INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Stephen Jan Einstein

TITLE "The Nature of the Jewish People As Seen In American Reform Jewish Theology and Liturgy"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [X]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [√]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. √ yes ___ no

March 10, 1971
Date

Stephen J. Einstein
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed 6/29/71
Date

Moira Steines
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE NATURE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE AS SEEN IN AMERICAN REFORM JEWISH THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

By

Stephen J. Einstein

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters
and
Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1971

Referee, Professor Jakob J. Petuchowski

DIGEST

This thesis deals with how American Reform Judaism, over the course of its development, has viewed the Jewish people. It is divided into four parts on a chronological basis. The first part covers the period up to the Pittsburgh Platform; the second part from the Pittsburgh Platform to the Balfour Declaration; the third part from the Balfour Declaration to the end of the Second World War; the fourth part covers the post-war period.

We begin the study by looking at some of the European statements on the subject since much of the seminal thinking of the Reform movement was done in Europe. We then turn to the question of definitions--are the Jews members of a religion, nation, or race? Most of the early Reformers believed that we are members of a religious community only, but there were exceptions. All held the position that we are God's people, with whom He made a Covenant. Many saw us as a priest-people and some even viewed us as a collective Messiah. In early Reform theology, the Mission of Israel was very important. That Mission was to make God's unity known, to teach truth to humanity, and to improve society. Many of the Reformers thought that struggle and suffering was a part of fulfilling the Mission.

The above positions continued to be the majority opinion throughout the period covered in the second part of the thesis. This period saw the rise of Political Zionism which most of the Reform leaders opposed. In the third part, we see the impact which world events had on Reform thinking. By the mid-thirties, the Reform movement was officially neutral on the question of Zionism, and a growing number of Reform rabbis were active Zionists. During the 1940's, a group of Reform rabbis and laymen who were unhappy with this change within Reform Judaism founded the American Council for Judaism, which was denounced on more than one occasion by the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Much of the thinking in the post-war period had to do with the relationship between American Jews and Jews living in other parts of the world, especially in the newly-established State of Israel. The movement in recent times, and especially since the Six Day War, has been concerned with Israel and has emphasized the Peoplehood of Israel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE NATURE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE
AS SEEN IN
AMERICAN REFORM JEWISH THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

PART I

UP TO THE PITTSBURGH PLATFORM

CHAPTER I

EUROPEAN BACKGROUNDS

Although our study deals with the nature of the Jewish People as seen in American Reform theology and liturgy, we must begin it by briefly looking at how the European reformers viewed the subject. This is true because Reform Judaism began in Europe, and it was there that much of the seminal thinking of the movement was done. Also we must look to the European backgrounds because virtually all of the early American Reform leaders were born and trained in Europe. Finally, the European materials are important because they are officially part of American Reform ideology. At its second meeting, the Central Conference of American Rabbis passed a resolution to the effect that all the declarations of reform which had been adopted at previous rabbinical conferences in Europe (as well as in this country) be considered the working basis of the CCAR.[1]

The term "nation," which we shall have occasion to discuss in greater detail later, played an important role in the debate of the French National Assembly which led to the Declaration of Emancipation in 1791. Clermont Tonnère presented the formula, "To the Jews as human beings, everything; to the Jews as a nation, nothing." Both the Assembly of

Notables in 1806 and the Sanhedrin of 1807 confirmed this resolution, and, as Joachim Prinz puts it, "the Jews, brow-beaten and brainwashed, accepted it."[2] The emergence of Reform can clearly be linked with Western Jewry's move toward emancipation. Samuel Karff seems right in maintaining that early Reform's concept of Israel was an ideological response to Tonnère's formula.[3]

The Jews of Westphalia were emancipated in 1808 and the Jews of Prussia in 1812. In the latter year, David Friedländer, who favored substitution of German for Hebrew prayers, argued for the omission of those prayers seeking a messianic return to Zion. He held that the Jews do not wish to leave their German fatherland.[4]

In 1837, a new magazine, Allegemine Zeitung des Judenthums, appeared. In the first edition, Ludwig Phillipson began a series entitled "What is Judaism?". In it he admitted that the Jews had formerly striven to create an independent nation, but that their goal was now to join other nations and "reach for the highest rung of development in human society." The task, therefore, was "to obtain from the other nations full acceptance into their society and therefy attain to participation in the general body social."[5]

The Society of the Friends of Reform in Frankfort was considered to be a radical group of reformers whose program was criticized not only by the Orthodox, but also by

the more moderate Reform leaders of the day. This statement from their platform of 1842 would probably have elicited the agreement of most reformers, however: "A Messiah who is to lead the Israelites back to the land of Palestine is neither expected nor desired by us; we know no fatherland except that to which we belong by birth or citizenship."[6]

In an article entitled "Can We Still Pray for Restoration?", written in 1842, Moses Gutmann answers the question in the negative. He notes the contradiction which exists if we ask God to lead us back to another land where we would found our own state while at the same time seeking full citizenship in our native land. He argues that the redemption which our greatest prophets said the Messiah was to bring was not dependent on a specific country nor limited to the Jewish people. Rather, they looked toward total human redemption, and for this, we, too, should pray. He climaxes his universalistic point by saying that if we pray for the redemption of all mankind, we will "nourish and strengthen within us the sentiment of brotherly love for all men who share their fate with us, but not by constant remembrance of Israel's former separateness and the less-than-forthright yearning for the restoration of this separateness, which would incur for us the accusation of pride and lack of love."[7]

We can agree with Theodore N. Lewis's analysis that the German reformers suffered from the illusion of utopianism.

They believed that they were living at the dawn of a new age. Because they felt that the Jews in Germany would soon enjoy complete equality and citizenship, they thought that there was no longer any need for Zion, Palestine, and Jewish nationalism.[8]

The earliest rabbinical conference was held at Brunswick in 1844. That conference unanimously approved the decisions of the French Sanhedrin. Some very interesting ideas were expressed at Brunswick. Abraham Geiger said that it was a greater miswah to donate to German charities than to Palestinian. A certain Rabbi Adler maintained that prayer was holy; Hebrew was not. Therefore, if one prays in German, German becomes holy. David Einhorn rejected the concept of the Messiah because it involved the "ingathering of the exiles," and he believed that the dispersion was not a curse, but a blessing. The conference adopted all of these ideas."[9]

Another rabbinical conference was held in 1845, this time at Frankfort-on-Main. A committee which had been appointed at the previous convention recommended that "the idea of Messiah deserves a high recognition in the prayers, yet all politico-national conceptions must be excluded from it."[10] Einhorn proposed that the messianic prayers be formulated in such a way as to express the hope of the spiritual regeneration and union of all mankind in faith and love,

accomplished through Israel. The convention voted to eliminate the prayers for the return to the land of our forefathers and the restoration of a Jewish state. A motion was also passed that the messianic idea be distinctively and prominently recognized in the ritual.[11] At the Frankfort conference, the rabbis also decided that the retention of Hebrew was advisable for the time being, but that there was no "objective necessity" for its retention. Although this passed with a very small majority, its passage was enough to cause Zecharias Frankel to walk out of the meeting and to found what became known as Conservative Judaism.[12]

In 1845, thirteen years before the last disabilities against British Jews were removed, David W. Marks of the West London Synagogue delivered a sermon entitled "A Patriotism As Glowing...". In it, he stated that the Jews do look forward to restoration to Judea, but that this will occur only within the context of a miraculous change in the system of government of all nations. Until that time, the Jews owe loyalty only to the land of their birth. He declared that "to this land we attach ourselves with a patriotism as glowing...as any class of our British non-Jewish fellow citizens." He further proclaimed that when God will bring us back to Judea, we will then rejoice in our title of "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" and thank God for being able to lead all mankind to acknowledge His unity. He made his plea for full citizenship by saying, "But since

this time is in the hands of God, and since we take no account of it in our relations to countries and to mankind...we boldly claim...every privilege of citizenship...."[13]

From our historical perspective, over 100 years later, the 1848 program of the Friends of Reform (Reform-Freunde) of Worms may sound a chord of irony. These reformers held that they should no longer pray for a return to Palestine because "the strongest bond ties our souls to the German Fatherland whose fate is inextricably interwoven with ours--for what is dear and precious to us is embraced by her." In line with this idea, they also felt that while the destruction of the Temple might be remembered yearly, it should not be mourned for because they saw "the loving hand of God" in that destruction.[14]

Berlin's Association for the Reform of Judaism (Genossenschaft für Reform im Judenthum) was German Reform's most radical element. In the introduction to the 1848 Berlin Prayerbook, it is maintained that the chosenness of Israel as a holy priest-people is valid only as a subjective fact in the religious consciousness of the Jewish people. As an objective fact, chosenness is denied. Tribal holiness, a specific vocation, and an eternal covenant between God and Israel is rejected. They considered man as chosen. Although Israel's choice is occasionally mentioned in the prayers, this is only to urge the worshipper on to "noble humanity"

so that the members of the congregation may distinguish themselves "not as a people, but as human beings."[15] A certain sense of kinship with other Jews can be seen in a Passover prayer which seeks the welfare of "our distant brethren who are still oppressed by persecutions, as they were centuries ago."[16] But the brethren are distant!

Häster's Reader was a textbook for Jewish parochial schools in Germany published in 1863. It does speak of Israel's priestly vocation. Israel's destiny is to "lead all mankind to advance in morality, humility, love of man, and true worship of God" and to be "a refuge for all who are ready to suffer for the sake of virtue."[17]

Two of Germany's leading reformers were Samuel Holdheim (1806-60) and Abraham Geiger (1810-74). Holdheim was a champion of radical Reform. In his Berlin congregation, Hebrew was almost totally eliminated. He believed that God showed that He desired the end of the national phase of Israel's life by destroying the Temple and State. He was opposed to all rituals which separated Jews from gentiles since he felt that, with emancipation, the messianic fulfillment of history was at hand and therefore maximum contact was desirable.[18] Holdheim wrote that he did not want to extinguish the characteristics of the Jewish people nor to destroy the particular characteristics of the other nations. Rather, he believed, that all the

peoples and nations should accept the teachings of Judaism and thereby "kindle their own lights, which will then shine independently and warm their souls."[19]

Abraham Geiger believed that Israel had been providentially called to its vocation to carry the faith in One God to the world. Joy over Israel's task, however, should not lead to arrogance or contemptuousness of others. He felt that prayers which expressed such attitudes should be eliminated. He therefore favored "Thou hast chosen us for Thy holy law," but opposed "Thou hast chosen us from among all nations, Thou hast elevated us above all tongues."[20]

Geiger held that the sense of peoplehood had full justification when Israel dwelt on its own soil. That day, of course, was long gone. It could no longer be maintained that the people of Israel exists. Instead, he saw it "resurrected as a congregation of <u>faith</u>."[21]

In 1869, a synod was held at Leipzig at which Geiger offered a number of resolutions. One resolution was that the historic mission of Israel as the banner-bearer of truth must be accentuated. As a result, the national side of Israel should be pushed into the background. This is to be accomplished by not referring to the separation of Israel or to "other nations" in the prayers. Also, the unification of mankind is to be stressed while denying the hope for a Jewish monarchy in Palestine, a rebuilt Temple, or a return

of the Jews to the promised land.[22]

A second synod was held at Augsburg in 1871. At that time it was affirmed that the essence and mission of Judaism were the same as they had always been. What had changed drastically were the views of "the adherents of Judaism" and the place those adherents occupied in the midst of the nations. The synod was aware of the connection between religious life and social and civil circumstances, and, therefore, felt duty-bound "to lend adequate expression to the consciousness of the unity of our co-religionists in all questions pertaining to their civil and social condition."[23]

With this brief summary of the European backgrounds, we are now ready to journey across the ocean.

CHAPTER 2

DEFINITIONS

Just what are we Jews? In this chapter, we shall look at some of the definitions proposed by early Reform leaders in America. The most widespread notion was that we are members of a religion. As such, we have no loyalty to any country save that of our birth or naturalized citizenship. Some spokesmen saw us as a nation; some as a race. Our relationship to the Hebrew language was seen differently by different theologians depending on whether they thought we were a religion or a nation. In the early days, even the terms "Israelite," "Hebrew," and "Jew" had significance.

American Reform's classical answer to the question "What is a Jew?" is to be found in the fifth plank of the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state."[1] The Pittsburgh Platform was not an authoritative creed, yet both its admirers and detractors seemed to regard it as such. This one plank has often been quoted to prove that Reform Judaism and Jewish nationalism are incompatible.[2]

However, the idea expressed in the Pittsburgh Platform was not new. It expressed the viewpoint shared by most of the early American Reform leaders. Reform Judaism began in America in Charleston, South Carolina. Congregation Beth Elohim was the first Reform congregation to last. (The earlier Reformed Society of Israelites--also in Charleston--failed.) When Beth Elohim's new synagogue building was dedicated on March 19, 1841, the preacher and reader, Rev. Gustav Poznanski, declared in his sermon, "This country is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem, this house of God our Temple."[3]

Isaac Mayer Wise (1819-1900) was the great organizer of American Reform. He believed very strongly that we must preserve our identity only in the synagogue, but that in public life, business, and culture any particular Jewish identity had already been lost and should not be restored. He advised that "as citizens we must not be distinct from the rest, in religion only are we Jews, in all other respects we are American citizens."[4]

The period prior to the Pittsburgh Platform saw the publication of a good many Reform prayerbooks. In many of these, we find a sense of gratitude for having finally arrived in a land of freedom where Jews were considered full citizens. This can be seen in the Seder service of Einhorn's Olat tamid of 1858. In one prayer, he acknowledges that

"even though the air has not yet been cleared everywhere," nevertheless "in our great and mighty fatherland, the tents of Jacob stand planted like gardens by the stream."[5]

In the 1830 prayerbook of the Charleston Reformed Society of Israelites, there is a "Prayer for Government" which expresses a feeling of kinship with all Americans. It thanks God for "uniting us all into one great family, where the noble and virtuous mind is the only crown of distinction, and equality of rights the only fountain of power."[6] Similar thoughts may be found in other prayerbooks of the time.[7]

Very often, the authors of prayerbooks hinted at their understanding of the nature of the Jewish people in the preface or conclusion of their books. For example, Edward B. M. Browne noted that we are permanent and happy citizens of the United States and that we must pray for the welfare of our country and not for Palestine. He advised that his prayerbook was "intended for <u>American</u> citizens."[8] In the preface, Raphael D'C. Lewin submitted the prayerbook to his "co-religionists,"[9] while Einhorn makes reference to his "English-speaking brethren in faith."[10]

In some of the Confirmation services, it appears as if one becomes a Jew by a profession of faith. Raphael Lewin told his confirmands, "You will then raise your right hands toward heaven and pronounce the vow which will make you ours forever."[11] In Charleston, Confirmation not only

made the youngster a Jew, it made him a Reform Jew! The confirmand had to declare: "I desire to appear in the presence of heaven and earth, an Israelite according to the faith and customs of the Reformed Society of Israelites, in whose temple of worship I now stand."[12]

Very closely connected with the idea that we are members of a religion and not a nation is the removal of those prayers referring to the re-establishment of the Temple, the rebuilding of Zion, and the return of the Jews to Palestine. Max Lilienthal, rabbi of Bene Israel in Cincinnati, refused to conduct a service of lamentation on the ninth of Ab shortly after his election in 1855. He said that he considered the destruction of Jerusalem a reason for rejoicing rather than mourning, as it was the cause of the Jews' spreading all over the world and carrying the light of monotheism everywhere.[13]

Einhorn's prayerbook omits prayers for the restoration of the sacrificial cult and for the return to Palestine. He does include a service for the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem. However, the prayers in that service make it clear that the home of God's "princely conqueror of the world" is no longer limited to "that narrow spot on which once stood his cradle," and that all of mankind, living in union with itself and with God is to become the Sanctuary.[14] The latter idea was part of liberal religious thought of the day. Theodore Parker, one of the leading nineteenth

century Unitarian theologians wrote in 1841, "Neither Gerizim nor Jerusalem, nor the soil that Jesus blessed, so holy as the good man's heart; nothing so full of God."[15]

In Edward Browne's prayerbook, we are told explicitly that Jerusalem is no more, the Sanctuary has disappeared, and all that the Jews have left from former glory is our religious heritage.[16] The Szold-Jastrow prayerbook is not quite so clear. A prayer in the Festival Additional Service asks God to make His house a house of prayer for all nations where they might worship Him with a reverence similar to that of our ancestors when they dwelt in their own land.[17] This does not seem to refer to an actual Jerusalem Temple. In the weekday service, in place of the traditional fourteenth of the eighteen benedictions which asks God to return to Jerusalem and rebuild it, Szold-Jastrow has the following:

> May the glory of Jerusalem, thy city, be restored as the spiritual center whence sprung forth all divine ideas in accordance with thy promise, that from Zion the law should go forth, and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem. Blessed be thou, O Lord, who didst rear up Jerusalem as the centre of religious ideas.[18]

This prayer, while speaking in glowing terms of Jerusalem, does not seek a rebuilt Jerusalem, inhabited by modern Jews.

All of the early Reform prayerbooks did not omit prayers for Zion, however. The prayerbook of the radical Charleston group contains a marriage blessing praising God "who causest Zion to rejoice in the gathering of her chil-

dren."[19] The 1855 Merzbacher Day of Atonement prayerbook has numerous references to Zion. One prayer asks God: "Redeem the residue of the captivity of Zion in Righteousness, and cause them to rejoice in thy holy mountain, and in thy house of prayer; for thou wilt yet again redeem them the second time. . . ."[20] We see a very interesting change in Merzbacher, though. In the preface to his 1864 prayerbook, he objects to "the dogmatic particularism, exceedingly displayed in regard to the restoration of Israel, the restitution of the Temple and offerings, the personality of the Messiah" in the Orthodox prayerbook.[21] An example of the elimination of particularism in this prayerbook is seen in the tenth of the traditional eighteen benedictions. The new prayer asks for the freedom of the nations and the collection of all exiles instead of our freedom and the collection of our exiles.[22]

We see a similar phenomenon in Isaac Mayer Wise. In his Minhag America of 1857, there are a number of prayers for Zion and services for the ninth of Ab.[23] In the 1889 revision of the prayerbook, there is no service for the ninth of Ab, and even the phrase referring to "a land so pleasant, fertile, and large" in the grace after meals was removed. In 1876, Wise wrote that the Jews do not think of going back to Palestine. He wrote that only the narrow minded tie the world's destiny to the soil of a certain

strip of country. He felt that the whole world must become one promised land.[24]

The changes concerning Zion in Wise's prayerbook are reflected in his other writings. In his early career, he was not afraid to use the words "nation" and "nationality." Shortly after he came to America, he wrote in The Occident that we must "maintain our distinct nationality in a religious respect all over the globe, until all mankind will have received our sacred message."[25] (Italics mine.) In a similar vein, he wrote in The Israelite of November 30, 1855 that "the nation must remain one and undivided until all nations have become one Israel."[26] (Italics mine.) In the 1857 Minhag America, he also referred to Israel as "one united nation on earth."[27] In 1879, he wrote that, to all intents and purposes, an American Jew is an American, an English Jew an Englishman, and so on. Yet in that very same article, he referred to the Jew's nationality and the purity of his race.[28] However, in a Hannukah sermon the next year, Wise came out clearly in opposition to a national or racial theory:

> The race-proud Jew is a fool, as all race-proud people are. The National Jew is a liar, because there exists no Jewish nation, and he is not a Jew simply because his mother was a Jewess. The Treitsche-Stoecker theory that the German Jew is not a German is a lie. The Jew's pride and distinction is exclusively in his religion and his firm faith in the laws and promises of the Almighty to Israel. . . . "[29]

There were some early Reform leaders who did see the Jews primarily as a nation. Most notable among these was Bernhard Felsenthal (1822-1908). He maintained that the Jews are a nation of purer blood than the German, French, Italian, or English nations. Converts to Judaism have been Jews only in the religious, but not in the ethnological sense. However, through inter-marriage with born Jews, their descendants have become Jews "in the complete sense of the word."[30]

Some of the early prayerbooks also refer to us as a nation. Einhorn refers to the fact that God "separated the nations and set their bounds," making Israel His priest.[31] The Szold-Jastrow prayerbook talks about the time when "our nation" was "in the youthful period of its existence."[32]

Apparently the terms "nation" and "race" were often used interchangably since the same men who referred to the Jews as a nation also referred to us as a race. Felsenthal pointed out the weakness of the argument that we are merely a religion by remarking that liberal Judaism is closer to liberal Christianity than it is to Hassidism. Yet he insisted that there is something that draws Jews together: race. "It can scarcely be said that it is the bond of religion which unites us--it is the racial bond, the bond of kinship, the bond which even the Jewish apostate does not willingly loosen."[33] The Einhorn and Jastrow-Szold prayer-

books also refer to the Jews as a race.[34] Raphael Lewin calls Judaism "the religion of our race." Einhorn also uses the terms "universal community of Israel"[36] and "people."[37]

We should look briefly at how the Hebrew language was viewed by the early reformers. Felsenthal thought that Hebrew in the synagogue was important because it was a tie uniting all Israel. Though it was not the strongest tie, it was, nevertheless, an important one.[38] The Philadelphia Conference of 1869 affirmed that the cultivation of Hebrew was a sacred duty. However, since it had "become unintelligible to the vast majority of our coreligionists" it was considered advisable to replace it with English in prayer.[39]

Raphael Lewin went a step further. He did not even think that it was a duty to study Hebrew. He believed that it was a language of the past whose only students in the future would be theologians who wished to study ancient Jewish lore. The American people are practical and would not devote their time to learning something from which they could derive no practical benefit. Since the younger generation of Jews are Americans, they share this view. Besides, Lewin felt that Judaism was not a sectarian religion, but the property of mankind, and therefore we have no right to prevent the world from understanding our prayers by keeping them in Hebrew! However, Lewin hastens to inform us that he doesn't advocate the total abolition of Hebrew: "For some

time to come, Hebrew should be retained for obvious reasons, but only in a minor degree and only in such parts of the service as are not actually prayers."[40]

We shall conclude our discussion of definitions by looking at some terms. We can say that during the nineteenth century, the term "Jew" was not favored. Wise preferred the term "Israelite" to "Jew." He wrote: "A Jew is one born of Jewish parents, but an Israelite is a worshipper of the One God."[41] Wise's dislike of the term "Jew" extended to the point that, in his prayerbook, rather than translating the word "יְהוּדִים", he merely transliterated it. For example, "As once in the days of Mordechai light, gladness, joy, and honor was with the Yehudim, so let them be also with us, . . ."[42] Wise alone used the term "Hebrew." In the 1870's when he founded the congregational union and the rabbinical seminary, he avoided calling them Jewish, but instead named them "Union of American Hebrew Congregations" and "Hebrew Union College." It should not be thought that the avoidance of the word "Jew" was an idiosyncrasy of I. M. Wise. When the Charleston group was founded in 1825, they called themselves the "Reformed Society of Israelites." Einhorn called his prayerbook Book of Prayers for Israelitish Congregations and the Szold-Jastrow volume was known as Israelitish Prayer Book. In all fairness, though, it should be mentioned that Max Landsberg called his 1885 prayerbook Ritual for Jewish

Worship, and Raphael Lewin called his 1870 work The American-Jewish Ritual.[43]

CHAPTER 3

GOD'S PEOPLE

Without exception, all of the early reformers believed that there is something distinctive about the Jewish people: We are God's people. Most of them believed that God has chosen us, although for many this concept created a problem because they felt that it conflicted with a universalistic outlook. In any event, we are the beloved of God and bound to Him by a covenant. We Jews were generally viewed as an historical people, having a definite relationship to our ancestors. Most of the Reform prayerbooks had special prayers for the people of Israel. Nearly all the reformers saw Israel as a priest-people; some even saw Israel as the world's Messiah.

Although references to God's having chosen Israel abound in the prayerbooks, there is often an ambivalence expressed. For example, in the "אהבה רבה", Merzbacher retains the phrase "who hast chosen thy people Israel with love."[1] However, in the "אתה בחרתנו", he skips the entire phrase "אתה בחרתנו מכל העמים אהבת אותנו ורצית בנו ורוממתנו מכל לשון" and begins the prayer with "אתה קדשתנו במצותיך וקרבתנו מלכנו לעבודתך".[2] In other words, he is happy to acknowledge that God has given us commandments and drawn

us into His service, but he is uneasy about the idea that God has chosen us.

This uneasiness of Merzbacher was shared by a number of his colleagues. Lewin skips the very same phrase about the Jews being chosen and exalted and also begins, "Thou hast sanctified us with thy commandments. . . ."[3] In the Szold-Jastrow prayerbook, the phrase "ורוממתנו מכל לשון" is omitted, but "אשר בחרת בנו מכל עם" is retained. However, they feel that the chosenness must be explained at this spot: "Thou hast chosen us from among all nations, and in thy love hast assigned unto us the priestly mission of spreading the knowledge of thy Holy Name, so that we may not alone perform thy commandments, but consecrate ourselves to thy service."[4] This is certainly more than a translation of the original Hebrew. There are other examples of authors exchanging the concept of "mission to the nations" for the concept of "exalted above the nations."[5]

The uneasiness about chosenness can be seen in other prayers, as well. We can sense the uneasiness by the fact that the author is unable to simply state that God chose us, but feels compelled to give the reason why He did so. The usual reasons given are that we were chosen to perform a mission, to do service, or to generally benefit mankind.[6] An interesting sidelight can be seen in the Charleston prayerbook. In the service for a circumcision, which usually stress-

es the unique relationship between God and Israel, this prayerbook makes the point that God has made the entire human race the object of His particular care.[7] However in the "עלינו", it proclaims that God "hath not made us as the unenlightened nations; nor placed us in darkness like the heathen multitude; . . ."[8]

God's love for Israel permeates the traditional prayerbook, and Israel is seen as God's beloved in the Reform prayerbooks as well. The "אהבת עולם" is not usually tampered with much during this period. Merzbacher gives a literal translation.[9] Wise makes it a bit more flowery: "Thou distinguishest Israel Thy people, with Thy perpetual love."[10] Though Landsberg begins his version with the universalistic phrase, "Thou art the loving Father of all men," he continues, "Thou hast guided thy people, Israel, with unchanging love; . . ."[11] Of course, there are references to God's love for Israel in other prayers, too.[12]

One of the manifestations of God's love for Israel is His Revelation of the Torah. While Revelation is mentioned by Merzbacher,[13] it seems to be especially stressed by Wise. In his prayerbooks, he tells us that God "has intrusted the Word of Salvation to Israel's care,"[14] and that He "delivered the law of truth to His people."[15] The idea was also expressed in Wise's other writings. In 1860, he wrote a "Letter to a Gentleman Who with his Family Wishes

to Embrace Judaism." In it he stated: "There is but one truth and this was revealed to Israel; therefore, Israel is the mountain of the Lord, which all nations must finally ascend, there to learn of God's ways and to walk in His paths."[16]

Torah was not stressed in all the prayerbooks, however. In the heavily universalistic Charleston prayerbook, we learn that true piety and deeds of kindness which the children of the house of Judah and of Israel should cultivate flow "from benevolent feelings and good fellowship."[17] The prayer for Pentecost mentions the end of winter, but not the giving of the Torah to Israel (although it does admonish us to be obedient to God's precepts).[18] This prayerbook is rather extreme in this regard.

The Jews are bound to God by a Covenant. This idea appears in a number of the prayers. Wise especially stresses the eternal nature of the Covenant. This can be seen both in the prayers[19] and in the Scriptural verses[20] which he includes in his prayerbooks. Wise even changes the wording of the "אמונה" from "זכור חסד אמונה" to "זכור ברית אמונה". The Covenant-idea ties together three parties: God, our ancestors, and us. This can be seen in such prayers as, "O remember unto us the covenant of our ancestors, . . .[21] and " . . . we thy people, the children of thy covenant--the descendants of Abraham thy follower, with whom thou didst

make a solemn covenant on Mount Moriah, . . ."[22]

The early reformers acknowledged that the Jews are an historical people, that there is a tie between the Jews of today and those of the past. Wise asks God to hear us just as He "graciously listened to the supplications of our pious ancestors."[23] For the morning service of the New Year, he composed an original English prayer to face the Hebrew of the "עמידה". In it, he traces the history of Israel from Abraham to modern times.[24] He also makes reference to our ancestors in the "פיוט מוסף" and in the "הושענות" for the Feast of Booths after the Additional Prayer.[25] Lewin also asks God to remember for Israel's benefit the righteousness of their ancestors[26] and, of course, nearly every Reform prayerbook retains the phrase "אלהי אבותינו ואמותינו" in the "קדושה". Einhorn recognizes that we are "the progeny of Abraham"[27] and even the Charleston prayerbook connects us with our ancestors.

Although all of the Reform prayerbooks which contained the Daily "עמידה" altered portions of that section as a rule, they retained (or even added) prayers asking God to bless His people, Israel. For example, the traditional fifteenth benediction asks for the "sprouting forth" of David's offspring and the "exalting" of his horn. Merzbacher changes this to read, "Cause thy salvation to sprout forth, and let thy people's horn be exalted in thy salva-

tion; . . ."[29] Wise changes "את צמח דוד" to "את צמח עבדיך".[30] However, he does not let his particularism run wild. In the sixteenth benediction, which, in the Ashkenazi rite, traditionally blessed God for hearkening to the prayer of His people Israel, Wise's version, following the Sephardi rite, reads, " . . . for Thou hearest in mercy the prayer of <u>every</u> heart."[31] (Italics mine.) A similar phenomenon may be seen in Lewin's prayerbook. The fifteenth benediction asks that God's people's cause be exalted, and even concludes, "Blessed art thou, O Lord! who makest the cause of Israel prosperous."[32] Yet, in the thirteenth benediction, in addition to asking for God's mercy on the just, the pious, and the elders of Israel, he also invokes it "upon all the righteous and benevolent of every sect and creed."[33]

The tenth benediction bothered the reformers because it traditionally prayed for Jewish freedom through the ingathering of the exiles. Einhorn and Landsberg pray for general freedom, seeing in it the end of Israel's mourning.[34] Lewin, though, prays for the freedom of nations and the collection of all exiles, but does not mention Israel.[35] Browne, in the seventh benediction, shows concern for his fellow Jews while confronting the "fact" that American Jews are not afflicted by changing "ראה בענינו" to "ראה נא בלחץ אחינו" and translating the latter, "Oh look upon the afflictions of our oppressed brethren, and hasten to redeem them for the sake of Thy name. . . ."[36]

Prayers in other sections of the prayerbooks, besides the "עמידה", ask God to exalt his people. Interestingly, in the "מוסף" for Sabbath morning, Merzbacher replaces "קומה עזרתנו וישראל" with "קומם קרן ישראל".[37] Einhorn's prayer is aware that Israel is troubled not only from without, but also within its ranks: "Bless Israel; exalt the horn of his salvation, and allow not his courage to falter in the strife, wherever he still bleeds for thy word; heal the deep and painful breach which discord has made in his own house. . . ."[38] Even the Charleston prayerbook recognizes that Israel is God's people and asks Him to preserve its remnant.[39]

The idea that Israel is a priest-people was very important to the early reformers. David Einhorn especially stressed this idea. In the "עבודה" section of his Day of Atonement service, he has a very beautiful prayer expressing it. In it he writes that for many centuries the scattered Jews believed themselves cast off from God's presence due to their sins. They seemed to be the outcasts of the nations. We now recognize in the dispersion not the loss, but the fullness of God's grace. The priestly dignity of old has passed from the house of Aaron to the whole commumity. Israel is "a world-embracing people of God" whose role is to lead all the nations to atonement. This idea is thus summarized:

> In the breaking up of Zion, O inscrutable Ruler, thou hast but dissolved the shadowy image of his future greatness; for thou hast called the priest-community to an incomparably higher service than was that of the scion of the house of Aaron. The priest of old had but the bliss of one tribe in view; the new priest bears in his heart the bliss of all the tribes of mankind.[40]

Einhorn has numerous other references to Israel's priestly task.[41] The idea was important to other reformers, too. Merzbacher notes that God has chosen Israel to minister to Him.[42] Wise expresses the idea in his rather free translation of the "first Torah blessing," which appears in the "ואהבת את ה'" :

> Praise be rendered unto Thee, O God, our Lord, universal king, who hath chosen us from among all nations, and intrusted us with His instruction, that we be unto Thee a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. We praise Thee, O God, teacher of humanity.[43]

Israel's priestly role is mentioned often in the Szold-Jastrow prayerbook. They even maintain that God "assigned the power of sanctification to Israel, thy priestly people."[44]

The idea that Israel is God's priest-people was expressed in works other than prayerbooks. The Philadelphia Conference of 1869 published the first statement by a body of reformers on this side of the Atlantic. In that statement, they declared:

> The Aaronic priesthood and the Mosaic sacrificial cult were preparatory steps to the real priesthood of the whole people, which began with the dispersion of the Jews, and to the sacrifices of sincere devotion and moral sanctification, which alone are pleasing and acceptable to the Most Holy.

Since they held that all Jews are priests, they were against any distinction between Aaronides and non-Aaronides in the religious rites. The Pittsburgh Platform of 1885 placed the priest-people idea even earlier in history when it stated in its second plank that "we recognize in the Bible the record of the consecration of the Jewish people to its mission as the priest of the One God. . . ."[45]

We have seen that the Reform leaders saw the Jewish people in many ways. Perhaps the loftiest appellation applied to Israel was that of Messiah. In The Israelite, Wise wrote that "Judaism is a universal religion. Israel itself is the Messiah."[46] Felsenthal was another ardent supporter of this view. In 1858, at the first meeting of the Chicago Reformverein, he said that we Jews "are still the chosen people, destined to become the Messiah of the nations of the earth."[47] Fourteen years later, in an address entitled "The Wandering Jew," delivered before the Chicago Young Men's Christian Union, he stated that we look at the dispersion as a blessing--a blessing for the gentile world--because we have become "their Messiah, their Savior and Redeemer."[48]

Einhorn also believed strongly that Israel is the world's Messiah. One of his prayers for the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem contains the following lines:

> Out of the flames of Zion arose the messiah--the martyr, Israel, who, freed from the bonds of childhood, marches through all the world, a man of sorrows, without form and appearance, despised and spurned; to deliver, through his fetters, his own tormentors; to bring healing, in his wounds, to them who wound him; to see seed--after his soul has been the sin-offering; to carry out the will of his Lord, and delight in the countless hosts gathering around him.[49]

He even makes Israel's Messiahship an article of faith to which confirmands and converts must subscribe. At the Confirmation rites, each confirmand was required to answer the following in the affirmative:

> Do you believe that God has chosen Israel to be his priest-people, to propagate by his character, his wonderful fate, and his unwearied struggle, the doctrine of sanctification all over the earth, and unite all men in the true knowledge and worship of God; and that Israel is destined to fulfill this high mission as the Messiah of all mankind, and ultimately to behold the sanctification of all nations, united for ever through the bonds of truth and love into one Congregation of God?[50]

Lewin also seems to see Israel's role as that of world-redeemer. This is indicated by his replacement of the phrase "who brings the Redeemer" in the "גואל" with the words, "who wilt in love fulfill the mission of thy chosen people Israel. . . ."[51] He replaces "Redeemer" not simply with "Redemption," but with redemption through Israel.

