



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

---

Reel  
45

Box  
14

Folder  
705

Men in Petticoats, 1959.



# **MEN IN FETTERCOATS**

**Some thoughts on the modern American male**

## **THE TEMPLE**

**January 18, 1959**

**Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver**

"O Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him?" "O Lord, what is man?" One of the great post-philosophers of the Bible asked that question many centuries ago, and in answering this question he formulated the traditional doctrine of man according to our faith.

"O Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou thinkest of him, yet Thou hast made him but little lower than the angels and Thou hast crowned him with glory and with honor." Man is physically limited but creatively infinite. His body cannot move beyond his time and his place, but his spirit and his mind and his creative capacity can overleap and soar above his own immediate situation and reach out and grasp for the infinite.

- "O Lord, what is man?" Recently, in a much more limited sense, this question has again been asked. It has been asked, not by post-philosophers, but by sociologists, critics of the social scene, by historians, by psychiatrists. And the answer which they give to this question is by no means as noble a picture of man as that given by the Bible. Recently there has been a surprising spate of research on the status of the American male. The answers derived by some of these thinkers ~~will~~ will, I believe, surprise you.

The French novelist and critic M. Amery de Reancourt, in a visit to America, observed that the most startling scene on the American situation was simply this: he felt that today the (and I quote) "American male was an oppressed minority". Look Magazine recently commissioned J. Robert Moskin to do a series of



feature articles on the status of the American male, and the gist of these reports can be understood from the opening sentence: "The scientists of the human situation believe that the American male is today dominated by the American female." The eminent anthropologist and thinker Margaret Meade recently concluded some years of study of the American home, and she summarized and capsulized her thinking in a survey which was published under the title "The American Man in a Woman's World". Social critics have made a great deal of the perhaps not unsurprising popularity of that story familiar to many of us last year, of a man who boasts of himself that in his family he made all the important decisions, and when friends of his wife taxed her upon this claim she said, "Yes, that is true. Henry decides whether the People's Republic of China shall be admitted to the United Nations, and how much economic aid shall be given to India, and I decide when we need a new car and when furniture should be bought for the living room."

There is a great deal of this ~~misconception~~. Perhaps it was best summarized by that brilliant young historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. who, in an article on the decline of American masculinity, asked the question of the Bible author, "What is Man?" and made these observations:

What has happened to the American male? For a long time, he seemed utterly confident in his manhood, sure of his masculine role in society, easy and definite in his sense of sexual identity. The frontiersmen of James Fenimore Cooper, for example, never had any concern about masculinity; they were men, and it did not occur to them to think twice about it. Even well into the twentieth century, the heroes of Dreiser, of Fitzgerald, of Hemingway remain men. But one begins to detect a new theme emerging in some of these authors, especially in Hemingway: the theme of the male hero increasingly preoccupied with proving his virility to himself. And by mid-century, the male role had plainly lost its rugged clarity of outline. Today men are more and more conscious of maleness not as a fact but as a problem. The way by which American men affirm their masculinity are uncertain and they are obscure. There are multiplying signs, indeed, that something has gone badly wrong with the American male's conception of himself.

On the most superficial level, the roles of male and female are increasingly merged in the American household. The American man is found as never before as a substitute for wife and mother -- changing diapers, washing dishes, cooking meals and performing a whole series of what once were considered female duties. The American woman meanwhile takes over more and more of the big decisions, controlling them indirectly when she cannot do so direct-



ly. Outside the home, one sees a similar blurring of function. While men design dresses and brew up cosmetics, women become doctors, lawyers, bank cashiers and executives. Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, the psychologist, writes: "Women now fill many 'masculine' roles, and expect their husbands to assume many of the tasks once reserved for their own sex. They seem an expanding, aggressive force, seizing new domains like a conquering army, while men, more and more on the defensive, are hardly able to hold their own and gratefully accept assignments from their new rulers. A recent book bears the stark and melancholy title The Decline of the American Male.

