our work, in camping, youth and social action, not just on a regional level but in our national councils too. In a word, you have fulfilled the promise inherent in the hour of your becoming. You have fashioned a profession in Jewish education among us and for this you were created.

"I hope that what I have said assures you of my regard for NATE. My absence from you was enforced, not voluntary, enforced by the incessant, insistent demands upon my time. Indeed, why should I offer you anything but genuine, heartfelt regard? After all, you are what I am, what every rabbi is or ought to be: teachers of Judaism, builders of our future.

Faithfully,

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath"

To all this I can only add my heartfelt, fervent Amen. You are indeed what you were created to be, and for this we honor you! Surely nothing, during my tenure in office, gave me greater satisfaction than my association with the men and women of NATE; your counsel guided me, your friendship sustained me. As I enter upon a new field of work, in which I have scarcely been tried, the memory of these years and your affection will be a source of lasting strength.

* * *

I want to talk to you today about youth and the challenge of change, about the protesting generation and the demands its members make on us. I want to talk to you about the beats, the drop-outs, the alienated young, about the hippies, if you will, and what their protest imports.

My subject may seem incongruous, oddly at variance with the occasion which brings us together. Mah Inyan Shemitah Etsel Har Sinai? What mean the hippies to Har Sinai, the beats to the b'nai mitzvah of N.A.T.E.?

Still, we must listen to our young, must we not? As teachers we know that knowledge of the students is a requisite of effective teaching. And while it is true that these youthful, outrageous dissenters represent only a minority of their peers, they nonetheless provide us with an image of their society and with a mirror-image of our own. Their words and deeds may be excessive, extravagant in exaggeration, even grotesque. But at least they speak. The others, alas too often, merely acquiesce; they play it cool by playing our game. In the final analysis the dissenters may well prove to have been precursors, not just aberrations.

What gives their message even greater immediacy is the fact that so many of these protestors are Jewish. Estimates vary, but a prominent sociologist, a member of one of our Northern California congregations, who just completed four months of intensive street work in San Francisco, reports that certainly 20% and perhaps 30% of Haight-Ashbury's residents are Jewish. Mike Loring adds the further information that 70% of that community's leadership is Jewish. Nor do we only encompass in our purview the hippies but all the protesting groups, so many of whom come from well-fed, comfortable suburban Jewish families. They are drop-outs from our schools. They rebel against us.

And so we must listen to them. They are trying to say something to us. And they are probably right in much of what they say, however wrong may be their remedies for righting matters.

I.

Now in the first instance, so I believe, our youthful protestors give voice to their distrust of conventional wisdom. They are loath to give assent to any value system which is asserted as "established and commonly received" and hence inviolate.

To some extent, this kind of anti-authoritarianism has always been a mark of youth -- moral preachment never really worked -- but it is more pronounced today and of a different quality. It has moved from a rebellion against a particular judgment, to a denial of all such judgments, from a rejection of this or that doctrine, to a disdain for all ideology, in fact.

In sharp and curious contrast with their nominal progenitors of an earlier age, present day movements of protest have not developed a clear-cut ideology. Even the New Left is anti-doctrinaire; its spokesmen embrace no "isms," not socialism, not communism, certainly not dialectical materialism. The New Left is no continuation of the rationalist, radical tradition of the enlightenment, as some would assume. If anything, it is a reaction against this tradition, supplanting its hopeful idealism with somber sober realism.

Its adherents are even anti-intellectual, in a way -- youthful dissenters of every stripe are -- suspecting not just systems of thought, but reasoned thought itself. It may well be -- so David Moynihan perceptively discerns -- that our young people are too familiar with that "rational commitment to logic and consistency which leads from the game theory of the Rand Corporation to the use of napalm in Vietnam."

Marginally noted, this antipathy to logical coherence appears reflected in the forms and rhythms of modernity's song: the eight-bar quatrains of yesteryear's tunes lost in the roar of rock-and-roll, the measured symmetry of the fox-trot superseded by the bacchic frenzy of the frug.

Be that as it may, when our youthful dissenters do not reject thought and value systems per se they certainly resent their self-righteous assertion. They abhor that ideological arrogance which insists on universal acceptance, which proposes, as a case in point and on a global level, that a political theory which works well in one country must, therefore, become the option of the world.

Here surely is the foremost reason why our young people are in the vanguard of the peace movement. They reject that ideological self-certainty which rules that just because democracy succeeds here, it must, perforce, be extended abroad, imposed on other lands -- and this, mind you, even while democracy's ideals are not fully secured at home.

II.

Which brings us full square to the second problem feeding the flames of the youth revolt: the credibility gap, the disparity between intent and deed; in a word, hypocrisy, our inability to bring about a harmony of preachment and of practice.

"A major reason for youth leaving society is their awareness of the hypocrisy practiced in this country" -- so writes our case worker from Haight-Ashbury --

"hypocrisy practiced from a national level, down to the family...the double standard toward violence for instance: murder in the streets is wrong, but murder in Vietnam is right." His confidential report continues:

"Young people are aware that within established Judaism there are some who take an active stand against the war. They know about the many rabbis and laymen who speak up courageously. But they decry the fact that these leaders speak in generalities, yet act in few specifics. Over and again young people say to me: 'perhaps there are Jewish alternatives to the draft, but how many Jewish centers and synagogues offer or even know about draft counselling? How many support the active anti-war program of youth?'"

Questions like this are not easy to answer -- especially in the light of our recent Biennial -- for the only answer we can give is the embarrassed silence of our guilt.

Often this imposture of which we are accused is not so much willful as it is inadvertent, due to our over-optimism, our proneness to make promises we cannot fulfill. Note, if you will, the innocent beginnings of our involvement in Southeast Asia. But once our deeds fall short of the goals which we so glibly pronounced, we are reluctant to admit to failure, we rationalize and improvise and cover up and end up doing things we never started out to do. But whatever the motivation, willful or not, the consequence of hypocrisy is cynicism, disenchantment, despair.

As teachers we know or ought to know just how important ethical consistency is to our youth, that deeds will teach what words cannot, that our students look more than they listen, that they follow the man who is, long before the man who only persuades with his lips.

In many ways the younger generation has become more pragmatic than the most pragmatic of those materialists against whom they inveigh. They look to deeds not words; they value achievements, not professed ideals.

Perhaps this is why the protest movement is so action-oriented. Its arts are action arts; folk singing, dance, and abstract films. Its recreation is kinesthetic; discotheques and happenings and psychedelics. The dissenters want a society which truly involves the individual, involves him, body, soul and mind. They demand an education which makes the community a lab for the humanities and breaks down the barriers between the classroom and life.

And they want a religion which demands and does. The benign humanism of 19th century reform simply will not do -- and this applies to its ritual and spiritual, no less than to its ethical dimensions. After all -- *mirabile dictu* -- Jewish hippies perform the religious exercises of Eastern disciplines and crowd their meditation chambers. Why, then, should we be afraid, afraid to make demands, afraid to insist on standards in the synagogue and home and in the daily lives of man?

Here, too, alas, we dissemble. We make no demands. We insist on no standards. We transmit a faith which presumably asks for nothing, where every man does what is right in his own eyes. And yet we pray, and teach our children piously to pray: O Lord, our Lord, we praise Thee for Thou has sanctified us through Thy commandments.

III.

A third factor stirring modern youth to its rebellion is the scientism of our society, leading, as it does, to its dehumanization, to the repressing of emotion, and the diminution of the individual's worth.

Young people fear this systematizing of life; they dread the mechanical ordering of people into categories, the compaction of humanity into efficient units of production and consumption. They resent the repression of human feeling and the strangulation of any sense of community, which the process of mechanization entails.

They refuse to be caught in the gears of this giant machine, and so they drop out. They leave society and huddle together for warmth, living in primitive, tribal style, choosing poverty, as it were. And they tell us, in effect, that they will not be bought.

Their heroes too cannot be bought, those balladeers who give voice to their longing, and serve as their exemplars: Joan Baez and Pete Seeger and Bobby Dylan. They may want money, writes Ralph Gleason, but they do not play for money. "They are not and never have been for sale, in the sense that you can hire Sammy Davis to appear, as you can hire Dean Martin to appear, so long as you pay his price. You have not been able to do this with Seeger and Baez and Dylan, any more than Alan Ginsberg has been for sale either to Ramparts or the C.I.A."

This near-disdain for matters material is most disturbing to the adult world; after all, it runs smack dab against our fundamental assumptions. At the same time -- at least for me -- it provides the love-and-flower generation with its one endearing charm. Imagine their brass, their unmitigatedchutzpah! They invade the sanctum of our society, the New York Stock Exchange, to scatter dollar bills much like confetti. It is a gesture worthy of a Don Quixote! The leader of this fateful expedition, a young man by the name of Abbe Hoffman -- I herewith make confession -- was one of my confirmands. I shudder to think of it! How many more were really listening?

The so-called sexual revolution is an aspect of the self-same revolt against society's mechanization; it does not import the furtherance of modernization through promiscuity and the reduction of sex to a mere physical act. Every available study of the subject attests that our young people are essentially romantic, that they do not seek the separation of sex and love, and that faithfulness is an essential element of their human approach. Sex, for them, is "not so much a revolution as it is a relationship...it is a shared experience consecrated by the engagement of the whole person." (Chickering)

Now all this is pertinent to us, even though as liberals, as religious liberals, we do take a firm stand against the mechanization of life. And yet we too accelerate the process of dehumanization with our hyper-intellectualism which disdains emotion and makes light of tribal loyalty.

Daniel P. Moynihan makes this telling point in his perceptive study of the problem:

"...as the life of the educated elite in America becomes more rational," he writes, "more dogged of inquiry and fearless of result, the well-springs of emotion do dry up and in particular the primal sense of community begins to fade. As much for the successful as for the failed,

society becomes, in Durkheim's phrase, 'a dust of individuals.' But to the rational liberals, the tribal attachments of blood and soil appear somehow unseemly and primitive. They repress or conceal them, much as others might a particularly lurid sexual interest. It is for this reason, I would suggest, that the nation has had such difficulties accepting the persistence of ethnicity and group cohesion..."

Perhaps we are premature in reading out ethnicity as a fact of American Jewish life. Certainly it is strange to note that the very same hippies who decline to serve in Vietnam were among the first to volunteer for Israel. True, the war in the Middle-East was just, its purposes clear and capable of eliciting the sympathetic understanding of all youth. But it is equally true that a people's danger aroused feelings more fundamental by far; it awakened attachments of soil and of blood.

* * * *

In his superb Biennial paper, giving a chapter of his forthcoming book, Emanuel Demby quotes this poignant statement made by one of our adolescents:

"We ask you what's ahead? You say war. We ask you when the war is going to end? You say you don't know...You don't know nothing. Yet you want us to listen to you. We've got nothing to listen to you for. You better start listening to us."

We listen to them, and listening find that there is altogether too much that is shoddy in our lives: moral arrogance, the widening gap between intent and deed, the self-centeredness of our human approach. The mirror-image of our lives which our youth provides gives substance to Dr. Demby's contention, that adult society and not rebellious youth is really alienated.

Be that as it may, if our understanding of the protest movement is correct, our young people do manifest an uncommon thirst for spirituality, a thirst for meaning, to use that word which Jack Spiro so beautifully adorned for us yesterday. It is a thirst which Judaism can well satisfy, because it is uniquely suited to the spirit of alienation which stirs our youth: with its insistence on human worth, its recognition of the need not just for belief but for a community of believers, with its essential pragmatism which holds the way far more important than the thought: "thou canst not see My face, but I will make all My goodness pass before thee."

Lest we become overly optimistic, we ought to know that our young people manifest one more need still: their moral and spiritual aspirations are suffused with a universalism which challenges the particularism of our belief; the options for actions within the structures of organized religion are not enough for them. This undoubtedly is why they feel so attracted to the near Eastern faiths, whose exotic elements give them the aura of universalism. Here, then, is the ultimate challenge of the protesting youth: Can Judaism be the faith for the global man whose prototype they see themselves to be and likely are?

Yes...if we are daring...if we, as religious liberals, have the courage to do, what Jack Bemporad challenged us to do: to experiment, to cut new paths, to take new directions, even while we build firmly on the solid foundations of the past.

Why should we doubt our faith's capacity to renew itself? After all, our children's vision of the future does not exceed the vision of the Prophets; their dreams do not eclipse the dreams of Israel's past!

We were...we are...and we shall be. For He who walked before us will be with us; He will not forsake us. Be not dismayed.

OFF-PRINT FROM
THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS
YEARBOOK, Vol. LXXIX, 1969

© 1970, by Central Conference of American Rabbis



II

ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

The world of moral certitudes has crumbled. Its center did not hold. Anarchy is loosed upon the land. "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned."¹

Our certitude, our moral confidence, was rocked by change, inexorable legacy of technological advance. It was eroded by the decay of its supportive institutions — of synagogue and church, of school and home. It was ground to the dust by the horror to which we were witness: the Cyclon B of Belsen and the mushroom cloud.

More was lost. More than this or that value — more even than a world of values. There has been a 'devaluation of valuation' as such.² Man's capacity to value has been brought to question.

Values, after all, call for choice. And choice is possible only where there is freedom for the will. But science sternly reminds us that this freedom is an illusion or at best severely circumscribed. We may think that we choose freely, but we don't. Our choice is conditioned by a complex of inner and outer circumstance. By situation and tradition, by the environment, and the coalescence of our genes.

The world which science perceives, moreover, is a morally neutral world; it is a world of fact alien to value. Values are only preferences, physics asserts, mere emotions, the proper object for study by psychology. But then psychology comes and abolishes the notion of integral normality: the normal and the abnormal, the good and the bad, they blend; there is no true line between them. "There is neither hot nor cold. There is no high nor low. And there is an enormous amount of nothing in the All."³

Man's mind is the sole source of value in a world devoid of values, and his capacity to value is feeble — so concludes science, even while it gives man power over nature, enormous power, the power to control, the power to manipulate, the God-given power to create. Here is that paradox of which Hans Jonas speaks:⁴ feebleness and strength in one, omnipotence and emptiness, the "anarchy of human choosing" combined with man's "apocalyptic" sway.

Thus is the ceremony of innocence drowned. "The best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity."⁵ Such are the stresses and the strains of which the "new morality" is consequence.

¹ William Butler Yeats, *The Second Coming*.

² Erich Kahler, *The Tower and the Abyss* (New York, Viking, 1967), pp. 184 ff.

³ Paul Valéry, *Mon Faust*.

⁴ Hans Jonas, "Contemporary Problems in Ethics from a Jewish Perspective" in *CCAR Journal* (New York), Vol. XV, #1, January, 1968.

⁵ Yeats, *op. cit.*

Now this phrase, this designation, "the new morality," is much abused. The range of its application is wide. It describes a system of thought as well as a style of life, both running the gamut from libertinism to heteronomy.

Seen as a way of life, the "new morality" is usually identified with the manners and the mores of modern youth. But modern youth is not of a cloth — not even the dissenters. Some are involved, others are not. Some are committed, while others abandon the fray. All hold the "old morality" in slight esteem, especially as it turns to self-righteousness and hypocrisy; but they do not take the same moral stance. As Kenniston's studies⁶ reveal, the alienated of our youth are often anti-idealist, situational, prone to indulge desire. The activists, however, are usually sternly moral, prepared to articulate codes of conduct which diverge from the codes of the past but which function like them in that they are held to apply to every moral situation.

The picture becomes no clearer when we focus on the "new morality" as a system of thought. Here, too, a blurring obtains and positions overlap. The situationists throw off the shackles of the law, or so they say, but then they quickly posit principles no less exacting. The heteronomists are pledged to uphold the law but forthwith bend it to meet the need of given circumstance.

Gustafson isolates no less than three distinct trends in contemporary contextualism: those who call for a socio-historical analysis of each situation, those who make their point of reference the person-to-person encounter, and those who listen for the still small voice as they confront their problems, theologians like Karl Barth who believe that the command of God is given not in prior formal rules of conduct but in the immediacy of every moral situation. As for the defenders of the law, they too cannot be lumped in one, Gustafson finds.⁷ And he concludes that the term "new morality" has been used to cover entirely too many theological heads and that the debate, hence, is misplaced in its entirety.

When Yale University's Professor of Christian Ethics cannot draw the lines of what has been a disputation primarily in the arena of modern Christian thought, what is a poor rabbi to do, a rabbi, mind you, who is not a *kohen* or a *levi* in Jewish theology, just a *proster yisroel*, a rabbi who has enough of a problem just trying to decide what is, or is not, normative in Judaism.

It is no simple matter to draw a consistent pattern of thought out of an evolutionary process such as Jewish Ethics or even out of a philosophical ambience such as the "new morality." The temptation is great to begin with a pre-conceived notion and then to select those facts which will sup-

⁶ Kenneth Kenniston, *Young Radicals* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, & World Inc.), p. 347.

⁷ James M. Gustafson, "Context vs. Principles: A Misplaced Debate in Christian Ethics" in *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 58, No. 2, April, 1965.

port it. But facts must be respected, all facts, and contradiction should not be ignored. They should be seen, at least, for what they are: parts of one whole in which divergent strains appear along with those that are more dominant and characteristic.

But we are only human. Autism manipulates us even while we are aware that it is operative. We will always see what we desire to see — find what we really want to find. Therefore, let me be honest with you — and with myself — by readily acknowledging my predilection.

I like this "new morality," as I perceive its mood. I respect its openness. I appreciate its hope. I respond to its essential dynamism and its insistence on passionate involvement. As a system of thought it may not be sufficient for Judaism but its major thrusts that focus on contextual considerations and especially its celebration of individual responsibility — these certainly are congenial to our ethos.

I see it especially valuable as a bridge to those who stand yet apart from the community of faith but who are as determined as are we to come to grips with moral malaise, to create new moral order out of the pervasive spiritual chaos of our time.

To be sure, now, this embrace is not all-encompassing. Judaism's ethical canopy is not so large that it shelters everything. It certainly doesn't shelter those who see the "new morality" as license to do what they please.

There are those, both young and old, who do, for whom the "new morality" means no constraint, free warrant to indulge desire whatever its demands. They think perhaps that we are presently undergoing that "transvaluation of values" of which Nietzsche spoke. Or, inebriated by man's exalted state — the power to create is heady wine — they feel that we have gone beyond the Nietzschean prediction, that all men, not just a few superior men, have now outgrown morality, as they outgrew mythology and magic, that no one 'longer is subject to judgments of right and wrong.⁸

This is no "new morality," of course. Wantonness is neither a new nor a moral phenomenon. Such styles of life are of an ancient vintage. They are as old as Sodom and Gomorrah.

They come and they go, these deviant so-called moralities, with pendulum-like regularity. "Puritanism and paganism alternate in mutual reaction in history."⁹ Let this thought bring comfort to those who need it: license cures itself through its own excess.

Not just morals, of course, but manners too have a way of alternating in history. Our children may yet see modesty modish and dress more appealing than undress. (In *their* day, O lord, and not in ours!)

⁸ Henry David Aiken, "The New Morals" in *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 236, No. 1413, February, 1968.

⁹ Will and Ariel Durant, *The Lessons of History* (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1968), pp. 37-51.

As the "new morality" takes its stand between libertinism and legalism, it comes closer to the cover of Judaism's canopy. Contextualism's first demand, that situational variables be weighed in the decision-making process, is certainly in order, so long as these variables remain but one of the factors and do not become the sole determinant of moral action.

Situations do vary, even when they involve the same moral principle. "Every case is like every other case and no two cases are alike."¹⁰ Judaism is not oblivious to this truth. It understands that objective law is in continuous tension with the subjective needs of the individual and that these needs must be given proper consideration.

The case of the *Aguna* provides classic illustration of this tension — and of its resolution in favor of subjective need. True, this need was fully met only by Liberal Judaism when it broke with tradition here. But even the traditionalists bent the law, and to no small degree: the testimony of one witness was seen sufficient to establish the husband's death; hearsay evidence was admitted by the court; the deposition of persons otherwise totally incompetent was received, and without cross-examination — all in the effort to loosen the woman's bonds, to serve *her* need and not the law alone.

Yes, Halacha is a legal and not a moral system, in the philosophical meaning of these terms, but it is not and never was blind legalism. The traditional Jew was no automaton of the law, a kind of mechanical man, like Tik-Tok in the *Wizard of Oz*, who could do only what he was wound up to do when he wanted so desperately to be human.¹¹ The halachists, certainly the greater among them, wanted to be human, and they were precisely because they were not blind but seeing, able to envisage the final union of morality and law.

As we move even closer to the mainspring of Jewish law, the Bible, we also find no aversion to contextual considerations. In its treatment of war, for instance, the *Tenah* is decisively situational. In one case war is justified, in another it is not. In one case God demands resistance to the enemy, in another he warns Jehoiakim through Jeremiah not to join in the revolt against Nebuchadnezzar. Examples can be multiplied. We all can add to them.

It might even be argued that the Biblical approach is fundamentally contextual, in that its principles are drawn from living situations. They are not catalogued as abstractions, set forth in hierarchical order. The Bible is no code of moral principles. It tells the story of men — of a people, and the word of God is deduced from their experience.

This argument is admittedly hyperbolic, an extravagant exaggeration to make a point. But surely it is true, that the Biblical word was never

¹⁰ Edmond Cahn, "The Lawyer as Scientist and Scoundrel," *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 36, p. 10, 1961.

¹¹ Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics* (New York, Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 18-39.

detached from the concrete situation. The message of the prophets was never an abstract message. It always referred to actual events. "The general was given in the specific and the verification of the abstract in the concrete."¹²

Contextualism does pose its problems (even as does legalism). Situations are not self-defining. Their outer limits cannot readily be set. Just what is the proper context of a given moral situation? Does it take in only the major protagonists, or also those who stand near to or even far from them? Raskolnikov killed the pawnbroker, and from the narrow perspective of their one-to-one relationship he was probably in the right. He quickly learned, however, that murder tears the fabric of the community, that it destroys not just the victim but the murderer and the bystander too. The rippling effects of moral decisions cannot be contained. Ultimately, they affect the total situation. What is the proper context then? And what about motivation? Can one really disentangle rational and irrational impulses, especially in moments of stress?

These are the reasons which impel Judaism to assert the primacy of principle. These are the reasons which impel even the most obdurate of situationists to posit rules which function not unlike the rules of ethical traditionalism.

A brief word about one of these rules: the law of love, that *summum bonum* of situation ethics.

This norm gives me some difficulty. Not that there is anything wrong with love *per se*. It is a noble ideal, a bright and shining star in the firmament of Judaism's values. But when it is applied as widely as it is by the "new morality," it loses all meaning and remains but a murky guide for human conduct.

It is especially unreliable as a yardstick for setting the boundaries of the boy-girl encounter, because love and lust are intrinsically related in the human psyche, and when the former is professed, the latter, more often than not, is purposed.

Cyrus Pangborn penetrates this prevailing pretense in his challenge to those who justify pre-marital intercourse on the ground that it removes an ignorance threatening the success of marriage. He writes:

I wonder why there is not consistency enough to advocate a trial establishment of joint bank accounts, the temporary designation of prospective partners as life insurance beneficiaries, and a series of dates with a small child along for company. Sexually successful marriages have foundered on differing views about the acquisition, spending and sharing of money, about how to treat and rear children, and about any number of other aspects of the human relationship called marriage. If so thoroughgoing a mutuality and reciprocity seems premature, why not peg sexual expression at some point of restraint chosen for the other factors?

¹² Abraham Joshua Heschel, *God in Search of Man* (New York, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1955), p. 204.

Such consistency is not likely to be attained or even sought. Precisely because love, in the fuller meaning of the term, as a concern for the total relationship, is not really at play, only love in the narrower physical sense. *Playboy* magazine is more honest here. One of its cartoons, called to our attention by Paul Ramsey (I never read *Playboy*, I just look at the pictures), shows a rumpled young man saying to a rumpled young woman in his embrace: "Why speak of love at a time like this!"

This subject, marginally noted, gives not infrequent occasion to the revival of good old-fashioned religious anti-Semitism. Thus we read in the Bible of the "new morality": The law of love has superseded the legalistic pilpul of Pharisaic rabbinism. And again: The commandments commanded in the New Testament are Judaizing passages which deserve only to be ignored. And this from Fletcher,¹³ a liberal Protestant theologian, who really should know better after these many years of exposure to the clean and cleansing winds of the ecumenical dialogue.

The distinguishing ingredient of the "new morality" is its insistence on individual responsibility. This is the cement which binds its divergent elements into a whole sufficiently cohesive to be called by one name. Whatever the differences among the "new moralists," one thing they all have in common: They acknowledge their direct responsibility for the moral act. They make the moral problem their very own. They do not externalize morality, seeing it an abstraction ("what is the moral view?") or a generalization ("just what ought one to do?"). Moral precepts become first-person precepts: What ought *I* to do, what are *my* commitments, what should *my* loyalties be?

The "new morality" is a morality of dissent, in that it runs counter to the current of the day, resisting its malaise and its gloom, asserting the reality of choice against the many who despair of it. It is also a morality of independence, of autonomy, in that it makes the moral choice a wholly personal reality, deeming the self and the self alone to be the source and arbiter of value.

As dissent, as protest against the temper of the times, the "new morality" stands at one with Judaism. Here, indeed, is the nexus of which I spoke, that bridge which spans the distance between the secular and the religious moralist. But when the adherents of the "new morality" claim full autonomy, they seem to row against the mainstream of Jewish thought.

We emphasize the "seem," for on closer look we find no complete incongruity. The morality of Judaism is neither a heteronomous nor is it an autonomous morality.¹⁴ It designates itself to be revealed, but then, in daring paradox — הכל צפוי והרשות נתונה — it declares men free, and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience, rather does it seek

¹³ Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹⁴ Cf. Emil Fackenheim, *Quest for Past and Future* (Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 204-228.

man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too,¹⁵ because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it.¹⁶ Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must *choose* to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism; don't misunderstand me; nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man; it remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too. "The outer limits of man touch revelation," wrote Leo Baeck; "we are God's partners and cannot abdicate this role, and man's vital function as creator is to make the moral choice."¹⁷

The cleft between Judaism and the "new morality" is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still, when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes," as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it; when they turn to tradition, if not in submission, then, at least, with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature, has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world, a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millennia ago. Science, assuredly, has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It has taught us little concerning their proper use, little concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers, and there is much that we can learn from them. This wisdom, moreover, this tradition alone provides that centripetal force which keeps moral autonomy from breaking its bounds to become mere moral nihilism.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons *us*, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is — so Gene Borowitz often reminds us¹⁸ — that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was written by Moritz Lazarus, now nearly eighty years ago.

Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the perplexing

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

¹⁶ *Midrash Tanhuma*, Yisro.

¹⁷ Leo Baeck, *Individuum Ineffabile*.

¹⁸ Eugene Borowitz, "Current Theological Literature" in *Judaism*, Vol. 15, No. 3, Summer 1966.

value issues emerging from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning — population growth in geometric progression, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution too — all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and exemplars are required, by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, ever begin to reflect the primacy of these concerns.

How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counseling? How many congregations, whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land, have taken the initiative to denounce the shameful fraud of those academies of higher learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose finest resources are at the command not of their students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough, to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak — by precept and example — if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's Rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's Rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the "opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity."¹⁹

There is one level at which the "new morality" and Judaism touch, if at all, but fleetingly. It is the level of God belief, of creed. Where situation ethics has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the "self" and "the other." They do not see it as

¹⁹ Conrad Arensberg, "Cultural Change and the Guaranteed Income" in *The Guaranteed Income*, Robert Theobald (ed.), (New York, Doubleday, 1966), p. 211.

the three-way relationship — involving man, his human neighbor, and God — which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth, in fact, that it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding.

Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the heaven that is in it would have brought them back to me.²⁰

A like hope is held forth in the reading which the *Tono debe Eliyohu* gives to Micah's celebrated maxim:

כי עם עשות משפט ואהבת חסד והצנע לכת עםך אלהיך

Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you.

This happening of our day, therefore, this "new morality," should not evoke our despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but rather the sure sign of new, returning strength; for beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deep-felt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream:

כי הנני בורא שמים חדשים וארץ חדשה

For behold I create new heavens and a new earth; the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind . . . your seed and your name, they will remain forever.

²⁰ *Pesikta Kahana*, XV

THE AMERICAN JEW: RETROSPECT AND
PROSPECT -- A New Curriculum for a
New Community.

How good and how pleasant it is to be
here, reunited with colleagues and friends,
with men and women from many congrega-
tions but of one faith, bound together
by a mutual sacred cause.

What do we seek in seeking our brothers?
What are the ends we mean to serve in
coming here? To learn, perhaps to teach,
to take counsel together, to gather the
rich fruit of our common experience --
all these, yet even more -- to draw
strength from one another, to receive
that sustenance of spirit which comes
from the companionship of kindred and
aspiring souls.

It is a sustenance which flows in ample
measure from our fellowship. I can well
testify to that, for no aspect of my
work gives me greater satisfaction than
my association with the men and women of
NATE, whose friendship I value, and
whose wise counsel is indispensable to

the fulfillment of my tasks. This is a professional organization of the highest order; its programs and activities are substantive, and its members establish exacting standards of conduct and attainment.

When important posts had to be filled this year, on a regional and national level, we did not have to look beyond our own ranks to find the men to fill them. This fact alone bespeaks NATE's considerable growth and maturity.

We meet in Philadelphia, cradle of American democracy and birthplace of much that is valuable in American Jewish life. In this community institutions vital to our continuity were born; here were reared the men and women, leaders of the spirit, whose life and work gave shape to our destiny.

This is a fitting place, then, for the communal "cheshev ha'nefesh" which our assembly, in its theme, enjoins. This is a fitting time to consider the American Jewish community -- its past,

its present, and its prospects.

A CHANGING COMMUNITY

This Convention Program Committee was wise to ask Dr. Bertram Korn to consider this theme in its fulness; he is a diligent student of our community, one of its foremost chroniclers, whose perceptive vision of its past gives him clear warrant to pierce the veil of our future.

Dr. Korn and I agreed, in order to avoid duplication, that I would limit my variations of the theme to education, while he would deal with the changing patterns of the community as a whole. On second thought, I am not entirely happy with this arrangement. At the very least, Dr. Korn's address should have preceded mine, for changes in the educative process follow, they do not precede changes in the character of the community. The school is the servant of society, not its master.

At the risk of offending a colleague by breaking my agreement with him, at the even more fearsome risk of having my

analysis contradicted less than 24 hours hence, I feel constrained to consider the transformations of our community, if only briefly, for without it, without some knowledge of its newer nature, the new directions demanded of our schools can not be understood. Now this transformation of our community is nothing short of cataclysmic, for it involves not only its externals -- its structures, composition, its institutions; it reaches to the very core of our communal being, and we encounter an entirely new Jew -- the American Jew -- and the problems he encounters are unlike those our people faced, at any other time in any other place.

"Al regel achat," simply and succinctly put, our inner alteration involves a loosening, a dissolution of the ethnic strains which bound us once, and the compensating reinforcement of religious bonds expected to serve as unifying force in their stead.

To put the matter somewhat differently,

the secular cult or nationhood envisaged by man, Jews of a previous generation, has proved illusory, incapable of fulfillment on the American scene; the community has become a communion, bound by belief, turning primarily to religion to define its nature and to justify its continuity.

JEWISH FACTORS

Two events of recent Jewish history gave main impulse and momentum to this metamorphosis: the destruction of European Jewry and the establishment of Israel.

The European Jewish community gave shape to our own, sustaining its cultural and its religious life during most of the formative years. More to the point, Europe gave us its community concept, with its dominant ethnic strains which permeated even its religious expressions. Until World War II, its ideology governed our thinking and our doing. We were involved in the European Jewish situation and conceived our own problem largely in its light, so much so that even the 100% American Council for Judaism spent

its full energies in the feverish debate of an essentially European question, the the Emancipation, which never really was of issue here. Be that as it may, the tragic death of European Jewry cut the physiological and the ideological nexus which bound us to our communal parents. We were compelled to look at our situation as it really is, without the overtones provided by their understanding of it. And we quickly learned that the old-world community concept does not conform to the realities of the American scene, that the resolutions offered by European Jewish ideology simply will not serve us here.

The achievement of Jewish nationhood in Israel, by curious paradox, further enfeebled the non-religious bonds of our union. True, the dream of secular no less than of religious nationalist was fulfilled, their loving labor justified, the validity of their thought established. But the very fulfillment of this dream robbed the adherents of political Zionism

of their reason for collective continuity in the Diaspora. The ever-waning force of a fervor fired before the State's establishment is not sufficient to sustain group loyalty, nor is the State's continuing need for help -- after all, one does not have to be a Jew to be a friend of Israel. Ultimately only two avenues lie open before the secular nationalist that he can choose: either he migrates to Israel, following in deed the logic of his thought; or remaining here, he finds an added, more relevant means for identification with the American Jewish community. The synagogue becomes his likely choice.

THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

But not only momentous changes in Jewish life contributed to the diminution of our ethnicity; this diminution was deepened further by an environment which does demand conformity as the price of acceptance.

The measure of required conformity is greater than we think, far greater than America's professed adherence to the creed

of cultural pluralism might lead us to expect. The American Way of Life is not so open that divergent cultural components can easily be made a part of it. A blue ribbon jury of the majority rules; it is ~~also~~ dominated by those who came here first; and they are reluctant to accept components which clash with their culture. Folkways fundamentally foreign to the American environment are quickly discarded by a minority which means to escape its not-so-invisible ghetto. Only religion is exempted from these demands; the American ethos recognises it as a "collective privacy" which may be maintained -- at least, so it appears, for even here some doubts prevail.

In his penetrating study of the problem, Ben Halpern of Brandeis University points out that the acceptance of the "triple melting-pot" analysis does not at all allow us to conclude that Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism stand in the very same relationship to the American social consensus. Here too a jury of the major-

ity rules, and the standard of acceptance is set by American Protestantism with its conception that religion resides in the single man, that the church, the congregation, is an institution designed to help the individual realize his faith, and not at all an instrument to nurture group religion; in a word, "that freedom of worship ... the privacy of religious conscience ... is a right of individuals, and not of collective entities at all."

If this is true in the realm of religion, it certainly is true, a fortiori, in the realm of culture. Individual divergences are accepted, but that which intensifies collective distinctiveness is decisively discouraged. To be sure now, certain elements of traditional group culture can be given public expression and then find public acceptance. But usually they are trivial traits, drawn from the surface of tradition, that which can be readily understood, the light, the amusing, the entertaining, but about as far removed from tradition's genuine core as is "Fiddler on

the Roof" from Sholom Aleichem.

This, then, is the confluence of inner and of outer forces, the interaction of Jewish experience and the American environment which has resulted in the diminution of our ethnic character and in the refashioning of our religious bonds. A hundred sociological studies attest to the reality of this transformation. American Jews see themselves as Jews primarily by their religion. Nothing else -- not culture, not nationhood, not even the giving of charity -- is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification.

AFFILIATION WITHOUT AFFIRMATION

But we must carry our analysis just one step further, for we find now that religious identification by itself, affiliation without affirmation, is also not sufficient for the need. American Jews may join a congregation as a matter of communal necessity; they cannot long remain in it, without facing the test of faith.

Ben Halpern puts the matter well:

"... it is impossible to live forever in the synagogue only as in a socially useful institution. At some time one is bound to realize that this is a House of God. Now, one must ask, do I stand before God? Do I really believe in Him? Do I believe in Him as a Jew?"

Are not these the questions which our people ask with ever-increasing urgency? We saw dramatic demonstration of this fact less than a month ago, at the Union's Biennial in San Francisco, in the reaction of the delegates, and not as merely in the substance of the discussions. Seven hundred people crowded a meeting hall, many of them standing the better part of and a full day to listen to a discussion of the "why" of Jewishness. A like number attended a lecture on "The Demands of Prayer," the kind of topic which, a decade ago, would at best have attracted a handful of cogniscenti. Yes, and 1800 men and women stormed the doors of the grand ballroom, to hear four rabbis define their God-belief. They could not get

their full of listening. Over and over again, they insisted on an answer to such questions as: How can I believe in God in the face of the teachings of modern science and technology? Can man really experience God through prayer? What is the unique and enduring contribution that Judaism can make to the modern world?

These are the questions which perplex our people. These questions also delineate the essential problem of the American Jew, for ours is no longer the problem of identification, the difficulty of defining our community status. Ours, rather, is the problem of finding meaning for an identification which we have already chosen or which has been chosen for us. Ours is essentially a spiritual problem. It is a problem of ideas and beliefs. It is a crisis of conscience.

THE COMMUNITY OF OUR CHILDREN

What is true for the adult community (to move just a bit closer to the area of our more immediate concern as educators) is true in equal if not greater measure for the community of our children, for the

emerging American Jew. This is to be expected. After all, our children have experienced neither the holocaust, nor the struggle for Israel's establishment, those two dramatic, traumatic events whose remembrance still binds us to the thinking and feeling of the past.

The Riverton Report was especially revealing in its contrast of the older and the younger generation. Surely you recall some of its findings:

When the respondents asked, for instance, why Jews continue to exist as a distinctive group, parents spoke of the age-old hostility between Jew and gentile. The children, on the other hand, felt that the virtues of Judaism justify the survival of the group. (Their reason for Jewishness is positive, no mere reaction to persecution.)

The adults of Riverton expressed an overwhelming preference for predominantly Jewish neighborhoods, while the majority of adolescents were perfectly willing to widen their community contacts. (Having

experienced no "age-old" hostility from the non-Jew, they feel no reluctance to live in mixed neighborhoods.)

In the realm of charitable giving, parents favored exclusively Jewish causes, both here and abroad, not excluding Israel. In sharp contrast, their children chose many non-Jewish causes as objects of their beneficence. (Clearly, a declining sense of group closeness is manifested here.) And, most directly to the point, when the respondents were asked: what is a Jew? How would you describe him? A good many parents still referred to Jewish culture and to the happenstance of birth - "my parent is a Jew...I'm a Jew," while fully ninety-seven per cent of the adolescents defined the Jew exclusively by his allegiance to the Jewish religion.

Conclude the authors of the study: "The present Jewish self-image demands religious affiliation as the identifying characteristic... Among adolescents, hardly any other way of distinguishing the Jew is possible...It is not that they are

more religious than their parents. Rather, they are more cut off from the old-world... more completely molded by the American scene, they simply see no other meaning for the word 'Jew'."

As for the matter of discovering meaning in Jewishness, if anything, our children are even more persistent than are their parents in their quest for the relevance of religion. Where adults can often evade the test of faith by accepting the authority of tradition or of religious leadership, adolescents, facing their maturity, cannot. That is why they ask us for an answer to the "why" of Jewishness and the more sensitive and intelligent they are, the more earnestly do they ask it.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF OUR TEACHING

Do we answer their questions in what we teach and do? Is our curriculum designed to answer them? Honesty compels us to say "no" or, at best, to offer only a qualified "yes," for our program of study was given its broad, bold outlines decades ago when our community was different and its needs

were different. Developed under the impact of the old community concept, it fails to meet the requirements of the new. It emphasizes the ethnic, rather than the religious; it focuses on outer form and not on inner faith.

Our problem is not unlike that of the miller whose mill is in excellent condition in all respects, its machinery sound, excepting only one: the mill wheel stands one foot above the water. Much of our teaching is just that -- one foot above the water, failing to cut into the current of our children's deeper needs.

The objectives which we articulate in our curriculum is sound enough. Dr. Freshhof's "Statement of Guiding Principles" clearly, stirringly sets forth our real purposes. The listing of curricular goals is also most acceptable, albeit I must confess some embarrassment with the wording of the very first article which bids us "instill in" our children, not a faith in God, mind you, but rather, a "faith in the Jewish religion, according to the Liberal Reform tradition," whatever that

may mean.

But when we move from principle to program, and from the program to the classroom, the gap between objectives and attainment widens, and the relevant becomes largely irrelevant. A Bible taught as literature, history presented principally as the story of persecution, a story moreover, in which God somehow disappears as a protagonist once we make the move from the Talmud, to the Current Era ... Hebrew instruction which emphasizes linguistic competence ... given the teaching of customs and ceremonies when portrayed primarily as pattern of group behavior ... all this may well attract our children and gain their initial willingness to be identified as Jew; it will not provide them with the meaning which they seek to make their identification lasting and vital. As Abraham Heschel put it, in a different context

"... an education which continues to evade intellectual problems or which ignores emotional obtuseness is doomed to

failure. Teaching the geography of Israel will not necessarily evoke the love of Israel. Nor will merely the teaching of the rules about the dagesh chazak assure one of becoming conscious of the pintaleh yid."

Clearly a new approach is needed, attendant upon the re-evaluation of our educational presuppositions and something more than superficial change is required. To paraphrase our colleague David Hachen: we cannot be content merely to put a new cover on an old curriculum, or even to revise it; we must write it anew, in the light of the newer need.

TOWARD A NEW CURRICULUM

This task will not be fulfilled overnight; only evolutions, not revolutions in education have a chance at success. As a case in point --- and I had occasion to make mention of this in a recent Jewish Teacher editorial --- it took the Lutheran Church of America nearly twenty years to complete its

new parish educational plan, and our Christian colleagues had almost unlimited material and professional resources at their command -- some \$5,000,000.00 and forty-one full time educators on their national staff.

But more than material and technical obstacles must be overcome; ideological problems confront us also, for no small part of our difficulty is rooted in the radical divergence of theological view which obtains on an adult level... After all, we cannot teach our children what we do not agree upon, what we cannot accept ourselves.

Here, at least, some forward steps are being taken, for only a few months hence, at the behest of the Commission Curriculum Committee and its Chairman Samuel Glasner, a Conference of Jewish Theologians will convene, involving leading thinkers of conflicting views -- Gittelsohn and Fackenheim, Bemporad and Joans, Borowitz and Reines and Olan -- not so much to forge a unified Reform

Jewish theology, but in the hope of at least coming to an agreement on what we should teach to our children and when we should teach it, on how we can enrich their knowledge and experience to make them believing Jews!

Hopefully these deliberations will be fruitful in their effect. But, of course, we don't have to await this fruition or even the more fundamental changes contemplated in our national curriculum in order to give the needed new direction to our common sacred enterprise. Our criticism of certain fundamentals does not encompass, in blanket fashion, everything we have and do. Much of what we have is exceedingly good, and everything we do can be made to yield our newer purposes, for their realization depends not so much on this or that subject, but rather on its use to which the subject is put, whatever be its matter.

As a concrete case in point, about a year ago a number of communal leaders

and educators from this very community
 (Philadelphia, Minutes of November 5, 1964
 meeting of Community Relations Council,
 incorporating sub-committee report Dr.
 William Kalritz, Dr. Elazar Goelman, Dr.
 Ben-Horin, et alia) gathered to develop
 objectives for the teaching of the holo-
 caust. This is a subject which should be
 taught in our schools indeed; we expect to
 have a text on it within the year. But
 listen to the educational objectives which
 the Philadelphia group selected:

our children must come to know and feel
 that "Nazism is a monstrous example of
 religious bigotry."

they must understand the "meaning of the
 Nuremberg laws" with particular reference
 to the Nazi "claim to the racial superior-
 ity of German"

they must be able to comprehend such
 words as "Swastika," "slave labor,"
 "concentration camps," and "gas chamber."

we should remind them that "Nazis
 persecuted others than Jews, such as the
 Christians and Poles, the Czechs and the

Russians."

and, lastly - listen to this travesty of travesties, this mockery of our martyrdom - we must be certain to teach our children that "Nazism directly affected the founding of the State of Israel," as if there ever ~~was~~ could be a mechanical equating of the two, a balancing of blessing and of curse! Is this what we want our children to know? Is this the sum and substance of the wisdom which can be gleaned from this most tragic chapter of our recent history?

Surely we would do better to help our students grapple with the more fundamental issues which are involved, issues whose resolutions might help them in their quest for faith and for a life reflective of ~~it~~: How does the Jew react to evil? Is spiritual resistance an answer to an enemy? Does collective guilt obviate individual responsibility? What can we say about the face of man after Auschwitz? And what about the face of God? Can we believe in Him in spite of it?

Yes, there is history and there is

history... There is the Bible as literature, and the Bible as the Word of God... There is ethical instruction which is mere moral preachment, and there is such instruction in which the antecedent of the moral law is probed... There is the kind of Hebrew study which constitutes the refinement of language skill alone, and then there is the kind of study in which language becomes a garment for sentiments of faith; when our students learn what a noble Zionist thinker, Chaim Greenberg, insisted, then they learn, not just the literal meaning of such words as "bitsva," and "yirah," and "chava," and "Middush Hashem," but also the meaning of these words to their deepest sounding and in the full context of all their spiritual tension.

JUDAISM MORE THAN 'RELIGION ONLY'

I trust that no one will misunderstand me and read into my lines a rejection of Judaism's cultural component or a disavowal of the bonds of kinship which bind us to another beyond the bonds of faith. Judaism is manifestly more than a mere

system of precept and belief; it is a covenant binding a historic community. One cannot extract an idea from its historic form and expect it to retain its essence; both must be transmitted, the idea and the form, tradition and belief.

I speak only of an emphasis in our teaching, a centrality of concern which, perforce, must vary from generation to generation, and which in our time and place must focus on the transmission of belief.

The narrow conception of Judaism as 'religion only' is alien to me, and not just on intellectual and historic grounds. I reject this narrow concept on experiential grounds as well for in my personal journey of the spirit, I was an "chev yisroel" long before I heard the "vechavto es Adonai."

It is the "vechavto es Adonai" which our children need to hear from us, hear it with the hearing of the ear, and sense it in their soul as well. For the Judaism which we mean to convey to them is more than verbal profession, more than intellect-

ual conceptualization, much more indeed than a refined doubt sublimated into a hesitant assumption. It is an all consuming inner conviction involving the full faculties of man, his heart and mind and will and spirit too, all of them blending in to a rapturous communion with the divine. This is faith! This is what we mean by belief in God!

May we find the way to kindle the spark of such a faith in our children, and the strength to nurture it to bright and burning flame. Then will we be able to contemplate with confidence the future of our community, that community of our people which we helped to shape. Then the time will come when those who see our children will say of us that we did not "labor in vain, nor bring forth for terror, that ours is the seed blessed of the Lord."

The American Jew: Retrospect and Prospect

A New Curriculum for a New Community

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

Director, Department of Education, UAH

HOW GOOD and how pleasant it is to be here—reunited with colleagues and friends, with men and women from many congregations, but of one faith—bound together by a mutual sacred cause.

What do we seek in seeking our brothers? What are the ends we mean to serve in coming here? To learn, perhaps to teach, to take counsel together, to gather the rich fruit of our common experience—all these, yet even more—to draw strength from one another and to receive that sustenance of spirit which comes from the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls.

It is a sustenance which flows in ample measure from our fellowship. I can well testify to that, for no aspect of my work gives me greater satisfaction than my association with the men and women of NATE, whose friendship I value, and whose wise counsel is indispensable to the fulfillment of my tasks. This is a professional organization of the highest order; its programs and activities are substantive, and its members establish exacting standards of conduct and attainment. When important posts had to be filled this year, on a regional and national level, we did not have to look beyond our own ranks to find the men to fill them. This fact alone bespeaks NATE's considerable growth and maturity.

We meet in Philadelphia, cradle of American democracy and birthplace of much that is valuable in American Jewish life. In this community, institutions vital to our continuity were born; here were reared the men and women, leaders of the spirit, whose life and work gave shape to our destiny. This is a fitting place, then, for the communal חשבון הנפש which our assembly, in its theme, enjoins. This is a fitting time to consider the American Jewish community—its past, its present, and its prospects.

A CHANGING COMMUNITY

The Convention Program Committee was wise to ask Dr. Bertram Korn to consider this theme in its fulness; he is a diligent

student of our community, one of its foremost chroniclers, whose perceptive vision of its past gives him clear warrant to pierce the veil of our future.