CHAPTER 4

THE MISSION OF ISRAEL

The concept of the mission of Israel has been associated with Reform Judaism more than any other concept. The reformers may have quibbled over whether we are a religious group or a nation, whether we were chosen or not, but they were unanimous in believing that we Jews have a mission to perform in the world. In this chapter, we shall look at the mission-idea and see just what it entailed. The most important aspects of the mission-idea were that we are to make God's Unity known, that we are to teach truth to humanity, that we must work to improve society, that we must suffer and struggle, and that finally the world will be united in brotherhood. We shall close the chapter by investigating how the reformers believed the observance of particular Jewish customs was related to Israel's mission.

The Philadelphia Conference of 1869 dealt with the mission-idea. In its statement, the Conference noted that Israel's Messianic aim was not the restoration of the old Jewish state for that would involve a second separation from the nations of the world. Rather, it was the union of all of God's children in the confession of His Unity. The destruction of the second Jewish commonwealth was, there-

fore, not looked upon as a punishment. The dispersion of the Jews would enable them to realize "their high priestly mission, to lead the nations to the true knowledge and worship of God."[1]

The idea that Israel's mission was to make God's Unity known to the world captured the poetic imaginations of a number of the authors of the Reform prayerbooks. The Szold-Jastrow prayerbook sees in this mission the element which led to Israel's preservation:

> Yea, we rejoice in the mission assigned to us, by means of thy law, to make known thy existence and thy unity. It is this which has sustained us, and preserved our existence among all nations, and day and night will we be mindful thereof.[2]

These words are from their rendition of "אמת ויציב". The mission-idea was of such importance to them that they vow to be mindful of <u>it</u>, rather than of the Torah's laws (as in the original), day and night.

The traditional "אמת כמה" states that God chose Israel to declare His Unity. However, the reformers transformed this duty into a "holy mission." This can be seen in Landsberg's rendition of this prayer: "Grant that we may never forget the holy mission for which our fathers were set apart, to acknowledge thee and thy unity before all the nations on earth."[3]

In a prayer for Pentecost morning, Einhorn movingly describes Israel:

> A small tribe was destined by thy inscrutible wisdom to stem the tide of corruption, to become a pattern, a guardian angel, to all mankind; its teachings, its example, and its fate were to give testimony of thee, the Only-one, and gradually lead all sons of man to the adoration and worship of thy name, and make them all thy people.[4]

In a prayer for the morning of the Feast of Conclusion, Einhorn tells how God originally isolated Israel in order that Israel might grow inwardly and later caused the people to issue forth as "a hero of the Lord, full of ardor to run his course from one end of the earth to the other, to become a blessing to all the families of man, and to proclaim the honor and glory of thy name through all the quarters of the globe."[5] Lewin expressed a similar idea when he asked God to "make us conscious of our mission . . . and hasten the time when all thy children will acknowledge thee alone. . . ."[6]

Nearly all of the reformers felt that part of Israel's mission was to be a teacher of truth to the rest of humanity. In his Confirmation service, Lewin states that in order to bring spiritual happiness to mankind, God gave to Israel those truths that make up the essence of pure religion and ordained that our people become "the moral guides and religious teachers of His children" until "all Nations will acknowledge the only true God, will accept these Truths and Laws, and will live as one family. . . ."[7]

In a prayer for the Sabbath preceding the New Moon, Einhorn waxes poetic when he describes Israel as the world's

teacher in these words:

> And thus may thy spirit never cease to reign in Israel, whom thou hast illumined with the sunlight of Sinai and destined to impart it, as the moon does her light, to those, who dwell in darkness, until the day shall break--when the radiance of the moon will be like that of the sun, and thy people will jubilantly receive its reward for what it has done and suffered.[8]

The Szold-Jastrow prayerbook lays special stress on Israel's mission to teach God's truth. They state that we have been scattered over the earth in order to teach truth. The task of teacher is never an easy one and often a thankless one. Still, the authors hope that the people of Israel will be "recognized and appreciated for their efforts toward the advancement of truth and enlightenment."[9] They considered the mission-idea so important that during the "Confession of Faith" at the Confirmation rites, their confirmands had to affirm that "Israel, by means of the revelation on Sinai, have received the sublime mission of spreading over all the earth the truths there made known and of confirming all mankind in the true knowledge of God," and that "the Messianic Days predicted by our prophets, will finally be realized through Israel's mission."[10]

Szold and Jastrow believed that God assigned every nation a mission and that Israel's mission was to disseminate God's commandments, the performance of which would lead mankind to perfection.[11] Similar ideas were to be found in

liberal Christian thought of the day. Therefore Parker wrote that "if we watch in history the gradual development and evolution of the human race, we see that one nation takes the lead in the march of mind, pursues science, literature, and the arts; another in war . . . while a third nation . . . takes the lead in religion, and in the comparative strength of its religious consciousness surpasses both."[12] Parker further noted that the three forms of monotheistic religion came from the "Shemitic" family and that "the Shemitish tribes . . . have had an influence in religious history entirely disproportionate to their numbers, their art, their science, or their laws."[13]

Landsberg interprets Passover and Pentecost in the light of Israel's mission. His prayerbook states that God gave liberty to Israel so that "it might become a people of priests from whom light and freedom, salvation and bliss should be brought to all those who dwell on earth."[14] Similarly, Pentecost reminds us of the covenant "by which Israel was appointed as thy first-born son to be the guardian of the highest and most sacred treasures of mankind, and the light of the nations."[15]

To Wise, also, we Jews are teachers. His prayerbook states that "God is the teacher of humanity, and Israel is the consecrated agent to bring this doctrine of life to all nations."[16] In 1849, he wrote in The Occident: "The mission

of Israel was and still is to promulgate the sacred truth to all nations on earth; to diffuse the bright light that first shone on Sinai's sanctified summit, all over the world."[17]

It seems that when theologians write about the nature of the Jewish people, what they describe is more theoretical than actual--what Israel should be like rather than how Jews really are. Wise may have seen Israel as the teachers of mankind, in theory, but on a very practical level he could also write the following:

> When these self made reformers say, 'We Jews made the Bible, the Talmud, and all the commentaries, all being spirit of our spirit, and we can also undo it if we want it so,' they tell a falsehood. Not we Jews, but some very few of us, have done it, and hammered it into the brains and souls of the masses in the hard-fought battles of truth against ignorance and stupidity. It is not spirit of our spirit, it is of the spirit of the few enlightened and God-inspired souls that rose among us by the grace of God.[18]

In the same practical vein, we can understand the appeal made by Moritz Loth in the 1870's. He does not ask the average Jew to be an actual teacher of morality. Rather, he asks that rabbis be sent out to preach to the masses at large. His goal is not to make proselytes, but to impress on mankind the great lessons of Judaism which, if accepted, would benefit all classes of people, in both their public and private lives.[19]

A number of theologians held that being a teacher was not enough; that Israel's mission required the Jews to

be active participants in the improvement of society. Thus, Samuel Hirsch (1815-89) wrote that "the Jews of the present day must, before all else, participate in the work of the age with all their powers; for this work is the object of Jewish history, yes, it is the be-all and the end-all of Judaism."[20] He further wrote concerning the modern Jew:

> He must not be a mere spectator of the work of the modern age, but must give himself heart and soul to it, for this is the command of the God of his father, who . . . called Abraham from the other side of the river, and desired to make him and his descendants a blessing for the world through their deeds and their sufferings.[21]

Isaac Mayer Wise also saw this as one of the roles of our people. Thus did he describe Israel:

> . . . the people which has seen the rise, decline and fall of ancient empires, has stood at the cradle of modern nations, has groped its way through the darkness of the Middle Ages; and at the dawn of liberty and justice among the nations, rose with energy to demonstrate its ability to cooperate in the solution of the new problems of resurrecting humanity.[22]

It was not only individual reformers who saw the improvement of society as part of our mission. The eighth plank of the Pittsburgh Platform declared that "we deem it our duty to participate in the great task of modern times, to solve, on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of society."[23]

The idea that Israel's mission was not an easy task, but a struggle involving much suffering was stressed by David

Einhorn. His prayer for the Sabbath before Purim states that one cause for the nations' hatred for Israel and their desire to see our destruction was the fact that Israel was engaged in a "struggle with the seed of Amalek, with falsehood and wickedness."[24] On the morning of the New Year, we read in the "עקדת יצחק" that "the cruel blows which it was Israel's fate to suffer became a blessing to himself and to all mankind; from his wounds blessedness flowed for all nations."[25]

In the Domestic Service on the Eve of Passover, Einhorn characterizes Israel as follows:

> . . . they were selected by God to carry on a severe and bitter struggle among the nations, to found a realm of priests, and to propagate the doctrine of the Only-One among all the peoples; and that as "צבאות", fighting hosts of God, they had to be prepared for wounds and sacrifices, but never to despair--as he for whom they were to fight was also to fight for them, carrying them through perils and persecutions, on thorny paths, through streams of blood and tears, to glorious victory.[26]

In a lecture entitled "The Wandering Jew," Wise said that the Jew must wander "till the habitable earth shall be one holy land."[27] This, indeed, was the goal of Israel's mission: One world united in brotherhood. This theme was echoed in nearly all the Reform prayerbooks. We read, in Lewin's preface, the following concerning Judaism:

> Its mission is the universal acknowledgement of the unity of the Supreme Being and the union of all God's children in a common bond of brotherhood. It is no sectarian, no national religion. It was not vouchsafed to Israel for the happiness of the few merely to the exclusion of the many.[28]

For the Sabbath during Hannukah, Einhorn has a prayer which looks forward to the day when heathenism will vanish, and "a universal God's nation, embracing the whole earth, will rise--a new temple to thee, resting on Israel, the corner-stone."[29] Einhorn also touched on this during his inaugural sermon in Baltimore. In that sermon, he said that Israel had been set apart from the other nations in order to bring about the universal union of the nations in God, and that our mission, therefore, is to carry God's Law to all peoples.[30]

On the ninth of Ab, the Szold-Jastrow prayerbook reminds us that we do not "unduly lament over the Temple that is destroyed" because, in the future, God will raise a Temple in the hearts of all men so that all nations may form one brotherhood in His service.[31] To work for such a world is not only the mission of Israel, it is, indeed, the mission to which the entire human race has been appointed.[32]

Landsberg has many references to a united humanity. Typical of these is this prayer:

> May all thy children, O God, soon be united in a common bond of brotherhood; may the time be hastened when no religious differences shall separate them; when they shall all adore thee as the universal Father, worship thee in the spirit of true religion, and unite in proclaiming the unity of thy holy name.[33]

An unusual prayer in the Landsberg volume is one which comes to grips with the reality that religious differences exist not only between the different peoples of the world, but also

within the household of Israel. In this prayer, he acknowledges that there are two basic groups within the house of Jacob:

> Its children stand divided into two camps, between a world that passes away, which believes Israel destined to dwell forever alone and isolated among the nations, and a rising world, which, filled with the spirit of the prophets, sees Israel's glory and highest destination in the union of all thy children, as the people of thy covenant.

The prayer naturally concludes with the hope that soon all Israel will be united in the latter camp.[34]

Since Israel's mission was conceived of in such universalistic terms, what part did the early reformers think particular Jewish customs should play in modern religious life? Samuel Hirsch, a leading philosopher of Reform, presents an interesting case of a man whose thoughts on this subject undergo a drastic change over the course of his career. Kohler points out that in Hirsch's early career he demanded the strict observance of the Mosaic ceremonies (including fringes and phylacteries) as symbolic expressions of Israel's vocation as God's witnesses.[35] In his later career, Hirsch still felt that symbols must be retained in Judaism, but they must be symbols that give testimony both to the Jews and to the rest of the world of the rule of the spirit over nature. He was against any symbol which would prevent the Jew from participating in modern life.[36]

Bernhard Felsenthal felt that we should preserve our Jewish distinctiveness.[37] However, these words of Raphael Lewin express the viewpoint which was much more widespread within the ranks of Reform:

> In diffusing the blessings of their mission, then, it is clearly the duty of Israel to abandon every doctrine, every idea, every custom, every form which may tend to obscure the true beauties of their hallowed faith. The principles of religion alone are eternal.[38]

The Pittsburgh Platform deals with this very question. The third plank reads:

> We recognize in the Mosaic legislation a system of training the Jewish people for its mission during its national life in Palestine, and today we accept as binding only its moral laws, and maintain only such ceremonies as elevate and sanctify our lives, but reject all such as are not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization.[39]

In the fourth plank, the rabbis who had gathered at Pittsburgh drew special attention to certain customs which they deemed worthy of rejection. They held that since all the Mosaic and rabbinical laws which regulate diet, priestly purity, and dress "fail to impress the modern Jew with a spirit of priestly holiness, their observance in our days is apt rather to obstruct than to further modern spiritual elevation."[40] This statement represented the tenor of Reform thought in the year 1885.

Before concluding this discussion of Israel's mission, we must point out that there were some Reform rabbis

who felt that the mission had already been largely accomplished since many non-Jews accepted the true faith, that is, a humanistic, ethical religion. The conclusion reached was that there was no longer a need to maintain Judaism as a separate religion, and that Jews should merge with all people trying to fulfill the mission. The man who acted on these principles most decisively during this period was Felix Adler. Though trained for the rabbinate, he felt that he could no longer accept as valid a distinctive Jewish religion. So, in 1876, he founded the Ethical Culture Society. His leaving Judaism could be seen as an outgrowth of the mission idea.[41]

PART II

FROM THE PITTSBURGH PLATFORM TO THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

CHAPTER 5

RELIGION OR RACE?

In this second period, between the Pittsburgh Platform and the Balfour Declaration, most of the attitudes which we found in the earlier period continued to manifest themselves. The question of definitions--are we a religion, a race, a nation, a nationality, or some combination of these?--became a more heated issue after the first Zionist Congress in 1897. Much of the material dealing with definitions during this period was a reaction to the rise of Jewish nationalism which many saw as a challenge to Reform Judaism.

We shall devote two chapters to the topic of definitions during this period. In this chapter, we shall deal with the specific question of religion versus race. We shall see that the official position remained that we are Jews by religion only. Some leaders admitted that there were other factors in being Jewish, but that religion was certainly the part to be emphasized. There were some adherents to the view that we are members of the Jewish race. Even among the latter group, it was generally felt that though we are a race, we have certain duties to fulfill as Jews. Very often the terms "race" and "nation" were used interchangeably, so that those who maintained a racial interpretation were often Jewish

nationalists as well.

On more than one occasion, the Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirmed the idea stated in the fifth plank of the Pittsburgh Platform that we Jews are members of a religious community. In 1906, the CCAR adopted the following resolution: "We, herewith, reaffirm that religion is the tie which unites the Jews; the synagogue is the basic institution of Judaism, and the congregation, its unit of representation."[1] In 1911, the Conference endorsed a statement of its Committee on Church and State which came out against any movement in Jewish communities which had other than a religious basis.[2]

In a sermon entitled, "What We Have To Be Thankful For," Adolph Moses maintained not only that we are Jews by religion, but that we are members of the "Church of Jehovah." He spoke as follows:

> It is not by the accident of our birth, but by spiritual succession and free choice that we are life-long devoted champions of the church universal of Jehovism. It is not by virtue of our blood, which heaven knows has flowed together from all possible sources, but by the indissoluble bonds of sacred memories, by the identity of beliefs, principles and ideals, that we are the inheritors of the burdens and duties, of the struggles, sorrows, joys, and glories of the missionary people of moral monotheism.[3]

In 1904, Max L. Margolis wrote that "he only is a Jew who is a Jew by conviction, who sympathizes with the religious content of Judaism and is willing to shape his life accordingly" and that we should, therefore, have no patience

for the "race Jew."[4] In line with this thinking, he appealed to the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to form a synod for the purpose of promulgating a "Creed of the Reformed Jewish Church of America."[5]

At the 1905 CCAR convention, Kaufmann Kohler responded to Margolis's recommendation. In the course of this response, Kohler said that "Professor Margolis states, and we all fully agree with him, that Judaism must be a matter of religious conviction, spiritual life and not merely race pride and nationalistic concern."[6] Although Kohler also held a religious interpretation, he was opposed to Margolis's plan because he felt that it would lead to a schism within Judaism.[7]

Margolis replied that a clear formulation of our own position should not be interpreted as schismatic, and that, in reality, modern Jewry was already divided into different groups. He reiterated that "to us, the Jewish body is not an ethnos, but an ecclesia.[8]

A number of leaders stressed the religious aspects of being Jewish without denying that there were other factors involved. In an address entitled "Why I Am Not A Zionist" Henry Berkowitz stated:

> Zionism declares that 'the Jews are more than a purely religious body, they are not only a race but also a nation.' The proposition should be reversed. The Jews are more than a race or a nation, they are primarily a religious body. The difference lies in putting the emphasis where it belongs, and that is on our religion.[9]

In this speech, Berkowitz did not deny the racial or national aspects; he simply emphasized the religious. Similarly, by maintaining that a Jew who became an apostate ceased to be a Jew and that his few racial characteristics disppeared in a single generation, Isaac M. Wise was admitting that there were racial characteristics although the religious predominated.[10]

Certainly, Kaufmann Kohler held that a positive Jew was a religious Jew. However, when he said that "the Jew without God is a monstrosity, an object of fear," he admitted the reality of Jews who were not Jews by religion.[11] A certain ambivalence about this can be sensed in these words of Kohler: "Not they who admit unbelievers and apostates into their ranks as members of the Jewish nation can lay claim to loyalty. . . ."[12] He was, thus, against a non-religious interpretation, but he did not go so far as to say that a nonbeliever was no longer a Jew.

In a sermon, "I Am a Hebrew," Leon Harrison said that it is not race-pride, but a common religion, which unites Jews. While laying stress on religion, he did not deny race. He asked his listeners to show that "your fidelity is rather to your religion than to your race; to the race when persecuted for their religion; but chiefly to the religion in its purity are we attached as a unit by our belief in its sublime excellence."[13]

Some of the Reform leaders saw the Jews primarily as a racial group. Probably the strongest adherent of this viewpoint was Bernhard Felsenthal. In many of his writings he underscores the racial tie between Jews. He often used the terms "Jewish race," "Jewish people," and "Jewish nationality" interchangeably. Felsenthal believed that religion was a very significant part of Jewish life. However, he certainly did not see Jews as members of a "church." He wrote that the Jewish people or race was the substratum and that the Jewish religion inheres in that substratum.[14]

Felsenthal noted that there were many people who were Jews but were not affiliated with any congregation. If Judaism could in any way be considered a church, he felt that it would have to be considered a national church rather than a world-religion. He did not believe that the final triumph of Judaism would be the making over of all men into Jews. That was an impossibility since humanity would always be divided into differing races. Judaism's triumph would be universal recognition of the truths of theism.[15]

In his second series of "Jewish Theses," Felsenthal tried to show how a racial interpretation of the Jewish people could be found throughout Jewish literature, from the Bible onward. Since he held that the Jews are a race, he wrote that a Jew was a Jew from the day of his birth to the day of his death. Nothing the Jew could do would alter the

fact of his Jewishness.[16] A person of another race could become a Jew religiously, but he maintained that Jewish law viewed that person differently from a born Jew.[17] He recognized that descendants of apostates would cease being Jews racially after three or four generations, and, likewise, descendants of proselytes who intermarried with born Jews would become Jews racially.[18]

When Felsenthal spoke of race, he acknowledged that he was not speaking as an anthropologist. He maintained that race is determined by descent rather than by physical characteristics such as the shape of the skull or the color of the hair. He admitted that there were both brachycephalic and dolichocephalic Jews, but considered them as two varieties of the Jewish race.[19] He also believed that the Jews were ethnically one of the purest races in the world. While thousands of Jews had been lost to the race over the centuries, he figured that no more than one thousand--perhaps less than three hundred--non-Jews had converted to Judaism since the Christianization of the Eastern Empire.[20] He did admit, however, that the Jewish race is not absolutely pure since, in antiquity, it originated out of a mingling of tribes.[21]

Felsenthal was not the only reformer to hold a racial view. Louis Grossman didn't speak of blood, but he spoke of temperament. He said that our ancestors "transmitted an un-

altered semitic mood and mind" to us.[22] Felsenthal's influential Chicago colleague, Emil G. Hirsch (1851-1923), also spoke in terms of race. He felt that we are Jews primarily by descent and that such a racial interpretation was in accord with the anthropological investigations of the day. He stated that "a racial Judaism is no more out of reason than is humanity itself, for humanity is ours by birth and physiology."[23]

Even those who held a racial interpretation usually recognized that there was more to being Jewish than blood. Hirsch spoke against Jews prating about their blood and referring to their race while neglecting the "spiritual elements involved in Jewish birth."[24] Hirsch elaborated those elements in an address entitled "Why am I a Jew?" when he said:

> Of course, birth confers merely the elemental data. Every Jew, such because his parents were such, must become a Jew also in the conviction, that this accident of birth places upon him certain responsibilities for the spreading of those ideal influences and views which to find and to teach was the call, the selection and election of Judaism in the great household of God's children.[25]

In his prayerbook, Joseph Krauskopf refers to the Jewish people as a race and goes on to state that "that people lives because destiny has preserved it, because the world still has need of it, because it has been divinely entrusted with a great mission."[26]

In 1913, Max Heller, one of the first American Zionists, presented a paper at the CCAR convention entitled "The

Place of the Jew in a Racial Interpretation of the History of Civilization." In it, he stated that while the Jews are not a race in a way that can be scientifically delimited, in the popular consciousness of the people and in its inner potentialities, a whole is formed. The Jews can, thus, be called a race, and that race is "God's illumined teacher of faith and righteousness."[27]

CHAPTER 6

THE JEWISH NATION

Jewish nationalism was one of the most controversial topics in Jewish life during this period. The bulk of the Reform leaders continued to believe that we Jews are not a nation. There were a minority, however, who felt otherwise. The rise of political Zionism drew a great deal of criticism within the ranks of Reform, both in private writings and in official CCAR pronouncements. Even in those days, though, there were some Reform Zionists. This whole area of Jewish nationalism will be our concern in this chapter. As part of our discussion, we shall also look at the relationship between the reformers and the Eastern European immigrants.

At the 1890 convention of the CCAR, the following resolution was presented by Rabbis Philipson, Landsberg, and I. S. Moses:

> Although it has been stated time and again that the Jews are no longer a nation, and they form a religious community only, yet has this thought not been thoroughly appreciated by the community at large; we still hear of the "Jewish nation" and the "Hebrew people," and therefore this Conference feels itself called upon to declare once more that there is no Jewish nation now, only a Jewish religious body, and in accordance with this fact neither the name Hebrew or Israelite, but the universal appellation Jew is applicable.

The resolution was defeated by the close vote of 13-12. The debate was not recorded. A motion to reconsider the matter was brought up, but the matter was not reconsidered.[1]

We can only speculate about why the resolution was defeated. Perhaps the opponents felt that there was no need to repeat this stand since the Pittsburgh Platform of five years before made the Reform position quite clear. Perhaps some of the men did not want to stop using the terms "Hebrew" and "Israelite." It is unlikely that most of the opponents voted against the resolution because they felt that we are a nation. From their writings, most of the Reform rabbis indicated that they did not believe that we are members of a Jewish nation.

In an 1899 address before the CCAR, Rabbi Samuel Sale said that the Jews have no nationality of their own today, and that if the term may be used at all, it can only have a spiritual meaning. He further claimed that the Jews are a religious community and have no desire to constitute a separate national body. The Jews are a religious denomination just like the Christians.[2]

Emil G. Hirsch admitted that at one time the Jews were a nation, but when the state and Temple fell, that political nationality came to an end. Certainly after the Bar Kochba defeat, Jewish political nationality changed from

being an actual fact into a potential hope. The vision of restoration became more intense "because the nations would not admit into their nationality the scattered members of the extinct Jewish political nationality."[3]

In a sermon delivered before the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1917, David Philipson strongly attacked Jewish nationalism because he felt that it made Israel like any other small people rather than a unique people. He called his view "the religious idealistic interpretation of history" and "religious internationalism." While agreeing that we are a people--a very special people at that--he did not think that we should draw ourselves off from the rest of mankind as a separate nationalistic group.[4]

To many reformers, Jewish nationalism conflicted with Americanism. Hirsch maintained that he was against Jewish nationalism because it assumed that to be a Jew, one must belong to the Jewish nation, but the Jew in America has a nation--America.[5] Kohler held that patriotism was a fundamental precept of Judaism:

> Obedience to the laws of faith and devotion to the land in which the Jew lives were made the unalterable imperatives of the synagogue to that extent that often the Jew fought against his brother Jew, and service to the country was held paramount even at the neglect of Mosaic statutes.[6]

Hirsch agreed with Kohler's view of Jews and patriotism. He noted that though medieval Jews were not allowed to be

citizens, they were patriots anyway. He argued that they clung so much to the language of the homeland, that the Jewish international language in his day was not Hebrew, but German. Such feelings remained part of the Jews who came to America, as well. Hirsch wrote: "Patriotism is part of the Jewish religion. . . ."[7]

Philipson noted that in the modern era, when Jews received full citizenship, this became the motto describing the status of the international people of Israel: "Jews in religion--Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, as the case may be, in nationality." When Aaron Wise wrote in his Passover prayer, "We thank Thee, O God, our Redeemer, that our lot has fallen in this happy land, where liberty and right are firmly established, and that we belong to a nation that loveth right and pursueth peace," the nation he was referring to was America.[8] To most reformers, the Jews were not a nation.

In 1905, Joseph Krauskopf was president of the CCAR. In his message at the annual convention, Krauskopf declared that Israel is not a nation or a race. He defined the Jews as "a people of fellow-sufferers," and maintained that the bond unifying the Jews was forced from without by religious and social antipathy.[9] The Committee on President's Message could not let this pass. In its report, the committee opposed Krauskopf's view, stating that "the real bond of union among

Jews is the historic consciousness of being a priest people among the nations, and that his birth imposes upon the Jew the mission to witness to and work for the realization of the kingdom of the One God which implies one humanity." They thus concluded that the bond of union "is not imposed from without, but comes from within."[10]

There were some Reform leaders who believed that we are a nation. One of these was Professor Caspar Levias of the Hebrew Union College faculty. At the 1899 CCAR convention, he presented a paper in which he stated that if we are not a nation, then we cannot have a mission.[11] Maintaining that the Jews are a nation, he went on to define the term "nation":

> "Nation" in an ethnological sense, is a given group of people that possess in common certain national characteristics and innate peculiarities. Such a group, by virtue of such innate peculiarities, have the inalienable right to form a separate political group, a nation in the political sense.[12]

Bernhard Felsenthal was another reformer who believed that we are a nation (as well as a race). He, too, drew the distinction between an ethnological and a political nation. He wrote:

> Politically, we ceased to be a nation at the time when Titus conquered Jerusalem and destroyed the Jewish commonwealth; ethnologically, Israel remained in existence as a separate nation, differentiated from other nations. Politically, we belong to that nation under whose territory we happen to live; ethnologically, we are by ourselves.[13]

Felsenthal held that we Jews are a nation and that Judaism is our national religion. Were there no Jews, there would be no Judaism.[14] Since we make up a nationality, Felsenthal thought it very natural that we be drawn more closely to one another than to members of some other nationality.[15]

The term "nation" was also used by men who were not normally considered proponents of a nationalist interpretation. Leon Harrison spoke of "the national character," "the Jewish type," and "Hebraic characteristics."[16] Isaac M. Wise said concerning Passover that "a nation was born on that memorable day."[17] Kaufmann Kohler called us "a nation of priests" and noted that one does not become Jewish by a rite of consecration or confession.[18]

Emil G. Hirsch did not call us a nation, but he did say that we are a Volk. He wrote that we "represent a 'Volks' consciousness and by it are appointed to an historic task."[19] He maintained that though we are Jews by birth, descent was not enough. Judaism is both universalistic and particularistic. He wrote: "From one point of view, Judaism is racial, tribal and religio-national. Yet from another, it is universal and all-embracing."[20]

Sentiments of Jewish nationalism were concretized in political Zionism at the end of the nineteenth century. Most Reform leaders were anti-Zionist. James G. Heller, in his biography of Isaac Mayer Wise, points out that as Wise

came to realize that Zionism was more than a visionary scheme of a few dreamers, he saw in it a menace to his interpretation of Judaism and his opposition became sharp.[21] Wise wrote articles against Zionism in his own newspaper and elsewhere. In a letter to the New York Times, he wrote that most Jews want no Jewish state and will not separate themselves from the nations of the world "to set up a miniature statelet, a feeble dwarf of a government of their own in Palestine or in any other country."[22]

As could be expected, Wise's articles on the First and Second Zionist Congresses which appeared in The Israelite were none too positive. In his report on the First Congress, he indicated his fear that the world might think that the entire body of Jews want a separate national life.[23] In his article on the Second Congress, he expounded his opposition to Zionism more fully:

> Two long cherished principles prevent us from taking any part in the Zionist movement as it presents itself now. The first is, we are American citizens, who will never violate our allegiance to our country and our attachment to its people. The second is, Judaism is to us a system of religion and ethics with a mission to mankind, entirely independent of nationality, politics, linguistical and ethnological, independent also of geographic location and social organization. . . .[24]

In accord with these principles, Wise attacked Nordau's speech at the Second Zionist Congress. Wise felt that the speech tried to convince Jews that we are outcasts and that all non-Jews are wicked. In his critique, Wise

reiterated his position that "each of us lives in his own country and among his own people."[25]

Although anti-Zionism was the prevalent attitude in Reform circles of the day, Bernhard Felsenthal was a notable exception. He dated his own Zionist activity from 1897. He claimed to be the first non-Polish American Jew to come forward as an advocate of Zionism. Several months before the First Zionist Congress at Basel, he published a letter in the American Hebrew urging American congregations to send delegates.[26]

Felsenthal actually wrote articles favoring colonization of Palestine as early as 1891. At that time, however, he viewed the matter as a philanthropic rather than a political question.[27] Later, he wrote that Zionism must be favored by those who do not wish to see the extinction of the Jewish nation. He felt that the failure of Zionism would lead to the disappearance of Israel. Anti-Zionism, he maintained, was national suicide because the anti-Zionist leaders preached assimilation. In his view, assimilation leads to amalgamation which leads to becoming absorbed which leads to becoming extinct.[28]

The following excerpt from a letter Felsenthal sent to Dr. Judah Magnes in 1907 (the year before Felsenthal's death) expresses clearly his feelings about Zionism and about his anti-Zionist Reform colleagues:

> From day to day my conviction becomes more intensified that Zionism alone will be the savior of our nation and its religion, and save it from death and disappearance. I know that the anti-Zionists, and especially those in the so-called Reform camp, do not share in this view; they--the "Dreamers"--believe that by their "reforms" they will save Israel, and that thereby they will enpower it to fulfill what they call the Jewish mission in the world! Just in the opposite direction will their endeavors run. Absorption of Israel by other nations and gradual dying of Judaism, this will be their achievement.[29]

Felsenthal was not the only Reform rabbi to adopt a Zionist position. Both Max Heller and Stephen S. Wise were leading Reform rabbis as well as active Zionists. Heller was a charter member of the CCAR and its president from 1909 to 1911. He was also an enthusiastic advocate of Zionism from the beginning of that movement and was prominent in the Zionist Organization of America, serving as its honorary vice-president from 1911 until his death.[30] Wise was active in the leadership of the Zionist movement from its inception. He was the English Secretary at the Second Zionist Congress and was a founder of the Zionist Organization in 1898. He later served as its president.[31]

Of course, Felsenthal, Max Heller and Stephen Wise were in the minority regarding Zionism. At the turn of the century, the vast majority of Reform rabbis were anti-Zionists. Emil G. Hirsch stated flatly that "we Jews in America have no excuse for Zionism."[32] In 1904, Max L. Margolis wrote:

> Reformed Judaism and political Zionism are naturally antagonistic. On the other hand, Reformed Judaism, in so far as it is a religious, spiritual movement, has

> points of affinity with spiritual Zionism, although we are quite aware that spiritual Zionism looks forward to the political independence of Palestinian Jewry as an ultimate goal.[33]

Perhaps the leading spokesman for Reform Judaism at the beginning of this century was Kaufmann Kohler. One of the reasons he opposed Zionism was his belief that Judaism required Jews to work for the redemption of all mankind rather than the erection of a small Jewish state. In other words, the vision of the Zionists was too narrow.[34] Kohler's eulogy of Bernhard Felsenthal is very interesting. In it, he noted that as Felsenthal advanced in years, he became disgruntled and underwent a radical change of views, as shown by his espousal of Zionism. Kohler wrote:

> In the morning of his life his face was turned toward the rising sun as champion of Reform Judaism, and he was a cheerful optimist. After he had passed the zenith of his life and the shadows of the day were lengthening before him, he became retrogressive.[35]