Most of us when we read the essays and analyses of the American male do so indulgently. Cynics have been telling us that the male was on his way to extinction as the dominant species ever since Eve first induced or enticed Adam to eat of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden. American humor has long since indulgently played upon the battle of the sexes. Mr. James Thurber, for instance, has been giving tongue-in-the-cheek advice to both contestants, and all of us cherish his advice to the young bride that wives should be careful to cultivate the illusion of freedom in the American husband that he is able to come and go when he wishes; he should have that opportunity. That if a husband uses by mistake the guest towel the wife should be careful not to send him from the room. But what is surprising about these new criticisms of the American male is that they are deadly serious. They are not done out of any sense simply of passing off lightly a subject of some interest. These critics for the most part feel that there is something definitely out of balance in the American home. They point to the rise of divorce, to the increase of delinquent behavior, to the increase of alcoholism and other forms of addiction, to the rapid rise of emotional disturbance and of suicide and of mental breakdown. And they say that at least some of these disturbing factors in the American home are directly tied to the lack of a stable, strong, respected father, authoritarian in his control and dominant in his position. A respected father, they say, would enforce a standard of discipline, a code of morals. He would not allow some of this excessive permissiveness which they feel has undermined the American character. They feel that the American family has been excessively concerned with questions of status, ~~far~~ with things, with "keeping up with the Joneses", with gossip, and they feel that a strong father-figure in the



home would focus again the interests of the home upon questions of values, upon ideas and ideals and basic loyalties. Father, to these critics, represents strength, a fine central balance which gives meaning and direction to the family and which can successfully pilot the vessel of family life out of roiling, stormy waters.

Has, then, the status of the American male declined? To measure such a subject quantitatively is of course impossible. And yet when we can look at the American home fifty years ago and again today, I think we will see that there has been a striking change in method of operation and in stratification and in organization. Many of you will I am sure recall that very pleasant bit of theater written by Mr. Clarence Day which was called "Life With Father". It depicted a typical American home at the turn of the century, middle income, middle class, happy, strong and stable. Father was the center of that home. The home revolved around his will and his wishes. The home was truly a life with Father. His business requirements determined the use of the family carriage. His day's schedule set the dining hours. No one thought of violating the peace of his after-dinner hour with a brandy and with the evening paper. His decisions were never challenged, at least publicly. The dining room table never became a debating society in which young and old argued the merits of family policy. The father was master of his castle. This was his refuge, and he rejoiced there in the affection of his family and as the center of attention of their interests. Now every family unit is generous and unique unto itself. Every man and every woman in each marriage has developed their modus vivendi, their own way of life. And yet I think that we can picture a not atypical modern American home and perhaps slightly exaggerating the outlines can see the direction in which change has taken place. For today's home is not father-centered, but family-centered, and often child-centered. Breakfast takes place when it fits the needs of all, usually at the hour when children need to be up and on their way to school, and dinner is served early because the maid wants the evening off. Father on his way to work must stop off



to take the children to school and he must leave work in time to pick up the children at some after-school class. The evening paper is not read in the quiet of the living room after the dinner meal, but in the bedroom late at night after the last restless child has been brought a final cup of water and after the last of the dinner dishes have been rinsed and washed and put away. Family decisions are precisely that, no longer *obiter Dictus* handed down by an authoritarian father but the results of family councils, and there is much pro and con and give and take and debate on every matter. Everyone in the family feels that he has a call on the family car and on the family budget and on the family schedule, and these are sufficiently flexible so that everyone feels that it is tailored to meet his needs. In the modern American family there is a great deal of rudimentary democracy, and everyone has gained more freedom in the modern American family except the father.