Dr. Korn and I agreed, in order to avoid duplication, that I would limit my variations of the theme to education, while he would deal with the changing patterns of the community as a whole. On second thought, I am not entirely happy with this arrangement. At the very least, Dr. Korn's address should have preceded mine, for changes in the educative process *follow*, they do not precede changes in the character of the community. The school is the servant of society, not its master.

At the risk of offending a colleague by breaking my agreement with him, at the even more fearsome risk of having my analysis contradicted less than twenty four hours hence, I feel constrained to consider the transformations of our community, if only briefly, for without it, without some knowledge of its newer nature, the new directions demanded of our schools cannot be understood. Now this transformation of our community is nothing short of cataclysmic, for it involves not only its externals—its structures, its composition, its institutions; it reaches to the very core of our communal being, and we encounter an entirely new Jew—the American Jew—and the problems *he* encounters are unlike those our people faced at any other time in any other place.

על רגל אחת simply and succinctly put, our inner alteration involves a loosening, a dissolution of the ethnic strains which bound us once, and the compensating reinforcement of religious bonds expected to serve as a unifying force in their stead.

To put the matter somewhat differently, the secular cult of nationhood envisaged by many Jews of a previous generation has proved illusory, incapable of fulfillment on the American scene; the community has become a communion, bound by belief, turning primarily to religion to define its nature and to justify its continuity.

JEWISH FACTORS

Two events of recent Jewish history gave main impulse and momentum to this metamorphosis: the destruction of European Jewry and the establishment of the State of Israel.

The European Jewish community gave shape to our own, sustaining its cultural and its religious life during most of the formative years. More to the point, Europe gave us its community concept, with its dominant ethnic strains which permeated even its religious expressions. Until World War II, its ideology governed our thinking and our doing. We were involved in the European Jewish situation and conceived our own problem largely in its light, so much so, that even the 100 per cent American Council for Judaism spent its full energies in the feverish debate of an essentially European question, the Emancipation, which never really was of issue here. Be that as it may, the tragic death of European Jewry cut the physiological and the ideological nexus which bound us to our communal parents. We were compelled to look at our situation as it really was, without the overtones provided by their understanding of it. And we quickly learned that the old-world community concept does not conform to the realities of the American scene, that the resolutions offered by European Jewish ideology simply will not serve us here.

The achievement of Jewish nationhood in Israel, by curious paradox, further enfeebled the non-religious bonds of our union. True, the dream of secular no less than of religious nationalists was fulfilled, their loving labor justified, the validity of their thought established. But the very fulfillment of this dream robbed the adherents of political Zionism of their reason for collective continuity in the Diaspora. The ever-waning force of a fervor fired before the state's establishment is not sufficient to sustain group loyalty, nor is the state's continuing need for help—after all, one does not have to be a Jew to be a friend of Israel. Ultimately only two avenues lie open before the secular nationalist that he can choose: either he migrates to Israel, following in deed the logic of his thought; or, remaining here, he finds an added, more relevant means for identification with the American Jewish community. The synagogue becomes his likely choice.

THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

But not only momentous changes in Jewish life contributed to the diminution of our ethnicity; this diminution was deepened further by an environment which *does* demand conformity as the price of acceptance.

The measure of required conformity is greater than we think, far greater than America's professed adherence to the creed of cultural pluralism might lead us to expect. The American Way of Life is not so open that divergent cultural components can easily be made a part of it. A blue-ribbon jury of the majority rules; it is dominated by those who came here first; and they are reluctant to accept components which clash with *their* culture. Folkways fundamentally foreign to the American environment are quickly discarded by a minority which means to escape its not-so-invisible ghetto. Only religion is exempted from these demands; the American ethos recognizes it as a "collective privacy" which may be maintained—at least, so it appears, for even here some doubts prevail.

In his penetrating study of the problem, Ben Halpern of Brandeis University points out that the acceptance of the "triple melting-pot" analysis does not at all allow us to conclude that Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism stand in the very same relationship to the American social consensus. Here, too, a jury of the majority rules, and the standard of acceptance is set by American Protestantism with its conception that religion resides in the single man, that the church, the congregation, is an institution designed to help the *individual* realize his faith, and not at all an instrument to nurture *group* religion; in a word, "that freedom of worship . . . the privacy of religious conscience . . . is a right of *individuals*, and not of *collective entities* at all."

If this is true in the realm of religion, it certainly is true, *a fortiori*, in the realm of culture. *Individual* divergences are accepted, but that which intensifies *collective* distinctiveness is decisively discouraged. To be sure now, certain elements of traditional group culture can be given public expression and then find public acceptance. But usually they are trivial traits, drawn from the surface of tradition, that which can be readily understood, the light, the amusing, the entertaining, but about as far removed

from tradition's genuine core as is "Fiddler on the Roof" from Sholom Aleichem.

This, then, is the confluence of inner and outer forces, the interaction of Jewish experience and the American environment which has resulted in the diminution of our ethnic character and in the refocillation of our religious bonds. A hundred sociological studies attest to the reality of this transformation. American Jews see themselves as Jews primarily by their religion. Nothing else—not culture, not nationhood, not even the giving of charity—is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification.

AFFILIATION WITHOUT AFFIRMATION

But we must carry our analysis just one step further, for we find now that religious identification by itself, affiliation without affirmation, is also not sufficient for the need. American Jews may join a congregation as a matter of communal necessity; they cannot long remain in it without facing the test of faith.

Ben Halpern puts the matter well: "... it is impossible to live forever in the synagogue only as in a socially useful institution. At some time one is bound to realize that this is a House of God. How, one must ask, do I stand before God? Do I really believe in Him? Do I believe in Him as a Jew?"

Are not these the questions which our people ask with ever-increasing urgency? We saw dramatic demonstrations of this fact less than a month ago at the Union's Biennial in San Francisco, in the reaction of the delegates, and not as merely in the substance of the discussions. Seven hundred people crowded a meeting hall, many of them standing the better part of the full day, to listen to a discussion of the "why" of Jewishness. A like number attended a lecture on "The Demands of Prayer," the kind of topic which, a decade ago, would at best have attracted a handful of cognoscenti. Yes, and 1800 men and women stormed the doors of the grand ballroom, to hear four rabbis define their God-belief. They could not get their fill of listening. Over and again, they insisted on an answer to such questions as: How can I believe in God in the face of the teachings of modern science and technology? Can man really experience God through prayer?

What is the unique and enduring contribution that Judaism can make to the modern world?

These are the questions which perplex our people. These questions also delineate the essential problem of the American Jew, for ours is no longer the problem of identification, the difficulty of defining our community status. Ours, rather, is the problem of finding *meaning* for an identification which we have already chosen or which has been chosen for us. Ours is essentially a spiritual problem. It is a problem of ideas and beliefs. It is a crisis of conscience.

THE COMMUNITY OF OUR CHILDREN

What is true for the adult community (to move just a bit closer to the area of our more immediate concern as educators) is true in equal if not greater measure for the community of our children, for the emerging American Jew. This is to be expected. After all, our children have experienced neither the Holocaust nor the struggle for Israel's establishment, those two dramatic, traumatic events whose remembrance still binds us to the thinking and feeling of the past.

The Riverton Report was especially revealing in its contrast of the older and the younger generation. Surely you recall some of its findings:

- When the respondents asked, for instance, why Jews continue to exist as a distinctive group, parents spoke of the age-old hostility between Jew and gentile. The children, on the other hand, felt that the virtues of Judaism justify the survival of the group. (Their reason for Jewishness is positive, no mere reaction to persecution.)

- The adults of Riverton expressed an overwhelming preference for predominantly Jewish neighborhoods, while the majority of adolescents were perfectly willing to widen their community contacts. (Having experienced no "age-old" hostility from the non-Jew, they feel no reluctance to live in mixed neighborhoods.)

- In the realm of charitable giving, parents favored exclusively Jewish causes, both here and abroad, not excluding Israel. In sharp contrast, their children chose many non-Jewish causes as objects of their beneficence. (Clearly, a declining sense of group closeness is manifested here.)

- And, most directly to the point, when

the respondents were asked: What is a Jew? How would you describe him? A good many parents still referred to Jewish culture and to the happenstance of birth—"my parent is a Jew . . . I'm a Jew," while fully 97 per cent of the adolescents defined the Jew exclusively by his allegiance to the Jewish religion.

The authors of the study conclude: "The present Jewish self-image demands religious affiliation as the identifying characteristic. . . . Among adolescents, hardly any other way of distinguishing the Jew is possible. . . . It is not that they are more religious than their parents. Rather, they are more cut off from the old world . . . more completely molded by the American scene, they simply see no other meaning for the word 'Jew.'"

As for the matter of discovering meaning in Jewishness, if anything, our children are even more persistent than are their parents in their quest for the relevance of religion. Where adults can often evade the test of faith by accepting the authority of tradition or of religious leadership, adolescents, facing their maturity, cannot. That is why they ask us for an answer to the "why" of Jewishness, and the more sensitive and intelligent they are, the more earnestly do they ask it.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF OUR TEACHING

Do we answer their questions in what we teach and do? Is our curriculum designed to answer them? Honesty compels us to say "no" or, at best, to offer only a qualified "yes," for our program of study was given its broad, bold outlines decades ago when our community was different and its needs were different. Developed under the impact of the old community concept, it fails to meet the requirements of the new. It emphasizes the ethnic, rather than the religious; it focuses on outer form and not on inner faith.

Our problem is not unlike that of the miller whose mill is in excellent condition in all respects, its machinery sound, excepting only one: the mill wheel stands one foot above the water. Much of our teaching is just that—one foot above the water, failing to cut into the current of our children's deeper needs.

The objectives which we articulate in our curriculum are sound enough. Dr. Freehof's

"Statement of Guiding Principles" clearly, stirringly, sets forth our real purposes. The listing of curricular goals is also most acceptable, albeit I must confess some embarrassment with the wording of the very first article which bids us instill in our children, not a faith in God, mind you, but rather, a "faith in the Jewish religion, according to the Liberal Reform tradition," whatever that may mean.

But when we move from principle to program, and from the program to the classroom, the gap between objectives and attainment widens, and the relevant becomes largely irrelevant. The Bible taught as literature, history presented principally as the story of persecution (a story, moreover, in which God somehow disappears as a force once we make the move from the talmudic to the current era), Hebrew instruction which emphasizes linguistic competence, even the teaching of customs and ceremonies when portrayed primarily as patterns of group behavior—all this may well attract our children and gain their initial willingness to be identified as Jews; it will not provide them with the meaning which they seek to make their identification lasting and vital. As Abraham Heschel put it: ". . . an education which continues to evade intellectual problems or which ignores emotional obtuseness is doomed to failure. Teaching the geography of Israel will not necessarily evoke the love of Israel. Nor will merely the teaching of the rules about the *dagesh chazak* assure one of becoming conscious of the *pinteleh yid*."

Clearly a new approach is needed, attendant upon the reevaluation of our educational presuppositions and something more than superficial change is required. To paraphrase our colleague, David Hachen: We cannot be content merely to put a new cover on an old curriculum, or even to revise it; we must write it anew, in the light of the newer need.

TOWARD A NEW CURRICULUM

This task will not be fulfilled overnight; only evolutions, not revolutions, in education have a chance of success. As a case in point—and I had occasion to make mention of this in a recent *Jewish Teacher* editorial—it took the Lutheran Church of America nearly twenty years to complete its new parish education plan, and our Christian

colleagues had almost unlimited material and professional resources at their command—some \$5,000,000.00, and forty-one full-time educators on their national staff.

But more than material and technical obstacles must be overcome; ideological problems confront us also, for no small part of our difficulty is rooted in the radical divergence of theologic view which obtains on an adult level. . . . After all, we cannot teach our children what we do not agree upon, what we cannot accept ourselves.

Here, at least, some forward steps are being taken, for only a few months hence, at the behest of the Commission Curriculum Committee and its Chairman, Samuel Glasner, a Conference of Jewish Theologians will convene. It will involve leading thinkers with conflicting views—Gittelsohn and Fackenheim, Bemporad and Jonas, Borowitz and Reines and Olan—not so much to forge a unified Reform Jewish theology, but in the hope of at least coming to an agreement on what we should teach our children and when we should teach it, and how we can enrich their knowledge and experience to make them believing Jews!

Hopefully these deliberations will be fruitful in their effect. But, of course, we don't have to await this fruition or even the more fundamental changes contemplated in our national curriculum in order to give the needed new direction to our common sacred enterprise. Our criticism of certain fundamentals does not encompass, in blanket fashion, everything we have and do. Much of what we have is exceedingly good and everything we do can be made to yield our newer purposes, for their realization depends not so much on this or that subject, but rather on the use to which the subject is put, whatever be its matter.

As a concrete case in point, about a year ago a number of communal leaders and educators from this very community gathered to develop objectives for the teaching of the Holocaust.* This is indeed a subject which should be taught in our schools; we expect to have a text on it within the year. But listen to the educational objectives which the Philadelphia group selected:

- Our children must come to know and feel that "Nazism is a monstrous example of religious bigotry."

- They must understand the "meaning of the Nuremberg laws" with particular reference to the Nazi "claim to the racial superiority of Germans."

- They must be able to comprehend such words as "Swastika," "slave labor," "concentration camps," and "gas chamber."

- We should remind them that "Nazis persecuted others than Jews, such as the Christians and Poles, the Czechs and the Russians."

- And lastly—listen to this travesty of travesties, this mockery of our martyrdom—we must be certain to teach our children that "Nazism directly affected the founding of the State of Israel," as if there ever could be a mechanical equating of the two, a balancing of blessing and of curse!

Is this what we want our children to know? Is this the sum and substance of the wisdom which can be gleaned from this most tragic chapter of our recent history?

Surely we would do better to help our students grapple with the more fundamental issues which are involved, issues whose resolutions might help them in their quest for faith and for life reflective of it: How does the Jew react to evil? Is spiritual resistance an answer to an enemy? Does collective guilt obviate individual responsibility? What can we say about the face of man after Auschwitz? And what about the face of God? Can we believe in Him in spite of it?

Yes, there is history and there is history. There is the Bible as literature, and the Bible as the Word of God. There is ethical instruction which is mere moral preaching, and there is such instruction in which the antecedent of the moral law is probed. There is the kind of Hebrew study which constitutes the refinement of language skill alone, and then there is the kind of study in which language becomes a garment for sentiments of faith; when our students learn what a noble Zionist thinker, Chaim Greenberg, insisted that they learn: not just the literal meaning of such words as קדוש השם and אהבה and יראתה and מצות but also the meaning of these words to their deepest sounding and in the full context of all their spiritual tension.

*Philadelphia, Minutes of November 5, 1964, meeting of Community Relations Council, incorporating sub-committee report.

**JUDAISM MORE THAN
"RELIGION ONLY"**

I trust that no one will misunderstand me and read into my lines a rejection of Judaism's cultural components or a disavowal of the bonds of kinship which bind us one to another beyond the bonds of faith. Judaism is manifestly more than a mere system of precept and belief; it is a covenant binding a historic community. One cannot extract an idea from its historic form and expect it to retain its essence; both must be transmitted—the idea *and* the form, tradition *and* belief.

I speak only of an emphasis in our teaching, a centrality of concern which, perforce, must vary from generation to generation, and which in our time and place must focus on the transmission of belief.

The narrow conception of Judaism as "religion only" is alien to me, and not just on intellectual and historic grounds. I reject this narrow concept on experiential grounds as well, for in my personal journey of the spirit I was an אִיִּשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל long before I heard the יְהוָה אֵת יְהוָה.

It is the יְהוָה אֵת יְהוָה which our children need to hear from us, hear it with the hearing of the ear, and sense it in their soul as well. For the Judaism which we mean to convey to them is more than verbal profession, more than intellectual conceptualization, much more indeed than a refined doubt sublimated into a hesitant assumption. It is an all-consuming inner conviction involving the full faculties of man, his heart and mind and will and spirit too, all of them blending into a rapturous communion with the divine. This is faith! This is what we mean by belief in God!

May we find the way to kindle the spark of such a faith in our children, and the strength to nurture it to a bright and burning flame. Then will we be able to contemplate with confidence the future of our community, that community of our people which we helped to shape. Then the time will come when those who see our children will say of us that we did not "labor in vain, nor bring forth for terror, that ours *is* the seed blessed of the Lord."

More was lost. More than this or that value -- more even than a world of values. There has been a 'devaluation of valuation' as such. Man's capacity to value has been brought to question.

Values, after all, call for choice. And choice is possible only where there is freedom for the will. But science sternly reminds us that this freedom is an illusion or at best severely circumscribed. We may think that we choose freely but we don't. Our choice is conditioned by a complex of inner and outer circumstances. By situation and tradition, by the environment, and the coalescence of our genes. The world which science perceives, moreover, is a morally neutral world. It is a world of fact alien to value. Values are only preferences, physics asserts, mere emotions -- the proper object for study by psychology. But, then, psychology comes and abolishes the notion of integral normality: the normal and the abnormal, the good and the bad -- they blend; there is no true line between them. There is neither hot nor cold. There is no high or low. And there is an enormous amount of nothing in the All.

Man's mind is the sole source of value in a world devoid of values and his capacity to value is feeble -- so concludes science, even while it gives man power over nature, enormous power, the power to control, the power to manipulate, the God-given power to create. Here is that paradox of which Hans Jonas speaks: feebleness and strength in one, omnipotence and emptiness, the 'anarchy of human choosing' combined with man's 'apocalyptic' sway.

This is the ceremony of innocence drowned. The best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity. Such are the stresses and the strains of which the New View of Man is consequence. Against this modern essentially hopeless view of man stands Judaism's assertion of man's perfectability. Note the noun: Judaism speaks of man's perfectability and not of his perfect state. It recognizes that man is weak and vain, self-centered and prone to evil. Indeed, Judaism's highest holy day - Yom Kippur - grows out of this recognition. And with all that, man's sinfulness is not Yom Kippur's central theme.

Rosh Hashonoh and Yom Kippur are called the Days of Awe, and awesome is the mood which fills us as we contemplate our lives, our past, as we strive to pierce the veil of our future. Somber, though, our sentiments may be, the fundamental force impelling our worship is really one of hope, for Yom Kippur speaks to us primarily of man's potentiality for achievement, of his capacity for good. This is the central message of the day, this the essence of its thought: not sin, but repentance -- not evil, but redemption!

Whatever there is of darkness in our contemplation of the past serves merely to enhance the light of our hope for the future. We are reminded of our failings, not to debase us, not to cast us into gloom, but to inspire us to higher and to nobler striving. We confess our sins not so much out of a sense of our unworthiness, but with full faith that out of feebleness new strength will come, that we can, if we will, turn every tear of disappointment into a pearl of virtue, every defeat of yesterday into the laughter and the triumph of tomorrow.

Judaism maintains an abiding faith in human nature, the passionate conviction that man can choose the good. Ours is not a religion of euphoria, to be sure; it does not close its eyes to the evil of the world. Yom Kippur's 'al chet' is long and detailed, no sin conceivable is left unspoken in its self-accusing lines. But Judaism refuses to see man as a sinner who must sin, whose sin is existential, whose transgression is inevitable. It sees within him, rather, the seed of self-improvement, it invests him with the dream for human betterment.

וְיָכֹחַ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁכַּח עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְיִשְׁכַּח עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְיִשְׁכַּח עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be whiter than snow." Every sinner can be a saint, every Jacob can become an Israel, if only he wrestle with his God. This is the beautiful promise of our faith and this is mandate: that we seek within ourselves and that we seek in others be it ever so hidden, the spark divine that hallows and exalts the dust that is man.

Can we heed this mandate: Can we share this vision? Is not faith in human nature, an empty dream, a vain illusion? How can we talk of human goodness, we who live in an age of unmatched desolation and destruction, especially we Jews who have been wounded more grievously than any other people by the naked blade of man's brutality to man? Just where shall we look for the good? Shall we look for it in others? But there is not one among us who has not been hurt by another, who has not been wounded to the innermost recesses of his heart by his fellow man: through slander, humiliation, the deprivation of some dear possession, a promise broken, a trust betrayed,

(unfurnished)

The Lives We Dream

Your program chairman, in her various communications with me, gave me free choice as far as my topic is concerned, and I am grateful for her courtesy. I finally determined to speak to you on the topic which has been announced: THE LIVES WE DREAM TO LIVE, and the theme which I want to develop is Judaism's essential faith in human nature, its conviction that man can choose and achieve the good.

It is a conviction which has been seriously challenged in our time, challenged by the sorry spectacle of man's brutality to man to which we are continuously witness and of which the massacre at Songmy is but the latest evidence -- look and listen if you have the guts to do so; the father of a child of his own mechanically gunning down a six or seven year old whose one hand covers an even younger child and whose other hand is stretched out to plead for mercy or to ward off the deadly bullets. Whatever the reason, in vain. Mechanical man knows no mercy. Only death was merciful then. Be that as it may, such and like spectacles of human behavior have led many thoughtful men to conclude that our moral foundations have decayed, that man is, at best, without values and that life, in its totality, is absurd.

William Butler Yeats, that great poet of our century, describes our modern malady in what has become one of his best known poems. His words go to the very heart of the matter:

The world of moral certitudes has crumbled
Its center did not hold.
Anarchy is loosed upon the land.
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned.

Our certitude, our moral confidence, was rocked by change -- inexorable legacy of technological advance. It was eroded by the decay of its supportive institutions -- of synagogue and church, of school and home. It was ground to the dust by the horror to which we were witness: the Cyclon B of Belsen and the mushroom cloud.

Russians."

and, lastly - listen to this travesty of travesties, this mockery of our martyrdom - we must be certain to teach our children that "Nazism directly affected the founding of the State of Israel," as if there ever ~~was~~ could be a mechanical equating of the two, a balancing of blessing and of curse! Is this what we want our children to know? Is this the sum and substance of the wisdom which can be gleaned from this most tragic chapter of our recent history?

Surely we would do better to help our students grapple with the more fundamental issues which are involved, issues whose resolutions might help them in their quest for faith and for a life reflective of ~~it~~: How does the Jew react to evil? Is spiritual resistance an answer to an enemy? Does collective guilt obviate individual responsibility? What can we say about the face of man after Auschwitz? And what about the face of God? Can we believe in Him in spite of it?

Yes, there is history and there is

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 THE AMERICAN JEW; RETROSPECT AND
2 PROSPECT - A New Curriculum for a
3 New Community.

4 How good and how pleasant it is to be
5 here, reunited with colleagues and friends,
6 with men and women from many congrega-
7 tions but of one faith, bound together
8 by a mutual sacred cause.

9 What do we seek in seeking our brothers?
10 What are the ends we mean to serve in
11 coming here? To learn, perhaps to teach,
12 to take counsel together, to gather the
13 rich fruit of our common experience --
14 all these, yet even more -- to draw
15 strength from one another, to receive
16 that sustenance of spirit which comes
17 from the companionship of kindred and
18 aspiring souls.

19 It is a sustenance which flows in ample
20 measure from our fellowship. I can well
21 testify to that, for no aspect of my
22 work gives me greater satisfaction than
23 my association with the men and women of
24 NATE, whose friendship I value., and
25 whose wise counsel is indispensable to

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 the fulfillment of my tasks. This is a
2 professional organization of the highest
3 order; its programs and activities are
4 substantive, and its members establish
5 exacting standards of conduct and attain-
6 ment.
7 When important posts had to be filled this
8 year, on a regional and national level,
9 we did not have to look beyond our own
10 ranks to find the men to fill them. This
11 fact alone bespeaks NATE's considerable
12 growth and maturity.
13 We meet in Philadelphia, cradle of Amer-
14 ican democracy and birthplace of much
15 that is valuable in American Jewish life.
16 In this community institutions vital to
17 our continuity were born; here were
18 reared the men and women, leaders of the
19 spirit, whose life and work gave shape to
20 our destiny.
21 This is a fitting place, then, for the
22 communal "cheshbon ha'nefesh" which
23 our assembly, in its theme, enjoins.
24 This is a fitting time to consider the
25 American Jewish community -- its past,

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 its present, and its prospects.

2 A CHANGING COMMUNITY

3 This Convention Program Committee was
4 wise to ask Dr. Bertram Korn to consider
5 this theme in its fulness; he is a dili-
6 gent student of our community, one of its
7 foremost chroniclers, whose perspective
8 vision of its past gives him clear warrant
9 to pierce the veil of our future.

10 Dr. Korn and I agreed, in order to
11 avoid duplication, that I would limit my
12 variations of the theme to education,
13 while he would deal with the changing
14 patterns of the community as a whole.
15 On second thought, I am not entirely
16 happy with this arrangement. At the
17 very least, Dr. Korn's address should
18 have preceded mine, for changes in the
19 educative process follow, they do not
20 precede changes in the character of the
21 community. The school is the servant of
22 society, not its master.

23 At the risk of offending a colleague
24 by breaking my agreement with him, at the
25 evenmore fearsome risk of having my

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 analysis contradicted less than 24 hours
2 hence, I feel constrained to consider the
3 transformations of our community, if
4 only briefly, for without it, without
5 some knowledge of its newer nature, the
6 new directions demanded of our schools
7 can not be understood. Now this trans-
8 formation of our community is nothing
9 short of cataclysmic, for it involves
10 not only its externals -- its structures,
11 composition, its institutions; it reaches
12 to the very core of our communal being,
13 and we encounter an entirely new Jew --
14 the American Jew -- and the problems he
15 encounters are unlike those our people
16 faced, at any other time in any other
17 place.

18 "Al regel achat," simply and succinctly
19 put, our inner alteration involves a loos-
20 ening, a dissolution of the ethnic
21 strains which bound us once, and the
22 compensating reinforcement of religious
23 bonds expected to serve as unifying force
24 in their stead.

25 To put the matter somewhat differently,

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 the secular cult or nationhood envisaged
2 by many Jews of a previous generation,
3 has proved illusory, incapable of ful-
4 fillment on the American scene; the
5 community has become a communion, bound
6 by belief, turning primarily to religion
7 to define its nature and to justify its
8 continuity.

9 JEWISH FACTORS

10 Two events of recent Jewish history gave
11 main impulse and momentum to this meta-
12 morphosis: the destruction of European
13 Jewry and the establishment of Israel.

14 The European Jewish community gave
15 shape to our own, sustaining its cultural
16 and its religious life during most of
17 the formative years. More to the point,
18 Europe gave us its community concept,
19 with its dominant ethnic strains which
20 permeated even its religious expressions.
21 Until World War II, its ideology governed
22 our thinking and our doing. We were
23 involved in the European Jewish situation
24 and conceived our own problem largely
25 in its light, so much so that even the
100% American Council for Judaism spent

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 its full energies in the feverish debate
2 of an essentially European question, the
3 the Emancipation, which never really was
4 of issue here. Be that as it may, the
5 tragic death of European Jewry cut the
6 physiological and the ideological nexus
7 which bound us to our communal parents.
8 We were compelled to look at our situation
9 as it really is, without the overtones
10 provided by their understanding of it.
11 And we quickly learned that the old-
12 world community concept does not conform
13 to the realities of the American scene,
14 that the resolutions offered by European
15 Jewish ideology simply will not serve us
16 here.

17 The achievement of Jewish nationhood in
18 Israel, by curious paradox, further en-
19 feebled the non-religious bonds of our
20 union. True, the dream of secular no
21 less than of religious nationalist was
22 fulfilled, their loving labor justified,
23 the validity of their thought established.
24 But the very fulfillment of this dream
25 robbed the adherents of political Zionism

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 of their reason for collective continuity
2 in the Diaspora. The ever-waning force
3 of a fervor fired before the State's
4 establishment is not sufficient to sus-
5 tain group loyalty, nor is the State's
6 continuing need for help -- after all,
7 one does not have to be a Jew to be a
8 friend of Israel. Ultimately only two
9 avenues lie open before the secular
10 nationalist that he can choose: either
11 he migrates to Israel, following the deed
12 the logic of his thought; or remaining
13 here, he finds an added, more relevant
14 means for identification with the Amer-
15 ican Jewish community. The synagogue
16 becomes his likely choice.

17 THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

18 But not only momentous changes in Jewish
19 life contributed to the diminution of our
20 ethnicity; this diminution was deepened
21 further by an environment which does de-
22 mand conformity as the price of acceptance.

23 The measure of required conformity is
24 greater than we think, far greater than
25 America's professed adherence to the creed

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 of cultural pluralism might lead us to
2 expect. The American Way of Life is not
3 so open that divergent cultural components
4 can easily be made a part of it. A blue
5 ribbon jury of the majority rules; it is ~~now~~
6 dominated by those who came here first; and
7 they are reluctant to accept components
8 which clash with their culture. Folkways
9 fundamentally foreign to the American
10 environment are quickly discarded by a
11 minority which means to escape its not-so-
12 invisible ghetto. Only religion is
13 exempted from these demands; the American
14 ethos recognizes it as a "collective
15 privacy" which may be maintained -- at
16 least, so it appears, for even here some
17 doubts prevail.

18 In his penetrating study of the problem,
19 Ben Halpern of Brandeis University points
20 out that the acceptance of the "triple
21 melting-pot" analysis does not at all
22 allow us to conclude that Protestantism,
23 Catholicism and Judaism stand in the very
24 same relationship to the American social
25 consensus. Here too a jury of the major-

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 ity rules, and the standard of acceptance
2 is set by American Protestantism with its
3 conception that religion resides in the
4 single man, that the church, the congrega-
5 tion, is an institution designed to help
6 the individual realize his faith, and not
7 at all an instrument to nurture group re-
8 ligion; in a word, "that freedom of worship
9 ... the privacy of religious conscience ..
10 is a right of individuals, and not of
11 collective entities at all."

12 If this is true in the realm of religion,
13 it certainly is true, a fortiori, in the
14 realm of culture. Individual divergences
15 are accepted, but that which intensifies
16 collective distinctiveness is decisively
17 discouraged. To be sure now, certain
18 elements of traditional group culture can
19 be given public expression and then find
20 public acceptance. But usually they are
21 trivial traits, drawn from the surface of
22 tradition, that which can be readily under-
23 stood, the light, the amusing, the enter-
24 taining, but about as far removed from
25 tradition's genuine core as is "Fiddler on

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 the Roof" from Sholom Aleichem.

2 This, then, is the confluence of inner
3 and of outer forces, the interaction of
4 Jewish experience and the American environ-
5 ment which has resulted in the diminution
6 of our ethnic character and in the refocil-
7 lation of our religious bonds. A hundred
8 sociological studies attest to the reality
9 of this transformation. American Jews see
10 themselves as Jews primarily by their
11 religion. Nothing else -- not culture, not
12 nationhood, not even the giving of charity
13 -- is of essential consequence in securing
14 the continuity of their identification.

15 AFFILIATION WITHOUT AFFIRMATION

16 But we must carry our analysis just one
17 step further, for we find now that
18 religious identification by itself,
19 affiliation without affirmation, is also not
20 sufficient for the need. American Jews
21 may join a congregation as a matter of
22 communal necessity; they cannot long
23 remain in it, without facing the test of
24 faith.

25 Ben Halpern puts the matter well:

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 "... it is impossible to live forever
2 in the synagogue only as in a socially
3 useful institution. At some time one is
4 bound to realize that this is a House of
5 God. Now, one must ask, do I stand before
6 God? Do I really believe in Him? Do I
7 believe in Him as a Jew??

8 Are not these the questions which our
9 people ask with ever-increasing urgency?
10 We saw dramatic demonstration of this
11 fact less than a month ago, at the Union's
12 Biennial in San Francisco, in the reaction
13 of the delegates, and not as merely in the
14 substance of the discussions. Seven
15 hundred people crowded a meeting hall,
16 many of them standing the better part of ~~an~~
17 a full day to listen to a discussion of
18 the "why" of Jewishness. A like number
19 attended a lecture on "The Demands of
20 Prayer," the kind of topic which, a
21 decade ago, would at best have attracted
22 a handful of cogniscenti. Yes, and 1800
23 men and women stormed the doors of the
24 grand ballroom, to hear four rabbis de-
25 fine their God-belief. They could not get

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 their full of listening. Over and over
2 again, they insisted on an answer to such
3 questions as: How can I believe in God in
4 the face of the teachings of modern science
5 and technology? Can man really experience
6 God through prayer? What is the unique
7 and enduring contribution that Judaism can
8 make to the modern world?

9 These are the questions which perplex
10 our people. These questions also delineate
11 the essential problem of the American Jew,
12 for ours is no longer the problem of identi-
13 fication, the difficulty of defining our
14 community status. Ours, rather, is the
15 problem of finding meaning for an identifi-
16 cation which we have already chosen or
17 which has been chosen for us. Ours is
18 essentially a spiritual problem. It is a
19 problem of ideas and beliefs. It is a
20 crisis of conscience.

21 THE COMMUNITY OF OUR CHILDREN

22 What is true for the adult community (to
23 move just a bit closer to the area of our
24 more immediate concern as educators) is
25 true in equal if not greater measure for
the community of our children, for the

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 emerging American Jew. This is to be
2 expected. After all, our children have
3 experienced neither the holocaust, nor
4 the struggle for Israel's establishment,
5 those two dramatic, traumatic events whose
6 remembrance still binds us to the thinking
7 and feeling of the past.

8 The Riverton Report was especially
9 revealing in its contrast of the older and
10 the younger generation. Surely you recall
11 some of its findings:

12 When the respondents asked, for
13 instance, why Jews continue to exist as a
14 distinctive group, parents spoke of the
15 age-old hostility between Jew and gentile.
16 The children, on the other hand, felt that
17 the virtues of Judaism justify the surviv-
18 al of the group. (Their reason for Jewish-
19 ness is positive, no mere reaction to per-
20 secution.)

21 The adults of Riverton expressed an
22 overwhelming preference for predominantly
23 Jewish neighborhoods, while the majority
24 of adolescents were perfectly willing to
25 widen their community contacts. (Having

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 experienced no "age-old" hostility from
2 the non-Jew, they feel no reluctance to
3 live in mixed neighborhoods.)

4 In the realm of charitable giving,
5 parents favored exclusively Jewish causes,
6 both here and abroad, not excluding
7 Israel. In sharp contrast, their children
8 chose many non-Jewish causes as objects of
9 their beneficence. (Clearly, a declining
10 sense of group closeness is manifested
11 here.) And, most directly to the point,
12 when the respondents were asked: what is a
13 Jew? How would you describe him? A good
14 many parents still referred to Jewish culture
15 and to the happenstance of birth - "my
16 parent is a Jew...I'm a Jew," while fully
17 ninety-seven per cent of the adolescents
18 defined the Jew exclusively by his alleg-
19 iance to the Jewish religion.

20 Conclude the authors of the study: "The
21 present Jewish self-image demands relig-
22 ious affiliation as the identifying
23 characteristic... Among adolescents,
24 hardly any other way of distinguishing the
25 Jew is possible...It is not that they are

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 more religious than their parents. Rather,
2 they are more cut off from the old-world...
3 more completely molded by the American
4 scene, they simply see no other meaning for
5 the word 'Jew'."
6 As for the matter of discovering meaning in
7 Jewishness, if anything, our children are
8 even more persistent than are their parents
9 in their quest for the relevance of religion.
10 Where adults can often evade the test of
11 faith by accepting the authority of tradi-
12 tion or of religious leadership, adolescents,
13 facing their maturity, cannot. That is why
14 they ask us for an answer to the "why" of
15 Jewishness and the more sensitive and
16 intelligent they are, the more earnestly do
17 they ask it.

18 THE IRRELEVANCE OF OUR TEACHING

19 Do we answer their questions in what we
20 teach and do? Is our curriculum designed
21 to answer them? Honesty compels us to say
22 "no" or, at best, to offer only a qualified
23 "yes," for our program of study was given
24 its broad, bold outlines decades ago when
25 our community was different and its needs

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 were different. Developed under the
2 impact of the old community concept, it
3 fails to meet the requirements of the new.
4 It emphasizes the ethnic, rather than the
5 religious; it focuses on outer form and
6 not on inner faith.

7 Our problem is not unlike that of the
8 miller whose mill is in excellent condition
9 in all respects, its machinery sound,
10 excepting only one: the mill wheel stands
11 one foot above the water. Much of our
12 teaching is just that -- one foot above
13 the water, failing to cut into the
14 current of our children's deeper needs.

15 The objectives which we articulate in
16 our curriculum is sound enough. Dr.
17 Freehof's "Statement of Guiding Principles"
18 clearly, ~~staringly~~ sets forth our real
19 purposes. The listing of curricular goals
20 is also most acceptable, albeit I must
21 confess some embarrassment with the word-
22 ing of the very first article which bids
23 us "instill in" our children, not a faith
24 in God, mind you, but rather, a "faith in
25 the Jewish religion, according to the
Liberal Reform tradition," whatever that

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 may mean.

2 But when we move from principle to
3 program, and from the program to the
4 classroom, the gap between objectives and
5 attainment widens, and the relevant be-
6 comes largely irrelevant. A Bible taught
7 as literature, history presented principal-
8 ly as the story of persecution, a story
9 moreover, in which God somehow disappears
10 as a protagonist once we make the move from
11 the Talmud, to the Current Era ... Hebrew
12 instruction which emphasizes linguistic
13 competence ... given the teaching of
14 customs and ceremonies when portrayed
15 primarily as pattern of group behavior ...
16 all this may well attract our children and
17 gain their initial willingness to be
18 identified as Jew; it will not provide
19 them with the meaning which they seek to
20 make their identification lasting and
21 vital. As Abraham Heschel put it, in a
22 different context:

23 "... an education which continues to
24 evade intellectual problems or which
25 ignores emotional obtuseness is doomed to

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 failure. Teaching the geography of
2 Israel will not necessarily evoke the love
3 of Israel. Nor will merely the teach-
4 ing of the rules about the dagesh chazak
5 assure one of becoming conscious of the
6 pintaleh yid."
7

8 Clearly a new approach is needed,
9 attendant upon the re-evaluation of our
10 educational presuppositions and some-
11 thing more than superficial change is
12 required. To paraphrase our colleague
13 David Hachen: we cannot be content
14 merely to put a new cover on an old
15 curriculum, or even to revise it; we
16 must write it anew, in the light of the
17 newer need.

18 TOWARD A NEW CURRICULUM

19 This task will not be fulfilled over-
20 night; only evolutions, not revolu-
21 tions in education have a chance at
22 success. As a case in point -- and I
23 had occasion to make mention of this in
24 a recent Jewish Teacher editorial --
25 it took the Lutheran Church of America
nearly twenty years to complete its

(Begin 1st
line flush;
indent subse-
quent paragraphs)

1 new parish educational plan, and our
2 Christian colleagues had almost unlimited
3 material and professional resources at
4 their command -- some \$5,000,000.00 and
5 forty-one full time educators on their
6 national staff.

7 But more than material and technical
8 obstacles must be overcome; ideological
9 problems confront us also, for no small
10 part of our difficulty is rooted in the
11 radical divergence of theologic view
12 which obtains on an adult level...

13 After all, we cannot teach our children
14 what we do not agree upon, what we
15 cannot accept ourselves.

16 Here, at least, some forward steps are
17 being taken, for only a few months
18 hence, at the behest of the Commission
19 Curriculum Committee and its Chairman
20 Samuel Glasner, a Conference of Jewish
21 Theologians will convene, involving
22 leading thinkers of conflicting views --
23 Gittelsohn and Fackenheim, Bemporad and
24 Joans, Borowitz and Reines and Olan --
25 not so much to forge a unified Reform

(Begin 1st
line flush;
indent subse-
quent paragraphs)

1 Jewish theology, but in the hope of at
2 least coming to an agreement on what we
3 should teach to our children and when we
4 should teach it, on how we can enrich
5 their knowledge and experience to make
6 them believing Jews!

7 Hopefully these deliberations will be
8 fruitful in their effect. But, of
9 course, we don't have to await this
10 fruition or even the more fundamental
11 changes contemplated in our national
12 curriculum in order to give the needed
13 new direction to our common sacred enter-
14 prise. Our criticism of certain funda-
15 mentals does not encompass, in blanket
16 fashion, everything we have and do.

17 Much of what we have is exceedingly good,
18 and everything we do can be made to yield
19 our newer purposes, for their realization
20 depends not so much on this or that
21 subject, but rather on its use to which
22 the subject is put, whatever be its
23 matter.

24 As a concrete case in point, about a
25 year ago a number of communal leaders

(Begin 1st
line flush;
indent subsequent
paragraphs)

1 and educators from this very community
2 (Philadelphia, Minutes of November 5, 1964
3 meeting of Community Relations Council,
4 incorporating sub-committee report ~~by~~
5 ~~William Kladitz, Dr. Elazar Goolman, Dr.~~
6 ~~Ben-Horin, et alia~~) gathered to develop
7 objectives for the teaching of the holo-
8 caust. This is a subject which should be
9 taught in our schools indeed; we expect to
10 have a text on it within the year. But
11 listen to the educational objectives which
12 the Philadelphia group selected:
13 our children must come to know and feel
14 that "Nazism is a monstrous example of
15 religious bigotry."
16 they must understand the "meaning of the
17 Nuremberg laws" with particular reference
18 to the Nazi "claim to the racial superior-
19 ity of German"
20 they must be able to comprehend such
21 words as "Swastika," "slave labor,"
22 "concentration camps," and "gas chamber."
23 we should remind them that "Nazis
24 persecuted others than Jews, such as the
25 Christians and Poles, the Czechs and the

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 Russians."

2 and, lastly - listen to this travesty of
3 travesties, this mockery of our martyrdom
4 - we must be certain to teach our children
5 that "Nazism directly affected the founding
6 of the State of Israel," as if there ever
7 could be a mechanical equating of the two,
8 a balancing of blessing and of curse!
9 Is this what we want our children to know?
10 Is this the sum and substance of the wis-
11 dom which can be gleaned from this most
12 tragic chapter of our recent history?

13 Surely we would do better to help our
14 students grapple with the more fundamental
15 issues which are involved, issues whose
16 resolutions might help them in their quest
17 for faith and for a life reflective of it:
18 How does the Jew react to evil? Is
19 spiritual resistance an answer to an
20 enemy? Does collective guilt obviate
21 individual responsibility? What can we
22 say about the face of man after Auschwitz?
23 And what about the face of God? Can we
24 believe in Him in spite of it?

25 Yes, there is history and there is

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 history... There is the Bible as literature,
2 and the Bible as the Word of God... There
3 is ethical instruction which is mere moral
4 preachment, and there is such instruction
5 in which the antecedent of the moral law
6 is probed... There is the kind of Hebrew
7 study which constitutes the refinement of
8 language skill alone, and then there is the
9 kind of study in which language becomes a
10 garment for sentiments of faith; when our
11 students learn what a noble Zionist
12 thinker, Chaim Greenberg, insisted, then
13 they learn, not just the literal meaning
14 of such words as "mitsva," and "yirah,"
15 and "ahava," and "kiddush Hashem," but
16 also the meaning of these words to their
17 deepest sounding and in the full context
18 of all their spiritual tension.

19 JUDAISM MORE THAN 'RELIGION ONLY'

20 I trust that no one will misunderstand me
21 and read into my lines a rejection of
22 Judaism's cultural component or a disavow-
23 al of the bonds of kinship which bind us
24 to another beyond the bonds of faith.
25 Judaism is manifestly more than a mere

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 system of precept and belief; it is a cov-
2 enant binding a historic community. One
3 cannot extract an idea from its historic
4 form and expect it to retain its essence;
5 both must be transmitted, the idea and the
6 form, tradition and belief.

7 I speak only of an emphasis in our teach-
8 ing, a centrality of concern which, per
9 force, must vary from generation to genera-
10 tion, and which in our time and place must
11 focus on the transmission of belief.

12 The narrow conception of Judaism as
13 'religion only' is alien to me, and not
14 just on intellectual and historic grounds.
15 I reject this narrow concept on experien-
16 tial grounds as well for in my personal
17 journey of the spirit, I was an "ohav
18 yisroel" long before I heard the "veohavto
19 es Adonoi."

20 It is the "veohavto es Adonoi" which
21 our children need to hear from us, hear it
22 with the hearing of the ear, and sense it
23 in their soul as well. For the Judaism
24 which we mean to convey to them is more
25 than verbal profession, more than intellect-

(Begin 1st line
flush; indent
subsequent
paragraphs)

1 ual conceptualization, much more indeed
2 than a refined doubt sublimated into a
3 hesitant assumption. It is an all consum-
4 ing inner conviction involving the full
5 faculties of man, his heart and mind and
6 will and spirit too, all of them blending
7 in to a rapturous communion with the divine.
8 This is faith! This is what we mean by
9 belief in God!

10 May we find the way to kindle the spark
11 of such a faith in our children, and the
12 strength to nurture it to bright and burn-
13 ing flame. Then will we be able to con-
14 template with confidence the future of our
15 community, that community of our people
16 which we helped to shape. Then the time
17 will come when those who see our children
18 will say of us that we did not "labor in
19 vain, nor bring forth for terror, that ours
20 is the seed blessed of the Lord."

*Additional
copies in
book case*

Chapter Eight

REFORM JUDAISM AND EDUCATION

ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

The American Jewish community's approach to the complex of problems encompassed in the phrase "religion and education" can best be understood as the effect of an interplay of inner and outer forces, of the ideal and the real, of Jewish theology and Jewish history; it is the product of a people's faith shaped by its experience.

The monism which characterizes Judaism, its steadfast insistence of God's unity and its attendant unitary conception of human nature, clearly calls for the most comprehensive understanding of education's role, for the summary dismissal of any effort to compartmentalize it into well-defined, only thinly-related segments labeled "secular" and "sacred." On the other

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler is Director of Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, holding primary responsibility for the development of Reform Judaism's program of religious education. In addition, Rabbi Schindler heads the national policy-making body for religious education within Reform Judaism.

hand, the life experience of Jews, their persecution in lands where church and state were one and the whiplash of anti-Semitism which they and their children were made to feel in state religion-oriented schools, have made them espouse the ideal of the "secular" public school and thus to qualify the concept of education which comes from their faith.

Hence Jews stand in the vanguard of the struggle to maintain the principle of separation wherever church and state meet on the American scene. They resist the intrusion of denominational instruction and observances in the public classroom even as they oppose with vigor the assignment of public funds to church-established schools. At the same time, their essentially religious world view leads them to understand that not all religious concerns can be excised from the public school curriculum, that every system of education worthy of the name must strive to awaken awareness of life's spiritual dimension and foster devotion to its values. American Jews are confident that the public school can serve these ends without invoking the sectarian symbols and sanctions of institutional religion, without transmitting the teaching and forms of even those great faiths from which our spiritual and moral values are ultimately derived.

Judaism's View of Education

Because it is one of the oldest religions of mankind, its adherents scattered through all the world and their faith challenged by many varied winds of thought, Judaism is not a simple faith. It is, rather, a complex system of life and thought, embracing many points of view and distinctive only in its totality, in the singular integration of diverse details. Thus, there is no single Jewish philosophy of education; the religious literature of the Jew sounds many variations on the theme.

Still, a leitmotif can be perceived among the descants, allowing us to speak of a Jewish view of teaching and of learning.

Central to this view is Judaism's concept of man, which holds his nature to be a blending of body and soul, of matter and of spirit. Man is made of the dust, yet there is something in him which has its source in the divine and enables him to achieve communion with it. Because he was fashioned in the image of God, he can encounter God, if only he seek Him. "Man is not cut off and isolated from the universe, but a part of it. Somehow he can reach out and understand it. Man may be limited and small, but he can grow toward God because something in him corresponds to God."¹ The realization of this potentiality latent within him, the attainment of communion with the divine, constitutes man's essential task; it is the infinite duty which has been laid on finite human life.

Education is a principal means for life's fulfillment; "a man needs to study, so that he may become himself."² The unlearned man can never be pious; he may will to find God, but he does not know the way; he perceives the design, but he lacks the tools and has failed to master the craft. Learning is the key to the universe. Man becomes God-like, holy as God is holy, only as he grows in the knowledge of His world and Word.