In his great work, Jewish Theology, Kohler explains why Reform opposed Zionism. He writes that in nineteenth century Western countries, the Jews had full citizenship, were no longer distinguished from their fellow-citizens in speech, dress, education, or thought, and fully identified with the nation of their birth. The Jews differed from their Christian neighbors only in religion. Reform, therefore, did away with prayers for the return to Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state under a Davidic king. This Reform view appealed to the Jews of Western Europe and America, but

not to those of Eastern Europe. Since the Jews in Eastern lands were kept apart from the Christians by mental training, social habits and legal discrimination, they regarded themselves as a different nationality. This viewpoint led to Zionism. Such was Kohler's analysis.[36]

Kohler believed that neither political nor cultural Zionism could have a place in Jewish theology because both regarded the Jewish people as a nation like any other, denying its character as a priest-people with a religious mission for humanity. He felt that religious Zionism was different because it combined ancient longings for the Jerusalem Temple and State with nationalism.[37]

Kohler admitted that some good had been accomplished by political Zionism. It had aroused in many a zeal for the study of Jewish history and literature. He hoped that such study would eventually transform national Jews into religious Jews.[38] Kohler was especially in disagreement with the Zionist view that the assimilation of the cultural of surrounding nations led to the deterioration of the genuine culture of the Jewish nation. He held that there never was, nor would there ever be an exclusively Jewish culture. By assimilation, the Jews constantly created and fashioned their culture anew. He firmly believed that the only thing unique about the Jews was the Jewish religion.[39]

A rather unique position concerning nationalism, Zionism, and Reform Judaism was held by David Neumark. In an article written in 1916, entitled "Reform Jews and Nationalists," he wrote that nationalism has two aspects, a secular one and a religious one, and that Jewish nationalism is religious.[40] He maintained that Judaism was divided into two wings, orthodox and reform. He saw the so-called religious Zionists as a subdivision of the orthodox wing and the so-called secular Zionists as a subdivision of the reform wing.[41] He proclaimed that "all modern Zionists, except, perhaps, a very few who may not be religious at all, are good reform Jews," and that "neither the theory of reform Judaism nor the majority of reform Jews is opposed to Zionism."[42]

Political Zionism elicited a response not only from individual Reform rabbis, but also from the Central Conference of American Rabbis itself. In 1897, the year of the First Zionist Congress, the CCAR passed the following resolution unanimously:

> Resolved, That we totally disapprove of any attempt for the establishment of a Jewish state. Such attempts show a misunderstanding of Israel's mission which from the narrow political and national field has been expanded among the whole human race of the broad and universal religion first proclaimed by the Jewish prophets. Such attempts do not benefit, but infinitely harm, our Jewish brethren where they are still persecuted by confirming the assertion of their enemies that the Jews are foreigners in the countries in which they are at home and of which they are everywhere the most loyal and patriotic citizens.[43]

By the end of the First World War, Zionism had become a very powerful movement in world Jewry. In his President's Message in 1917, Rabbi William Rosenau attacked political Zionism and said that Reform rabbis have no place in any movement in which Jews band together on national or racial grounds or which works for a political state. He called upon the Conference to publish a statement indicating that it stands for an Israel whose mission is religious and, therefore, looks with disfavor upon any movement whose purpose is other than religious.[44]

As a result of Rosenau's request, the Committee on President's Message issued a majority report which reaffirmed the fundamental principle that the essence of Israel as a priest-people consists in its religious consciousness and not in any political, racial, or national characteristics. It also came out against "the new doctrine of political Jewish nationalism, which finds the criterion of Jewish loyalty in anything other than loyalty to Israel's God and Israel's religious mission."[45] Two minority reports were also presented to the Conference. The first was by Max Heller. It pointed out that Reform does not insist on the dispersion of the Jews as an indispensable condition for the welfare and progress of Judaism. He, therefore, concluded that there was mothing in the effort to secure a legally safe-guarded home for Jews in Palestine which was not in accord with the

principles and aims of Reform. The second minority report was by Louis J. Kopald. He was not a Zionist, but was interested in protecting the principle of Jewish liberalism. He felt that the Conference should not deny individual members the right to determine the best way to achieve the Jewish mission. He conceded that Zionism was an interpretation of the best way to conserve Judaism.[46]

There was a great deal of discussion on these reports on the Conference floor. Some of the remarks made by individuals are interesting to note. Clifton H. Levy said that "the great contribution of reform Judaism is the thought that Judaism is a universal religion." Samuel N. Deinard retorted that "it is not true that reform Judaism has eliminated the idea of Nationalism." Leo M. Franklin remarked: "If Zionism means the rehabilitation of Jewish nationality on Palestinian soil, it's a misreading of Jewish history. If Zionism means establishing a cultural center in Palestine or a center for philanthropy, we're all that kind of Zionists because that is Judaism."[47]

Stephen S. Wise was a leader of both Zionism and Reform Judaism. At the Conference, he stated: "I would not have you say that a reform teacher or rabbi has forfeited the right to be a teacher of reform Judaism because he has subscribed to the Zionist platform." David Philipson replied: "According to my understanding, reform Judaism

teaches universalism as over and against this very principle of nationalism. That is what I mean when I say that reform Judaism and political Zionism are incompatible."[48]

It was a lively debate, indeed! Joseph Stolz proposed a substitute resolution which passed by a vote of 68-20. In that resolution, the Conference reaffirmed its position that Israel's religious consciousness is the essence of its nature as a priest-people. It looked with disfavor upon any unreligious or anti-religious interpretation of Judaism, but also stated that we should emphasize the sacred principles that all Jews share rather than the differences dividing the people.[49]

On November 2, 1917, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur J. Balfour wrote a letter to Lord Rothschild in which he stated that the British government looked with favor upon the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Such an eventuality was not to prejudice the rights of non-Jews living in Palestine or of Jews living in other countries. The Balfour Declaration caused much excitement in the Jewish world, and the CCAR was also affected. At the 1918 convention, a resolution was introduced by a number of rabbis expressing appreciation to Great Britain for the declaration, and thanking France and Italy for seconding it. This resolution was referred to the Committee on President's Message.[50]

The committee issued the following report which was adopted by the Conference. It clearly stated the view of the majority of America's Reform rabbis concerning Zionism in the period immediately following the First World War:

> The Central Conference of American Rabbis notes with grateful appreciation the declaration of the British Government by Mr. Balfour as an evidence of good-will toward the Jews. We naturally favor the facilitation of immigration to Palestine of Jews who, either because of economic necessity or political or religious persecution desire to settle there. We hold that Jews in Palestine as well as anywhere else in the world are entitled to equality in political, civil and religious rights but, we do not subscribe to the phrase in the declaration which says, "Palestine is to be a national home-land for the Jewish people." This statement assumes that the Jews although identified with the life of many nations for centuries are in fact a people without a country. We hold that Jewish people are and of right ought to be at home in all lands. Israel, like every other religious communion, has the right to live and assert its message in any part of the world. We are opposed to the idea that Palestine should be considered the home-land of the Jews. Jews in America are part of the American nation. The ideal of the Jew is not the establishment of a Jewish state--not the re-assertion of Jewish nationality, which has long been outgrown. We believe that our survival as a people is dependent upon the assertion and the maintenance of our historic religious role and not upon the acceptance of Palestine as a home-land of the Jewish people. The mission of the Jew is to witness to God all over the world.[51]

To round out our discussion of "The Jewish Nation," we shall see how the Reform leaders related to the Hebrew language, to the Eastern European immigrants, and to the idea of Jewish agricultural colonization. Isaac Mayer Wise believed that every Jew should learn the language of the country in which he lived and should speak it well. However, he also felt that Hebrew should also be the language of every

Jew--that he should know it and read it well. In 1891, he even expressed satisfaction that "the rising generation of Hebrews in Palestine will speak Hebrew."[52] By 1899, though, Wise had come to view Zionism as a serious challenge to Reform, and he attacked nearly every Zionist proposal including Zionism's push for the revitalization of Hebrew. He wrote against the Zionists' "wanting us to speak and to write Hebrew again, which nobody in all Christendom besides a few theologians and select students understand."[53] Wise's earlier estimate of Hebrew language study was shared by Leon Harrison who wrote that "the Hebrew language that has been a vital bond among Israelites in all lands should be more widely studied."[54]

Wise also displayed a change of views with regard to the Jews who had recently come from Eastern Europe. At first, he thought that the newcomers would soon become Americanized. Americanization, of course, also meant the adoption of Reform Judaism. When Wise realized that Reform was not being accepted by the immigrants, he lost patience with them. He resented the fact that after Reform Jews had housed, fed, and clothed the immigrants, they did not recognize the reformers as coreligionists.

Wise feared that the social status of the German Jews in America would be adversely affected by the Russian Jews. Because the immigrants were building up "a semi-Asiatic Hassidism and medieval orthodoxy," Wise concluded that "the

good reputation of Judaism must naturally suffer materially, which must without fail lower our social status."[55] Wise held that both customs and language kept Eastern European Jews strangers in the United States. He was, therefore, violently opposed to Yiddish, which he always referred to disparagingly as a "jargon." About Yiddish, he wrote, "So they have now a jargon, without alphabet (they use the Hebrew) and without grammar, an obsolete and corrupt German-Hebrew-Slavonic excuse for a language."[56]

Not all of Wise's words about the immigrants were cold. Some of the articles in his newspaper which try to persuade his fellow-Jews to welcome the refugees are quite warm. However, when he did attack them, he sometimes wrote as if the Russian Jews belonged to a different people. In one article, he wrote as follows:

> If it were not for the reform congregations of New York and Philadelphia, there would be as much difference between the Hebrew populations of those cities and of this great country as between us and the inhabitants of North Africa. It is next to an impossibility to associate or identify ourselves with that half-civilized orthodoxy which constitutes the bulk of population in those cities. We are Americans and they are not. . . . We are Israelites of the nineteenth century and a free country, and they gnaw the dead bones of past centuries. Besides the name we have very little in common with them. For the honor of American Judaism and our defense opposite the enlightened world, we do not want to have even that in common; we let them be Jews and we are the American Israelites. . . .[57]

A far different attitude can be seen in Bernhard Felsenthal. Concerning the Eastern European immigrants, he

wrote, "Notwithstanding these great differences in religious belief we feel ourselves drawn to them; we feel in our hearts they are our brothers. It is Israel to whom they and we belong."[58] He was very friendly with many of the Orthodox immigrants. When a Jewish hospital refused to serve Kosher meals to them, he wrote a letter of protest. He was not sorry that the traditional dietary laws were falling into disuse. However, he felt that it was important for the hospital to provide these Jews with Kosher meals. He believed that it was radical fanaticism to say to the poor and sick, "We will help you, but only on the condition you accept our religious views."[59]

In 1904, Rabbi Abram Hirschberg wrote a paper entitled "Reform Judaism and the Recent Immigrant." In it, he maintained that most of the work done for the Russian immigrants was in the areas of clothing, food, and medicine, but that not enough was done to give them better surroundings and ideals. As a result of this, he feared that "their economic standards, racial differences and religious prejudices are threatening to create a Jewish question of serious proportions."[60] Rabbi Hirschberg admitted that one reason the Russian immigrant did not take to Reform Judaism was due to the treatment he received from the German Jews. He wrote that the German Jew, "in his inflated self-importance and aristocratic exclusiveness, offered material help to the

Russian, but withheld from him the sympathy and soceity for which he craved most of all."[61]

Hirschberg saw agriculture as a possible solution to the problems of the Jewish immigrants. He praised the work of the Jewish Agriculturists' Society of America, which was directed by a Reform rabbi, A. R. Levy. By 1904, nearly 300 families with over 1450 people had been assisted by the Society.[62] Wise was not opposed to Jewish colonization and agriculture. He viewed it as the best solution for Jewish homelessness. Jews needed farming as a corrective to the distortions of the ghetto, he felt. He was not even initially against agricultural colonization of Palestine. Only his violent opposition to Zionism later caused him to reject experiments of settling Jews in Palestine.[63]

Kohler also believed that the life of the farmer would reinvigorate the spiritual life of the people coming out of the ghetto. As a matter of fact, "the transformation of the wandering Jew into a peaceloving and productive farmer" was the only element in the Zionist movement which Kohler believed to be valuable.[64] Hirsch held that while we are no longer farmers, there is no natural instinct ingrained in the Jew which would prevent him from agricultural pursuits. As a matter of fact, in Biblical times our ancestors did till the soil. It was the Christian states which would not allow the Jews to own land.[65]

CHAPTER 7

GOD'S PEOPLE--II

Most of the feelings about Israel being God's people which were expressed before the Pittsburgh Platform (see chapter 3) also manifested themselves during the period between the Pittsburgh Platform and the Balfour Declaration. The Reform leaders largely viewed Israel as a people chosen by God to enter into a covenant with Him. Ours is a unique people with a unique history. All agreed that we are priests of the One God; some went so far as to contend that, collectively, we are the world's Messiah.

In 1892, the Central Conference of American Rabbis introduced the Union Prayer Book. It served as a unifying factor in the Reform Movement in that it soon replaced the many different prayerbooks previously in use in America's Reform temples. This prayerbook has undergone two revisions, and can be considered, in essence, the official liturgy of American Reform.

The Union Prayer Book has many references to God's special relationship with His people, Israel. Its "אהבה" "פדות" speaks of God having guided Israel with unchanging love, and using us as a vehicle to reveal to the rest of mankind His laws.[1] The Adoration states that God "delivered us

from the darkness of false belief and sent us the light of His truth."[2] On the High Holydays, the UPB reminds us that Israel has been appointed to carry the message of God's love through all ages and to all nations.[3] The "אתה בחרתנו" thanks God for choosing our fathers from among all nations. It asks that we might follow our ancestors' example of piety by devoting all our powers to the service of humanity.[4]

Even after the Union Prayer Book was in print, some rabbis continued to publish their own liturgies. One such work was by Aaron Wise and Rudolph Grossman of New York's Rodeph Sholom. It contained many prayers recalling God's selection of Israel. One particularly lovely one was recited on the Festival of Pentecost. It read, in part: " . . . we, likewise remember the first ripening of the fruits of the spirit, implanted in the heart of mankind, when Thou didst reveal Thy law unto Israel. Then were the people betrothed unto the Lord. . . ."[5] J. Leonard Levy's A Book of Prayer was a series of Sunday morning services which were extremely universalistic in outlook. Yet within it, there were some prayers which recognized that we Jews have a special relationship with God. One prays that we be worthy of the inheritance left to us by our fathers. It concludes thusly: "May we deserve to be enlisted among those chosen of Thee, even though men condemn us and make us a byword and a scorn."[6]

The concept of Israel's election was also to be found in works other than prayerbooks. Kaufmann Kohler, in his great book on Jewish theology, devotes a chapter to it. In it, he notes that Israel has a special task--to be the bearer of the truths of religion to mankind.[7] He holds that the belief in Israel's election implies that the Jewish people has a superiority over other peoples by being particularly qualified to be the champion of religious truth. While all great historical peoples had a special cultural task, one cannot speak of their election because they were unaware of their destiny. Only Israel was self-conscious.[8] What made Israel fit for its particular task? Kohler wrote:

> Of course, the election of Israel presupposes an inner calling, a special capacity of soul and tendency of intellect which fit it for the divine task. The people which has given mankind its greatest prophets and psalmists, its boldest thinkers and its noblest martyrs . . . must be the religious people par excellence.[9]

Kohler did not think that Israel's election was an arbitrary act of God. Rather, he wrote, it was due to hereditary virtues and tendencies of mind and spirit which Jews possessed.[10] By admitting "hereditary virtues," Kohler was tacitly giving a racial interpretation of Judaism because individuals who are merely members of a religious group cannot pass on hereditary virtues. While individual Jews have excelled in many areas, Kohler maintained that the Jewish people, as a whole, has accomplished great things in only one area, that of religion.[11]

Directly related to the idea of election is that of covenant. God chose Israel and made a covenant with us. A number of Reform leaders made this point. Isaac M. Wise, in a sermon entitled "Freedom, Justice and Fidelity," praised Israel for its steadfast adherence to the covenant. He said no nation besides Israel had preserved the God, the religion, the literature and the language of their ancestors.[12] Krauskopf's Service Manual contains a prayer to be recited at the Consecration of a child. This prayer, "in accordance with the spirit of our religion," admits the child into the covenant of Israel and, showing Krauskopf's view of the covenant, expresses the hope that the child "may ever be steadfast to the cause of truth and right, which Israel teacheth in Thy name, for the good of all."[13] The stress that Aaron Wise placed on the covenant as Israel's bond of unity can be seen from his referring to fellow-Jews as "our brethren of the Covenant of Israel."[14] His Tabernacles prayer also expresses the hope that prosperity will not cause us to be faithless to God and His covenant.[15]

Virtually every Reform thinker during this era saw the Jewish people as a unique people with a unique history. In a sermon before the CCAR, Israel Aaron told the rabbis that "we must again accept the burden, and the exquisite pleasure, the sting and the honey of a people, peculiar, set apart in the working out of its mission to the world."[16] He

further stated that "Israel is born into its task. Nothing can erase the stamp of divine ownership which God has set on the soul of the honest Jew."[17]

Such feelings about the peculiar nature of the Jewish people and its Divine task were expressed in the writings of most of Aaron's contemporaries. In a discourse entitled "Why am I a Jew?", Emil G. Hirsch told his congregation that being born a Jew entailed a duty to be loyal to an historic task. He held that each people has been endowed by God with a genius and is responsible to guard these treasures which their genius has produced. What are the treasures of our people? Hirsch stated: "That the moral principles basic to prophetic civilization are original with Judaism and as such Judaism's tribute of love and labor to mankind is a patent truth."[18] Hirsch went on to raise the question of whether Jews are more noble than other people because of our contribution to morality. He responded in the negative:

> Our election puts upon us heavier burdens, not higher prerogatives. A Jew must be the best possible man, for it is only by his life that he can prove what he claims by his lips, that man is not depraved. . . .[19]

Kaufmann Kohler had much to say about Israel's unique history. In a lecture, "The Wandering Jew," he compared the Jewish people to our ancestor Abraham who was commissioned by God to become a wanderer, bestowing blessing upon all the families of man. He noted that there is

something about the history of the Jewish people that is different from the history of other peoples. He felt that our endurance, elasticity, tenacity, and powers of resistance were without parallel. He said that we Jews experienced a perpetual rejuvenation, an oft-repeated resurrection from the grave. This was due to our combining of two forces, a material and a spiritual, a national and a cosmopolitan idea of man.[20]

In his "Purim Lecture" of 1885, Kohler stressed the idea of the Jews' responsibility for one another. About this sense of responsibility, he said, "It was the secret of their endurance amidst trials of the ages and the freaks of fortune. It is the chief cause of all our troubles and trials and our wonderful power of resistance."[21] He concluded his lecture on the note of unity: "If in the farthest part of the globe the Jews are held in bondage, in seclusion or in darkness, we feel the consequences. We are inseparably one."[22]

Kohler returned to the theme of Israel's unique history in a sermon entitled "A Glorious Patrimony and a Perennial Pledge." In it, he said that the promise of the whole people's allegiance to God made our ancestors the marvel of mankind and the bravest of heroes, willing to defy temptation and persecution. It made Israel an example of faithfulness, purity and piety. Kohler then realistically

pointed out that we modern-day Jews can no longer boast of our virtue and our loyalty to God. While passing the test in the ages of persecution, we have not fared so well in the era of prosperity and liberty. However, he was optimistic that we would not forever remain indifferent to our high calling.[23]

In Jewish Theology, Kohler wrote once again about Jewish uniqueness. He claimed that the process of mankind's spiritual and moral development began--in accordance with God's Divine plan of salvation--with the separation of Israel from the heathen nations.[24] In the future, mankind will attain full knowledge of God, and universal monotheism will make all humanity one.[25] Kohler also emphasized a particular claim of the Jewish people above other nations. This was what the rabbis called "זכות אבות", "the merit of the fathers," and what Kohler preferred to call "hereditary virtue." Concerning this, he wrote:

> Translated into our own mode of thinking, this merit of the fathers claimed for Israel signifies the unique treasure of a spiritual inheritance which belongs to the Jew. This inheritance of thousands of years provides such rare examples and such high inspiration that it incites to the highest virtue, the firmest loyalty, and the greatest love for truth and justice.[26]

In "Genius in History and the History of Genius," Isaac M. Wise said that the most sublime geniuses in the history of man were "the ancestor, the legislator, the prophets and the bards of Israel whose supersensuous

treasures are still the fountain of life and salvation to the civilized world."[27] Wise went on to say that the ancient Hebrew people venerated these messengers of God, and the spirit of "those lofty geniuses was incarnated in the body of the congregation of Israel." Thus, the whole nation became "genius itself in its state of actualization."[28]

Some of the reformers' writings on this subject would lead us to think that all Jews are religious geniuses. However, in the same volume in which Wise's sermon on genius is found, we can read a sermon by I. S. Moses entitled "A Definition of Judaism." Moses began his sermon with a more restrained approach. He noted that with Jews, Judaism is not a fashionable subject and that Jews are not given to discussing religious topics.[29] Moses was certainly aware of the Jews' contribution to the world. He stated that "it certainly transcends human imagination to picture the state of society today depleted of the spiritual and moral elements derived from the treasure of Israel's thought."[30]

The concept of Israel as a priest-people was adhered to by most of the Reform leaders. At the end of a sermon delivered before the CCAR in 1899, Israel Aaron painted a poetic portrait of "The Jew." He said, "His greatest joy is in the knowledge that he is the willing servant of mankind, and his sublime ambition is to grow worthy of being the high priest of humanity."[31]

Kaufmann Kohler was especially fond of the priest-idea. It appears in a number of his sermons and other writings. He waxed truly eloquent in "A Glorious Patrimony and a Perennial Pledge" when he said:

> In order to have His banner of truth triumph over all the falsehood and follies, all the errors and degeneracies of the nations, God needed a people peculiarly His own, a people distinguished from the rest as a holy priest people, a people of heroic strength and courage, of singular steadfastness and firmness, of purpose, of ardent enthusiasm and burning zeal, of passionate love for truth and for justice, a people made of the stuff of which prophets and martyrs are made.[32]

In Jewish Theology, Kohler wrote that Israel could only carry out its historical task if it kept itself distinct as a priest-people. Only at the end of time, when all mankind will have entered the Kingdom of God, will Israel, the high-priest among nations, be able to renounce its priesthood.[33] How will the nations enter the Kingdom of God? Israel, the priest-people, will have led them up to the Mountain of the Lord.[34]

Joseph Silverman wrote a sermon entitled "Jewish Theology." In it he said that our ancestors pledged for us that we will be the banner-bearers of the One God, "a kingdom of priests to teach and convert the world." Our mission has not ended since the world is not yet converted. He maintained that as long as there remained one heathen altar on the earth (and as long as church and state are not everywhere separated!), we must remain Jews.[35]

In his sermon, "Israel: The International People," David Philipson showed how, in Jewish history, the priesthood of a single family gave way to the idea of the priesthood of the whole people.[36] He went on to say that Israel, the priest-people, had been set free in modern times to serve God everywhere as "the international religious community that was to furnish the palpable proof that stronger and loftier than all artificial nationalisms that are of man's devising are the universal bonds that are of God's making."[37]

The Union Prayer Book has many references to the Jewish people being God's priests. A Sabbath morning prayer reads: "As priests of Thy law Thou hast appointed Israel, Thy people, and hast charged him to guard and preserve it amidst all the changes of time and the differences of human opinion."[38] A Passover morning prayer calls Israel "Thy first-born son, chosen for Thy service, to bless all the children of Man."[39] A prayer for the morning of Pentecost states that Israel is "the priest-people whose very existence proclaims that Thou art He who leadeth from bondage to freedom."[40] During the Confirmation ceremony as outlined in the UPB, the confirmands were to declare: "We believe that Israel is the priest-people of God, destined by Him to proclaim and spread all over the earth the knowledge of the One Eternal, and to teach obedience to His Holy will to all families of man."[41]

The priesthood of Israel was also mentioned in the High Holyday liturgy. This was especially true in the prayers for the afternoon of the Day of Atonement. After recounting the ancient Temple service, the prayerbook asks: "May we recognize in the office of the ancient high priest the lesson of our own priestly mission, to be exemplars of truth and righteousness, of holiness and purity, before the world."[42] The authors of the UPB were aware of the fact that not all Jews were religious. They included the winning back of the estranged Jews as part of Israel's priestly duty: "And so may we remember that as a people of priests it is our duty to reconcile to Thee the hearts of all Israel, to restore the erring, to win back those estranged from the heritage of their fathers. . . ."[43]

Levy's prayerbook also mentioned Israel's role as God's priest-people. He included a prayer: "Help us to be faithful to our ennobling duty, loyal to our high calling as priests of Thy word and teachers of Thy unity, by the recognition of which all men will be bound by the ties of co-operation and unity."[44]

A number of the leaders of Reform held that the Jewish people was the Messiah of the world. Probably more than anyone else, Kohler was an exponent of this viewpoint. It appears in a number of his writings. In "The Wandering Jew," he said, "Mankind is wandering and moving onward and

forward from station, and the Jew, the suffering Messiah of former times, must still lead to see his humanity's cause triumph."[45] He saw in Elijah the prototype of the wandering Jew, that is, a herald of the Messianic age.[46] In "Jew and Gentile," Kohler remarked, "If future humanity will crown a crucified Messiah, a man of sorrow from whose wounds healing flowed for the nations, it will be the medieval Jew."[47]

In "Israel's Perennial Spring," Kohler again called Israel the Messiah:

> If there ever was a lamb of God brought to slaughter by cruel executors, if there ever was a crucified Messiah suffering for the sins of man with no guilt of his own, it was the Jew. The Jew is the Passover lamb whose blood God saw and said: "By this blood the world shall be saved."[48]

However, Kohler went on to say that Israel is no longer the Man of Sorrow, the Suffering Messiah, the Lamb of Slaughter of former days. Israel now has a higher mission: to be the bond of union of all the nations.[49]

In his Jewish Theology, Kohler called Israel "the man of woe and grief, whose blood is to fertilize the soil with the seeds of righteousness and love for mankind."[50] He again stated that Israel is the suffering Messiah of the nations. He held that some day the world will recognize that it was not a Jew, but the Jew who fulfilled this role, who had been sent forth to be the savior of the nations.[51]

Max Margolis also considered Israel as the world's Messiah. In The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism, he wrote that "Reformed Judaism has reverted to the collectivistic conception of the Messiah. Israel is the Messiah."[52] He believed that Israel must do the Messianiac work of redemption--it must conquer the world for the Kingdom of God.[53]

The concept of Israel as Messiah also found its way into Krauskopf's prayerbook. Krauskopf saw proof that Israel is the Anointed of the Lord in the fact that both man and nature have been powerless to destroy Israel. He believed that Providence had singled Israel out for a great work which cannot be achieved without suffering. Eventually, Israel will thank God for having forced him to become the suffering Messiah of the world.[54]

CHAPTER 8

THE MISSION OF ISRAEL--II

The mission of Israel remained a compelling concept for most of the Reform leaders throughout this period. Nearly all of them maintained that the reason for the continued existence of the Jewish people was that we had--and have--a mission to perform. Not only Jewish existence, but also Jewish suffering was explained in this way. Suffering was necessary to fulfill our mission. Since our mission was to unify humanity, universalism became a cornerstone of Reform teaching. With such an emphasis on universalism, the Reform rabbis were called upon to justify why we should remain Jews at all.

Every human being wants to feel that there is a purpose to his life, that his existence has meaning. This is true for groups as well as for individuals. Jews wanted to know what was the reason for being Jewish? The rabbis answered: We have a mission! So Isaac S. Moses wrote in 1893:

> To know that we are living for a purpose, that we are a link in the spiritual chain of humanity, and that by our work, by our moral fervor, our faithfulness and fidelity to our intrusted charge, we are furthering the advent of the time predicted by our prophets, the time of universal righteousness and peace, is, for noble minds and pure hearts, a source of the highest joy, of the sweetest recompense.[1]

We Jews had been wanderers for centuries. Emil G. Hirsch saw in this the genesis of the mission idea: "Israel had nowhere to lay his head; therefore his is the Messianic mission with his principles of social justice and human solidarity. . . ."[2] He believed that we had been appointed by our own history to be missionaries. He held that Israel's task was to be "the pattern people," and that our mission, therefore, was for mankind, and not for ourselves. Universal in outlook, he noted: "This mission does not imply distinctness from others in dress, in customs, in diet, in habit, in language,--this mission does not involve the segregation of Jews into a ghetto of their own making. . . ."[3]

Jewish wandering, which Hirsch cited as the genesis of the mission-idea, also gave impetus to the Zionist movement. Most Reform rabbis of this era were opposed to Zionism because they felt the Zionists did not understand Israel's mission. Samuel Sale's thinking was representative. He felt that the Jews had been scattered throughout the world to teach "that highest ideal of humanity, which transcends all national limitations"--in other words, to oppose nationalism and to foster the brotherhood of all men.[4]

Bernhard Felsenthal was one of the few Zionist Reform rabbis of his time. Many of his colleagues accused him of disloyalty to his earlier conception of the universality of Judaism and the mission of Israel to uphold monotheism in

the world. Though he may have modified his ideas about the mission, he did not reverse them. He believed that the Jews still had a mission, but he did not feel that we must remain scattered in order to accomplish it. He wrote, "A small and well organized nation can work more efficaciously for good than many millions scattered and disorganized."[5] In her biography of her father, Emma Felsenthal analyzes that he altered his ideas about the mission in only one way: "The pretentious 'mission' of former times, that 'mission' which the Reform rabbis continued to preach, he held up almost to scorn; the Jewish mission, as he finally conceived it, was simply to work, as one nation among many, to further the ends of humanity."[6]

This concern for humanity, though without the nationalist slant, was echoed in "A Definition of Judaism," a sermon by Rabbi I. S. Moses. In it, he said:

> The moral life of Israel, his entire ethical code--yea, his whole history,--it is a preparation, yet not a preparation for Christianity, but for Humanity. The way out of Judaism leads not into any sectarian faith, but into a larger life which includes all men and all faiths. And here we strike the major key of Israel's Mission--'Israel, the servant of God,' means 'Israel the servant of humanity.'[7]

He further stated that if a new faith should arise in modern times it would be similar to Israel, its parent. He felt that it was Israel's mission to bring the message of social regeneration, moral rebirth, and spiritual unity to the world.[8]

Jacob Voorsanger also stressed Israel's mission to be the world's teacher. However, instead of talking about "the way out of Judaism" as did Moses, he underlined the need to perpetuate our identity--both physical and spiritual--as "one of the great families of mankind."[9]

Kaufmann Kohler spoke in glowing terms of the mission of Israel. He seemed to feel that Jewish nationalism and the mission-idea were incompatible. In "Judaism and the Jew" he wrote, "No nationalism and no clannishness with this messenger of God who is sent forth by God since the days of Abraham to win the hearts of man for the great universal God and Father in heaven, to preach justice and teach love and peace on earth to all!"[10] Though opposed to Jewish nationalism, Kohler did, in a sense, regard Israel as a unique nation. He called the ancient words, "Whatever the Lord shall speak we shall do it and hearken," "a unique promise and pledge to perform a mission such as was never before or afterwards offered by any nation however great their attainments in art, philosophy, science, or law."[11] Kohler was universalistic in outlook. However, he felt that God would not allow Israel to disintegrate as a people until the object of our mission is fulfilled.[12]

In Jewish Theology, Kohler noted that the mission of the Jewish people had been not only spiritual, but also cultural. Because we had been dispersed for centuries, our

people cultivated both commerce and science, and served as cultural intermediaries between the East and the West. Furthermore, though commercial activity was forced upon us by external pressures, we used the gains won by trade in the promotion of learning. Kohler concludes that "Our modern civilization, with its higher values of life, owes much to the cultural activity of the medieval Jew, which many leaders of the ruling Church still ignore completely."[13]

The idea of the mission of Israel was so important to the Reform leaders of this period that it became almost an article of faith. In 1892, the CCAR decided that in order to admit a convert into Judaism, that person must agree both verbally and in writing to a number of principles, one of which was "To adhere in life and death, actively and faithfully, to the sacred cause and mission of Israel, as marked out in Holy Writ."[14] One of the principles of Max L. Margolis's proposed "Creed of Reformed Judaism" stresses the mission-idea. Under the topic of "Ecclesiology," Margolis had:

> I believe that Israel was chosen by God as His anointed servant to proclaim unto the families of mankind His truth and though despised and rejected of men, to continue as His witness until there come in and through him the kingdom of peace and moral perfection and the fulness of the knowledge of God, the true Community of the Children of the Living God.[15]

The mission of Israel had a prominent place in many of the Reform prayerbooks of the era. The Union Prayer Book was widely adopted in Reform temples, and it had many refer-

ences to the mission. An introductory Sabbath morning prayer contained these words, which were typical:

> . . . help us that through our lives we may sanctify Thy name before the nations amongst whom Thou hast sent us to testify of Thee and of Thy holy law. May all prejudice against Thy people soon pass away, and Israel's mission be fulfilled, to lead all Thy children to the temple of holiness and truth.[16]

Other prayerbooks in use also stressed the mission-idea. Krauskopf's The Service Manual stated that "' . . . Israel has been destined for a great and holy mission. No power on earth can hinder him, no race, no nation, no people, shall attempt it and go unpunished.'"[17] A Pentecost prayer in the Wise-Grossman prayerbook centers on Israel's mission: "Happy is Israel that he was found worthy to be the guardian of Thy teachings, the messenger of good tidings to the nations of the earth."[18] Even a prayerbook as universalistic in tone as J. Leonard Levy's contains references to Israel's mission: " . . . and especially may we dedicate ourselves to the mission of Israel, Thy servant, to become the witnesses of Thy existence, Thy righteousness, Thy justice and Thy love."[19]

The suffering of the Jewish people over the centuries was a reality that the Reform rabbis had to confront. Often the suffering was tied into the mission-idea. In order to remain faithful to God's covenant and to be teachers of righteousness, suffering was often necessary. However, God always saved His people. This idea was expressed in some of the rabbis' sermons, but especially in the prayerbooks.