Has the American male lost in status? Yes, he has, and I would add that he should have, because authoritarian family living is as outmoded and as outdated in the twentieth century as authoritarian government. We know now that the farmer's son is as capable of casting an intelligent ballot as the nobleman's son, and that when he has been educated he is as capable of dispensing the powers of government as anyone born into the purple. And similarly we know that though we husbands have sometimes difficulty in admitting it that our wives are as wise and as understanding and, yes, quietly we whisper it, that they have as much common sense as we do, and that they are as capable of directing and of managing family affairs and of making family policy decisions as we. We recognize today that marriage is a contract, a partnership between equals, not an act of submission, and we recognize that ~~in~~ a successful family requires the energies of two hearts and of two minds and of four pairs of hands. Yes, the American male has lost in status, but he lost a status that he should have lost long since.

But this is not really the claim which is made by the critics of the American scene. They go further. They say that the American man is today led



about by an invisible thread attached from his nose and controlled by his wife, that his decisions, his leisure time, and his activities, his work are conditioned, determined if you will by her wishes and her will and that he has no will of his own. And they make this claim on the basis of several factors in the American society. Recently a survey discovered that eighty per cent of the leisure time of the man is controlled by the wishes of the woman. It is she who determines what plays will be seen, what symphonies will be attended, what television programs will be watched. It is she who determines <sup>which</sup> ~~what~~ parties will be attended and which circle of friends the family will cultivate. Mr. Walt Disney made this interesting observation: he said that he always directed his pictures and his television programs to the women, for he said: "They are the masters of the television set. They are the theater-goers. They badger their husbands until they go along with them. If they are satisfied with my programs then to heck with the male." Recently Fortune Magazine published this interesting statistic: sixty per cent of all purchases in America are made by women, and of the remaining forty per cent most are influenced, deeply influenced by the woman. Fortune pointed out that even some such seemingly masculine items as cars, furnaces, cigars, that the manufacturers of these items gear most of their advertising budget to the distaff side because if they could convince the women of the need of a powder-blue car then the family will own a powder-blue car. It is on evidence such as this that these critics of the American scene bespeak <sup>the</sup> a man ruled by a legion of petticoats. Can we admit that this analysis is a correct one? I do not believe so. There have been strong-willed women and weak men from time immemorial. There are certainly men today whose lives are filled with the badgering of their wives, who allow themselves to be trampled upon and trodden down by the will of their women. Each of us has been in homes where the husband had to spend his free weekends running a hundred errands ~~that he could~~ that the wife could have easily have run during the work week. Each of us has been with families where the husband meekly assented to whatever the woman determined to do. Each of us has been with couples where the wife was allowed to spend whatever met



her fancy without thought to the family budget or the family needs. And each of us has seen women who were more preoccupied with their selves and their persons than with their homes, who were always ready to set themselves down at a card table but were seldom ready to set the family down at the dinner table, women who could not allow their husbnads a much needed evening of quiet and leisure to refresh themselves <sup>but who</sup> after a hard day's work ~~for they~~ were always prodding and badgering their husbands to be up and to be doing, to be running to an endless, futile, folly-filled round of parties and diversions. Each of us has seen such marriages. They are the result of much needless and foolish acceptance and acquiescence on the part of the man, and they are the result of needless and foolish demands on the part of the woman.

But I do not think, looking about me at the American home, that they represent a cross section, the majority, or even a significant minority of American homes. From what I have seen, most American couples are determined to share the labor of family living. They are seeking to work out in a very changing, kaleidoscopically changing society the balance of obligation, of responsibility which is required to meet family obligations. They are intelligent about it. I think that possibly the greatest area of misgiving and of mistake occurs in one respect, and it is this: a wife wears one hat, a husband two. A wife is house-maker, mother. A husband is house-owner and house-helper, but he is also provider. He has a vocation, a profession, a business outside the home. His interests are not confined to the four corners of the family domicile and to the four sections of the family lot. The husband has interests outside the home and sometimes he must expend prodigious amounts of time to cultivate his professional competence and to achieve in his given business enterprise. There are weeks sometimes, and there are months, and sometimes even years when the husband cannot assume any major sense of responsibility in the home, and where the intelligent wife knows that she must take in the slack. For even in our very modern society, a woman's fundamental, primary and essential responsibility is her home and her family. Modern society gives her a great deal of free time. When the children are of school age and later