Education is a means, not the end. Though prizing knowledge above all earthly possessions, Judaism ascribes no worth to study for study's sake alone. "He who has knowledge of the Torah but no fear of God, is like the keeper of a treasury who has the inner keys, but not the outer keys. He cannot enter."³ The goal of learning is the refinement of a sensitivity to the divine; the beginning and the end of wisdom is the fear of heaven.

Judaism's conception of human nature is essentially unitary. It speaks of body and of soul but sees them bound in indis-

soluble union. Certainly the body is not burdened with all sin, nor is the soul given credit for all virtue.

To what may this be compared? To a king who owned a beautiful orchard which contained splendid figs. Now, he appointed two watchmen therein, one lame and the other blind. One day the lame man said to the blind, "I see beautiful figs in the orchard. Come and take me upon thy shoulder, that we may procure and eat them." So the lame bestrode the blind, procured and ate them. Some time later, the owner of the orchard came and inquired of them, "Where are those beautiful figs?" The lame man replied, "Have I then feet to walk with?" The blind man replied, "Have I then eyes to see with?" What did he do? He placed the lame upon the blind and judged them together. So will the Holy One, blessed be He, return the soul to the body and judge them as one.⁴

Man is not a loose federation of two or even three separate states—body, mind, spirit—but rather is a composite of these correlative principles of being.

The implications of this conception for the understanding of education's task are clear. Its function is all-encompassing. It cannot be divided in any manner or restricted in any fashion. One cannot refine the competence of mind while oblivious to the needs and potentialities of body or blind to the values and final purposes which are born of man's spirit. The development of the total man is every teacher's concern. All life is education's proper province.

Judaism's reluctance to ascribe a final duality to human nature extends to the nature of man's universe. Here too, no artificial divisions are made, no realms sequestered from the horizons of inquiry which a man can properly pursue. "There is no not-holy, there is only that which has not been hallowed, which has not yet been redeemed to its holiness."⁵

The history of the Jews reveals no parallel to the warfare of theology with science which mars the history of Christendom.

Scientific inquiry was usually encouraged and given free rein. As one example, a twelfth-century curriculum sets the following order of studies: reading, writing, Torah, Mishnah, Hebrew grammar, poetry, Talmud, philosophy of religion, logic, arithmetic, geometry, optics, astronomy, music, mechanics, medicine, and lastly, metaphysics.⁶ The array of Jewish scholars who coupled knowledge of Jewish law and lore with equal competence in the sciences is impressive; the leading contributors to the development of Jewish theology invariably ranked among the foremost scientists of their day. Moses ben Maimon (usually called Maimonides) offers classic proof: he was Talmudist and philosopher, astronomer and physician; his mastery of rabbinics was sufficiently great to have future generations of Jews designate him as a "second Moses"; his philosophical writings, seeking to harmonize Judaism and Aristotelianism, reveal an equally excellent grasp of Greek thought; and his scientific works—two volumes on poisons and their antidotes, a book on sexual intercourse, essays on asthma, on hemorrhoids, on hygiene, and a commentary on the aphorisms of Hippocrates—were consequential enough to merit translation and republication throughout the eight centuries since they were first written, most recently in English, by Johns Hopkins University, on the occasion of a Maimonides anniversary.

The study of nature is not inimical to the pursuit of the religious life, so teaches Judaism; it is a pillar on which the life of faith rests; God can be known only through its free and unrestricted service.⁷ The student of science ought never be hindered in his quest by theological presuppositions; the "Torah is not a code that compels us to believe in falsehoods."⁸ A contradiction between the teachings of Judaism and the findings of science can only be apparent, never real, and calls for the careful reevaluation of both. Either may be at fault, tradition misunderstood or scientific method poorly applied, and if

the conclusions of science prove correct, tradition must yield the point and modify its understanding of the Word.

Nothing which serves to expand the adventurous horizon of man's mind should be excluded from consideration in the life-long educative process. The science, the wisdom, the skills of the world are as significant to man as are the teachings of tradition. All are necessary if man is to fulfill the purpose inherent in life.

That purpose must be served. If it is not, knowledge, whatever its kind, is vain; "the end of the matter, all having been heard: revere God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."⁹ It is in this spirit that the modern Jew voices his prayer:

O Lord, open our eyes, that we may see and welcome all truth, whether shining from the annals of ancient revelations or reaching us through the seers of our own time; for Thou hidest not thy light from any generation of Thy children that yearn for Thee and seek Thy guidance.¹⁰

When they speak these lines at their weekly Sabbath services, and when they translate into their lives, as they hopefully do, the ideal implicit in them, Jews keep alive the ancient prophet's dream, a dream superbly characteristic of Judaism's view of learning, which envisages man's future as a time when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea."¹¹

Faith Tempered by Experience

This then is the compelling religious conception which governs Judaism's approach to education: study is a never-ending task in life, a vital means for its fulfillment. All realms of knowledge, not just religious disciplines, but the sciences of

man and nature too, and the humanities, are encompassed by this mandate; and all learning must be made to serve the end of faith, this end alone, the principal object of being—to help the I encounter the Eternal Thou.

It is a conception which still holds sway for Jews, at least for those who define their Jewishness primarily in religious terms. Its modification, to which we alluded in the introduction, is not one of substance but one of detail; and it applied, in the main, to American Jews, whose recent history witnessed their mass migration from central Europe to America.

Jews were made to suffer grievously in the lands of their origin; their existence was in continuous jeopardy, their religious life severely circumscribed. Invariably, their persecution was most relentless where Luther's dictum, *cuius regio eius religio*, determined the relation between church and state, where rulers told the ruled how to worship God, and priests told rulers how to execute state affairs. By the time Jews came to these shores in substantial numbers, the alliance between Protestant dissent and secular humanism had yielded its richest fruit; the principle of religious freedom was well established, and the concept of voluntariness in matters of faith had become a cornerstone of American law. Here Jews found safety. Here they found freedom in a measure rarely matched in the two thousand years of their wandering. Little wonder that they attributed their liberties primarily to the principle of separation and that they are boldly zealous in its defense!

The sharp and comforting contrast between the old and the new was strikingly manifested in the realm of public education. In Europe only a handful of Jewish children were granted admission to government-established schools; the lucky few who were thus chosen had to make a payment of blood for their privilege. They were subjected to stinging indignities, insulted

and assaulted to remind them of their inferiority, to make them appreciate the gracious gift bestowed. Whatever the ultimate purpose, the state was hardly guiltless. State-appointed teachers condoned or even encouraged such incidents. These expressions of anti-Semitism invariably were cloaked in the garment of religious bigotry, given occasion by class prayers (always alluding to the Crucifixion), by school observances of festivals (Easter was ever a propitious time to resuscitate the blood libel), and by the caustic commentaries of teachers in interpreting the Biblical text. Not so in America! Here the Jewish immigrant found governmental schools whose doors were opened wide to welcome his children, whose teachers and administrators accorded them treatment fully equal to that extended to all other students. Again, the American Jew attributed his blessing primarily to the principle of separation, to the circumstance that the American public school had been divested of those denominational dimensions that so distressed him and his children elsewhere. Thus it was that American Jews became champions of the "secular" public school, learning to reverence it as a "precious gift to be passionately protected and preserved."¹²

Here we confront the modern-day modification of Judaism's traditional approach to learning. Today's American Jews recognize the worth of disjoining the educational process, conceding the possibility of its departmentalization into "secular" and "sacred" components.

The modification is modest indeed. It involves a peripheral change, not an alteration in essence. It constitutes a division of labor, as it were, and not a dichotomy of final purposes. The goals of education, public and private, remain the same. The public school can well serve religion's ultimate concerns without also teaching religion in any formal sense.¹³

Maintaining the Wall—Religious Observances

American Judaism offers substantial, unaccustomed unanimity in its approach to the many issues affecting the adjustment of church and state in the realm of public education. The response is uniform and unequivocal, always applying the principle enunciated by the highest court, "separation means separation, not something less."

Every ritual expression of religion in the public elementary and high schools is rejected on this basis, from the recitations of prayers to the devotional reading of the Bible, from the singing of sacred songs to the observance of sectarian festivals, not excluding joint religious celebrations.

Long before the Supreme Court rendered its decision in the *Engel v. Vitale* case, American Jews asserted that state laws requiring or permitting the recitation of prayers are wholly inconsistent with the Establishment Clause, even when these prayers are chosen for their "nondenominational" quality or composed with this intent in mind.¹⁴ Moreover, to be true to its essential nature, prayer must be personal, particular, passionate; it cannot be neutral or detached. Here, Jews share fully the view of the late Paul Tillich, who holds the "unspecified affirmation of God" to be "irrelevant," a "rhetorical-political abuse" of religion in its finest sense.

Politicians, dictators, and other people who wish to use rhetoric to make an impression on their audience like to use God in this (unspecified) sense. It produces the feeling in their listeners that the speaker is serious and morally trustworthy. This is especially successful if they can brand their foes as atheistic.¹⁵

The rote recitation of "neutral" prayers holds forth no hope for the attainment of a meaningful religious experience; it is form without substance, an empty gesture bereft of spiritual significance. Nor can such recitation, without further comment

by the teacher or discussion by the class, be seen to serve the ends of character education; the expectation that the mechanical mouthing of prayer formulas will steel the moral fibre of the student runs counter to reason, counter to evidence, counter to all accepted theories of learning.

What is true for "neutral" prayer is true for nondenominational Bible reading, not when the Book is studied as part of a great literature course, but when it is ordered as a daily exercise in religious devotion. Such Bible reading as the latter virtually constitutes compulsory attendance at a religious service. Jews fear, further, that in this manner Christological ideas at variance with the Jewish understanding of the Bible will be transmitted to their children.¹⁶ The Bible is not a nonreligious book, and the hypothesis that it is a nondenominational book must similarly be put to serious question.

Theological difference among Protestants, Catholics and Jews have necessitated each group authorizing its own translation of the Bible. These theological differences resulted in frequent and prolonged controversies in the nineteenth century, when in numerous instances Catholics asked the courts to ban the readings of the King James Bible and when even Protestant groups fought among themselves as to which denominational translation should be declared non-denominational.¹⁷

Again, as in the use of prayer, the hurried, perfunctory recitation of texts can never further but only retard the advancement of both religion and moral education.

Jewish opposition to school observance of holy days—particularly the celebrations of Christmas and Easter, the singing of carols, the presentation of Nativity and Crucifixion plays, the display on school property of manger scenes—has been a cause of considerable community tension and of serious inter-religious misunderstanding. Hopefully, the preceding paragraphs have helped to clarify the issue somewhat by showing

that a consistent application of the principle of separation makes this opposition essential.

After all, Christmas and Easter are religious holidays in the specific sense of the term. They are sectarian, denominational festivals. They celebrate the birth and death of Jesus, who is the founder of the Christian faith. The Nativity scene is a hallowed symbol of Christ's birth. Christmas pageants are representations in word and dance of profoundly religious, Christian ideas. And Christmas carols derive from the music of the church; their words have origin in its sacred liturgy.

Manifestly, Christmas and Easter are not national or cultural holidays, and thoughtful Christians should be as offended as are Jews by the effort to obscure or to diminish the theological content of their celebration.

The fact that Christmas music is mixed with such other "holiday" music as "Rudolph, the Red-Nosed Reindeer" and "All I Want for Christmas Is My Two Front Teeth" in no way changes the situation. . . . If Christmas is a holy day of great religious importance, Christians should be the first to rebel against its vulgarization in the public schools. Indeed, many sensitive Christians have joined in the campaign to "Put Christ Back into Christmas." But it is with a sense of sadness that we observe how very few Christians have seriously objected to the cheapening of their sacred day.¹⁸

In a sense, Jews long for the restoration of at least some of the stern standards of colonial New England, whose Puritans prohibited the public celebration of Christmas, barred all "pomp and pagan revelry" in the observance of the day, and insisted that it be marked in conduct with a solemnity befitting Christianity's most holy hour.

The attempt to assuage Jewish sensitivity by instituting joint holiday observances fails in the desired effect. American Jews are particularly discomfited by the Christmas-Hanukkah union,

which, principle aside, gives currency to a grave misunderstanding of their faith when it equates a relatively minor festival of Judaism with a feast of the greatest moment to Christendom. The springtime twin-observance is only slightly more appealing; Easter and Passover hardly strike a heavenly harmony of theme. But what is infinitely more important, a principle is at stake. And principle will not be compromised. Joint observances of religious holidays in public school are not less a breach of the American ideal than are the celebrations of a single faith.

Religious Education and the School Curriculum

The problem of religious instruction in the public school is vexing in its complexity, more intricate by far than are the issues of religious observance. Its ramifications are many and tangled, forming a Gordian knot which, so the better part of valor dictates, cannot be cut in a single bold stroke but must be unraveled with infinite patience and care.

Two possible approaches, both extreme, can readily be rejected and require no lengthy elaboration. Sectarian indoctrination on public school premises clearly constitutes a breaching of the wall between church and state. Indeed, it was ruled to be so by the court in the historic *McCullum* case. The opposite alternative, the elimination of all religious concerns from general school teaching, is neither desirable nor feasible. One simply cannot teach without transmitting some religious data. One cannot convey a full understanding of contemporary culture without at the very least recognizing religion's role in the making of its essential elements—its music, literature and art, its morals and its laws. This view, too, is supported by court opinion. In the *Schempp-Murray* majority decision, Justice Clark took pains to point out that the banning of devotional Bible reading and the injunction against the recitation of the

Lord's Prayer do not by any means imply that the study of the Bible for its "literary and historic qualities" or the study of religion "when presented objectively . . . as part of a secular program of education" constitute a violation of the First Amendment.

But the objective transmission of religion's historic contribution to civilization hardly qualifies as religious teaching. Can religion itself be taught in the public school—its tenets and its values—without partiality, without the substitution of indoctrination for learning? This the question that yields no ready answer and continues to trouble the waters of intergroup relations on the American scene.

A number of proposals in recent years aim to allow the teaching of religious tenets without doing violence to the principle of separation. They build on the assumption that there are fundamental principles of faith which all religions share, which can be isolated and organized in unit form and then transmitted as the common, nondenominational core of faith.

American Jews do not embrace such efforts with a full heart. Of course they agree that a common core exists, that the great religions of the world do hold many views in common. There is a place to allow for full cooperation between religions. However, Jews doubt that these tenets can be isolated from the context of the religious current without destroying their essential nature and without vitiating all that is spiritually meaningful in every faith. Religious ideas and their forms are inseparably intertwined. Both are sanctified by faith. The moment they are separated one from the other, form loses its essence and the idea is robbed of its force.

Phrasing and style become supremely important and indeed matters of conscience, as is evidenced by the fact that churches differ not as to the content of the Lord's Prayer, but as to its wording. There is not a single thought in that prayer to which

a devout Jew could take exception. Yet it is for him a Christian prayer which Jewish tradition and his own religious sensitivity enjoin him from reciting. It is only a person emancipated from religious tradition who speaks of forms as the "externals" of religion. How meaningful then can a common core of belief be that does not have the support of a tradition which includes symbols, memories, powerful emotional associations.¹⁹

More than this, once an idea is abstracted from one form and is cast in another form, the idea itself undergoes substantive change. When the principles of a faith are isolated from their tradition and combined with other principles similarly extracted, something entirely new emerges. Doubtless this is what the American Council on Education had in mind when it criticized the common-denominator plan on the ground that it "might easily lead to a new sect, a public school sect, which would take its place alongside the existing faiths and compete with them."²⁰ Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, makes this pertinent and incisive comment:

Public school sponsorship of non-denominational religious exercises (and teaching) potentially establishes a new major faith—"public school religion." For a brief, but significant time during the school day, the school becomes a house of worship, the teacher becomes a religious leader, the class becomes a congregation, and the members of the school board are enshrined as founders of the new faith. How are the ritual, the theology, and spiritual heritage of the "new Public School Religion" determined? Through divine revelation and interpretation by theologians? No, by public boards, commissions and courts, elected or appointed through the secular, political process.

Still one other, more practical matter must be considered. Once such a common-core curriculum is actually developed,²¹

how can we be certain that teachers will transmit this teaching without partiality toward their own religious commitment? Are we reasonable to expect teachers to suppress their own deep devotions and commitments? More important by far, and assuming for the moment that the impossible is possible, just what religious values would such objectivity in teaching yield? Proper religious instruction calls not for objective detachment but for passionate involvement. "There is no more ineffective way of teaching religion than to give an objective account of religious history. For this means robbing history of the inner meaning and specific elements of faith and truth."²²

These arguments manifestly mitigate against all nondenominational or interdenominational religious education plans put forward thus far. This is the considered view of the American Jewish community on the subject.

We are opposed to all attempts by the public elementary and secondary schools to . . . teach about the doctrines of religion. Without passing on the question whether such teaching is inconsistent with the principle of separation of church and state, we believe that factual, objective and impartial teaching about the doctrines of religion is an unattainable objective. Any attempt to introduce such teaching into the public schools poses the great threat of pressures on school personnel from sectarian groups and compromises the impartiality of teaching and the integrity of the public school educational system. Our opposition to such teaching rests on these grounds.²³

If religious doctrines cannot be taught, what of moral and spiritual values? Can they be drawn from the matrix of religion which brought them to existence and be kept alive without continued dependence on their source?

Here, American Judaism voices a somewhat more optimistic view.

Insofar as the teaching of "spiritual values" may be understood to signify religious teaching, this must remain, as it has been,

the responsibility of the home, the church, and the synagogue. Insofar as it is understood to signify the teaching of morality, ethics, and good citizenship, a deep commitment to such values has been successfully inculcated by our public schools in successive generations of Americans. The public school must continue to share responsibility for fostering a commitment to these moral values, without presenting or teaching any sectarian sources or sanctions for such values.²⁴

This mandate is not easy to fulfill. It requires the delicate disjoining of the educative process, which, as indicated, historic Judaism did not deem possible, the abstraction of the ideal from its original form, the separation of ethical values from their life-giving tradition. American Judaism encourages this departmentalization only because of its profound regard for the secular public school, because of the school's ability to transmit religious values apart from denominational doctrine and without sectarian bias.

To be sure, spiritual and moral values cannot forever be maintained without reference to their source; faith is the necessary condition of their continuance; they gain their fullest dimension only when they are woven into the tapestry of a rich religious life. That is why Judaism insists on an intensive program of religious instruction in the synagogue and on the development of meaningful religious life-patterns in the home.

It might be noted, in this connection, that the *Zorach* decision did not end the Jewish community's unfavorable response to the released- and dismissed-time programs. The following objections are usually offered: such plans threaten the principle of separation; the amount of religious instruction which can be given in the time provided is negligible; more often than not, school authorities put pressure on students to attend religious school classes; those who refuse to be "released" are rarely if ever given meaningful general instruction; such programs serve to emphasize religious difference in a public arena; indeed,

Jewish children at times attend Christian classes for fear of disclosing their religious differences.

Be that as it may, the public school cannot be enjoined from transmitting ethical and moral concepts, however religious the origins. To begin with, these concepts cement our democracy. They form the faith of this land. Their preservation is vital toward the fulfillment of the American dream. Were we to keep our schools from fostering moral values, we would deprive them of their reason for being and then we might as well give up the enterprise of public education. A school which does not seek the moral development of its students is no school at all; all education worthy of the name is essentially education of character.

An Aid to Religion and a Challenge

What has been said concerning the proper goals of public education should serve to refute the charges that our schools are "godless," "atheist," and "antireligious," that they create, of necessity, an antagonism to faith and institutional religion. On the contrary, the spirit of religion, though not its forms, can animate the atmosphere with which the school surrounds its students. And in this atmosphere our children can grow, intellectually and spiritually, precisely in a manner in which we as religious people want them to grow.

When Jews espouse the cause of the "secular" public school, they do not use the adjective in its philosophical context. Our determined opposition to doctrinal instruction extends with equal force to the dogmas of scientific naturalism. We do *not* want the school to teach our children that reality is limited to the "seen," that empirical science and logic are the only proper tools in man's quest for knowledge. We do *not* want the school to teach our children that spiritual values are "purely sub-

jective," that religion is thus but a branch of psychology, revealing the vagaries of man's mind and the caprices of his emotional life, and no more. Even as the teacher is debarred from teaching principles which presuppose the acceptance of religious doctrines, so is he debarred from teaching principles which presuppose the acceptance of antireligious doctrines.

"Secular," as the American Jewish community applies the word to the public school, means not "irreligious" but "non-denominational," "nonsectarian," intended for pupils of all religious persuasions, and even for those whose parents affirm no faith. What it means is that the state, enjoined by law from establishing any one religion, without endeavoring to provide for all education but leaving many of its essential aspects to church and home, attempts to give moral and mental training and instruction in secular subjects of consequence to all future citizens—the entire process being conducted in "an atmosphere of social idealism."²⁵

Jewish opposition to doctrinal instruction in the public classroom rises in no small measure from the fear that such teaching, in attempting to meet the conflicting demands of competing religious groups, will not further but hinder the advance of religion. "We urge a broad interpretation of the first amendment precisely because we want religion. If we were truly secularists, we would encourage such things as non-denominational prayer in the public schools as a tool by which to make life and faith less sacred, less passionate . . . the worst thing that could happen to the churches and the synagogues would be to . . . [develop in the public schools] a religion which would consist of a set of meaningless, watered-down, non-sectarian platitudes."²⁶

Thus, the problem of religious education can never be solved by shifting the burden of responsibility for its advancement from church to public education.²⁷ It will be solved only when

church and synagogue recognize their full and final responsibility in this realm and take the matter of religious education much more seriously than they have.

When organized religion spends more for religious education than for its choirs; when it plans its programs of religious education with the fervor with which it promotes evangelistic campaigns; when it is more proud of its schools than of the size of the congregation or the beauty of its architecture; when it selects ministers of education with the same care it chooses its preachers and when it invests its attempts at educating the young with the importance it ascribes to its weekly Sabbath service—then shall it have begun to cope with the problem of religious education.²⁸

In this manner, the public school both aids and challenges the religious of America in their quest to transmit the heritage of faith. It aids the synagogue and church by fostering a devotion to the values which they share. It offers them challenge by imposing on them the duty to transmit the doctrinal beliefs and practices which give these values sanction.

The late President John F. Kennedy perceived this challenge and expressed it well when, immediately following the Court's announcement of the *Engel v. Vitale* ruling, he declared: "The Supreme Court has made its judgment. Some will disagree, others will agree. In the efforts we are making to maintain our constitutional principles, we will have to abide by what the Supreme Court says. We have a very easy remedy here, and that is to pray ourselves. We can pray a good deal more at home and attend our churches with fidelity and emphasize the true meaning of prayer in the lives of our children."

NOTES

1. Eugene B. Borowitz, *Philosophies of Education*, Philip Phenix, ed. (New York: Wiley, 1963), p. 87.

CHAPTER EIGHT

2. Ibid., p. 88.
3. *Sabbath*, 31b.
4. *Sanhedrin*, 91a-b.
5. Martin Buber, *Hasidism* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), p. 135.
6. Joseph ben Judah ibn Aknin, *Cure of Souls* (12 Century), Chapter 27. Ibn Aknin's criteria for successful teaching may interest the modern reader: the teacher must have complete command of the subject he wishes to transmit; he must carry out in his own life the principles he wishes to inculcate in his pupils; he must exact no pay for his teaching; he must look upon his pupils as if they were his own sons; he must train his pupils to lead an ethical life; he must not be impatient but come to his pupils with a happy countenance; and he must teach his pupils according to the range of their intellectual capacities.
7. Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, Part I, Chapter 55. Cf. *Sabbath*, 75a.
8. Levi ben Gerson (Gersonides) in *The Wars of the Lord*, quoted by W. Gunther Plaut, *Judaism and the Scientific Spirit* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1962), p. 6. His book offers a superb exposition of the problem under discussion.
9. Ecclesiastes 12:13.
10. *Union Prayer Book*, Part I (Cincinnati: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940), p. 34.
11. Isaiah, 11:9.
12. Leo Pfeffer, *Creeeds in Competition* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 60.
13. Eugene B. Borowitz, p. 93. Also, Anson Phelps Stokes and Leo Pfeffer, *Church and State in the United States* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 355.
14. Jews never acquiesced in lower court rulings which held the Lord's Prayer to be "non-denominational." Although the words, when taken literally, are not at variance with Jewish teaching, sacred usage over many centuries by Christians has made this prayer wholly Christian. As such, it violates the conscience of the Jew. The Lord to which the prayer's title refers is not God as Jews conceive of Him, but Jesus of the Christian tradition. Indeed, the words are the words of Jesus drawn verbatim from the Gospels.

Reprinted from
AMERICA'S
SCHOOLS AND
CHURCHES

Union of American Hebrew Congregations
838 Fifth Avenue, New York

500 copies
minuted
3/1/67

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

Remarks before the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative)
66th Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada.

May 18, 1966

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

- Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

AMSTalks

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER
Address before
THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY
Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention
May 18, 1966

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I feel constrained to note some serious omissions. Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of the occasion, he might well have added that my first cousin, Pesach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of the United Synagogue. He might further have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevorsk, ~~author of~~ the Or P'nei Moshe and a spiritual companion of the Baal Shem Tov. This identifies me as a Galizianer^{to}, of course, and offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here. How can I possibly prevail in this arena; even before I begin I am "out-Foxed."

It is good to be here, let me assure you, and what we do here is good. Those who planned this program and brought it to be well merit our applause; their effort makes no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moves us to meet. Not so much for what we say, but the very event of our meeting is of worth, for if the science of education has taught us one lesson it is this: our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with the ego ideal; they look, more than they listen; they follow the man who is long before the man who only persuades with his lips. The visible demonstration of our desire for unity teaches a lesson more powerful than any ideological agreement we may reach and articulate. In this case surely, as in so many others, the determined quest for an answer in and of itself give shape and substance to that answer.

I
Let me say, at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox and what he has to say. I sense him to be a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, at least in its broader outlines. I share his essential conception of our problem as the need to deepen our instruction, to instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound religious convictions, convictions which do not ignore genuine differences but go beyond them to attain a greater unity. I appreciate his

probing analysis of secularism, his refusal to deem the common concern with social issues a sufficient ground for unity when this concern is merely a reaction to external pressures and not also an expression of inner, shared belief. Lastly, I too cling to the hope that an earnest encounter of Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts, will lead us, and through us, our children, to affirm conviction about God and man and human duty which may not be identical in all respects but nonetheless will be sufficiently akin to justify the claim of our identity.

It is intriguing and a portent of good tidings for the future that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which at first flush might well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them all stand at the very heart and center of our ideological divergence. The liberal Jew does not view the past bounded by a framework which is eternally fixed, and he refuses to submit to its authority. Nonetheless -- so Dr. Fox assures us -- and I share his pious hope: when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition; when he does not assert that absolute authority of the present over the past but is willing at least to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments; in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, why then, he surely will be led to affirmations which may not fully coincide with those of the traditional Jew but will be sufficiently close to them to form a unified whole.

As Dr. Fox himself has occasion to point out, even traditional Jews differ in the degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths and this difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith. It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all, liberal and traditional Jew, in a ^Union, or at least a meaningful confederation of belief.

II

I am especially glad to note, also, that Dr. Fox foresees the possibility of convergence not only in the realm of ideas, but in the realm of practice, in our approach to Mitsvah. He feels the binding, unifying force of these practices as they are observed in our personal lives and homes and in the worship pattern of the synagogue. Ordinarily, those who accept a systemic, normative Judaism feel that there is a sharp line -- not just a quantitative but a categorical line -- between the practices of liberalism and orthodoxy. But is this categorical difference really as great as all that? Can we find no common ground in the understanding of commandment? I believe we can once we view mitsvah in its wider dimensions not just as given law, but as law form as commandment invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view: it does not believe that the Torah demands just for the sake of demanding; that it was given to us as a vain thing, a test of our obedience only and unrelated to all further purposes of God and needs of man. "The laws of the Torah serve an end" taught the RAMBAM, "an end that is useful in regard to being," -- to bind man and God, to provide man with a means to sanctify his life. These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of mitsvah held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

But these ideological considerations aside, let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, as it is manifested in our communal life. True, the Chassidic shtib^{el} and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart; but they are also worlds together; they share a host of common elements which give them common character; the ark and the Torah, essential prayers and a coincidence of time when they are voiced, hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jews, yes Jews, who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls in their quest for God.

The Chassidic shtible and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart, But how many Temple ^{EMANUEL'S} ~~Shtibles~~ remain on the American scene? and how many Chassidic Shtibles? When we wear our denominational lenses we often see differences where none, in fact, exist. And

often, when we see true differences we fail to distinguish between variants of sentiment and style and those which reflect true ideological divergence.

What we say concerning religious practice, applies to the matter of its terminology. Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language, but it is still the same religious language; invested with the strength of long-lived, hallowed use, it exercises a contripetal, cohesive force of no small consequence. Hebrew merits an emphasis in our teaching precisely for this reason, if for none other.

III

As we go about the task of seeking our common ground of belief, we might do well to take a closer, more careful look at the concept of peoplehood itself especially as its meaning has been extended and attenuated to its present composite designation of "Klal Yisroel." No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency than this -- Klal Yisroel, the Community of Israel -- and none is more abused. It is enlisted, in support of every cause, to bolster every argument, to justify policies ^{diametrically} ~~diametrically~~ opposed, in a word, to designate anything and everything, if only the label Jewish can somehow be applied to it. It has, by its abuse, lost virtually all denominative and valuational force.

The mitzvah of "pidyon sh'vuyim" alone might stir us to the task of definition: nothing so precious ought long remain debased. But there is more immediate reason which summons us to do so, a reason more immediate to our concern, and it is rooted in the pedagogic axiom that vague, amorphous, ill-defined concepts simply cannot be taught. If we want the concept of community to be meaningful to our children, we must invest it with discernible meaning first. ⁹¹ There was a time not so long ago, when this concept did not have to be taught, or articulated, to be transmitted, when it was implicit in the Jewish experience, when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being. Not so today. And not so most certainly on the American scene. Here the cultural and ethnic bonds which bound our community once have loosened and bonds of faith must serve as unifying force in their stead. This is especially true for our

children whose Jewish self-image reveals primarily the face of religion; nothing else, not culture, not nation, not even the giving of charity, is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification. This is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right when he insists that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability to transmit our shared and profoundly held convictions. And that is also why the concept of community itself, once implicit in the Jewish experience, must now be made explicit.

IV

But not all of our problem is rooted in the ideological realm; here too Dr. Fox is right. Institutional loyalties, quite unrelated to clear-cut ideological distinctions, exercise a divisive influence which, nolens volens, is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

Indeed, much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines, far from reflecting greater ideological divergence, is rather the consequence of its convergence, of a blurring of ideological distinctions. Distinctions there are and we should not ignore them, but they are not as great and as many as we often think or say they are, and they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations. The overlapping of belief and practice pattern is the rule and not the exception.

Surely I need not elaborate; supportive evidence is hardly wanting and has been offered over and again. Reconstructionism, nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative movement, in its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform. Schechter's espousal of 'haskamat hak'lal' as a determinant of religious practice no longer is acceptable to many Conservative rabbis, and so they embrace a systemic, normative Judaism which separates them from other Conservative rabbis to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from Reform. And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of its organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred. Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called 'religious;' and so-called 'secular' agencies

assume a religious stance, if not yet fully in their program then at least in their pronouncements, and if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our seminaries to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being that when true distinctions are lacking the temptation is great that we create them, or that we magnify them in our teaching and in our preaching -- only for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

Now I do not suggest that we can or should shuffle off our institutional coil. Nor is this the time or the place to consider a major realignment of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may be. All I really want to say is the self-recognition of motivation is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the need for denominational identity effects our teaching and our doing, let us at least say so!

When institutional concerns shape our Temple program let us call them institutional concerns!

When, in the larger community, we engage in a struggle for power, let us call it that: let us not obscure its true character by designating it an ideological confrontation!

Whatever it is, let us call it by its honest name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else!

This is not a reprimand, an accusation, cholilo vechas. All I say is really in the way of a confession. Grant me only the privilege accorded by tradition of saying not 'al chet shechotosi,' but rather 'al chet shechotonu,' for the sins which we have sinned.

V

There is, then, much that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children even before the fuller unfoldment of the quest for an ideological unity which Dr. Fox bids us pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of

our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do?

We can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. And when we speak of our difference -- in faith and form -- we can describe these differences as they really are, we can approach them, examine them -- teacher and student both -- in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry. We can bring our children into contact with one another crossing denominational barriers for communal programs of education and for united activity arising to advance our common cause. Surely more than ideas are involved in our problem. People are involved. The sense of communion is sustained by encounter. We can bring our teachers and educators into more frequent association with one another. We can teach them together, in areas where no ideological divergence is at stake. We might exchange our teachers for a time to broaden their perspective and the perspective of those they teach. We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all.

We can do more than that. We might ourselves communalize ~~with~~ some segments of the congregational school program... on a secondary level perhaps ... so that together then we might have the kind of intensive religious high schools which we singly do not have. Or at least we can begin this process by avoiding needless, wasteful duplication where none is justified by cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work: in the recruitment of teachers, in the development of educational tools, in the publication of our texts, in the realm of experimentation and research. In this and like manner we can teach our children a love for the community of Israel not just by precept, but by example.

Even as we are doing now, when we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern. That is why we are beholden to those who planned this program and

brought it to be. They offer opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in the saying of the Rimanoover Rebbe, "Paam vofaam Hakodosh boruch hu menasseh Yisroel bilrushim acherim." At various times the Holy One blessed be He garbs Israel in different garments, "Paam bilvush seh ufaam bilvush zeh." At times in this kind of garment and at times in another kind of garment. "Avo! hanekudoh Hajuhudis Tomid nishores." Ober dos pintele Yid ... it remains, it flames, and it is not consumed!

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

**Remarks before the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative)
66th Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada.**

May 18, 1966

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER
Address before
THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY
Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention
May 18, 1966

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I feel constrained to note some serious omissions. Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of the occasion, he might well have added that my first cousin, Pesach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of the United Synagogue. He might further have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevorsk, ~~author~~ of the Or P'nei Moshe and a spiritual companion of the Baal Shem Tov. This identifies me as a Galizianer, of course, and offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here. How can I possibly prevail in this arena; even before I begin I am "out-Foxed."

It is good to be here, let me assure you, and what we do here is good. Those who planned this program and brought it to be well merit our applause; their effort makes no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moves us to meet. Not so much for what we say, but the very event of our meeting is of worth, for if the science of education has taught us one lesson it is this: our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with the ego ideal; they look, more than they listen; they follow the man who is long before the man who only persuades with his lips. The visible demonstration of our desire for unity teaches a lesson more powerful than any ideological agreement we may reach and articulate. In this case surely, as in so many others, the determined quest for an answer in and of itself give shape and substance to that answer.

I

Let me say, at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox and what he has to say. I sense him to be a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, at least in its broader outlines. I share his essential conception of our problem as the need to deepen our instruction, to instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound religious convictions, convictions which do not ignore genuine differences but go beyond them to attain a greater unity. I appreciate his

probing analysis of secularism, his refusal to deem the common concern with social issues a sufficient ground for unity when this concern is merely a reaction to external pressures and not also an expression of inner, shared belief. Lastly, I too cling to the hope that an earnest encounter of Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts, will lead us, and through us, our children, to affirm conviction about God and man and human duty which may not be identical in all respects but nonetheless will be sufficiently akin to justify the claim of our identity.

It is intriguing and a portent of good tidings for the future that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which at first flush might well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them all stand at the very heart and center of our ideological divergence. The liberal Jew does not view the past bounded by a framework which is eternally fixed, and he refuses to submit to its authority. Nonetheless -- so Dr. Fox assures us -- and I share his pious hope: when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition; when he does not assert the absolute authority of the present over the past but is willing at least to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments; in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, why then, he surely will be led to affirmations which may not fully coincide with those of the traditional Jew but will be sufficiently close to them to form a unified whole.

As Dr. Fox himself has occasion to point out, even traditional Jews differ in the degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths and this difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith. It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all, liberal and traditional Jew, in a Union, or at least a meaningful confederation of belief.

II

I am especially glad to note, also, that Dr. Fox foresees the possibility of convergence not only in the realm of ideas, but in the realm of practice, in our approach to Mitsvot. He feels the binding, unifying force of these practices as they are observed in our personal lives and homes and in the worship pattern of the synagogue. Ordinarily, those who accept a systemic, normative Judaism feel that there is a sharp line -- not just a quantitative but a categorical line -- between the practices of liberalism and orthodoxy. But is this categorical difference really as great as all that? Can we find no common ground in the understanding of commandment? I believe we can once we view mitsvah in its wider dimensions not just as given law, but as law form as commandment invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view: it does not believe that the Torah demands just for the sake of demanding; that it was given to us as a vain thing, a test of our obedience only and unrelated to all further purposes of God and needs of man. "The laws of the Torah serve an end" taught the RAMBAM, "an end that is useful in regard to being," -- to bind man and God, to provide man with a means to sanctify his life. These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of mitsvah held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

But these ideological considerations aside, let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, as it is manifested in our communal life. True, the Chassidic shtible and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart; but they are also worlds together; they share a host of common elements which give them common character; the ark and the Torah, essential prayers and a coincidence of time when they are voiced, hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jews, yes Jews, who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls in their quest for God.

The Chassidic shtible and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart, But how many Temple ^{EMANUEL'S} ~~Shtibles~~ remain on the American scene? and how many Chassidic Shtibles? When we wear our denominational lenses we often see differences where none, in fact, exist. And

often, when we see true differences we fail to distinguish between variants of sentiment and style and those which reflect true ideological divergence.

What we say concerning religious practice, applies to the matter of its terminology. Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language, but it is still the same religious language; invested with the strength of long-lived, hallowed use, it exercises a contripetal, cohesive force of no small consequence. Hebrew merits an emphasis in our teaching precisely for this reason, if for none other.

III

As we go about the task of seeking our common ground of belief, we might do well to take a closer, more careful look at the concept of peoplehood itself especially as its meaning has been extended and attenuated to its present composite designation of "Klal Yisroel." No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency than this -- Klal Yisroel, the Community of Israel -- and none is more abused. It is enlisted, in support of every cause, to bolster every argument, to justify policies diametrically opposed, in a word, to designate anything and everything, if only the label Jewish can somehow be applied to it. It has, by its abuse, lost virtually all denominative and valuational force.

The mitzvah of "pidyon sh'vuyim" alone might stir us to the task of definition: nothing so precious ought long remain debased. But there is more immediate reason which summons us to do so, a reason more immediate to our concern, and it is rooted in the pedagogic axiom that vague, amorphous, ill-defined concepts simply cannot be taught. If we want the concept of community to be meaningful to our children, we must invest it with discernible meaning first. There was a time not so long ago, when this concept did not have to be taught, or articulated to be transmitted, when it was implicit in the Jewish experience, when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being. Not so today. And not so most certainly on the American scene. Here the cultural and ethnic bonds which bound our community once have loosened and bonds of faith must serve as unifying force in their stead. This is especially true for our

children whose Jewish self-image reveals primarily the face of religion; nothing else, not culture, not nation, not even the giving of charity, is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification. This is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right when he insists that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability to transmit our shared and profoundly held convictions. And that is also why the concept of community itself, once implicit in the Jewish experience, must now be made explicit.

IV

But not all of our problem is rooted in the ideological realm; here too Dr. Fox is right. Institutional loyalties, quite unrelated to clear-cut ideological distinctions, exercise a divisive influence which, nolens volens, is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

Indeed, much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines, far from reflecting greater ideological divergence, is rather the consequence of its convergence, of a blurring of ideological distinctions. Distinctions there are and we should not ignore them, but they are not as great and as many as we often think or say they are, and they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations. The overlapping of belief and practice pattern is the rule and not the exception.

Surely I need not elaborate; supportive evidence is hardly wanting and has been offered over and again. Reconstructionism, nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative movement, in its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform. Schechter's espousal of 'haskamat hak'lal' as a determinant of religious practice no longer is acceptable to many Conservative rabbis, and so they embrace a systemic, normative Judaism which separates them from other Conservative rabbis to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from Reform. And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of its organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred. Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called 'religious;' and so-called 'secular' agencies

assume a religious stance, if not yet fully in their program then at least in their pronouncements, and if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our seminaries to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being that when true distinctions are lacking the temptation is great that we create them, or that we magnify them in our teaching and in our preaching -- only for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

Now I do not suggest that we can or should shuffle off our institutional coil. Nor is this the time or the place to consider a major realignment of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may be. All I really want to say is the self-recognition of motivation is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the need for denominational identity effects our teaching and our doing, let us at least say so!

When institutional concerns shape our Temple program let us call them institutional concerns!

When, in the larger community, we engage in a struggle for power, let us call it that: let us not obscure its true character by designating it an ideological confrontation!

Whatever it is, let us call it by its honest name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else!

This is not a reprimand, an accusation, cholilo vechas. All I say is really in the way of a confession. Grant me only the privilege accorded by tradition of saying not 'al chet shechotosi,' but rather 'al chet shechotonu,' for the sins which we have sinned.

IV

There is, then, much that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children even before the fuller unfoldment of the quest for an ideological unity which Dr. Fox bids us pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of

our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do?

We can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. And when we speak of our difference -- in faith and form -- we can describe these differences as they really are, we can approach them, examine them -- teacher and student both -- in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry. We can bring our children into contact with one another crossing denominational barriers for communal programs of education and for united activity arising to advance our common cause. Surely more than ideas are involved in our problem. People are involved. The sense of communion is sustained by encounter. We can bring our teachers and educators into more frequent association with one another. We can teach them together, in areas where no ideological divergence is at stake. We might exchange our teachers for a time to broaden their perspective and the perspective of those they teach. We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all.

We can do more than that. We might ourselves communalize ~~with~~ some segments of the congregational school program... on a secondary level perhaps ... so that together then we might have the kind of intensive religious high schools which we singly do not have. Or at least we can begin this process by avoiding needless, wasteful duplication where none is justified by cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work: in the recruitment of teachers, in the development of educational tools, in the publication of our texts, in the realm of experimentation and research. In this and like manner we can teach our children a love for the community of Israel not just by precept, but by example.

Even as we are doing now, when we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern. That is why we are beholden to those who planned this program and

brought it to be. They offer opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in the saying of the Rimanoover Rebbe, "Paam vofaam Hakodosh boruch hu menasseh Yisroel bilrushim acherim." At various times the Holy One blessed be He garbs Israel in different garments, "Paam bilvush seh ufaam bilvush zeh." At times in this kind of garment and at times in another kind of garment. "Avol hanekudoh Hajuhudis Tomid nishores." Ober dos pintele Yid ... it remains, it flames, and it is not consumed!

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

- Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

RABBI ALEXANDER SCHINDLER
Address before
THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY
Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention
May 18, 1966

I am not a speaker, just a discussant, so don't worry.

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I am afraid I am constrained to note a number of serious omissions. Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of this occasion, he might well have added that my twelfth cousin, Pesach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of United Synagogue.

He might have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevosk, or Pneh Moshe, and the spiritual companion to the Baal Shem Tov. This identifies me as a Galitzyaner, of course. (Laughter) And it offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here. (Laughter) How can I possibly prevail in this arena? Even before I begin I am out-Foxed. (Prolonged laughter and applause)

It is good, my friends, to be here, let me assure you, and what we do, is good. Those who planned this program

and who brought it into being, well merit our applause. For their efforts make no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moved us to meet. It is not so much what we say, but the very event of our meeting is a Mitzvah.

For if the science of education has taught us one thing, it is this: our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with their ego ideals. They look more than they listen. They follow the man who is, long before the man who only persuades with his lips. And thus the visible demonstration of our desire for unity, teaches a lesson more powerful than any kind of ideological agreement we may reach or articulate.

In this case, surely, as in so many others, the determined quest for an answer in and of itself gives shape and substance to the answer.

Now, let me say at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox, personally, and also to what he has to say. I sense in him a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, in its broader outlines, and even in much of its details. I share his central conception of our problem, as the need to deepen our instructions, to

instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound religious conviction, convictions which do not ignore ideological and genuine differences, but which go beyond them to affirm a greater unity.

I appreciate his probing analysis of secularism; his refusal to deem the common concern with social issues a sufficient ground for unity, when this concern is merely a reaction to outer pressure, and not also an expression of inner-shared religious belief.

Lastly, I, too, cling to the hope that an earnest encounter with Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts will lead us, and through us our children, to a firm conviction about God and man and human duty, which may not be identical in all respects, but nonetheless, will be sufficiently close to justify the claim of our identity.

It is intriguing, and a portent of good tidings for the future, that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which, at first blush, may well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, the past tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them, all go to the very heart and center

of our ideological divergence.

The liberal Jew does not view the past, bounded by a framework which is eternally thickened; and he refuses to submit to its authority. Nonetheless, though, Dr. Fox assures us, and I share his highest hopes, when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition, when he does not assert the absolute superiority of the present over the past, but is at least willing to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments, in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, why, then, he surely will be led to affirmation.

This may not fully coincide with both of the Traditional Jews, but it will be sufficiently close to them, to form a unified pattern, a unified whole.

As Dr. Fox himself had occasion to point out, even traditional Jews differ in their degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths. And the difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith.

It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all,

liberal and traditional Jew, in a union or at least in a meaningful confederation of belief.

Now, I am especially glad that Dr. Fox foresees the possibility of conversion, even in the realm, not so much of the ideas themselves, but in the realm of practice, of our approach to MITZVAH and how we understand it. That he feels there is a binding and unifying force of the MITZVAH, even as they are observed today, in our personal lives, and as expressed in the worship patterns of the Synagogue.

Ordinarily, those who accept a systemic, normative Judaism, feel that there is a sharp line, not just a quantitative but a categorical line, between the practices of liberalism and Orthodoxy. But this categorical difference really is not as great as all that. I, too, believe that we can find some common grounds in the understanding of Commandment. I believe we can, once we view the MITZVAH in its wider dimensions, not just as giving law, but as law forms, as commandments invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view. It does not believe that the Torah commands just for the sake of commanding something. That it was given to us as an obeying thing, a test of our obedience only, and totally

unrelated to our further services to God and each of man.

The laws of the Torah serve an end, said the RAMBAM, and the end is useful in regard to being. These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment, and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of Mitzvah, held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

But all of these ideological considerations aside, let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, even as it is manifested in our communal life. True, the CHASIDIC SHTIEBEL and the Chicago Temple Sinai, are worlds apart; but they are also worlds together. They share a host of common elements which gives them common character.

The Ark and the Torah, essential prayers and the coincidence of time when they are voiced, hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jew--yes Jew--who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls, in their quest for God.

The Chasidic Shtiebel and Temple Sinai may be worlds apart, but how many Temple Sinais remain on the American scene? And how many Chasidic Shteibel? When we wear denominational language, we often see differences where

none exist. And often when we see true differences, we fail to distinguish between variance of sentiment and style, and those which reflect true ideological diversion.

What we say concerning religious practices, is obviously true in the matter of terminology. Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language. But it is still the same religious language. Given strength by long-lived, hallowed use, this language exercises a cohesive force of no small consequence.

Now, as we go about the task of seeking our common ground of belief, we might all do well to take a closer, more careful, look at the concept of people for itself. Especially as its meaning has been extended to its present composite designation, Klal Yisroel, the community of Israel. No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency than this, and none is more abused.

It is enlisted in support of every cause, to bolster every argument, to justify causes, and color these diametrically opposed, in a word, to designate anything and everything if only the label "Jewish," can somehow be applied to it. It has, by its abuse, lost virtually all denominative and valuational force.

The Mitzvah of PIDYAN SHEVUYIM alone might stir it to the task of definition. Nothing so precious should long remain debate.