In the Union Prayer Book, we find, for example, "O Rock of Israel, may Thy redeeming power be revealed to them that are in bondage, to all who suffer persecution for the sake of their faith in Thee."[20] In the afternoon service for the Day of Atonement, this theme was underscored:

> Long and dreary was the night of their suffering. But they suffered not for their sins, but for their unshaken fidelity to Thy covenant, which no earthly power could force them to renounce.[21]

The Wise-Grossman prayerbook has a number of passages presenting this idea. One of them reads:

> As then, so at all times hast Thou, O Heavenly Father, been the Tower of our help and the Rock of our refuge whenever men rose up against us. Thy shield always was held over us when we went forth to do battle against Amalek, the implacable foe, to wage war upon falsehood and evil. Gird us anew with the courage to defend the right and the truth. Let us lead the van in the combat against error and malice, until selfishness and iniquity shall be vanquished everywhere, and all men acknowledge Thee as the sole Ruler of the world.[22]

In J. Leonard Levy's prayerbook, a similar thought is expressed:

> Thus, too, has Israel suffered in the long procession of the ages. Men have made of him a byword and a scorn, a mockery and a derision. Yet Thy people have only done their appointed duty of announcing Thy holiness and unity and of testifying to Thy existence.[23]

In 1896, the CCAR published a volume of sermons by leading Reform rabbis. A number of these sermons make reference to Israel's suffering. I. S. Moses paid tribute to our people for pursuing the path of duty while bearing the persecution of the world and suffering unparalleled martyrdom.[24]

Emil G. Hirsch noted that "Whatever human ingenuity could devise to degrade brother man was utilized for the subjection of the children of Israel."[25] Louis Grossman claimed that "we are the marvel of history, but also its embarrassment" because "we have withstood every kind of attack."[26]

In "Judaism and the Jew," Kaufmann Kohler also spoke about the Jew's suffering. However, he claimed that the great tragedy of the Jew does not lie in the persecutions, massacres, and hatred he has had to encounter. Rather, the real tragedy is that he is indifferent and apathetic toward his religion while non-Jews bow down to Israel's God and study Israel's holy books. In other words, the Jew has taught others, but not lived up to his own teaching.[27]

One of the aspects of Israel's mission, as seen by Reform, was to unify humanity. Thus universalism became a cornerstone of Reform teaching. As Israel Aaron told the CCAR in 1899, "Intense devotion to Judaism does not imply separation from mankind, but rather is an avowal of union with it, and living for it."[28] I. S. Moses saw the notion of "a Common Humanity" as the foundation of Israel's commonwealth and as that made possible the people's survival during centuries of persecution.[29] One of the principles of Max Margolis's "Creed of Reformed Judaism" read: "I believe that the pious who obey God's Law and do His will with a perfect heart and those who truly repent, share as immortal souls,

in the everlasting life of God." He felt that this universalistic doctrine of general salvation was not recognized sufficiently, even in the Union Prayer Book.[30]

David Philipson stated that "the chief and underlying principle of the reform movement is the universalistic interpretation of Judaism as over against the nationalistic. If the reform does not signify that, it signifies nothing. This is the burden of its thought."[31] He expounded this universalistic interpretation in his sermon, "Israel: The International People." In it, he noted that, as time passed, Israel assumed the character of a universal religious community. During the ages of persecution, this universalism was not emphasized.[32] Today, however, we are bidden "to get ourselves out of our narrow confines of doubt and despair" and "to sound the universal note of Israel's true place among the nations librit am leor goyim as God's covenant people, missioned by Him to be the light of the nations."[33]

Kaufmann Kohler underlined the idea of universalism in many of his writings. In "Jew and Gentile," he made a distinction between the orthodox and reform Jew. The orthodox Jew hopes for a messianic national restoration, and this requires him to keep apart from the gentile world. The idea of One God and One Humanity is the grand truth for the reform Jew, and he is obligated to propagate ethical monotheism to the world.[34] In that same lecture, Kohler admitted that

"Judaism started in the garb of nation, as did all religions," and that "Mosaism was a national religion." It was only after coming into contact with other races and religions that Judaism became a universal religion.[35] He expressed a slightly different historical viewpoint when he declared in a "Sukkoth Sermon" that the whole character of the Jewish faith had been broad and universal in its scope and aim ever since the days of Abraham.[36]

In sermon after sermon, Kohler returned to this theme. In "Judaism's Four Characteristic Traits," he stated, "High above loyalty to country and nation towers Israel's ideal of a united humanity."[37] In "The World is the Field of the Jew," he noted that "Judaism is by its very nature universal, cosmopolitan." He went on to point out that during the years of barbarism and oppression, the Jews had lost sight of their world-mission. Now that the dark age had passed, the great leaders of Reform were urging Israel to take up its spiritual cause once again.[38]

In his Jewish Theology, he also dealt with the matter of universalism. In it, he wrote that "as soon as the Torah passed from the care of the priests into that of the whole nation, the people of the book became the priest-nation, and set forth to conquer the world by its religious truth."[39] He noted that the motive for universalism became stronger as the Jewish faith became more centered in the conception of

God as the master of the entire universe.[40] He took cognizance of the fact that the term "the nations" (goyim) had taken on the connotation of "wicked ones." However, he said that this was due to Jewish opposition to heathenism, not to heathens.[41] He concluded that "where no cause existed to fear the influence of idolatry, friendly relations with non-Jews were always recommended and cultivated."[42]

Kohler was aware that certain bounds must be placed on universalism. The Jews had to remain distinct or Israel's mission could not be fulfilled. He wrote:

> In order that it may carry out the world mission mapped out by its great seers of yore, the Jewish people must guard against absorption by the multitude of nations as much as against isolation from them. It must preserve its identity without going back into a separation rooted in self-adulation and clannishness.[43]

Because he felt that we must maintain our separateness in order to fulfill our mission, he opposed marriages between Jews and non-Jews. He justified these particularistic tendencies by noting that they had universlism as their motive and aim.[44] Of course, this separateness, too, had its limits. Jews had to be in close contact with non-Jews in order to fulfill the mission. Kohler could, therefore, only approve of Jews being different from non-Jews in religious principles. He could not, for example, encourage such practices as the observance of the dietary laws which might serve to separate Jews from gentiles socially.[45]

Universalistic teachings were widespread among the reformers of this time. However, there were exceptions. One of these was Professor Caspar Levias. In 1899, he wrote:

> A universal religion dreamt of by our visionaries is as impossible as a universal language. The road to messianic times does not lead through an imaginary universality of belief, but lies rather in the development of the various groups of mankind along the innate particularities and natural idiosyncrasies to the greatest possible perfection each one of them is capable of attaining.[46]

Levias concluded that any cosmopolitan religion is an impossibility, and that the phrase "a common humanity" is really a meaningless jingle. What, then, of the mission of Israel? He felt that it was "to further the nationalization of all groups of humanity, of course, their own first of all."[47]

Of course, the view held by Levias was a minority position. Universalism was the keystone of Reform during this period. This could be seen in the prayerbooks. Krauskopf's The Service Manual tied together the ideas of mission and universalism with the prayer;

> . . . we consecrate ourselves anew this evening to continue the blessed mission our fathers have taken upon themselves, like them to carry the banner in the van of civilization, inscribed with our creed: ONE GOD OVER ALL; ONE BROTHERHOOD OF ALL; PEACE AND GOOD-WILL AMONG ALL.[48]

Krauskopf did point out that all of humanity would never form one religious denomination under one head. This was not God's intention. Our goal should be "not unison, but concord in the midst of variety; not absolute sameness, but harmony in the midst of difference."[49]

The Union Prayer Book's afternoon service for the Day of Atonement spoke of the ancient Temple service, but ended on a universalistic note. It looked forward to the time when "Israel shall become the people of God, that shall embrace all the families of the earth."[50]

The Wise-Grossman prayerbook contained elements of both universalism and particularism. On the one hand, it contained a prayer that all nations may enjoy the blessings of liberty, and that all God's children be united in a covenant of peace and love.[51] On the other hand, there is a prayer asking God to "guard His people Israel, and grant them their daily needs."[52]

J. Leonard Levy's prayerbook leaned heavily to the universalistic side. One prayer stated:

> Thy love embraces both Jew and non-Jew, Israel and the Gentiles, as well as pagans and unbelievers. Thou art the merciful Father of all men. Before Thee the barriers erected by human hands are as nought, and man-made distinctions of creed cannot restrict Thy limitless love.[53]

Although Levy admonishes us to be faithful to Israel's calling, he warns that such faithfulness cannot preclude us from acting justly toward others whose faith is different.[54] One prayer even asks God to "bless all churches, and cause their labors for mankind's good to succeed."[55]

During this period, as in the earlier period, a small number of men become so universalistic that they felt

that they could no longer serve as leaders of the religion of a particular people. Two rabbis who left Judaism on this count were Solomon Schindler and Charles Fleischer. Both of these men served Temple Israel in Boston. In 1893, Schindler left the pulpit to become a propagandist for Edward Bellamy's national socialism. Eighteen years later, his successor, Fleischer, left Temple Israel to establish a community church in Boston. These men felt that if Judaism taught what any rational man, seeking justice and progress desired, then why remain within Jewish bounds?[56] Of course most Reform rabbis also felt that Judaism taught what rational men could accept, and because of this belief felt that Judaism was the proper vehicle for teaching mankind, and, therefore, remained with the Jewish fold.

PART III

FROM THE BALFOUR DECLARATION TO THE END OF WORLD WAR II

CHAPTER 9

1919-1935

The period between the end of the First World War and the end of the Second World War was less than thirty years, but those years were among the most momentous in all of Jewish history. During this time, Britain was given the mandate over Palestine, and Jewish colonization there increased greatly. This period also witnessed the rise of the Nazi regime and the resultant destruction of European Jewry. What was happening in the world at large had a definite impact on the thinking of American Reform leaders.

In this third part of our paper, we shall depart somewhat from our prior format. Instead of discussing the material topically, we shall now look at it more from the perspective of its chronological development. We have decided to do this because during this period the question of the nature of the Jewish people came to take on greater and greater significance, and, as the years went by, the viewpoint of most of the Reform rabbis changed. Much of the discussion at the annual conventions of the Central Conference of American Rabbis had to do with Jewish nationalism and Zionism. Whereas most rabbis were anti-Zionist at the beginning of this period, by the end of the period, the official Confer-

ence position was neutral, and many of the rabbis were Zionists.

In this chapter, we shall discuss the official views of the Conference, as well as the personal views of a number of its leading members, on the topic of the nature of the Jewish people, as those views were expressed between 1919 and 1935. We have chosen 1935 as the cut-off point because that was the year that Samuel Schulman and Abba Hillel Silver presented lengthy and important papers on this topic to the Conference. We shall devote the next chapter to those two papers and the discussion they touched off. In Chapter 11, we shall complete our chronological survey of the topic through the end of the Second World War. Since this period was also an active period, liturgically speaking, in the conference, we shall devote the final chapter of this section to the two revisions of the Union Prayer Book which were produced during this time, and to how they reflect the changed view of the Conference with regard to the nature of Isrel.

At the 1919 convention of the CCAR, Kaufmann Kohler gave a paper entitled "The Mission of Israel and Its Application to Modern Times." A major thesis of this paper was that Israel's great gift to the world was not culture, but religious truth.[1] Kohler gives a brief sketch of Jewish history, showing how the mission-idea unfolded. While admitting that as long as Israel's God was only a tribal deity, the idea of

a world-mission could not develop,[2] Kohler feels that from the time of the giving of the Decalogue, the Jewish people was aware of its role as the teachers of a universal religion.[3]

During the middle ages, while the world was filled with vulgarity and sensuality, the Torah molded the Jews to display chastity and modesty. Thus, though they were not recognized as such, the Jews were in fact living as priests in the midst of the nations.[4] Kohler holds that when emancipation made the Jews citizens of all Western lands, they had to choose between loyalty to all the customs of the past or to accept unreservedly the mandates of newly acquired citizenship.[5] He maintains that "the Jew is still the God-appointed champion of freedom and righteousness, the world's missionary of justice and liberty, all the more as he is still to battle and suffer for them like no other class of people."[6] He sees the Jew's obligation as two-fold: to take care of his coreligionists and to promote social justice.[7]

With regard to the question of the observance of customs, Kohler reiterates a position which he had taken in previous writings. He states that the laws of diet, dress, and levitical purity had been imposed upon us to distinguish us from the rest of mankind. These laws were dropped by modern Jews not from frivolity nor merely for convenience, but in order to facilitate closer contact with the gentile

world which is necessary in order to win that world for our truths. Though the actual customs have been given up, their spirit should be maintained, Kohler advises, so that Israel might continue to serve as a model of life's holiness.

Kohler also expresses himself on the question of Zionism in this paper. He is willing to let Palestine, under the protection of the great powers or under Britain, become, once again, a center of Jewish culture. He is even willing to aid in the promotion of this work. He only insists that this would not accomplish the historic task of the Jewish people. The place of the Jew is "not among the League of Nations, but among the League of Religion."[9] The Jew must be loyal to Judaism's aim--the establishment of God's kingdom on earth. The priest-people does not seek a universal church nor a uniform religion, but "the divine truth reflected in many systems of belief and thought."[10]

After Kohler completed his paper, a discussion followed. Two of Samuel Schulman's remarks are worth noting. The first is that "the masses of our people are not types and exemplars of holiness." He, therefore, concludes that modern Judaism must stress more than just the prophetic element--we must also evaluate the priestly and mystic elements in Judaism. His second point is that whatever is done in Palestine is "purely incidental." He is interested in the welfare of his fellow Jews and if some of them feel that

they will be happier living in Palestine, he feels that he should help them go there. However, he is not inclined to over-estimate the value of a so-called cultural center in Palestine, nor does he feel that Palestine can be a center for the Jewish people which is destined to remain scattered. What Israel needs is not a homeland, but perfect freedom all over the world to be itself. He feels that our mission is to be God's witness and that that witness will include martyrdom for a long time "because martyrdom is an inevitable concomitant of minority."[11]

At the 1919 convention, Julian Morgenstern also delivered a paper, entitled "Were Isaac M. Wise Alive Today." A large part of the paper deals with his view of the nature of the Jewish people and outlines some of his arguments with Zionism. He points out that German Jewish immigrants came to America as German citizens who were Jewish only in religion. They expected to become American citizens and to maintain Judaism only as a religion. However, Russian Jews came out of a completely different milieu. Jews were not Russian citizens; they constituted a distinct national group. Morgenstern claims that Zionism's fundamental principle of the distinctness of the Jewish people fits in with the political experience of the Eastern European Jews in their homelands, but does not fit into the American notion of one nation indivisible.[12]

Morgenstern sees the Zionist controversy hinging on the question of whether Judaism in America is self-perpetuating or whether it must be bolstered by Palestinian Jewish culture. If Judaism in America requires the stimulus of Palestinian culture to survive, he reasons that in order to remain Jews, we would have to remain distinct, not only religiously, but also nationally and culturally, from the American nation and people. This would fit the Eastern European mold, but not the American, and he rejects it. He is confident that Judaism can perpetuate itself in America without any foreign stimuli.[13]

Morgenstern feels that one can labor for a Jewish home in Palestine or even an independent Jewish state. As long as one still believes in America as a unified nation and that American Judaism can be a living religion in America, then he still remains an American and an American Jew.[14] He, thus, seems to imply that if one believes that American Judaism needs Palestinian culture in order to survive or if one wishes to maintain a distinct Jewish culture, then he is not a real American or American Jew. He further states that if a Jewish state ever be established in Palestine, he would not object to any cultural contribution that Palestine might be able to offer to American Judaism. We will always be united with "the Judaisms of other lands" by bonds of history and religion. American Judaism will also contribute "of its

own knowledge and strength to those foreign Judaisms, even the Judaism of Palestine."[15]

Although we have concerned ourselves primarily with what occurred at the CCAR conventions, we should take cognizance of a resolution passed at the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1919:

> In accordance with the spirit of our whole history we declare that it is imperative for the welfare of Jews everywhere as a great religious community with a universal message for humanity that Israel dedicate itself not to any aspiration for the revival of a Jewish nationality or the foundation of a Jewish state, but to the faithful and consistent fulfillment of its religious mission in the world. We, therefore, do not seek for Israel any national homeland, it being our conviction that Israel is at home in every free country and should be at home in all lands. Nor do we approve of the demand for specifically Jewish national rights in any land, but we demand equal rights for all inhabitants of all lands regardless of race or creed.
>
> We reaffirm the declaration made by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations twenty-one years ago that we are Jews in religion and Americans in nationality.
>
> We reassert the ideal to which this Union owes its being and to which it has been steadfastly devoted, namely, the promotion of the Mission of Israel, to serve mankind through the propagation of the great moral and religious principles first enunciated by our prophets.[16]

In 1920, the San Remo Conference of the Allied Powers which had won World War I granted to Great Britain the mandate over Palestine. The president of the CCAR, Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, had refused to send a delegation to the extraordinary meeting called by the Zionist Organization of America to celebrate this event. At the 1920 convention of the CCAR, Rabbi Franklin explained that he had not appointed

a delegation because the Conference had already made its position known. However, he stated that he believed that the Conference would cooperate with any movement for the rehabilitation of Palestine, so as to make it not only a "refuge for the downtrodden Jew but as a place where a fuller expansion may be given to the spiritual genius of the Jew." He asked for the Conference's endorsement of what he had said.[17] Another reaction to the San Remo Conference was offered by the Committee on Resolutions. It offered a resolution rejoicing in the British mandate. It called it a duty of Jews in this country to "aid unstintedly in this work of redemption, of the restoration of our land and our people. It also offered support to the agencies of the Zionist Organization of America.[18] Both the president's message and this resolution were referred to the Committee on President's Message.

This latter committee issued a majority report and a minority report. The majority report endorsed the president's refusal to send a delegation to the ZOA Extraordinary Convention. It also rejoiced at the decision of the San Remo Conference, but reiterated the position taken by the CCAR two years previous (that the CCAR did not recognize Palestine as the national homeland of the Jewish people). It recognized that the British mandate would allow some Jews to settle in Palestine and predicted that they may become a great spiritual influence. The report rejected the idea that

this historic event marked Israel's Redemption. That Redemption could be realized only when Jews will have the right to live everywhere in the world and all racial and religious prejudice shall have ended. This report emphasized that while the Conference was ready to help in the work of rebuilding of Palestine for some Jews, it did not view Israel as a nation, but as a religious community.[19]

A minority report was proposed which stated, among other things:

> Now that Palestine is to be by world consent, a national homeland for our people, our duty is, first of all, to lift our hearts in fervent gratitude to the mysterious Providence which is guiding the Jewish people out of its wilderness into the Promised Land. . . to honor the memories of those no longer with us who have fought and suffered for the realization of our longings of almost two score centuries. . . .

This minority report was rejected by a vote of fifty-six to eight.[20] The majority report was then adopted fifty-eight to eight.[21]

In 1921, Kaufmann Kohler gave a sermon entitled "The Lord is My Banner." In it, he came out against nationalist interpretation of Judaism because that interpretation did not give sufficient stress to Israel's mission. Kohler declared:

> Not secularism, not the trumpet call of a non-religious Nationalism will save and perpetuate the Jewish race. Let engineering skill and wisdom succeed in wrestling undreamt-of forces of electricity from the Jordan and Yarmuk rivers, and turn all the arid places of Palestine into gardens of God, the Jew's life-task is too great to find its scope in a small territory.

> The God of History appointed him amidst all the travail of the ages to be His champion of righteousness and holiness, the establisher of truth and peace all over the wide globe, and only in carrying out this world-wide mission we shall find salvation and life perennial.[22]

Though most of the members of the CCAR were opposed to the political activities of the Jewish nationalists, they did favor cooperation in the physical rehabilitation of Palestine. At the 1924 convention, a resolution was adopted unanimously which reaffirmed the Conference's agreement to cooperate in Palestine's rehabilitation. That resolution also favored the formation of a non-partisan group for the redevelopment of Palestine. It further recommended that the Conference cooperate in seeking a solution to the problem of "the migration of our brethren."[23]

We have previously mentioned that Stephen S. Wise believed that Zionism and Reform Judaism need not be antagonistic. One of the chief complaints of many Reform leaders against Zionism was that it did not sufficiently stress Israel's mission. In an address given at the founding meeting of the World Union for Progressive Judaism in 1926, Wise answered this argument:

> I conceive of a Jewish Mission, a Mission not to keep up forever this wretched business of an unsufficing philanthropy in Russia and Poland. That avails nothing in lands of hurt and wounds and grievous oppression. . . . I conceive of a Jewish Mission to create a centre of Jewish life, in which the loftiest spiritual and ethical ideals of the Jewish religion shall be lifted up and magnified in the sight of the Jew and of the world.[24]

In 1932, Barnett R. Brickner delivered a paper before the CCAR entitled "The Reform of Reform Judaism." In it, he spoke in favor of a synthesis of Reform Judaism with Jewish Nationalism which he called "the most dynamic movement in Jewish life."[25] He maintained that history has proved that the early reformers exaggerated the hopes of messianic cosmopolitanism which they associated with political emancipation. The antipathy between Reform Judaism and Jewish Nationalism which they set up came down to the thirties.[26]

Brickner placed the religious interpretation central in his philosophy of Jewish history. Although he was a Jewish Nationalist, he disagreed with the secular nationalists who denied the religious motivation of Jewish life and insisted that Israel is not a unique people.[27]

Brickner argued that Reform Jews were not cosmopolitan and anti-national. The slogan that we are Americans by nationality and Jews by religion proves this. Indeed, he held that Reform Jews are "excessively nationalistic" about countries where they live, "but a-national when it comes to Jewish nationalism."[28] Brickner believed that we Jews are "an international nationality scattered among the nations of the world." He used the term "nationality" to describe "a people that is bound together by a sense of unity because of its consciousness of a common past, and its aspirations toward

a common future, and which, despite its internal differences, possesses the will to co-operate in the achievement of these ends."[29]

Toward the end of his paper, Brickner noted that the early reformers feared Zionism because they thought that a homeland in Palestine would "unhome us everywhere." He then countered that without the homeland, we are unhomed nearly everywhere. He further argued that by denying peoplehood, we deny the possibility of religious growth. He concluded that our experience in America had shown that wherever the philosophy that we are Jews by religion only had been rigorously taught and adhered to, it had led to assimilation.[30]

In the Conference Sermon delivered at the 1934 convention, Abraham J. Feldman also spoke in favor of a synthesis of the religious and nationalist positions. In the sermon, he described the three groups which dominated Jewish life of the day. The first he called the "denominationalists" who, he maintained, were indifferent to the people. The second were the "secular-nationalists" who were indifferent to the religions and spiritual values of Jewish life. The third were the "religious-nationalists" who believed in the synthesis and unity of people and faith. He declared that he was convinced that salvation would come only from the latter group.[31]

At the CCAR convention of 1935, the Conference changed its official stance toward Zionism. No longer was

the Conference officially anti-Zionist; it was now neutral. A resolution was passed stating that acceptance or rejection of the Zionist program should be left to the determination of the individual members, that the CCAR takes no official stand on the subject of Zionism, and that the CCAR would continue to cooperate in the upbuilding of Palestine.[32]

That same 1935 convention heard two papers on the topic of "Israel" delivered by Samuel Schulman and Abba Hillel Silver, who represented very different points of view. It is to those papers that we will direct our attention in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 10

TWO PAPERS ON "ISRAEL"

At the 1935 convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, a series of papers was read. These papers were intended to be a re-evaluation of Reform on the fifteenth anniversary of the Pittsburgh Platform. Two of these papers were on the topic of "Israel." The two lengthy papers, by Samuel Schulman and Abba Hillel Silver, differ on their fundamental definition of the Jewish people. Schulman presents the older Reform view that we are primarily a religious community. Silver expounds the nationalist interpretation which by 1935 had gained a sizable support within the ranks of the Conference. In this chapter, we shall summarize the two papers and then look at some of the reaction they engendered on the convention floor.

In Samuel Schulman's view, the Reform movement expressed a revolution in the attitude of the Jew. It was a rejection of the view that Israel still considered itself to be in exile and must mourn until returned to Palestine. In line with this, Reform did away with prayers for a personal Messiah, feeling that this concept was part of a political nationalism which should be disavowed. Reform emphasized the other aspect of messianism--universalism. It

sought to break down any unnecessary walls of separation between Israel and the nations.[1]

Schulman held that Zionism came as a reaction to Reform Judaism and negated all of Reform's affirmations. Reform said that Israel was not a nation in any modern sense of the word, and that Israel was only a religious community whose essential characteristic was to witness to God. Zionism opposed this viewpoint. Schulman claimed that Reform Jews wished to be "in the midst of the nations" while Zionists wished to be "like the nations." While for the nationalists, Israel was primarily a self-sufficient nation, for the religionists, Israel was not self-sufficient, but was under God's providential care.[2]

Schulman believed that in the course of Jewish history a transformation had taken place within Israel. An ordinary people with ordinary ambitions which could be expressed politically became a community which felt the essence of its being was fidelity to a particular kind of religion. This transformation was expressed by a new term which appears in many of the midrashim. That term was Keneseth Israel which Schulman would render as "the Synagogue written with a capital S," and which he saw as the exact counterpart of the word Ecclesia.[3]

To Schulman, Israel was not a race in the strict sense of the word, meaning a people of pure blood descending

from one ancestor. Neither is Israel a nation, meaning a people with a common language and traditions which expresses its nationalism in the form of a political organization, the state.[4] Schulman also denied that Israel was a nationality. He defined nationality as "a group of people who have a common religion, an historical tradition, common customs and nevertheless have no State of their own." He maintained that every nationality is considered in spe a nation, having the tendency to try to become a nation. Though Israel has a common religion and historical continuity, he felt that it was not a candidate for nationhood. He insisted that we are a religious community, and that what we seek is the freedom to be such a community in any part of the world.[5]

Why, then, is Israel often called a nation or nationality? One of the reasons is that in the Bible, Israel is referred to by words translated as "people" or "nation." Schulman pointed out that in the Semitic world, there was no such thing as a nation in the modern sense of the word. Human beings were grouped around their god, and nations were communities whose existence centered in their god.[6]

Israel, then, is a religious group witnessing to a particular kind of faith. Noting that Jews live in different parts of the world, speak different languages, observe different customs, and are of many physical types, Schulman asked what they all have in common. He answered: "What they

have in common is the fact that mornings and evenings they say, or ought to say: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is one. There is nothing else that binds them."[7] He did not admit that if a Jew were opposed to religion, he did not cease to be a Jew. If one were born a Jew, he was automatically a member of "Israel of the flesh," and, potentially, a son of "spiritual Israel." He excluded himself from Israel only if he joined another religious communion.[8]

The tension between universalism and particularism which we have seen in the writings of many of the Reform rabbis should also be noted in Schulman. He wrote:

> This people could survive loss of land and nationality, so that now it carries the Bible, its only "center" with it, all over the world. The great paradox of Israel's history is that there was in this people a hunger for universalism, for union with humanity that transcends race or nationality. And on the other hand there was the mysterious tenacity of will, in self-conscious persistence in living, in remaining itself--an intense particularism because of the conviction that Israel as a community has something to do in the world but also a readiness to receive, those who came, within its folds.[9]

Schulman attacked the idea of Judaism as a civilization. He said that Jews in America are steeped in American civilization. The danger involved in speaking of Jewish civilization in America is that since there is little of it today, a proponent of it would try to create such a civilization. This would require the creation of a new ghetto which Schulman clearly opposed. He reiterated that "the only difference which distinguishes us from the other elements of Amer-

ican civilization is our religion, and nothing else."[10]

Schulman concluded his paper with an appeal for a new synthesis of religion and Jewish consciousness. He said that the strength of Reform had been the rediscovery of the universal element in Judaism. Its weakness had been not keeping "a sufficiently strong hold on the thought of Israel as a distinct community." The strength of the nationalists had been their emphasis on the importance of Israel. They strengthened the backbone of Jewish consciousness. Their weakness had been making Israel a nation like other nations. He felt that Palestine would lead to a new synthesis. He favored both aiding Jewish settlement and sending half a dozen young men there to spread the message of Progressive Judaism. He closed by restating his central point that "Israel is not a Goy like other Goyim, but it always was, it is now, and if it is to live at all, will always be, a witness to God."[11]

Abba Hillel Silver began his paper by looking at the fifth paragraph of the Pittsburgh Platform, especially the phrase, "We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community." He noted that while individual Reform rabbis had stated this sentiment previously, never before in Jewish history had any assembly of religious leaders made such a categorical declaration of "national abjuration." He felt that such a declaration on Jewish nationalism was an

import from Germany. There was nothing in the American-Jewish scene of the 1880's which called for it--no political pressure or need to placate anti-semitic forces.[12]

According to Silver's analysis, Reform in Germany had not been an attempt to reinstate prophetic universalism in Jewish religious thought. That had only been a rationalization. Its real purpose had been to gain full rights of citizenship for German Jews. It had been erroneously assumed that Jewish separatism, manifested in speech, dress, rituals, and in the Messianic expectation of a return to Palestine, was responsible for gentile hostility.[13] German Jews were so opposed to Jewish nationalism because German anti-semitism was so virulent and German nationalism was so intense. German Reform, and even some Orthodox, leaders "attempted to throw overboard all the racial and national baggage of Israel in the fond hope of calming this sea of hate."[14] Hitler's rise to power ended the pattern of assimilation, and German Jewry responded with a strong revival of Jewish nationalism.[15]

Silver noted that throughout the Diaspora experience, from the sixth century BCE to the present, Jews have faced the two-fold task of adjusting themselves to the environment while at the same time remaining loyal to themselves as Jews. This has always caused a certain element of stress in Diaspora life and shall always do so. Those who could not stand this strain of Jewish existence disappeared as Jews.[16]

The Jewish people has always had a will to survive. However, there was never a uniform plan for survival. The formula that worked for Jewish communities living in empires embracing many nationalities would not apply to those living in a unicultural national state. The strategy of survival was dictated by the compelling sense of destiny. The desire not to die as a people was so great that when the people were threatened, they raised stronger walls of defense. Silver saw this as the origin of the regimen of סייג וסימן which secured the people against disintegration.[17]

Similarly, Silver believed that the Mission-idea evolved in response to a desperate national emergency. It grew out of the people's will to live, and served to give meaning and dignity to their exile. "It was a noble compensatory ideal, warranted by the fact that Israel did possess a religious outlook which far transcended that of the heathen, and moral code of superior excellence."[18] The Mission-idea was not a substitute for any other concept, but was a supplement. It did not supplant nationalism; it reinforced it. It did not look upon the dispersion as a blessing nor assume that the Jews must remain in exile so that Yahweh might become the God of all nations. When the prophets spoke of Restoration, they were not referring to "the colonization of Palestine as a philanthropic effort deserving of general support" (a concession made by anti-Zionist

Reform rabbis), but to the rebuilding of political life in the land of the Jewish people. They did not regard the ideas of a rebuilt Zion and an ingathered Israel as irreconcilable with the hope of the world converting to Yahweh. The nations would come to Zion which would become the religious center of mankind. Silver concluded:

> Anyone, therefore, who attempts to exploit the historic Mission Idea of Israel as an argument against Jewish nationalism or against the rebuilding of Palestine or in justification of the Galut is guilty of gross distortion of an idea which is very clearly and unambiguously defined in its original sources.[19]

Silver maintained that nation, race, land, language, and religion were always vital and indispensable concepts in Jewish life. They were all organically united. There were times when one or the other of these concepts were stressed. However, at no time--until the Reform rabbis of Germany came upon the scene--was any of the concepts abandoned.[20]

Silver also noted how Israel had reconciled ideas which were theoretically irreconcilable: universalism and particularism. Judaism spoke of God both as the Universal God and as the God of the people of Israel. Though it extolled its own race, it admitted members of other races into the family. While longing for restoration to Palestine, it admonished Jews to be good citizens of the countries where they resided.[21]

Silver attacked the idea of the anti-nationalistic, transcendental Messianic Age as a distortion of the Messianic idea. National restoration was the heart of the Messianic ideal from its beginning. With the exception of some of the Hellenistic apocalyptic writers, a Messianic hope not bound up with the restoration of Israel to Palestine is not found in Jewish literature up to the time of the modern reformers.[22]

He felt that it was idle to say that our people is no longer a nation but a religious community considering that millions of Jews are recognized as national minorities in Eastern European countries and that the League of Nations recognized not only the national existence of the Jewish people, but its historic claim to Palestine. The national concept also gave a legitimate place in Israel to those Jews who were non-religious or anti-religious.[23]

Silver, of course, was a religious Jew, and he held that the Jewish religion was the crowning achievement of our people. It was the enduring tie and the strongest survival factor of Israel. Without it, he doubted whether the Jewish people would long endure in the Diaspora. He concluded that religious leaders should stress the total program of Jewish life--the religion, the mission, and the national aspirations of the Jewish people.[24]

These two fine papers by Schulman and Silver brought out a good deal of discussion on the convention floor after they were read. A look at some of the comments will afford us further insight into how the Reform rabbis of the time saw the nature of the Jewish people.