when they have graduated into adult life she will have an opportunity, as she had before marriage, to engage in business and to fulfill her talents and interests. But when she determines that she wishes to marry and she wishes to raise her family, then she ought to take to heart the wisdom of the Book of Proverbs, "the wisdom of the wife is towards her home, and the foolish woman destroys, tears down her home with her own hands." The foolish woman is the woman who does not center every bit of energy, every power of concentration at her disposal in making a success of her marriage and of her family. She is the woman who today dissipates her energies in a thousand vain pursuits, becomes too quickly tired of the tedium and the routine of home making, who forgets that marriage is a double responsibility and that she bears the fundamental root responsibility of keeping the home running like a well-oiled machine, of keeping the children clothed and happy, of keeping her husband healthy and content. This is the fundamental and essential responsibility of the woman today.

And what is the fundamental and essential responsibility of the modern American male? I would draw out this responsibility to you by an illustration. Our Bible contains one of the most brilliant panegyrics in praise of woman ever written. In the Book of Proverbs there is that beautiful poem:

A woman of valor who can find?  
Her praise is far above rubies.  
The heart of her husband does safely trust in her  
And he has no lack of gain.  
She doeth him good and not evil all the days of her life.

And then for verse after verse it goes on to picture and portray the virtues that make for the beauty of this woman. And these virtues are the virtues of wife and of mother.

She looks well to the way of her household,  
Her hand is always at the weaving.  
She makes coverlets for her house.  
The garments of her household are cared for.

These are her virtues -- the virtues of motherhood and the virtues of house making. And it is interesting to note that the Bible no place paints, poetically or other-



wise, a picture of the man of valor. It never describes the essential area of his activity, for a man's activities are much more diverse, wide-spread, than those of the woman. For a man must reckon with this fundamental fact - that his home is only as secure as his community is secure and as his nation is secure, that his home will only be as healthy as his community is healthy, that his children will only be raised in as wonderful a world as his nation can provide for them. And so he has an obligation not only to provide and to sustain and to support the home, but to support all good causes of his community, to encourage the attainment of justice and of peace and of a better society <sup>and</sup> ~~in~~ his world. For ultimately no single can withstand the tidal wave of social upheaval, and unless each husband, and later perhaps joined by his wife when she has the free time, unless each husband bestirs himself in community good, in programs of social activity, unless he seeks to encourage the economic wellbeing of his community, unless he seeks to establish justice in the gates, unless he seeks to establish peace among men, and unless, together with other fathers and husbands, he succeeds in these tasks he will have defaulted on one of the primary responsibilities of husband and of father. For the responsibilities of the husband are to the home, and they are beyond the home. And the understanding wife will recognize that the husband has interests which will take him inevitably out of daily contact with the home and which will make it inevitably responsible for her to undertake added responsibility towards the house and towards her family.

Margaret Meade wrote these lines, and I commend them to you:

"Traditionally, women, as the custodians of home and child, have been a conservative force worrying about exposure to poverty, physical hardship, danger and shipwreck. Yet today men refuse international jobs because the "climate of living" for their children will not be admirable; they refuse assignments to public service committees, where they are sorely needed, because such assignments would spoil their weekends with their families.

"There are many commentators who will describe all this as a victory for women, now that they have their men where they want them -- as dishwashers, baby sitters, companions and escorts, docilely dashing for the suburban train and slaving their lives away to give their wives every luxury. For what? So that they can die -- as embittered young men say



over their beer -- five years earlier and leave their wives to the ineffable delights of lonely but well-heeled widowhood.

"The only way to break this deadlock is to reinstitute the range of ideals without which any civilization perishes. Home and family are good things -- in which to raise children -- but they are not the end-all and be-all of every human being in our society."