But there is a more immediate reason which summons us to do so. A reason more immediate to our concern, and it is rooted in the Pedagogic Axiom, that nothing that is vague, amorphous, and ill-defined, can be taught.

If we want the concept of our community to have meaning for our children, we have to invest it with discernable meaning, first.

There was a time not so long ago, when this concept did not have to be taught, or even articulated to be transmitted; when it was implicit in the Jewish experience; when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being. Not so, today, and not so especially on the American scene, where the cultural and ethnic bonds have loosened. And bonds of faith must serve as the unifying force, in their stead.

This is especially true for the world of our children, whose true self-image reveals primarily the face of religion, nothing else--not culture, not nationhood, not even the giving of charity is of essential consequence in

securing the continuity of their identification.

And this is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right, when he insists that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability to transmit our shared and profoundly held convictions. And that is also why the concept of community itself, once implicit in the Jewish experience, must now be made explicit.

But not all of our problems is rooted in the ideological realm. Here, too, Dr. Fox is right. Institutional loyalties quite unrelated to clear-cut, ideological distinction, exercise a devisive influence which known and swollen is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

Indeed, much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines, far from reflecting greater ideological diversion, is actually the consequence of this convergence of a blurring of ideological distinctions; distinctions there are, and we should not ignore them, but they are not as great and not as many as we often think or say they are. And they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations.

The overlapping of belief and practice pattern is the rule, and not the exception.

Surely I need not elaborate: The supportive evidence is hardly one thing, and has been offered over and over again. Reconstruction is nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative Movement, and its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform. Schechter's espousal of HASH CHUMASH KLAL as a determinant of religious practice, no longer is acceptable to many Conservative Rabbis, and so they embrace a systemic normative Judaism, which separates them from other Conservative Rabbis to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from the Reform. And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of the organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred. As Dr. Fox pointed out, Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called religious. And conversely, also, our so-called secular organizations, assume a religious stance. If not yet fully in their program, then at least in their pronouncements. And if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our Seminary to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being, that when true

distinctions are lacking, the temptation is great that we create them, or at least magnify them in our teaching, only for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

Now, I do not suggest that we should or even can, shuffle off our institutional identity. Nor is this the time or place to consider a major realignment of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may or may not be. All I really want to say, for the time being, is that the self-recognition of motivation is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the for denominational identity affects our teaching and our doing, let us at least say so. When institutional concerns shape our Temple programs, let us call them "institutional concerns." When, in the larger community we engage in a struggle for domination, let us call it that; let us not obscure its real character by designating it as a kind of ideological confrontation. Whatever it is, let us call it by its real name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else.

This is no reprimand or accusation, believe it or not. All I say is really in the way of a confession. Grant me only the privilege accorded by tradition, of saying

not, AL CHAIT A'SHECHATASI, but, rather, AL CHAIT SHECHATANU, for the sins which we have sinned.

There is, then, a good deal that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children, even before the fuller unfoldment of the quest for an ideological unity, which Dr. Fox bid us to pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do? Yes, we can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. And when we speak of our differences in faith and in form, we can describe these differences as they really are. We can approach them, examine them, teacher and student both, in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry.

We can bring our children into contact with one another, crossing denominational barriers, for communal programs of education; for united activities aiming to advance our common cause. For surely more than ideas are involved in our problems. People are involved. The sense of union is

sustained by encounter.

We can bring our teachers and educators into more frequent association with one another. We can teach them together in areas where no ideological divergence is at stake. We might even exchange our teachers, for a time, a given period during the year, to broaden their perspectives, and the perspectives of those they teach.

We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all. We can do more than that: we might even explore the possibility of communalizing, of uniting some segments of the congregational school program; at least on a secondary level. Or at least we can begin this process by avoiding needless, wasteful, duplication where none is justified. By cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work--in the recruitment of teachers, in the development of educational tools, in the publication of texts, in the realm of experimentation and research.

In this and like manner, then, will we give our children a love for the community of Israel. Not just by precept, but by example. And this, in effect, is what we are doing now. Can we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern? That is why we are grateful to those who

planned this program and brought it to be. For they offer us opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in a saying of a RIMINOVER REBBE:

PAAM VAFAAM HAKADOSH BARUCH HU MENASHEH YISROEL BILVUSHIM ACHAIRIM. At various times the Holy One, Blessed be He, God of Israel in different garments.

PAAM BILVUSH ZEH, UFAAM BILVUSH ZEH. A time in one kind of garment, and a time in another kind of garment.

AVOL HANIKUDAH HAYIHUDIS TOMID NISHARES, UBER DOS PINTELE YID. It remains, it flames, and it is not consumed.

— Rai - Give it heading of transcript —

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I feel constrained to note some serious omissions.

Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of the occasion, he might well have added that my first cousin, Pessach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of the United Synagogue.

He might further have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevorsk, author of the Or P'nei Moshe and a spiritual companion of the Besht. ^{Base Shem TV.}

This identifies me as a Galizianer, of course, and offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here

How can I possibly prevail in this arena;

Even before I begin, I am 'outfoxed.'

It is good to be here, let me assure you, and what we do here is good.

Those who planned this program and brought it to be well merit our applause; their effort makes no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moves us to meet.

Not so much what we say, but the very event of our meeting is of worth,

for if the science of education has taught us one lesson it is this:

our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with the ego ideal;

They look, more than they listen;

They follow the man who is long before the man who only persuades with his lips.

The visible demonstration of our desire for unity teaches a lesson more powerful than any ideological agreement we may reach and articulate.

In this case surely, as in so many others,

the determined quest for an answer

in and of itself give shape and substance to that answer.

Let me say, at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox and what he has to say. ~~I sense him to be a kindred spirit~~ I sense him to be a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, at least in its broader outlines.

① I share his essential conception of our problem as the need to ~~define a common ground of belief~~ ^{deepen our instruction to instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound convictions, convictions} which does not ignore genuine differences but goes beyond them to ^{attain} reveal a greater unity.

② I appreciate his probing analysis of ~~the secular~~ ^{INSTITUTIONALISM + ITS DIVISIVE} ~~solution~~ ^{IMPACT ON OUR} his refusal to deem the common concern with ~~communal~~ ^{SOCIAL COMMUNITY + ITS SCHOOLS} issues a sufficient ground for unity when this concern is merely a reaction to external pressures and not also an expression of inner, shared belief.

③ Lastly, I too cling to the hope that an earnest encounter of Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts, will lead ~~us each in our way~~ ^{us + through us} ~~to our children + us too society~~ to affirm conviction about God and man and human duty which may not be identical in all respects but nonetheless will be sufficiently akin to justify the claim of our identity.

the

It is intriguing and a portent of good tidings for the future that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which at first flush might well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them all stand at the very heart and center of our ideological divergence. The liberal Jew does not view the past bounded by a framework which is eternally fixed, and he refuses to submit to *its* authority.

Nonetheless -- so Dr. Fox assures us -- and I share his pious hope: when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition, when he does not assert the absolute superiority of the present over the past but is willing at least to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments, in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage

with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, *when* then, he surely will be led to affirmations which may not fully coincide with those of the traditional Jew but will be sufficiently close to them to form a unified *whole* ~~pattern~~.

As Dr. Fox himself has occasion to point out, *25* even traditional Jews differ in the degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths and this difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith. It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all, liberal and traditional Jew, in a union, or at least a meaningful confederation of belief.

I am especially glad to note, also, that Dr. Fox forces the possibility of convergence not only in the realm of ideas, but in the realm of practice, in our approach to Mitsvah. He feels the binding, unifying force of these practices as they are observed in our personal lives + homes + in the worship pattern of the synagogue.

Ordinarily, those who accept a ^{systemic} ~~normative~~ Judaism feel that there is a sharp line - not just a quantitative but a ^{categorical} line - between the practices of liberalism + orthodoxy. But is this categorical difference really etc (as on next page),

I too share his hope that there might be the possibility of convergence
not only in the realm of conviction but also
in the realm of practice, that he is

In the light of this conclusion

I am somewhat puzzled by Dr. Fox's reluctance to ascribe a binding, unifying
force to the mitzvot

as they are observed in our personal lives and expressed in the worship
patterns of the synagogue,

Perhaps I shouldn't say 'puzzled,'

ORDINARILY THOSE WHO ACCEPT
because I understand the philosophical presuppositions
his acceptance of halahik Judaism

which ^{compels} him to draw not just a quantitative, but a sharp ^{categorical} qualitative line
between the practices of liberalism and orthodoxy.

But is this qualitative difference really as great as all that?

Can we find no common ground in the understanding of commandment?

I believe we can

once we view mitsvah in its wider dimensions

not just as given law, but as law form

as commandment invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view:

it does not believe that the Torah demands just for the sake of demanding;

that it was given to us as a vain thing, a test of our obedience only

and unrelated to all further purposes of God and needs of man.

"The laws of the Torah serve an end" taught ^{the RAMBAM} Maimonides, "an end that is useful
in regard to being," —

to bind man and God, to provide ^{man} with a means to sanctify his life.

These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment

and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of mitsvah

held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

PLEASE -
SEE REVERSE
OF PRECEDING
PAGE

But these ideological considerations aside,

let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, ~~as~~ ^{for} it is manifested in our communal life.

True, the Chassidic shtible and Temple ~~Sinai~~ ^{Shema-Ee} are worlds apart;

but they are also worlds together;

They share a host of common elements which give them common character:

the ark and the Torah

essential prayers and a coincidence of time when they are voiced,

hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jews,

yes Jews, who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls in their quest for God

The Chassidic Shtibel and Temple ~~Sinai~~ ^{Shema-Ee} are ~~far~~ ^{worlds} apart.

But how many Temple Sinais remain on the American scene? and how many Chassidic Shtibels

When we wear our denominational lenses we often see differences where none,

in fact, exist

And often, when we see true differences

we fail to distinguish between variants of sentiment and style

and those which reflect true ideological divergence.

What we said concerning religious practice, applies to the matter of its terminology.

Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language,

but it is still the same religious language;

invested with the strength of long-lived, hallowed use,

it exerts a centripetal, cohesive force of no small consequence.

Hebrew merits an emphasis in our teaching

precisely for this reason, ~~of~~ for none other.

111

As we go about the task of ^{seeking out} defining the common ground of belief,
we might do well to take a closer, more careful look at the concept of peoplehood ^{itself}
especially as its meaning has been extended ^{+ ~~as the word~~} to its present composite designation
of "Klal Yisroel."

No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency
than this -- K'lal Yisroel, the Community of Israel, -- and none is more abused.
It is enlisted, in support of every cause,
to bolster every argument,
to justify policies diametrically opposed,
in a word, to designate anything and everything, if only the label Jewish can
somehow be applied to it.

It has, by its abuse, lost ^{virtually} all denominative and valuational force.

The mitzvah of ~~pidyon~~ ^{pidyon} sh'vuyim' alone might stir us to the task of definition;
nothing so precious ought long remain debased.

But there is more immediate reason which summons us to do so, ^{a reason}
more immediate to our concern, ~~that is~~, and it is rooted in the ^{pedagogic} ~~pedagogic~~ axiom
that vague, amorphous, ill-defined ^{concepts} ~~ideas~~ simply cannot be taught.

If we want the ^{concept of} ~~community idea~~ to be meaningful to our children,
we must invest it with discernible meaning first.

There was a time not so long ago,
when this concept did not have to be taught, ~~or~~ articulated to be transmitted,
when it was implicit in the Jewish experience,
when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being.
Not so today. And not so most certainly on the American scene.

Here the cultural and ethnic bonds which ~~boude~~ ^{bound} our community once have loosened
and ~~only~~ bonds of faith ^{can} ~~can~~ serve as unifying force in their stead.
_{must}

This is especially true for our children
whose Jewish self-image reveals primarily the face of religion;
nothing else, not culture, not nation, not even the giving of charity,
is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification.
This is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right when he insists
that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability
to ~~find and define some common ground of belief.~~ ^{transmit our shared + profoundly held convictions.}
And that is also why the concept of community itself,
once implicit in the Jewish experience,
must now be made explicit.

IV

But not all of our problem is rooted in the ideological realm; ^{here too Dr Fox is right.}
Institutional loyalties, quite unrelated to clear-cut ideological distinctions,
~~exercise~~ ^{exercise} constitutes a divisive influence
which, nolens volens, is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

~~Distinctions there are, and we should not obscure them.~~ ^{Indeed,}
much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines,
far from reflecting greater ideological divergence,
^{rather} is ~~often~~ the consequence of its convergence, of a blurring of ideological distinctions.

Distinctions there are and we should not ^{ignore} ~~obscure~~ them, ^{or}
but they are not as great and as many as we often think ~~they~~ say they are,
and they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations.

The overlapping of belief and practice pattern
is the rule and not the exception.

Surely, I need not elaborate;

supportive evidence is ^{handy} certainly not wanting and has been offered over and again.

Reconstructionism,

nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative movement

in its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform.

Schechter's espousal of 'haskamat hak'lal' as a determinant of religious practice

no longer is acceptable to ^{many} ~~some~~ conservative rabbis,

and so they embrace a systemic, normative Judaism

which separates them from other Conservative rabbis

to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from Reform.

And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of its organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred.

Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called 'religious;'

and so called 'secular' or 'secularist' agencies assume a religious ^{stance} ~~role~~,

if not yet fully in their program

then at least in their pronouncements,

and if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our seminaries to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being that when true distinctions are lacking ^{then} ~~OR THAT WE MAGNIFY THEM~~ ^{IN OUR TEACHING} the temptation is great that we create them, ~~that we magnify them in our teaching.~~

~~that when we talk in the classroom of ideas and ideals which are really shared, we do not talk of them not as shared ideas and ideals, but as some kind of denominational possession;~~

~~as if there were only one true Judaism and it is ours~~

-- ^{only} ~~all this~~ for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

~~Denominational devotion has its place, even its value. don't misunderstand me.~~

~~Now~~ I do not suggest that we shuffle off our ~~institutional~~ ^{coil}.

Nor is this the ~~place~~ ^{time} or ~~place~~ ^{time} to consider a major ~~refashioning~~ ^{realignment} of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may ~~well~~ be.

All I really want to say

is that the self-recognition of ~~our~~ motivations is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the need for denominational identity affects our teaching, let us ~~at least~~ ^{do it at least} say so!

When institutional concerns shape our Temple program let us call them institutional concerns!

When, in the larger community, we engage in a struggle for power, let us let us call it that, ~~and not obscure the nature of our struggle by designating it~~ ^{let us not let it take character} a kind of ideological ~~revolt~~ ^{confrontation}!

Whatever it is, let us call it by its honest name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else.

~~Forgive me. This is not a reprimand, an accusation,~~

~~I don't mean to assume a holier-than-thou stance.~~

~~What All~~ Everything I say is really in the ~~nature~~ ^{way} of a confession.

~~But~~ ^{only} Grant me the privilege accorded by tradition of saying

not 'al chet shechotosi,'

but rather 'al chet shechotonu,' ~~for the sins which we have sinned,~~

~~forgive us.~~

CHOLILLO KECHING
all right
5/52

for the sins which we have sinned.

for the sins which we have sinned,

V

There is, then, much that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children even before the fuller unfolding of the quest for an ideological unity which Dr. Fox bids us pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart + mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do?

We can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. ~~And when~~ ~~And when we speak~~

And when we (continue as is)

^{but} there is much that we can do ^{then} ^{now} in our schools, to lead ^{a wide} ~~concern~~
~~long before the fuller unfolding of the quest for an ideological consensus~~

to deepen the devotion of our children to the larger community
to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

^{teach our heritage} ~~We can transmit a substantial element of our~~ ^{Judaism in our schools, lead it, moreover} ~~instructional process~~ ^{not as} ~~exclusively ours~~ but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations of Judaism have a vital relation.

^{When we speak of our} ~~When we speak of~~ our difference-in faith and form -

^{we can describe} ~~we can describe~~ these differences as they really are,

^{we can approach them, examine them -- teacher and student} ~~we can approach them, examine them --~~ ^{both} ~~like~~ --

in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry.

We can bring our children into contact with one another

~~crossing denominational barriers~~
^{crossing denominational barriers}

~~and limitless are our opportunities to do so~~

^{for} communal programs of education +

^{for} united activity ^{aiming} ~~purposing~~ to advance our common cause

^{Surely} ~~Surely~~ more than ideas are involved in our problem.

People are involved.

The sense of communion is sustained by encounter.

^{+ educators} ^{association}
We can bring our teachers into more frequent ~~contact~~ with one another.

We can teach them together, in ~~those~~ areas where no ideological divergence is at stake.

We might ~~even~~ exchange our teachers for a time

to broaden their perspective

and the perspective of those they teach.

We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all

We can do more than that

We ^{might} could ourselves communalize ^{unite} some segments of the congregational school program...on a secondary level perhaps... so that together we ^{then} might have the kind of intensive religious high schools which we singly ^{too} do not have

Or at least we can begin this process

by avoiding needless, wasteful duplication where none is warranted- justified

by cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work: in the recruitment of teachers,

in the development of educational tools,

in the publication of our texts,

and especially in the realm of experimentation and research,

~~which suffers precisely because we go, each our way alone~~

~~although the task of research is by its nature not parochial~~

~~and its fruit could sustain us all, no matter what our orientation.~~

In this and like manner we can teach our children a love for the community of Israel

not just by precept, but by example.

Even as we are doing now,

when we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern

That is why we are beholden to those who planned this program and brought it to be,

They offer opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in the saying of the Rimanoover Rebbe

Paam vofaam Hakodosh boruch hu menasseh yisroel *bilvushin acherin*

At various times the Holy One blessed be He garbs Israel
in different garments,

Paam bilvush seh ufaam bilvush zeh

At times in this kind of garment and at times in another *kind of garment*

Avol hanekudoh Hajehudis Tomid nishores

Ober ^{*idos*} ~~dos~~ pintele yid...it remains, it flames, and it is not
consumed.

[Dr. Herman Warnum rose. Prolonged applause.]

CHAIRMAN (SEYMOUR) FOX: I am going to ask later, if we have the opportunity, for Dr. Warnum to say a word. However, at this point, I would like to have Rabbi Schindler conclude his remarks.

RABBI SCHINDLER: I accept Dr. Fox's expression of condolence for my heritage, understanding that he does not understand that there is no need for condolence, but that there is need for envy. (Laughter and applause.)

Why doesn't he understand this? Because the worm living in horseradish thinks the whole world is horseradish. (Laughter) ~~Just a few minutes of VORNISH ADULTUM.~~

All right, I will forget the question about the home, because obviously I don't think there are going to be any objections to our teaching, or our intensifying our efforts to teach, religion; nor will there be any objection to our forgetting about denominational differences. Because if the truth be told, most of our laymen are very much--very much--appalled by the hardening of institutional lines which they see on the American scene.

On the question of MITZVAH, as the substance of my paper tried to point out, we obviously do not see it just

as a given law,^{to} which we must lend blind obedience to. We teach the MITZVAH as a--I use the term "form"--commandment form, to which the individual must make a commitment, which he must observe with a devotion and a self-discipline, and also with a sense of purpose.

Obviously, in our teaching, we underline the purpose of MITZVAH. They are binding for us: As a means, above all, and without going into all of this detail, to sanctify our lives. This, surely, is a common conception of MITZVOT, that in observing them, we have a means of hallowing life.

~~I agree that the SIDDUR ought to be taught.~~
~~That bothers me.~~

As far as areas of diversity are concerned, I certainly agree with Dr. Fox, that the crucial question is the question of TORAS MOSHE MISINAI. This is the question. This is the ultimate mark of divergency between the liberal and the Orthodox. It is not the ultimate mark of divergence between Conservatism and Orthodoxy and Reform. As I pointed out, there is a crossing, an intermingling, a blurring of differences, especially as pertains to Conservatism and Reform.

Obviously, the difference of attitude toward

Torah has its expression in differences of practice. The Shabbos of Dr. Marvin Fox is not the Shabbos of Rabbi Schindler. The two are different. But I maintain, that even in this difference, even in this diversity, there is a greater unity which brings us closer than further apart.)

→ Dr. Fox's Shabbos is different from my Shabbos, but after all, I still don't celebrate All Saints Day. (Laughter) Now, as far as Hebrew is concerned, precisely for this reason we ought to teach it, because it is a unifying force, a unifying bond, which binds us one to another.

~~Let me add only one more item:~~ Of course we must not consider ^{Hebrew} it just as a lingua franca, but as a lingua sancta, as the most fitting, the most dignified, the most beautiful garment for the sentiment of our faith. And it should be taught as such, and not just as a language for daily use.

We ought to teach our children not just the literal meaning of such terms as MITZVAH, TERUMAH, A'HAVOY, YIRU and KIDUSH HASHEM, but we ought to teach them the meaning of these terms in the fullest context of the spiritual tension. ~~And in this connection I think, and this we have to realize we have been overlooking, all day, and it ought to be~~

said in just one sentence:

There is one more matter we have been overlooking
everyday yet must not overlook!
 We cannot look at ^{view} the problem of the Jewish
 community in America, only in American terms. It must be
 seen in ^{proper} ~~bolder~~ terms. And any definition of the Jewish
 religion or of the religious community which has meaning for
 us, must be related in a vital ^{pattern} ~~pattern~~ to our co-religionists
 in MEDINAT YISROEL. (Prolonged applause.)

RABBI (SEYMOUR) FOX: Thank you all very much.
 And in your name I would like to thank our two colleagues,
 who came from so far to join us here today.

[The members rose and applauded.]

Ever-Ready Reporters

TWO CROWNS OF SERVICE

During July, Jerusalem was the site of an historic conference -- the Fifteenth International Convention of the World Union for Progressive Judaism. It was the first time in its 42 year history, that Reform Jewry's world organization held one of its biennial assemblies in Israel.

It was also the largest, if not the most significant World Union convention ever held. ^{Over} ~~One~~ five hundred delegates -- representing Reform Jewish communities of twenty-four lands and five continents -- were in attendance. They heard reports concerning the growth of Liberal Judaism in Latin America, Europe, South Africa, Australia, and India. They listened to prominent Israeli personalities debate the need for liberal alternatives to orthodoxy in the Jewish State. They responded to the presentations of earnest, eager Israeli delegates who sought support in their quest for a redress of grievances against their government.

These pleadings were re-echoed in Rabbi Shankman's opening-day address as well as in his lucid, urbane impromptu-response to President Shazar's greeting. They were more fully elaborated by Rabbi Eisendrath who spoke as Chairman of the World Union's Ad Hoc Committee on Religious Rights in Israel.

In its bold, broad outline, Reform Judaism's case is this: Israel was established with the promise that complete equality of social and political rights would be granted to all its citizens and that freedom of religion and of conscience is guaranteed. For practical political reasons -- in order to gain a working parliamentary majority, Israel's plurality party required the cooperation of the religious bloc -- certain concessions were made to Orthodoxy. It was agreed that the personal status of Jews would be regulated by Halacha, that the Sabbath and the Festivals would be official days of rest, that parents would retain the right to place their children in state-supported religious schools, and that Kashrut would be kept in public places; lastly, the Rabbinate and its institutions were to be supported by the state,

the Rabbinical Council was made an organ of the state itself and through its Courts granted exclusive jurisdiction in matters of marriage, divorce, and personal status.

This political compromise, somewhat modified by subsequent court decisions, has not served to restrict the freedom of non-Jewish religions in Israel; the religious rights of Moslem and Christian, of Druze and Bahai are fully upheld. Only non-orthodox Judaism is hedged in with vexatious restraints. Reform Rabbis are not considered Rabbis under the law; they may not celebrate marriages, officiate at funerals or serve as army chaplains. Jews converted by Reform rabbis are not permitted to enter Israel as Olim; they are denied admittance under the Law of Return. Aliyah by born Jews of non-orthodox affirmation is regarded with misgiving. In realms where Halachah does not rule, Orthodoxy seeks to impose its will through the exercise of coercive political influence. Thus the Ministry for Religious Affairs gives only lip and token service to the State's injunction that all congregations be granted financial help to build places of worship and to acquire needed religious appurtenances. And when reform congregations thus denied seek to lease facilities for worship, the Rabbinate intimidates the local public and private sector and our congregants are harassed and compelled to move from place to place.

The indignation of the Reform Jewish community can well be understood. After all, our efforts to support Israel have never been open to question; our help is asked and given without reservation. Why, then, in Israel should our Jewishness be impugned and our religious liberties denied? Redress must be made, so concludes the Ad Hoc Committee report. Certainly the problem is "not inherent in the value system of the religious structure of the Jewish people." It is the product, rather, of "political factors which have no valid claim to permanence." It can be altered even as the advantage of the moment brought it to be.

On the morning following his presentation, Rabbi Eisendrath together with Rabbi Shankman met with Premier Levi Eshkol and petitioned the government to grant Reform Judaism wider legal status. Putting aside for the time being their hope for the final separation of church and state in Israel, Progressive leaders requested that (1) Reform rabbis be permitted to marry duly registered Jews in Israel, (2) all Jews converted by Reform rabbis be recognized as Jews and be admitted to Israel under the Law of Return as Jews, and (3) Reform congregations receive aid from the Ministry of Religious Affairs equal to that received by Orthodox congregations.

The Premier seemed willing to consider financial aid but offered scant hope for the fulfillment of other requests "until Reform increases its ranks in Israel." His specious argument, superficially reasonable but fundamentally unfair ("since when is justice predicated on the counting of noses," thundered Rabbi Eisendrath), was to be heard again in the reaction of the Israeli press to the Conference as a whole and especially to l'affaire Western Wall.

This affair -- which completely overshadowed the convention and well nigh threatened to disrupt its proceedings -- had its genesis in Conference program plans which called for a worship service with men and women praying together at the Wall. Not that the Wall *per se* was so important to us from a strictly theological point of view; in its approach to worship Reform has always eschewed the sacerdotal, preferring to follow Judaism's prophetic tradition which holds that God can be found wherever He is sought with contrite heart. But the Wall has become something more than the last remaining ruin of Judaism's Second Temple. It is the symbol of a people's destiny, of two-thousand years of pain and perseverance, and finally of triumph. By praying at the Wall, we meant to express our oneness with Israel the land and people reborn.

Be that as it may, a routine request for permission to hold such a service was denied. Minister of Religion Warhaftig conveniently forgot or perhaps never knew that there was a time, immediately following the Six-Day War, when the men and women of our

congregations prayed together at the Wall; but those were the days before the Rabbinate had captured the Wall from the State (and what a pity too, if only in contrasting the shabbiness of this site with the sacred beauty with which government-held places such as Yad-VaShem and the Hechal HaSefer are invested). The religious establishment did not stop with refusals lest the Reformers refrain from heeding them. Huge posters were affixed on the walls of Jerusalem's Orthodox quarters, calling the faithful to their duty. "This must not happen!" the signs warned. "It is a profanation of God's Name. Come by the thousands to the Holy Wall." And come they did, shock-troops of black-robed, black-hatted Chassidim, to take their turns guarding the Wall, even while more than one thousand Jerusalem policemen stood by to prevent possible violence.

General Dayan was summoned from his desk in the Ministry of Defense to join a high-level government commission hurriedly convened to deal with the matter. The Commission conceived a compromise: let the Reformers worship not at the Wall, but some distance away from it. But the Reformers were in no mood to confirm the second-class status too often conferred on them. Only two avenues lay open before them that they could choose -- either to brave the stones or to postpone the service. Instinct, bred by our participation in many a civil-rights march, tempted us to take the first course, but other voices prevailed. We were persuaded by Dayan and Eban and their colleagues that pictures of violence, flashed round the world, would give strong argument to Israel's enemies; Israel cannot secure the religious rights of its fellow Jews, they will say, how can it secure the holy places of other faiths. A concern not for our peace but for the peace of Jerusalem united impelled us to act as we did.

Government circles reacted with relief and applauded our decision, as did the general public if comments in the Israeli press provide a true measure of its feeling. "We have reason to be grateful to Reform Jews," said the Jerusalem Post in its page-one editorial, "for withdrawing in time from a painful conflict and saving Jerusalem from the likelihood of shame and disgrace. They showed more respect and regard for the Wall

than others have done." Ha-Arets featured a cartoon which depicted Israelis urging Reform Jews to come to Israel, the latter with baggage in hand prepared to respond but unable to proceed, stopped by the forbidding moat which Orthodoxy has dug.

About the only discordant note in response was struck not by a citizen of Israel but by a visiting Toronto rabbi who published a lengthy J'Accuse deprecating Reform leaders for "persistently fighting the wrong battles" -- as if this battle had been chosen by us, rather than for us -- and denouncing them for their failure to cooperate with the Conservative Movement "to establish one program^{me} for Israel." His argument would have told with better grace and greater force had not Reform Jewry's offer to cooperate with all non-Orthodox groups in Israel been rejected, ab initio, by the very Movement for which Rabbi Rosenberg is spokesman. We say this not to deny the logic of his reasoning -- indeed, we do not serve Israel's spiritual needs when we transplant our divisive institutional pattern -- but merely to set the record straight.

All in all, then, progress was made and our stake in Israel was confirmed by our corporate presence even as it was established by our deeds of the past. Our seven congregations in Israel may be small and struggling, but their pains are the pains of certain growth. The number of our leaders and adherents, olim and sabras^{both} among them, is steadily increasing. The ground was broken for a multi-million dollar building to house our Leo Baeck Primary and Secondary School in Haifa. Our youth program in Israel is burgeoning; wherever we turned, so it seems, we came upon NFTYites engaged in manifold, meaningful activity. The continued success of the Union's Israel Fund campaign gives promise that the required material resources will also be available.

All this is as it should be. We are bound to Israel, by bonds of faith and kinship both. Certainly we need Israel, to heighten our sense of peoplehood, to strengthen our identity, to enlarge the horizon of our self-knowledge and to deepen our faith. Surely Israel also needs us, not just for material and political support, but also for those gifts of the spirit which will satiate the yearning of many of its sons and

some thoughts on a JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

The occasion of this journey: a conference of world Jewish leaders convened by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol of Israel. About one-hundred-and-thirty men and women -- from twenty-one lands and six continents -- respond to the Premier's call. The Reform Jewish community is well represented, directly through its institutional leadership, and indirectly among the delegates of other national and international Jewish organizations. The four central conference themes delineate the common concern of world Jewry: Israel's political and security situation, aliyah and the need to strengthen the link between Israel and the Diaspora, the plight of Eastern European Jewry, and Jewish Education both in Israel and throughout the world.

* * * * *

The departure for Israel is scheduled some days following the Beirut raid in retaliation for the terrorist attack in Athens. Friends are apprehensive: is this trip really necessary? and if you must go, must you fly El-Al? No one seems deterred. Our Boeing 707 is filled to near capacity. Other airlines, a subsequent check revealed, manage only twenty or so per cent on their off-season flights to **Lud**.

(But, then, they cannot offer what El-Al does: a unique experience in flying. As a case in point, the forward section of our plane is filled with young UJA leaders from the Mid-West, the aft cabin with a group of orthodox rabbis on their first trip to Israel from Florida. To the fore, there is a demand for more martinis; rear cabin stewardesses are kept busy pouring matzo-ball soup. And in the morning there are two worship services, with tallit, tefillin, and all -- one for those who managed to catch a nap, the other for those who didn't and as a consequence have to omit that portion of the traditional morning liturgy which includes the benediction extolling God "who removes sleep from the eyes and slumber from the eyelids.")

The passengers are not entirely at ease; their parting quip "we'll see you in Cairo" reveals some inner tension. Extraordinary security measures are taken. Boarding passengers are scrutinized with more than customary care. All unusual looking packages are opened. Planes are parked far from the terminal and other craft. Immediately on halting, the plane is surrounded by vehicles carrying service and security personnel.

In a word, going El-Al is something more than flying friendly skies. It is in its way a demonstration of solidarity with Israel.

* * * * *

The prevailing mood in Israel is one of calm assurance. The visitor is dumb-founded. Prepared to offer encouragement, he finds solicitude in response: are things in the United States really as bad as we read them to be...the riots...the burning of the synagogues...we fear for your safety!

The terrorists certainly have not succeeded in terrorizing Israel's population. Perhaps it is a matter of becoming inured to danger. Perhaps protective psychological forces come into play; when you confront reality as it really is, madness threatens. Or perhaps the danger is not as grave as we deem it to be; relatively

speaking, Israel's boundaries, and by extension her safety, are more secure today than they were two years ago.

Whatever the reason, life goes on. A bomb explodes, the debris is swept away, the dead are buried. And life goes on, affirmatively, even joyfully.

* * * * *

Israel's policy of 'instant retaliation' is questioned by many conference delegates. They are reassured by the awareness manifested by Israel's leaders that their every act reflects not only on Israel but on every Jew. "To speak for Israel is to hold Jewish pride in sacred trust," Abba Eban avows. Israel's cause, therefore, must always be expressed with a Jewish voice, in terms of a "universal Jewish humanism."

Unfortunately, retaliation is the only language which the Arab understands. Anything less is seen a sign of weakness. The retaliatory act, moreover, must be carried deep into Arab territory. The terrorists clearly are agents of their governments, harbored and supported by them, designated their national heroes. Arab leaders, therefore, must be made to know that they too, and not just lone terrorists along distant borders, are exposed to danger.

As for adverse opinion on this score, well, world opinion be damned. "El Fatah does not read the New York Times," Dayan reminded his listeners. Abba Eban takes a more historic view: we Jews have the unhappy lot of gaining world sympathy only when we are on the point of death; at times it is more important to survive than it is to be popular; national suicide is not an international obligation.

* * * * *

While adverse world opinion and especially UN resolutions of censure are met with a shrug and a sigh, there is ample appreciation of the potential influence of foreign governments and of the consequent importance of foreign policy.

Concerning Washington and its new administration, there is qualified optimism. Nixon is essentially an unknown -- no less abroad than he is at home -- but what is known about him marks him a political realist. It is a quality which is seen to work ultimately in Israel's favor.

Direct Russian intervention is not feared, at least not for the time being. Arab arms lost during the six-day war have been replaced. Russia's military experts serve on every level of the Arab command (to the dismay of some Egyptian general officers who yearn for the freer, easier life of earlier days). Russian training has improved the technical proficiency of the Arab soldier, but it has "not changed his fundamental character," that is to say, his incentive to fight has not been heightened or even provided.

France is another matter. The embargo is a blow. Israel has the industrial capacity to produce small arms and ammunition, even spare parts, but not tanks and planes. Especially galling is DeGaulle's refusal to return substantial sums, in hard currency, which Israel advanced in payment for goods which now will not be delivered.

Israel's reaction is remarkably restrained. She has not imposed a counter-embargo or called for a boycott of French goods. Individual Jews around the

world may be of a different mind. The term "gastronomic Judaism" takes on a new dimension: French wines are out, at least for the season.

* * * * *

Conferees are deeply moved by the stand of the French delegation: "The need of the many prevails over the need of the few. Do what you must, we will manage."

* * * * *

'Aliyah' ranks second only to 'security' in the hierarchy of Israel's concerns. The reason is not far to seek. Israel's Arab population now exceeds one million; there are 2,700,000 Jews in the land. The birth-rate among Jews is 1.7 children per family; the birth-rate of the Arab population is four-fold this number.

Many rely on the slogans of the past. Israel alone offers safety to the Jew, they say; come, while the coming is good.

Such arguments bear no great weight. Activist American Jewish youth will not be attracted by the call to escape from danger. They may be drawn by the summons to danger, to challenge, to the opportunity for the fulfillment of ideals.

* * * * *

There is no generation-gap in Israel. There are no hippies, yippies; there is no alienated youth. Young people know that what they do is of importance. They feel that each individual really counts.

* * * * *

The problem of Jewish Education receives careful scrutiny, its needs are explored, its sorry state bemoaned. As at home, these discussions are dispiriting: the diagnosis is detailed, but the cure is wanting.

There is a new appreciation in Israel for the significance of Jewish education, not just as a tool for aliyah but for the sake of survival of the Diaspora community. This too is a fruitage of the six-day war. Even as many American Jews discovered unknown depths of their love for Israel, so did many Israelis rediscover their love for and need of world Jewry.

Golda Meier summarizes this new-old spirit: "The battle for Jewish survival is fought not only along the frontiers of Israel but in Jewish schools throughout the world...and who is to say which frontier is the more perilous...and the more important."

Her words are heartening. They also challenge us: to bring to our frontier and struggle the same resources, skill and devotion which are mustered in the defense of Israel.

* * * * *

A quick trip to K'far Galim where the members of seven Israeli Reform congregations are convened in Biennial Assembly.

Close to two hundred men and women are in attendance -- a number comparing favorably with many a regional UAHC convention. The spirit is good. Recently

returned E-I-E students speak with enthusiasm concerning their six-month stay in the States. There are reports of continuing, if painful, growth.

I am embarrassed. Our promises were many but we have not fulfilled them. There is still no synagogue building for any of our congregations in Israel. More personnel is desperately needed -- not just rabbis, but youth leaders and educators. The Leo Baeck School has ample space, in its beautiful new structure, but the classrooms lack furniture and equipment. There is a need to develop new forms of religious expressions; institutions other than synagogue centers should be developed. The issue of rights is far from resolved -- and we are silent.

* * * * *

Back to the President's Conference and more talk. Our endurance is tested, especially by those eternal, infernal "general debates" whose rules are that there are no rules. Anyone can speak on any subject he pleases -- whether germane to the discussion or not -- for as long as he pleases.

Young Israelis disdainingly designate such debates as Zionut, associating the term with interminable talk and little action. They prefer the direct, unvarnished speech of a Dayan. Conferees are of an older generation; they still respond to the rhetoric of Eban.

* * * * *

A tour of the occupied territories. A flight along the Suez Canal and over Sinai. A brief stop at Sharm el Sheikh. (The Straits of Tiran are narrower than we conceived them to be -- surely no more than small ships in single file can make passage.) Back to Beersheba. A visit with Ben-Gurion (his voice is still vigorous, his presence still inspiring). And then, too soon, the long journey home.

Was the conference fruitful in its effect? Certainly, if its purpose was symbolic more than substantive.

We demonstrated our solidarity with Israel...

We affirmed our conviction that the fates of Israel and World Jewry are inextricably intertwined, that an attack on Israel is an attack on the Jew wherever he may be, that Israel's pain is our pain, her victory our gladness...

We symbolized, we concretized our faith, nay the reality, that Israel the land and the people are one...

Alexander M. Schindler

some thoughts on a JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

The occasion of this journey: a conference of world Jewish leaders convened by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol of Israel. About one-hundred-and-thirty men and women -- from twenty-one lands and six continents -- respond to the Premier's call. The Reform Jewish community is well represented, directly through its institutional leadership, and indirectly among the delegates of other national and international Jewish organizations. The four central conference themes delineate the common concern of world Jewry: Israel's political and security situation, aliyah and the need to strengthen the link between Israel and the Diaspora, the plight of Eastern European Jewry, and Jewish Education both in Israel and throughout the world.

* * * * *

The departure for Israel is scheduled some days following the Beirut raid in retaliation for the terrorist attack in Athens. Friends are apprehensive: is this trip really necessary? and if you must go, must you fly El-Al? No one seems deterred. Our Boeing 707 is filled to near capacity. Other airlines, a subsequent check revealed, manage only twenty or so per cent on their off-season flights to **Lud**.

(But, then, they cannot offer what El-Al does: a unique experience in flying. As a case in point, the forward section of our plane is filled with young UJA leaders from the Mid-West, the aft cabin with a group of orthodox rabbis on their first trip to Israel from Florida. To the fore, there is a demand for more martinis; rear cabin stewardesses are kept busy pouring matzo-ball soup. And in the morning there are two worship services, with tallit, tefillin, and all -- one for those who managed to catch a nap, the other for those who didn't and as a consequence have to omit that portion of the traditional morning liturgy which includes the benediction extolling God "who removes sleep from the eyes and slumber from the eyelids.")

The passengers are not entirely at ease; their parting quip "we'll see you in Cairo" reveals some inner tension. Extraordinary security measures are taken. Boarding passengers are scrutinized with more than customary care. All unusual looking packages are opened. Planes are parked far from the terminal and other craft. Immediately on halting, the plane is surrounded by vehicles carrying service and security personnel.

In a word, going El-Al is something more than flying friendly skies. It is in its way a demonstration of solidarity with Israel.

* * * * *

The prevailing mood in Israel is one of calm assurance. The visitor is dumb-founded. Prepared to offer encouragement, he finds solicitude in response: are things in the United States really as bad as we read them to be...the riots...the burning of the synagogues...we fear for your safety!

The terrorists certainly have not succeeded in terrorizing Israel's population. Perhaps it is a matter of becoming inured to danger. Perhaps protective psychological forces come into play; when you confront reality as it really is, madness threatens. Or perhaps the danger is not as grave as we deem it to be; relatively

speaking, Israel's boundaries, and by extension her safety, are more secure today than they were two years ago.

Whatever the reason, life goes on. A bomb explodes, the debris is swept away, the dead are buried. And life goes on, affirmatively, even joyfully.

* * * * *

Israel's policy of 'instant retaliation' is questioned by many conference delegates. They are reassured by the awareness manifested by Israel's leaders that their every act reflects not only on Israel but on every Jew. "To speak for Israel is to hold Jewish pride in sacred trust," Abba Eban avows. Israel's cause, therefore, must always be expressed with a Jewish voice, in terms of a "universal Jewish humanism."

Unfortunately, retaliation is the only language which the Arab understands. Anything less is seen a sign of weakness. The retaliatory act, moreover, must be carried deep into Arab territory. The terrorists clearly are agents of their governments, harbored and supported by them, designated their national heroes. Arab leaders, therefore, must be made to know that they too, and not just lone terrorists along distant borders, are exposed to danger.

As for adverse opinion on this score, well, world opinion be damned. "El Fatah does not read the New York Times," Dayan reminded his listeners. Abba Eban takes a more historic view: we Jews have the unhappy lot of gaining world sympathy only when we are on the point of death; at times it is more important to survive than it is to be popular; national suicide is not an international obligation.

* * * * *

While adverse world opinion and especially UN resolutions of censure are met with a shrug and a sigh, there is ample appreciation of the potential influence of foreign governments and of the consequent importance of foreign policy.

Concerning Washington and its new administration, there is qualified optimism. Nixon is essentially an unknown -- no less abroad than he is at home -- but what is known about him marks him a political realist. It is a quality which is seen to work ultimately in Israel's favor.

Direct Russian intervention is not feared, at least not for the time being. Arab arms lost during the six-day war have been replaced. Russia's military experts serve on every level of the Arab command (to the dismay of some Egyptian general officers who yearn for the freer, easier life of earlier days). Russian training has improved the technical proficiency of the Arab soldier, but it has "not changed his fundamental character," that is to say, his incentive to fight has not been heightened or even provided.

France is another matter. The embargo is a blow. Israel has the industrial capacity to produce small arms and ammunition, even spare parts, but not tanks and planes. Especially galling is DeGaulle's refusal to return substantial sums, in hard currency, which Israel advanced in payment for goods which now will not be delivered.

Israel's reaction is remarkably restrained. She has not imposed a counter-embargo or called for a boycott of French goods. Individual Jews around the

world may be of a different mind. The term "gastronomic Judaism" takes on a new dimension: French wines are out, at least for the season.

* * * * *

Conferees are deeply moved by the stand of the French delegation: "The need of the many prevails over the need of the few. Do what you must, we will manage."

* * * * *

'Aliyah' ranks second only to 'security' in the hierarchy of Israel's concerns. The reason is not far to seek. Israel's Arab population now exceeds one million; there are 2,700,000 Jews in the land. The birth-rate among Jews is 1.7 children per family; the birth-rate of the Arab population is four-fold this number.

Many rely on the slogans of the past. Israel alone offers safety to the Jew, they say; come, while the coming is good.

Such arguments bear no great weight. Activist American Jewish youth will not be attracted by the call to escape from danger. They may be drawn by the summons to danger, to challenge, to the opportunity for the fulfillment of ideals.

* * * * *

There is no generation-gap in Israel. There are no hippies, yippies; there is no alienated youth. Young people know that what they do is of importance. They feel that each individual really counts.

* * * * *

The problem of Jewish Education receives careful scrutiny, its needs are explored, its sorry state bemoaned. As at home, these discussions are dispiriting: the diagnosis is detailed, but the cure is wanting.

There is a new appreciation in Israel for the significance of Jewish education, not just as a tool for aliyah but for the sake of survival of the Diaspora community. This too is a fruitage of the six-day war. Even as many American Jews discovered unknown depths of their love for Israel, so did many Israelis rediscover their love for and need of world Jewry.

Golda Meier summarizes this new-old spirit: "The battle for Jewish survival is fought not only along the frontiers of Israel but in Jewish schools throughout the world...and who is to say which frontier is the more perilous...and the more important."

Her words are heartening. They also challenge us: to bring to our frontier and struggle the same resources, skill and devotion which are mustered in the defense of Israel.

* * * * *

A quick trip to K'far Galim where the members of seven Israeli Reform congregations are convened in Biennial Assembly.

Close to two hundred men and women are in attendance -- a number comparing favorably with many a regional UAHC convention. The spirit is good. Recently

returned E-I-E students speak with enthusiasm concerning their six-month stay in the States. There are reports of continuing, if painful, growth.

I am embarrassed. Our promises were many but we have not fulfilled them. There is still no synagogue building for any of our congregations in Israel. More personnel is desperately needed -- not just rabbis, but youth leaders and educators. The Leo Baeck School has ample space, in its beautiful new structure, but the classrooms lack furniture and equipment. There is a need to develop new forms of religious expressions; institutions other than synagogue centers should be developed. The issue of rights is far from resolved -- and we are silent.

* * * * *

Back to the President's Conference and more talk. Our endurance is tested, especially by those eternal, infernal "general debates" whose rules are that there are no rules. Anyone can speak on any subject he pleases -- whether germane to the discussion or not -- for as long as he pleases.

Young Israelis disdainingly designate such debates as Zionut, associating the term with interminable talk and little action. They prefer the direct, unvarnished speech of a Dayan. Conferees are of an older generation; they still respond to the rhetoric of Eban.

* * * * *

A tour of the occupied territories. A flight along the Suez Canal and over Sinai. A brief stop at Sharm el Sheikh. (The Straits of Tiran are narrower than we conceived them to be -- surely no more than small ships in single file can make passage.) Back to Beersheba. A visit with Ben-Gurion (his voice is still vigorous, his presence still inspiring). And then, too soon, the long journey home.

Was the conference fruitful in its effect? Certainly, if its purpose was symbolic more than substantive.

We demonstrated our solidarity with Israel...

We affirmed our conviction that the fates of Israel and World Jewry are inextricably intertwined, that an attack on Israel is an attack on the Jew wherever he may be, that Israel's pain is our pain, her victory our gladness...

We symbolized, we concretized our faith, nay the reality, that Israel the land and the people are one...

Alexander M. Schindler

DISTRIBUTION AND DESTRUCTION
OF
MIMEOGRAPHED AND PRINTED MATERIAL

Form H 1

Name Rae Weiner

Department Vice President Date 2/5/69

Title of Material Report

DESTROY REMAINING STOCKROOM SUPPLIES (date)* _____

Paper: Letterhead _____

Other bond Color white Size _____ Weight _____

Impressions: One side _____ Back to back xx

Padded (No. per pad) _____ Bound at Top _____ Side _____

Instructions

Return to Issuing Dept.

Instructions for Stencils: Destroy _____ Return to originating Dept. xx
Hold until (date) then Destroy _____

DISTRIBUTION		AMOUNT
1. No. of copies for originating department		
2. No. of copies to be put in stockroom		200
Indicate below Mailing Lists and/or staff classifications which are also to receive material.		
3. _____		
4. _____		
5. _____		
6. _____		
7. _____		
8. _____		
9. _____		
10. _____		
11. _____		
		TOTAL

Bin # _____
Shelf _____

No. of Pages _____
Date Destroyed _____ No. of copies _____

*Must be filled in whenever line 2 in distribution section is used.

some thoughts on a JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

←The occasion of this journey: a conference of world Jewish leaders convened by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol of Israel. About one-hundred-and-thirty men and women -- from twenty-one lands and six continents -- respond to the Premier's call. The Reform Jewish community is well represented, directly through its institutional leadership, and indirectly among the delegates of other national and international Jewish organizations. The four central conference themes delineate the common concern of world Jewry: Israel's political and security situation, aliyah and the need to strengthen the link between Israel and the Diaspora, the plight of Eastern European Jewry, and Jewish Education both in Israel and throughout the world.