Samuel H. Goldenson brought up the point that no one had ever denied that Israel is a people. The real question is what kind of a people we are. He asked whether we should emphasize the people, or the qualities which have enabled the people to survive.[25]

Professor Zevi Diesendruck noted that the terms "religion," "race," "civilization," and "nation" do not adequately describe Israel. He proposed the following solution:

> The difficulty is that we are using dictionary definitions, ready-made words which do not cover the finer shades of reality as is also frequently the case in regard to human feelings. In such cases we need a new word. I would suggest Israel. It is not a word, it is a name, because a unique phenomenon cannot be defined, it can only be named.[26]

Harry W. Ettelson disagreed with Silver's contention that since there was no political pressure on the rabbis at Pittsburgh, their anti-nationalism was simply an import from Germany. Ettelson believed that since there was no compelling expediency, the anti-nationalism was a genuine principle for the framers of the Pittsburgh Platform.[27] He went on to note that not even the most radical of the early reformers wished to cut himself off from the

Jewish people or alienate himself from Israel's historical past. Ettelson said that he was not an anti-Zionist. He merely insisted "that the peoplehood of Israel, however we define people, is secondary and subordinate; the primary thing is Judaism itself, as a spiritual message and mission, and Israel, simply as its bearer."[28]

Samuel S. Cohon took exception to Silver's view that the reformers perverted the Messianic ideal. He claimed that there were two forms of Messianism in Judaism. One form was that of universal justice and peace under the sovereignty of God with the Davidic Messiah as vicegerent. The second form was that of the Messiah as a supernatural being who would rule over a recreated world. Reform did away with the second idea and the personal aspect of the first, but not the ideal of the first.[29]

Cohon also pointed out that the Diaspora was a permanent condition for the Jews since Palestine was not large enough to house all of world Jewry. The majority of the Jewish people, whether by choice or necessity, will continue to live in other lands and will share in the political, cultural, and economic life of their fellow-citizens. We will only be able to retain our individuality in religion, he claimed. He, therefore, concluded that "our place in America and in other countries where emancipation is a reality is not as a national minority but as a religious community.[30]

Barnett R. Brickner stated that in wanting to be like other nations, secular nationalism was untrue to Jewish history. On the other hand, Reform Judaism gave undue emphasis "to what we call religion." Brickner believed that as formal revelatory religion was losing its hold, the Jewish people was projecting a new ideal, namely spiritual Zionism, which included the ideas of God and religious values. He said:

> It is ridiculous to think of a people, scattered all over the world, influencing the thought of the world, but with a place where we can be free, live, and express the spiritual and creative forces of our nature, we strengthen our hand wherever we may be. Of course, we want to live in the world, no Zionist wants all the Jews in Palestine; what we want is to have that part and then to have all the other organs and create a synthesis by which all that is truly spiritually creative in the Jewish people shall be released.[31]

The two papers on Israel and the discussion which followed give us a strong feeling for the differing viewpoints within the Conference at the time when the Columbus Platform was about to be written. It is to that Platform and the years which followed that we shall direct our attention in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 11

FROM THE COLUMBUS PLATFORM TO THE END OF THE WAR

Fifty years after the Pittsburgh Platform had been adopted, the world was a very different place. One world war had been fought and another was coming. Hitler was in power. America was becoming the center of the Diaspora. Zionism had become a spiritual and political force, and most Reform Jews were no longer anti-Zionistic. These changes led to the need for a new platform for Reform.

At the 1936 convention of the CCAR, some "Guiding Principles for Reform Judaism" were presented, and a discussion was held to determine whether or not to adopt them. It was decided to use them as a basis, to send them to members of the Conference for comments, and to present a report at the 1937 meeting. Samuel S. Cohon noted that one of the chief points of dissatisfaction was the section on Palestine. The position taken was in line with the 1935 "neutrality resolution." However, the anti-Zionists complained that it went too far in the direction of Zionism, and the Zionists criticized it for not going far enough.[1]

At the 1937 convention, held in Columbus, Ohio, the Conference adopted a declaration of Guiding Principles

which were viewed "not as a fixed creed but as a guide for the progressive elements of Jewry."[2] The plank on "Israel" reads as follows:

> Judaism is the soul of which Israel is the body. Living in all parts of the world, Israel has been held together by the ties of a common history, and above all, by the heritage of faith. Though we recognized in the group-loyalty of Jews who have become estranged from our religious tradition, a bond which still unites them with us, we maintain that it is by its religion and for its religion that the Jewish people has lived. The non-Jew who accepts our faith is welcomed as a full member of the Jewish community.
>
> In all lands where our people live, they assume and seek to share loyally the full duties and responsibilities of citizenship and to create seats of Jewish knowledge and religion. In the rehabilitation of Palestine, the land hallowed by memories and hopes, we behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed but also a center of Jewish cultural and spiritual life.
>
> Throughout the ages it has been Israel's mission to witness to the Divine in the face of every form of paganism and materialism. We regard it as our historic task to cooperate with all men in the establishment of the kingdom of God, of universal brotherhood, justice, truth and peace on earth. This is our Messianic goal.[3]

When the vote was taken on the platform, it passed almost unanimously. With 110 members present, five voted against, two stated that they favored the items in the Declaration but were opposed to the adoption of a platform, and one requested that his vote on the paragraph referring to Palestine be recorded in the negative.[4]

It should be noted that Samuel Schulman privately prepared his own "Statement of Principles for the Guidance of

the Modern Jew." This statement was not accepted by the committee which prepared the Columbus Platform, nor was it adopted by the CCAR as a whole. His section on Israel stressed his concept of Keneseth Yisrael. He stated that regardless of whether Israel is conceived of as a religious community only or as a nation, its mission remains the same--to prove its loyalty to God's covenant.[5] When Schulman complained, on the convention floor, that the Columbus Platform did not mention that Israel was chosen (as his statement did), Cohon, the chairman of the commission which drew up the platform, took pains to note that the commission had gone out of its way to utilize a number of points from Schulman's statement.[6]

At that 1937 convention, the Conference Sermon was given by Maurice N. Eisendrath. In it, he spoke out against the "either-or" polemics about Palestine and advocated a synthesis between Zionism and the Diaspora which he felt Jewish history warrants. He said that the Diaspora should not be minimized. Zion was not the only hope for the redemption of the Jewish people. He commended the kibbutzim for putting the social justice of the prophets to work. He saw it as our duty "to create, not in one land only, but throughout the earth, the kind of society which those sacrificial pioneers are so inspiringly bringing into being in Zion."[7]

In a paper entitled "The Synagogue and Forces of Antagonism to the Jew," which Edward L. Israel delivered

before the 1937 convention, he deplored the tendency toward secularization in Jewish life. He felt that the chief cause of religious anti-semitism was the lack of religion among great masses of Jews. Although he did not view with favor the lack of religion on the part of many Zionists, he believed that would eventually come to a "spiritual Jewishness." He was especially distressed by the secularization of those who were both anti-Zionist and anti-synagogue. Many Jewish social workers and those in Jewish philanthropies were of this type.[8]

In 1940, Julius Gordon presented a paper to the Conference entitled "Palestine in Jewish Life and Literature." In it, he argued that there were liturgical-theological motives which accounted for the elimination of Zion from Reform prayerbooks. The reformers were against animal sacrifices, but reinterpreted the Messianic Ideal, and had developed a new concept of Exile (no longer was it seen as a punishment, but as a blessing, allowing Israel to disseminate prophetic ideals throughout the world). These ideas did not necessitate the discarding of the national ideal. The real cause of this was the socio-political motivation connected with emancipation. The Reform leaders felt that the new spirit of universal equality and freedom necessitated the denationalization of Judaism.[9]

Just as the negative attitude toward Palestine was an effect of the Zeitgeist, so, Gordon maintained, the modern

movement of anti-semitism had also caused a change in Reform's philosophy of Jewish life.[10] He believed that the return to the land of our fathers gave us dignity in the eyes of the world and in our own eyes. The revival of Palestine implied a spiritual and moral renaissance. Because of the precarious position of the Jews in the world, the carrying out of our mission had not been very effective. Jewish settlement in Palestine gave us an opportunity to exemplify prophetic ideals to the world.[11] Since Palestine was a "door of hope" at that time of our people's uprootedness, he maintained that Reform should reintroduce the prayer "Gather our dispersed" into the liturgy.[12]

Gordon noted that some Reform leaders opposed Zionism on one or more of three grounds: nationalism, secularism, and dual loyalty. He answered each of these reasons for anti-Zionism. He held that some nationalism is good. It is chauvinism which is bad. Nationalism restored Hebrew as a living tongue, inspired Hebrew literature, and gave Jewish life new pride. Zionism, which was associated with the revival of Hebrew culture and which aimed to preserve Jewish life, was not really secular. The lack of religion among Palestinian youth was viewed by Gordon simply as a challenge to us.[13] As far as the dual loyalty allegation was concerned, he held that the American Jew is a better citizen of the United States by retaining loyalty to his people. The thrust of the article

was that Reform should crystalize a positive attitude toward Palestine.[14]

At the 1942 convention, Julian Morgenstern delivered the Conference Lecture entitled "With History as our Guide." In that lecture, he declared that the peoplehood of Israel is the absolute fundamental of Jewish life--that from the entrance of the tribes into Palestine onward Israel has conceived itself as a unique people. With the development of the concept of a universal God, Israel became the eternal people, chosen by God to play a special role in God's plan.[15]

Morgenstern saw nationhood as a secondary and incidental phenomenon in Jewish life. It developed in Palestine in response to historical circumstances, and lasted for four and one half centuries. However, the consciousness of nationhood deeply ingrained itself on Israel's soul. Universalism was also a secondary development in Jewish life, but it was logical rather than incidental. Particularism was seen as a tertiary principle, the negative reaction to universalism. It was a conscious return to a separatistic concept of Jewish peoplehood. Both universalism and particularism grew out of the soul and life-experience of Israel, and both were thoroughly Jewish. Whenever the environment was favorable, the balance in the life of the Jewish people swung in the direction of universalism. However, when the environment was hostile the balance swung toward particularism.[16]

Early Reform developed during an age of enlightenment, and, therefore, its universalism was extreme. Political Zionism represented the latest response of the Jewish people to conditions confronting it, namely persecution.[17] Morgenstern noted that at that time, the vast majority of the Jewish people were Zionists in thought, belief, and program. He stated that the events of the previous fourteen years "have made all of us who are worthy of the name, Jew, Zionists in a certain sense, in that, since Palestine seems to be the only potential haven of escape and renewed life and hope for our brethren, we must all desire eagerly and actively to secure Palestine in the maximum degree for them and support their migration thither in every proper and practicable way."[18]

Morgenstern also held that nationhood of some type was necessary for the Jews in Palestine for self-maintenance and creative self-expression.[19] He emphasized, though, that Jewish nationalism would only be for Jews in Palestine. They would constitute the Jewish nation. We, in the Diaspora, would be citizens of the nations of our residence and not part of the Jewish nation. We would, of course, be an integral part of the Jewish people and have an indissoluble attachment to our brethren in all lands.[20] Morgenstern's basic understanding of the nature of the Jewish people can be seen in these words:

> Eternity for Israel lies not in the quality nor in the realization of nationhood. Eternity for Israel lies only in the quality and the consciousness of peoplehood, in being a people of destiny, in being a religious people.[21]

We have seen that after Hitler came to power, the sentiment within the Reform bodies shifted radically. In 1937, both the CCAR and the UAHC moved away from their official anti-Zionist policies. After the outbreak of World War II it became clear what was happening in Europe, the securing of Palestine as a homeland became a central goal in Jewish endeavor. To many, it became apparent that Palestine would have to be more than a colony, but an independent Jewish commonwealth. An American-Jewish Conference was organized in 1943 to deal with the wartime and post-war problems of Jewry. The Reform movement gave leadership to this effort. In the wake of the shift of the American Reform institutions from anti-Zionism to neutrality and then to pro-Zionism, a group led by Lessing Rosenwald and a small number of rabbis formed the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism.[22]

At its 1942 convention, the CCAR passed a resolution in which the Conference added its voice "to the demand that the Jewish population of Palestine be given the privilege of establishing a military force which will fight under its own banner on the side of the democracies, under allied command, to defend its own land and the Near East to the end that the victory of democracy may be hastened everywhere."[23] It was

only after a lengthy debate, in which many of the old wounds concerning Zionism were re-opened, that the resolution was finally passed by a vote of 64 to 38.[24]

Arthur J. Lelyveld, in his article "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," wrote that it was this resolution which was the proximate cause of the American Council for Judaism. In June, 1943, a group of eighty-nine anti-Zionist members of the CCAR met in Atlantic City and drew up a "Statement of Principles by Non-Zionist Rabbis." That statement reaffirmed the old Conference position of supporting practical work in Palestine, but opposing political action. The Atlantic City meeting formed a "Committee of Lay-Rabbinical Cooperation" to found "an organization to counteract the inroads of 'Jewish nationalistic endeavor.'" Elmer Berger drew up a plan of action and got lay support which led to the formation of the American Council.[25]

The platform of the American Council admitted that Palestine had contributed to the alleviation of the catastrophe in Jewish life by providing a refuge for a part of European Jewry. It hoped that Palestine would continue as <u>one</u> of the places for resettlement. However, it went on to state:

> We oppose the effort to establish a National Jewish State in Palestine or anywhere else as a philosophy of defeatism, and one which does not offer a practical solution of the Jewish problem. We dissent from all those related doctrines that stress the racialism, the nation-

> alism, and the theoretical homelessness of Jews. We oppose such doctrines as inimical to the welfare of Jews in Palestine, in America, or wherever Jews may dwell. We believe that the intrustion of Jewish national statehood has been a deterrent in Palestine's ability to play an even greater role in offering a haven for the oppressed, and that without the insistence upon such statehood, Palestine would today be harboring more refugees from Nazi terror. The very insistence upon a Jewish Army has led to the raising of barriers against our unfortunate brethren. There never was a need for such an army. There has always been ample opportunity for Jews to fight side by side with those of other faiths in the armies of the United Nations.
>
> Palestine is a part of Israel's religious heritage, as it is a part of the heritage of two other religions of the world. We look forward to the ultimate establishment of a democratic, autonomous government in Palestine, wherein Jews, Moslems, and Christians shall be justly represented; every man enjoying equal rights and sharing equal responsibilities; a democratic government in which our fellow Jews shall be free Palestinians whose religion, even as we are Americans whose religion is Judaism.[26]

At the 1943 CCAR convention, a discussion of Zionism and Reform Judaism was held in executive session. Four papers were given--two pro-Zionist and two anti-Zionist. The result of this discussion was two resolutions.[27] The first resolution passed with only two dissenting votes. While admitting the right of members of the Conference to be opposed to Zionism, it asserted that there was no essential incompatibility between Reform Judaism and Zionism.[28]

The second resolution was adopted 137-45 after a minority report had been rejected. The resolution maintained that the continued existence of the American Council for Judaism would be a threat to the CCAR. It was feared that world Jewry would view the American Council as another example of

Reform's opposition to Zionist aspirations, and that this impression would do a grave injustice both to the many devoted Zionists within the CCAR and to the Conference itself. While granting both Zionists and non-Zionists the right to disseminate their views, the resolution called upon the rabbinical leaders of the American Council to terminate that organization.[29]

The minority report on the second resolution was written by S. H. Goldenson and Joseph Rauch. It held that the recommendation to break up the American Council was beyond the moral and legal authority of the Conference. It further pointed out that the rabbis might never have formed the American Council had there been organizations expressing and furthering the non-Nationalist point of view.[30] Although the minority report was rejected and the resolution was adopted, the CCAR members who were leaders of the American Council did not acquiesce to the request. The American Council was not terminated.

While the CCAR had become more and more pro-Zionist, so had the UAHC. At its 1943 biennial council, the Union reaffirmed its 1937 resolution which stated that "the time has now come for Jews, irrespective of ideological differences, to unite in the activities leading to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine." In 1943, the Union further expressed the hope that after the war, provision would be

made for large-scale immigration to Palestine, that self-government would be democratic and non-sectarian. It was hoped that the government would maintain separation of church and state and that the inviolability of holy places would be guaranteed.[31]

CHAPTER 12

TWO PRAYERBOOK REVISIONS

Between 1918 and 1945, the Union Prayerbook underwent two revisions. In 1918, the revised edition of the first volume was published, and in 1922, the revised second volume came out. The newly revised editions of the two volumes were published in 1940 and 1945 respectively. The purpose of this chapter is not to present a detailed analysis of the changes which occurred in the two revisions. We will limit our discussion to how the Jewish people was viewed in the revised and newly revised editions of the UPB which have served as the liturgy in virtually all American Reform temples from 1918 to the present.

The differences between the three Union Prayerbooks (original, revised, and newly revised) are more linguistic than theological. Many of the same prayers appear in all three with alterations only in the style of language. In previous chapters, we have seen that in the original UPB, God's special relationship with Israel had been stressed. Israel served as God's priests and had a mission to fulfill. In fulfilling its mission, Israel had undergone much suffering. The UPB was noted for its universalistic emphasis.

In the revised edition, we find these same elements expressed. God has a special relationship with Israel, a relationship characterized by love. His infinite love was manifested to our people by His giving to us laws and commandments.[1] His love watched over us in times of oppression,[2] and it is in love that He brings us redemption.[3]

Israel is God's Chosen People. We were called to God's service so that through us God's Name might become known through all the earth.[4] On the Sabbath during Passover, we are reminded that we were delivered from slavery so that we could become a kingdom of priests and a light unto the nations.[5] On the High Holydays, too, there are a number of references to Israel's Mission.[6] A high point is reached in the Afternoon Service for the Day of Atonement:

> By Thy grace, O God, it has been given us to see in our dispersion over the earth, not a means of punishment, but a sign of blessed privilege. Scattered among the nations of the world, Israel is to bear witness to Thy power and Thy truth and to endeavor to unite all peoples in a covenant of brotherhood and peace.[7]

It should be mentioned that the revised edition does cut out the phrase, "Israel shall become the people of God, that shall embrace all families of the earth," which appeared in the 1893 edition.[8]

In that same Afternoon Service, there is a confession that Jews are often indifferent to faith, worship, and love of God. It continues:

> We have declared to the world that we were sent by Thee to teach justice and lovingkindness, brotherhood and peace. And yet, even in our own household, petty prejudices, class enmities, and the envious conflicts for the prizes of worldly gain, have not ceased.[9]

This prayer goes on to state that by not observing the Sabbath, we discredit ourselves as ministers of the Lord. We have found an excuse for our sin in the iniquity of the persecutor instead of pointing to our own breasts.[10]

Suffering has been the lot of the Jewish people throughout much of its history. The UPB is congnizant of this fact and deals with it. A prayer for the Sabbath preceding Purim contains the following:

> Painful trials and bitter struggles, torment of body and agony of soul have been his (Israel's) portion through the dreary centuries of fiery hatred and bloody persecution.[11]

The prayerbook maintains that the suffering has not been in vain: "Israel has not struggled and suffered in vain. And though many a bitter experience may await us before the prejudice and hate that divide brother from brother shall have vanished, still do we trust, as did our fathers, that in the end all barriers to brotherhood shall be broken down."[12] The prayerbook calls Israel "the martyred people,"[13] and praises God for "thy martyrs whose memory and example have ever inspired Thy people to heroism and loyalty."[14]

While asserting God's special relationship with Israel, the Union Prayerbook is universalistic in tone. The following prayer is indicative of this:

> As Thou hast redeemed Israel and saved him from arms stronger than his own, so mayest Thou redeem all who are oppressed and persecuted. Praised be Thou, O Lord, Redeemer of Israel.[15]

On the Sabbath preceding Purim, a time marking the deliverance of Israel, we pray, "Make us truly conscious that Thou art the loving Father of all men, and that it is Thy will that Thy children be not divided by distrust and strife, but be united in an eternal covenant of brotherhood and peace." It concludes, "Then will deliverance be the portion of Thy people and salvation the heritage of all who put their trust in Thee.[16]

Often, the authors of the UPB appear embarrassed about anything smacking of particularism. They may allow a particularistic phrase to remain in the Hebrew, but eliminate it in the English. A good example of this can be seen in the Sabbath Afternoon Service. In it, we find the phrase, "ומי כעמך ישראל גוי אחד בארץ". However, the English version of this prayer does not mention Israel at all. It reads, " . . . may Thy truth unite all mankind into one holy brotherhood and may our love for one another be our crown of glory and armor of strength."[17]

In 1928, Samuel S. Cohon delivered a lengthy paper to the CCAR entitled "The Theology of the Union Prayerbook." In that paper, he pointed out that the UPB "wages a needless polemic against both religious and political Zionism. He cited such phrases as "Not backward do we turn our eyes,

O Lord, but forward to the promised and certain future," and "And though we cherish and revere the place where stood the cradle of our people . . . our longings and aspirations reach out toward a higher goal."[18]

Cohon stated that Israel's place in the world was reflected in the petition, "Be Thou with the whole house of Israel, so that we may live in freedom everywhere and unite with all men in singing a new song of salvation and deliverance." He noted that the reference to the whole house of Israel was exceptional and that the unity of Israel was not sufficiently stressed. While there are many references to the mission of Israel, "the welfare of the missionary in various parts of the world is all too often overlooked."[19] Cohon also argued that though there is much talk about the mission, Israel's adherence to the ideals constituting that mission is not emphasized: "All too little is said about Israel as a people of Torah, who must learn before it can teach and who must practice before it can serve as an example to others."[20]

In the discussion which followed Cohon's paper, Ferdinand M. Isserman made the following observation. It is worth noting because it indicates that there were Reform rabbis who recognized that the Mission was sometimes over-emphasized:

> For me the claims of the mission of Israel which we make in our Prayer Books and which we make in our pulpits are somewhat overstated. We know from the science of comparative religion and from the history of religion that there have been peoples outside of the fold of Israel who have discovered the unity of God and who have come to high ethical and social ideals without the direct influence of Israel's teachings.[21]

The Newly Revised edition of the Union Prayerbook is the one commonly in use in Reform temples today. It views the Jewish people in much the same way that its predecessors did. However, it was published during the Holocaust period, and it reflects, to a certain extent, an awareness of what was happening to the Jews at that time.

The prayerbook opens with a ritual for lighting the Sabbath candles. That ritual indicates that this ceremony "unites Israel in all lands and in all ages."[22] That the Jewish religion binds the Jew to his people is further expressed in this passage from one of the daily services:

> In every crisis of his life, even in the presence of death, has the Jew affirmed his faith in the one and only God. By this he has endured the duty and suffering of the centuries and risen to a sublime ministry of service. So do we take up the ancient watchword of our fathers which binds generation to generation in an everlasting covenant.[23]

In the newly revised UPB, there are references to Irael's task. One of these reads, "From the very beginning of our existence, Thou hast destined for us a sacred task to toil for the speedy dawn of that day, when Thou wilt be revered and obeyed the whole world over, and all mankind

will live in peace and unity."[24] However, the Mission-idea seems to be toned down a bit. This can be seen by comparing the same prayer in the revised and in the newly revised editions. In the revised edition, the prayer reads:

> Thou didst appoint us to proclaim Thy truth unto the nations and to win them for Thy law of righteousness. Sanctify us for the service to which Thou hast called us, O heavenly Father, that Thy name may be hallowed through us in all the world.[25]

In the newly revised, it reads:

> Open our eyes to the beauty of Thy truth and help us so to exemplify it in our lives that we may win all men for Thy law of righteousness.[26]

A further comparison shows not only the toning down of the Mission-idea, but also the avoidance of the term "chosen." In the revised UPB, it was written, "Thou hast called us as teachers of Thy law; Thou hast chosen us for a holy mission unto mankind."[27] In the newly revised this became, "Thou hast called us and drawn us nigh unto Thee to serve Thee in faithfulness."[28]

The concept of chosenness was generally avoided in the newly revised edition. This is done by translating the verb "בחר" as "call" rather than "choose." This is to be found throughout the prayerbook.[29] The concept of chosenness was not completely eliminated from the prayerbook, however. In the Afternoon Service for the Day of Atonement, we read, "We have proclaimed to the world, even as law-giver and prophet taught, that we were Thine own treasure, a chosen

people, Thy servant, upon whom Thou didst put Thy spirit."[30]

The newly revised UPB is aware that the Jewish people was in the midst of trying times. Thus, on the first evening of Passover we find the prayer, "Grant, O God, that Thy people Israel may be freed from the tyranny that sorely besets them, and from the sorrow and despair that burden their heart."[31] Similarly, on the Sabbath during Hanukah, we read, "Dangers still threaten our existence. Uphold us in our struggles for our preservation as a people of faith."[32] The sentiment that our suffering had not been in vain which had been expressed in the revised edition were deleted in the newly revised.[33]

The change in viewpoint within the ranks of the CCAR with regard to Zionism also found expression in the newly revised UPB. The paragraph in the Afternoon Service for the Day ot Atonement emphasizing that the dispersion was not a punishment, but a "blessed privilege" was deleted in the newly revised edition.[34] The most radical change in the newly revised UPB is the prayer in the fifth Sabbath Eve Service which views the rebuilding of Zion in a positive light and which admits that Zion's restoration was always part of the Jewish consciousness:

> O Lord our God, we turn to Thee in hope as did our fathers. May Thy mercy descend upon our people in all their habitations. Extend Thy protection and help unto our brothers who struggle in lands of darkness as victims of oppression and persecution. Fill the hearts of all

men with a love of freedom and justice, that tyranny may vanish and the reign of righteousness be established everywhere on earth. Uphold also the hands of our brothers who toil to rebuild Zion. In their pilgrimage among the nations, Thy people have always turned in love to the land where Israel was born, where our prophets taught their imperishable message of justice and brotherhood and where our psalmists sang their deathless songs of love for Thee and of Thy love for us and all humanity. Ever enshrined in the hearts of Israel was the hope that Zion might be restored, not for their own pride or vainglory, but as a living witness to the truth of Thy word which shall lead the nations to the reign of peace. Grant us strength that with Thy help we may bring a new light to shine upon Zion. Imbue us who live in lands of freedom with a sense of Israel's spiritual unity that we may share joyously in the work of redemption so that from Zion shall go forth the law and the word of God from Jerusalem.[35]

PART IV

THE POSTWAR ERA

CHAPTER 13

THE LATE FORTIES

In the period following the Second World War, the question of the nature of the Jewish people still engaged the minds of the Reform rabbinate. Many of the same queries continued to be discussed on the floor of the CCAR and in the writings of various rabbis: What are we, a religious group or a people? Does Israel have a mission, and what is it? Have we been chosen, and what can the concept of chosenness mean after Auschwitz? What is the relationship between American Jewry and Jews throughout the world, and especially with the Jews of the new State of Israel? The emergence of an independent Jewish state after nearly 1900 years--and particularly since it followed on the heels of the Holocaust--was the most important event in Jewish history during this period. How to relate to the state became a question of overriding importance to the rabbis.

At the end of the war, the immensity of the loss sustained by the Jewish people became clear. In the wake of the tragedy, thousands of Jewish survivors remained homeless. At the 1947 CCAR convention, the Committee on President's Message approved a recommendation that the Conference appeal to the United States government to work for an arrangement

whereby large numbers of displaced persons would be allowed to go to Palestine. The recommendation also called upon the United States "to take steps to insure that the basic rights of the Jewish people, historically grounded and internationally guaranteed to it by the Palestine Mandate, shall not be violated in any permanent settlement which will be made of the Palestine issue."[1]

By the time the Conference had met in 1948, the State of Israel had declared its independence. Various reports of committees at the 1948 convention took joyful cognizance of this fact. The Committee on Palestine noted that "the establishment of the Republic of Israel fulfills a 2000 year-old dream of the Jewish people. The committee further offered "our Israeli brothers all possible encouragement and assistance in the maintenance of independence and in the achievement of security," and expressed its hope for peace so that Israel could carry on its spiritual revival, Hebrew cultural contributions, and its enrichment of Judaism.[2] The Committee on President's Message called Israel's establishment "the consummation of the millennial hopes and aspirations of our people," and took pride in the fact that members of the CCAR had played an important role in the creation of the state.[3] These statements were certainly a far cry from the anti-national views expressed by the early reformers!

In 1949, in honor of the College's seventy-fifth anniversary, the Hebrew Union College Press published a volume entitled Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni. The work contained a number of essays by leading thinkers of the Reform movement. In the rest of this chapter, we shall look at the concepts of the Jewish people expressed in those essays.

In his introduction to the volume, Bernard J. Bamberger gave a brief sketch of the relationship between Reform Judaism and Zionism. He pointed out that long before the rise of modern Jewish nationalism, Reform had repudiated Messianic national aspirations, so that when Herzl proposed a Jewish state, he was denounced by most Reform leaders. After World War I, sentiment within the ranks of Reform began to change. The condition of Eastern European Jewry was worse than ever, and many former havens, such as the United States, were closed to large-scale immigration. Many Reform Jews began to see the rebuilding of Palestine as a practical, humanitarian undertaking in which they wished to participate, regardless of their views concerning political Zionism.[4]

Bamberger mentioned a number of developments which we have already pointed out, such as the CCAR's neutrality resolution and the founding of the American Council for Judaism. Bamberger cited the fact that during the 1940's, a few temples adopted statements of principles with strongly worded

repudiations of Zionism to which their members were required to subscribe. Such doctrinal tests, however, were generally deprecated, even by non-Zionists.[5] The partition of Palestine, establishment of Israel, and the War of Independence changed the controversy over Zionism. Bamberger interpreted that change in the following way:

> Many Jews who had never accepted a nationalist interpretation of Jewish life have come to the conclusion that current realities permit no other solution of the Palestine problem. Even among anti-Zionist extremists, there has been a general feeling that the decision of the United Nations must be accepted and supported, and that Palestine must be made secure for those who now live there and for those Jews who wish to settle there.[6]

Joshua Loth Liebman, in his essay "New Trends in Reform Jewish Thought," stated that it is enormously difficult to define Israel because of the many forms which the Jewish people has taken in its long history. He did insist, however, that "we must accept as reality the existence of a world-wide Jewish people--a people assuming different shapes and contours in varying environments."[7] Citing agnostic, socialist, and Zionist Jews, Liebman argued against the notion that Jews are united only by religion. Jews cannot be defined by any one term; Israel cannot be reduced to a nation or a creed or a culture.[8]

Liebman noted that in the previous one hundred years many Jews had stressed one element of Jewish experience to the exclusion of others. For example, many Reform thinkers had stressed Israel's dream, but minimized the importance

of the dreamer. Many secular nationalists also oversimplified by stressing the "agent" while forgetting the "purpose."[9]

Liebman, of course, was very interested in psychology. He felt that there was a great difference in our sense of security if we call ourselves a people or a religious sect. Recognizing ourselves as part of a people helps us to overcome alienation and loneliness:

> When we recognize Israel as a people, creative, tragic, downtrodden, glorious, world-wide in dimensions, we feel immediately that we share in a significant and eternal destiny. We are no longer isolated atoms drifting in cosmic space, but we are participating members of a great family--creative in one part of the world and frustrated in another, free in one area and enslaved in another.[10]

We Reform Jews, Liebman argued, should resist the temptation to isolate ourselves from the rest of the Jewish people. We should take pride in the achievements of our fellow-Jews in Palestine, regardless of our views concerning Zionism.[11] Concerning the Mission of Israel, Liebman maintained that there was a sense in which we could become a "light unto the nations." The Jewish social philosophy is based on a sense of human brotherhood which is all the more passionate and uncompromising because we have been history's eternal sufferers. We, thus, have something unique and vital to give to the world.[12]

The 1949 volume contained two essays on the topic of Reform Judaism and Zionism, one from a Zionist perspective and the other from a non-Zionist viewpoint. The Zionist

interpretation was presented by Leon Fram. He stated that in order to attain citizenship, the German reformers wanted to show that they were committed to life in Germany. They, therefore, had to demonstrate that they were not a nation waiting to return to Palestine.[13] When the founders of Reform opposed Jewish nationalism, the modern Zionist movement had not yet come into being.[14]

Fram noted that by 1885, the year that the Pittsburgh Platform was framed, many of the Reform rabbis had been in the United States between fifteen and twenty-five years and should have "known better than to believe that they had to defend their existence to the American people, or explain away those characteristics of culture, tradition, history, and social solidarity which mark the Jews as a people."[15] According to Fram, the anti-nationalist position which had been born entirely out of political conditions in Germany in the early nineteenth century, had, by the late nineteenth century, become a fixed idea.[16]

Fram argued that the Pittsburgh Platform's rejection of laws associated with Jewish national life in Palestine and preservation of only laws and traditions which are universal was a distortion of liberal religion. Liberalism does not reject on the basis of nationalism verus universalism, but rejects customs which have been outgrown and which thus pervert spiritual life. He pointed out that Reform did

not actually reject all the national elements of Jewish life since Passover and Hannukah continued to be celebrated.[17]

In Fram's view, the men of Pittsburgh caused moral havoc in the lives of members of American Reform congregations. They introduced a self-consciousness and feeling of guilt about Jewish peoplehood:

> The Pittsburgh platform caused those Jews who could have been most completely adjusted to Jewish life in America to become incapable of enjoying their life as Jews. Everything distinctly Jewish had either to be suppressed, or if clung to, had to be apologized for. Everything distinctively Jewish was naturally a token of Jewish peoplehood, and therefore a contradiction of what had become a dogma.[18]

As soon as Reform Judaism collided with a Jewish nationalism which was not a repetition of the Messianic hope, but a movement based on Jewish persecution, there was no longer unanimity within Reform against it. With the beginning of the Zionist movement, rabbinical resolutions on Jewish nationhood, and Zionism, were no longer unanimous. More and more Reform rabbis became sympathetic to Zionism. Fram concluded that the UAHC's declaration of neutrality toward Zionism in 1946 marked the removal of an element of Reform Judaism which was never really an organic part of it.[19]

A non-Zionist viewpoint was given by David H. Wice. He noted that Reform Judaism had followed an old pattern in oscillating between universalism and particularism. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, American reformers

thought they were close to the millennium. By denying Herzl's thesis, they hoped to find the road to universalism a bit shorter. The events of the twentieth century showed that the Messianic Era is still quite a long way off. The non-Zionists are as concerned with the survival of the Jewish people as are Jewish nationalists. They do not believe that his survival can be achieved only through political Zionism. Though denying the Zionist thesis of homelessness in the Diaspora, they still labor for the upbuilding of Palestine.[20] In so arguing, Wice presented a non-Zionist, but not an anti-Zionist position.[21]

Wice admitted that we are not a church, but he also denied that we are a nation like other nations. Our religion, he held, has been the reason for our survival. To make national survival through the creation of a political state the central purpose of Jewish existence would be a distortion of our history. Wice stated that the Zionists have often failed to give due weight to the universal values of Judaism because they have been preoccupied with the problems of physical survival. He noted that "political expediency is rarely compatible with the highest ethical aims."[22]

Wice also noted other problems connected with a nationalist interpretation. If we made nationalism the essential element in Jewish life, we would have to exclude proselytes unless they took on Jewish national loyalty. Another

problem is that of the separation of church and state in Israel. The choice will have to be made between an established religion and a secular Hebrew state, which is an anomaly. Wice concluded that further growth in Jewish influence must come through the religious interpretation, and not through nationalism.[23]

CHAPTER 14

THE 1950's

On March 20-22, 1950, an Institute of Reform Jewish Theology was held at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Round table discussions were held on such topics as God, Revelation, the Mission of Israel, Immortality, Prayer, the Soul, and Reform Jewish Practice. The round tables on the Mission of Israel and on Reform Jewish Practice were the only ones able to complete their work and to make statements which were then approved by those in attendance (75-100 rabbis, some laymen, and HUC students).