"Home and family are good things -- in which to rear children -- but they are not the end-all and be-all of every human being in this society."

"O Lord, what is man?"

Man is a frail, fragile creature of clay who must somehow create a world at peace, concord, humanity and justice. "What is man?" Man is a frail, fragile piece of clay who must somehow intelligently divide his energies between responsibilities to his world, responsibilities to his family, responsibilities to himself.

"O Lord, what is man?" Man is a fragile piece of clay who lives but twenty-four hours in each day and needs part of each day to refresh his spirit. Who must work out for himself in this changing world a new role and a new status. He will need help. He will need the help of wives and of children who will understand the extent of the responsibilities which lie heavily upon his shoulders. But he is not dominated, nor is he submissive. For man today, my friends, understands full well the extent of his duty, and he is grand, not little in his endeavors to fulfill that responsibility.

"O Lord, what is man?" Man is but "little lower than the angels", and he is crowned if he will crown himself with glory and with honor.

Amen.







Edward after myel notes a great deal of detail  
Catching, many ~~as well as~~ the persons not even being popularly  
of a man who boarded that in his family knowledge all the major  
decision - When questioned he said although that was such as, being  
decide whether the P.R. of China should be admitted to the U.N. &  
how much economic aid should be sent to India - a  
decide on the new gun & the new families for our living room.

p p 6 on "

of kind what is man - when Arthur & Edna were Jr. - Edward's  
bulldozed young profession of history ended family like question -  
his answer left the form.





2

11

[illegible][illegible]

How can a statutory Commission make progress?

[illegible]

You, however, cannot have the life.



[illegible]

Tunes have, of course, changed. It is difficult to remember just how much can be copied and - The house no longer remembers so completely around the knowledge. Modern laws are found almost everywhere. ~~as follows~~.

and  
 let me picture a home with sufficient supply of stuff to make  
 the needed things under the place. Recycled is to do  
 around under is a commonest and only for the good but for the condition  
 on the way to a good. Diverse appears and on the whole as good as  
 made can be so every off. Faded after office quick in full  
 with around that need to be very different of under that need  
 be accomplished. The saving paper is reduced and in the light  
 room, the paper and in the bed room of the end of the  
 with has been brought to a whole and in the rest of the house  
 under has been moved to the end. Major decisions require family  
 under has been moved to the end of the house. The under has been  
 under consultation and the under has been moved to the end of the house  
 a. Under the end of the house.

Rhona personally asked - But how would the answer differ and  
 I will go for the more a small. My point is simply that the  
 group no longer needs several Fiddle - this should be  
 sufficient has been replaced by a substituting form of answer  
 however. To find everyone in the home at each Fiddle is a possible  
 Fiddle - can be signed therefore.



manistata has declined.

Manistata should have declined. Absolute male supremacy in the family is as established as absolute monarchy in politics. We live in a more enlightened age. We know that a farmer can be as capable as a nobleman in caring an intelligent man and that our women are in every way as capable of understanding and even being - yes - even of common sense. Indeed, one of our own says, the British anthropologist Huxley Montagu has even claimed that physically & emotionally our women are naturally superior to us. Manistata is a partnership not a submission. I thought it my part to tell you that an enemy to feel superior & to seek to dominate was known that a husband & wife must meet not on the level of two minds, but hands & 4 hands.

The question before us really is how far has manistata declined. Mr. de Beencourt spoke of us as an oppressed minority. Mr. Montagu in one of his books on the Bull Question "Why do Women dominate the American male - Does he also follow a rule or has it all been forced on him by the strong sex?"

As evidence of man's inferiority much evidence is offered. A survey has shown that men receive different almost 90% of the news of our times. Cine. Mr. Walt Disney the able producer of movies & Television couple years ago all his production to women. Quite openly he stated "This is the work of the T.V. set and the theatre goes. They're the ones who drag the men along. If the women didn't do it he'd be with the men."