* * * * *

←The departure for Israel is scheduled some days following the Beirut raid in retaliation for the terrorist attack in Athens. Friends are apprehensive: is this trip really necessary? and if you must go, must you fly El-Al? No one seems deterred. Our Boeing 707 is filled to near capacity. Other airlines, a subsequent check revealed, manage only twenty or so per cent on their off-season flights to Lod.

(But, then, they cannot offer what El-Al does: a unique experience in flying. As a case in point, the forward section of our plane is filled with young UJA leaders from the Mid-West, the aft cabin with a group of orthodox rabbis on their first trip to Israel from Florida. To the fore, there is a demand for more martinis; rear cabin stewardesses are kept busy pouring matzo-ball soup. And in the morning there are two worship services, with tallit, tefillin, and all -- one for those who managed to catch a nap, the other for those who didn't and as a consequence have to omit that portion of the traditional morning liturgy which includes the benediction extolling God "who removes sleep from the eyes and slumber from the eyelids.")

The passengers are not entirely at ease; their parting quip "we'll see you in Cairo" reveals some inner tension. Extraordinary security measures are taken. Boarding passengers are scrutinized with more than customary care. All unusual looking packages are opened. Planes are parked far from the terminal and other craft. Immediately on halting, the plane is surrounded by vehicles carrying service and security personnel.

In a word, going El-Al is something more than flying friendly skies. It is in its way a demonstration of solidarity with Israel.

* * * * *

The prevailing mood in Israel is one of calm assurance. The visitor is dumb-founded. Prepared to offer encouragement, he finds solicitude in response: are things in the United States really as bad as we read them to be...the riots...the burning of the synagogues...we fear for your safety!

The terrorists certainly have not succeeded in terrorizing Israel's population. Perhaps it is a matter of becoming inured to danger. Perhaps protective psychological forces come into play; when you confront reality as it really is, madness threatens. Or perhaps the danger is not as grave as we deem it to be; relatively speaking, Israel's boundaries, and by extension her safety, are more secure today than they were two years ago.

Whatever the reason, life goes on. A bomb explodes, the debris is swept away, the dead are buried. And life goes on, affirmatively, even joyfully.

* * * * *

Israel's policy of 'instant retaliation' is questioned by many conference delegates. They are reassured by the awareness manifested by Israel's leaders that their every act reflects not only on Israel but on every Jew. "To speak for Israel is to hold Jewish pride in sacred trust," Abba Evan avows. Israel's cause, therefore, must always be expressed with a Jewish voice, in terms of a "universal Jewish humanism."

Unfortunately, retaliation is the only language which the Arab understands. Anything less is seen a sign of weakness. The retaliatory act, moreover, must be carried deep into Arab territory. The terrorists clearly are agents of their governments, harbored and supported by them, designated their national heroes. Arab leaders, therefore, must be made to know that they too, and not just lone terrorists along distant borders, are exposed to danger.

As for adverse opinion on this score, well, world opinion be damned. "El Fatah does not read the New York Times," Dayan reminded his listeners. Abba Evan takes a more historic view: ~~we~~ Jews have the unhappy lot of gaining world sympathy only when we are on the point of death; ~~at~~ times it is more important to survive than it is to be popular; national suicide is not an international obligation.

* * * * *

While adverse world opinion and especially UN resolutions of censure are met with a shrug and a sigh, there is ample appreciation of the potential influence of foreign governments and of the consequent importance of foreign policy.

Concerning Washington and its new administration, there is qualified optimism. Nixon is essentially an unknown -- no less abroad than he is at home -- but what is known about him marks him a political realist. It is a quality which is seen to work ultimately in Israel's favor.

Direct Russian intervention is not feared, at least not for the time being. Arab arms lost during the six-day war have been replaced. Russia's military experts serve on every level of the Arab command (to the dismay of some Egyptian general officers who yearn for the freer, easier life of earlier days). Russian training has improved the technical proficiency of the Arab soldier, but it has "not changed his fundamental character," that is to say, his incentive to fight has not been heightened or even provided.

France is another matter. The embargo is a blow. Israel has the industrial capacity to produce small arms and ammunition, even spare parts, but not tanks and planes. Especially galling is DeGaulle's refusal to return substantial sums, in hard currency, which Israel advanced in payment for goods which now will not be delivered.

Israel's reaction is remarkably restrained. She has not imposed a counter-embargo or called for a boycott of French goods. Individual Jews around the world may be of a different mind. The term "gastronomic Judaism" takes on a new dimension: French wines are out, at least for the season.

* * * * *

Conferees are deeply moved by the stand of the French delegation: "The need of the many prevails over the need of the few. Do what you must, we will manage."

* * * * *

'Aliyah' ranks second only to 'security' in the hierarchy of Israel's concerns. The reason is not far to seek. Israel's Arab population now exceeds one million; there are 2,700,000 Jews in the land. The birth-rate among Jews is 1.7 children per family; the birth-rate of the Arab population is four-fold this number.

Many rely on the slogans of the past. Israel alone offers safety to the Jew, they say; come, while the coming is good.

Such arguments bear no great weight. Activist American Jewish youth will not be attracted by the call to escape from danger. They may be drawn by the summons to danger, to challenge, to the opportunity for the fulfillment of ideals.

* * * * *

There is no generation-gap in Israel. There are no hippies, yippies; there is no alienated youth. Young people know that what they do is of importance. They feel that each individual really counts.

* * * * *

The problem of Jewish Education receives careful scrutiny, its needs are explored, its sorry state bemoaned. As at home, these discussions are dispiriting: the diagnosis is detailed, but the cure is wanting.

There is a new appreciation in Israel for the significance of Jewish education, not just as a tool for aliyah but for the sake of survival of the Diaspora community. This too is a fruitage of the six-day war. Even as many American Jews discovered unknown depths of their love for Israel, so did many Israelis rediscover their love for and need of world Jewry.

Golda Meier summarizes this new-old spirit: "The battle for Jewish survival is fought not ^{only} along the frontiers of Israel but in Jewish schools throughout the world... and who is ^{to} say which frontier is the more perilous...and the more important."

Her words are heartening. They also challenge us: to bring to our frontier and struggle the same resources, skill and devotion which are mustered in the defense of Israel.

* * * * *

A quick trip to K'far Galim where the members of seven Israeli Reform congregations are convened in Biennial Assembly.

Close to two hundred men and women are in attendance -- a number comparing favorably with many a regional UAHC convention. The spirit is good. Recently returned

E-I-E students speak with enthusiasm concerning their six-month stay in the States. There are reports of continuing, if painful, growth.

I am embarrassed. Our promises were many but we have not fulfilled them. There is still no synagogue building for any of our congregations in Israel. More personnel is desperately needed -- not just rabbis, but youth leaders and educators. The Leo Baeck School has ample space, in its beautiful new structure, but the classrooms lack furniture and equipment. There is a need to develop new forms of religious expressions; institutions other than synagogue centers should be developed. The issue of rights is far from resolved -- and we are silent.

* * * * *

Back to the President's Conference and more talk. Our endurance is tested, especially by those eternal, infernal "general debates" whose rules are that there are no rules. Anyone can speak on any subject he pleases -- whether germane to the discussion or not -- for as long as he pleases.

Young Israelis disdainingly designate such debates as Zionut, associating the term with interminable talk and little action. They prefer the direct, unvarnished speech of a Dayan. Conferees are of an older generation; they still respond to the rhetoric of Eban.

* * * * *

A tour of the occupied territories. A flight along the Suez Canal and over Sinai. A brief stop at Sharm el Sheikh. (The Straits of Tiran are narrower than we conceived them to be -- surely no more than small ships in single file can make passage). Back to Beer Sheva. A visit with Ben Gurion (his voice is still vigorous, his presence still inspiring). And then, too soon, the long journey home.

Was the conference fruitful in its effect? Certainly, if its purpose was symbolic more than substantive.

We demonstrated our solidarity with Israel...

We affirmed our conviction that the fates of Israel and World Jewry are inextricably intertwined, that an attack on Israel is an attack on the Jew wherever he may be, that Israel's pain is our pain, her victory our gladness...

We symbolized, we concretized our faith, nay the reality, that Israel the land and the people are one...

Alexander M. Schindler

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

Remarks before the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative)
66th Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada

May 18, 1966

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I feel constrained to note some serious omissions. Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of the occasion, he might well have added that my first cousin, Pesach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of the United Synagogue. He might further have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevorsk, the Cr Pne Moshe and a spiritual companion of the Baal Shem Tov. This identifies me as a Galitsianer, of course, and offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here. How can I possibly prevail in this arena; even before I begin I am "out-Foxed."

It is good to be here, let me assure you, and what we do here is good. Those who planned this program and brought it to be well merit our applause; their effort makes no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moves us to meet. Not so much for what we say, but the very event of our meeting is of worth, for if the science of education has taught us one lesson it is this: our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with the ego ideal; they look, more than they listen; they follow the man who is long before the man who only persuades with his lips. The visible demonstration of our desire for unity teaches a lesson more powerful than any ideological agreement we may reach and articulate. In this case surely, as in so many others, the determined quest for an answer in and of itself give shape and substance to that answer.

I

Let me say, at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox and what he has to say. I sense him to be a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, at least in its broader outlines. I share his essential conception of our problem as the need to deepen our instruction, to instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound religious convictions, convictions which do not ignore genuine differences but go beyond them to attain a greater unity. I appreciate his probing analysis of secularism, his refusal to deem the common concern with social issues a sufficient ground for unity when this concern is merely a reaction to external pressures and not also an expression of inner, shared belief. Lastly, I too cling to the hope that an earnest encounter of Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts, will lead us, and through us, our children, to affirm conviction about God and man and human duty which may not be identical in all respects but nonetheless will be sufficiently akin to justify the claim of our identity.

It is intriguing and a portent of good tidings for the future that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which at first flush might well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them all stand at the very heart and center of our ideological divergence. The liberal Jew does not view the past bounded by a framework which is eternally fixed, and he refuses to submit to its authority. Nonetheless -- so Dr. Fox assures us -- and I share his pious hope: when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition; when he does not assert the absolute authority of the present over the past but

is willing at least to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments; in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, why then, he surely will be led to affirmations which may not fully coincide with those of the traditional Jew but will be sufficiently close to them to form a unified whole.

As Dr. Fox himself has occasion to point out, even traditional Jews differ in the degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths and this difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith. It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all, liberal and traditional Jew, in a union, or at least a meaningful confederation of belief.

II

I am especially glad to note, also, that Dr. Fox foresees the possibility of convergence not only in the realm of ideas, but in the realm of practice, in our approach to Mitsvot. He feels the binding, unifying force of these practices as they are observed in our personal lives and homes and in the worship pattern of the synagogue. Ordinarily, those who accept a systemic, normative Judaism feel that there is a sharp line -- not just a quantitative but a categorical line -- between the practices of liberalism and orthodoxy. But is this categorical difference really as great as all that? Can we find no common ground in the understanding of commandment? I believe we can once we view mitsvah in its wider dimensions not just as given law, but as law form as commandment invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view: it does not believe that the Torah demands just for the sake of demanding; that it was given to us as a vain thing, a test of our obedience only and unrelated to all further purposes of God and needs of man. "The laws of the Torah serve an end" taught the RAMBAM, "an end that is useful in regard to being," -- to bind man and God, to provide man with a means to sanctify his life. These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of mitsvah held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

But these ideological considerations aside, let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, as it is manifested in our communal life. True, the Chassidic shtibel and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart; but they are also worlds together; they share a host of common elements which give them common character; the ark and the Torah, essential prayers and a coincidence of time when they are voiced, hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jews, yes Jews, who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls in their quest for God.

The Chassidic shtibel and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart. But how many Temple Emanuel's remain on the American scene? And how many Chassidic shtibels? When we wear our denominational lenses we often see differences where none, in fact, exist. And often, when we see true differences we fail to distinguish between variants of sentiment and style and those which reflect true ideological divergence.

What we say concerning religious practice, applies to the matter of its terminology. Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language, but it is still the same religious language; invested with the strength of long-lived, hallowed use, it exercises a contripetal, cohesive force of no small consequence. Hebrew merits an emphasis in our teaching precisely for this reason, if for none other.

III

As we go about the task of seeking our common ground of belief, we might do well to take a closer, more careful look at the concept of peoplehood itself especially as its meaning has been extended and attenuated to its present composite designation of "Klal Yisroel." No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency than this -- Klal Yisroel, the Community of Israel -- and none is more abused. It is enlisted, in support of every cause, to bolster every argument, to justify policies diametrically opposed, in a word, to designate anything and everything, if only the label Jewish can somehow be applied to it. It has, by its abuse, lost virtually all denominative and valuational force.

The mitsvah of "pidyon sh'vuyim" alone might stir us to the task of definition: nothing so precious ought long remain debased. But there is more immediate reason which summons us to do so, a reason more immediate to our concern, and it is rooted in the pedagogic axiom that vague, amorphous, ill-defined concepts simply cannot be taught. If we want the concept of community to be meaningful to our children, we must invest it with discernible meaning first.

There was a time not so long ago, when this concept did not have to be taught, or articulated, to be transmitted, when it was implicit in the Jewish experience, when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being. Not so today. And not so most certainly on the American scene. Here the cultural and ethnic bonds which bound our community once have loosened and bonds of faith must serve as unifying force in their stead.

This is especially true for our children whose Jewish self-image reveals primarily the face of religion; nothing else, not culture, not nation, not even the giving of charity, is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification. This is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right when he insists that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability to transmit our shared and profoundly held convictions. And that is also why the concept of community itself, once implicit in the Jewish experience, must now be made explicit.

IV

But not all of our problem is rooted in the ideological realm; here too Dr. Fox is right. Institutional loyalties, quite unrelated to clear-cut ideological distinctions, exercise a divisive influence which, nolens volens, is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

Indeed, much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines, far from reflecting greater ideological divergence, is rather the consequence of its convergence, of a blurring of ideological distinctions. Distinctions there are and we should not ignore them, but they are not as great and as many as we often think or say they are, and they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations. The overlapping of belief and practice pattern is the rule and not the exception.

Surely I need not elaborate; supportive evidence is hardly wanting and has been offered over and again. Reconstructionism, nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative movement, in its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform. Schechter's espousal of 'haskamat hak'lal' as a determinant of religious practice no longer is acceptable to many Conservative rabbis,

and so they embrace a systemic, normative Judaism which separates them from other Conservative rabbis to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from Reform. And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of its organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred. Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called 'religious'; and so-called 'secular' agencies assume a religious stance, if not yet fully in their program then at least in their pronouncements, and if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our seminaries to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being that when true distinctions are lacking the temptation is great that we create them, or that we magnify them in our teaching and in our preaching -- only for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

Now I do not suggest that we can or should shuffle off our institutional coil. Nor is this the time or the place to consider a major realignment of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may be. All I really want to say is the self-recognition of motivation is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the need for denominational identity effects our teaching and our doing, let us at least say so!

When institutional concerns shape our Temple program let us call them institutional concerns!

When, in the larger community, we engage in a struggle for power, let us call it that; let us not obscure its true character by designating it an ideological confrontation!

Whatever it is, let us call it by its honest name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else!

This is not a reprimand, an accusation, cholilo vechas. All I say is really in the way of a confession. Grant me only the privilege accorded by tradition of saying not 'al chet shechotosi,' but rather 'al chet shechotomi,' for the sins which we have sinned.

V

There is, then, much that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children even before the fuller unfoldment of the quest for an ideological unity which Dr. Fox bids us pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do?

We can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. And when we speak of our difference -- in faith and form -- we can describe these differences as they really are, we can approach them, examine them -- teacher and student both -- in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry.

We can bring our children into contact with one another crossing denominational barriers for communal programs of education and for united activity arising to advance our common cause. Surely more than ideas are involved in our problem. People are involved. The sense of communion is sustained by encounter.

We can bring our teachers and educators into more frequent association with one another. We can teach them together, in areas where no ideological divergence is at stake. We might exchange our teachers for a time to broaden their perspective and the perspective of those they teach. We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all.

We can do more than that. We might ourselves communalize some segments of the congregational school program...on a secondary level perhaps...so that together then we might have the kind of intensive religious high schools which we singly do not have. Or at least we can begin this process by avoiding needless, wasteful duplication where none is justified by cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work: in the recruitment of teachers, in the development of educational tools, in the publication of our texts, in the realm of experimentation and research. In this and like manner we can teach our children a love for the community of Israel not just by precept, but by example.

Even as we are doing now, when we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern. That is why we are beholden to those who planned this program and brought it to be. They offer opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in the saying of the Rimanofer Rebbe, "Paam vofaam Hakodosh boruch hu menasseh Yisroel bilrushim acherim." At various times the Holy One blessed be He garbs Israel in different garments, "Paam bilvush seh ufaam bilvush zeh." At times in this kind of garment and at times in another kind of garment. "Avol hanekudch Hajuhudis Tomid nishores." Ober dos pintele Yid...it remains, it flames, and it is not consumed!

community to community, and vary also with time and changing conditions; the smaller the population, the greater the need for consolidation. Wherever possible such coordination should be effected within ideological groupings. Where these lines must be crossed, distinctive needs should be met and distinctive orientations respected.

This caution is applicable especially in the realm of teacher recruitment and training which almost everywhere calls for the pooling of community-wide resources. Bureau leaders' complaints that congregational schools are refractory to close cooperation are often true, alas; but it is equally true that community teacher training schools too often fail to heed the needs of the Reform Jewish community. This failure is not only a viola-

tion of the community concept, it makes for poor education; a teacher who does not share the commitments of the school which he serves only babbles, he does not really teach.

Close cooperation is vital to progress in Jewish education, and an effort should be made to come to grips with problems precipitated by the interaction of community forces. These problems are capable of resolution once agency and temple leaders make סבלנות their watchword, valuing every effort, great or small, to further their cause. No institutional loyalties or ideological divergences should be permitted to obscure the essential unity of our striving.

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

1 BORAN WITH THE

ARE
WE ALIKE - IN MORE THAN IN OUR PAIN
THE ASSERTION OF OUR ESSENTIAL KINSHIP
NO EMPTY DREAM - NO VAIN ILLUSIO
AND I AM GLAD TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE
DELIBERATIONS IF ONLY IN THAT IT
AFFORDS ME OPPORTUNITY TO ASSERT

BUREAU-CONGREGATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The Jewish Education Committee of New York prepares to enter the twenty-fifth year of its existence. Its anniversary—on which we congratulate our sister institution and its capable leadership—gives us occasion to make some comments concerning the function of communal agencies for Jewish education, especially as they relate to temple religious schools.

To begin with, we can assert Reform Jewry's devotion to the ideal of communal unity. אהבת ישראל is a מדרגה to which we aspire. It is articulated as our guiding principle, affirmed in our prayers, posited as a fundamental goal of our religious education effort. We cannot countenance the isolation of the temple school from the community-wide program of Jewish education. To do so is to deny what we profess, to negate in practice what we teach.

Wherever the relationship between the Bureau and the temple school is firm, the temple school is stronger because of it. Hopefully, the converse is also true and these relationships—which now

exist in many cities—have strengthened the wider community effort. Indeed, this must be so, for Gresham's law has its parallel in education: bad schools drive good schools out of circulation. This is one of many reasons why the community agency for education can ill afford to be parochial in its concern, serving one program alone and disdaining to serve those schools whose objectives do not conform to that program in all respects. As a central body, the Bureau's purview must be as broad as possible, encompassing schools of divergent ideologies and advancing Jewish education generally by helping each school to raise its standards of achievement.

The quest for the evolution of a single school system under community auspices appears futile, at least for now. Most efforts to do so have been abortive, and institutional narcissism (the congregations' reluctance to "yield" the education of their children to the community), is not alone responsible for this failure. Ideological diversities
(continued on inside back cover)

JEWISH UNITY AND JEWISH EDUCATION

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

Remarks before the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative)
66th Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada.

May 18, 1966

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER
Address before
THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY
Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention
May 18, 1966

I appreciate Rabbi Fox's kind introduction, although I feel constrained to note some serious omissions. Taking into account the ecumenical spirit of the occasion, he might well have added that my first cousin, Pesach Schindler, is the Associate to the Director of Education of the United Synagogue. He might further have added that I trace my lineage to Moshe Sofer of Pshevorsk, ~~author~~ of the Or Pne Moshe and a spiritual companion of the Baal Shem Tov. This identifies me as a Galizianer, of course, and offers full explanation for my foolishness in agreeing to come here. How can I possibly prevail in this arena; even before I begin I am "out-Foxed."

It is good to be here, let me assure you, and what we do here is good. Those who planned this program and brought it to be well merit our applause; their effort makes no small contribution toward the solution of the very problem which moves us to meet. Not so much for what we say, but the very event of our meeting is of worth, for if the science of education has taught us one lesson it is this: our children make their commitments primarily by means of identification with the ego ideal; they look, more than they listen; they follow the man who is long before the man who only persuades with his lips. The visible demonstration of our desire for unity teaches a lesson more powerful than any ideological agreement we may reach and articulate. In this case surely, as in so many others, the determined quest for an answer in and of itself give shape and substance to that answer.

I
Let me say, at once, that I respond with a good deal of warmth to Dr. Marvin Fox and what he has to say. I sense him to be a kindred spirit. His presentation appeals to me, at least in its broader outlines. I share his essential conception of our problem as the need to deepen our instruction, to instill in our children not denominational devotion but profound religious convictions, convictions which do not ignore genuine differences but go beyond them to attain a greater unity. I appreciate his

probing analysis of secularism, his refusal to deem the common concern with social issues a sufficient ground for unity when this concern is merely a reaction to external pressures and not also an expression of inner, shared belief. Lastly, I too cling to the hope that an earnest encounter of Judaism's past, the serious study of its teachings as they are expressed in our classic texts, will lead us, and through us, our children, to affirm conviction about God and man and human duty which may not be identical in all respects but nonetheless will be sufficiently akin to justify the claim of our identity.

It is intriguing and a portent of good tidings for the future that Dr. Fox finds the possibility of a consensus in realms and by a means which at first flush might well seem least likely to yield agreement. After all, tradition, its texts, the manner in which we understand and approach them all stand at the very heart and center of our ideological divergence. The liberal Jew does not view the past bounded by a framework which is eternally fixed, and he refuses to submit to its authority. Nonetheless -- so Dr. Fox assures us -- and I share his pious hope: when the liberal Jew is honest in his approach to tradition; when he does not assert the absolute authority of the present over the past but is willing at least to expose the standards of modernity to older judgments; in a word, when he turns to his religious heritage with receptivity, with openness, with seeing eye and hearing ear, why then, he surely will be led to affirmations which may not fully coincide with those of the traditional Jew but will be sufficiently close to them to form a unified whole.

As Dr. Fox himself has occasion to point out, even traditional Jews differ in the degree of sophistication with which they understand some of these truths and this difference of understanding does not destroy the unity of their faith. It is not unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that the common encounter of the Jewish past can bind us all, liberal and traditional Jew, in a Union, or at least a meaningful confederation of belief.

II

I am especially glad to note, also, that Dr. Fox foresees the possibility of convergence not only in the realm of ideas, but in the realm of practice, in our approach to Mitzvot. He feels the binding, unifying force of these practices as they are observed in our personal lives and homes and in the worship pattern of the synagogue. Ordinarily, those who accept a systemic, normative Judaism feel that there is a sharp line -- not just a quantitative but a categorical line -- between the practices of liberalism and orthodoxy. But is this categorical difference really as great as all that? Can we find no common ground in the understanding of commandment? I believe we can once we view mitsvah in its wider dimensions not just as given law, but as law form as commandment invested with purpose.

Traditional Judaism affirms this wider view: it does not believe that the Torah demands just for the sake of demanding; that it was given to us as a vain thing, a test of our obedience only and unrelated to all further purposes of God and needs of man. "The laws of the Torah serve an end" taught the RAMBAM, "an end that is useful in regard to being," -- to bind man and God, to provide man with a means to sanctify his life. These purposes give substance to the liberal Jew's understanding of commandment and because they do, he shares a vital element of the idea of mitsvah held by those who also affirm the belief in verbal revelation.

But these ideological considerations aside, let us not underrate the unifying force of outer form itself, as it is manifested in our communal life. True, the Chassidic shtible and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart; but they are also worlds together; they share a host of common elements which give them common character; the ark and the Torah, essential prayers and a coincidence of time when they are voiced, hallowed language and hallowed song, and Jews, yes Jews, who seek the companionship of kindred and aspiring souls in their quest for God.

The Chassidic shtible and Temple Emanu-El are worlds apart, But how many Temple EMANU-EL'S Shtibles remain on the American scene? and how many Chassidic Shtibles? When we wear our denominational lenses we often see differences where none, in fact, exist. And

often, when we see true differences we fail to distinguish between variants of sentiment and style and those which reflect true ideological divergence.

What we say concerning religious practice, applies to the matter of its terminology. Liberal and traditional Jew do make different use of the same religious language, but it is still the same religious language; invested with the strength of long-lived, hallowed use, it exercises a contripetal, cohesive force of no small consequence. Hebrew merits an emphasis in our teaching precisely for this reason, if for none other.

III

As we go about the task of seeking our common ground of belief, we might do well to take a closer, more careful look at the concept of peoplehood itself especially as its meaning has been extended and attenuated to its present composite designation of "Klal Yisroel." No other concept is invoked in our councils with greater frequency and urgency than this -- Klal Yisroel, the Community of Israel -- and none is more abused. It is enlisted, in support of every cause, to bolster every argument, to justify policies diametrically opposed, in a word, to designate anything and everything, if only the label Jewish can somehow be applied to it. It has, by its abuse, lost virtually all denominative and valuational force.

The mitsvah of "pidyon sh'vuyim" alone might stir us to the task of definition: nothing so precious ought long remain debased. But there is more immediate reason which summons us to do so, a reason more immediate to our concern, and it is rooted in the pedagogic axiom that vague, amorphous, ill-defined concepts simply cannot be taught. If we want the concept of community to be meaningful to our children, we must invest it with discernible meaning first. There was a time not so long ago, when this concept did not have to be taught, or articulated to be transmitted, when it was implicit in the Jewish experience, when a sense of belonging was born of a state of physical being. Not so today. And not so most certainly on the American scene. Here the cultural and ethnic bonds which bound our community once have loosened and bonds of faith must serve as unifying force in their stead. This is especially true for our

children whose Jewish self-image reveals primarily the face of religion; nothing else, not culture, not nation, not even the giving of charity, is of essential consequence in securing the continuity of their identification. This is why Dr. Fox is absolutely right when he insists that the attainment of communal unity rests in the final analysis on our ability to transmit our shared and profoundly held convictions. And that is also why the concept of community itself, once implicit in the Jewish experience, must now be made explicit.

IV

But not all of our problem is rooted in the ideological realm; here too Dr. Fox is right. Institutional loyalties, quite unrelated to clear-cut ideological distinctions, exercise a divisive influence which, nolens volens, is reflected in the classroom and conveyed to our students.

Indeed, much of the present-day hardening of institutional lines, far from reflecting greater ideological divergence, is rather the consequence of its convergence, of a blurring of ideological distinctions. Distinctions there are and we should not ignore them, but they are not as great and as many as we often think or say they are, and they certainly do not coincide with denominational demarcations. The overlapping of belief and practice pattern is the rule and not the exception.

Surely I need not elaborate; supportive evidence is hardly wanting and has been offered over and again. Reconstructionism, nurtured in the bosom of the Conservative movement, in its theology is far to the left of the current consensus within Reform. Schechter's espousal of 'haskamat hak'lal' as a determinant of religious practice no longer is acceptable to many Conservative rabbis, and so they embrace a systemic, normative Judaism which separates them from other Conservative rabbis to an extent far greater than the latter are separated from Reform. And so it goes.

Even in the larger Jewish community, in the framework of its organized life, patterns overlap and distinctions are blurred. Synagogues foster attitudes and activities which cannot really be called 'religious;' and so-called 'secular' agencies

assume a religious stance, if not yet fully in their program then at least in their pronouncements, and if not there, then in the symbolic act of turning to the graduates of our seminaries to find their professional leadership.

The point of it all being that when true distinctions are lacking the temptation is great that we create them, or that we magnify them in our teaching and in our preaching -- only for the sake of preserving institutional identity.

Now I do not suggest that we can or should shuffle off our institutional coil. Nor is this the time or the place to consider a major realignment of existing categories, desirable as this eventuation may be. All I really want to say is the self-recognition of motivation is the requisite of communal harmony.

When the need for denominational identity effects our teaching and our doing, let us at least say so!

When institutional concerns shape our Temple program let us call them institutional concerns!

When, in the larger community, we engage in a struggle for power, let us call it that; let us not obscure its true character by designating it an ideological confrontation!

Whatever it is, let us call it by its honest name, and not try to justify it on the basis that it is something else!

This is not a reprimand, an accusation, cholilo vechas. All I say is really in the way of a confession. Grant me only the privilege accorded by tradition of saying not 'al chet shechotosi,' but rather 'al chet shechotonu,' for the sins which we have sinned.

There is, then, much that we can do to create a sense of communal devotion in our children even before the fuller unfoldment of the quest for an ideological unity which Dr. Fox bids us pursue. There is much that we can do to deepen the devotion of

7.

our children to the larger community, to extend their reach of heart and mind to encompass all of Israel.

What can we do?

We can begin by teaching Judaism in our schools, teaching it, moreover, not as some kind of denominational possession, but as a shared possession to which variant interpretations have a vital relation. And when we speak of our difference -- in faith and form -- we can describe these differences as they really are, we can approach them, examine them -- teacher and student both -- in an atmosphere of respectful inquiry. We can bring our children into contact with one another crossing denominational barriers for communal programs of education and for united activity arising to advance our common cause. Surely more than ideas are involved in our problem. People are involved. The sense of communion is sustained by encounter. We can bring our teachers and educators into more frequent association with one another. We can teach them together, in areas where no ideological divergence is at stake. We might exchange our teachers for a time to broaden their perspective and the perspective of those they teach. We can support communal agencies and programs which seek sincerely to serve us all.

We can do more than that. We might ourselves communalize with some segments of the congregational school program... on a secondary level perhaps ... so that together then we might have the kind of intensive religious high schools which we singly do not have. Or at least we can begin this process by avoiding needless, wasteful duplication where none is justified by cooperating with one another in areas vital to our work: in the recruitment of teachers, in the development of educational tools, in the publication of our texts, in the realm of experimentation and research. In this and like manner we can teach our children a love for the community of Israel not just by precept, but by example.

Even as we are doing now, when we take counsel together and meet to express our common concern. That is why we are beholden to those who planned this program and

brought it to be. They offer opportunity to demonstrate the truth of a promise inherent in the saying of the Rimanofer Rebbe, "Paam vofaam Hakodosh boruch hu menasseh Yisroel bilrushim acherim." At various times the Holy One blessed be He garbs Israel in different garments, "Paam bilvush seh ufaam bilvush zeh." At times in this kind of garment and at times in another kind of garment. "Avol hanekudoh Hajuhudis Tomid nishores." Ober dos pintele Yid ... it remains, it flames, and it is not consumed!

11
/

but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsofui vehareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too.

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It is taught us little concerning their proper use, concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - as Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now more than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and examplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the shameful fraud of those academies of learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose ^{Finest} resources are at the command not of students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of belief, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth and that, in fact, it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." A like hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim: "Ki'm asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho...Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke *our* despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather a sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ ^{new} returning strength, For ^{beneath} its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayin chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

11
/

but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsoref v'hareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too.

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It is taught us little concerning their proper use, concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - as Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now more than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and examplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the ~~shameful~~ ^{First} fraud of those academies of learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose resources are at the command not of students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of belief, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth and that, in fact, it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." Alike hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim: "Ki im asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho... Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke *our* despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather a sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ ^{new} returning strength, ~~for~~ ^{for} beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayin chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

11/
but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsofui vehareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too.

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It is taught us little concerning their proper use, concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - as Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now more than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and examplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the ~~shameful~~ ^{First} fraud of those academies of learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose resources are at the command not of students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of belief, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth and that, in fact, it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." A like hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim:

"Kim asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho...Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke *ou*/ despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather a sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ ^{new} returning strength, ~~for~~ ^{new} beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayin chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

11
/

but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsofui velhareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too.

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things.

It is taught us little concerning their proper use, concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - as Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now more than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and examplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the shameful fraud of those academies of learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose ^{First} resources are at the command not of students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of belief, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth and that, in fact, it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." A like hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim:

"K'im asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho...Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke *ou* despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather a sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ returning strength, ^{and} ~~For~~ beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayin chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

Supplement

but then, in audacious paradox (hakol tsofui vehareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth; he is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah, therefore, is given only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too.

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous innovators do not claim all understanding and are prepared to listen to the past, when - as Fletcher bids them do - they turn to tradition, though not in submission, with due attention and respect.

Reverence for tradition is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin yesterday. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature, has not changed, as has his world. The inner man is still the same, his fears,

his passions, his needs, his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It has taught us little concerning their proper use, ~~but~~ little concerning those ends which 'things' should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

Even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which holds that radical change never succeeds, that ~~a~~ change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the ~~social and cultural~~ ^{moral} realm as well, ~~and in the moral too~~. Conservation is the needful first step. Only ~~thereafter~~ ^{then} can there be change, the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of belief, of creed. ~~There~~ ^{Where} ~~as~~ situation ethics has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. ~~As far as~~ ^{As For} the secular moralists ~~are concerned~~ - to whom we feel to some extent and even greater kinship - they do not see the need for faith. They define morality as essentially a two-way relationship - between the self and the other - and not ~~as~~

the three-way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which ^{our Faith} demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth, that in fact it may well be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with the Torah, the heaven which is in it would have brought them back to me" (Pesikta Kahana).

The same hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eljohu gives to Micah's celebrated maxim: ~~Ma'ad Lecho Odom Na Tov..~~ Im Asous mishpot veahavas chesed vehatznea leches imcho elohecho... Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, ^{therefore} this New Morality, need not ^{therefore} ~~lead~~ us to dismay. Upon the contrary it should afford us ^{great} comfort, and stir in us new hope. It is not a symptom of ^{our home that size} ~~disorder~~. ^{is} Beneath ^{its} seeming disregard for traditional morality, ~~it reveals~~ a deeply personal sense of moral responsibility. ^{is developing} Something immensely valuable ^{is} ~~may well be~~ emerging from a moral point of view, ^{perhaps} even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having ^{heeded} ~~fulfilled~~ the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's ^{dream} ~~promise~~: Ki hineni voure shomayim chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... For behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth... the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind... your seed and your name ^{they} will remain... forever.

This is the heading →

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER
Banquet Address
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE EDUCATORS
~~Miami, Florida~~
Thirteenth Annual Convention
December 28, 1967

*1/10
Number
300
copies*

Dear Col,

Please convey my deepfelt regret to the men and women of NATE for my failure to be with you as promised. Be assured that only the most pressing duties keep me from honoring my obligation and sharing your simcha. I am really embarrassed about it all, embarrassed by my inability to be with you not only now but all these many years.

I feel very much like a wayward father who deserts his offspring just after the bris and even lacks the decency to return for the Bar Mitzvah celebration.

The child is a child no more. It has grown to robust manhood, not only in physical size, but in mind and spirit too. Your contributions toward the advancement of our mutual cause are many. The exacting standards of education which you have established and maintained have served to deepen the religious instruction program of our congregations. The fruit of your creative genius -- your research projects, your curricula, your syllabi and texts -- have immeasurably enlarged our arsenal of resources in the struggle against Jewish illiteracy, in ever increasing number, your members are assuming position of leadership in the wider areas of our work, in camping, youth and social action, not just on a regional level but in our national councils too. In a word, you have fulfilled the promise inherent in the hour of your becoming. You have fashioned a profession in Jewish education among us and for this you were created.

I hope that what I have said assured you of my regard for NATE. My absence from you was enforced, not voluntary, enforced by the incessant, insistent demands upon my time. Indeed, why should I offer you anything but genuine, heartfelt regard? After all, you are what I am, what every rabbi is or ought to be: teachers of Judaism, builders of our future.

Faithfully,

THE CHALLENGE OF PROTESTING YOUTH

This is my swan song as far as the National Association of Temple Educators is concerned; ^{it is the last time that I stand before you as the} ~~my last address to you as the~~ outgoing Director of the Commission on Jewish Education.

I leave with the assurance that the leadership of Reform Jewish education is in good hands. Jack Spiro is an exceedingly capable young man, bringing many extraordinary qualities of mind and heart to his endeavors: knowledge, integrity, intelligence, the determination to advance the cause of Jewish education, and the ability to do so. Nor does he stand alone; ~~whereas~~ he is surrounded by strong and able men who are willing to share his burden and ~~are~~ to sustain him: the young and brilliant Director of Camp Education, Rabbi Widom; the old-new Director of Adult Education, Rabbi Bemporad, whose knowledge and percipience continues to fill ^{us} ~~me~~ with awe; and, acharon acharon chaviv, Abe Segal, knowledgeable, wise, sensitive, a Jewish educator second to none.

Can we really dream for more? All we need do is ask their health and strength so that the good promise of their investiture will find fulfillment during the years ahead.

Now I am not only a has-been, completely out-of-date and season. My fate and yours is worse than that, for I am also a surrogate, a substitute, a filler-inner, the understudy who has a chance to take center stage only because the star is indisposed. Dr. Eisendrath promised to be here; he meant to be here; his duties dictated otherwise. As you may know, he is about to embark on a mission of peace, together with leading clergymen of other faiths, which will take him on a round-the-world journey scheduled to begin just a few days hence. He asked that I read you this message, which he addressed to Cel Singer and through her to you:

(see #1 attached) (copy, indented) *(in quotes)*

To all this I can only add my heartfelt, fervent Amen. You are indeed what you were created to be, and for this we honor you! Surely nothing, during my tenure in office, gave me greater satisfaction than my association with the men and women of NATE; your counsel guided me, your friendship sustained me. *(No new §)*

(No new S)
As I enter upon a new field of work, in which I have scarcely been tried, the memory of these years and your affection will be a source of lasting strength.

* * *

I want to talk to you today about youth and the challenge of change, about the protesting generation and the demands its members make on us. I want to talk to you about the beats, the drop-outs, the alienated young, about the hippies, if you will, and what their protest imports.

My subject may seem incongruous, oddly at variance with the occasion which brings us together. Mah Inyan Shemitah Etsel Har Sinai^a? What mean the hippies to Har Sinai, the beats to the b'nai mitzvah of N.A.T.E.?

Still, we must listen to our young, must we not? As teachers we know that knowledge of the students is a requisite of effective teaching. And while it is true that these youthful, outrageous dissenters represent only a minority of their peers, they nonetheless provide us with an image of their society and with a mirror-image of our own. Their words and deeds may be excessive, ^{or} extravagant in exaggeration, ^{or} even grotesque, ^{or} But at least they speak. The others, alas too often, merely acquiesce; they play it cool by playing our game. In the final analysis the dissenters may well prove to have been precursors, not just aberrations.

What gives their message even greater immediacy is the fact that so many of these protestors are Jewish. Estimates vary, but a prominent sociologist, a member of one of our Northern California congregations, who just completed four months of intensive street work in San Francisco, reports that certainly 20% and perhaps 30% of Haight-Ashbury's residents are Jewish. Mike Loring adds the further information that 70% of that community's leadership is Jewish. Nor do we only encompass in our purview the hippies but all the protesting groups, so many of whom come from well-fed comfortable suburban Jewish families.

They are drop-outs from our schools. They rebel against us. ~~And so we must listen~~

E And so we must listen
 to them. They are trying to say something to us. And they are probably right in much of what they say, however wrong may be their remedies for righting matters.

I.

Now in the first instance, so I believe, our youthful protestors give voice to their distrust of conventional wisdom. They are loath to give assent to any value system which is asserted as "established and commonly received" and hence inviolate.

To some extent, this kind of anti-authoritarianism has always been a mark of youth -- moral preachment never really worked -- but it is more pronounced today and of a different quality. It has moved from a rebellion against a particular judgment, to a denial of all such judgments, from a rejection of this or that doctrine, to a disdain for all ideology, in fact.

In sharp and curious contrast with their nominal progenitors of an earlier age, present day movements of protest have not developed a clear-cut ideology. Even the New Left is anti-doctrinaire; its spokesmen embrace no "isms," not socialism, not communism, *certainly* not ~~even~~ dialectical materialism. The New Left is no continuation of the rationalist, radical tradition of the enlightenment, as some would assume. If anything, it is a reaction against this tradition, supplanting its hopeful idealism with somber sober realism. *(NEW PARAGRAPH)* Its adherents are even anti-intellectual, in a way -- youthful dissenters of every stripe are -- suspecting not just systems of thought, but reasoned thought itself. It may well be -- so David Moynihan perceptively discerns -- that our young people are too familiar with that "rational commitment to logic and consistency which leads from the game theory of the RAND Corporation to the use of napalm in Vietnam."

Marginally noted, *this* ~~their~~ antipathy to logical coherence appears reflected in the forms and rhythms of modernity's song: the eight-bar quatrains of yesteryear's tunes lost in the roar of rock-and-roll, the measured symmetry of the fox-trot superseded by the *bacchic* frenzy of the frug.

Be that as it may, when our youthful dissenters do not reject thought and value systems per se they certainly resent their self-righteous assertion. They abhor that ideological arrogance which insists on universal acceptance, which proposes, as a case in point and on a global level, that a political theory which works well in one country must, therefore, become the option of the world. ^{§ (New paragraph)} Here surely is the foremost reason why our young people are in the vanguard of the peace movement. They reject that ideological self-certainty which rules that just because democracy succeeds here, it must, perforce, be extended abroad, imposed on other lands -- and this, mind you, even while democracy's ideals are not fully secured at home.

II.

Which brings us full square to the second problem feeding the flames of the youth revolt: the creditability gap, the disparity between intent and deed; in a word, hypocrisy, our inability to bring about a harmony of preachment and of practice.

"A major reason for youth leaving society is their awareness of the hypocrisy practiced in this country" -- so writes our case worker from Haight-Ashbury --

✓ "hypocrisy practiced from a national level, down to the family... the double standard toward violence for instance: murder in the streets is wrong, but murder in Vietnam is right." His confidential report continues:

"Young people are aware that within established Judaism there are some who take an active stand against the war. They know about the many rabbis and laymen who speak up courageously. But they decry the fact that these leaders speak in generalities, ^{yet} ~~but~~ act in few specifics. Over and again young people say to me: 'perhaps there are Jewish alternatives to the draft, but how many Jewish Centers and synagogues offer or even know about draft counselling? How many support the active anti-war program of youth?' "

Questions like this are not easy to answer -- especially in the light of our recent Biennial -- for the only answer we can give is the embarrassed silence of our guilt.

Often this imposture of which we are accused is not so much willful as it is inadvertent, due to our over-optimism, our proneness to make promises we cannot fulfill.

[Note; if you will, the innocent beginnings of our involvement in Southeast Asia]. But once our deeds fall short of the goals which we so glibly pronounced, we are reluctant to admit to failure, we rationalize and improvise and cover up and end up doing things we never started out to do. But whatever the motivation, willful or not, the consequence of hypocrisy is cynicism, disenchantment, despair.

(New paragraph)
As teachers we know or ought to know just how important ethical consistency is to our youth, that deeds will teach what words cannot, that our students look more than they listen, that they follow the man who is, long before the man who only persuades with his lips.

In many ways the younger generation has become more pragmatic than the most pragmatic of those materialists against whom they inveigh. They look to deeds not words; they value achievements, not professed ideals.

Perhaps this is why the protest movement is so action-oriented. Its arts are action arts; folk singing, dance, and abstract films. Its ^{recreation} ~~reaction~~ is kinesthetic; discoteques and happenings and psychedelics. The dissenters want a society which truly involves the individual, involves him, body, soul and mind. They demand an education which makes the community a lab for the humanities and breaks down the barriers between the classroom and life.

And they want a religion which demands and does. The benign humanism of 19th century reform simply will not do -- and this applies to its ritual and spiritual, no less than to its ethical dimensions. After all -- mirabile dictu -- Jewish hippies perform the religious exercises of Eastern disciplines and crowd their meditation chambers. Why, then, should we be afraid, afraid to make demands, afraid to insist on standards in the synagogue and home and in the daily lives of man.²

Here, too, alas, we dissemble. We make no demands. We insist on no standards. We transmit a faith which presumably asks for nothing, where every man does what is right in his own eyes: ~~the eyes of desire and not the eyes of individual conscience.~~ And yet we pray, and teach our children piously to pray: O Lord, our

Lord, we praise Thee for Thou has sanctified us through Thy commandments.

III.

A third factor stirring modern youth to its rebellion is the scientism of our society, leading, as it does, to its dehumanization, to the repressing of emotion, and the diminution of the individual's worth.

Young people fear this systematizing of life; they dread the mechanical ordering of people into categories, the compaction of humanity into efficient units of production and consumption. They resent the repression of human feeling and the strangulation of any sense of community, which the process of mechanization entails.

They refuse to be caught in the gears of this giant machine, and so they drop out. They leave society and huddle together for warmth, living in primitive, tribal style, choosing poverty, as it were. And they tell us, in effect, that they will not be bought. ^{S (new paragraph)} Their heroes too cannot be bought, those balladeers who give voice to their longing, and serve as their exemplars: Joan Baez and Pete Seeger and Bobby Dylan. They may want money, writes Ralph Gleason, but they do not play for money. "They are not and never have been for sale, in the sense that you can hire Sammy Davis to appear, as you can hire Dean Martin to appear, so long as you pay his price. You have not been able to do this with Seeger and Baez and Dylan, any more than Alan Ginsberg has been for sale either to Ramparts or the C.I.A."

This near-disdain for matters material is most disturbing to the adult world; after all, it runs smack dab against our fundamental assumptions. At the same time -- at least for me -- it provides the love-and-flower generation with its one endearing charm. Imagine their brass, their unmitigated chutzpah! They invade the sanctum of our society, the New York Stock Exchange, to scatter dollar bills much like confetti. It is a gesture worthy of a Don Quixote! The leader of this fateful expedition, a young man by the name of Abbe Hoffman -- I herewith make confession -- was one of my confirmands. I shudder to think of it! How many more were really listening?

The so-called sexual revolution is an aspect of the self-same revolt against society's mechanization; it does not import the furtherance of modernization through promiscuity and the reduction of sex to a mere physical act. Every available study of the subject attests that our young people are essentially romantic, that they do not seek the separation of sex and love, and that faithfulness is an essential element of their human approach. Sex, for them, is "not so much a revolution as it is a relationship... it is a shared experience consecrated by the **engagement** of the whole person." (Chickering)

Now all this is pertinent to us, even though as liberals, as religious liberals, we do take a firm stand against the mechanization of life. And yet we too accelerate the process of dehumanization with our hyper-intellectualism which disdains emotion and makes light of tribal loyalty.

Daniel P. Moynihan makes this telling point in his perceptive study of the problem:

"..as the life of the educated elite in America becomes more rational," he writes, "more dogged of inquiry and fearless of result, the well-springs of emotion do dry up and in particular the primal sense of community begins to fade. As much for the successful as for the failed, society becomes, in Durkheim's phrase, 'a dust of individuals.' But to the rational liberals, the tribal attachments of blood and soil appear somehow unseemly and primitive. They repress or conceal them, much as others might a particularly lurid sexual interest. It is for this reason, I would suggest, that the nation has had such difficulties accepting the persistence of ethnicity and group cohesion..."