The round table on the Mission of Israel declared that God elected Israel and revealed to us the Torah as the way of life for man. The Jewish People, therefore, both as individuals and as a community, has the privilege and duty to exemplify the teachings of the Torah in our personal lives and in working toward a just social order. Israel's lot has been to be the conscience of the world, the degree of our suffering being the measure of the world's willingness to implement the Jewish ideal of social justice. The statement denied that Israel's election implied that the Jews had a particular genius for religion.

The statement went on to outline two aspects of the mission, one was to the Jews and the other was to the world. The mission to Jews was to win back to active participation in Jewish life the unsynagogued, the roamers from Traditional Judaism, and the Jews in non-progressive countries. It also entailed assisting existing progressive congregations and helping to create new ones. It recognized that Israel presented a unique opportunity for Reform Judaism. The mission to the world was three-fold: to recognize that we have been derelict in our devotion to the mission, to support every progressive measure for social justice, and to promote social justice programs in every congregation.[1]

At the same Institute, Emil L. Fackenheim presented a paper entitled "Existentialism and Judaism." He held that Jewish existence can neither be a mere fate over which Jews had no control, nor wholly the function of Jewish human beings. He stressed that Jewish tradition holds that God imposed separateness on the Jews but that Israel freely chose its task.[2]

The CCAR convention of 1950 featured a symposium entitled "Israel and the American Jew." The participants in the symposium were Abraham J. Feldman, Charles E. Shulmam. Feldman stated that the emergence of the State of Israel was the greatest event in the Jewish history of millennia, and that we have the unmerited distinction of being the "generation of the redemption."[3] Feldman emphasized that there was

no organic political bond between the American Jew and the Israeli Jew, yet he expressed confidence that American Jews would not sever themselves emotionally from those who are rebuilding the land of our ancestors. Though American Jews should not meddle politically in Israel's affairs, we should render our help to Israel. He suggested that that help might be financial, protective (for example, using our prestige as free Americans to see that Israel is not destroyed), cultural, and political.[4]

Shulman felt that American Reform Judaism had not gone far enough in its relationship with the State of Israel. He urged that we "must advance beyond the Columbus Platform, beyond neutrality, and openly support not only the state, but the philosophy that brought the state into being."[5] Blumenfeld held that the cultural relationship between Israeli and American Jewries should be a "two-way passage." He felt that Jewish culture in Israel would prove to be more authentic and more creative, but he insisted that Israeli and American Jewries are indispensable to one another and must maintain close contact for their mutual spiritual welfare.[6]

Max Nussbaum presented a paper to the CCAR in 1952 entitled "Eretz Yisrael, Galut and Chutz La'aretz, in their Historic Settings." Nussbaum waxed poetic when he called Eretz Yisrael "a title of honor that spells uniqueness and conveys the idea of holiness which, in turn, derives its

essence from the immanence of the Shekinah in the land, and the settlement by the people of Israel on the land."[7] Nussbaum pointed out that the name of Israel has always meant more than the ethnic term "Yehudim." The name "Israel" proclaims the spiritual quality of our people in its attachment to God. It is the name of Israel which binds all Jews together.[8]

At that 1952 convention, the CCAR unanimously passed a resolution saluting Israel's achievements--absorbing 700,000 immigrants and establishing new settlements, new industries, medical and social services, and democratic political freedoms. The resolution recognized the consistent and ever-growing support of Israel by the American-Jewish community. The Conference commended "all who through their contributions of energy and substance thus affirm their faith in the miracle of restoration of our people to its ancient land."[9] Based on the principle, enunciated in the Columbus Platform, that we should aid in the upbuilding of Palestine, the CCAR established a Committee on Projects for Israel. In its 1952 report, that committee stated: "It is our conviction that our concern with Jewish life in Israel is of the very essence of our Judaism and that it does not detract from, but rather enhances our devotion to American democracy."[10] In 1952, the CCAR invested $5,000 of Conference funds in Israel bonds. A CCAR study-institute was held in Israel in the summer of 1951 with nine-

teen in attendance. An attempt to repeat this in 1952 failed, however, due to lack of participation.[11]

The 1953 CCAR convention featured a symposium on "The State of the Reform Movement." Two of the papers read at that symposium touch upon our subject. Lou H. Silberman spoke about "The Recent History of Reform Philosophy." He declared that the motivating force in the demand for the revision of Reform's interpretation of "Israel" which led to the Columbus Platform had been more practical than theoretical. The discussion had actually revolved more around the question of the compatibility of Reform Judaism and Zionism than the nature of Israel.[12] Silberman noted that there is no mention of "nation" in the Columbus Platform. In fact, there is no repudiation of the Pittsburgh Platform's statement that "we are no longer a nation." Even the use of the term "Jewish people" was not new in the Columbus Platform; it had appeared in the Pittsburgh document as well. What, then, was the contribution of the Columbus statement? It recognized that Israel and Judaism are not synonymous. However, it did not go beyond that to say what Israel is.[13]

Herbert A. Friedman, in his paper "Goals of the Reform Movement," urged that "we must reaffirm that great secret that Brandeis learned so late in his life--the secret that the Jews are a people--one, as God is one, indivisible, irrefragably bound in a physical and metaphysical union

which is greater than the sum of all its parts."[14] Friedman felt that Reform was leaving its isolationist camp by linking itself with Jews everywhere. He asserted that one of the Reform's goals must be to avoid falling prey again to parochialism.[15]

Israel Bettan apparently did not view the Israeli flag as a symbol of the metaphysical union of the Jewish people about which Friedman had spoken. In a responsum he gave to the question of whether national flags should be displayed at religious services, Bettan wrote in 1954 that a national flag of a country does not have a proper place in the synagogue. However, just as the American flag does not have a place in Israeli synagogues, Bettan felt that the Israeli flag is out of place in American synagogues.[16] In his "Presidential Message" to the CCAR in 1957, Bettan stated that the allegation that classical Reform had rejected the concept of the peoplehood of Israel was erroneous. He felt that the early reformers' emphasis on the Mission of Israel proved that they did not view Judaism as a denominational creed. He insisted that "what the exponents of Reform actually opposed was not the concept of peoplehood with all that it implied, but the idea of statehood, which they identified with the political nationalism of their day."[17]

In his "Presidential Message" the year before, Barnett R. Brickner had stated that the Jew and Judaism would

not survive in the United States as a nationality or as a secular people, but as a religio-cultural community. He felt that after the establishment of the State of Israel, the term "nationalism," which had too many political connotations, should be replaced by the term "peoplehood," a concept which was shared by Jews the world over. He held that in the future, there would be two great Jewish centers: America will be a religio-cultural community and Israel will be the nuclear center of the whole Jewish people, a sovereign political state. The two centers will influence one another both spiritually and culturally.[18]

At the 1956 convention, the CCAR once again repudiated the American Council for Judaism. The Committee on President's Message attacked the American Council for impairing the work of the United Jewish Appeal, injecting divisiveness within Reform congregations, seeking to influence American policy contrary to the best interests of both Israel and the United States, reinforcing the efforts of Arabs and others to incite prejudice and enmity against the State of Israel and the Jewish people throughout the world, impugning the patriotism of the vast majority of American Jews, and distorting and misrepresenting the nature and meaning of Judaism. The CCAR reaffirmed its repudiation and declared that the American Council for Judaism "does not represent liberal, Reform Judaism or any other valid interpretation of Judaism."[19]

In 1957, Theodore N. Lewis read a paper before the CCAR entitled "The Idea of Israel." He began the paper by summarizing the biblical and rabbinic view of Israel. According to that view, Israel was an equivalent term for the Jewish people, which was the peculiar possession of God. The Covenant people of God was imperishable. Nevertheless, when Israel sins, it is punished. God was seen not only in His relationship with Israel, but also as the father of all mankind. The rabbis thus combined universalism and particularism.[20]

Lewis maintained that the early reformers found this concept embarrassing and, therefore, watered it down. They were insecure galut Jews. Their desire for acceptance by the Christian community led them to proclaim their loyalty to German culture. This adoration of the Fatherland, which Lewis viewed as neurotic, colored their attitude toward the Jewish people, Palestine, Hebrew, Jewish ceremonies, indeed toward Judaism in its entirety. It led to the theory that the Jewish people was a religious denomination and nothing more. Lewis called this dogma absurd and a distortion of Jewish history.[21] He also held that the delegates to the Pittsburgh meeting of 1885 had brought their anxieties with them to this country from Europe. The platform they produced was a document of denial which reached its climax in the plank dealing with Israel.[22]

Lewis was also opposed to interpreting Israel in purely humanistic terms, divorcing the Jewish people from its mission. He felt that if Israel's only function is to exist and if Jews are just another grouping--be it national, religious, or political--then Jewish history is without meaning. He exclaimed:

> Let us courageously and proudly affirm that Israel represents a supernatural phenomenon, a miracle! Having defied every law of social organization, every law of history, and every law of logic, Jews are a unique, a holy people. This uniqueness and holiness consist in the conviction that the Jew has been chosen by God to be the bearer of His message to mankind.[23]

The concept of chosenness does not involve snobbishness since the invitation to join the Jewish faith and people is extended to all races and creeds. Our people is unique in its combination of religion with national qualities. Lewis said that in insisting that religion is the basic characteristic of the Jew, Reform was voicing a cardinal truth of the Jewish people.[24]

Lewis argued that the concept of Israel is profoundly and indissolubly linked to the Land of Israel just as it is to the faith of Israel. He also stressed the crucial role of the Hebrew language in Jewish worship, education, and survival.[25] Lewis concluded that the concept of Israel as a holy people dedicated to the service of God is basic to Judaism. To give it an authentic Jewish setting, he claimed that Reform must link the holy people with the

holy land and the holy language.[26]

At the same convention at which Lewis read his paper, Samuel S. Mayerberg delivered a paper entitled "The Columbus Platform--Twenty Years Later" which had a very different tenor. He expressed sorrow that the Jews living in the ancient homeland of the Jewish people chose the word "Israel" as the name of the state because that word is used by Jews throughout the world to describe themselves.[27] He argued that we cannot call the State of Israel a Jewish homeland. Though most Reform Jews happily aid the State of Israel, he said that we cannot view its flag as our own, but must reiterate the religious nature of our status as a Jewish community. In other words, politically we are Americans and religiously we are Jews. He felt that no description of Reform Judaism should limit geographically or ethnically its program or purpose. The term "Israel" refers to a "universal Jewish religious community."[28]

At that same 1957 convention, Leon I. Feuer gave the Conference Lecture, "Beyond Zionism." In it, he said that neither Israel nor the Diaspora can exist for the sake of the other. Each must strive for an aim which unites and, at the same time, transcends them.[29] He noted that three times in history, the Jewish people has embarked on the task of nation-building. He held that "the urge to nation building is fundamentally and demonstrably the effort to channel

an unquenchable desire to create a religiously motivated civilization."[30]

Feuer noted the importance of the Covenant in Israel's determination to exert its national will in history. The synthesis of the Covenant-idea with the concepts of the Selection and Mission of Israel provided the propulsion for Israel's wish to influence events in history.[31] In fact, in Feuer's view, the only indissoluble bond between the modern State of Israel and the Diaspora is the Covenant-Mission concept.[32]

Unlike Mayerberg, Feuer thought that the choice of the name "Israel" for the new state was felicitous. He felt that it indicated that the founders of the state realized the organic connection between the state and the people which brought it to birth and the religion which must motivate its actions.[33] Feuer insisted that Jewish nationalism cannot be a substitute for Jewish world fellowship or universal fellowship. The State of Israel is important for relieving homelessness of fellow Jews, but, in the long run, he said that it is not more significant than American Jewry or any other Jewish community. The Covenant-Mission requires us to build an order of justice in Israel and to advocate the values of Judaism in relations between men and nations in all societies.[34]

In 1959, a case came up in Israel of whether the child of a Jewish father and an unconverted gentile mother could be registered as Jewish. This case brought up the recurrent question of "Who is a Jew?" A symposium was held at the CCAR convention on this topic and two articles were published in the CCAR Journal which also dealt with this question. In the symposium, David Max Eichhorn said that "to think and talk of a Jewish race and of Jewish blood in the light of twentieth century scholarship is to think and to talk unadulterated nonsense."[35] He argued that being Jewish includes two indispensable elements--self-identification and group acceptance. By this he meant that a person must say that he is Jewish and an authentically Jewish group (not necessarily the synagogue, but one which reflects the truths of the synagogue) must accept him.[36]

Joachim Prinz stated that the question posed by the symposium was a post-Emancipation question. Before Emancipation, Jews were recognized as members of a national group which was held together by historical memory, a common fate and faith, a mode of living, by submission to rabbinical law, as well as by the law of the gentiles which singled Jews out for special treatment.[37] The formula suggested by Clermont Tonnère which led to the Declaration of Emancipation in 1791 was "To the Jews as human beings, everything; to the Jews as a nation, nothing."[38] Prinz argued that we cannot today

define a Jew by his faith alone. Peoplehood is a basic prerequisite of the Jewish faith; the two must not be separated. However, he also maintained that we have overcome nationalism. Nationalism has fulfilled itself--it cannot produce values which can be handed down from generation to generation.[39]

The two articles in the CCAR Journal on the question of "Who is a Jew?" were by Solomon B. Freehof and Samuel S. Cohon. Freehof noted that the old way of stating the question was to ask whether we are a race, nation, or religion. Of course, we could be some combination of these, such as a religious nation or a racial religion. He held that there is, in fact, a blending of affiliation in us which makes any specific definition difficult. When the Jewish state existed, it was founded under the tutelage of the Jewish religion. The Jewish blood kinship was also created out of a heterogeneous mass by the religion. It was our religion which created our kinship, and now our kinship is strong enough to preserve the religion. We became Jews by our religion. He felt that we can be Jews without our religion, but not for long. A lasting and complete break with the faith would lead to the breaking of the kinship spectrum.[40]

The controversy which was then current in Israel raised the possibility of a permanent non-religious Jewishness. Such a permanent, non-religious Jewishness Freehof felt was impossible outside of Israel. However, in Israel,

where the environment is Jewish, it is possible. There is danger in this situation because it is the Jewish religion which maintains the kinship which binds the Diaspora with the State. His solution to the Israeli case was to give the child Jewish political affiliation, but withhold religious rights until such time as the child convert. This solution would result in people who were at the same time Jews and non-Jews. Freehof held that such persons would correspond to the ancient category of תושב גר.[41]

Cohon declared that the answer of history to the question of "Who is a Jew?" is embodied in Jewish law. He argued that a Jew is a person of Jewish descent and faith. If a person should pursue an anti-religious philosophy, his birth would still bind him to the Jewish people. However, if he should adopt another faith, "a complete severance with the Jewish people has been effected."[42] Cohon went on to say that a person of any race who embraces Judaism is regarded as a full member of the Jewish community. American Reform Judaism made conversion to Judaism easier by eliminating the traditional requirements of circumcision and ritual immersion. He noted that "men and women are accepted into Judaism by a ceremony of conversion if they express a sincere desire to become Jews and demonstrate their understanding of the basic convictions of Judaism."[43]

CHAPTER 15

THE 1960's--TO THE SIX DAY WAR

We have seen that at the end of the 1950's the question of "Who is a Jew?" had drawn a great deal of attention. In the revised edition of the Rabbi's Manual, published in 1961, the Conference stated its position on the status of children born of mixed marriages. It reiterated the fact that according to Jewish law, a child born of a Jewish mother and a gentile father is Jewish whereas a child born of a gentile mother and a Jewish father is not. It then stated that Reform Judaism recognizes the latter child as Jewish, without his conversion, provided that he attends a Jewish school and follows a course of studies leading to Confirmation.[1] Though this is the official Conference view, it should be noted that it is not universally accepted by Reform rabbis. Frederic A. Doppelt and David Polish wrote in A Guide for Reform Jews that "where the confirmand whose mother is not Jewish has not previously been inducted into the Jewish faith, this induction should take place privately before the service."[2]

At its 1963 convention, the CCAR issued a very important statement dealing with the relationship of Reform Judaism with the State of Israel. Because this statement touches upon many of the topics which have been of concern

to us in this paper, we will here reproduce it in full:

> We affirm our faith in the One Living God, Creator and Governor of the Universe. Our fathers pledged eternal loyalty to Him and He, we believe, accepted them as a people consecrated to His service. It is this Covenant between God and Israel that gives historic Jewish existence its distinctive character.
>
> Changes of time, place, and circumstances have evoked divergent views among Jews as to the nature of Israel's Covenant with God and its implications for our time. Some give primary emphasis to Jewish nationhood. Some limit their interest to the maintenance of ethnic and cultural continuity. For us, Jewish religious faith is indispensable to the Jewish way of life. Yet we Jews are one people the world over, with a common historic background and a distinct consciousness of Jewish brotherhood. The familiar classifications of race, nationality, and church do not properly describe us. We are a unique community.
>
> Jewish religious duty and Jewish historical experience both demand of us constant concern with all that Jews do and all that happens to them wherever they may live. "All Jews are responsible for one another" does not mean for us that we must approve and defend the words and actions of all Jews. It means that we are obligated to provide help--material and spiritual--that other Jews may need and to draw from other Jewish communities benefits they may confer upon us.
>
> We share the joy, gratitude, and pride felt by Jews everywhere over the growth and progress of the State of Israel. We hail the heroism and sacrifice of its builders and of all who are struggling to maintain its security and to further its development. The State of Israel has been the great refuge for our oppressed. It has established a center for a dynamic Hebrew culture. It has translated some of the prophetic ideals of Judaism into living forms and institutions. It has been a source of living inspiration to all our people. It offers great promise in the future.
>
> As we acknowledge our responsibilities toward all Jews everywhere, we affirm our special obligation to provide the fullest measure of brotherly support and assistance--material and moral--for the people of the State of Israel.
>
> We note with deep gratification the establishment of Liberal Jewish congregations in the land of Israel. This new religious movement requires our wholehearted encouragement and support.
>
> We pledge ourselves to continued effort toward fuller understanding between the Jews who live in the land of Israel and those who live elsewhere. We have no right to speak for each other; but it is our duty to speak to each

other continually in mutual concern and genuine love. Our lives as Jews in America are enriched by the creative developments of Jewish life in the State of Israel. The lives of our brothers in the State of Israel are, in turn, enriched by the distinctive and creative Jewish experience in America. Jewish creativity knows no geographical boundaries.

There will be disagreements between us, and even criticisms of each other. American Jews should not give the impression that they are trying to direct the affairs of the State of Israel and the leaders of the State of Israel should avoid giving the impression that they speak for American Jewry. Yet the bridge of communication and help, built with knowledge and love, must stand firm and unshaken.

The distinctive character of historic Jewish existence rooted in our Covenant with the One Living God, affirmed in each generation and in every place and circumstances by the noblest teachers of Judaism, imposes upon us all the unceasing striving for the implementation of the Jewish prophetic vision.

This divine mission again unites and challenges our brothers in the State of Israel, in America, and everywhere on earth.[3]

The nature of the Jewish people, including the relationship of Israeli and Diaspora Jewries, was a topic which engaged Jakob J. Petuchowski in a number of articles which he authored in the early 1960's. A year before the Conference issued the statement which we have just quoted, his "Towards a Definition of our Relationship to Israel" was published in the CCAR Journal. In it, he stated that due to its divinely ordained character, it has been impossible to define the Jewish people in terms of common historical and sociological categories. However, common history, commitments, and hopes have made it possible for Jews of all geographical and racial backgrounds to recognize each other as "sons of the Covenant."[4] He noted that the modes of

Jewish existence have varied throughout Jewish history, but that the different modes are not mutually exclusive. In whatever situation the Jew finds himself, he has an obligation to work toward the realization of the messianic vision.[5]

He held that the State of Israel can be a showcase of "Judaism in action." We must materially aid the State before it will be prepared to play its role in the Mission of Israel. We are joyful at the rebirth of the Hebrew language and literature. However, he insisted--with the prophets, rabbis, and early reformers--that Judaism is a viable faith which is independent of any geographical center. Though the State of Israel may become a spiritual leader for world Jewry, it will not exclude other centers. We would not expect Israel to solve religious problems which are peculiar to American Jewish life. Possibly as a retort to the oft-repeated Zionist contention that a "full Jewish life" can be lived only in Israel, Petuchowski wrote, "Striving to lead a full Jewish life in our particular circumstances, we consider ourselves the equals of those who are animated by similar strivings within the predominantly Jewish environment of the State of Israel."[6] He also showed that for the rabbis, the concept of אונס was not limited to the physical absence of the Jews from the Promised Land. It also included the eclipse of God's Presence from the world. That being the case, no corner of the globe is exempt from אונס at the present time.

Writing in the CCAR Journal in 1965, Petuchowski stated that a Jew is more than an individual--he is also a member of the Household of Israel. Progressive revelation manifests itself through the community. Thus, the עם ישראל is "the people of revelation through whom the רוח הקודש remains active."[7]

Petuchowski gave the tenth annual Lessing J. Rosenwald Lecture to the Philadelphia chapter of the American Council for Judaism. In it, he pointed out that while conceiving of the Jewish people as a national entity was a post-Emancipation phenomenon, so was the viewpoint that we are only a religious community. Judaism is much older than either modern European nationalism or the Protestant concept of "religion."[8] He restated his view that the Jewish people is "a community of believers which has been moulded by a common history, refined by a common suffering, and sustained by a common faith and a common hope." He held that this people has nothing to do with modern political categories. It is an entity which is supra-historical and supra-political, though a portion of the people has decided, in our day, to resume a corporate form of existence in the land of the Patriarchs.[9]

Frederic A. Doppelt, in his 1961 article, "A Reappraisal of the Chosen People Concept," maintained that in classical Reform Jewish theology, the affirmation that God

chose Israel really meant that the Jews chose God. In the course of its development, the Jewish people singled out the religious and moral realm as its domain of self-expression.[10] He felt that there was nothing unique about Judaism's conviction of being chosen or in its concept of mission. In every religion there is something that is chosen to work toward the fulfillment of its mission in the world: In Buddhism, it is a religious brotherhood of monks; in Hinduism, it is the Brahmin caste; in Christianity, it is the Church. What is unique in Judaism is that it is a people--not an ecclesia, a class, a caste, or an institution--which is chosen to serve the will of its God.[11]

Doppelt pointed out an important distinction between Judaism and other religions. Other religions were the result of one personality. The Jewish people was not converted to Judaism; Judaism was created and developed by the Jews. The faith of Judaism is the spiritual personality of the Jewish people.[12]

The questions of chosenness and Israel's Mission were also discussed by Leon Fram in his 1962 paper, "What is Judaism's Mission in the Contemporary World?" He stated that the Jewish people was the only people of all the nations of antiquity that had a conscious sense of mission and that Israel survived because of this sense of living for a purpose. The Jewish idea of One God and the Jewish ideal of

ethical monotheism endowed the Jewish people with a mission to humanity.[13] The Mission of Israel is, thus, not a Reform idea. It is integral to Judaism and the heritage of all three branches today. The mistaken notion that the Mission of Israel was a Reform idea was due to the controversy between Reform and Zionism which appeared to be a conflict between a universal mission and a Jewish state. That controversy is over. Fram felt that the Columbus Platform was positive toward both the Mission-idea and Zionism.[14]

When speaking of the Chosen People, the prophets and rabbis meant that God gave the Jewish people the privilege of upholding the faith and moral principles of ethical monotheism. Fram held that "to say that God chose the Jewish people is to speak the language of supernaturalism." If we utilize the language of history, we would say that the Bible and Talmud record the fact that the Jewish people regarded itself as having been the Chosen People. Fram argued that we have outgrown the language which describes the Jewish people as Chosen. No matter one may argue that chosen never meant racially superior or chosen for privilege, he claimed that the word "chosen" cannot escape the connotation of favoritism. He felt that we could say that the Jewish people is unique or called to perform a special function.[15]

Some scholars say that the uniqueness of the Jewish people is that we are a Covenant People. Homiletically, Fram

maintained, the Covenant-idea is eloquent. However, it can only be one-sided. We can no longer view it as a contract. When the Jews suffer, we do not believe that God is punishing us for our sins. Furthermore, if we accept the Covenant literally, then we are bound to the 613 commandments. He did accept the idea of partnership with God in the ongoing work of creation. He wrote that "Judaism does involve a unique historical relationship between the Jewish people and God, but for the contemporary Jew it is not defined either by the Chosen People idea or by the Covenant idea."[16]

Fram believed that the Jewish people will survive only if it has a purpose. The instruments for Jewish survival will be the working out of a beneficent democracy in the State of Israel, the emphasis on Social Action in the Diaspora, and effective Jewish education.[17]

Fram's paper elicited quite a bit of discussion on the convention floor. Abraham Shusterman stated that God has an eternal plan in which the Jewish people has an important part to play. It is the interpreter of Divine truth and the spokesman for values which have redemptive power.[18] God chose Israel to proclaim His message of redemption.[19]

Frank Rosenthal noted that the Jews of Israel give the Jews of the world a new image, one of secular values --courage, strength, statesmanship, ingenuity, and pioneering. This presents a new danger: The religiously non-

committed Jew has now become an authentic Jew. He argued that we must return to the real center of our uniqueness and authenticity, the center of which is "Yne".[20]

Arthur Gilbert stated that God chose the Jews to play a unique and significant role in history. Our survival has not been a matter of our merit alone, but must be attributed to God's grace. He did not feel that the suffering which the Jews had experienced forced him to reject the Covenant-idea, for when the Destroyer is set loose, both the righteous and the evil suffer. The Jews' suffering has not been due to our own sins, but to the sins of man. He further held that God is not our partner; we are His partners. We have lost, and must regain, the sense of holiness.[21]

In 1965, the Conference published Retrospect and Prospect, a collection of essays in honor of the CCAR's seventy-fifth anniversary. Arthur J. Lelyveld, in his contribution to the volume entitled "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," offered a number of interesting historical footnotes. He pointed out that at its first session in 1890, an abortive attempt was made to commit the Conference to a declaration that the Jews constitute a "religious community only." The proposal was defeated by a vote of thirteen to twelve.[22] He commented that the CCAR never was a monolith. It never was totally anti-Zionist. Rather, "it was a deliberative body seeking to express the

judgments of the majority without disrespect for the minority."[23]

With regard to the CCAR resolution on the Balfour Declaration, Lelyveld held that the Conference had not adequately studied the declaration and had reacted to it emotionally. They attacked its phrase "Palestine is to be a national homeland for the Jewish people." However, the declaration really said something different, namely that the British government "view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." It also specifically disavowed any action which would interfere with existing Jewish rights anywhere in the world.[24]

Lelyveld noted that both Zionists and non-Zionists within the Conference combined an affirmation of the peoplehood of Israel with an insistence on the religious nature of its identity. However, he pointed out, the Conference's search for a definition never went beyond the affirmation of uniqueness which we have seen in the 1962 statement. In proclaiming that the Jews are neither a race, nation, or church, the Conference was showing a similarity between the People and its God: "Just as Maimonides could define God only in negative terms, so the Conference has been able to define the Jews only by saying what they are not."[25] Lelyveld also felt that the stress on Covenant which was evident in the 1962 statement showed that the Conference was renewing

its emphasis on Israel's Mission. Thus, it was Israel as the Covenant-people, rather than Israel as the state alone, which the Conference saw as defining the position of the Jew in the modern world.[26]

In 1965, David Polish published The Higher Freedom: A Turning Point in Jewish History. In this thoughtful work, he argued that the Jewish people is in danger of disintegration due to the fact that both its identity and purpose are being dissolved. The danger today is not persecution, but the reality that "as the economic, social, and political fortunes of Jews continue to flourish, the desire to persevere in a Jewish existence will diminish."[27]

In discussing the relationship of Israel with the Diaspora, Polish noted that the Western Jew is no longer in גלות. He lives in the Diaspora by an act of will. Our goal should not be a Diaspora which is spiritually dependent upon Israel nor an Israel which is materially dependent upon the Diaspora. Our goal must be "the organic oneness of the people Israel, in territory and beyond." Polish continued:

> To talk of two distinct peoples is to sentence the diaspora to certain disintegration and the state to certain isolation of body and spirit. We are Siamese twins, bound to a common fate, sustained by a common heartbeat.[28]

Polish felt that when the term "holiness" was applied to Israel, it referred to the entire people in the totality of its historical experience, rather than being

limited to any specialized event or institution. The people Israel came to be distinguished for its unitary approach to all existence. Ethics and ceremonies interpenetrated as aspects of life. Polish lamented the fact that more and more we are confining the holy to "holy places."[29]

Concerning Jewish nationalism, Polish argued that prior to Zionism the idea of a Jewish people was more of a dream and hope than a fact. There was a people, but it was in the process of disintegration. Zionism set into motion corollary movements which contributed to the rehabilitation of the Jewish people. These movements fostered the rebirth of Hebrew, the development of modern Hebrew literature, the modernization and expansion of Jewish education, youth movements, community organizations, and fund-raising instruments.[30] Polish held that the Jews could be considered a people because they were a group which shared common goals. The particular goal was the rebuilding of the ancient homeland. Though many Jews refused to subscribe to this goal, the greater number of Jews was committed to restoring the land. The concept of the people was, of course, not new. He noted that "even in their decline, Jews never questioned their membership in a 'Jewish people.'"[31]

Polish claimed that in modern times mutations have taken place in the sharply defined structure of the Jewish triangle of God, Israel, and Torah.[32] The seculariza-

tion of the people and the new ideal of peoplehood led to the dominance of people over God and Torah in the triangle. In this process, the people becomes a value from which human values are expected to emerge. However, the people is no longer a sacred community within which the Divine Law and Presence are constantly interacting. A beneficial aspect of the ideal of peoplehood is that it has endowed Jews everywhere with a mutual relationship. This is the only common denominator today.[33]

Polish fervently believed that it is not the State, but the People of Israel which must be the center of Jewish existence. The Jewish people has the opportunity to exist within a national nucleus and to be in the world as a universal entity. We can no longer be content with parochial existence. Peoplehood must be redefined as an integral part of the classic triangle of God, Israel, and Torah because "when peoplehood becomes an end in itself, it becomes corrupted."[34] He stated that the purpose of the Jewish people should not be limited to self-emancipation and self-rescue. Its task must also be to work for the redemption of all mankind.[35]

The June, 1967 CCAR Journal contained an article by Daniel Jeremy Silver entitled "A Lover's Quarrel with the Mission of Israel." In this article, Silver argued that the Mission concept "is embarrassing as an explanation of Jewish survival and inadequate and inaccurate as a definition of

Jewish doctrine." He further held that the concept was less a clarification of doctrine than "an improvisation built on stray themes and fugitive citations."[36] He admitted that the Tradition does believe that the Jewish people have a central role in God's plan, but it emphasizes that the plan is God's.[37] Silver stressed that abandoning the mission-idea does not force us to deny Israel's unique relationship with God. It does not deny Israel's providential role in God's plan. Neither does it imply that Israel should cut back its active involvement in social reform.[38]

Being a statistically-minded generation, we realize that thirteen million people in a world of over two billion is a very small percentage. Being self-analytic, we also realize that we "do not qualify as the Lamad Vavniks of mankind." Israel's primary responsibility is what it has always been--to cultivate dignity and justice in Israel.[39] If Israel is to be God's witness in the world, we must maintain a uniqueness in our religious culture. Silver concluded that "a lengthy history as long and successful as that of the Jew is in its own way the proof of the virtue of its particularity and its claim on our partnership in this history."[40]

CHAPTER 16

FROM THE SIX DAY WAR TO THE PRESENT

No single event in recent history has had as much effect on the unity of the Jewish people as the Six Day War of June, 1967. The generation which had witnessed the annihilation of one-third of our people and had shortly thereafter rejoiced at the realization of the dream of rebirth on the ancient Land, now faced the possibility of another Holocaust. The soul of nearly every Jew was touched in June, 1967. The dread, followed so quickly by exaltation at the swift victory, strengthened old bonds of Jewish loyalty and even forged some new ones. Within the ranks of Reform, this effect of the war was echoed. In this chapter, we shall look at how the Jewish people has been viewed by Reform leaders since the Six Day War.