Fortune magazine has established that women make 60% of the personal care & that they profoundly influence much of the rest. Advertisers of such <sup>various</sup> make items as automobiles, organs, furniture, and such & the have always directed marketing their advertising campaign to the women. In the long run these women have a way of winning victory.



Do men engrave men the picture - no, we do not. But undoubtedly some men do and the number may not be small.

I have all been in home where the burden of financial responsibility  
rested with the man. I do not mean financial responsibility - but  
rather the delegation of responsibility to children to ~~aff~~ shared classes,  
of necessary maintenance or the equivalent, of family and social functions  
he had accomplished that the wife might be able to complete  
during the school years to men at work.

we have all seen ladies who gave more thought to their persons  
than to their homes - who spent more time gossiping with their friends  
than reading to their children - who are always prepared to  
sit down at the card table but seldom ready or <sup>desire</sup> to sit out  
with the family table - who cannot sit quietly for an evening at  
home just, their husband's desire to sit at the bridge but must  
be always flocking about to and fro with a gentleman and a partner.

This are such names because there are husband who <sup>are</sup> needlessly  
and foolishly ~~acconsenting~~ and because there are men who  
needlessly & foolishly dissenting.

But by in large the American home is an honest partnership - one in which each is freely shared and rendered without protest. The tension which seems to arise most often occurs because a man <sup>of necessity</sup> ~~uses~~ <sup>has</sup> to be the woman generally only one. A woman is mother, a man is husband - father and provider, he has a business - a profession - another law - another area of responsibility.

Often the lone - this mechanism - would require prodigious expenditure of time. The husband will not be able easily or very much or for weeks on end to share family activities. The wife will unfortunately have no other choice. She will not make demands of her husband which he can fulfil without expense to his career.







Good acc. to the Bible created woman for man as a help-mate - to keep home & hearth, turning the man about under his feet as husband passing responsibility to his wife. At his command in support and protection - but it involves much more.

Let me amuse by illustration - ~~The Bible contains a world of~~  
~~beautiful passages to encourage~~ ~~from the~~ first and hymn of praise to woman in old testament

"a woman of ruler - who can find  
 to - free of for alone ruler  
 The heart of her husband does as she pleases in her  
 household no lord of her  
 She shall be feared - not and also do day  
 his life

In the story woman is presented as power keeper & maker - "She  
 search herself well as land, she light her hand to do his work,  
 She makes for herself counsel, she lead make to be way of her  
 household."

There is in the Bible no such paragon description of the <sup>man</sup> of  
~~The woman of power~~ ~~as it is~~  
 woman - man's duties are much more widely dispersed - They are  
 to the home & beyond the home - to the community and to the nation  
 seeking safety & security at least of the home. They must be concerned  
 with securing a livelihood & establishing peace - with educating  
 his family & enlightening his world - with protecting his children and  
 protecting the innocent.

Modern life frees women in the last years to join man in the  
 duties - whatever the temptations - they can not be shirked, nor do  
 hundreds in uneducated and underpaid social upheaval, I quote  
 with approval one line from Margaret Mead

p. 110 " "

God made man - man is what he makes of his talents &  
 opportunities

read no more about man - that if he will respond to  
 his duties - his struggles & moving will be crystal clear to him



IN REVERENCE AND DEEP HUMILITY, O LORD, GOD OF OUR FATHERS, I COME BEFORE THEE THIS DAY  
IN SOLEMN PRAYER, IN BEHALF OF THIS CONGREGATION.

HEAVENLY FATHER, BLESS THE MEMBERS OF THIS CONGREGATION THEIR CHILDREN AND ALL THAT  
IS THEIRS. EVERYONE OF US IN OUR ACTIONS AND IN OUR DEVOTIONS, IS A SERVANT AND  
CHILD OF THE ONE LIVING GOD. MAY THY BLESSINGS REST UPON US ACCORDING TO THE  
GRACIOUS PROMIS OF THY WORD.

TEACH US THE TRUE SPIRIT OF THY TEMPLE THAT OURS IS THE RELIGION AND SERVICE OF THE HEART  
TEACH US THAT JUDAISM IS MORE THAN A RITUAL WAY OF LIFE THAT IT IS A LIGHT UNTO OURSELVES  
AND ALL HUMANITY. GIVE US INNER ENLIGHTENMENT TEACH US TO BE KIND AND GENEROUS  
TO SPEAK GENTLY TO LOVE OUR FELLOWMAN AND TO FOLLOW IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF OUR FATHERS.  
TEACH US THAT REGULAR ATTENDANCE AT WORSHIP WILL MAKE US BETTER PERSONS THAT ONE WAY  
OF SERVING YOU IS BY TAKING A REAL AND ACTIVE PART IN TEMPLE LIFE THAT THROUGH REGULAR  
TEMPLE ATTENDANCE AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES WE ADD NEW STRENGTH TO OUR LIVES FOR IT IS  
STRENGTH WHICH WE ALL NEED AND HERE, THROUGH YOUR PRESENCE WE FIND IT. TEACH US  
THAT THROUGH REGULAR WORSHIP WE WILL FIND COURAGE STRENGTH BEAUTY AND THE JOY OF  
FELLOWSHIP. TO THE YOUTH OF OUR CONGREGATION GIVE THE DESIRE AND  
UNDERSTANDING OF REGULAR WORSHIP WITH THEIR PARENTS THAT THEY AS A FAMILY MAY HAVE  
THE WARM FEELING OF TOGETHERNESS FOR THE FAMILY THAT PRAYS TOGETHER STAYS TOGETHER.  
IT WAS THEIS PRAYING TOGETHER AND STAYING TOGETHER WHICH HAS KEPT OUR FAITH ALIVE THROUGH  
THE AGES. TEACH US THAT ONLY THROUGH PRAYER CAN WE FIND THE TRUE HARMONY BETWEEN MAN & GOD.  
TO OUR BELOVED RAEBIS GIVE THE INTELLECTUAL ASPIRATIONS WHICH YOU GAVE TO THE PROPHETS AND  
PRIESTS OF OLD THAT THEY MAY CONTINUE TO GUIDE AND TEACH US SO THAT WE MAY BECOME  
BETTER MEN AND BETTER WOMEN IN THINE EYES  
AS YOUR TORAH HAS EFFECTED THE LIVES OF BOTH THE JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH WORLD SO MAY WE  
YOUR CHILDREN EFFECT THE LIVES OF ALL ABOUT US THROUGH EXAMPLE AND STRIVING TO MAKE  
OURSELVES IN THINE IMAGE.  
ON OUR HEADS POUR ONLY THE SWEET WATERS OF SERENITY GRANT UNTO US THY MOST PRECIOUS GIFT  
OF THE UNTROUBLED MIND - - - THY PRICELESS GIFT OF "SHOLOM" PEACE.

AMEN



The only way to break <sup>this</sup> the deadlock is to reinstitute the range of ideals without which any civilization perishes. Home and family are good things -- in which to <sup>raise</sup> rear children -- but they are not the end-all and be-all of every human being in <sup>the</sup> society. There are gifted men and women, adventurous men and adventurous women, people who never stop thinking about what they are doing, people who work eighteen hours a day, people who have to travel into far places and risk not coming back, people who will give and give of themselves in the public good.

People, not just men. By hamstringing women at the point where some of them could make the contributions we need, we have hamstrung men also. The United States needs good wives and good husbands. But not only good wives and good husbands -- we also need men and women with commitment to the tasks of a world in which we are becoming the model setters, with or without our consent.