Perhaps we are premature in reading out ethnicity as a fact of American Jewish life. Certainly, it is strange to note that the very same hippies who decline to serve in Vietnam were among the first to volunteer for Israel. True, the war in the Middle-East was just, its purposes clear, and capable of eliciting the sympathetic understanding of all youth. But it is equally true that a people's danger aroused feelings more fundamental by far; it awakened attachments of soil and of blood.

In his superb Biennial paper, giving a chapter of his forthcoming book, Emanuel Demby quotes this poignant statement made by one of our adolescents:

"We ask you what's ahead? You say war. We ask you when the war is going to end? You say you don't know...You don't know nothing. Yet you want us to listen to you. We've got nothing to listen to you for. You better start listening to us."

We listen to them, and listening find that there is altogether too much that is shoddy in our lives: moral arrogance, the widening gap between intent and deed, the self-centeredness of our human approach. The mirror-image of our lives which our youth provides gives substance to Dr. Demby's contention, that adult society and not rebellious youth is really alienated.

Be that as it may, if our understanding ^{of} ~~that~~ the protest movement is correct, our young people do manifest an uncommon thirst for spirituality, a thirst for meaning, to use that word which Jack Spiro so beautifully adorned for us yesterday. It is a thirst which Judaism can well satisfy, because it is uniquely suited to ^{the} ~~this~~ spirit of alienation which stirs our youth? ~~Judaism~~, with its insistence on human worth, its recognition of the need not just for belief but for a community of believers, with its essential pragmatism which holds the way far more important than the thought: "thou canst not see My face, but I will make all My goodness pass before thee."

Lest we become overly optimistic, we ought to know that our young people manifest one more need still: their moral and spiritual aspirations are suffused with a universalism which challenges the particularism of our belief; the options for actions within the structures of organized religion are not enough for them. ^{Undoubtedly} This is why they feel so attracted to the near Eastern faiths, whose exotic elements give them the aura of universalism.

Here, then, is the ~~the~~ ultimate challenge of the protesting youth: Can Judaism be the faith for the global man whose prototype they see themselves to be and likely are?

Yes...if we are daring...if we, as religious liberals, have the courage to do, what Jack Bemporad challenged us to do: to experiment, to cut new paths, to take new directions, even while we build firmly on the solid foundations of the past.

Why should we doubt our faith's capacity to renew itself? After all, our children's vision of the future does not exceed the vision of the Prophets; their dreams do not eclipse the dreams of Israel's past'.

We were...we are...and we shall be. For He who walked before us will be with us; He will not forsake us. Be not dismayed.

1. William Butler Yeats, The Second Coming
2. Erich Kahler, The Tower and the Abyss (N.Y., Viking, 1967), pp. 1844-1846.
3. Paul Valery, Mon Faust
4. Hans Jonas "Contemporary Problems in Ethics from a Jewish Perspective" in C.C.A.P. Journal (New York, N.Y.) Vol XV, #1 pp. 23-28 January, 1968.
5. Yeats, op. cit.
6. Kenneth Kenniston, Young Radicals (New York, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc), p. 347
7. James M. Gustafson "Context vs. Principles: A Misplaced Debate in Christian Ethics" in Harvard Theological Review, vol. 53, no. 2, April, 1965)
8. Henry David Aiken "The New Morals" in Harper's Magazine Vol. 236, no. 1413, February, 1968.
9. Will and Ariel Durant, The Lessons of History (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1968) pp. 37-51
- ~~9. Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (New York, Westminster Press, 1966), pp.~~
10. Edmond Cahn "The Lawyer as Scientist and Socratic Scoundrel" New York University Law Review, Vol. 36, p. 10 1961
11. Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (New York, Westminster Press, 1966) pp. 18-29
12. Abraham Joshua Heschel, God in Search of Man (New York, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1955), p. 204
13. Fletcher, op. cit. p. 70.
14. Cf. Emil Fackenheim, Quest for Past and Future (Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 204-228.
15. Ibid. p. 223
16. Midrash Tanhuma, Visro
17. Leo Baeck, Individuum Ineffabile
18. Eugene Borowitz, "Current Theological Literature" in Judaism, Vol. 15, no. 3, Summer 1966.
19. Conrad Arensberg "Cultural Change and the Guaranteed Income" in The Guaranteed Income, Robert Theobald (ed.) (New York Doubleday, 1966), p. 211
20. Pesikta Kahana XV

JUDAISM AND THE NEW MORALITY
Conference Paper: First Draft
A. Schindler

The world of moral certitude has crumbled. Its center did not hold. Anarchy is loosed upon the land. "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned."

Our certitude, our moral confidence, was rocked by change - bitter-sweet legacy of technological advance. It was eroded by the decay of its supportive institutions, of synagogue and church, of school and home. It was ground to the dust by the horror to which we were witness: the Cyclon B of Belsen and the mushroom cloud.

More was lost. More than this or that value. More even than a world of values. There has been a 'devaluation of valuation' as such. Man's capacity to value has been brought to question.

Values, after all, call for choice, and choice is possible only where there is freedom for the will. But science sternly reminds us that this freedom is an illusion or at best severely circumscribed. We may think that we choose, but we don't. Our choice is conditioned by a complex of inner and outer circumstance, by situation and tradition, by the environment and the coalescence of our genes.

The world which science perceives, moreover, is a morally neutral world, a

12
world of fact alien to value. Values are only preferences, physics asserts, mere emotions, the proper object for study by psychology. But then psychology comes and abolishes the notion of integral normality: the normal and the abnormal, the good and the bad, they blend; there is no true line between them. There is neither hot nor cold. There is no high nor low. And there is an enormous amount of nothing in the All.

Man's mind is the sole source of values in a world devoid of values and his faculty to value is but feeble - so concludes science, even while it gives man power over nature, enormous power, the power to control, the power to manipulate, the God-like power to create. Here is the paradox of which Hans Jonas spoke: feebleness and strength in one, omnipotence and emptiness, the 'anarchy of human choosing' combined with man's 'apocalyptic' sway.

Thus is the ceremony of innocence drowned. "The best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity." Such are the stresses and the strains of which the New Morality is consequence.

I.

Now this phrase, this designation, the New Morality, is much abused. The range of its applications is wide. It describes a system of thought as well as a style of life - both running the gamut from libertinism to heteronomy.

Seen as a way of life, the New Morality is usually identified with the manners and the mores of modern youth. But modern youth is not of a cloth, not even the dissenters. Some are involved and others are not. Some are committed,

while others abandon the fray. All hold the 'old morality' in slight esteem, especially as it turns to self-righteousness and hypocrisy. But they do not take the identical moral stance. As Kenniston's ~~illuminating~~ studies reveal, the alienated of our youth are often anti-idealistic, situational, prone to indulge desire. The activists, however, are sternly moral, prepared to articulate codes of conduct which ~~may well~~ diverge from the codes of the past, but ^{function like them in that} ~~nonetheless~~ are held to apply to every moral situation.

The picture becomes no clearer, when we focus on the New Morality as a system of thought. Here too, a blurring obtains and positions overlap. The situationists throw off the shackles of the law, or so they say, but then quickly posit principles no less exacting. The heteronomists are pledged to uphold the law but forthwith ~~twist and~~ bend it to meet the need of given circumstance.

Gustafson isolates no less than three distinct trends in contemporary contextualism: those who call for a socio-historical analysis of each situation, those who make their point of reference the person-to-person encounter, and those who listen for the still small voice ^{when they confront their problems} ~~as they approach their moral~~ decisions, theologians like Karl Barth who believe that the command of God is given not in prior formal rules of conduct but in the immediacy of every moral situation. As for the defenders of the law, they too cannot be lumped in one, Gustafson finds. And he concludes that the term New Morality has been used to cover entirely too many theological heads, ^{and} that the debate, ^{hence,} is misplaced in its entirety.

When Yale University's Professor of Christian Ethics cannot draw the lines ~~and limits~~ of what has been a disputation primarily in the arena of modern Christian thought, what is a poor rabbi to do, a rabbi, mind you, who is not ~~even~~ a kohen or a levi in Jewish theology, just a proster visroel,

4
arable

who has enough of a problem ^{just} trying to decide ~~just~~ what is or is not normative in Judaism.

It ~~surely~~ is not simple matter to draw a consistent pattern of thought out of ^{an} ~~the~~ evolutionary process ^{such as} ~~of~~ Jewish Ethics, or even out of a philosophical ambience such as the New Morality. The temptation is great to begin with a pre-conceived notion and then to select those facts which will support it. But facts should be respected, all facts, and contradictions should not be ignored. At least they should be seen ^{for what they are,} parts of one whole in which divergent strains ^{appear, along} ~~exist~~ ^{alongside} those which are more dominant and characteristic.

But we are only human. Autism manipulates us even when we are aware that We will always see what we desire to see, find what we really want to find. it is operative. ~~X~~ Therefore let me be honest with you, and with myself, by readily acknowledging my predilection.

I like the ^{at least as I perceive its mood} New Morality. I respect its openness. I appreciate its hope. I respond to its essential dynamism and its insistence on passionate involvement. As a system of thought it may not be sufficient for Judaism, but its ^{major} ~~major~~ ^{emphasis} ~~emphasis~~ ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{on contextual consideration} ~~on contextual consideration~~ ^{from individual responsibility} ~~from individual responsibility~~ [—] ~~—~~ ^{the celebration of individual responsibility} ~~the celebration of individual responsibility~~ ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{certainly} ~~certainly ^{congenial} ~~congenial~~ to our ethos.~~

I see it especially valuable as a bridge to those who stand yet apart from the community of faith but who are as determined as are we to come to grips with moral malaise, to create new moral order out of the pervasive spiritual chaos of our time.

5

II.

To be sure, this embrace is not all-encompassing. Judaism's ethical canopy is not so large that it shelters everything. It certainly does not shelter those who see the New Morality as license to do what they please.

There are those - both young and old - who do, for whom the New Morality means no constraint, free warrant to indulge desire whatever its demands. They think, perhaps, that we are undergoing that 'transvaluation of values' of which Nietzsche spoke. Or inebriated by man's exalted state - the power to create is heady wine - they feel that we have gone beyond the Nietzschean prediction, that all men, not just a few 'superior men', have now outgrown ~~moral~~ morality, as they outgrew mythology and magic, that no one longer is subject to judgments of right and wrong.

This is no New Morality, of course. Wantonness is neither a new nor a moral phenomenon. Such styles of life are of an ancient vintage. They are as old as Sodom and Gomorrah.

They come, and they go, these deviant so-called moralities with pendulum-like regularity. Puritanism and paganism alternate in mutual reaction in history. Let this thought bring comfort to those who need it: License cures itself through its own excess.

[Not just morals, of course, but manners too have a way of alternating in history. Our children may yet see modesty modish and dress more appealing than undress. (In their day, O Lord, and not in ours!)]

6

III.

As the New Morality takes its stand between libertinism and legalism¹ it comes closer to the cover of Judaism's canopy. Contextualism's first demand that situational variable be weighed in the decision making process is certainly in order, so long as these variables remain but one of the factors and do not become the sole determinant of moral action.

Situations do vary, even when they involve the same moral principle. Every case is like every other case, and no two cases are alike. Judaism is not oblivious to this truth. It understands that objective law is in continuing tension with the subjective needs of the individual, and that these needs must be given consideration.

The case of the Agunah provides classic illustration of this tension - and of its resolution in favor of subjective need. True, this need was fully met only by liberal Judaism when it broke with tradition here. But even the traditionalists bent the law - and to no small degree: the testimony of one witness was seen sufficient to establish the husband's death; hearsay evidence was admitted by the court; the deposition of persons otherwise totally incompetent was received, and without cross-examination - all in the effort to loosen the woman's bonds, to serve her need and not the law alone.

Yes, Halacha is a legal and not a moral system in the philosophical meaning of these terms. But it is not and never was blind legalism. The traditional Jew² is no automaton of the law, a kind of mechanical man - like Tik-Tok in the Wizard of Oz who could only do what he was

1
wound up to do when he wanted so desperately to be human. The halachists, certainly the greatest among them, wanted to be human and they were, precisely because they were not blind but seeing, able to envisage the final union of morality and law.

As we move even closer to the mainspring of Jewish law, the Bible, we also find no aversion to contextual considerations. In its treatment of war, for instance, the Tanach is decisively situational. In one case war is justified, in another it is not. In one case God demands resistance to the enemy, in another he warns Jehoiakim through Jeremiah not to join in the revolt against Nebuchadnezzar. Examples can be multiplied. We all can add to them.

It might even be argued that the Biblical approach is fundamentally contextual in that its principles are drawn from living situations. They are not catalogued as abstractions, set forth in hierarchical order. The Bible is not a code of moral principles. It tells the story of men, of a people - and the word of God is deduced from their experience.

This argument is admittedly hyperbolic, an extravagant exaggeration to make a point. But surely it is true that the Biblical word was never detached from the concrete situation. The message of the prophets was never an abstract message. It always referred to actual events. The general was given in the specific and the verification of the abstract in the concrete.

Contextualism does pose its problems (even as does legalism). Situations are not self-defining. Their outer limits cannot readily be set. Just what is the proper context of a given moral situation? Does it take in only the major protagonists, or also those who stand near to or even far from them? Raskolnikov killed the pawnbroker and from the narrow perspective of their

9
1

one-to-one relationship he was probably in the right. He quickly learned, however, that murder tears the fabric of the community, that it destroys not just the victim, but the murderer and the by-stander as well. The rippling effects of moral decisions cannot be contained. Ultimately, they affect the total situation. What is the proper context then? And what about motivation? Can one really disentangle rational and irrational impulses, especially in moments of stress?

These are some of the reasons which impel Judaism to assert the primacy of principle. These are the reasons which impel even the most obdurate of situationists to posit rules which ^{function} ~~are~~ not unlike the rules of ethical traditionalism.

IV.

A brief word ~~or two~~ about one of these rules: the law of love, that summum bonum of situation ethics.

This norm gives me ~~a good deal of~~ ^{some} difficulty. Not that there is anything wrong with love per se. It is a noble ideal, a bright and shining star in the firmament of our **Values**. But when it is applied as widely as it is by the New Morality, it loses all meaning and remains but a murky guide for human conduct.

It is especially unreliable as a yardstick for setting the boundaries of the boy-girl encounter, because love and lust are intrinsically related

9
in the human psyche and when the former is professed the latter, more often than not, is purposed.

Cyrus Pangborn penetrates this prevailing pretense in his challenge to those who justify pre-marital sexual intercourse on the ground that it removes an ignorance threatening the success of marriage. He writes:

"I wonder why there is not consistency enough to advocate a trial establishment of joint bank accounts, the temporary designation of prospective partners as life-insurance beneficiaries, and a series of dates with a small child along for company. Sexually successful marriages have foundered on differing views about the acquisition, spending, and sharing of money, about how to treat and rear children, and about any number of other aspects of the human relationship called marriage. If so thoroughgoing a mutuality and reciprocity seems premature, why not peg sexual expression at some point of restraint chosen for the other factors."

Such consistency is not likely to be ~~established or even~~ sought, precisely because love in the fuller meaning of the term, as a concern for the total relationship, is not at all at play, only love in the narrower physical sense. Playboy magazine is more honest here. One of its cartoons, called to our attention by Paul Ramsey (I never read Playboy; I just look at the pictures), shows a rumpled young man saying to a rumpled young female in his embrace: "Why speak of love at a time like this!"

This subject ~~of love~~, marginally noted, gives not infrequent occasion to the revival of good old-fashioned religious anti-semitism. Thus we read in the Bible of the New Morality: "The law of love has superceded the legalistic pilpul of Pharisaic rabbinism." And again: "The precepts proposed in the New Testament are but Judaizing passages which should be ignored." Tsk, tsk, tsk. And this from Fletcher, a liberal theologian, who really should know better after these many years of exposure to the clean and cleansing winds of the ecumenical dialogue.

The distinguishing ingredient of the New Morality is its insistence on individual responsibility. This is the cement which binds its divergent elements into a whole sufficiently cohesive to be called by one name. Whatever the differences among the New Moralists, one thing they all have in common. They acknowledge their direct responsibility for the moral act. They make the moral problem their very own. They do not externalize morality, seeing it an abstraction ("what is the moral view") or a generalization ("just what ought one to do). Moral precepts become first-person precepts: What ought I to do, what are my commitments, what should my loyalties be.

The New Morality is a morality of dissent in that it runs counter to the current of the day, resisting its malaise and its gloom, asserting the reality of choice against the many who despair of it. It is also a morality of independence of autonomy, in that it makes the moral choice a wholly personal reality, deeming the self and the self alone to be the source and arbiter of value.

As dissent, as protest against the temper of the times, the New Morality stands at one with Judaism. Here indeed is the nexus of which I spoke, that bridge which spans the distance between the secular and the religious moralist. But when the adherents of the New Morality claim full autonomy they seem to row against the mainstream of Jewish thought.

We emphasize the "seem" for on closer look we find no complete incongruity. The morality of Judaism is neither a heteronomous nor is it an autonomous morality. It designates itself to be a "revealed ~~morality~~", true,

11
but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsofui vehareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too. *"The outer limits of man's revelation, wrote Leo Baeck, we are God's partners + cannot abdicate this role. And man's vital function as creature is to make the moral choice."*

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It is taught us little concerning their proper use, ^{of them} concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - ~~to~~ Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now ~~more~~ ^{nearly} than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of ~~day~~ ^{our past.}

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and examplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the ~~shameful~~ ^{higher} fraud of those academies of ^{learning}, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose ^{First} resources are at the command not of ^{their} students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something ~~tried~~ ^{tried} and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of ^{belief} ~~belief~~, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth, ~~and that~~ ^{that} in fact, it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." A like hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim: ".K'im asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho...Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke ~~our~~ despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather the sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ ^{new} returning strength, For beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayin chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

JUDAISM AND THE NEW MORALITY
Conference Paper: First Draft
A. Schindler

The world of moral certitude has crumbled. Its center did not hold. Anarchy is loosed upon the land. "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned."

Our certitude, our moral confidence, was rocked by change - bitter-sweet legacy of technological advance. It was eroded by the decay of its supportive institutions, of synagogue and church, of school and home. It was ground to the dust by the horror to which we were witness: the Cyclon B of Belsen and the mushroom cloud.

More was lost. More than this or that value. More even than a world of values. There has been a 'devaluation of valuation' as such. Man's capacity to value has been brought to question.

Values, after all, call for choice, and choice is possible only where there is freedom for the will. But science sternly reminds us that this freedom is an illusion or at best severely circumscribed. We may think that we choose, but we don't. Our choice is conditioned by a complex of inner and outer circumstance, by situation and tradition, by the environment and the coalescence of our genes.

The world which science perceives, moreover, is a morally neutral world, a

12
world of fact alien to value. Values are only preferences, physics asserts, mere emotions, the proper object for study by psychology. But then psychology comes and abolishes the notion of integral normality: the normal and the abnormal, the good and the bad, they blend; there is no true line between them. There is neither hot nor cold. There is no high nor low. And there is an enormous amount of nothing in the All.

Man's mind is the sole source of values in a world devoid of values and his faculty to value is but feeble - so concludes science, even while it gives man power over nature, enormous power, the power to control, the power to manipulate, the God-like power to create. Here is the paradox of which Hans Jonas spoke: feebleness and strength in one, omnipotence and emptiness, the 'anarchy of human choosing' combined with man's 'apocalyptic' sway.

Thus is the ceremony of innocence drowned. "The best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity." Such are the stresses and the strains of which the New Morality is consequence.

I.

Now this phrase, this designation, the New Morality, is much abused. The range of its applications is wide. It describes a system of thought as well as a style of life - both running the gamut from libertinism to heteronomy.

Seen as a way of life, the New Morality is usually identified with the manners and the mores of modern youth. But modern youth is not of a cloth, not even the dissenters. Some are involved and others are not. Some are committed,

while others abandon the fray. All hold the 'old morality' in slight esteem, especially as it turns to self-righteousness and hypocrisy. But they do not take the identical moral stance. As Kenniston's ~~illuminating~~ studies reveal, the alienated of our youth are often anti-idealistic, situational, prone to indulge desire. The activists, however, are sternly moral, prepared to articulate codes of conduct which ~~may well~~ diverge from the codes of the past, but ^{function like them in that} ~~nonetheless~~ are held to apply to every moral situation.

The picture becomes no clearer, when we focus on the New Morality as a system of thought. Here too, a blurring obtains and positions overlap. The situationists throw off the shackles of the law, or so they say, but then quickly posit principles no less exacting. The heteronomists are pledged to uphold the law but forthwith ~~twist and~~ bend it to meet the need of given circumstance.

Gustafson isolates no less than three distinct trends in contemporary contextualism: those who call for a socio-historical analysis of each situation, those who make their point of reference the person-to-person encounter, and those who listen for the still small voice ^{when they confront their problems} ~~as they approach their moral~~ ~~decisions~~, theologians like Karl Barth who believe that the command of God is given not in prior formal rules of conduct but in the immediacy of every moral situation. As for the defenders of the law, they too cannot be lumped in one, Gustafson finds. And he concludes that the term New Morality has been used to cover entirely too many theological heads, ⁺ and that the debate, ^{hence,} is misplaced in its entirety.

When Yale University's Professor of Christian Ethics cannot draw the lines ~~and limits~~ of what has been a disputation primarily in the arena of modern Christian thought, what is a poor rabbi to do, a rabbi, mind you, who is not ~~even~~ a kohen or a levi in Jewish theology, just a proster yisroel,

4
arable

just
who has enough of a problem trying to decide ~~just~~ what is or is not normative in Judaism.

It ~~surely~~ is not simple matter to draw a consistent pattern of thought out of ~~the~~ ^{an} evolutionary process ~~or~~ ^{such as} Jewish Ethics, or even out of a philosophical ambience such as the New Morality. The temptation is great to begin with a pre-conceived notion and then to select those facts which will support it. But facts should be respected, all facts, and contradictions should not be ignored. At least they should be seen for what they are, parts of one whole in which divergent strains ~~exist~~ ^{appear along} ~~longside~~ those which are more dominant and characteristic.

But we are only human. Autism manipulates us even when we are aware that We will always see what we desire to see. Find what we really want to find. it is operative. Therefore let me be honest with you, and with myself, by readily acknowledging my predilection.

~~at least a~~ ^{hope} ~~I perceive it to be~~
I like this New Morality. I respect its openness. I appreciate its hope.

I respond to its essential dynamism and its insistence on passionate involvement. As a system of thought it may not be sufficient for Judaism, but its ^{major} ~~two-fold emphasis~~ - ^{it focuses on} ~~internal considerations & celebration~~ ^{Here} ~~major thrust - the celebration of~~ individual responsibility - is certainly ~~an~~ congenial to our ethos.

I see it especially valuable as a bridge to those who stand yet apart from the community of faith but who are as determined as are we to come to grips with moral malaise, to create new moral order out of the pervasive spiritual chaos of our time.

5

II.

To be sure, this embrace is not all-encompassing. Judaism's ethical canopy is not so large that it shelters everything. It certainly does not shelter those who see the New Morality as license to do what they please.

There are those - both young and old - who do, for whom the New Morality means no constraint, free warrant to indulge desire whatever its demands. They think, perhaps, that we are undergoing that 'transvaluation of values' of which Nietzsche spoke. Or inebriated by man's exalted state - the power to create is heady wine - they feel that we have gone beyond the Nietzschean prediction, that all men, not just a few 'superior men', have now outgrown morality, as they outgrew mythology and magic, that no one longer is subject to judgments of right and wrong.

This is no New Morality, of course. Wantonness is neither a new nor a moral phenomenon. Such styles of life are of an ancient vintage. They are as old as Sodom and Gomorrah.

They come, and they go, these deviant so-called moralities with pendulum-like regularity. Puritanism and paganism alternate in mutual reaction in history. Let this thought bring comfort to those who need it: License cures itself through its own excess.

[Not just morals, of course, but manners too have a way of alternating in history. Our children may yet see modesty modish and dress more appealing than undress. (In their day, O Lord, and not in ours!)]

6
III.

As the New Morality takes its stand between libertinism and legalism' it comes closer to the cover of Judaism's canopy. Contextualism's first demand that situational variable be weighed in the decision making process is certainly in order, so long as these variables remain but one of the factors and do not become the sole determinant of moral action.

Situations do vary, even when they involve the same moral principle. Every case is like every other case, and no two cases are alike. Judaism is not oblivious to this truth. It understands that objective law is in continuing tension with the subjective needs of the individual, and that these needs must be given consideration.

The case of the Agunah provides classic illustration of this tension - and of its resolution in favor of subjective need. True, this need was fully met only by liberal Judaism when it broke with tradition here. But even the traditionalists bent the law - and to no small degree: the testimony of one witness was seen sufficient to establish the husband's death; hearsay evidence was admitted by the court; the deposition of persons otherwise totally incompetent was received, and without cross-examination - all in the effort to loosen the woman's bonds, to serve her need and not the law alone.

Yes, Halacha is a legal and not a moral system in the philosophical meaning of these terms. But it is not and never was blind legalism. The traditional Jew ^{is} no automaton of the law, a kind of mechanical man - like Tik-Tok in the Wizard of Oz who could only do what he was

1
wound up to do when he wanted so desperately to be human. The halachists, certainly the greatest among them, wanted to be human and they were, precisely because they were not blind but seeing, able to envisage the final union of morality and law.

As we move even closer to the mainspring of Jewish law, the Bible, we also find no aversion to contextual considerations. In its treatment of war, for instance, the Tanach is decisively situational. In one case war is justified, in another it is not. In one case God demands resistance to the enemy, in another he warns Jehoiakim through Jeremiah not to join in the revolt against Nebuchadnezzar. Examples can be multiplied. We all can add to them.

It might even be argued that the Biblical approach is fundamentally contextual in that its principles are drawn from living situations. They are not catalogued as abstractions, set forth in hierarchical order. The Bible is not a code of moral principles. It tells the story of men, of a people - and the word of God is deduced from their experience.

This argument is admittedly hyperbolic, an extravagant exaggeration to make a point. But surely it is true that the Biblical word was never detached from the concrete situation. The message of the prophets was never an abstract message. It always referred to actual events. The general was given in the specific and the verification of the abstract in the concrete.

Contextualism does pose its problems (even as does legalism). Situations are not self-defining. Their outer limits cannot readily be set. Just what is the proper context of a given moral situation? Does it take in only the major protagonists, or also those who stand near to or even far from them? Raskolnikov killed the pawnbroker and from the narrow perspective of their

9
one-to-one relationship he was probably in the right. He quickly learned, however, that murder tears the fabric of the community, that it destroys not just the victim, but the murderer and the by-stander as well. The rippling effects of moral decisions cannot be contained. Ultimately, they affect the total situation. What is the proper context then? And what about motivation? Can one really disentangle rational and irrational impulses, especially in moments of stress?

These are some of the reasons which impel Judaism to assert the primacy of principle. These are the reasons which impel even the most obdurate of situationists to posit rules which ^{Function} ~~are~~ not unlike the rules of ethical traditionalism.

IV.

A brief word ~~or two~~ about one of these rules: the law of love, that summum bonum of situation ethics.

This norm gives me ^{some} ~~a good deal of~~ difficulty. Not that there is anything wrong with love per se. It is a noble ideal, a bright and shining star in the firmament of our ^{values}. But when it is applied as widely as it is by the New Morality, it loses all meaning and remains but a murky guide for human conduct.

It is especially unreliable as a yardstick for setting the boundaries of the boy-girl encounter, because love and lust are intrinsically related

9
in the human psyche and when the former is professed the latter, more often than not, is purposed.

Cyrus Pangborn penetrates this prevailing pretense in his challenge to those who justify pre-marital sexual intercourse on the ground that it removes an ignorance threatening the success of marriage. He writes:

"I wonder why there is not consistency enough to advocate a trial establishment of joint bank accounts, the temporary designation of prospective partners as life-insurance beneficiaries, and a series of dates with a small child along for company. Sexually successful marriages have foundered on differing views about the acquisition, spending, and sharing of money, about how to treat and rear children, and about any number of other aspects of the human relationship called marriage. If so thoroughgoing a mutuality and reciprocity seems premature, why not peg sexual expression at some point of restraint chosen for the other factors."

Such consistency is not likely to to be ~~established or even~~ sought, precisely because love in the fuller meaning of the term, as a concern for the total relationship, is not at all at play, only love in the narrower physical sense. Playboy magazine is more honest here. One of its cartoons, called to our attention by Paul Ramsey (I never read Playboy; I just look at the pictures), shows a rumpled young man saying to a rumpled young female in his embrace: "Why speak of love at a time like this!"

This subject ~~of love~~, marginally noted, gives not infrequent occasion to the revival of good old-fashioned religious anti-semitism. Thus we read in the Bible of the New Morality: "The law of love has superceded the legalistic pilpul of Pharisaic rabbinism." And again: "The precepts proposed in the New Testament are but Judaizing passages which should be ignored." Tsk, tsk, tsk. And this from Fletcher, a liberal theologian, who really should know better after these many years of exposure to the clean and cleansing winds of the ecumenical dialogue.

The distinguishing ingredient of the New Morality is its insistence on individual responsibility. This is the cement which binds its divergent elements into a whole sufficiently cohesive to be called by one name. Whatever the differences among the New Moralists, one thing they all have in common. They acknowledge their direct responsibility for the moral act. They make the moral problem their very own. They do not externalize morality, seeing it an abstraction ("what is the moral view") or a generalization ("just what ought one to do). Moral precepts become first-person precepts: What ought I to do, what are my commitments, what should my loyalties be.

The New Morality is a morality of dissent in that it runs counter to the current of the day, resisting its malaise and its gloom, asserting the reality of choice against the many who despair of it. It is also a morality of independence of autonomy, in that it makes the moral choice a wholly personal reality, deeming the self and the self alone to be the source and arbiter of value.

As dissent, as protest against the temper of the times, the New Morality stands at one with Judaism. Here indeed is the nexus of which I spoke, that bridge which spans the distance between the secular and the religious moralist. But when the adherents of the New Morality claim full autonomy they seem to row against the mainstream of Jewish thought.

We emphasize the "seem" for on closer look we find no complete incongruity. The morality of Judaism is neither a heteronomous nor is it an autonomous morality. It designates itself to be a "revealed" ~~morality~~, true,

11
but then, in daring paradox (hakol tsofui vehareshus nesunoh), it declares man free and grants him full authority to make his moral choices.

Judaism does not exact unquestioning obedience. Rather does it seek man's free assent. The commandments are to be performed not just for God's sake, but for their own sake too, because they are seen to possess intrinsic worth. Man has the power to perceive that worth. He is unique in knowing good and evil. The Torah is given, therefore, only when men are ready to receive it. Sinai is not imposed. It is self-imposed. Man must choose to scale its heights.

Law is not of secondary concern to Judaism. Nor does it become irrelevant once it is appropriated by man. It remains an essential element of the ethical process. But the autonomous choice of man is an integral part of this process too. "The outer limit of man's free revelation" writes Baezel. "We are God's partners & cannot abdicate His role. And man's vital function as creator is to make the moral choice."

VI.

The cleft between Judaism and the New Morality is not so great after all. It becomes more narrow still when these outrageous dissenters do not claim all understanding but are prepared to listen to the past, when they remember to "read yesterday's minutes" as Al Vorspan so felicitously put it, when they turn to tradition if not in submission then at least with attention and respect.

Reverence for the past is a peculiarly Jewish prescription. It is also the counsel of prudence. Human experience did not begin with the birth of science. It began with the birth of man. And man, in his essential nature,

has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Science assuredly has taught us much concerning the nature of things. It is taught us little concerning their proper use, ^{life} concerning the ends which things should be made to serve. We are more knowledgeable but no more understanding than were our fathers and there is much that we can learn from them.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is - ~~to~~ Gene Borowitz often reminds us - that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was writtent by Moritz Lazarus now ~~more~~ ^{nearly} than eighty years ago. ~~Yet our problems have scarcely lessened, they have multiplied since then.~~ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning - population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, euthenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well - all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of ^{our past.} ~~day~~

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Example and exemplars are required - by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by a passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of

these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the ^{shameful} ~~shameful~~ fraud of those academies of ^{higher} ~~learning~~, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose ^{Finest} ~~resources~~ are at the command not of ^{them} ~~students~~ but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city in despair.

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak - by precept and example - if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something ~~tried~~ ^{tried} and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of ^{belief} ~~belief~~, of creed. Where situation ethics

has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the 'self' and the 'other'. They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

But even here we can hold with Judaism that the moral pursuit has its own intrinsic worth ~~and that~~, in fact, ^{that} it can be the decisive first step toward a higher understanding. "Would that they had deserted me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with Torah, the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to me." Alike hope is held forth in the reading which the Tono debe Eliyohu gives to Mica's celebrated maxim: ".K'im asous mishpot, ahavas chesed, vehatsnea leches imcho elohecho...Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly, then God will be with you."

This happening of our day, therefore, this New Morality should not evoke ~~our~~ despair. Upon the contrary, it should afford us comfort, stir in us new hope. It requires not repression, but careful nurturing and guidance. It is not a symptom of moral sickness, but ^{rather the sure} ~~a certain sign of~~ ^{new} returning strength, ~~For~~ ^{For} beneath its seeming disregard for traditional morality, a deepfelt sense of moral responsibility is manifest. In a word, something good is emerging here, from the moral point of view, perhaps even that "new heart" and that "new spirit" of which Ezekiel spoke.

And having heeded the mandate of one prophet, we may well witness the fulfillment of another seer's dream: ki hin'ni voure shomayn chadoshim vo-orets chadosho... for behold I create a new heaven and a new earth...the former things shall not be remembered nor come to mind...your seed and your name...they will remain... forever."

JUDAISM AND THE NEW MORALITY

by

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

Central Conference of American Rabbis
Shamrock Hilton Hotel
Houston, Texas

June 16-19, 1969

JUDAISM AND THE NEW MORALITY

by

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

The world of moral certitude has crumbled. Its center did not hold. Anarchy is loosed upon the land. The blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned.(1)

Our certitude, our moral confidence, was rocked by change -- bitter-sweet legacy of technological advance. It was eroded by the decay of its supportive institutions, of synagogue and church, of school and home. It was ground to the dust by the horror to which we were witness: the Cyclon B of Belsen and the mushroom cloud.

More was lost. More than this or that value. More even than a world of values. There has been a 'devaluation of valuation' as such. Man's capacity to value has been brought to question.(2)

Values, after all, call for choice, and choice is possible only where there is freedom for the will. But science sternly reminds us that this freedom is an illusion or at best severely circumscribed. We may think that we choose, but we don't. Our choice is conditioned by a complex of inner and outer circumstance, by situation and tradition, by the environment and the coalescence of our genes.

The world which science perceives, moreover, is a morally neutral world, a world of fact alien to value. Values are only preferences, physics asserts, mere emotions, the proper object for study by psychology. But then psychology comes and abolishes the notion of integral normality: the normal and the abnormal, the good and the bad, they blend; there is no true line between them. There is neither hot nor cold. There is no high nor low. And there is an enormous amount of nothing in the All.(3)

Man's mind is the sole source of values in a world devoid of values and his faculty to value is but feeble -- so concludes science, even while it gives man power over nature, enormous power, the power to control, the power to manipulate, the God-like power to create. Here is the paradox of which Hans Jonas spoke: feebleness and strength in one, omnipotence and emptiness, the 'anarchy of human choosing' combined with man's 'apocalyptic' sway. (4)

Thus is the ceremony of innocence drowned. "The best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity." Such are the stresses and the strains of which the New Morality is consequence.(5)

I.

Now this phase, this designation, the New Morality, is much abused. The range of its applications is wide. It describes a system of thought as well as a style of life -- both running the gamut from libertinism to heteronomy.

I see it especially valuable as a bridge to those who stand yet apart from the community of faith but who are as determined as are we to come to grips with moral malaise, to create new moral order out of the pervasive spiritual chaos of our time.

II.

To be sure, this embrace is not all-encompassing. Judaism's ethical canopy is not so large that it shelters everything. It certainly does not shelter those who see the New Morality as license to do what they please.

There are those -- both young and old -- who do, for whom the New Morality means no constraint, free warrant to indulge desire whatever its demands. They think, perhaps, that we are undergoing that 'transvaluation of values' of which Nietzsche spoke. Or inebriated by man's exalted state -- the power to create is heady wine -- they feel that we have gone beyond the Nietzschean prediction, that all men, not just a few 'superior men,' have now outgrown morality, as they outgrew mythology and magic, that no one longer is subject to judgments of right and wrong. (8)

This is no New Morality, of course. Wantonness is neither a new nor a moral phenomenon. Such styles of life are of an ancient vintage. They are as old as Sodom and Gomorrah.

They come, and they go, these deviant so-called moralities with pendulum-like regularity. "Puritanism and paganism alternate in mutual reaction in history. Let this thought bring comfort to those who need it: License cures itself through its own excess." (9)

(Not just morals, of course, but manners too have a way of alternating in history. Our children may yet see modesty modish and dress more appealing than undress. (In their day, O Lord, and not in ours!))

III.

As the New Morality takes its stand between libertinism and legalism, it comes closer to the cover of Judaism's canopy. Contextualism's first demand that situational variables be weighed in the decision making process is certainly in order, so long as these variables remain but one of the factors and do not become the sole determinant of moral action.

Situations do vary, even when they involve the same moral principle. "Every case is like every other case, and no two cases are alike."⁽¹⁰⁾ Judaism is not oblivious to this truth. It understands that objective law is in continuing tension with the subjective needs of the individual, and that these needs must be given consideration.

The case of the Agunah provides classic illustration of this tension -- and of its resolution in favor of subjective need. True, this need was fully met only by liberal Judaism when it broke with tradition here. But even the traditionalists bent the law -- and to no small degree: the testimony of one witness was seen sufficient to establish the husband's death; hearsay evidence was admitted by the court; the deposition of persons otherwise totally incompetent was received, and without cross-examination -- all in the effort to loosen the woman's bonds, to serve her need and not the law alone.

This norm gives me some difficulty. Not that there is anything wrong with love per se. It is a noble ideal, a bright and shining star in the firmament of our values. But when it is applied as widely as it is by the New Morality, it loses all meaning and remains but a murky guide for human conduct.

It is especially unreliable as a yardstick for setting the boundaries of the boy-girl encounter, because love and lust are intrinsically related in the human psyche and when the former is professed the latter, more often than not, is purposed.

Cyrus Pangborn penetrates this prevailing pretense in his challenge to those who justify pre-marital sexual intercourse on the ground that it removes an ignorance threatening the success of marriage. He writes:

"I wonder why there is not consistency enough to advocate a trial establishment of joint bank accounts, the temporary designation of prospective partners as life-insurance beneficiaries, and a series of dates with a small child along for company. Sexually successful marriages have foundered on differing views about the acquisition, spending, and sharing of money, about how to treat and rear children, and about any number of other aspects of the human relationship called marriage. If so thoroughgoing a mutuality and reciprocity seem premature, why not peg sexual expression at some point of restraint chosen for the other factors."

Such consistency is not likely to be sought, precisely because love in the fuller meaning of the term, as a concern for the total relationship, is not at all at play, only love in the narrower physical sense. Playboy magazine is more honest here. One of its cartoons, called to our attention by Paul Ramsey (I never read Playboy; I just look at the pictures), shows a rumpled young man saying to a rumpled young woman in his embrace: "Why speak of love at a time like this!"

This subject, marginally noted, gives not infrequent occasion to the revival of good old-fashioned religious anti-semitism. Thus we read in the Bible of the New Morality: "The law of love has superseded the legalistic pilpul of Pharisaic rabbinism." And again: "The precepts proposed in the New Testament are but Judaizing passages which should be ignored." (13) And this from Fletcher, a liberal theologian, who really should know better after these many years of exposure to the clean and cleansing winds of the ecumenical dialogue.

V.

The distinguishing ingredient of the New Morality is its insistence on individual responsibility. This is the cement which binds its divergent elements into a whole sufficiently cohesive to be called by one name. Whatever the differences among the New Moralists, one thing they all have in common. They acknowledge their direct responsibility for the moral act. They make the moral problem their very own. They do not externalize morality, seeing it an abstraction ("What is the moral view") or a generalization ("Just what ought one to do). Moral precepts become first-person precepts: What ought I to do, what are my commitments, what should my loyalties be.

The summons to listen to the past, to hear and heed tradition, also summons us, as teachers of tradition, to make its substance pertinent, to bring it to bear on the pressing moral issues of the day. What irony it is -- so Gene Borowitz often reminds us -- that with all our talk about Jewish ethics, the last significant work on the subject was written by Moritz Lazarus now nearly eighty years ago.⁽¹⁸⁾ Nor is there the need only for a fuller, more contemporary exposition of ethical theory. There is a need to be concerned with the critical value issues resulting from the ever more decisive role of our advancing technology. The bitter-sweet fruitage of all our learning -- population growth in geometric progression, ever increasing concentration of economic and political power, fundamental alteration of family function and social structure, eugenics and eugenics, the ability to modify not just cultural but biological evolution as well -- all these have raised diverse and pressing moral cares to which we have barely spoken and rarely if ever brought the light of our past.

Nor can we be content to teach by precept only. Examples and examplars are required -- by our tradition and by protesting youth. Moral preachment simply will not do. Yes, as a Conference we have the right to be proud of our many colleagues who speak and act with daring, stirred by passion which does honor to our prophetic past. But we cannot in all honesty preen that our institutions, in the life-blood of their program, even begin to reflect the primacy of these concerns. How many synagogues, for instance, offer or even know about draft counselling? How many congregations whose sons and daughters crowd the universities of our land have taken the initiative to denounce the fraud of those academies of higher learning, those so-called Temples of Truth, whose finest resources are at the command not of their students but of an industrial military machine? And how many temples can say: we have done enough, we have truly done enough to relieve the needy, to free the bound, to bridge that yawning, fearsome gap between comfortable, safe suburbia and an inner city of despair?

These are the issues which compel the concern of our youth. These are the issues to which we must speak -- by precept and example -- if our demand that they learn from tradition is to have any meaning and effect.

It might be pertinent to note in this connection that even science admonishes us not to neglect the past. In paleontology there is a law called Romer's rule. It is a law of evolutionary advance which asserts that radical change is always abortive, that change is possible only when it is adaptive, when it begins by holding on to something tried and true, when it conserves the old in face of the new. Preservation is the first step, innovation only follows. (19) Romer's rule is operative in the moral realm as well. Conservation is the needful first step. Only then can there be the opening of vast new doors, that splendid serendipity.

VII.

There is one level at which the New Morality and Judaism touch if at all but fleetingly. It is the level of God belief, of creed. Where situation ethics has been a religious concern, it has been a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. As for the secular moralists, they do not see the need for faith to validate morality. They define morality as a two-way relationship, between the "self" and the "other". They do not see it as the three way relationship involving man, his human neighbor and God which our faith demands.

1. William Butler Yeats, The Second Coming
2. Erich Kahler, The Tower and the Abyss (N.Y., Viking, 1967), pp. 34ff.
3. Paul Valery, Mon Faust
4. Hans Jonas "Contemporary Problems in Ethics from a Jewish Perspective" in C.C.A.R. Journal (New York, N.Y.) Vol. XV, #1 January, 1968
5. Yeats, op. cit.
6. Kenneth Kenniston, Young Radicals (New York, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.) p. 347
7. James M. Gustafson "Context vs. Principles: A Misplaced Debate in Christian Ethics" in Harvard Theological Review, vol. 58, no. 2, April, 1965)
8. Henry David Aiken "The New Morals" in Harper's Magazine Vol. 236, no. 1413, February, 1963
9. Will and Ariel Durant, The Lessons of History (New York, Simon & Shuster, 1968) pp. 37-51
10. Edmond Cahn "The Lawyer as Scientist and Scoundrel" New York University Law Review, Vol. 36, p. 10 1961
11. Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (New York, Westminster Press, 1966) pp. 18-39
12. Abraham Joshua Heschel, God in Search of Man (New York, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1955), p. 204
13. Fletcher, op. cit. p. 70
14. Cf. Emil Fackenheim, Quest for Past and Future (Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 204-228.
15. Ibid. p. 223
16. Midrash Tanhuma, Yisro
17. Leo Baeck, Individuum Ineffabile
18. Eugene Borowitz, "Current Theological Literature" in Judaism, Vol. 15, no. 3, Summer 1966.
19. Conrad Arensberg "Cultural Change and the Guaranteed Income" in The Guaranteed Income, Robert Theobald (ed.) (New York Doubleday, 1966), p. 211
20. Pesikta Kahana XV

There is one other element of faith which retains its vitality whose present worth endures despite the changes of times and of seasons. It is that element of faith which involves the humérus, a consciousness of the holy, the ability to respond with awe to the essential mystery of life.

"Where wast thou when the foundations of the earth were laid, when the morning stars sang together and the hosts of heaven shouted for joy? Hast thou commanded the sky? Hast thou entered the springs of the sea? Have the portals of death been opened unto thee? Take off thy shoes from off your feet, for the place whereon thou standest, it is holy."

The voice from out of the whirlwind or from the burning bush finds few listening ears in our day. By and large we are not given to amazement and to wonder. Few achievements arouse our admiration, as blandly we walk the way of life untouched by its essential magic. The temper of our times does not allow us to listen and to respond. Positivism which enjoins us to accept as real only that which can be perceived by the physical senses alone, pragmatism which leads us to regard only that which is of use, which is of practical worth.

But there is a realm of reality beyond the realm perceived by the physical senses alone and some among us are blessed with the capacity to perceive that realm.

To one man for instance a "primrose by a river's brim, a yellow primrose is to him, and it is nothing more." Another man has a clearer vision and so he finds tongues in trees, books in running brooks, and God in everything. Who of these two has the perception of reality in its fuller sense?

The physicist can tell us that water is composed of two parts of hydrogen and one part of oxygen. That is a scientific fact, but is this all we can say about water? Is this the sum and substance of its essence? Shakespeare, as we read books and brooks and Israel's sweet singer found firm faith by still and stilling waters. Surely their discoveries are as real and as meaningful as are the technical formulae of the laboratory.

Aye, there is a world of reality beyond the world perceived by the physical senses and altogether multitudinous also are life's blessings which are of little practical worth but which as gifts are altogether wondrous.

The earth's green covering of grass,
 The blue serenity of sea and sky,
 The song of day,
 The silent wonder of the night,
 The petals on the grass and winds in the air.

How flat, how narrow our world is, when we measure its gifts by their usefulness alone, when in Rilke's happy simile we take a hold of peacock's feathers to tickle one another while being oblivious to their intrinsic charm. Then do the words of prophesy apply to us: They have eyes but they do not see; they have ears, but they do not hear; they do not know, they do not understand, they walk in darkness.

No, learning is not enough. The accumulation of knowledge is not enough. The human story simply cannot be told without reverence for that mystery and majesty which transcends all human knowledge. Only humble men who know this truth can confront the grandeur and the terror of their lives without being blinded by the grandeur or crushed by its terror.

, Rae Weiner

1/4/68

Vice President

1/8/68

Speech

1 each

XX

Single space

THE CHALLENGE OF PROTESTING YOUTH

This is my swan song as far as the National Association of Temple Educators is concerned; ^{it is the last time that I stand before you as the} ~~my last address to you as the~~ outgoing Director of the Commission on Jewish Education.

I leave with the assurance that the leadership of Reform Jewish education is in good hands. Jack Spiro is an exceedingly capable young man, bringing many extraordinary qualities of mind and heart to his endeavors: knowledge, integrity, intelligence, the determination to advance the cause of Jewish education, and the ability to do so. Nor does he stand alone; ~~whereas~~ he is surrounded by strong and able men who are willing to share his burden and ~~and~~ to sustain him: the young and brilliant Director of Camp Education, Rabbi Widom; the old-new Director of Adult Education, Rabbi Bemporad, whose knowledge and percipience continues ^{vs} to fill ~~me~~ with awe; and, acharon acharon chaviv, Abe Segal, knowledgeable, wise, sensitive, a Jewish educator second to none.