In the January, 1968 CCAR Journal, Eugene J. Lipman published an article entitled "The Mission of Israel and Social Action." In it, he maintained that Israel's mission is to fulfill its covenantal purpose.[1] He then went on to give four possible meanings for the term "Israel." The first was the traditional view of Israel as a physical entity, the community of all Jews with a collective purpose. It is the basis of those institutions which aid and rescue Jews everywhere. This physical entity must reach out to all men

both to teach Torah and to perform גמילות חסדים . The second meaning of "Israel" was any group of Jews committed to a course of action in fulfillment of covenant obligations. The third meaning was a purely spiritual concept with no physical implications. The function of Israel, according to this view, would be to animate individual Jews to live in congruence with the heritage of Israel. This view gives denominational status to Judaism and would be the one subscribed to by the American Council for Judaism. The fourth meaning would be a mystical concept uniting all adherents to it. This is the Christian use of the word, Israel. Lipman stated that how one views Israel will determine his concept of Israel's mission.[2]

Lipman also argued that a person's God-concept will affect his view of Israel's mission. For example, he held that for finitists, the idea of a people with a collective purpose is incongruent. His own theistic theology led him to believe that the Jewish people is a physical collectivity with a collective purpose. That purpose is to do collective גמילות חסדים , both those relating to God and those relating to other men.[3]

In an April, 1968 article entitled "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom," Samuel E. Karff argued that Reform's earlier posture on Israel's nature was inauthentic. Besides the fact that the mission was seen as having no con-

nection with the land of Israel, Karff claimed inauthenticity on three more grounds. Firstly, the credibility of the Jewish witness "requires more than the celebration of a harried people's resilient endurance of recurring catastrophe." Secondly, the restoration of Jewish sovereignty offers a potential mode of witness to the covenant which is not available to Diaspora Jewry. Thirdly, Reform's earlier concept of Israel has been discredited by history. A significant number of Jews live in Israel, and there can be no Judaism without Jews.[4]

Karff noted that the Reform prayerbook made explicit what has been a basic Jewish motif--that God's covenant with Israel was the paradigm for His relationship with all mankind. Reform's universalistic emphasis did not alter its commitment to Jewish self-preservation. Israel's mission could only be fulfilled with the continued existence of the Jews. "The reformers did not cease to hope that their children would build a house rooted in the covenant, nor did they forsake the goal of transmitting the Torah from generation to generation."[5]

Karff contributed an essay entitled "The Election, the Covenant, and the Mission of Israel" to the 1968 volume, Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought. In it, he explained that the rabbis offered a two-fold answer to the question "Why should I be a Jew?" The answer was that "covenant

existence is both the means to my personal fulfillment as a man who was born a Jew and the way I may share my people's unique vocation in the world."[6] In Karff's view, the answer is still true.[7] He noted that very often liberal Judaism was so preoccupied with what the Jew could offer the world that it ignored what living within the covenant could offer the Jew.[8]

Karff denied that God loves the Jew more than He loves other men. While affirming the election of Israel, he rejected the concept of special love. Both Jews and Christians have a role in the work of redemption.[9] Though one dimension of the Covenant affirms man's power, another confirms his finitude. Man must wait for the Messiah even as he prepares the way for his coming. In other words, even though man is God's partner, he is not His cosmic successor.[10]

Our time has witnessed enourmous evil. Man's incapacity to hear has been compounded by God's failure to speak. Karff saw this "hiddenness of God" as responsible for those Jews who affirm Jewish fate without faith. The goal of an authentic Covenant existence is a reunion of fate and faith. To Karff, "the authentic Jew is Yisroel, the one who contends with God but does not deny Him, who argues while he prays, who doubts as he serves, and whose very demands of his Creator betray a primordial trust yearning for confirmation."[11]

Karff's article "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom" came out strongly against the concept of Radical Freedom which is espoused by Alvin J. Reines. Noting that Jewish Covenant Theology is talk about God in which Torah and Israel are intrinsically included, he found Reines' theology deficient because "his talk about God is not integrally related to talk about Torah and Israel."[12] Karff also held that Reines betrayed a lack of concern for the unity of Israel when he suggested that, since the meaning of the Sabbath has no essential relationship to the day on which it is observed, Reform should boldy overcome the obstacle of seventh days which do not fit real-life calendars.[13]

Eugene B. Borowitz faulted Reines on similar grounds. He argued that Reines empties Jewish symbols, including the word "Jew," of particularistic significance. In Reines' view, the word "Jew" is an ontal symbol. Borowitz noted that if "Jew" is an ontal symbol, then it is a term for having being, and the word "Jew" simply equals the word "man."[14] Borowitz further opposed Reines' treatment of Jewish survival which, he held, Reines viewed as another instance of survival in history in general without particular reference to the nature of Israel or any special place it may have in history.[15]

One year after the Six Day War, Daniel Jeremy Silver wrote that Diaspora Jewish life is more vigorous today than it was thirty years ago. He saw the reason for this

phenomenon in Israel. Israel gave the world a new Jewish stereotype and gave many Jews a new self-image. Interest in Israel gave the Diaspora a chance to develop adequate structures. He felt that "some day, perhaps, the Diaspora will have its own viable élan as it once did in Babylonia, Spain, and Eastern Europe, but that time is not yet here and until then the strengthening of Israel must be the priority of Jewish life--for Israel's sake and ours."[16] He suggested that we develop programs encouraging Aliyah in our schools. He also stated that we should rethink the goals of our Hebrew curriculum and should stress the sense of peoplehood. We should emphasize nation rather than denomination.[17]

In October, 1968, Silver wrote that if there is to be a compelling thrust toward Jewish survival, there must be a distinctive Jewish way of life. He felt that Jewish experience will attract Jews "if the Jewish people do their thing: light lights, build a State, speak Hebrew, seek learning, retain their calendar, remain sensitive and stiff-necked, remain rooted in history and, therefore, marginal to any contemporary ideology and seek holiness and God in the ordinary and the every day."[18] He further maintained that "being Jewish is a dynamic concept dominated by a category of becoming, Aliyah; disciplined by a dynamic category of wisdom, Torah; and devoted to a dynamic category of belief in God and the unity of meaning."[19] On the question

of the survival of the Jewish people, he confessed to his belief that God wills our survival.[20]

Two articles, one by Leon Kronish and one by Leon Fram, which appeared in the June, 1968 CCAR Journal were clearly reactions to the Six Day War. Kronish began his article, "Yisrael Goralenu," by quoting Daniel Jeremy Silver's statement on Israel which had been adopted by the CCAR on June 21, 1967:

> We declare our solidarity with the State and the people of Israel. Their triumphs are our triumphs. Their ordeal is our ordeal. Their fate is our fate.

Kronish correctly noted that "never before in the history of our movement has the oneness, the unity, the interlocking destiny of the Jewish people been so sharply and simply stated."[21]

After analyzing a number of the Conference's resolutions concerning Israel, Kronish declared that we have been more concerned with statements and resolutions than with reality. The reality, he feared, was that the young Jews of Israel are rooted in the land, language, and literature of Israel reborn whereas our young Jews "know little Hebrew, near zero of the literature and not much more of Torah."[22]

It is true that during the Six Day War the Jewish people was united as never before. The vital question raised by Kronish is whether we can convert that crisis reaction into a permanent partnership, a permanent peoplehood. His

answer was that we will develop the feeling of Jewish peoplehood only if we establish living links between ourselves and Israel.[23] He then suggested some possible links. These included every Jewish family having at least one member living in Israel, each family making a pilgrimage to Israel (or at least each youngster making such a pilgrimage), rabbinical seminars and sabbaticals in Israel, and an Israel committee in every congregation.[24] After summarizing what Israel has done for American Jewry as well as what American Jewry has done for Israel, Kronish concluded that if we forge living links with Israel, the sense of interlocking destiny will not fade away. He felt that we might even be moved to add a second Shema to our services: "Shema Yisrael, Yisrael Goralenu Yisroel echod! Hear O Israel, Israel is our destiny, Israel is one!"[25]

Fram's article, "Reform Judaism, Zionism and the State of Israel," argued that the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel had an epochal impact on the ideology of Reform Judaism. Reform finally unburdened itself of the anti-Zionist ideology which had isolated it from the Jewish people.[26] Fram stated that, with few exceptions, there are no Jewish anti-Zionists today, and that the term "non-Zionist" had also lost all meaning. The exceptions which he listed included the Neturai Karta, the Satmar Chasidim, and the American Council for Judaism. He parti-

cularly castigated the latter group because its membership consists of Reform Jews who should be "capable of adjusting to new circumstances." He hoped that the events of June, 1967 would "persuade the rank and file of the Council, if not its warped leaders, that there is a Jewish people, that it is threatened, and that no Jew can afford to do other than unite with the Jewish people in our common defense."[27]

Fram called the present a new epoch when Reform Judaism and Zionism are not incompatible. In this epoch, Reform aspires to a role in the religious development of Israel. Just as Reform arose as an alternative to Orthodoxy in Europe, it can function similarly in Israel. He complained about the non-separation of Church and State in Israel, but stated that this will have to be overcome by the Israelis. All that we can do at present is to support the Reform congregations in Israel.[28]

The Six Day War probably had no greater effect on any Reform thinker than on Jakob J. Petuchowski. In his article, "More Than A Plank," published in October, 1968, Petuchowski admitted that his previous evaluation of Zion had been unduly colored by nineteenth century Reform ideology. Though he still did not like Jewish secularism, he could not deny the role that secularists play in the battle for Israel's survival. He did not become a sholel hagolah; he continued to hold that a "full Jewish life" can be lived in

the Diaspora. However, he now subscribed to the view that such a "full Jewish life" "cannot be divorced from concern for the State of Israel, and from the affirmation of Jewish peoplehood with all that this implies."[29]

The main point in Petuchowski's article was that the rejection of Zionism and the de-emphasis of Jewish peoplehood--or its "spiritualization"--was Reform's central affirmation from which nearly everything else in Reform was derived: In liturgy, the first and most universally accepted change was the cutting of prayers for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the return to Zion. Concerning Hebrew, Geiger had argued that insisting upon the "objective necessity" of Hebrew in Jewish worship would imply that Judaism was tied to a "national" thing like language. Since Diaspora was considered normal by the early reformers, they felt that we needed a religion attuned to the religious expression of the West. That meant eliminating "orientalisms" such as hazanuth, the central bimah, the cantillation of the Torah, the hat and the tallith. The rejection of the halakhah, according to Petuchowski, was tied up with the rejection of the return to Zion and the transformation of the Jewish people into a "universal brotherhood of believers."[30]

Petuchowski maintained that while the Columbus Platform was more sympathetic to Jewish observance and more positive toward Jewish peoplehood, it did not negate the

underlying theological assumptions of the Pittsburgh Platform.[31] He insisted that we cannot reject the "anti-Zionist" plank of the Pittsburgh Platform and still retain everything else of early Reform. We must, therefore, re-evaluate everything from the perspective of Kelal Yisrael. This would include a reconsideration of the realm of halakhah which might lead to a new halakhic category of duties which Jews have toward their fellow-Jews. This category would include laws of personal status.[32]

Steven S. Schwarzchild published "On the Theology of Jewish Survival" in the October, 1968 CCAR Journal. The main point of this lengthy article was that the survival of the Jewish people is guaranteed by God and that we, therefore, do not need to concern ourselves with it. In fact, preoccupation with the question of survival is a form of sickness. Attributing our survival to human instrumentalities--especially our own--leads to acts of שׂנאת חנם which victimize other human beings. Our task as Jews is to be mentshen and, in this way, to hasten the coming of the Messiah.[33]

Bernard Bamberger's contribution to the 1968 volume, Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought, was called "The Concept of Israel." In it, he remarked that the arguments about whether Jews are a race, nation, or church were bound to be futile because the usual categories do not fit the Jewish people. We are a people with a unique experience. No theory

of economic or historic determinism accounts for Jewish history.[34] Bamberger argued that not only was the Jewish historical experience unique, but that the Jews have understood this experience as stemming from a divine appointment. He felt that Zangwill's epigram about the "choosing people" was ingenious but was not a sufficient explanation of the Chosen People concept. Though Israel assented, the proposal came from God.[35] Though Bamberger himself recognized that he was unable to give a full rational explanation of Israel's chosenness, he said that the fact of chosenness seemed to be beyond dispute.[36]

In discussing the obligation of the Jewish people and of the individual Jew, Bamberger said that "the recipient of a heritage has the duty to employ it responsibly and to conserve, enhance, and transmit it." Our experience marks out our mission, and at the heart of the Jewish experience is the commitment to freedom, justice, and peace.[37]

Joseph Narot's essay, "The Nature and Destiny of Israel" presented a different interpretation of Israel's uniqueness and chosenness. He held that Israel's reaction to life was a great longing to sanctify it. This desire led the people to a quest for God. Israel's destiny has been to pioneer in the quest for meaning in terms of moral values. Others also share in the search for moral meaning and improvement in human life, and Narot claimed that "both we and they

reject any claim to supernatural uniqueness." Election thus means chosenness, not of the Jews, but of Judaism, and refers to the historical influence Judaism has had on the Jews.[38]

Narot offered a non-supernatural interpretation of Judaism. He argued that many Jews today would accept the election, covenant, and mission of Israel if these terms were "given a contemporary significance shorn of the supernatural and grounded in historical experience." He noted that a passion for justice, freedom and peace has led the Jewish people to assume a clear identity of its own, and on this point his thinking was in agreement with Bamberger's. His approach to Judaism was further evident in his interpretation of אמת which he felt had been transformed from an external divine command into an inner-directed act of reverence.[39]

At the 1969 CCAR convention, Nelson Glueck spoke on "The Future of Reform Judaism." At that time, he said that "whatever Reform Judaism of the future will be, it must continue and strengthen and deepen the teachings and insights of historical Judaism, of the miraculous story of our people, and of concern with K'lal Yisrael."[40] In pursuit of this goal, Glueck proposed that all Reform rabbinic students begin their training with a year's study in Israel, so that while they remain proud citizens of America, they also become spiritual citizens of Israel.[41]

CHAPTER 17

AFTERTHOUGHTS

The Reform movement has changed dramatically over the past hundred years. The changes have been both ideological and demographic. Not only have the ideas expressed from the Reform pulpit changed, the background of people sitting in the Reform pew has varied over time.

These changes have been reflected in our study. It is true that at no time has there been unanimity in how the Reform rabbis viewed the Jewish people, but at every juncture there has been a commonly held view. The common view a hundred years ago was very different from the one held today. In the days of Isaac M. Wise, virtually the only tie which was seen as binding Jews throughout the world was religion. Today, most Reform leaders would say that while religion is a very important aspect, it by no means exhausts the possible expressions of one's Jewishness nor is it the only tie binding Jews. It would have been inconceivable for Isaac M. Wise to have suggested, as did his successor Nelson Glueck, that all Reform rabbinic students should spend a year in Israel--impossible not only because the Jewish state did not exist in his day, but also because concern for ישראל was not an overriding consideration of early Reform ideology.

What has caused these changes? The factors we would cite are primarily political and sociological. Reform developed in the nineteenth century which was an era of liberalism and optimism. Progress seemed to have been woven into the very fabric of the universe. The twentieth century has been a very different era. No longer did it seem as if the Messianic Age was around the corner. Man's inhumanity to man has been the hallmark of this century. This century has witnessed the nadir and the zenith of modern Jewish history: the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel. The events have awakened in most Jews the realization that they are not simply people whose religion is Judaism; they are Jews. Being Jewish involves more than belonging to a particular religious denomination.

The sociological cause of the changes within Reform is the fact that the composition of the movement's adherents has changed. Early Reform was peopled almost exclusively by German Jews. In more recent times, more and more Jews with Eastern European forebears became part of Reform. These newcomers brought with them a different sense of Jewish peoplehood.

A study such as this one brings to mind a number of questions. What would Reform have been like if its early leaders had not brought their German "hang-ups" with them to America? Perhaps Conservative Judaism would not have developed

because Reform would have appealed to the Eastern European immigrants. Perhaps Reform would have continued to be American Judaism rather than becoming merely a branch.

This paper has dealt with how Reform leaders viewed the nature of the Jewish people. We might wonder how much of an impact this has had on the average Reform Jew. How has what the Reform rabbi taught affected the way the Reform congregant viewed himself and his people? Have Reform rabbis formed or reflected the thinking of American Jewry?

The questions flowing from our study are intriguing. The answers to them lie beyond the purview of this paper. Perhaps one of my younger colleagues will deal with them in another thesis, or, God-willing, I, myself, might attempt that task in the future.

I would close with a word of thanks to my advisor, Jakob J. Petuchowski, for his assistance and encouragement. My appreciation also goes to my beloved wife, Robin, for her diligent proofreading of the text.

NOTES

NOTES

Chapter 1

1. David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1967), p. 358.

2. Joachim Prinz, "Who is a Jew?," CCAR Yearbook, LXIX (1959), 251.

3. Samuel E. Karff, "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom," CCAR Journal, XV (April, 1968), 19.

4. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Judaism Today," Religion in the Middle East: Three Religions in Concord and Conflict, ed. A. J. Arberry (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969), p. 13.

5. W. Gunther Plaut, The Rise of Reform Judaism: A Sourcebook of Its European Origins (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, Ltd., 1963), p. 134.

6. Ibid., p. 52.

7. Ibid., p. 136.

8. Theodore N. Lewis, "The Idea of Israel," CCAR Yearbook, LXVII (1957), 189.

9. Ibid., pp. 189-90.

10. CCAR Yearbook, I (1890), 87.

11. Ibid., p. 88.

12. Petuchowski, op. cit., p. 19.

13. Plaut, op. cit., p. 137.

14. Ibid., pp. 61-62.

15. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

16. Ibid., p. 60.

17. Ibid., p. 141.

18. Petuchowski, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

19. Plaut, op. cit., p. 138.

20. Ibid., pp. 157-58.

21. Ibid.

22. CCAR Yearbook, I (1890), 109.

23. Ibid., pp. 116-17.

Chapter 2

1. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 356.

2. Bernard J. Bamberger, "Theological Developments," Retrospect and Prospect, ed. Bertram Wallace Korn (New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965), p. 29.

3. Philipson, op. cit., pp. 333-34.

4. James G. Heller, Isaac M. Wise: His Life, Work, and Thought (New York: The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1965), p. 598.

5. David Einhorn, Gebetbuch Für Israelitilche Reformgemeinden (olat tamid) (New York: Thalmessinger & Cahn, 1858, p. 484.

6. Barnett A. Elzas (ed.), The Sabbath Service and Miscellaneous Prayers (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1916), p. 26. This is a reprint of the 1830 prayerbook of the Reformed Society of Israelites.

7. See B. Szold, Songs and Prayers and Meditations for Divine Services of Israelites, trans. M. Jastrow (Philadelphia: By the translator, 1873), p. 92, and Max Landsberg, Ritual for Jewish Worship, Pt. 1 (Rochester, New York: Charles Mann, 1885), p. 31.

8. Edward B. M. Browne, Prayers of Israel (2d ed.; New York: Privately published, 1885), p. 169. The title page of this work informs us that it has been arranged for American Reform Services.

9. Raphael D'C. Lewin, The American-Jewish Ritual (New York: L. H. Frank and Company, Publishers, 1870), p. XI.

10. David Einhorn, Book of Prayers for Israelitish Congregations (ʿolat tamid) (New York: Privately printed, 1872), Preface (not numbered.)

11. Lewin, op. cit., p. 234.

12. Elzas, op. cit., p. 53.

13. Philipson, op. cit., p. 340

14. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 333.

15. Theodore Parker, A Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1907), p. 203. This book was originally published in 1841.

16. Browne, op. cit. p. 153.

17. M. Jastrow and H. Hochheimer (ed.), Israelitish Prayer Book (ʿabodat yiśrael) (2d ed. rev.; Philadelphia: By the editors, 1873), p. 109. This work was originally arranged by Benjamin Szold.

18. Ibid., p. 553.

19. Elzas, op. cit., p. 48.

20. L. Merzbacher, The Order of Prayer for Divine Service, Vol. II: Prayers for the Day of Atonement (New York: Privately published, 1855), p. 121. See also pp. 29, 43, 95, 97, 115, 163, 165, and 203 for further references to Zion.

21. L. Merzbacher, The Order of Prayer for Divine Service (3d ed. rev.; New York: M. Thalmessinger and Company, 1864), p. XI. The title page advises us that this edition has been revised and corrected by Dr. S. Adler.

22. Ibid., p. 71. Compare Joseph H. Hertz, The Authorised Daily Prayer Book (rev.; New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1961), p. 143.

23. Isaac M. Wise (tr.), The Daily Prayers, Pt. I (Minhag America) (Cincinnati: Bloch and Company, 1857). This work was revised and compiled by the Cleveland Conference. Prayers for Zion can be found on pp. 77, 101-102, 104, 105, 107, and 109.

24. Heller, op. cit., pp. 602-603.

25. Ibid., p. 600.

26. Arthur J. Lelyveld, "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," Retrospect and Prospect, p. 174 (note 21).

27. Wise, op. cit., p. 93.

28. Heller, op. cit., p. 599.

29. Ibid., p. 601.

30. Emma Felsenthal, Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel (New York: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 245.

31. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 191.

32. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 9.

33. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 246. For other remarks, made during this period, concerning the racial tie, see pp. 121 and 243.

34. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 378, and Jastrow, op. cit., p. 585.

35. Lewin, op. cit., p. 231.

36. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 38.

37. David Einhorn, Inaugural Sermon, trans. C. A. Rubenstein. Delivered before the Har Sinai Verein in Baltimore, Maryland, September 29, 1855 (Baltimore: Privately printed, 1909), p. 9.

38. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 253.

39. Philipson, op. cit., p. 354.

40. Lewin, op. cit., pp. VII-IX.

41. Heller, op. cit., p. 520.

42. Wise, op. cit., p. 96. See also p. 24.

43. This dislike of the term "Jew" was part of the European "baggage" brought over to America. The phenomenon can be seen as early as the French Sanhedrin which avoided using the term in its statement. It was not limited to Reform Jews, either. The British Orthodox congregational union is called the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire.

Chapter 3

1. Merzbacher, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, p. 59.

2. Ibid., p. 12. Merzbacher shows the same ambivalence in his Sabbath and Festival services. In his 1864 The Order of Prayer for Divine Service (3d ed. rev.), he retains the idea of chosenness in the blessing before the Torah reading, but skips the same phrase again in the "אתה חוננתנו". See p. 48 of the latter work.

3. Lewin, op. cit., p. 15.

4. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 31.

5. See Browne, op. cit., p. 9, and Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, p. 7. Landsberg uses the word "select" in place of "choose."

6. See Jastrow, op.cit., p. 95, Einhorn, Book of Prayers for Israelitish Congregations, p. 69, and Lewin, op. cit., p. 35.

7. Elzas, op. cit., p. 7.

8. Ibid., p. 15.

9. Merzbacher, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, p. 7.

10. Isaac M. Wise, The Divine Service of American Israelites for the New Year (Minhag America) (Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Company, 1892?-1900?), p. 39.

11. Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, p. 4.

12. e.g., in Isaac M. Wise, The Divine Service of American Israelites for the Day of Atonement (Minhag America) (Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Company, 1892?-1900?), p. 247, we are told that it is God's love for His people, Israel, which was the reason He gave us the Day of Atonement. On pp. 135-37, while recounting the story of the Red Sea, Wise calls Israel God's "favorites" and "beloved ones."

13. Merzbacher, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, p. 87.

14. Wise, The Divine Service . . . for the New Year, p. 146.

15. Wise, The Daily prayers, p. 48.

16. Heller, op. cit., p. 518.

17. Elzas, op. cit., p. 50.

18. Ibid., p. 52. There is very little reference to the people of Israel in this prayerbook, especially in the Sabbath eve service. It does include the "קדוש" in English, but follows it with a blessing thanking God for having "instituted the Sabbath for thy rational creatures."

19. e.g., Wise, The Divine Service . . . for the Day of Atonement, pp. 151 and 231.

20. e.g., Wise, The Daily Prayers, pp. 9 and 36.

21. Merzbacher, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, p. 129.

22. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 305

23. Wise, The Divine Service . . . for the New Year, p. 82.

24. Ibid., pp. 129-33.

25. Wise, The Daily Prayers, pp. 84-85 and 91-92.

26. Lewin, op. cit., p. 162.

27. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 253.

28. Elzas, op. cit., p. 24.

29. Merzbacher, The Order of Prayer for Divine Service, p. 71.

30. Wise, The Divine Service . . . for the New Year, p. 16.

31. Ibid., p. 17.

32. Lewin, op. cit., p. 221.

33. Ibid., p. 220.

34. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 348, and Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, p. 53. The wording of this prayer in these two works is almost identical.

35. Lewin, loc. cit.

36. Browne, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

37. Merzbacher, The Order of Prayer . . . , p. 35.

38. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 154.

39. Elzas, op. cit., p. 28. Prayers on pp. 33 and 41 also make particular mention of Israel.

40. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , pp. 264-68.

41. Ibid., pp. 19, 25, 43, 51, and 256.

42. Merzbacher, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, p. 235.

43. Wise, The Divine Service . . . for the Day of Atonement, p. 101. He adds the words "להיות לך ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש" to the Hebrew blessing on p. 100.

44. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 361. See also pp. 42, 45, 65, and 414-15 for references to Israel as God's priests.

45. Philipson, op. cit., pp. 354-56.

46. Heller, op. cit., p. 561

47. Philipson, op. cit., p. 337. Congregation Sinai grew out of the Reformverein, and Felsenthal became its first rabbi.

48. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 198

49. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 332.

50. Ibid., p. 368. A similar question was posed to prospective converts at the Conversion ceremony. Another reference to Israel as God's Messiah can be found in the "[illegible]" on p. 8.

51. Lewin, op. cit., p. 38.

Chapter 4

1. Philipson, op. cit., p. 354.

2. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 19. See also p. 193.

3. Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, p. 19.

4. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , pp. 84-85.

5. Ibid., pp. 116-17.

6. Raphael D'C. Lewin, The American-Jewish Ritual, p. 65.

7. Ibid., p. 233. See also p. 11.

8. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 46. Einhorn is almost as poetic in similar references on pp. 28 and 254-55.

9. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 6. See also pp. 217, 411-12, and 588-89.

10. Ibid., p. 553.

11. Szold, op. cit., p. 104.

12. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 8.

13. Parker, op. cit., p. 24.

14. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

15. Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, p. 7.

16. Ibid.

17. Wise, The Daily Prayers, p. 34

18. Heller, op. cit., p. 537.

19. Ibid., p. 562.

20. W. Gunther Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism: American and European Sources until 1948 (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, Ltd., 1965), p. 176.

21. Philipson, op. cit., pp. 352-53.

22. Ibid., p. 353.

23. Heller, op. cit., p. 598.

24. Philipson, op. cit., p. 357.

25. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 26.

26. Ibid., p. 151.

27. Ibid., p. 383. A similar idea is expressed in the service for the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem, pp. 330-31.

28. Heller, op. cit., p. 521.

29. Lewin, op. cit., p. V.

30. Einhorn, Book of Prayers . . . , p. 29. See also p. 260.

31. Einhorn, Inaugural Sermon, p. 16.

32. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 589.

33. Ibid., p. 587.

34. Landsberg, op. cit., Pt. I, pp. 36-37. See also Pt. I, p. 45; Pt. II, pp. 144-45.

35. Ibid., Pt. II, pp. 144-45.

36. Kaufmann Kohler, "Samuel Hirsch--A Historical Study," A Living Faith (selected sermons and addresses from Kohler's literary remains), ed. Samuel S. Cohon (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1948), p. 234.

37. Philipson, op. cit., pp. 352-53.

38. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 247.

39. Lewin, loc. cit. See also pp. 231-32.

40. Philipson, op. cit., p. 356.

41. Ibid.

42. Nathan Glazer, American Judaism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 48-49.

Chapter 5

1. Philipson, op. cit., p. 361.

2. Ibid.

3. Adolph Moses, "What We Have To Be Thankful For," Sermons by American Rabbis (Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896), p. 243. In the same sermon,

Dr. Moses mentioned that a "true worshipper of Jehovah" could be a follower of Moses or of Christ, and that a "true Israelite" could be a Jew or a Christian. However, later in the sermon, the term "Israelite" was used as a synonym for "Jew."

4. Max L. Margolis, The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism (Baltimore: The Friedenwald Company, 1904), p. 121.

5. Ibid., p. 124.

6. CCAR Yearbook, XV (1905), 97.

7. Ibid., p. 83.

8. Ibid., p. 104. It should be noted that, in later years, Margolis completely altered his ideas on this subject.

9. Henry Berkowitz, "Why I Am Not A Zionist," an address delivered before the CCAR in Cincinnati, March 16, 1899, CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), 171.

10. Heller, op. cit., p. 601.

11. Kohler, "The Need of a Living Creed," A Living Faith, pp. 6-7.

12. Kohler, "Judaism's Four Characteristic Traits," A Living Faith, p. 156.

13. Leon Harrison, "I Am a Hebrew," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 92.

14. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 214. See also pp. 194-95 and 234-35.

15. Ibid., pp. 216-18. See also pp. 246-47.

16. Ibid., pp. 218-20.

17. Ibid., pp. 221-22. A proselyte was not qualified to hold office (such as judge of a rabbinical court). Certain Biblical marriage restrictions did not apply to a proselyte. A member of the priestly line could not marry a proselyte.

18. Ibid., p. 222.

19. Ibid., p. 223.

20. Ibid., p. 225.

21. Ibid., p. 234.

22. Louis Grossman, "The Law," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 320.

23. Emil G. Hirsch, "Why am I a Jew?", Pt. II, A discourse delivered before the Sinai Congregation of Chicago, reprint from The Reform Advocate (Chicago: Bloch and Newman, Publishers, 1895), pp. 19-20.

24. Emil G. Hirsch, "Attacks on Jews and Judaism," reprint from The Reform Advocate (Chicago: Bloch and Newman, Publishers, 190-?), p. 11.

25. Hirsch, "Why am I a Jew?" Pt. II, p. 20.

26. Joseph Krauskopf, The Service Manual (Philadelphia: Press of Edward Stern and Company, 1892), pp. 554-55.

27. Max M. L. Heller, "The Place of the Jew in a Racial Interpretation of the History of Civilization," CCAR Yearbook, XXIII (1913), 338.

Chapter 6

1. James G. Heller, op. cit., pp. 601-602.

2. Samuel Sale, "Address on Zionism," Delivered before the Central Conference of American Rabbis in Cincinnati on March 16, 1899, CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), 176.

3. Hirsch, "Attacks on Jews and Judaism," p. 12.

4. David Philipson, "Israel: The International People," Sermon delivered before the Convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations at Baltimore, Maryland on January 15, 1917, (Unpublished pamphlet), pp. 13-14.

5. Hirsch, "Attacks on Jews and Judaism," pp. 15-17.

6. Kohler, "Judaism's Four Characteristic Traits," p. 157.

7. Hirsch, "The Harvest Festival," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 102.

8. Aaron Wise, The Temple Service for the Sabbath and the Festivals ( ), Vol. I, revised by

Rudolph Grossman (New York: Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 1897), p. 187.

9. CCAR Yearbook, XV (1905), 194.

10. Ibid., p. 111.

11. Caspar Levias, "The Justification of Zionism," CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), 183.

12. Ibid., pp. 188-89.

13. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 257

14. Ibid., p. 214. This view was also expressed by Levias; see p. 186 of "The Justification of Zionism."

15. Ibid., p. 258.

16. Harrison, op. cit., p. 89.

17. I. M. Wise, "Freedom, Justice and Fidelity," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 180.

18. Kaufmann Kohler, Jewish Theology: Systematically and Historically Considered (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968), p. 448. This work was first published in German in 1910 and in English in 1918. It was considered such "a comprehensive exposition of the spirit of modern Judaism" by the CCAR Committee on Systematic Jewish Theology that the committee decided to give up its 10-year project of producing a volume of essays on Reform Jewish Theology. See CCAR Yearbook, XXVIII (1918), 112-13.

19. Emil G. Hirsch, "The Philosophy of the Reform Movement in American Judaism," CCAR Yearbook, V (1895), 107-108.

20. Ibid., p. 107.

21. James G. Heller, op. cit., p. 596.

22. Ibid., pp. 605-606.

23. Ibid., p. 606.

24. Ibid., p. 607

25. Ibid., p. 608.

26. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 74.

27. Ibid., p. 75.

28. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 150.

29. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 83.

30. "Maximillian Heller," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isaac Landman, V (1941), 309.

31. "Stephen Samuel Wise," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, X, 543.

32. Hirsch, "Attacks on Jews and Judaism," p. 17.

33. Margolis, op. cit., p. 110. This is taken from note 13 on that page.

34. Kohler, "Israel's Perennial Spring," A Living Faith, pp. 106-107.

35. Kohler, "Bernhard Felsenthal," A Living Faith, pp. 258-59.

36. Kohler, Jewish Theology, pp. 388-90.

37. Ibid., p. 390.

38. Ibid., pp. 390-91.

39. Ibid., p. 396.

40. David Neumark, "Reform Jews and Nationalists," Essays in Jewish Philosophy (Vienna: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1929), p. 93.

41. Ibid., p. 97.

42. Ibid., pp. 98-99.

43. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 361.

44. CCAR Yearbook, XXVII (1917), 202.

45. Ibid., p. 132.

46. Ibid., p. 133.

47. Ibid., pp. 136-37.

48. Ibid., pp. 139-40.

49. Ibid., p. 141.

50. CCAR Yearbook, XXVIII (1918), 95.

51. Ibid., pp. 133-34.

52. James G. Heller, op. cit., p. 547.

53. Ibid., p. 610.

54. Harrison, op. cit., p. 91.

55. James G. Heller, op. cit., p. 585.

56. Ibid., p. 586.

57. Ibid.

58. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 64.

59. Ibid., p. 67.

60. A. Hirschberg, "Reform Judaism and the Recent Immigrant," CCAR Yearbook, XIV (1904), 184.

61. Ibid., p. 192.

62. Ibid., p. 186.

63. James G. Heller, op. cit., p. 587. In 1892, five years before the First Zionist Congress, Wise said that if he were not so busy, he would found a society for all Jews in the United States to assist a broad project of colonization in Palestine. See p. 591.

64. Kohler, "Sukkoth Sermon," A Living Faith, pp. 72-73.

65. Hirsch, "The Harvest Festival," p. 98.

Chapter 7

1. Union Prayer Book (סדור תפלה), Part I (Chicago: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1892). p. 9.

2. Ibid., p. 17. This appeared in the 1892 edition which was published as a manuscript. It was deleted in the official edition of 1895.

3. Union Prayer Book (סדר תפלות), Part II (Chicago: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1893), p. 209.

4. Ibid., p. 20.

5. Aaron Wise, op. cit., p. 191. See also pp. 76, 104, 105, 176, 192, and 336.

6. J. Leonard Levy, A Book of Prayer, 2d. ed. (Pittsburgh: Publicity Press, 1902), pp. 25-26.

7. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 323.

8. Ibid., p. 325.

9. Ibid., pp. 326-27.

10. Ibid., p. 328.

11. Ibid., p. 330.

12. I. M. Wise, "Freedom, Justice and Fidelity," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 186.

13. Krauskopf, op. cit., p. 45.

14. Aaron Wise, op. cit., p. 45.

15. Ibid., p. 240

16. Israel Aaron, "The Holiness of a Peculiar People," A sermon delivered before the CCAR in Cincinnati on March 18, 1899, CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), p. 204.

17. Ibid., p. 205

18. Hirsch, "Why am I a Jew?," Pt. II, pp. 21-22.

19. Ibid., p. 29.

20. Kaufmann Kohler, "The Wandering Jew," Lecture delivered at Temple Beth El in New York City, April 1, 1888, Temple Beth El Sunday Lectures, 1887-88 (Privately published), p. 4.

21. Kohler, "Purim Lecture," A Living Faith, p. 101.

22. Ibid., p. 102.

23. Kohler, "A Glorious Patrimony and a Perennial Pledge," A Living Faith, pp. 127-28.

24. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 397.