## Kaddish

Friday JANU 16  
" - 18  
Sunday

Those who passed away this week

MOE L. ROTHMAN

## Yahrzeit

RABBI MOSES SILVER  
ISAAC KLEIN  
MARY WEITZ  
JAY B. GOODMAN  
EDITH W. LEFTON  
JOSEPH H. KITAY  
EVA DAVIS WAYNE  
ARCHIE A. WEISS  
PAULINE NEUMARK  
EDWIN N. HORTON  
ROSA HIRSCHMEIER  
CELIA FRIEDMAN  
CELIA ABRAMS  
STELLA MOSKOWITZ KOHN

ROSA SCHARTENBERG



The essential truth about the Man in the Gray Flannel Suit today is not that he abhors the "ruthless, terrible competition" of American life. Far more than abhorring competition, he does not want a career. Men -- and women -- still want the things that a successful career will bring them -- high salaries, a high standard of living, residence in a good suburb, social prestige and membership in the appropriate clubs and organizations. But in their choice of a field they make demands which guarantee that they will never give a job the kind of devotion that a "career" requires.

A career demands "taking risks" -- running the risk of failure, of being passed over, of finding out that one is not first rate, of working for years and perhaps never "hitting the jack pot". Careers demand deferred marriages, deferred childbearing and fewer children. (This is what the young man told his girl who said she wanted "to do something".) Today young men refuse to enter the kind of training which means postponed marriages and postponed parenthood, and as husbands and fathers they cannot afford to take risks.

Traditionally, women, as the custodians of home and child, have been a conservative force worrying about exposure to poverty, physical hardship, danger and shipwreck. <sup>Yes</sup> Today men refuse international jobs because the "climate of living" for their children will not be admirable; they refuse assignments to public service committees, where they are sorely needed, because such assignments would spoil their weekends with their families. ~~Angry scare stories are written about keeping our armed forces overseas because of what the enforced absences of the man or the cramped living quarters are doing to American home life.~~

There are many commentators who will describe all this as a victory for women, now that they have their men where they want them -- as dish washers, baby sitters, companions and escorts, docilely dashing for the suburban train and slaving their lives away to give their wives every luxury. For what? So that they can die -- as embittered young men say over their beer -- five years earlier and leave their wives to the ineffable delights of lonely but well-heeled widowhood. ~~Alternatively, we may see it as one of those failures to go forward which almost inevitably ends in going backward.~~



What has happened to the American male? For a long time, he seemed utterly confident in his manhood, sure of his masculine role in society, easy and definite in his sense of sexual identity. The frontiersmen of James Fenimore Cooper, for example, never had any concern about masculinity; they were men, and it did not occur to them to think twice about it. Even well into the twentieth century, the heroes of Dreiser, of Fitzgerald, of Hemingway remain men. But one begins to detect a new theme emerging in some of these authors, especially in Hemingway: the theme of the male hero increasingly preoccupied with proving his virility to himself. And by mid-century, the male role had plainly lost its rugged clarity of outline. Today men are more and more conscious of maleness not as a fact but as a problem. The way by which American men affirm their masculinity are uncertain and <sup>they are</sup> obscure. There are multiplying signs, indeed, that something has gone badly wrong with the American male's conception of himself.

On the most superficial level, the roles of male and female are increasingly merged in the American household. The American man is found as never before as a substitute for wife and mother -- changing diapers, washing dishes, cooking meals and performing a whole series of what once were considered female duties. The American woman meanwhile takes over more and more of the big decisions, controlling them indirectly when she cannot do so directly. Outside the home, one sees a similar blurring of function. While men design dresses and brew up cosmetics, women become doctors, lawyers, bank cashiers and executives. <sup>quote</sup> "Women now fill many 'masculine' roles," <sup>3</sup> (writes the psychologist, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim) <sup>2</sup> "and expect their husbands to assume many of the tasks once reserved for their own sex." <sup>unquote</sup> They seem an expanding, aggressive force, seizing new domains like a conquering army, while men, more and more on the defensive, are hardly able to hold their own and gratefully accept assignments from their new rulers. A recent book bears the stark and melancholy title The Decline of the American Male. ||