Can we really dream for more? All we need do is ask their health and strength so that the good promise of their investiture will find fulfillment during the years ahead.

Now I am not only a has-been, completely out-of-date and season. My fate and yours is worse than that, for I am also a surrogate, a substitute, a filler-inner the understudy who has a chance to take center stage only because the star is indisposed. Dr. Eisendrath promised to be here; he meant to be here; his duties dictated otherwise. As you may know, he is about to embark on a mission of peace together with leading clergymen of other faiths, which will take him on a round-the-world journey scheduled to begin just a few days hence. He asked that I read you this message, which he addressed to Gel Singer and through her to you:

(see #1 attached) (copy, indented) *(in quotes)*

To all this I can only add my heartfelt, fervent Amen. You are indeed what you were created to be, and for this we honor you! Surely nothing, during my tenure in office, gave me greater satisfaction than my association with the men and women of NATE; your counsel guided me, your friendship sustained me. *(No new §)*

Dear Gail,

Please convey my deepest regret to the men and women of HATS for my failure to be with you as promised. Be assured that only the most pressing duties keep me from honoring my obligation and carrying your sincha. I am really embarrassed about it all, embarrassed by my inability to be with you not only now but all these many years.

I feel very much like a wayward father who deserts his offspring just after the bris and even lacks the decency to return for the Bar Mitzvah celebration.

The child is a child no more. It has grown to robust manhood, not only in physical size, but in mind and spirit too. Your contributions toward the advancement of our national cause are many. The exacting standards of education which you have established and maintained have served to deepen the religious instruction program of our congregations. The fruit of your creative genius -- your research projects, your curricula, your syllabi and texts -- have immeasurably enlarged our arsenal of resources in the struggle against Jewish illiteracy. In ever increasing numbers, your members are assuming positions of leadership in the wider arena of our work, in camping, youth and social action, not just on a regional level but in our national councils too. In a word, you have fulfilled the promise inherent in the hour of your becoming. You have fashioned a profession in Jewish education among us and for this you were created.

I hope that what I have said assured you of my regard for HATS. My absence from you was enforced, not voluntary, enforced by the incessant, insistent demands upon my time. Indeed, why should I offer you anything but genuine, heartfelt regard? After all, you are what I am, what every rabbi is or ought to be: teachers of Judaism, builders of our future.

Sincerely,

Rabbi Maurice H. Eisenkrath

(No news)

As I enter upon a new field of work, in which I have scarcely been tried, the memory of these years and your affection will be a source of lasting strength.

I want to talk to you today about youth and the challenge of change, about the protesting generation and the demands its members make on us. I want to talk to you about the beats, the drop-outs, the alienated young, about the hippies, if you will, and what their protest imports.

My subject may seem incongruous, oddly at variance with the occasion which brings us together. Mah Inyan Shemitah Etsel Har Sinai^a? What mean the hippies to Har Sinai, the beats to the b'nai mitzvah of N.A.T.E.?

Still, we must listen to our young, must we not? As teachers we know that knowledge of the students is a requisite of effective teaching. And while it is true that these youthful, outrageous dissenters represent only a minority of their peers, they nonetheless provide us with an image of their society and with a mirror-image of our own. Their words and deeds may be excessive, ~~extravagant~~ ^{extravagant} in exaggeration, even grotesque. But at least they speak. The others, alas too often, merely acquiesce they play it cool by playing our game. In the final analysis the dissenters may well prove to have been precursors, not just aberrations.

What gives their message even greater immediacy is the fact that so many of these protestors are Jewish. Estimates vary, but a prominent sociologist, a member of one of our Northern California congregations, who just completed four months of intensive street work in San Francisco, reports that certainly 20% and perhaps 30% of Haight-Ashbury's residents are Jewish. Mike Loring adds the further information that 70% of that community's leadership is Jewish. Nor do we only encompass in our purview the hippies but all the protesting groups, so many of whom come from well-fed comfortable suburban Jewish families.

They are drop-outs from our schools. They rebel against us. ~~And so we must listen~~

E And so we must listen
 to them. They are trying to say something to us. And they are probably right in

much of what they say, however wrong may be their remedies for righting matters.

I.

Now in the first instance, so I believe, our youthful protestors give voice to their distrust of conventional wisdom. They are loath to give assent to any value system which is asserted as "established and commonly received" and hence inviolate.

To some extent, this kind of anti-authoritarianism has always been a mark of youth -- moral preachment never really worked -- but it is more pronounced today and of a different quality. It has moved from a rebellion against a particular judgment, to a denial of all such judgments, from a rejection of this or that doctrine, to a disdain for all ideology, in fact.

In sharp and curious contrast with their nominal progenitors of an earlier age, present day movements of protest have not developed a clear-cut ideology. Even the New Left is anti-doctrinaire; its spokesmen embrace no "isms," not socialism, not communism, *certainly* not ~~even~~ dialectical materialism. The New Left is no continuation of the rationalist, radical tradition of the enlightenment, as some would assume. If anything, it is a reaction against this tradition, supplanting its hopeful idealism with somber sober realism. *(NEW PARAGRAPH)* Its adherents are even anti-intellectual, in a way -- youthful dissenters of every stripe are -- suspecting not just systems of thought, but reasoned thought itself. It may well be -- so David Moynihan perceptively discerns -- that our young people are too familiar with that "rational commitment to logic and consistency which leads from the game theory of the RAND Corporation to the use of napalm in Vietnam."

Marginally noted, *this* ~~their~~ antipathy to logical coherence appears reflected in the forms and rhythms of modernity's song: the eight-bar quatrains of yesteryear's tunes lost in the roar of rock-and-roll, the measured symmetry of the fox-trot superseded by the *bacchic* frenzy of the frug.

Be that as it may, when our youthful dissenters do not reject thought and value systems per se they certainly resent their self-righteous assertion. They abhor that ideological arrogance which insists on universal acceptance, which proposes, as a case in point and on a global level, that a political theory which works well in one country must, therefore, become the option of the world. ^{§ (New concept)} Here surely is the foremost reason why our young people are in the vanguard of the peace movement. They reject that ideological self-certainty which rules that just because democracy succeeds here, it must, perforce, be extended abroad, imposed on other lands -- and this, mind you, even while democracy's ideals are not fully secured at home.

II.

Which brings us full square to the second problem feeding the flames of the youth revolt: the creditability gap, the disparity between intent and deed; in a word, hypocrisy, our inability to bring about a harmony of preachment and of practice.

"A major reason for youth leaving society is their awareness of the hypocrisy practiced in this country" -- so writes our case worker from Haight-Ashbury -- "hypocrisy practiced from a national level, down to the family... the double standard toward violence for instance: murder in the streets is wrong, but murder in Vietnam is right." His confidential report continues:

"Young people are aware that within established Judaism there are some who take an active stand against the war. They know about the many rabbis and laymen who speak up courageously. But they decry the fact that these leaders speak in generalities, ^{yet} ~~but~~ act in few specifics. Over and again young people say to me: 'perhaps there are Jewish alternatives to the draft, but how many Jewish Centers and synagogues offer or even know about draft counseling? How many support the active anti-war program of youth?' "

Questions like this are not easy to answer -- especially in the light of our recent Biennial -- for the only answer we can give is the embarrassed silence of our guilt.

Often this imposture of which we are accused is not so much willful as it is inad-

due to our over-optimism, our proneness to make promises we cannot fulfill.

[Note, if you will, the innocent beginnings of our involvement in Southeast Asia]. But once our deeds fall short of the goals which we so glibly pronounced, we are reluctant to admit to failure, we rationalize and improvise and cover up and end up doing things we never started out to do. But whatever the motivation, willful or not, the consequence of hypocrisy is cynicism, disenchantment, despair. (disparaging) As teachers we know or ought to know just how important ethical consistency is to our youth, that deeds will teach what words cannot, that our students look more than they listen, that they follow the man who is, long before the man who only persuades with his lips.

In many ways the younger generation has become more pragmatic than the most pragmatic of those materialists against whom they inveigh. They look to deeds not words; they value achievements, not professed ideals.

Perhaps this is why the protest movement is so action-oriented. Its arts are action arts; folk singing, dance, and abstract films. Its ^{reaction} ~~reaction~~ is kinesthetic: discoteques and happenings and psychedelics. The dissenters want a society which truly involves the individual, involves him, body, soul and mind. They demand an education which makes the community a lab for the humanities and breaks down the barriers between the classroom and life.

And they want a religion which demands and does. The benign humanism of 19th century reform simply will not do -- and this applies to its ritual and spiritual, no less than to its ethical dimensions. After all -- mirabile dictu -- Jewish hippies perform the religious exercises of Eastern disciplines and crowd their meditation chambers. Why, then, should we be afraid, afraid to make demands, afraid to insist on standards in the synagogue and home and in the daily lives of man.

Here, too, alas, we dissemble. We make no demands. We insist on no standards. We transmit a faith which presumably asks for nothing, where every man does what is right in his own eyes: ~~the eyes of desire and not the eyes of individual conscience~~. And yet we pray, and teach our children piously to pray: O Lord, our

6.
Lord, we praise Thee for Thou has sanctified us through Thy commandments.

III.

A third factor stirring modern youth to its rebellion is the scientism of our society, leading, as it does, to its dehumanization, to the repressing of emotion, and the diminution of the individual's worth.

Young people fear this systematizing of life; they dread the mechanical ordering of people into categories, the compaction of humanity into efficient units of production and consumption. They resent the repression of human feeling and the strangulation of any sense of community, which the process of mechanization entails.

They refuse to be caught in the gears of this giant machine, and so they drop out. They leave society and huddle together for warmth, living in primitive, tribal style, choosing poverty, as it were. And they tell us, in effect, that they will not be bought. ^{S (new paragraph)} Their heroes too cannot be bought, those balladeers who give voice to their longing, and serve as their exemplars: Joan Baez and Pete Seeger and Bobby Dylan. They may want money, writes Ralph Gleason, but they do not play for money. "They are not and never have been for sale, in the sense that you can hire Sammy Davis to appear, as you can hire Dean Martin to appear, so long as you pay his price. You have not been able to do this with Seeger and Baez and Dylan, any more than Alan Ginsberg has been for sale either to Ramparts or the C.I.A."

This near-disdain for matters material is most disturbing to the adult world; after all, it runs smack dab against our fundamental assumptions. At the same time -- at least for me -- it provides the love-and-flower generation with its one endearing charm. Imagine their brass, their unmitigatedchutzpah! They invade the sanctum of our society, the New York Stock Exchange, to scatter dollar bills much like confetti. It is a gesture worthy of a Don Quixote! The leader of this fateful expedition, a young man by the name of Abbe Hoffman -- I herewith make confession -- was one of my confirmands. I shudder to think of it! How many more were really listening?

The so-called sexual revolution is an aspect of the self-same revolt against society's mechanization; it does not import the furtherance of modernization through promiscuity and the reduction of sex to a mere physical act. Every available study of the subject attests that our young people are essentially romantic, that they do not seek the separation of sex and love, and that faithfulness is an essential element of their human approach. Sex, for them, is "not so much a revolution as it is a relationship... it is a shared experience consecrated by the engagement of the whole person." (Chickering)

Now all this is pertinent to us, even though as liberals, as religious liberals, we do take a firm stand against the mechanization of life. And yet we too accelerate the process of dehumanization with our hyper-intellectualism which disdains emotion and makes light of tribal loyalty.

Daniel P. Moynihan makes this telling point in his perceptive study of the problem: "...as the life of the educated elite in America becomes more rational," he writes, "more dogged of inquiry and fearless of result, the well-springs of emotion do dry up and in particular the primal sense of community begins to fade. As much for the successful as for the failed, society becomes, in Durkheim's phrase, 'a dust of individuals.' But to the rational liberals, the tribal attachments of blood and soil appear somehow unseemly and primitive. They repress or conceal them, much as others might a particularly lurid sexual interest. It is for this reason, I would suggest, that the nation has had such difficulties accepting the persistence of ethnicity and group cohesion..."

Perhaps we are premature in reading out ethnicity as a fact of American Jewish life. Certainly, it is strange to note that the very same hippies who decline to serve in Vietnam were among the first to volunteer for Israel. True, the war in the Middle-East was just, its purposes clear, and capable of eliciting the sympathetic understanding of all youth. But it is equally true that a people's danger aroused feelings more fundamental by far; it awakened attachments of soil and of blood.

In his superb Biennial paper, giving a chapter of his forthcoming book, Emanuel Demby quotes this poignant statement made by one of our adolescents:

"We ask you what's ahead? You say war. We ask you when the war is going to end? You say you don't know...You don't know nothing. Yet you want us to listen to you. We've got nothing to listen to you for. You better start listening to us."

We listen to them, and listening find that there is altogether too much that is shoddy in our lives: moral arrogance, the widening gap between intent and deed, the self-centeredness of our human approach. The mirror-image of our lives which our youth provides gives substance to Dr. Demby's contention, that adult society and not rebellious youth is really alienated.

Be that as it may, if our understanding ^{of} ~~that~~ the protest movement is correct, our young people do manifest an uncommon thirst for spirituality, a thirst for meaning, to use that word which Jack Spiro so beautifully adorned for us yesterday. It is a thirst which Judaism can well satisfy, because it is uniquely suited to ^{the} ~~this~~ spirit of alienation which stirs our youth? ~~Judaism~~, with its insistence on human worth, its recognition of the need not just for belief but for a community of believers, with its essential pragmatism which holds the way far more important than the thought: "thou canst not see My face, but I will make all My goodness pass before thee."

Lest we become overly optimistic, we ought to know that our young people manifest one more need still: their moral and spiritual aspirations are suffused with a universalism which challenges the particularism of our belief; the options for actions within the structures of organized religion are not enough for them. This, ^{is why} they feel so attracted to the near Eastern faiths, whose exotic elements give them the aura of universalism.

Here, then, is the ~~the~~ ultimate challenge of the protesting youth: Can Judaism be the faith for the global man whose prototype they see themselves to be and likely are?

You...if we are daring...if we, as religious liberals, have the courage to do,
what Jack Bemporad challenged us to do: to experiment, to cut new paths, to take
new directions, even while we build firmly on the solid foundations of the past.

Why should we doubt our faith's capacity to renew itself? After all, our
children's vision of the future does not exceed the vision of the Prophets;
their dreams do not eclipse the dreams of Israel's past'.

We were...we are...and we shall be, ^{For} He who walked before us will be with
us; He will not forsake us. Be not dismayed.

Do you want this in time
for the Board meetings or
can it wait until after?

To Sh Chernella
for duplication
(200 copies)

Do you want this in time
for the Board meetings or
can it wait until after?

To Sh Chernick
for duplication
(200 copies)

MANUSCRIPTS

PROMPT PRAISE -
HUMILITY IS REALLY CONCEALED PRIDE
IN ANOTHER

WHAT HAS THE 'DEATH OF GOD' DONE TO RELIGION?
Public Relations Society of America
Atlanta, Ga., Nov. 17, 1970
Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

It is with a measure of awe and deep humility that I approach my tasks this morning,
for if the social scientists of our day are right,
I stand in the presence of ultimate power.

You are masters of the human mind,
masters of techniques which can direct and mold ^{it.} ~~the human mind~~.

You know ^{our} ~~your~~ needs before we speak them.

You tell us what to buy, for whom to vote, even what to believe.

You provide us with the stuff of which our promises are made -
our hopes, our dreams, our visions of the good.

We cannot even see your face

- you are the hidden persuaders -

only your goodness passes before us.

Is there any wonder that I am filled with ^{trembling} awe?

Yours are the qualities, the powers to which we once ascribed the name of God,
ascribed it until we were persuaded - guess by whom - that He is dead.

There simply is no denying it. ~~I fully agree w/ Father Hux here~~

Without the mass media, the 'death of God' debate would have been an exclusive affair,
limited to respected academicians

and that handful of cognoscenti who delight in theological fare.

After all, the divinity professors who announced the death of God some years ago,
did not really report something new.

It was, at best, the second heralding of ^{God's} demise.

Nietzsche forged this dramatic phrase ^{- the death of God -} now nearly a century ago.

As for the ^{concept} ~~idea~~ behind the phrase, there has not been a time in the last 3000 years
when the God-idea has not seemed to some to be ~~it~~ moldering, mossgrown, wholly
gone to seed. (no new Huxley)

^{poor} Nietzsche ^{he} was a fine thinker and writer. ^{indeed} What ^{obviously} he lacked was a good PR man.
~~Moses fared better. I suppose you know that old saw about his PR man,~~
~~who approached him before the crossing of the Red Sea with this promise:~~
~~"If you can pull this one off, Moses, I'll ^{get} ~~guarantee~~ ^{sell} you 3 pages in the Bible."~~

Be that as it may,

the Jewish community, concerning whose reaction I am presumably to report,
also did not take notice of the death-of-God debate until the media spoke.

To begin with, this was a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought.

Moreover, it must be noted with due regret,

that while American Jews ^{undoubtedly are voracious} ~~may be~~ good readers,

Thomas Altizer and William Hamilton ^{know what I put, well then} simply don't have the pulling power of
a Philip Roth; ^{no offense intended}

But ^{once} ~~when~~ ^{magazine} the New Yorker devoted three successive issues to this subject,
why then, American Jews too began to hear and take sides in the debate.

Their response - now that the passing of the years has given us some perspective -
was most surprising.

One might have expected wide acceptance of the new radicalism.

Polls probing the religious attitudes of American, had shown the Jews
to be the strongest of all groups in their disbelief
and weakest ^{than} in observance.

The New Theology, moreover, with its ^{decisive} ~~strong~~ thrust toward the immersion of
religion in secular society, was generally scknowledged to be a Judaizing tendency;
Judaism had made its peace with secularism long ago.

One might have expected, therefore,

that the death-of-god theology would take hold
and capture the allegiance of the Jew.

Nothing of the sort occurred.

^A~~One~~ single Jewish writer did proclaim himself an exponent of the newer view, but his arguments drew mostly censure ~~and~~ only scant support.

A single temple did determine to designate itself "an atheistic Jewish congregation," but its membership-rolls failed to burgeon, and no kindred congregations blossomed forth. Death-of-God Judaism died aborning.

It had an opposite than intended ~~and~~ effect.

American Jews discovered that there are limits to their disbelief.

Perhaps the holocaust accounts for this singular, seemingly capricious reaction.

I refer ^{now} to the extermination of 6 000 000 Jews, by Hitler and his minions.

Eugene Borowitz, ^a leading contemporary Jewish thinker, isolates this as ^{probable} the cause.

He reminds us that the concentration camp survivors did not desert the Jewish people.

There were no whole-sale defections from God ^{among them}.

If anything, they approached their Jewishness with a greater intensity than before.

Consciously or sub-consciously they ^{+ the Jewish people as whole} reasoned ~~that was the Jewish people~~

that were Jewry to die or even to decline, Hitler would have a posthumous victory.

They did not want "to give him in death what he was denied in life"

and so they continued to live as Jews, and even to build a state,

sensing in ^{too} its establishment and survival ^{the} positive presence of God."

We are not a community of true believers, ^{don't misunderstand me} not yet, by any means.

But at least the boundaries of our unbelief ^{have been} ~~are~~ drawn,

and standards for a higher quality of ^{religious} ~~Jewish~~ living ~~have been~~ set.

To put the matter graphically, ~~now~~ many Jews ^{may} still say that there is no God,

but before they do, they quickly cover their heads with ~~a~~ skull-caps -

since no pious Jew ^s will utter God's name with uncovered head!

Handwritten note:
Don't forget to mention -

The sacred still lives.

Sometimes I think that about the only place God might really have been dead is in the seminaries and in the learned tomes of theologians.

God certainly is alive and well and living in the hearts of our concerned young people.

I speak now not only of Jewish youth, but of an entire generation, especially the ^{committed} ~~protesters~~ among them.

Look beyond their unkempt hair, their extravagant dress, their outrageous manner of speech...

Look and see: their protest is essentially an affirmation of faith.

Of course they are rebels, and they rebel against religion too, but only as it is ^{narrowly} ~~is~~ mistakenly conceived.

They reject institutionalism with its swollen pride and its divisiveness.

They disdain all formalisms:

the clinging to ceremonial prayer on state occasions...

invocations at football games...

the bland recitation of ^{doctrine} ~~doctrinal truths~~ which lack all fire in the belly.

But they do not reject the concept of human worth.

They hold life sacred.

They speak of man's relationship to man and really feel it.

They insist that all cannot be chaos,

that life must ^{yield} ~~have~~ its meaning

and they persist in the quest to discover that meaning.

This, my friends is what religion, at its finest has always been about.

And when our young people focus on the specific problems of our society,
they also perceive the religious dimension,
let them call it what they will.

They enjoin us to pursue justice, not just law and order,
to remember human need in our drive for material progress,
to guard the gossamer fabric of human relationships in ~~our~~^{the} quest for technological
proficiency.

And they want an education which reaches the heart and not just the mind,
a process of learning which makes the community a lab for the humanities
and breaks down the barrier separating the classroom and life.
This too is what religion, at its finest, has always been about.

When our young people speak in such terms,
then for all practical purposes God lives with them.

The test lies not in ^{any} verbal formulation, but in the experienced relationship to
the religious demand.

When measured by such a test,
the present generation of young people is the most idealistic, the most sensitive,
yes, the most religious the world has ever known.

If my message must have its peroration, its plea, let it be this:
tell it like it really is.

Let those who brought the news of God's demise speak now of the survival of the sacred.
~~Let me speak again, let me~~
We need your help, ~~we~~ need it desperately,

for in all truth, you hold great power,
the power to speak,
the power to reach the inner ear,
the god-given power to mold man's very soul.

Use this power to serve not only profit but our ^{human} higher need,
^{Apply it} to reverse the pervasive pessimism which threatens ^{city} disaster,

to bring hope where there is despair,

beauty where there is ugliness

love where there is hate.

Be the bearer, of ^{sublimated} these tidings,
and the impossible ^{will} ~~may~~ yet be possible.

Remarks by Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler to the
Public Relations Society of America
Atlanta, Georgia, November 17, 1970

WHAT HAS THE 'DEATH OF GOD' DONE TO RELIGION?

It is with a measure of awe and deep humility that I approach my tasks this morning, for if the social scientists of our day are right, I stand in the presence of ultimate power. You are masters of the human mind, masters of techniques which can direct and mold it. You know our needs before we speak them. You tell us what to buy, for whom to vote, even what to believe. You provide us with the stuff of which our promises are made - our hopes, our dreams, our visions of the good. We cannot even see your face - you are the hidden persuaders - only your goodness passes before us. Is there any wonder that I am filled with trembling awe? Yours are the qualities, the powers to which we once ascribed the name of God, ascribed it until we were persuaded - guess by whom - that He is dead.

There simply is no denying it. Without the mass media, the "death of God" debate would have been an exclusive affair, limited to respected academicians and that handful of cognoscenti who delight in theological fare. After all, the divinity professors who announced the death of God some years ago, did not really report something new. It was, at best, the second heralding of God's demise. Nietzsche forged this dramatic phrase - the death of God - now nearly a century ago. As for the concept behind the phrase, there has not been a time in the last 3,000 years when the God-idea has not seemed to some to be moldering, mossgrown, wholly gone to seed. Poor Nietzsche, he was a fine thinker and writer indeed. What he obviously lacked was a good PR man.

Be that as it may, the Jewish community, concerning whose reaction I am presumably to report, also did not take notice of the death-of-God debate until the media spoke. To begin with, this was a debate primarily in the arena of Christian thought. Moreover, it must be noted with due regret, that while American Jews undoubtedly are voracious readers, Thomas Altizer and William Hamilton simply don't have the pulling power of a Philip Roth; but once the "New Yorker Magazine" devoted three successive issues to this subject, why then, American Jews too began to hear and take sides in the debate.

Their response - now that the passing of the years has given us some perspective - was most surprising. One might have expected wide acceptance of the new radicalism. Polls probing the religious attitudes of Americans had shown the Jews to be the strongest of all groups in their disbelief and weakest in their observance. The New Theology, moreover, with its decisive thrust toward the immersion of religion in secular society, was generally acknowledged to be a Judaizing tendency; Judaism had made its peace with secularism long ago. One might have expected, therefore, that the death-of-God theology would take hold and capture the allegiance of the Jew. Nothing of the sort occurred. A single Jewish writer did proclaim himself an exponent of the newer view, but his arguments drew mostly censure and only scant support. A single Temple did determine to designate itself "an atheistic Jewish congregation," but its membership-rolls failed to burgeon, and no kindred congregations blossomed forth. Death-of-God Judaism died aborning. It had an opposite than intended effect. American Jews discovered that there are limits to their disbelief.

Perhaps the holocaust accounts for this singular, seemingly capricious reaction. I refer now to the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews, by Hitler and his minions. A leading contemporary Jewish thinker, Eugene Borowitz, isolates this as the probable cause. He reminds us that the concentration camp survivors did not desert the Jewish people.

There were no wholesale defections from God among them. If anything, they approached their Jewishness with a greater intensity than before. Consciously or subconsciously they and the Jewish people as a whole reasoned that were Jewry to die or even to decline, Hitler would have a posthumous victory. They did not want "to give him in death what he was denied in life" and so they continued to live as Jews, and even to build a state, sensing in its establishment and survival too "the positive presence of God."

We are not a community of true believers, don't misunderstand me, not yet, by any means. But at least the boundaries of our unbelief have been drawn, and standards for a higher quality of religious living set. To put the matter graphically, many Jews may still say that there is no God, but before they do, they quickly cover their heads with skull-caps since no pious Jew will utter God's name with uncovered head! The sacred still lives. Sometimes I think that about the only place God might really have been dead is in the seminaries and in the learned tomes of theologians. God certainly is alive and well and living in the hearts of our concerned young people.

I speak now not only of Jewish youth, but of an entire generation, especially the committed among them. Look beyond their unkempt hair, their extravagant dress, their outrageous manner of speech... Look and see: their protest is essentially an affirmation of faith.

Of course they are rebels, and they rebel against religion too, but only as it is narrowly mistakenly conceived. They reject institutionalism with its swollen pride and its divisiveness. They disdain all formalisms: the clinging to ceremonial prayer on state occasions... invocations at football games... the bland recitation of doctrine which lacks all fire in the belly. But they do not reject the concept of human worth. They hold life sacred. They speak of man's relationship to man and really feel it. They insist that all cannot be chaos, that life must yield its meaning and they persist in the quest to discover that meaning. This, my friends is what religion, at its finest has always been about. And when our young people focus on the specific problems of our society, they also perceive the religious dimension, let them call it what they will. They enjoin us to pursue justice, not just law and order, to remember human need in our drive for material progress, to guard the gossamer fabric of human relationships in the quest for technological proficiency. And they want an education which reaches the heart and not just the mind, a process of learning which makes the community a lab for the humanities and breaks down the barrier separating the classroom and life. This too is what religion, at its finest, has always been about.

When our young people speak in such terms, then for all practical purposes God lives with them. The test lies not in any verbal formulation, but in the experienced relationship to the religious demand. When measured by such a test, the present generation of young people is the most idealistic, the most sensitive, yes, the most religious the world has ever known.

If my message must have its peroration, its plea, let it be this: tell it like it really is. Let those who brought the news of God's demise speak now of the survival of the sacred. We need your help, need it desperately, for in all truth, you hold great power, the power to speak, the power to reach the inner ear, the God-given power to mold man's very soul. Use this power to serve not only profit but our higher human need, apply it to reverse the pervasive pessimism which threatens only disaster, to bring hope where there is despair, beauty where there is ugliness, love where there is hate.

Be the bearers of these tidings and the impossible will yet be possible.

The attached is your
original material
which was reproduced
as per your instructions.

If you plan to re-run
this job, please send
this original with
your next order.

Thank you.
PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT

IMAGE OF A LIKELY TOMORROW

Some Thoughts Concerning the Future of the UAHC and the Synagogue

You know the purpose which brings us here -- to set those goals which will direct our activities over the next few years...and to initiate those alterations in structure which will help us meet these tasks. To introduce our discussion, I undertook to make a presentation which delineates the changing religious situation as we perceive it to be. The plural pronoun is not accidental. This is to be not a single man's projection of our over-arching need. All of you were asked to send me your views on the subject, and it is my task to synthesize these disparate statements into what will hopefully be some cohesive whole.

I am deeply grateful to those among you who responded to this request. And most of you have done so. I hope that you will recognize your ideas as they appear and disappear and reappear in the ebb and flow of my synthesis. If I misunderstood your ideas, you will have ample opportunity to give them your own expression. If I failed to mention some thoughts, it is not that I hold them in slight regard. In the weaving of a pattern some strands simply have to be cut.

In any event, let me be quick to admit that what is good is yours and what is not so good is due to the weaver and not the fault of those strands of material with which he was provided.

PROPHECY - PROBLEM AND NEED

Now two or three among you failed to respond to our request. I do not blame you. The prognosticative enterprise is complex and perilous. There are many variables which must be taken into account...forces at work at any given time in our world whose ultimate ~~affect~~ simply cannot be foreseen. No one can lay claim to an absolute knowledge of the future.

One of our rabbinic colleagues, Sanford Ragins, recently re-read for us certain predictive articles written by the leaders of the German Jewish community on the eve of the twentieth Century, in December of 1899. Their words were veritably euphoric, ecstatic. They foresaw the continuing burgeoning of German Jewish life, a flowering more beautiful and grand than that of the Golden Age of Spanish Jewry. Alas, their flowers were quickly cut down, crushed by a merciless machine, a machine fuelled by forces which were operative even while the leaders of German Jewry wrote their words of sanguine expectation.

But we don't have to go that far back in time to find evidence of events dealing perversely with prediction. Al Vorspan likes to remind us of his reaction to President Johnson's first and only State of the Union message delivered six or seven years ago. Most of you recall this message. Flushed by some recent spectacular successes in the legislature in civil rights and social security, President Johnson heralded the imminent fulfillment of the American dream -- the great day of a great society -- liberty and plenty for all. Al really believed him then. We all of us did. How quickly our dreams were broken, shattered on the rock of actuality. Look about you and see; the very fabric of our nation is torn to shreds.

Thus do events deal perversely with prediction. No one can say with assurance just what tomorrow will bring. As a Chinese proverb wryly puts it: "To prophecy is extremely difficult -- especially with respect to the future." But prophesy we must. Amos did, even though he averred that he was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. We must look ahead, though knowing that our vision is but blurred. Let there be a multiplicity of such visions if you will, many attempts to probe the future, varying images of potential tomorrows. Such imaginative projections are needed to stir and to redirect our work today if we truly mean to work for a tomorrow.

THE WORLD - A QUALIFIED FUTURE

In order to make our task not insuperable I will eliminate from our purview, and arbitrarily so, a number of imponderables of world-wide consequence whose adverse resolution would make all our predictions meaningless. Will Israel survive? Will there be a nuclear holocaust, a third world war? And what of those revolutionary currents which are sweeping the world? How will they run their course?

Don't misunderstand me; I am not suggesting that these questions are beyond our concern. After all, we are bound to Israel and to the Jewish people everywhere and we are citizens of the world. These questions do have an immediacy, but in a different context. Still, for our more immediate purposes of predicting the religious situation in American for the next five, ten, fifteen years, we will simply have to assume a future reasonably free of those surprises of world shaking consequence of which we spoke.

AMERICA - A LIKELY FUTURE

Now supposing for a moment that we will have such a surprise-free future. What can we say about the future of the American Jewish Community in the broader context of the society in which we live?

There is one prediction we can make with a certainty. The form of that future will never be final and fixed, its shape will be in constant flow, in never ceasing flux. Change is the leitmotif of the future -- relentless, ever accelerating alteration. It may well be argued, of course, that change is nothing new in history, and this is manifestly so. Nevertheless, the changes of our time have assumed proportions which make them historically unique. We actually idealize change, valuing it for its own sake, and we institutionalize it in agencies whose sole purpose is to innovate and to invent. Barely an area of our lives is untouched by fundamental alteration, from our inmost attitudes to our most public performance, and the rate of society's mutation has accelerated to such dizzying speeds that all of us are beginning to suffer a new kind of illness, a mal-de-mer brought to be by our inability to gain inner balance on these seething seas of change. It is a socio-psychological almost physical illness which Toffler correctly isolates and labels: "Future Shock."

These storms, moreover, are not likely to abate. If anything, they will gather in strength. Change will continue to sweep over us with waves of ever accelerating speed.

Now the growth of human knowledge is the critical node in that network of causes which impels all change. Consider its expanding, exploding horizons if you will: It is calculated, as a case in point, that fully ninety percent of all the scientists and engineers who ever lived in all of human history are alive today. It is adjudged that man's scientific knowledge doubled between 1948 and 1960. It is further estimated that nearly all of the degrees in the natural sciences to be granted by the world's universities this year will be obsolete, totally worthless in less than a decade, because the total sum of human knowledge is expected to double once again by 1980, if not sooner.

Human knowledge in turn provides the fuel for technological invention. Here too the accelerative thrust is dramatic. Each innovation spawns a multiplicity of other innovations whose number is enlarged still further by the rich fruitage of serendipity: supersonic planes or rockets which will take us from New York to Tel Aviv in but an hour; the ability to determine not only the number but even the sex of our children; machines and or drugs which will improve man's ability to think or which will enable him to feel, to sense, to experience whatever he wishes to experience at any given moment; extensive use of the Cyborg technique, that is to say, the free substitution of artificial devices for all disabled human organs and limbs in a kind of man-machine symbiosis. All these inventions -- and a hundred like them -- are well within the trajectory of contemporary science. They are deemed capable of perfection in ten, twenty, at most thirty years, that is to say, within the lifetime of most of us who are assembled here today.

Now all of these innovations, all of these technological advances, have their impact on society, on culture, on the way in which men live. They reshape man's personal environment, his style of being.

Biochemical advances will continue to improve man's health and lengthen his days. There will be many more older people in our communities and congregations than there are now. The life expectancy of Jews, incidentally, is higher than that of the general population. It is likely to reach eighty if not approach ninety within one generation.

Automation, computerization, cybernation will serve to give men ever increasing time for leisure. Those five, long holiday weekends which go into effect this year are but an omen of things to come. Ponder if you will what a weekly mini-vacation will do to our weekend program of religious activity, especially given the continuing recreation boom and an improving transportation system which will make the owning of second homes both practically and economically feasible.

Closed circuit television, video cassettes, and computers linked to libraries will bring their revolution to the educative process. Instruction will be more individualized, more geared to the needs and talents of the single student. Home education will be facilitated, because of these inventions. Hebrew teachers can well take heart. Herman Kahn is convinced that revolutionary techniques for rapid foreign language instruction are just around the corner -- no more than five or six years from now (can you survive that long?). Some futurists even insist that we will soon be able to transfer knowledge directly, by means of chemical or perhaps electronic impulses. I strongly suspect, though, that only twenty-first century melamdim, only twenty-first century religious school teachers will be able to shep this kind of naches.

And so we might continue with area after area of our life. Technological innovation penetrates its very corner. Impermanence stamps it all. Change is everywhere about ... an increasing mobility which threatens to turn us into modern day nomads; the availability of more and more throw-away products -- lighters for a month, pens for a week, paper garments to be worn a day then discarded; modular homes; structures which are erected only for temporary need; entire cities built and torn down and built again in never-ending process.

Even human relationships are becoming relatively less lasting. We may meet more people, but we make less friends. We establish many more relationships, but most of them are only partial, they involve only a limited aspect of our being. We have our work-a-day friends and our home friends; we have our commuter train friends and our golfing friends, and rarely do they coincide. Even the closest of human relationships are becoming more tenuous, less enduring. "Turnover" is the name of the game even here. The average man of today has more wives-per-lifetime than did his counterpart of yesterday.

We live in the Age of Aquarius -- the Time of Psychedelics, of swiftly sifting shades and shapes. Stability is gone. Permanence is gone. What remains is only the uncertain, the changing, the ever new.

To this leitmotif of ever accelerating change, I want to add two more motifs, two more themes which are likely to predominate in our immediate future: The first is the "sensate" quality of our society, which values feeling, experiencing sensing over reason. Here is a process, already so apparent in our lives, which will, if anything be deepened during the years ahead.

The second theme is that of diversity. I speak now of that diversity of life-styles to which we are witness. The prophets of doom -- the Eluls and Mumfords and Fromms -- were wrong in this respect at least: technological advance has not lead to a greater compaction of humanity in the manner in which men live. If anything, the range of choices has been enlarged. More people are doing their own thing in more and more ways. Every day, so it seems, new forms of socialization are being spawned. This matter is of some importance to

us, because it appears that Jewish youth is disproportionately represented in such social and economic innovations and experimentations.

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION

Now how does religion fare in all this? Does it have a place in the constellation of contemporary life and thought? Or has convulsive change rendered religion obsolete?

Man's NEED for faith has certainly not lessened. If anything, change has deepened it. When a man stands on shifting ground, and whirlwinds rage about, he requires this above all: bearings, direction, thrust. He stands in burning need of standards, of values sufficiently enduring to give him a sense of permanence in the midst of seething change.

Religion provides precisely such rootage, this needed sense of continuity -- not just with its ideas and ideals but with its rituals as well. They give us added anchorage, another means to orient ourselves in space and time.

Further, religion speaks more to the inner than the outer man; and man, in his essential nature has not changed as has his world. The inner man is still the same. Within that inner world, a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past. Man's joys and griefs, his passions and his dreams, these are as they were millenia ago. Job still speaks to modern man, and the kaddish has not lost its power.

Burgeoning scientific knowledge poses no challenge to the continuing validity of religion's moral mandate. Indeed, while science has taught us much concerning the nature of things it has taught us but little concerning their proper use, little concerning these ends which things should be made to serve.

Lastly, and not in the least, there is still a need for that insight which emanates from religion's mystic core, which stills man's yearning for inwardness, which enables him to experience, not just to conceptualize a sense of at-one-ness with the universe. I speak now of the numinous, a sconsciousness of the holy, kavanah leading to devekus, a sense of reverence which flames into a cleaving.

Modern man, no less than his forebear, requires such a sense of awe. Outer innovation is not sufficient for the need. The accumulations of knowledge is not enough. The human story simply cannot be told without reverence for that mystery and majesty which transcends logic and reason. Only humble men who know this truth can confront the grandeur and the terror of their lives, without being blinded by the grandeur or crushed by its terror.

Is all this a whistling in the dark, an analysis more designed to give heart than to be reflective of actuality? I do not think so, and I find supportive evidence in our youth. They are the precursors of the future. They show us what tomorrow will bring. Our youth is essentially religious -- is it not? we all agree, I think -- religious in the inner, deeper meaning of that term; their protest is a profound affirmation of faith. Of course they are rebels and they rebel against religion too, but only as it is narrowly, mistakenly conceived. They reject institutionalism with its swollen pride and its divisiveness. They disdain all formalisms, the clinging to ceremonial prayers on state occasions, invocations at football games, the bland recitation of doctrine which lacks all fire in the belly. But they do not reject the concept of human worth. They hold life sacred. They speak of man's relationship to man and really mean it. They insist that all cannot be chaos, that life must yield its meaning, and they persist in the quest to discover that meaning. This, my friends, is what religion at its finest has always been about.

And when our young people focus on the specific problems of our society, they also perceive the religious dimension, let them call it what they will. They enjoin us to pursue justice, not just law and order, to remember human need in the drive for material progress, to guard the gossamer fabric of human relationships in the quest for technological proficiency. And they want an education which reaches the heart, not just the mind, a

process of learning which makes the community a lab for the humanities and breaks down the barrier separating the classroom and life. This too is what religion, at its finest, has always been about.

Many of our young people are even drawn to religious mysticism and they submit themselves to disciplines designed to refine man's sense of inwardness. Chassidism has made its mark among them. More than a few of our sons, the products of Reform religious education, now wear yarmulkes, eat only kosher food, and say their prayers -- say them daily, mind you -- wrapped in a tallis and tefillin. The preoccupation with eastern religions also continues, on the campus and off, and many young Jews are among such seekers.

Now all this is no mere fadism, so Jacob Needleman assures us. It is not just a modishness of the moment. It is a true reaching for inwardness, a hunger to be in touch with the source of being.

Thus does contemporary disillusionment with religion reveal itself to be a religious disillusionment. The moving away from religion is, paradoxically, a moving toward it, a reaching for its enduring essence.

THE JEWISH SITUATION -- ESSENTIAL INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PROBLEMS

Now all of this does not import that we are home free, that we can sit back and relax, casually remove a few institutional trappings which drive people away from us, and all will be well. We do have some serious issues to resolve, and the first of them is the dilemma posed by the tension between the universal and the particular in Judaism.

Many modern men are religious, true. Many of our young people are religious. But their moral and spiritual aspirations are suffused with a universalism which challenges the particularism of our beliefs. They want to know not so much why they should be religious but why they should be Jewish and what they must do to live as Jews.

Such questions arise particularly in the realm of Judaism's ethical commands. The call of secular radicalism is powerful and persuasive. Our young people hear that call and understand it fully. They understand why they should be just and merciful and humble in their ways, but they do not understand why they must be Jews to be so -- not only as a matter of Pietaetsgefuehl, of loyalty to a tradition because it is a tradition, but in order to persevere for themselves and to preserve for others those values which we insist on designating characteristically Jewish.

I need not belabor the point. All of us are cognizant of the problem. In his background paper, prepared for the 1971 Biennial, Balfour Brickner articulates this tension as our overriding problem. Ours is the need, he writes, "to restore a sense of the Jewish particular to the achieved feelings of universalism to which our movement carried its constituency over the past one hundred years." I manifestly agree, preferring only the symbolic language of a Shlansky who portrayed the tension between the universal and the particular in Judaism with the image of an open door whose post always displays a mezuzzah. This is our present task in its quintessence: to affix the mezuzzah to the doors of our people even while we make certain that these doors remain open to the world.

It might be noted, marginally, that aspects of contemporary life facilitate our efforts toward this end. The call for a greater particularism as a means to self realization does not come only from committed Jews. It is heard in many places. This is what the liberation movements to a large extent are all about, are they not? -- the blacks, the young lords, homosexuals, women -- not just a demand for justice and equality, but also for the right to be what they were born to be. These movements constitute a rebellion against the myth of the melting pot, a challenge to the homogenizing effect of our consensus culture, an insistence on comprehensive, permanent particularism in the open society.

"Wie es christelt sich so juedelt es sich." Reacting to this temper of our times, many of our own people increasingly will seek precisely what we mean to give them: more explicit forms of Jewish identification. Albeit in this realm of life style too we must take heed to keep the door open, as it were, to resist those forces, both internal and external, which would stampede us into that kind of particularistic radicalization which can only lead to exclusiveness and separatism.

To affix the mezuzzah to the doorposts of our people even while we make certain that their doors remain open to the world...I was intrigued to note in this connection that our social action-iks -- with but one exception -- failed to look through that open door to give us some projection of what tomorriw is likely to bring on the wider American or world scene. Perhaps they meant to tell us by their silence that we will only have more of the same -- poverty and pollution, racial injustice and war. These and like problems undoubtedly will continue to weigh heavy upon us. Progress here is slow, if progress indeed there be. Anita Miller does not think that we are progressing. Let me read to you her plaintive touching note.

"Alex, I don't think I'm going to be of much help. I've got an occupational disease -- it's called 'knowing where things are at.' And I caught it from living with the results of the great distance backwards that we've traveled as a nation over the last one and a half years.

"Clearly, this Congress and this Administration have beaten back our most cherished dreams for a humane society; moreover, we of the liberal community are standing paralyzed and ineffective -- witnesses to the disaster. Perhaps this is because of the new Foundation Law; perhaps it's because we're busy nursing our own wounds -- economic and otherwise.

"One need only to look at programs for feeding our hungry or manpower training, or housing, or welfare (payments remain at miniscule levels and stagnate there while the cost of living sours), or unemployment, or school integration, or at our penal institutions, or the hard drug problem, or where most serious crime occurs -- in the ghetto -- or our educational or health care failures -- to see what a vast moral depression we're engulfed in.

"Add to that such things as the official reaction to the Scranton Report and a little bit of Army surveillance, and the picture winds out a little more goulishly.

"Then, too, there is the very special, unique 'tsoris' of our own people. Crime -- which to an urban population like ours -- is all too real! Israel: Soviet Jewry!

"I guess that what I'm really saying is that for our nation -- I'm deferring dreams -- until November, 1972, for our Jewish people, I feel a deep compassion and share a deep concern. Perhaps I am also saying that for the UAHC maybe it is also a time for deferring dreams, and for an added share of compassion. Perhaps, it is time for listening a little harder to our congregations -- helping them a little more with the problems they face in their own communities -- relating a little better to the needs of their members. Is it possible, Alex, that wounds and their licking can be positive in the long run -- at some future time?"

Let me add to your dolefulness, Anita, with some doleful, if marginal comments, of my own.

Doleful Comment #1: I think it will become increasingly more and not less difficult to gain Jewish support for liberal causes -- not only in reaction to the anti-Semitism which is bound to sweep a post-Vietnam America, but also because the new liberalism's espousal of egalitarian principles will run increasingly afoul of those class interests of Jews who gained their advantaged state under the old meritocratic system. I am afraid that even some of our younger idealists will become less selfless once their personal aspirations run smack dab against those walls of exclusion which the representative quota system -- born of a thoroughgoing populism -- will increasingly erect.

Doleful Comment #2: We are likely to lose some of our political clout during the decades ahead. First, there is the oft-noted waning of our relative numeric strength -- our population growth curve is simply not as bullish as that of the rest of the population. Secondly, we can anticipate, sooner or later, that the electoral college system of presidential selection will be abolished, an eventuation which can only serve to diminish, if not^{to} destroy, our key role as a political force in keystone states.

Doleful Comment #3: Our financial significance is likely to wane as well. Present occupational trends among Jews -- into the professions, into technology, into various service organizations -- will assure us continuing affluence, but not substantial wealth. A Jewish sociologist described this trend in graphic fashion: The grandfather was a scrap dealer, the father owned a steel plant, the son becomes a metallurgical engineer. Well, the son won't make anywhere near as much money as the father did, and he'll lose his father's money on the market to boot.

Still, I don't suppose we'll lick our wounds too long, Anita. We'll persist in our efforts to keep that door open. It is our mandate, after all. Besides, we have no other choice...We cannot sustain our particular concerns in sheltered, if splendid, isolation. We can sustain and transmit them only when we expose them to the winds of challenge which come from without.

Conversely, of course, the universal can be attained and expressed only through the particular. This is why the affixing of that mezuzzah which we deem our more immediate task is no betrayal of the universal ideal. Indeed, once Reform Judaism succeeds in re-rooting its moral fervor in a religious faith which is clearly understood, which its congregants can articulate in word and in deed, why then, it will surely be better able to work toward the attainment of the universal ideal than can a movement which is so lamentably adrift.

OUR TASKS

As for our specific programmatic tasks, they flow directly from our perception of the need. In this manner our all over-riding obligation is the duty to delineate a meaningful reform Jewish identity. We must decide what we believe as Reform Jews, why we believe it, and how -- beyond theory -- this belief can be transmuted into the life style of our congregations and the conduct of our congregants.

Nearly all of you are agreed that this should be our focal task, and many suggestions are offered toward its implementation. Most of us look to the scholars and theologians for guidance here, urging that we convene conventions and conferences which will give them the impetus and opportunity to articulate their ideas. Our house scholar, Jack Bemporad, alas, enjoins us to look more to ourselves; he insists that we institute an on-going program of Jewish study for the staff. DIMENSIONS is proposed as an ideal forum for this purpose: its editors are urged not just to explore conflicting ideas or to expose institutional crises, but to give guidance, to convey a greater sense of where Reform Judaism stands, how it defines itself, and what its leaders think it has to offer.