25. Ibid., p. 398.

26. Ibid., pp. 406-407.

27. Isaac M. Wise, "Genius in History and the History of Genius," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 213.

28. Ibid.

29. I. S. Moses, "A Definition of Judaism," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 74.

30. Ibid., p. 84.

31. Aaron, op. cit., p. 208.

32. Kohler, "A Glorious Patrimony and Perennial Pledge," p. 126.

33. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 353.

35. Joseph Silverman, "Jewish Theology," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 269.

36. Philipson, "Israel: The International People," p. 8.

37. Ibid., pp. 11-12.

38. Union Prayer Book, Pt. I, p. 66.

39. Ibid., p. 104.

40. Ibid., pp. 105-106.

41. Ibid., p. 211.

42. Union Prayer Book, Pt. II, p. 211.

43. Ibid., p. 213

44. J. Leonard Levy, op. cit., p. 279.

45. Kohler, "The Wandering Jew," p. 7.

46. Ibid., p. 8.

47. Kaufmann Kohler, "Jew and Gentile," Lecture delivered at Temple Beth El in New York City, April 15, 1888, Temple Beth El Sunday Lectures, 1887-88 (Privately published), p. 6.

48. Kohler, "Israel's Perennial Spring," A Living Faith, p. 104.

49. Ibid., p. 108.

50. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 375.

51. Ibid., pp. 376-77.

52. Margolis, op. cit., p. 118.

53. Ibid., p. 120.

54. Krauskopf, op. cit., pp. 430-31.

Chapter 8

1. Isaac S. Moses, "The Meaning of the Survival of Israel," CCAR Yearbook, IV (1895), 21.

2. Hirsch, "Why am I a Jew?" Pt. II, p. 25.

3. Ibid., p. 30.

4. Samuel Sale, "Address on Zionism," CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), 177.

5. Felsenthal, op. cit., p. 77.

6. Ibid.

7. I. S. Moses, "A Definition of Judaism," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 83.

8. Ibid., pp. 85-86.

9. Jacob Voorsanger, "The Sabbath Question," CCAR Yearbook, XII (1902), 119-20.

10. Kohler, "Judaism and the Jew," A Living Faith, p. 68.

11. Kohler, "A Glorious Patrimony and a Perennial Pledge," A Living Faith, p. 127.

12. Kohler, "Judaism and the Jew," A Living Faith, p. 69.

13. Kohler, Jewish Theology, pp. 363-64.

14. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 372.

15. Max L. Margolis, The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism, p. 118.

16. Union Prayer Book (1892), Pt. I, p. 34. See also pp. 75, 82, 83, and 84. Also, Pt. II, pp. 51, 68, and 326.

17. Krauskopf, op. cit., pp. 428-29. See also pp. 435 and 438.

18. Aaron Wise, op. cit., p. 238. See also pp. 44, 45, and 259.

19. J. Leonard Levy, op. cit., p. 53. See also pp. 116-17.

20. Union Prayer Book, Pt. I, p. 40. See also pp. 70 and 245.

21. Union Prayer Book, Pt. II, pp. 222-23. See also p. 121.

22. Aaron Wise, op. cit., p. 49. See also pp. 46-47 and 234-35.

23. J. Leonard Levy, op. cit., pp. 185-86. See also pp. 78-79.

24. I. S. Moses, "A Definition of Judaism," Sermons by American Rabbis, pp. 81-82.

25. Hirsch, "The Harvest Festival," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 95.

26. Grossman, "The Law," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 320.

27. Kohler, "Judaism and the Jew," A Living Faith, p. 68.

28. Israel Aaron, "The Holiness of a Peculiar People," CCAR Yearbook, IX (1899), 207.

29. I. S. Moses, "A Definition of Judaism," Sermons by American Rabbis, p. 85. See also pp. 79-80.

30. Margolis, op. cit., p. 117.

31. A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and Its Development (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), p. 278. Idelsohn here quotes Philipson's History of the Reform Movement, p. 222.

32. Philipson, "Israel: The International People," p. 9.

33. Ibid., p. 15.

34. Kohler, "Jew and Gentile," p. 5.

35. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

36. Kohler, "Sukkoth Sermon," A Living Faith, p. 74.

37. Kohler, "Judaism's Four Characteristic Traits," A Living Faith, p. 158.

38. Kohler, "The World is the Field of the Jew," A Living Faith, pp. 194-95.

39. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 354.

40. Ibid., p. 358.

41. Ibid., pp. 399-400

42. Ibid., p. 403.

43. Ibid., p. 365.

44. Ibid., pp. 445-46.

45. Ibid., p. 453.

46. Levias, op. cit., pp. 185-86.

47. Ibid., p. 186.

48. Krauskopf, op. cit., p. 10.

49. Ibid., p. 442.

50. Union Prayer Book, Pt. II, p. 224.

51. Aaron Wise, op. cit., p. 328.

52. Ibid., p. 332.

53. J. Leonard Levy, op. cit., p. 258. See also p. 13.

54. Ibid., p. 259.

55. Ibid., p. 260.

56. Nathan Glazer, American Judaism, p. 49.

Chapter 9

1. Kohler, "The Mission of Israel and Its Application to Modern Times," CCAR Yearbook, XXIX (1919), 268.

2. Ibid., p. 267.

3. Ibid., p. 269.

4. Ibid., p. 279.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 282.

7. Ibid., p. 283.

8. Ibid., pp. 284-85.

9. Ibid., p. 287.

10. Ibid., p. 288.

11. CCAR Yearbook, XXIX (1919), 298.

12. Julian Morgenstern, "Were Isaac M. Wise Alive Today," CCAR Yearbook, XXIX (1919), 233-36.

13. Ibid., pp. 236-37.

14. Ibid., p. 237.

15. Ibid., p. 238.

16. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, pp. 154-55.

17. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 363.

18. CCAR Yearbook, XXX (1920), 107.

19. Ibid., p. 142.

20. Ibid., pp. 142-43. This report was co-authored by Max Heller and Horace J. Wolf.

21. Philipson, loc. cit.

22. Kohler, "The Lord is My Banner," A Living Faith, p. 307.

23. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 365.

24. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 151.

25. Barnett R. Brickner, "The Reform of Reform Judaism," CCAR Yearbook, XLII (1932), 178.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid., p. 179.

28. Ibid., p. 180

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., pp. 182-83.

31. Abraham J. Feldman, "Conference Sermon--Between the Dead and the Living," CCAR Yearbook, XLIV (1934), 186.

32. CCAR Yearbook, XLV (1935), 103.

Chapter 10

1. Samuel Schulman, "Israel," CCAR Yearbook, XIV (1935), 262.

2. Ibid., pp. 264-65.

3. Ibid., p. 289.

4. Ibid., pp. 290-91.

5. Ibid., p. 292.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p. 293.
8. Ibid., p. 294.
9. Ibid., p. 298.
10. Ibid., p. 301.
11. Ibid., pp. 309-11.
12. Abba Hillel Silver, "Israel," CCAR Yearbook, XLV (1935), 312-14.
13. Ibid., p. 314.
14. Ibid., p. 318.
15. Ibid., pp. 319-20.
16. Ibid., p. 321.
17. Ibid., pp. 322-23
18. Ibid., p. 326
19. Ibid., pp. 327-28.
20. Ibid., p. 330.
21. Ibid., p. 331.
22. Ibid., pp. 337-38.
23. Ibid., p. 340.
24. Ibid., pp. 341-42.
25. CCAR Yearbook, XLV (1935), 343-44.
26. Ibid., p. 344.
27. Ibid., p. 345.
28. Ibid., pp. 346-47.
29. Ibid., p. 350.

30. Ibid., p. 351.

31. Ibid., p. 352.

Chapter 11

1. CCAR Yearbook, XLVI (1936), 96.

2. CCAR Yearbook, XLVII (1937), 97.

3. Ibid., pp. 98-99.

4. Ibid., pp. 113-14. The negative vote on the Palestine paragraph was cast by Solomon Foster.

5. Ibid., pp. 419-20.

6. Ibid., pp. 108-109.

7. Maurice N. Eisendrath, "Conference Sermon--Retreat or Advance," CCAR Yearbook, XLVII (1937), 218-20.

8. Edward L. Israel, "The Synagogue and Forces of Antagonism to the Jew," CCAR Yearbook, XLVII (1937), 289.

9. Julius Gordon, "Palestine in Jewish Life and Literature," CCAR Yearbook, L (1940), 264.

10. Ibid., p. 266.

11. Ibid., pp. 268-69.

12. Ibid., p. 270.

13. Ibid., pp. 270-72.

14. Ibid., pp. 274-75.

15. Julian Morgenstern, "Conference Lecture--With History as our Guide," CCAR Yearbook, LVII (1942), 275.

16. Ibid., pp. 275-77.

17. Ibid., p. 279.

18. Ibid., p. 283.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 285.

21. Ibid.

22. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 155.

23. CCAR Yearbook, LII (1942), 169-70.

24. Ibid., p. 182, The debate is recorded on pp. 171-82.

25. Arthur J. Lelyveld, "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," Retrospect and Prospect, pp. 162-63.

26. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 156. This platform was put into the record of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives when that Congressional committee held hearings on the question of "The Jewish National Home in Palestine."

27. Lelyveld, op. cit., p. 164. Lelyveld claims that no stenographic record was kept of this discussion. This is incorrect. The CCAR published a pamphlet entitled "Are Zionism and Reform Judaism Incompatible?" which contained the four papers by William H. Fineschriber, Hyman Judah Schachtel, Felix Levy, and David Polish.

28. CCAR Yearbook, LIII (1943), 92-93.

29. Ibid., pp. 93-94.

30. Ibid., pp. 95-96.

31. Plaut, The Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 158.

Chapter 12

1. The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship (שבת ויום טוב), Pt. I, Revised (Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1918), p. 8.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

3. Ibid., p. 14.

4. Ibid., p. 182. See also p. 31.

5. Ibid., p. 39.

6. The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship (סדור תפלה לישראל), Pt. II, Revised (Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1922), pp. 25, 42, 62, 80, and 244.

7. Ibid., p. 254.

8. UPB, Pt. II, 1893, p. 224.

9. UPB, Pt. II, Revised, p. 242.

10. Ibid., pp. 242-43.

11. UPB, Pt. I, Revised, p. 108. See also p. 190.

12. Ibid., p. 109. See also p. 97.

13. Ibid., p. 28.

14. Ibid., p. 52.

15. Ibid., p. 14. See also p. 74.

16. Ibid., p. 57.

17. Ibid., p. 140.

18. Samuel S. Cohon, "The Theology of the Union Prayerbook," CCAR Yearbook, XXXVIII (1928), 263. The polemical statement is found in the Afternoon Service for the Day of Atonement, UPB, Pt. II, Revised, p. 255.

19. Ibid. The reference is to UPB, Pt. I, Revised, p. 227.

20. Ibid.

21. CCAR Yearbook, XXXVIII (1928), 278.

22. The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship (סדור תפלה לישראל), Pt. I, Newly Revised (Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940), p. 7.

23. Ibid., p. 328.

24. Ibid., pp. 95-96

25. UPB, Pt. II, Revised, p. 44.

26. The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship (סדר תפלה ישראל), Pt. II, Newly Revised (Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1945), p. 42.

27. UPB, Pt. II, Revised, p. 48.

28. UPB, Pt. II, Newly Revised, p. 46.

29. See UPB, Pt. I, Newly Revised, pp. 120, 145-46, and 192. In the "סדר", on p. 93, the phrase "מוריד הטל" is eliminated, though it is retained in the Torah blessing on p. 146.

30. UPB, Pt. II, Newly Revised, p. 263.

31. UPB, Pt. I, Newly Revised, p. 116.

32. Ibid., p. 90.

33. Cf. UPB, Pt. I, Newly Revised, pp. 134 and 136 with UPB, Pt. 1, Revised, pp. 97 and 109.

34. This paragraph appeared in UPB, Pt. II, Revised, pp. 253-54. It would be expected in UPB, Pt. II, Newly Revised, p. 272. It is not there.

35. UPB, Pt. I, Newly Revised, pp. 68-69.

Chapter 13

1. CCAR Yearbook, LVII (1947), 225.

2. CCAR Yearbook, LVIII (1948), 93-94.

3. Ibid., p. 168.

4. Bernard J. Bamberger, "Introduction," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1949), p. 19.

5. Ibid., p. 20.

6. Ibid., p. 21.

7. Joshua Loth Liebman, "New Trends in Reform Jewish Thought," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni, p. 65.

8. Ibid., pp. 66-67.

9. Ibid., pp. 67-68.

10. Ibid., pp. 70-71.

11. Ibid., p. 71.

12. Ibid., p. 78.

13. Leon Fram, "Reform Judaism and Zionism: A Zionist Interpretation," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni, pp. 179-80.

14. Ibid., p. 182.

15. Ibid., p. 187.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p. 188.

18. Ibid., pp. 189-90.

19. Ibid., pp. 192-94.

20. David H. Wice, "Reform Judaism and Zionism: A Non-Zionist Interpreation," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni, pp. 196-97.

21. No anti-Zionist interpretation was presented in this volume, which was published after the establishment of the State of Israel.

22. Wice, op. cit., pp. 200-201.

23. Ibid., pp. 202-203.

Chapter 14

1. "Tentative Statement of the Round Table on 'The Mission of Israel'" in "Report and Addresses on Institute of Reform Jewish Theology." Mimeographed. The Institute was held at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, March 20-22, 1950.

2. Emil L. Fackenheim, "Existentialism and Judaism" in "Report and Addresses on Institute of Reform Jewish Theology."

3. CCAR Yearbook, LX (1950), 281.

4. Ibid., pp. 282-84.

5. Ibid., p. 294.

6. Ibid., p. 303.

7. Max Nussbaum, "Eretz Yisrael, Galut and Chutz La'aretz, in their Historic Settings," CCAR Yearbook, LXII (1952), p. 493.

8. Ibid., p. 509.

9. CCAR Yearbook, LXII (1952), 276.

10. Ibid., p. 215.

11. Ibid., 218-22.

12. Lou H. Silberman, "The Recent History of Reform Philosophy," CCAR Yearbook, LXIII (1953), p. 287.

13. Ibid., p. 288.

14. Herbert A. Friedman, "Goals of the Reform Movement," CCAR Yearbook, LXIII (1953), p. 301.

15. Ibid., pp. 301-302.

16. Israel Bettan, "National Flags Displayed at Religious Services," CCAR Journal, No. 5 (April, 1954), pp. 30-31.

17. Israel Bettan, "Presidential Message," CCAR Yearbook, LVII (1957), pp. 5-6.

18. Barnett R. Brickner, "Presidential Message," CCAR Yearbook, LXVI (1956), p. 11.

19. CCAR Yearbook, LXVI (1956), 133.

20. Theodore N. Lewis, "The Idea of Israel," CCAR Yearbook, LXVII (1957), pp. 187-88.

21. Ibid., p. 189.

22. Ibid., pp. 190-91.

23. Ibid., p. 195.

24. Ibid., p. 196.

25. Ibid., pp. 197-98.

26. Ibid., pp. 199-200.

27. Samuel S. Mayerberg, "The Columbus Platform--Twenty Years Later," CCAR Yearbook, LXVII (1957), p. 168.

28. Ibid., p. 169.

29. Leon I. Feuer, "Conference Lecture--Beyond Zionism," CCAR Yearbook, LXVII (1957), p. 130.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p. 133.

32. Ibid., p. 136.

33. Ibid., p. 137.

34. Ibid., p. 138.

35. David Max Eichhorn, Who is a Jew?," CCAR Yearbook, LXIX (1959), p. 243.

36. Ibid., pp. 244-45.

37. Joachim Prinz, "Who is a Jew?," CCAR Yearbook, LXIX (1959), pp. 250-51.

38. Ibid., p. 251.

39. Ibid., p. 256.

40. Solomon B. Freehof, "Who is a Jew?," CCAR Journal, No. 26 (June, 1959), pp. 3-4.

41. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

42. Samuel B. Cohon, "Who is a Jew?," CCAR Journal, No. 26 (June, 1959), p. 12. He cites Hulin 5a, Hil. Akum 2.5, Hil. Teshuba 3.9-10, and Orah Hayyim 385.3. He mentions that some authorities are lenient on this point, but only if the conversion was forced.

43. Ibid., p. 13.

Chapter 15

1. Rabbi's Manual, Revised Edition (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1961), p. 112.

2. Frederic A. Doppelt and David Polish, A Guide For Reform Jews (Privately published, 1957), p. 64.

3. CCAR Yearbook, LXXII (1962), 114-15. This report of the Committee on the Relationship of Reform Judaism and the State of Israel, chaired by Ely E. Pilchik, was adopted with the revisions included in this text.

4. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Towards a Definition of Our Relationship to Israel," CCAR Journal, IX, No. 3 (Issue #35, Oct., 1961), p. 10.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

7. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Footnotes to The Current Debate," CCAR Journal, XXII, No. 3 (Issue #51, Oct. 1965), p. 15.

8. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Self-Definition and Commitment," Tenth Annual Lessing J. Rosenwald Lecture in American Judaism sponsored by the Philadelphia chapter of the American Council for Judaism, Preprint from Issues (quarterly of the ACJ), Winter, 1965-66, pp. 2-3.

9. Ibid., p. 11.

10. Frederic A. Doppelt, "A Reappraisal of the Chosen People Concept," CCAR Journal, IX, No. 2 (Issue #34, June, 1961), p. 12.

11. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

12. Ibid., p. 15.

13. Leon Fram, "What is Judaism's Mission in the Contemporary World?," CCAR Yearbook, LXXII (1962), pp. 202-203.

14. Ibid., pp. 206-207.

15. Ibid., pp. 208-209.

16. Ibid., p. 211-13.

17. Ibid., pp. 215, 217.

18. CCAR Yearbook, LXXII (1962), 218.

19. Ibid., p. 220.

20. Ibid., pp. 220-21.

21. Ibid., pp. 221-22. Since that time, Gilbert has become associated with the Reconstructionist movement. In his article, "The Meaning and Purpose of Jewish Survival" in the Oct., 1968 CCAR Journal, he repudiated a supernatural God-concept.

22. Arthur J. Lelyveld, "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," Retrospect and Prospect, ed. Bertram Wallace Korn (New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965), p. 129.

23. Ibid., p. 130

24. Ibid., p. 177. See footnote 79 on that page.

25. Ibid., pp. 143-44.

26. Ibid., p. 171

27. David Polish, The Higher Freedom: A Turning Point in Jewish History (Chicago: Quadrangle Press, 1965), p. 19.

28. Ibid., p. 41.

29. Ibid., pp. 103-104.

30. Ibid., pp. 196-97.

31. Ibid., pp. 197-98.

32. Ibid., p. 202.

33. Ibid., pp. 204-205.

34. Ibid., pp. 207-209.

35. Ibid., pp. 214-15.

36. Daniel Jeremy Silver, "A Lover's Quarrel with the Mission of Israel," CCAR Journal, XIV, No. 3 (Issue #58, June, 1967), p. 9.

37. Ibid., p. 10.

38. Ibid., p. 14.

39. Ibid., p. 16.

40. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

Chapter 16

1. Eugene J. Lipman, "The Mission of Israel and Social Action," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 1 (Issue #60, January, 1968), p. 64.

2. Ibid., pp. 64-65.

3. Ibid., pp. 65-66.

4. Samuel E. Karff, "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom, CCAR Journal, XV, No. 2 (Issue #61, April, 1968), p. 20.

5. Ibid., p. 21.

6. Samuel E. Karff, "The Election, the Covenant, and the Mission of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), p. 167. This volume was published in cooperation with the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

7. Ibid., p. 172.

8. Ibid., p. 168.

9. Ibid., p. 173.

10. Ibid., pp. 174-75.

11. Ibid., p. 177.

12. Karff, "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom," p. 29.

13. Ibid., p. 30.

14. Eugene B. Borowitz, "The Problem of the Form of a Jewish Theology," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vols. XL-XLI (1969-70), p. 400. See especially footnote 25.

15. Ibid.

16. Daniel Jeremy Silver, "Editor's Comments," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), pp. 4-5.

17. Ibid., p. 5.

18. Daniel Jeremy Silver, "Beyond the Apologetics of Mission," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968) p. 59.

19. Ibid., p. 62.

20. Ibid.

21. Leon Kronish, "Yisrael Goralenu," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), p. 31.

22. Ibid., p. 34.

23. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

24. Ibid., pp. 35-36. At least one of his suggestions has become a reality. The 1970 CCAR convention was held in Jerusalem.

25. Ibid., p. 37, His transliteration is inconsistent.

26. Leon Fram, "Reform Judaism, Zionism and the State of Israel," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), p. 38.

27. Ibid., pp. 39-40.

28. Ibid., pp. 42-43.

29. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "More Than A 'Plank'," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968), p. 76.

30. Ibid., pp. 77-78.

31. Ibid., p. 78.

32. Ibid., p. 79.

33. Steven S. Schwarzchild, "On the Theology of Jewish Survival," CCAR Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issued #63, October, 1968), p. 19.

34. Bernard Bamberger, "The Concept of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought, p. 125.

35. Ibid., p. 127

36. Ibid., p. 129

37. Ibid., pp. 129-30.

38. Joseph Narot, "The Nature and Destiny of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought, pp. 137-38.

39. Ibid., p. 142.

40. Nelson Glueck, "The Future of Reform Judaism," CCAR Yearbook, LXXIX (1969), p. 249.

41. Ibid., p. 250. This proposal has been put into effect. The present freshman class is now studying in Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Browne, Edward B. M. Prayers of Israel. 2d edition. New York: Privately published, 1885.

Calisch, Edward N. A Book of Prayer. Richmond, Virginia: Ezekiel & Bass, Printers, 1893.

Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal. Issues 1-71.

Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook. Vols. 1-LXXIX.

Doppelt, Frederic A., and Polish, David. A Guide for Reform Jews. Privately published, 1957.

Einhorn, David. Book of Prayers for Israelitish Congregations (Olat Tamid). New York: Privately published, 1872.

_____. Gebetbuch für Israelitilche Reform-Gemeinden ( ). New York: Thalmessinger & Cahn, 1858.

_____. Inaugural Sermon. Translated by C. A. Rubenstein. Baltimore: Privately printed, 1909.

Elzas, Barnett A. (ed.). The Sabbath Service and Miscellaneous Prayers. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1916.

Felsenthal, Emma. Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel. New York: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Glazer, Nathan. American Judaism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Heller, James G. Isaac M. Wise: His Life, Work, and Thought. New York: The Union of American Hebrew Congregation, 1965.

Hertz, Joseph H. The Authorised Daily Prayer Book. Revised edition. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1961.

Idelsohn, A. Z. Jewish Liturgy and Its Development. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.

Jastrow, M. Israelitish Prayer Book (סדר תפלות). 2d. ed. revised. Philadelphia: Published by the Editor, 1873.

Kohler, Kaufmann. A Living Faith. Edited by Samuel S. Cohon. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1948.

_____. Jewish Theology: Systematically and Historically Considered. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.

Korn, Bertram Wallace (ed.). Restrospect and Prospect. New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965.

Krauskopf, Joseph. The Service Manual. Philadelphia: Press of Edward Stern & Co., 1892.

Landsberg, Max. Ritual for Jewish Worship. Rochester: Charles Mann, 1885.

Levy, J. Leonard. A Book of Prayer. 2d. edition. Pittsburgh: Publicity Press, 1902.

Lewin, Raphael D'C. The American-Jewish Ritual. New York: L. H. Frank & Co., Publishers, 1870.

Mahzor Matteh Levi, Minhag Ashkenaz. Tel Aviv: Sinai Publishing, 1966.

Margolis, Max L. The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism. Baltimore: The Friedenwald Co., 1904.

Martin, Bernard (ed.). Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.

Merzbacher, L. The Order of Prayer for Divine Service. Vol. II: Prayers for the Day of Atonement. New York: (No publisher listed), 1855.

_____. The Order of Prayer for Divine Service. 3d. ed. revised and corrected by S. Adler. New York: M. Thalmessinger & Co., 1864.

Parker, Theodore. A Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1907.

Philipson, David. The Reform Movement in Judaism. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1967.

Plaut, W. Gunther. The Growth of Reform Judaism: American and European Sources until 1948. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, Ltd., 1965.

_____. The Rise of Reform Judaism: A Sourcebook of its European Origins. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, Ltd., 1963.

Polish, David. The Higher Freedom: A Turning Point in Jewish History. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.

Rabbi's Manual. Revised edition. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1961.

Szold, B. Songs and Prayers and Meditations for Divine Services of Israelites. Translated by M. Jastrow. Philadelphia: By the Translator, 1873.

The Daily Prayers for American Israelites (Minhag America). Cincinnati: The Bloch Publishing & Printing Co., 1889.

The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship ( ), Pt. I. Revised edition. Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1918.

The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship ( ), Pt. II. Revised edition. Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1922.

The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship ( ), Pt. I. Newly revised edition. Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940.

The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship ( ), Pt. II. Newly revised edition. Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1945.

Union Prayer Book ( ), Pt. I. Chicago: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1892.

Union Prayer Book ( ), Pt. II. Chicago: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1893.

Wise, Aaron. The Temple Service for the Sabbath and the Festivals ( ). Vol. I. Revised by Rudolph Grossman. New York: Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 1897.

Wise, Isaac M. (trans.). The Daily Prayers, Pt. I (Minhag America). Cincinnati: Bloch & Co., 1857.

_____. The Divine Service of American Israelites for The Day of Atonement (Minhag America). Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1892?-1900?

_____. The Divine Service of American Israelites for The New Year (Minhag America). Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1892?-1900?

Articles

Aaron, Israel, "The Holiness of a Peculiar People," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IX (1899), 202-208.

Bamberger, Bernard J. "Introduction," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1949, 3-27.

_____. "The Concept of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought. Edited by Bernard Martin. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965, 123-30.

_____. "Theological Developments," Retrospect and Prospect. Edited by Bertram Wallace Korn. New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965, 20-45.

Berkowitz, Henry. "Why I Am Not a Zionist," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IX (1899), 167-173.

Bettan, Israel. "National Flags Displayed at Religious Services" (a responsum), Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, No. 5 (April, 1954), 30-31.

_____. "President's Message," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXVII (1957), 3-12.

Borowitz, Eugene B. "The Problem of the Form of a Jewish Theology," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vols. XL-XLI (1969-70), 398-408.

Brickner, Barnett R. "President's Message," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXVI (1956), 3-12.

_____. "The Reform of Reform Judaism," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XLII (1932), 170-183.

Calisch, E. N. "Israel's Modern Kings," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IV (1895), 49-54.

Cohon, Samuel S. "The Theology of the Union Prayerbook," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XXXVIII (1928), 246-294.

_____. "Who is a Jew?," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, No. 26 (June, 1959), 9-13.

Doppelt, Frederic A. "A Reappraisal of the Chosen People Concept," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, IX, No. 2 (Issue #34, June, 1961), 11-15, & 21.

Eichhorn, David Max. "Who is a Jew?," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXIX (1959), 240-47.

Eisendrath, Maurice N. "Conference Sermon--Retreat or Advance," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XLVII (1937), 202-24.

Feldman, Abraham J. "Conference Sermon--Between the Dead and the Living," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XLIV (1934), 178-189.

Felsenthal, B. "Thoughts Concerning Some Jewish Questions of the Day," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XIV (1904), 193-201.

Feuer, Leon I. "Conference Lecture--Beyond Zionism," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXVII (1957), 128-38.

Fram, Leon. "What is Judaism's Mission in the Contemporary World?," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXXII (1962), 201-25.

_____. "Reform Judaism and Zionism: A Zionist Interpretation," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1949, 174-195

_____. "Reform Judaism, Zionism and The State of Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), 38-43

Freehof, Solomon B. "Who is a Jew?," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, No. 26 (June, 1959), 3-8.

Friedman, Herbert A. "Goals of the Reform Movement," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXIII (1953), 299-304.

Gilbert, Arthur. "The Meaning and Purpose of Jewish Survival," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968), 38-44.

Glueck, Nelson. "The Future of Reform Judaism," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXXIX (1969), 247-50.

Gordon, Julius. "Palestine in Jewish Life and Literature," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, L (1940), 261-76.

Grossman, Louis. "The Law," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Pubication Committee, 1896, 316-328.

Harrison, Leon. "I Am A Hebrew," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 87-93.

Heller, Max. "The Place of the Jew in a Racial Interpretation of the History of Civilization," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XXIII (1913), 304-339.

"Heller, Maximillian," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 5. Edited by Isaac Landman. 1941, 309.

Hirsch, Emil G. "The Harvest Festival," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 94-113.

Hirschberg, A. "Reform Judaism and the Recent Immigrant," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XIV (1904), 179-192.

Israel, Edward L. "The Synagogue and Forces of Antagonism to the Jew," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XLVII (1937), 276-308.

Karff, Samuel E. "Judaism, Reform and Radical Freedom," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 2 (Issue #61, April, 1968), 16-31, & 53.

_____. "The Election, the Covenant, and the Mission of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought. Edited by Bernard Martin. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968, 61-79.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Mission of Israel and Its Application to Modern Times," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XXIX (1919), 265-305.

Kronish, Leon. "Yisrael Goralenu," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), 31-37.

Lelyveld, Arthur J. "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World," Retrospect and Prospect. Edited by Bertram Wallace Korn. New York: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965, 129-180.

Levias, C(asper). "The Justification of Zionism," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IX (1899), 179-191.

Lewis, Theodore N. "The Idea of Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXVII (1957), 182-200.

Liebman, Joshua Loth. "New Trends in Reform Jewish Thought," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1949, 57-80.

Lipman, Eugene J. "The Mission of Israel and Social Action," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 1 (Issue #60, January, 1968), 64-66, & 93.

Mayerberg, Samuel S. "The Columbus Platform---Twenty Years Later," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXVII (1957), 162-73.

Morgenstern, Julian. "Conference Lecture---With History as Our Guide," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LVII (1947), 257-87.

_____. "Were Isaac M. Wise Alive Today," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XXIX (1919), 224-258.

Moses, Adolph. "What We Have To Be Thankful For," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 233-243.

Moses, Isaac S. "A Definition of Judaism," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 74-86.

_____. "The Meaning of the Survival of Israel," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IV (1895), 14-22.

Narot, Joseph. "The Nature and Destiny of Israel," Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought. Edited by Bernard Martin. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965, 131-44.

Neumark, David. "Reform Jews and Nationalists," Essays in Jewish Philosophy. (No city of publication--printed in Vienna): Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1929, 91-100.

Nussbaum, Max. "Eretz Yisrael, Galut and Chutz La'aretz, in their Historic Settings," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXII (1952), 489-509.

Petuchowski, Jakob J. "Footnotes to the Current Debate," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XII, No. 4 (Issue #51, October, 1965), 13-17.

_____. "Judaism Today," Religion in the Middle East: Three Religions in Concord and Conflict. Edited by A. J. Arberry. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969, 3-58.

_____. "More Than A 'Plank'," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968), 76-79.

_____. "Self-Definition and Commitment," Issues, Winter 1965-66 (Used in preprint form).

_____. "Towards a Definition of Our Relationship to Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, IX, No. 3 (Issue #35, October, 1961), 7-11.

Prinz, Joachim. "Who is a Jew?," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXIX (1959), 248-56.

Sale, S(amuel). "Address on Zionism," Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, IX (1899), 174-178.

Schulman, Samuel. "Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook. XLV (1935), 260-311.

Schwarzschild, Steven S. "On the Theology of Jewish Survival," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968), 2-21.

Silberman, Lou H. "The Recent History of Reform Philosophy," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, LXIII (1953), 282-89

Silver, Abba Hillel. "Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XLV (1935), 312-354.

Silver, Daniel Jeremy. "Beyond the Apologetics of Mission," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 4 (Issue #63, October, 1968), 55-62.

_____. "Editor's Comments," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XV, No. 3 (Issue #62, June, 1968), 2-5.

_____. "A Lover's Quarrel with the Mission of Israel," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, XIV, No. 3 (Issue #58, June, 1967), 8-18.

Silverman, Joseph. "Jewish Theology," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committe, 1896, 259-269.

Voorsanger, Jacob. "The Sabbath Question," Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, XII (1902), 103-22.

Wice, David H. "Reform Judaism and Zionism: A Non-Zionist Interpretation," Reform Judaism: Essays by Hebrew Union College Alumni. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1949, 196-205.

Wise, Isaac M. "Freedom, Justice and Fidelity," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 180-188.

_____. "Genius in History and the History of Genius," Sermons by American Rabbis. Chicago: The Central Conference Publication Committee, 1896, 200-216.

"Wise, Stephen Samuel," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 10. Edited by Isaac Landman. 1941, 543-44.

Unpublished Material

Central Conference of American Rabbis. "Report and Addresses on Institute of Reform Jewish Theology" held at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, March 20-22, 1950. (Mimeographed.)

Fineshriber, William H., Levy, Felix, Polish, David, and Schachtel, Hyman Judah. "Are Zionism and Reform Judaism Incompatible?" Papers read at the convention of

the Central Conference of American Rabbis, New York City, June 24, 1943. (Four papers published together under the same title.)

Hirsch, Emil G. "Attacks on Jews and Judaism." Chicago, 190-? (In a booklet, most of which is reprints from The Reform Advocate, published by Bloch and Newman, edited by Emil G. Hirsch--this discourse has no title page.)

_____. "Why am I a Jew?" Part II. Discourse delivered before Sinai Congregation, Chicago, 1895. Reprinted from The Reform Advocate, Bloch and Newman, Publishers, Chicago.

Kohler, K. "Jew and Gentile." Lecture delivered at Temple Beth El on Sunday, April 15, 1888. (From the collection Temple Beth El Sunday Lectures, 1887-88.)

_____. "The Wandering Jew." Lecture delivered at Temple Beth El on Sunday, April 1, 1888. (From the collection Temple Beth El Sunday Lectures, 1887-88.)

Philipson, David. "Israel: The International People." Sermon delivered before the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations at Baltimore, Maryland, January 15, 1917.