Al Vorspan imaginatively opts for a new Platform of Reform Judaism, to be adopted at the 1973 Centennial of the Union, with the actual vote to be preceded not just by a full debate at the Biennial itself and in Committee, but by open hearings in every region and synagogue of our movement.

I hope that we will have ample time to explore these suggestions and to add to them, for I am convinced that if we do nothing else during the years ahead but this: to define what the nature of authentic commitment to Reform Judaism is, we will have gone a long way toward enabling liberal Jewry to survive and even to flourish.

Closely related to this first new program emphasis is a second which, for the lack of a better name, I will call the innovative thrust. Somehow, we will have to build into our essentially conserving structure, an arm or agency whose purpose it is not to conserve what we have or to serve it, but to prepare for the unpredictable new.

On a theoretical level, there is a need of a mechanism for on-going re-definition, re-evaluation and self-correction. Al Vorspan and Jack Bemporad both suggest that we create a Center for Jewish Public Policy a la the Center for Democratic Studies, to meet this need. I always saw the Long Range Planning Committee as a first small step in this direction.

We certainly need input of every kind: demographic analyses, an investigation by gerontologists of the Reform Jewish aged; follow-up studies on Reform Jewish youth and what happens to them when they leave NFTY; studies of suburban Jewish women and what needs of theirs can be served through the synagogue and Judaism. In a word, we need an on-going process for gathering and assessing information relevant to our needs.

Our innovative efforts should grow from midrash to maaseh, beyond theory to practice. All manner of experiments should be encouraged and funded, encouraged and funded by us the establishment institution, without controls upon them, off-beat synagogues and chavuroth, and rabbis working freely in the inner city or with student radicals or with social drop-outs. I know that we don't even have the funds for what we have, but a portion of whatever we have ought to be applied toward this innovative thrust. Perhaps we can make a beginning by asking each of our regions to shelter and nourish at least one experiment along these lines.

Our Israel program needs to be enlarged, and deepened considerably, if only because it is the best vehicle for the nurturing of Jewish identity at our command. Recently we spent a full staff session determining our priorities in this realm. I hope that Dick will have the chance to report to you what we concluded.

We will have to give more thought, new thought to the needs of the aged. What should our congregations do? What programs should we undertake? Our Florida and Southern regions might well consider the establishment of special communities for the elderly.

The coming age of leisure and its attendant problems must be brought into the focus of our concerns. It will likely lead us to reaffirm some time-honored values which we have allowed to fall by the wayside under the impact of the Protestant ethic. I speak of "menuchoh" and "kedusho" as ways of dealing with both time and social significance. I speak also of what Heschel calls the "Jewish architecture of time," regular worship and regular study and regular rest which made Judaism a "religion of time" aiming at the "sanctification of time."

The Jewish Family.

Intermarriage.

The special place of women: Reform granted women equality but failed to take into account their peculiarity, their particular nature and need. If the synagogue can find a way of giving meaning to their existence, they in turn will provide a force sufficient to secure the synagogue's survival.

The problem of communications will continue to preoccupy us. You know the crucial questions here -- Jack has drilled them into us. To whom do we speak, and what do we want to say to them? Brickner and Vorspan still urge us to publish a weekly newspaper for our people and to make it good enough to become a national paper for all Jews.

Our educative efforts should be prepared to take advantage of all technological innovations in this realm -- foreign language labs, and video cassettes and closed circuit TV. More extensive use of camping as a vehicle for Jewish learning is urged by nearly everyone, not just camping for children and youth but for adults and families as well. The day school chassidim have lost none of their verve. We should set up an experimental prep school without delay. If we really pull together we can do it.

And then there is the problem of college youth. Nearly all of you feel that we haven't done enough in this realm, that we must do something -- anything -- to project a clear and attractive image on campus. Our efforts here will have to be re-thought. We certainly have the obligation to reach out to our students. Someone actually went so far as to suggest that we turn all of our staff members loose and have them travel the campus in circuit. This may not be such a bad idea at that. I am convinced of this: All members of our staff ought to be on campus and with college students for at least a brief time during each year, if not for the sake of the students then for our sake, so that we can discuss Jewish issues with those who may be our constituency just a few years hence, so that we will have the experience of facing the questions and confronting the demands which Jewish colleagues make.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

Now some of the programs which we discussed are at least on the way: Israel, camping, an advancing technology for education, principally because we have departments which work in these realms. Other tasks are in danger of falling by the wayside because they are inter-departmental concerns -- and, as an old axiom forged at the Union has it: everybody's business is nobody's business. In such a manner does structure become both program and policy.

First a word about the synagogue structure, the structure of the congregation traditionally the object of our concern, as a Union. You ought to know that in our staff there obtains a critical division of views on this subject of the future of the synagogue, one which we had better resolve. Some among us are conservatives, others are radicals, some see a continuing valid role for this institution, others insist that it has outlived its usefulness and they herald its immanent demise.

The trouble with prophecy along these lines, so Jane wisely reminds us, is that such prophecies have a way of being self-fulfilling. If you have a seminary faculty which feels and teaches that the synagogue is dead, that the rabbi has no function in the congregation, that he is but a facilitator for functions which will take place elsewhere involving different people in different places at different times, if you then have these young rabbis go out into the congregations convinced of the essential uselessness of their role with a disdain for congregants and their work; and, if you top it all off by having leaders of the synagogue movement re-echo their sentiments of doom, why then the synagogue will be dead and buried without benefit of clergy.

Let me say at once that I am not among the radicals on this subject. I see a continuing role for the synagogue. I deem it a viable institution, an indispensable institution, an institution as indispensable to our future as it was to our past. If you don't take my word, consider the supportive view of Herman Kahn and his associates. In their projection of the year 2000 the foremost minds of our country agree on this at least: that religious institutions -- the church, the synagogue -- will be needed then as they are needed now.

- ← A modification of synagogue structure is required, to be sure, and the direction of that change must be the de-emphasis of form itself: a greater flexibility, a softening of rigid structure.
- ← The synagogue building itself will have to become less big, less fixed, more modular for the mobile age.
- ← Its inner organization will have to become more pliant, more responsive to diverse human need rather than to more traditional category of being. Ellie Schwartz makes this point most forcefully when she writes that there is "too much separatism" both in labelling and in the assigning of functions in congregational life.

The barrier between the pulpit and the pew must be broken. We must de-professionalize religious life. More laymen must be brought into the decision-making process of the congregation, and not just on an administrative level but in its substantive concerns as well. The hierarchical order of temple life is obsolete. Religious leadership must function, can function only in other than top-down terms.

Those self-same principles must be applied on the national level as well, greater mobility through decentralization; greater flexibility through the modification of our Commission structure, a breaking of those lines which separate our endeavors into obsolete divisions; and a de-professionalization here too, a far great involvement of our constituency.

A word about decentralization: Some of you are quite radical in your suggested surgery here. Some of you propose that we break up the House of Living Judaism here in New York and scatter it in miniature replica all over the place. Obviously we can't and won't do that. Much of it would be wasteful duplication.

In my own mind I draw a distinction between the program and activities departments of the UAHC. The former are creative, more theoretical, if you will, evolving the ideas and the programs which give direction to our doing; the latter attempt to bridge the gap between midrash and maaseh, developing activities which translate these ideas into the fibre of our communal lives. The proliferation of the former departments would be wasteful. Why, for instance, should we develop video cassettes here and in Los Angeles? The decentralization of our activities departments obviously makes sense. But even here there is no need to staff every region alike. Few demographic studies projecting Jewish population trends are available, but I would venture to guess that within one generation ninety percent of our members will live in a handful of cities, all clustered about three or four major areas: the Northeast, the Midwest (Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis), and the West, and perhaps also Florida. These should be the major centers from which our services radiate.

Within the regions, incidentally, I see paradoxically a far greater coalescence of activity, unifying the effort of many congregations, beginning with Reform and including those of other labels as well. Institutional narcissism exacts too prohibitive a price in alienation. Those who could be most valuable to the temple are driven out of it primarily because of the divisiveness to which institutional rivalry gives evil, monstrous birth.

In any event, the likely declining strength of our congregations, as well as their inability, as well as our limited manpower resources, make this cooperation mandatory. I even foresee the time when the regional office will directly employ and pay rabbis. Rabbis could then be free to satisfy those congregational needs which are genuine, and they could be used for those activities which play to their particular strength.

I hope in this connection that we spend more thought exploring what priorities regional work should have now, before we approach some of these ideal visions.

As far as the greater flexibility of our internal organization is concerned, we have substantial agreement on the staff on this score. The Commission structure is too rigid, we all agree, too subject-centered if you will; the task force approach to major issues, marshalling both professionals and members of several departments and divisions, is recommended as allowing us that kind of flexibility which will allow us to respond to swiftly changing needs. Toffler has won his adherents. Adhocracy is the new word (Jack Spiro, Dave Hachen, thanks).

Actually, we have at times resorted to this technique. The drug problem is a case in point, our Biennial travail of planning for Biennials is another. Still, I agree, we ought to move more decisively in this direction. One word of caution is in order, and this caution comes to us from Hank Skirball. If we change too suddenly, we run the risk of leaving our patrons stranded. We still have religious schools to serve and affiliates to nurture. We simply cannot disband what we have all at once. But we certainly can make a decided move toward greater inter-departmentalization and perhaps we can begin this well-planned effort by establishing task forces for some of those new program concerns on which we have agreed to focus.

Surely I don't have to buttress the case for breaking the barrier between the pulpit and the pew even on the national level. There simply is no doubt about it: the inertia of our movement derives to a considerable extent from our over-emphasis on the role of the professional, an emphasis which denies the laity a sense of meaningful participation in our work. The blame for this over-emphasis is no longer out there, in an indifferent laity which is content to have us act as surrogate for them. The blame is largely ours. There is no doubt in my mind that if we go about this task purposefully we can find many people who are willing and able to serve us meaningfully and extend the effectiveness of our work. And no aspect of our work is excluded from this possibility. Not just administrative chores and the collection of funds are within the capacity of our congregants whose education in many areas exceeds our own.

One other marginal comment is in order: I believe it important that we establish a closer relationship and liaison with newer audiences, that is to say with audiences which heretofore were only on the periphery of our concern. We should make a special effort to meet younger rabbis and to involve them in our thinking and our work, and we should establish a closer liaison with the Hebrew Union College.

In this connection, it might be well to reconsider the counsel which Marvin Braiterman offered to us some years ago and which he reintroduces now: that we make an end-run around the synagogue, and talk also to people who are outside its structure.

* * * * *

Let me conclude as I began with the expression of my earnest conviction, that the real future of our movement lies in the personality of its leadership. I speak of all of us who are assembled here today. What we do, more important what we are, will make the ultimate difference. If we despair, despair will be the harvest. If we stand by our tasks, resolutely pledged to pursue them, the impossible will yet be possible.

MARRIAGE OF GAYLE ISELIN AND HILTON SLUNG

TEMPLE BETH EMETH, ALBANY NEW YORK

August 25, 1973

Remarks to the Bride and Groom

by

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

Gayle, Hilton, we welcome you to the House of God, as you prepare to speak those words and perform those rites which will bind you one to another as husband and as wife. You are here to demonstrate your faith in one another and in the future. You are here to proclaim to us and to all the world that you are in love.

You are not alone. You are surrounded by your family and friends, all those who know you well and hold you dear; we, your rabbis, count ourselves in this closer circle of affection.

We, too, are here for a purpose -- not just to share your simcha, but to let you know that what you do is exceedingly important to us all. For you see, a marriage is not just an act involving two people; it is a social contract which involves many, certainly those who stand near, and even those who stand far. Everything you do will affect us both for good and for evil. Your joy will be our joy, your sadness our sorrow. What you do or fail to do, the stand you take or refuse to take, will make it either easier or more difficult for all of us to take heart, to make the right choices, to deepen conviction.

Much of what I want to say to you as rabbi is contained in those lines which are inscribed on your beautiful marriage certificate:

LO ISH BELO ISHO...

There is no man without a woman, no woman without a man...

VELO SHENEHEM BLI SHECHINA...

And neither can be without God.

The first two lines of this tristich will give you little difficulty: no man without woman, no woman without man. You know that this is so, that it is good to find a mate, good to see an answering look in the eyes of another, good to select from the human welter that one person who can soothe the terrible loneliness of the soul.

The last line of the Rabbinic passage will give you greater difficulty, for it seems to clash with the temper of the times: neither man nor woman can be without God. And yet, what the rabbis assert here is a truth which still has force. What they say, in effect, is that a marriage is something more than just a physical and material arrangement, more than a matter of convenience and pleasure for the outer man. It demands the inner man as well. It is the spirit that makes a marriage, not just two bodies -- not anymore, I suppose, than a doctor is a doctor by virtue of his skills alone. To be something more he has to offer more than just the skill of his hands. To become a great doctor he must offer his heart and draw on his imagination. And the heart and the imagination are gifts of the spirit and not just products of matter. Even so it is with a marriage. At its finest, it involves not just the outer but the inner life; at its noblest, it is given strength and sanctity through the offering of those qualities to which we ascribe the name "divine."

These qualities are known to you. You have seen them shown in the lives of those who serve as your exemplars, and your parents are foremost among them.

Truth is such a quality on which a marriage must rest. Non-truth erects a barrier which separates.

Respect is another quality essential to the continuity of your union. A marriage does not succeed if one partner dominates the other, or if one allows himself to be possessed by the other. A man and his wife should move through life very much like two melodies, each with distinctive lines, which rise and fall and blend with one another to form the harmony of wondrous music.

Love certainly is essential to a marriage, but love at its fullest flowering is something more than just a feeling; it becomes a doing for the object of your care. That is why this moment of your marriage is not the culmination of your love, but only the beginning and only a possibility for finding love, that love which turns from feeling to doing, that love which rises from sentiment to sacrifice. This is the kind of love which never sinks into nothingness; if anything, it increases in loveliness to shine forever more.

Bring each other these gifts of the spirit and your marriage will succeed. Our dreams will be fulfilled and your dreams too. Then the time will come when many years hence you will look back upon this day and speak words descriptive of actuality which you now offer only as a fervent hope:

VE-ERASTICH LI LE-OLOM.

Yea, I have betrothed ~~the~~ thee unto me, forever.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Board of Trustees Meeting

October 14, 1974 • New York, N.Y.
UAHC HOUSE OF LIVING JUDAISM

Presidential Message

IT IS GOOD TO BE HERE, MY FRIENDS, GOOD to be reunited with the leaders of Reform Jewry, with men and women from many congregations and communities but of one faith, bound together by a common sacred cause. Your presence here gives us much strength as does your work throughout the year. We are what we are because of you, a product of those rich gifts of heart and mind you bring to our work.

It is a full year now nearly since I stood before you last—illness, as you will recall, prevented my being with you in the spring. This was a year not unmingled in its blessing; it brought us more than the usual measure of tragedy touching too close to life's essential loveliness.

It was a year which saw the death of our leaders, Maurice and Harry, of blessed memory. We miss them still; death has set no end to our remembrance. Nor was the good they did interred with their bones. Their legacy lives on to bless the lives of others.

Our chairman's place has been taken by one who is entirely worthy to succeed him. I cannot begin to tell

you how happy I am with the choice in which I joined to select Matthew Ross as our foremost leader. His effectiveness has exceeded even our highest expectations; he is able, wise, and articulate; unsparing in his efforts to advance our common good. It is amazing to see how quickly he has mastered the intricacies of our work. This is most evident when I listen to him, as I have several times now, speak to congregations and their leadership about the Union. When I hear his answers, lucid and forceful in articulating our doing and our needs, I *shep great naches* . . . as will you, when he will come to your communities.

Thus do our joys and sorrows intertwine. Our losses grow from our gifts, whatever is given is taken. And our hopes grow out of our very losses, for whatever is taken is, in some form, given back. Blessed be God's name!

* * *

No, this was not a year unmingled in its joy. Indeed, I cannot remember a year in recent memory which has been more convulsive and depressing.

Think for a moment, if you will, of what has happened during the year just passed to this land in which we live, this land which we hold dear. America has been brought low, has it not? An administration disintegrated before our very eyes. Our relative material strength has suffered a precipitous decline. Precious freedom was eroded and the highest trust betrayed. And our once proud image as the moral leader of the world has been befouled.

We of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations can take some measure of satisfaction in the knowledge

that we did *not* remain silent, that we spoke the truth as we saw it, steadfastly refusing either to appease our enemies or to please our friends. We were right with Watergate as we were right with Vietnam, not that there is any satisfaction in such a rightness.

Hopefully the future will continue to find us in the vanguard of those who refuse to give up on America, who continue to maintain their faith in this land, who will insist that our present leaders will confront forthrightly those many causes of our tragedy—rival intelligence agencies, uncontrolled bureaucracies, reelection politics, inflated campaign spending, all these and other unresolved problems which drove our presidency to its fearsome excesses.

In this context, we of this Board of Trustees feel compelled to express our dismay that one of our colleagues, a life trustee, our long-time supporter of the spirit, Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, was a victim of what can only be described as a despicable election tactic, another dirty trick of political cynicism. We send Justice Goldberg our warmest wishes. He needs no defense from us or anybody else. America needs defense, once and for all, against this climate of malice and chicanery which we have too long dismissed as "politics as usual" but which is really, at bottom, an assault on our liberties and our integrity.

* * *

Nor has the year just passed been a good year for Israel, that land of our dreams. Contrast, if you will, how we feel today, as we begin our first Board mission to Israel,

with how we felt about Israel when we planned this function a little over a year ago.

Our joy was undiluted then. We had drunk from the cup of victory and it was heady stuff. We were secure, then, we were so sure. We dared the future and all that it might bring. Today, alas, our joy is not abounding. We have seen the tragedy of Israel touching too close to her loveliness. Our tears are tears of sorrow and not of joy, and our confidence has been supplanted by foreboding.

Our complacency was shattered by reality. Most Jews were so certain a year ago that Israel could survive by the strength of her arms alone, but the War of the Sons taught us a different lesson. The Arabs were united. They fought as they never fought before. They inflicted serious harm on Israel. And since Israel cannot take diplomatic advantage of further military victories—after all, what will it do with a Damascus, or even a Cairo—a bitter reality will not away: a series of such wars will seal Israel's doom.

Yes, we were so certain a year ago that Israel had achieved full self-reliance. But again the Yom Kippur War taught us a different lesson. The blood and the bodies of Israel's sons averted disaster—but only for some few days. Thereafter, blood, however freely, nobly given, was not enough, and more was needed, more by far than even the resources of world Jewry could command. And how much bleeding can we ask and suffer?

There is a paradox here which may well be deepening our dismay. The State was created to enable Jews to be

the masters of their destiny. They are that, at long last, in their land and in magnificent fulfillment of the Zionist dream. But now the State as a whole must pursue that self-same subtlety of approach and careful accommodation to others which enabled individual Jews to survive these many centuries.

Be that as it may, and whatever the reason, the anniversary of the Yom Kippur War finds the Israelis sad and insecure. This is the report which we receive from our staff members in Israel and from those who spent the summer there: There is almost a spirit of *Goetter-daemmerung* prevailing, many are preparing to leave the land, "every man for himself," others spend their life savings on a final fling—"live today for tomorrow you die!"

Again we record, without any satisfaction whatsoever, that there were in the leadership ranks of Reform Jewry those who forewarned that Israel could *not* survive by the strength of her arms alone, that she must come to terms with her neighbors as best and as soon as she can. If we have a regret, it is that we did not give voice to such views with sufficient force, that we too were captured and enraptured by the euphoria which prevailed, and that we told our brothers in Israel *not* the truth as we saw it but rather what we thought would please them to hear.

As we begin our journey to Israel, we become the bearers of different and desperately needed tidings—That even as our swaggering self-assurance of yesteryear

proved but a snare and a delusion, so is Israel's present foreboding, in its deepest gloom, not warranted by fact.

We are not so isolated as we think or even say we are. Of course, we have our enemies. There always were and will be Hamans like Amin and harlots like France, but their number does *not* make up the sum of our world. There are other individuals and other nations, too, who care deeply for Israel, who will not suffer her destruction, even as these individuals and nations do not always do what we want them to do and do not always say what pleases us to hear.

We Americans can certainly attest to the fact that there remains an enormous reservoir of good will for Israel in our land. There has been no substantial erosion of that good will, even in the face of the oil embargo and serious economic dislocation.

Last Monday I was at the State Department, once again, to be briefed by our Secretary of State just before his departure for the Middle East. He is still hopeful concerning the possibilities for peace in that troubled area. Of course, he recognized the many dangers which lie in the path: The Arabs may be posturing to curry United States favor, the Russians may yet succeed in scuttling the talks, the Palestinians are far from impotent as would-be wreckers of the peace. Indeed, this very day, the United Nations is preparing to invite Arafat, leader of the PLO, to speak from the UN General Assembly rostrum, thus placing an ignoble and immoral stamp of approval on terrorism and murder as political weapons. But, with all that, at least the governments directly

concerned, certainly Israel and Egypt, have acted in some small measure to nurture that mutual confidence which is the precondition of peace.

This at any rate is the perspective which we will bring, as we journey to Israel. And this is why we will continue as a Union to pursue our work in Israel with firm faith in her ultimate endurance and out of a knowledge that "Israel's life depends upon our presence." Alone she is silent. When we are there she is a proclamation. Alone she is a widow. When we are there she is a bride.

* * *

No, this has not been a good year, not for America, not for Israel, and, for that matter, not for the American Jewish community. We too have suffered a decline, of both political and economic strength. The root cause of both these ills is the same—the emergence of the oil cartel as a powerful economic force and the determination of the Arabs to mix their politics and oil. It is not in our interest to have such a mixing, and we do well to keep these issues apart and to help the American people understand that the problem of oil would be with us even if there were no Israel.

It is a problem of the most serious proportions. Secretary of State Kissinger has gone so far as to warn us that, unless the oil consuming nations act in concert, Western democracy as we know it will crumble, to be replaced by a dictatorship of the right or of the left, most likely the latter.

Call it doomsday language, dismiss it as saber rattling, label it an effort to create an atmosphere conducive to

gunboat diplomacy, this much is certain, however, when the Arab nations will, within the year, be in a position to buy effective control of a General Motors once every month, we face a traumatic diminution of our economic and political sway.

I am not at all persuaded, despite the signs, that the end is necessarily doom. Once properly prodded, the Western industrial nations *will* be able to convert from a dependence on the limited and disappearing supply of oil to other energy resources and technologies. Once properly prodded, they *will* be able to muster that unity which is the sine qua non of their survival.

Nonetheless, the near-term future is not bright, however rosy those lenses through which one views it. Effective countermeasures must be taken against that economic uncertainty which lies ahead. We as a Union must prepare for it and we must help our congregations prepare for it. This is why I have instructed the staff of the Union to make the strengthening of the synagogue the present priority of its concerns. Two task forces have been established by us: one to deal with the problems of synagogue management and the other to develop a nationwide program of membership retention and recruitment.

Later on this morning you will hear concerning Project Outreach, an imaginative program for the involvement of unaffiliated Jews in urban areas, which has been developed and tested by our West Coast director, Rabbi Herman. A number of resolutions will also be introduced which will authorize us to proceed as we

earnestly hope. It is our determination to involve in this work every Union staff member, every department and council of our Union, and hopefully also many members of this Board so that our religious community will be able effectively to withstand the double threat of world inflation and world depression.

Marginally, it must be noted in this connection that the UAHC is probably the only national Jewish agency which has not suffered a decline in its income during the year just past. This is a tribute to our work, I venture to boast. Congregations are not compelled to join or to remain in the Union, and yet they do because they see what we do and they like what they see. It is a tribute also to those who conceived the MUM plan and to those, professionals and laymen alike, who provide this plan with such effective stewardship.

Don't breathe easy, not just yet. We *will* ask you for more material support! Our growth in income did not begin to keep the pace of rampant inflation, and at times we think that we are on a treadmill. The more we advance, the more we go back. Our comfort is only a *relative* comfort.

Let me emphasize also that while austerity is needed, both for the congregations and for the central institutions of Reform Judaism, it is not the only or even the best answer to the crisis. A reordering of the Jewish community's priorities is necessary. Our congregants must be persuaded to assign the synagogue a higher place in the order of their giving. And we have the right to demand and obtain community funds for our

community-wide programs, especially in the realm of formal and informal education.

There is something wrong with our giving. I refer now not just to the Union and the College but to our constituent congregations as well, for they, too, encounter too great a problem. They all suffer from too great a tightening of the economic belt.

Israel receives an ever-increasing share of our community's financial wealth as it properly should—the saving of life must remain our first concern. Local secular communal agencies, because their income is tied through local federations on a percentage basis to the total raised for Israel, are reasonably secured. But the synagogue and the school and their supportive institutions are left in limbo, turning and twisting slowly in the wind.

How short-sighted a scale of priorities this is, especially when seen from the perspective of Jewish history! For Jewish history has demonstrated, over and again, that it is the synagogue which sustains Jewish life, that it is the synagogue which is the magic ingredient of our people's wondrous endurance.

All the more so do these institutions merit our support now because we feel the emergence of a *Zeitgeist*, a spirit of the age, which is infinitely more congenial to those ideas and ideals which the synagogue enshrines. That secular world which was our antagonist is getting a mite less secular itself, at least its fundamental assumptions no longer are affirmed with such swaggering

assurance and the stirrings of a counterspirit can be perceived. Do not underestimate the scope or the potential of this counterspirit. It is expressed in many ways and in many places, and the cement which binds this counterculture in all of its disparate expressions is essentially a religious affirmation: The future of mankind cannot be entrusted wholly to the mindscape of scientific rationality; as the spirit within us withers, so does everything we build about us; when all is said and done, the fate of the soul is the fate of the universe.

Aye, there is something new in the world today and we all can feel it. The very air we breathe is tense, a wind blows through space and the treetops are astir. Men and women are restless, but not with the restlessness of those who have lost their way in the world and have surrendered to despair, but rather with the hopeful searching of those who want to find a way and are determined to reach it. It is a searching after newer and truer values, for deeper personal meaning. It is a purposeful adventure of the spirit. These men and women are in the grips of a great hunger which, like all "great hungers, feeds on itself, growing on what it gets, growing still more on what it fails to get."

The prophet Amos spoke of such a hunger when he said:

*Behold the day cometh saith the Lord God
that I will send a famine in the land
not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water
but of hearing the words of the Lord.*

Can you find a more vivid description of the very body and spirit of our age? Can you paint a more vivid portrait of the Great Hunger which has seized us? Aye, this is a time for the building of congregations, for the strengthening of the core! Never before, certainly not in our time, has there been a greater need for those ideas and ideals which the synagogue enshrines and which alone give substance to our striving.

This is not a time to despair, this is rather a time to hope; this is not a time for the wringing of hands, but it is rather a time to build and to uphold! Let this be the essence of my message this day: Be strong and of good courage! Take heart! Do not allow an embittered time to turn you to more bitterness. Do not tarry in the valley of weeping but turn it into a place of many springs.

This applies also to our more personal losses . . . Maurice Eisendrath, Harry Gutmann . . . two men healthy and strong one day, then crumbling like a house of sand built by children 'long the shore when the waves of destiny roll in.

This, then, is what Judaism ultimately asks of us: In the midst of life's losses we must think of life's gifts, in the midst of life's sorrows we must remember life's joys, in the midst of life's despair we must cling to life's undying hope. Nor are these losses apart from these gifts, these joys from these sorrows, these griefs from these hopes. Our losses grow from our gifts—whatever is given is taken. Again our hopes grow out of our very losses—whatever is taken is, in some form, given back again.

Our sorrows are but joys softened into the tenderness of aching recollection and our tears . . . our "tears are naught else than our remembered smiles."

But if our tears are nothing more than remembered smiles, we must allow the soft remembrance of the smiles of our better days to glisten even through our tears. Let our grief never be so black but that there shine through it the light of hope. And let this hope not be the "last refuge of the disconsolate" but rather a strong life-giving force, seeking to enhance human existence in all of its manifestations!

This then is the message of our faith: Life flows on. Tarry not weeping among the ruins of your past, lest like Lot's wife you turn into a pillar of salt. "Onward" is written on Israel's banner. Leave the hidden things to God . . . Yours is the task and the life that lies ahead!

1973

from all of you surrounds me at this time; the achievements of a hundred years of Jewish life are the foundations upon which we build, aware that the millennia of Jewish life move through us into the future. The martyrs of our time are also present in the solemnity of this moment. They lived for us, and we live for them.

Let each one bring his special memories into the holy silence of this moment. My own memory brings me into my father's house, to his teaching, to his song. He taught me Torah. He taught me exile. And he taught me hope. May I transmit his teachings in my actions in the years to come.

נצח-ליד

(געזאנג פון דער צעירי-אגודת-ישראל)

Brother, *chaver*,
Do not tire!
Your *netzach* song
Gives joy and fire.

ברודער, חבר,
ווער ניט מיד!
פריילעך זינג
דיין נצח-ליד!

With the Torah
In your hand,
Brother, go
From land to land.

מיט דער תורה
אין דער האַנט,
ברודער גיי
פון לאַנד צו לאַנד.

Have no fear
Of fire, sword.
Have no fear
Of foreign port.

שרעק זיך ניט
פאַר פייער שווערט.
שרעק זיך ניט,
פאַר פרעמדער ערד!

With *emunah*,
Walk your ways
Till it comes:
The Day of Days.

מיט אמונה,
גיי דיין וועג.
ביז צום טאָג
פון אַלע טעג!

(congregation is seated)

Announcements

Eliezer Schindler

Netzach Lied

J. Weiser
2vr. S. Adler

mf

Bru-der Cha-ver, Ver nit mid!

mf *4* *3* *4* *mp* *p.*

Fröylich zing Dein Netzach Lied! Mit der Toi-rah In der- Hand

p. *p.*

Bruder gay fun Landtsu Land. Shrecklich nit For fel-er Schwert

Shrecklich nit For fremden Erd! Mit E-mu-na Gay dine Weg

Bis tsum Tog Fun 21-len Tog! Bruder Cha-ver, Ver nit mid!

Fri-lich zing dine Netzach Lied!

1974 Draft CCH

ISRAEL AND THE DIASPORA: OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER

It is good to be here; good to be with colleagues from whose companionship we always draw much strength.

It is good above all to be in Jerusalem, the city of our dreams; to feel that inner force which emanates from here, to breathe that air which is the life of our very soul. Jerusalem, whose space is filled with the voices of the past, whose stones are the frozen echoes of eternity — this city, "where waiting for God was born," where the "anticipation of everlasting peace" came into being. Jerusalem of hope, the "prologue of redemption," the place for the ever new beginning.

I approach my task this morning, let me confess, not knowing precisely what my proper function is. My first directive from the program committee enjoined me to respond to those two most impressive presentations which we heard last night.

But when the papers failed to arrive in time to allow me that thoughtful consideration which the speakers and this audience merit, Arthur Lelyveld quickly assured me that while he wants this "session as a whole to be a response" to last night, my introductory address need not, in and of itself, be such a response. "In any event," he added enigmatically, "I want yours to be a spiritual response" whatever that means.

By way of further effort to be of help to me, Arthur recalled an evening at our 1941 convention when "one by one the members of the Conference rose to state their position on pacifism, militarism, and the war. That was a wholly spontaneous session (Arthur said); it was off-the-record and deeply moving, and that's what I want you to do." How to prepare for that which is to be spontaneous is a puzzlement. Moreover, I was not even at that '41 Conference. I was busy at the time, preparing for my *Bar Mitzvah*, which was scheduled for the fall of that year.

I take it, though, that Arthur does not want the more traditional dissident's critique, a well-ordered response to last night. He wants us, rather to enter into a kind of collective *chesbon-hanefesh* more personal than institutional in its nature, not provocative in thought as much as it is to be evocative in both thought and feeling. True to this mandate, as I perceive it, I will offer merely some reflections, some currents of my thoughts on our theme. My words will be words which come from the heart, and in the hope that they will touch the heart.

Now I want to organize these reflections within the framework provided by this session's sub-theme: "Israel And The Diaspora — Our Responsibilities." And the first responsibility of which I want to speak is our obligation, our opportunity to bring to Israel a perspective born of distance, to counteract a tendency to which we are too often subject: the tendency to swing from hope to despair, from complacency to paranoia, both to the extreme and with reckless abandon.

Contrast, if you will, how we feel today with how we felt when last we met here in 1970. Our joy was undiluted then. We drank from the cup of victory, and it was heady stuff. We were secure, then; we were so sure. We dared the future and all that it might bring. Today, our joy is not abounding. We see the tragedy of Israel touching too close to its loveliness. Our tears are tears of sorrow, not of joy. And our confidence has been supplanted by foreboding.

Our complacency was shattered by reality. We were so certain then that Israel would endure by the strength of her arms alone. But the War of the Sons taught us a different lesson. The Arabs were united. They fought as they had never fought before. They inflicted serious harm on Israel. And since Israel cannot take advantage of further military victories, a bitter reality will not away: a series of such wars would seal Israel's doom.

We were certain, four years ago, that this nation had achieved full self-reliance. But again, the present war taught us another lesson. The blood and the bodies of Israel's sons averted disaster — but only for some few days. Thereafter blood, however freely nobly given, did not suffice and more was needed, more by far than the resources of even world Jewry could provide. And how much bleeding can we ask and suffer?

There is a paradox here which may well be deepening our dismay. The state was created to enable Jews to become the masters of their destiny. They are that, at long last, in their own land, and in magnificent fulfillment of the Zionist dream. But now the state as a whole must pursue that self-same subtlety in approach and careful accommodation to others which enabled individual Jews to survive these many centuries.

Be that as it may, even as our swaggering assurance proved a snare and a delusion, so is our foreboding in its deepest gloom not warranted by fact.

We are not so isolated as we think or say we are. Of course we have our enemies. There always were and always will be Hamans like Amin and harlots like France, but their number does not make the sum of this world. There are other individuals and other nations who deeply care for Israel, who will not suffer her destruction — even if at times these nations and these individuals disagree with what we do; even if they do not always say what pleases us to hear.

We Americans can certainly attest that there remains an enormous reservoir of good will for Israel in our land. There has been no substantial erosion of that good will even in face of the oil embargo and serious economic dislocation. Our gloom, then, is not justified by the facts of the present, nor is it justified by our past. Jewish history, after all, was never a blind alley. Somehow our people always found the way from night to light. This, at any rate, is the perspective which we seek and ought to bring.

We have a second responsibility — we of the diaspora and of Israel, too: to speak the truth to one another as we see it. When we see intransigence, let us call it that. When we see that values are devalued, let us say so. When we see pride swell into arrogance, let us say that the fever

of an overweening pride is consuming us. Let us not call it by any other name. Let us not tell our brothers simply what we think they want to hear. We owe them much more. We owe them the truth.

Dissent should never be equated with disloyalty. Yet there are pressures on the American Jewish scene which would seem to make it so. These pressures come not from without as much as they come from within. They are applied with most vigorous force not by the Israelis but by the self-appointed minions with American passports — minor functionaries strutting about as the guardians of the state's security. And the further from the center of power they are, the more inquisitorial they become.

Isn't it always so? *Shamossim* plague us ever more than *gabo-im*. Clerks invariably are more officious than presidents. Must I indulge in annexationist fantasies to prove that I am a passionate Jew? Must I applaud this government's every act to demonstrate my love for Israel? Is this love diminished in the slightest when I decry this government's manifest incapacity to cope with that yawning social gap which tears this society's fabric? Why should I not be able to say what Israelis themselves are free to say in their land; you heard Eliav! Here in Israel, not so marginally noted, the leftist position has become the centrist position. But in America, the leftist position is still deemed heresy.

Who knows, we might well have spared each other much anguish had we spoken to one another more honestly and freely. Delusion swells when it is re-mirrored. In any event, we are one people. And as one people, and in order to remain one people, we owe one another an open heart and mind.

This too is our responsibility: to build Jewishly strong communities wherever we live; to nurture the inner life of our people; to sink our roots deep into the soil of *Torah*, a soil more enduring than the soil of any continent. In the final analysis, the struggle for the survival of our people is fought not only along the frontiers of Israel, but in every Jewish school and in every house of prayer in our world.

Now, we inflict irreparable harm on ourselves and on Israel too when we make Israel a surrogate synagogue — when we allow, as we do, our Jewishness to consist almost entirely of a vicarious participation in the life of this state. There is a greater Israel, which sustained our Judaism through the many years of our dispersion. It is not isomorphic with the political state. And it is this greater Israel which we must nurture, to survive.

I cannot agree with those who insist that the conceptualization of Israel's centrality enfeebles us in this respect. The incontrovertible fact of our all-embracing unity as a people deprives such words as "primacy" and "centrality" of all substantial meaning. *Sheilat hagalut* finds little acceptance as a viable theory of modern Jewish life. Certainly no responsible Israeli leader conceives the concept of centrality of negating the dispersion.

It is rather we who have sinned. It is we, the leaders of American Jewry, who have allowed the political state to become that "kidney ma-

chine" of which Dave Polish spoke, either because we ourselves have abandoned the hope for a vigorous and creative Jewish life in America or simply because we find it less difficult to focus on Israel in our thinking and our doing rather than to come to grips with those critical issues of faith which confront us as a religious community.

Yet if we fail to come to grips with these issues, we shall fail also in the task of building Reform Judaism in this land. Then we shall be morally and religiously bankrupt wherever our people and our synagogues are.

We have a concomitant obligation in this regard: to seek and to secure the well-being of those larger communities in which we live. We cannot turn away from this larger world. We would be less than true to our ideal were we to do so. The love for the Jewish people and the love for humankind are inextricably intertwined. One makes no sense at all without the other.

As Americans we *must* confront that moral and constitutional crisis which threatens to destroy the democratic fabric of our land. We cannot turn away from that crisis. We cannot stand idly on the sidelines of this struggle. Our profoundest convictions are at stake, and so, for that matter, is our security as a particular community. Israel cannot survive without a strong American Jewish community. And American Jewry will be strong only in a land which is truly free.

One more duty summons us, as leaders of the diaspora community: We must come here to this land and to this city. We must come here for our sake, because the exposure to Israel serves to sensitize us Jewishly, because without such a linkage we stand the risk of becoming a thing-apart from the body Jewish, a kind of party or even a sect rather than a movement within Judaism.

We must come here also for Israel's sake, to help the state to deepen its Jewish being, to move it more closer to that ideal for which it was established, to root it even more fully in that reality which undergirds all Jewish communities and, indeed, the state itself — *am Yisrael*, the Jewish people — a reality which transcends them all.

Jerusalem, so Heschel wrote, is not divine. "Her life depends on our presence." Alone she is silent, when we are here she is a proclamation. Alone she is a widow, when we are here "she is a bride."

And so we shall come here, and we shall bring our children here. Some will be here for a time, and some for always. Here we shall build our synagogues and schools and camps. The very center of our movement will be established here. And on the easternmost site of that center there will be a synagogue. And the eastern wall of that synagogue will be made of glass, even the wall of the ark against which our *Torah* scrolls will be framed. And through that glass we shall see the walls of our holy city, and the Tower of David, and the mount where waiting for God was born.

Then Jerusalem will live. And we will live. All Israel will live.

Ken Yehi Rotzon.

Robert F. Katz 1874

It is a privilege which I greatly appreciate, to stand before you in this magnificent hall - this most beautiful jewel in the crown of Israel. It is good to be here -- is it not -- in Jerusalem, the city of our dreams, whose space is filled with the voices of the past, whose stones are the frozen echoes of eternity. Jerusalem, where waiting for God was born, where the expectation for ever-lasting peace came into being.

It is an honor to present our speaker, but he needs no introduction. Allow me, therefore, to present you to him.

We are the leaders of American Reform Judaism - men and women from many communities, but of one faith, bound together by a mutual sacred cause. We represent over seven hundred congregations and some one million souls. Together with our Conservative co-religionists, we speak for the predominant plurality of diaspora Jewry.

We are here to seek our brothers, to demonstrate our solidarity with Israel. In all truth, your pain is our pain, your victory our gladness. We are an inseparable, inextricable part of that reality of which both the State and the diaspora communities are but modes of manifestation -- Am Yisrael, this people Israel, that reality which transcends them all.

We are here to tell you that you are not alone. I speak now not just of fellow Jews, but of others, too -- individuals and nations who deeply care for Israel, who will not suffer her destruction. We American Jews can certainly attest to the fact that there remains an enormous reservoir of good will for Israel in our land and that there has been no substantial erosion of that good will even in the face of the oil embargo and serious economic dislocation. Only yesterday, the Jackson Amendment was resolved, an historic undertaking, demanded by the American people and their representatives in Congress.

Take heart then and be of good courage! Jewish history was never a blind alley. Some how, we always found the way from dark night to light.

We are here as Reform Jews to extend our stake in Israel, to see how far we have come and where we must go. During these days of our presence here, we visited our schools and camps. We spoke to our rabbis and their congregants. Proudly we listened to those of our young people, the very flowering of our youth, who have formed a "nachal-gareen," determined to build a Reform Jewish kibbutz in the Aravah. We know full well that Israel depends upon our presence. And so we will continue to come here and bring our children here, some will come for a time and some for always.

Here we will build more and more congregations, and more academies and camps, and kibbutzim. The World Center for our movement will be erected here -- on the land so generously provided by this government -- and on the easternmost part of that Center there will be a synagogue, and the easternmost wall of the synagogue will be made of glass, yea, even the wall of the ark against which the Torah scrolls will be framed. And through that glass we will see the walls of our ancient city, and the Tower of David, and the mount where waiting for God was born. And all Israel will live, and we will live - ken yehi ratzon.

But even as we prepare to participate fully in the life of this land, so do we expect to receive the full privileges which go with that participation. We have earned that privilege - by the sweat of our brows, and by the blood of our sons and brothers.

Lemashal - as a case in point, our invocation was delivered by Moshe Weiler, Rabbi Moses Weiler, a Reform rabbi. He was trained and ordained by our seminary, the College-Institute. He moved to South Africa where he built a Reform Jewish community, which flourished and ultimately also played a vital role in the upbuilding of Zion.

Then he became an oleh and made his greatest sacrifice. His first born son, Adam, was killed in Sinai seven years ago...his second son, Gideon, gave his life in a tank on Golan's heights a year ago. Yet Moshe is not allowed to function as a rabbi in the fullest sense of the word. He cannot marry and bury or teach and accept gereem...and the synagogue to which he belongs does not receive the support which this government, through the Ministry of Religious Affairs, extends to Orthodox synagogues or even to churches, for that matter.

We reject, most utterly reject this conception of our status in the land. We will not be read out of the Jewish people. We refuse to be beggars at Jerusalem's gates. We will fight for our rights as full citizens, with the courage of our convictions, with the boldness of truth. At the same time, we will not slacken, even for a moment, in our fight for a secure and tranquil Israel in a peaceful world, recognizing Israel's fate is our fate.

This is what we are, Mr. Prime Minister, Ohavei Yisroel, and this is what we mean to be and to do.

As for you, we know you well. First your name became known to us as a legendary figure, a modern hero of our people, the brilliant architect of Israel's successful defense.

Then we came to know you as a friend, when you came to our shores and fended well that cause of Israel in the highest councils of our land.

And now we have come to respect you as a leader of the nation, a statesman who has the courage, the guts, to take those risks which are the indispensable requisites for peace.

My friends, I present to you the Prime Minister of Israel - K'vod rosh hamemshala - Yitzchak Rabin.

UAHC Board Mission
K'nesset
Jerusalem, Israel

October 20, 1974

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler ..

1074
f

It is a privilege which I greatly appreciate, to stand before you in this magnificent hall - this most beautiful jewel in the crown of Israel. It is good to be here -- is it not -- in Jerusalem, the city of our dreams, whose space is filled with the voices of the past, whose stones are the frozen echoes of eternity. Jerusalem, where waiting for God was born, where the expectation for ever-lasting peace came into being.

It is an honor to present our speaker, but he needs no introduction. Allow me, therefore, to present you to him.

We are the leaders of American Reform Judaism - men and women from many communities, but of one faith, bound together by a mutual sacred cause. We represent over seven hundred congregations and some one million souls. Together with our Conservative co-religionists, we speak for the predominant plurality of diaspora Jewry.

We are here to seek our brothers, to demonstrate our solidarity with Israel. In all truth, your pain is our pain, your victory our gladness. We are an inseparable, inextricable part of that reality of which both the State and the diaspora communities are but modes of manifestation -- Am Yisrael, this people Israel, that reality which transcends them all.

We are here to tell you that you are not alone. I speak now not just of fellow Jews, but of others, too -- individuals and nations who deeply care for Israel, who will not suffer her destruction. We American Jews can certainly attest to the fact that there remains an enormous reservoir of good will for Israel in our land and that there has been no substantial erosion of that good will even in the face of the oil embargo and serious economic dislocation. Only yesterday, the Jackson Amendment was resolved, an historic undertaking, demanded by the American people and their representatives in Congress.

Take heart then and be of good courage! Jewish history was never a blind alley. Some how, we always found the way from dark night to light.

We are here as Reform Jews to extend our stake in Israel, to see how far we have come and where we must go. During these days of our presence here, we visited our schools and camps. We spoke to our rabbis and their congregants. Proudly we listened to those of our young people, the very flowering of our youth, who have formed a "nachal-gareen," determined to build a Reform Jewish kibbutz in the Aravah. We know full well that Israel depends upon our presence. And so we will continue to come here and bring our children here, some will come for a time and some for always.

Here we will build more and more congregations, and more academies and camps, and kibbutzim. The World Center for our movement will be erected here -- on the land so generously provided by this government -- and on the easternmost part of that Center there will be a synagogue, and the easternmost wall of the synagogue will be made of glass, yea, even the wall of the ark against which the Torah scrolls will be framed. And through that glass we will see the walls of our ancient city, and the Tower of David, and the mount where waiting for God was born. And all Israel will live, and we will live - ken yehi ratzon.

But even as we prepare to participate fully in the life of this land, so do we expect to receive the full privileges which go with that participation. We have earned that privilege - by the sweat of our brows, and by the blood of our sons and brothers.

Lemashal - as a case in point, our invocation was delivered by Moshe Weiler, Rabbi Moses Weiler, a Reform rabbi. He was trained and ordained by our seminary, the College-Institute. He moved to South Africa where he built a Reform Jewish community, which flourished and ultimately also played a vital role in the upbuilding of Zion.

Then he became an oleh and made his greatest sacrifice. His first born son, Adam, was killed in Sinai seven years ago...his second son, Gideon, gave his life in a tank on Golan's heights a year ago. Yet Moshe is not allowed to function as a rabbi in the fullest sense of the word. He cannot marry and bury or teach and accept gereem...and the synagogue to which he belongs does not receive the support which this government, through the Ministry of Religious Affairs, extends to Orthodox synagogues or even to churches, for that matter.

We reject, most utterly reject this conception of our status in the land. We will not be read out of the Jewish people. We refuse to be beggars at Jerusalem's gates. We will fight for our rights as full citizens, with the courage of our convictions, with the boldness of truth. At the same time, we will not slacken, even for a moment, in our fight for a secure and tranquil Israel in a peaceful world, recognizing Israel's fate is our fate.

This is what we are, Mr. Prime Minister, Ohavei Yisroel, and this is what we mean to be and to do.

As for you, we know you well. First your name became known to us as a legendary figure, a modern hero of our people, the brilliant architect of Israel's successful defense.

Then we came to know you as a friend, when you came to our shores and fended well that cause of Israel in the highest councils of our land.

And now we have come to respect you as a leader of the nation, a statesman who has the courage, the guts, to take those risks which are the indispensable requisites for peace.

My friends, I present to you the Prime Minister of Israel - K'vod rosh hamemshala - Yitzchak Rabin.

UAHC Board Mission
K'nesset
Jerusalem, Israel

October 20, 1974

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler ..