

17

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"The Development of American Jewish Thought in the Twentieth Century as Reflected in the Writings of Horace M. Kallen, Ludwig Lewisohn, and Morris Raphael Cohen."

written by Morton Hoffman
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: ()
cannot be considered for publication: (✓)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (✓)
may not be loaned by the Library: ()

Ellis Rivkin
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin
(referee)

May 1, 1953
(date)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH THOUGHT IN THE
TWENTIETH CENTURY AS REFLECTED IN THE WRITINGS OF
HORACE M. KALLEN, LUDWIG LEWISOHN AND
MORRIS RAPHAEL COHEN

by
Morton Hoffman

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
March, 1953

Referee:
Professor Ellis Rivkin

Digest

The Development of American Jewish Thought in the Twentieth Century as Reflected in the Writings of Horace M. Kallen, Ludwig Lewisohn, and Morris Raphael Cohen

American writing was not bypassed by the unbelievable social and technical developments of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. A revolution was in the making in American letters with the advent of the machine age.

Occupying a not insignificant place in the galaxy of literary luminaries in this country were the Jewish writers. Many of them, of course, assimilated totally to American themes. But even those who continued to occupy themselves with Jewish themes were affected unmistakably by the forces that shaped the course of American literature.

Horace Kallen, Ludwig Lewisohn and Morris Raphael Cohen grew and wrote in the same generation, and each of the trio can quite accurately be designated by the label, American Jewish Writer.

It has been the aim of this thesis to show the relatedness of these three to the American milieu and thus ultimately to each other. But it would be a mistake to take this as a sign of totally pre-determined uniformity. Each personality was capable of producing unique performances within a certain framework. It has been the under-

standing of that framework which has been our main concern.

The characteristically American philosophy of pragmatism gave rise among other things to a pre-occupation among the intellectuals with social conditions. One of the most important successes of pragmatism was its culmination in the "sociological jurisprudence" movement. So we have taking shape in the first decades of the twentieth century a liberal intellectual movement pre-occupied with social justice, and creating a literature of social criticism.

It was not unexpected that the doctrines of Karl Marx should have attained popularity with this movement in its early years. And the coupling of Marxism with pragmatism was bound to manifest itself in a rejection of religious institutions.

Kallen, Lewisohn, and Cohen fit into this pattern with few reservations during the early years.

But these writers unlike their Gentile contemporaries, were bound up with an additional factor, the issue of their Jewishness. And we find that in applying themselves to the problems posed by this issue, they appropriated typically American trends of thinking and synthesized a new creative Jewish literature.

Kallen's approach to the American scene as well as to Judaism has remained throughout a thoroughly consistent pragmatic one. Lewisohn's early writings identify

him as belonging to the liberal school of intellectuals. By the thirties a total reaction had set in but even then Lewisohn, by his own intentional admission identified himself with the American bourgeois and a recognizably American bourgeois movement i.e. the native reaction to reason and science, often referred to as neo-orthodoxy.

Cohen's identification with the liberal intellectual group would be secure if only as a result of his efforts in behalf of the "sociological jurisprudence" movement. His preoccupation with the liberal interpretation of Americanism as based on his critical scientific method and as applied to specifically American Jewish problems cements his position as an American-Jewish writer.

The work of all three, then, in short tends to support the proposition that American Jewish intellectualism consists in great measure of the application of typical American thought patterns to the problems of Jewish modernity and is unintelligible without an understanding of the American intellectual climate.

Table of Contents

	page
Introduction	1
Chapter I	
The Backgrounds of Modern American Thought	1
Chapter II	
Horace Meyer Kallen	38
Chapter III	
Ludwig Lewisohn	70
Chapter IV	
Morris Raphael Cohen	103
Footnotes	122
Bibliography	128

Introduction

Whether because of the onslaught of national maturity with its tendency toward reflection or the spread of national insecurity with its tendency toward chauvinism, a huge amount of writing has been produced in recent years, focusing on the development of the American intellect and the contributions of America and Americans to modern thought.

As it happens, a not inconsequential part has been played by Jews in the development of the American intellect -- the catalogue is quite large. The serious secular historiographer however has usually been interested only in the literarily assimilated Jew, writing on non-sectarian American themes. And this is understandable, since, after all, he must place the accent on the adjective in the term "American intellect," and it may well be argued from his point of view that Jews occupying themselves with predominantly Jewish themes, are not in the main stream of distinctively American thought.

But the fact that it may be possible to understand American thought without a consideration of Jewish-oriented writing, does not mean that therefore there is no relationship between the two. It is, in fact, the major contention of the present thesis that Jewish writing

is immensely dependent on and demonstrative of the forces at work in the American intellectual scene as a whole. Indeed, the Jewish writers (and from now on I use this term with reference to the nature of subject material) are unintelligible without an understanding of these forces, and this is not to imply that slavish imitation was necessarily their major preoccupation. Their ability to synthesize modernity with eternal Jewish problems was very often creative in the highest tradition of Jewish thinking -- in the traditions of Maimonides and Mendelssohn.

To those who have been brought up in the school of Jewish hero-worship this will be a blow. To those who believe in the divine origin and distinctive originality of all Jewish ideas it will be equally hard to bear. But the story of American Jewish intellectualism merely gives further support to the view that Jewish culture always has reflected the social and economic milieu in which it has resided.

In choosing this theme it was felt, then, that in the present flurry of American intellectual evaluation a consideration of some Jewish intellectuals not commonly studied would not be amiss. Three such individuals were arbitrarily chosen on the basis of their prolificness, the wide range of their interests and their intellectual and literary powers. (The approbation admittedly in-

tended in the above statement does not infer that no attempt at criticism will be made. On the contrary, since American Jewry depends on the intellectual leadership of men such as these it is of great importance to see wherein their limitations have existed.)

Four chapters comprise this thesis. The opening chapter is intended to survey as briefly, yet as relevantly as possible, the general American social and intellectual scene as far back as the middle of the nineteenth century, in order to establish a frame of reference into which the details of the activity of the Jewish intellectuals will fall and become meaningful without repetition. This first chapter will then be followed by three chapters, one each on Horace M. Kallen (1882-), Ludwig Lewisohn (1882-), and Morris Raphael Cohen (1880-1947), in that order for no particular reason.

At the outset it must be pointed out that due to the immense output of the individuals under consideration, it is impossible to include in the space of a work of this nature every utterance on a given subject. The aims of this thesis will be to illumine typically consistent patterns by selected incisive documentation rather than by the heaping up of mass documentation.

CHAPTER I

The Backgrounds of Modern American Thought

Probably the most influential of the many varieties of opinion that streamed into nineteenth century America from Europe was the thesis of Evolution, popularly ascribed to Darwin as a result of his Origin of the Species in 1859. The idea was, however, no sudden discovery -- it was long in the process of formulation. As a result of the forces of the Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, philosophers had popularized the idea of the gradual, continuous progress of society and had even specified the various stages of development. With the rise of modern science, the notion of development became inescapable as the various branches -- such as botany, geology, etc. began to flourish. Darwin's work merely crowned the labors that had been transforming all phases of natural science for many decades. The implications of Darwinism were ruinous for many of the traditional frames of thought and quite timely for certain new frames of thought. "Divine will" was superseded by "natural causes" -- the struggle for existence, adaptation to environment, and the survival of the fittest. "Social evolutionists reduced men's ideas and institutions to mere evolutionary products, still imperfect, but destined to evolve toward perfection.

'Social Darwinists' applied the ideas of the survival of the fittest in crude jungle style to the justification of acquiring empire from 'backward nations' or to the defense of economic monopoly over less efficient business rivals. As for the evolutionary 'law of progress', Americans had long felt encouraged by their material successes to believe that progress is inevitable."¹

Many Americans joined the ranks of the Darwinists but the one whose efforts in the cause was destined to have the most profound effect on American thought was William James. In 1868 William James had written to his brother Henry:

"The more I think of Darwin's ideas the more weighty do they appear to me, though of course my opinion is worth very little -- still, I believe that that scoundrel Agassiz is unworthy either intellectually or morally for him to wipe his shoes on, and I find a certain pleasure in yielding to the feeling."²

James's Darwinism is embodied in his fruitful psychological work but most important it led him ultimately to the doctrine of Pragmatism. Much had been done earlier on this idea by Charles S. Peirce who wrote that in order to clarify ideas it was necessary to show their consequences in action. From this James took his point of departure.

"A pragmatist turns his back resolutely and once for all upon a lot of inveterate habits dear to professional philosophies. He turns away from abstractions and insufficiency, from verbal solutions, from bad a priori reasons, from fixed principles, closed systems, and pretended absolutes and origins You must bring out of each word its practical cash-values, set it at work within the

stream of your experience."³

James' pragmatism enabled him to entertain a hospitable viewpoint toward religion as a value for concrete experience, and this attitude is expressed in the famous Varieties of Religious Experience (Longmans, Green and Company, 1902)

To determine to what extent James' pragmatic thinking was encouraged by the commercial materialism of the age which admittedly identified success with virtue, would be quite difficult, and would doubtless lead to pointless contention. It can only be said that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that at sometime in the course of the titanic inner struggle leading up to his pragmatism, James was tempted to grasp on to something whose stability and trustworthiness were visible, and nothing was more comfortingly visible in the "Gilded Age" in America than the blessings of the prosperous, than the well-being of the man who succeeded. It must be quickly added however that James himself had no love for the vulgarizers of Pragmatism who held an idea to be true merely if it worked for an individual and nothing more. James himself had much more than this in mind -- as a Darwinist, he believed that ideas must meet the selective test of their environment to survive, but he was too scientific and ethical a person to allow this test to be anything but rigorous.

But while speculation as to the indebtedness of James's own development to the material aspects of American life may not yield great fruit, it can be safely said that having elaborated the idea it became intimately bound up with them, indeed, it would have been difficult to hit even intentionally upon a philosophy more ideally suited to the needs and character of American life as it expanded from the Gilded Age to the Machine Age, (that it permeated American thought is well documented, its impress on American Jewish writing will be clearly demonstrated in the present work).

James found a worthy co-worker and successor in John Dewey whose philosophy and new pedagogy were gaining the day at the University of Chicago at the turn of the century. Dewey like James had moved from Emersonian idealism towards empiricism which emphasized experience as the sole reality. Affected deeply by the Darwinist^t revolution in philosophy, Dewey rejected philosophy as an inquiry after absolute origins and finalities but accepted it rather as the means for exploring specific values and the specific conditions which generate them. Like James he was a "voluntarist", believing in the power of the human intelligence to remake man's environment and hence in his ability to escape wholly deterministic influences. Unlike James who remained a social conservative Dewey attempted the practical application of his philosophy to life and devoted himself to social causes.

Also unlike James, Dewey harbored no friendly feelings toward religion. He could accept the beneficent effects of the religious attitude but insisted on differentiating between "Religion" and the "Religious" and inveighed against the former with its "... doctrinal apparatus (which) it is incumbent upon 'believers' to accept." And their insistence "that there is special and isolated channel of access to the truths they hold."⁴ Dewey was given to speaking harshly of religion and could only foresee its downfall.

Dewey influenced American educational theory more deeply than any other man with his child-centered curriculum stressing "learning by doing" and the democratic principle of cooperation rather than the traditional aristocratic principle of promoting the exceptional child and the competitive individual.

Two more names must be inserted at this point, before considering the ramifications of Pragmatism in the broad reaches of American life.

First is the name of Karl Marx. Americans were first introduced to Marx when Horace Greeley in the 1840's vowed himself a socialist and opened the columns of his Tribune to him. Already in the middle period of American history men of Greeley's mental power and political standing were drawn to the socialistic philosophy -- it was no longer just the subject of discourse for obscure circles of working people. Only the civil war and the free land

opened to labor by the Homestead Act were able to check the strong radical drift in this country.

At any rate, this once obscure contributor to the Tribune was destined to become the philosopher of the most formidable working class movement in the history of the world. In 1847 Marx in collaboration with his friend, Frederick Engels, issued the challenge of the Communist Manifesto to the ruling classes of the world: "Workingmen of all lands, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!"

Within a short time the Manifesto crossed the Atlantic. A socialist paper, Die Republik der Arbeiter was founded in 1850 by William Weitling, and in the same year a socialist gymnastic society was organized in New York. Radical sentiment reached fearful enough proportions, despite the meager numbers of actual socialists, to become an object of the crusade which the "know-nothing" party carried on against aliens, atheism, and anarchy.

It had certainly seeped through to some of the most unexpected places in American ~~places in American~~ thought. Radical farmers of native American stock for example were, all through this period, engaged in a class enterprise of their own which was certainly tinged with socialist theories. By 1884 no less a person than James Russell Lowell was of the opinion that socialism means "the practical application of Christianity to life and has

in it the secret of an orderly and benign reconstruction."⁵
 By the end of the nineteenth century the influence of socialism on the American scene, especially the intellectual scene was not to be ignored.

The second name to be inserted at this point is that of Sigmund Freud. Freud first visited America in 1909. President G. Stanley Hall of Clark University, another ardent disciple of James had invited Freud to give a series of lectures, and in these lectures he set forth his theories concerning the censorship of the "ego" in repressing the basic drives of the "id" especially in the area of sex, and the techniques of free association and dream interpretation in obtaining entry into the subconscious level of existence. From 1910 on, books on Freud appeared by the score and the popularization as well as the vulgarization of his ideas was assured. It provided the ingredients on the one hand for the cults of irrationality and human animality and on the other hand for the beneficent mental hygiene movement.

Returning now to our consideration of pragmatism we find that one of its most striking successes was the revolution it brought about in the field of jurisprudence. This field, heavily handicapped by the load of professionalism carried on its back, lagged as a science.

"Like theology, with which it was long associated in Western Europe, civil law, its vigilant guardians averred, was a mysterious substance discovered in the realm of abstract justice by adepts at the business. The mastery

of the subject was to be attained mainly by a study of the words of lawgivers. On such verbal nutriment, generations of practising attorneys were brought to maturity and conviction, and, as long as they were able to keep their domain isolated from the inquiries of the profane, their authority was secure.

"But under the all-penetrating searchlight of modern science it was impossible to maintain the cabalistic spell, especially as law now had to climb down to the market place."⁶

When delivering a dissenting opinion on the validity of a labor statute in 1907 Justice Holmes of the Supreme Court who became the shining light of the new school of jurisprudence wryly remarked, "this case is decided upon an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain ... General propositions do not decide concrete cases. The decision will depend on a judgment or intuition more subtle than any articulate major premise."⁷

Thus did it gradually become apparent that the law was merely a form of social and economic expression, everchanging, ever-adapting to the processes of society. A new faith began to flourish known as "sociological jurisprudence" under whose terms it became fitting for students to inquire into ~~the~~ economic and psychological motives of those who made and interpreted the law. To this school of thought, the pragmatic test to determine truth and justice was far more important than the tradition of the law's certainty -- and with the spreading of this idea, pragmatism had scored another great victory.

In the field of literature the impact of the Darwinistic sciences was also felt. The naturalistic novel had come to the fore already in the nineties. Man was studied frankly as an animal motivated by his appetite. The sexual life of the subject was fully portrayed. Zola and Dostoevski laid the foundations for this school in Europe and it was not long before the Americans William Dean Howells and Stephen Crane were their ardent disciples.

One of the greatest of the literary naturalists was Theodore Dreiser. He started out as a newspaperman and later as so many of the naturalistic novelists did, he drew much of his materials from his contact with all levels of urban life and from press files themselves. Sister Carrie, his first novel, was a remarkable study, displaying a concern for economic factors in determining behavior, realism, and an utter frankness on sex which caused a good many years delay in distribution. Dreiser's American Tragedy (1925) continued the realistic approach and the concern with economic factors but showed a more sensitive psychological technique on a par with Dostoevski. As for W. D. Howells' it must be noted that his significance lies not only in his early espousal of the naturalistic cause. For naturalism was not the lone characteristic of Howells' writing. Marxism had influenced him, too. He was drawn early into the struggle of labor against the plutocracy that accompanied the rise of the national

labor movement in the second half of the nineteenth century. He not only made that conflict and its antithesis, the socialism of A Traveller from Altruria, an integral part of his literary art, but he also entered into the forum of political life to champion the lowly -- even to protest against the execution of the Chicago anarchists when he knew his protest would be unpopular with the vast majority of Americans.

The confluence of these two streams of thought, naturalism and socialism was of course not unusual -- the former devoting itself to such a great degree to the frank and sympathetic portrayal of human suffering and the latter addressing itself to the alleviation of same. Howells thus was not a lone figure.

Edward Bellamy in Looking Backward combined the two, the synthesis was also at the root of the art of the gifted storyteller of the Alaskan frontier, Jack London, though at times in most contradictory terms, and the socialistic writings of Upton Sinclair rounded out the ranks of the leaders of the new dissident school of novelists.

Also experiencing a renaissance as a literary form by the turn of the century was the medium of the magazine. This was made possible in no small measure by technical advances in reproducing illustrations. With the development of cheap photo-engraving in the nineties, a revolutionary cut in costs was effected. In 1893, Frank

Munsey announced that Munsey's Magazine would sell at ten cents instead of twenty five and others had to follow his lead.

In 1865 an Anglo-Irish immigrant, Edwin L. Godkin had founded a journal of opinion known as The Nation and established a national tradition for independent, intellectual journalism. Godkin did not perceive the new social forces behind trade unions and Populism, and was unwilling to propose anything more radical than free trade. Nevertheless he made The Nation a dominant force in the field of literary and esthetic criticism. One of his chief successors on The Nation was the liberal Oswald Garrison Villard, whose connections began during Godkin's final years. With Villard began a reversal in social policy toward the dissidence of the Howells-London-Sinclair school.

By the 1900's the progressive movement in journalism was well under way, going by the name of "muck-raking." This represented of course the spread of the attitude of social protest from the novel. But it was also due in very large measure to the economic necessities brought by the technical advances alluded to above. When the price of Munsey's Magazine went down from twenty-five cents to ten a new market was established made up of lower income readers -- if the other magazines were to hold their ground in the race for circulation they not only had to drop their prices but also had to cater to the social outlook of the lower-income groups. It was natural therefore that enter-

prising magazine publishers like S. S. McClure, Hearst and others should eventually turn to popular articles on the abuses of corporate monopolies and urban politics. It was in this metier that Lincoln Steffens attained fame, muck-raking the rottenness of urban politics in startling articles while managing editor of McClure's -- articles that were republished as books in The Shame of the Cities (1904) and The Struggle for Self Government (1906). It is only necessary to mention in passing that the same forces were reflected in the field of newspaper writing -- where the names of Pulitzer and Hearst became synonymous with the New Journalism and the sensational press.

We turn now from the fields of science, philosophy and art to the realm of politics. The guiding light of the men who shaped nineteenth century American politics, the politics of annexation and expansion, was a unique doctrine known as Manifest Destiny. The pioneer farmers, so the argument ran, had rights to the soil that were superior to those of backward nomadic peoples; also the Anglo-Saxon benefited mankind by introducing everywhere democracy, civilization, and regeneration; besides geography determined the eventual annexation of nearby undeveloped areas by powerful states; and above all, American expansion was not selfish in a colonial sense anyway, but offered equality to all peoples under the flag. Such patriots as proclaimed the doctrine of Manifest Destiny could plainly see that their nation had a glorious mission to spread the blessings of civilization

to mankind and by 1865 they had evolved an entire library of imperialist writings.

In the 1880's and 1890's, the extreme exponents of Manifest Destiny became feverishly active. European examples in imperialism in Asia and Africa offered some inspiration. Nationalism, social Darwinism and racialism added fuel to the fire. By this time, too, imperialism was encouraged by the fact that the frontier was gone and by the alleged need of outlets for the rapidly growing cities and factories. But businessmen were still too absorbed by the highly profitable domestic market to risk capital upon uncertain overseas investments. Even by 1900, American investments abroad did not exceed a half-billion dollars; but by 1914 the total was over three and a half billion and the United States Steel Corporation alone could boast of two hundred and sixty-eight agencies in over sixty nations. At the same time, this country moved from the colonial status of a debtor nation to the world position of a major creditor.

With such exponents of "realistic" imperialism as Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan and his ardent admirers, no less personages than Theodore Roosevelt, John Hay and Henry Cabot Lodge, not to mention the outspoken Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana, leading the way, America embarked on an unmistakable policy of expansionism at the turn of the century.

The greatest example of the application of this policy was the Spanish American war.

When the Republican party returned to power in 1879 they were committed to a national platform which "had declared in favor of using influences and good offices to give peace and independence to Cuba and had taken note of the fact that Spain was unable to protect the property of lives of resident American citizens, referring to economic interests which included more than fifty million in invested capital, sixteen million dollars worth of alleged damages done to American citizens, and a trade ^{ch}reasing approximately a hundred millions annually."⁸

Through all of the difficult occurrences of 1879 and 1898 the government of Spain maintained a position which sought to avoid a war which it knew could have but one end. When the Maine was sunk the Spanish government was more than solicitous in its attempts to do the proper thing in the circumstances. In April 1898 it assured McKinley that it was ready to suspend Hostilities, call a Cuban parliament and grant a generous local autonomy, thus complying substantially with every demand that the president had made. But McKinley was beset by the war party calling for extreme measures, and the sentiment they stirred up overwhelmed him. The war's outcome was a foregone conclusion, Cuba received its independence and the United States received Porto Rico, an island in the Ladrones and authority over the Philippines pending final

settlement. As the Beards genially put it, "To suppose that the State and Navy Departments of the United States were at that point unconscious of the economic and strategic utility of the Philippines, especially in view of American operations in the Pacific for a century past, is to imagine that they were lacking in the sophistication commonly displayed by the Anglo-Saxon people on such occasions."⁹

This is not to say that the entire country had become rabid with acute imperialism. The orientation of the masses still called for discrimination and caution, but the influence of imperialism could no longer be denied.

At the opposite end of the political scale there existed a peace movement in America which was well organized as far back as the first half of the nineteenth century. The Civil War had dealt it a severe blow but it gradually recovered, and after the Civil War took on a new orientation shifting away from the vague and mystical generalities regarding the wickedness of war and embracing arbitration as a course of action. Vigorous English, French, and Scandinavian peace organizations cooperated with the revived American Peace Society in pressing for arbitration treaties, a league of nations, an international court and a reduction of armaments. These peacemakers had an influence in the successful arbitration by a Geneva Tribunal in 1872 of the Alabama claims of the United States for damages sustained during the Civil War by

reason of England's building of vessels for the Confederacy, as well as in many other cases.

Ironically, the peak of pacifist activity came during the decade before World War I. In 1910 the World Peace Foundation was established with a large endowment to spread throughout America information on international affairs. Andrew Carnegie whose steel factories produced among other things naval armour plate built the Peace Palace at the Hague and provided a ten million dollar fund in 1910 for an educational agency known as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, headed by President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia.

Active as the serious literati of the pacifist movement at this time were the Englishman Norman Angell and William James who published the famous essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War."

The United States entered World War I at the height of the peace movement and with a member of the American Peace Society in the White House. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to attempt to discuss the many factors that came into play, political, economical, even philosophical to change Wilson from the man who had little sympathy with either side, who had publicly called attention to the fact that "the objects which the statesmen of the belligerents on both sides have in mind in this war are virtually the same, as stated in general terms to their own people and to the world,"¹⁰ to the man who called for the declaration

of war against Germany in April 1917.

Once in the war, however, changes in the face of the American social pattern became apparent. The compulsions of modern war led to a regime of "war socialism." Industry was regimented under Bernard Baruch's War Industries Board. Socialization overtook the communications industry as well as the light and full industries. Labor gained measurably in status as a result of war needs, Negro migration to northern cities received new impetus giving new meaning to slum problems and urban racial tensions.

The problem of civil liberties was one of the most delicate brought out by the war. Immediately after the declaration of war, Wilson organized a committee on public information for the purpose of "selling the war to America," and in turn for deluging the world with American propaganda. Never before in history had such a thorough campaign been organized and its success in uniting a divided nation surpassed expectation. By means of such patriotic themes as Wolves of Kultur and The Beast of Berlin they were able to convince most Americans. But for those who weren't convinced the government dealt mercilessly under drastic status.

"In June 1917 Congress passed the Espionage Act, laying heavy penalties on all persons who interfered in any way with the effective mobilization of the military and naval forces of the nation. Not content with the sweeping provisions of this law, the President asked and received from Congress a still more severe measure, the Sedition Act

of May 1918, a statute which in effect made any criticism of the Wilson administration illegal. Though this measure surpassed in violence the Sedition Law of 1798, so hotly denounced by Thomas Jefferson, it was enacted without difficulty."¹¹

Naturally the great burden of work under the Espionage and Sedition Acts fell upon the Department of Justice which now became transformed into a nation-wide spy system, with thousands of employees at its service not to mention an additional force of over two hundred thousand paranoid private citizens who fancied themselves detectives and enrolled with the Justice Department in the work of watching neighbors.

Mass hysteria was beginning to catch on, Anti-German demonstrations were widespread, and even the German language and German music became the victims of discrimination in many circles.

Mass hysteria was further nourished in the popular loan drives which compelled everyone including recalcitrants to join. Every agency of social control from the church to theaters to industrial plants was mustered to add momentum to the drive. "All the vociferous advertising methods so characteristic of American business in general were mobilized to force each issue 'over the top.' Not a latent sentiment of loyalty, fear, love, or hate was left unstirred. Immense posters bearing the imprint of a bloody hand and carrying the legend, 'the Hun, his Mark. Blot it out with Liberty Bonds,' were flung^{upon} the hoardings to move one type of investor. Streamers bearing the inscrip-

tion, 'Ask his Mother How Many Bonds You Should Buy,' appealed to another class."¹²

To make matters much worse, the sudden eruption of Lenin and the Communist Revolution in Russia added the violent ingredient of a Red scare to the hysterical sentiment. As a result doctrines of repression that had been dormant since the era of the Alien and Sedition Acts in 1798 were revived on both the federal and the state levels.

Education in particular suffered because of the war. Professors were expelled from institutions of higher learning frequently on evidence that would not convict a notorious cut-purse in normal times, Columbia University leading off in this kind of purification.

"It is very difficult to discharge professors once employed," wrote A. Barton Hepburn, the banker philanthropist on its (Columbia's) board of trustees. "They make common cause and howl about academic freedom ..."¹³

Such was the temper of the land when peace came at the end of 1918.

One of the things accomplished by wartime nationalism was to cut short the progressive impulse toward social reform and send the country back in the direction of laissez-faire individualism. Now with the war over the reaction at home became even more pronounced. It was compounded of a Red Scare, (in which the middle class applied the colored brush to all organized labor agitation fearing the revolt of the working classes), chauvinism and racialism. The postwar upsurge of communism in Europe had

caused widespread reaction there within a short time of the end of the war, causing nationalists in Italy and Germany to seek anti-communists insurance by organizing fascist parties. Even England ultimately yielded to the panic and the Labour party was defeated at the end of 1924.

In America, the year 1919 opened with a bewildering outbreak of strikes which the newspapers hastily attributed to communist origin. Actually the cause for labor's unrest were far more obvious -- the results of postwar inflation which increased the cost of living at the same time that overtime pay came to an end making it hard for laborers to maintain living standards.

Frederick Lewis Allen tells us that:

"Those were the days when column after column of the front pages of the newspapers shouted the news of strikes and anti-Bolshevist riots; when radicals shot down Armistice Day paraders in the streets of Centralia, Washington, and in revenge the patriotic citizenry took out of the jail a member of the I.W.W. -- a white American, be it noted -- and lynched him by tying a rope around his neck and throwing him off a bridge; when properly elected members of the Assembly of New York State were expelled (and their constituents thereby disfranchised) simply because they had been elected as members of the venerable Socialist Party; when a jury in Indiana took two minutes to acquit a man for shooting and killing an alien because he had shouted, 'To hell with the United States'; and when the Vice-President of the nation cited as a dangerous manifestation of radicalism in the women's colleges the fact that the girl debaters of Radcliffe had upheld the affirmative in an intercollegiate debate on the subject: 'Resolved, that the recognition of labor unions by employers is essential to successful collective bargaining.' It was an era of lawless and disorderly defense of law and order, of unconstitutional

defense of the Constitution, of suspicion and civil conflict -- in a very literal sense, a reign of terror."¹⁴

Of course ...

"... there was, too, a rag-tag-and bobtail collection of communists and anarchists, many of whom ^{were} former Socialists, nearly all of them foreign-born, most of them Russian, who talked of going still further, who took their gospel direct from Moscow and, presumably with the aid of Russian funds, preached it aggressively among the slum and factory-town population.

"This latter group of communists and anarchists constituted a very narrow minority of the radical movement -- absurdly narrow when we consider all the to-do that was made about them. Late in 1919 Professor Gordon S. Watkins of the University of Illinois, writing in the Atlantic Monthly, set the membership of the Socialist party at 39,000 and of the Communist Labor party at from 10,000 to 30,000, and the Communist party at from 30,000 to 60,000. In other words, according to this estimate the Communists could muster at the most hardly more than one-tenth of one per cent of the adult population of the country; and the three parties together -- the majority of whose members were probably content to work for their ends by lawful means -- brought the proportion to hardly more than two-tenths of one per cent, a rather slender nucleus, it would seem, for a revolutionary mass movement.

"But the American business man was in no mood to consider whether it was a slender nucleus or not. He, too, had come out of the way with his fighting blood up, ready to lick the next thing that stood in his way. He wanted to get back to business and enjoy his profits. Labor stood in his way with a militant patriotism; and mingling his idealistic with his selfish motives, after the manner of all men at all times, he developed a fervent belief that 100 per cent Americanism and the Welfare of God's Own Country and Loyalty to the Teachings of the Founding Fathers implied the right of the business man to kick the union organizer out of his workshop. He had come to distrust anything and everything that was foreign, and this radicalism he saw as the spawn of long-haired slavs and unwashed East-Side Jews. And, finally, he had been nourished during the war years upon stories of spies and

plotters and international intrigue. He had been convinced that German sympathizers signaled to one another with lights from mountain-tops and put ground glass into surgical dressings, and he had formed the habit of expecting tennis courts to conceal gun-emplacements. His credulity had thus been stretched until he was quite ready to believe that a struggle of American laboring-men for better wages was the beginning of an armed rebellion directed by Lenin and Trotsky, and that behind every innocent professor who taught that there were arguments for as well as against socialism there was a bearded rascal from eastern Europe with a money bag in one hand and a smoking bomb in the other.¹⁵

This fear of course was fed just enough by occasional extreme incidents such as the postal bombs which could be attributed to radicals, to assure that no slackening in the intensity of the Red Scare would take place.

Worst of all the strikes in the critical year of 1919 was the Boston police strike. The police had a legitimate grievance -- their salary scale started at eleven hundred dollars out of which uniforms had to be bought, and the inflation made eleven hundred dollars seem very small at that. The city failed to remedy the situation and at the same time refused to allow the police to organize a union or to strike. The police felt they were left with no other alternative so they left the city without protection. When this happened public opinion turned against the striking police. Theirs became a lost cause and they were denounced from all quarters including the governor of Massachusetts, Calvin Coolidge, whose politically astute rebuke to Samuel Gompers "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime"

made him an overnight hero and paved the road to the White House in no small degree.

The public reaction to the great Steel Strike of 1919 involving several hundred thousand steel workers in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois as well as the famed Sacco-Vanzetti affair further demonstrated the extent to which the roots of the Red Scare had implanted themselves.

On the ~~obverse~~ side of the red-tinted coin was the fostering of cha^{uv}minism and intolerance. By 1920 the Klu Klux Klan had grown from a few thousand to one hundred thousand and by 1924 it had reached an estimated two and a half million members.

The "eugenics cult" an illegitimate offspring of scientific eugenics had gained momentum in the United States during the second decade of the twentieth century, preaching that brand of racialism known as Aryan superiority or Nordicism. The Frenchman Gobineau had prepared the ground for this with his "racial-determinism" interpretation of history. Super-patriotism and "America Firstism" carried the attack against Negroes, Jews, Roman Catholics and virtually all foreigners of non-Nordic descent whose numbers had been swelled by the huge immigration from East Europe at the turn of the century. The bitterly fought over Immigration Act of 1924 with its sharp non-Aryan restrictions reflected the influence of these movements on federal policy. Their influence on

the civil life of the land was no less contentious. The new urban settlement of Negroes caused a jostling with whites in residential districts, street-cars and public places and in a hundred other ways to produce a situation never before encountered on a large scale in America. Racism and the fear of Bolshevism turned this new circumstance into the basis for conflict and rioting on a violent scale.

Jews, too, fell under the suspicion of a majority bent upon an undiluted Americanism. Henry Ford disclosed the menace of the "International Jew" in the forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

"The Ford attack, absurd as it was, was merely an exaggerated manifestation of a widespread anti-Semitism ... Landlords grew less disposed to rent to Jewish tenants, and schools to admit Jewish boys and girls, ... Harvard College seriously debated limiting the number of Jewish students; and all over the country Jews felt that a barrier had fallen between them and the Gentiles."¹⁶

On his sixty-fifth birthday in August 1927 Rabbi David Philipson pessimistically stated:

"... we seem to have gone backward. The conditions are not nearly so bright today as they were when I entered professional life forty-four years ago."¹⁷

Of course Philipson saw Zionism at the root of all the Jews' troubles and it was mostly against this movement that he was inveighing. But despite his inability to see beyond his pet peeve, he was quite right in sensing that all was not well with the Jewish position in America.

in the twenties.

Jewish national defensive societies such as the American Jewish Committee (1906) and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith (1913) had their hands full, and the American Jewish Congress (the second organization of that name) was called into being in 1922 by those who felt that the situation still wasn't being ^{"correctly"} coped with.

As a consequence of the needs of the war-impo-
verished Jewry of Eastern Europe the Joint Distribution Committee was organized to provide efficient relief. Another consequence of the war had been the Balfour Declaration of 1917 by which England committed herself to a Palestinian homeland for the Jews. This alarmed the largely German Reformed movement but it gave new hope to American Zionists who despite early English and continental leadership were soon to become the most powerful segment of the world Zionist movement.

Racialism and the Red Scare did not monopolize all of the attention of Americans in the twenties. The worst of the Red Scare was over by 1921 as a matter of fact, though racialism and intolerance retained their grasp throughout most of the decade. But taking place during these same twenties was what Frederick Lewis Allen calls "the Revolution in Manners and Morals"¹⁸ especially among the younger generation. The feminine half of this generation was raising the hemline of its skirts, using cosmetics, smoking cigarettes, getting drunk and indulging

in petting. The forces of morality were outraged and Reform groups rallied to the defense of "womanly purity, the very fountainhead of family and civil life."

A number of forces were working together and interacting upon one another to make this revolution inevitable. First of all there was the wild abandon and devil-may-care attitude fostered by the exigencies of the World War, followed by post-war disillusion. There was the new independence of the American woman who had won suffrage in 1920, and who was being freed from household drudgery by new domestic inventions. And perhaps the greatest influence was Freud. Sex became the central topic for the more-or-less educated public. Almost every human motive was attributable to it and the first requirement of mental health was to have an uninhibited sex life. Interpreters and popularizers with varying degrees of guilelessness made it an assured prospect that the spread of Freudianism would not be without its harmful effects. And the effects were not long in coming. Sex and confession magazines and lurid motion pictures crowded the news stands and theaters and their influence reached a class of readers and movie-goers who had never heard and never would hear of Freud and the libido.

The automobile and prohibition also played their parts in bringing about the revolution in manners and morals. Altogether the power of these forces was irresistible.

Another result of the revolution was the growth of vulgarity and the negation of civil amenities.

"Someday," wrote F. L. Allen, "perhaps the ten years which followed the war may aptly be known as the Decade of Bad Manners."¹⁹

Immensely significant was the business expansion of the twenties. With the return to "normalcy" during the Harding administration the tide of prosperity began to gather -- even though the Big Bull market was still in the future. The war had impoverished Europe and hardly damaged the United States at all so that when peace came Americans found themselves the economic masters of the world. With enormous resources in materials and in human energy and with a wide domestic market they were ready to take advantage of the situation. They had developed mass production to a new point of efficiency, had turned high pressure advertising into a science, and besides felt that the Republican administration was their ally. Thus the imaginative and daring strides taken by American business are not surprising.

A most striking characterization of the prosperity of the decade is given in one short paragraph by F. L. Allen:

"Pick up one of those graphs with which statisticians measure the economic ups and downs of the Post-war Decade. You will find that the line of business activity rises to a jagged peak in 1920, drops precipitously into a deep valley in late 1920 and 1921, climbs uncertainly upward through 1922 to another peak at the middle of 1923, dips somewhat in 1924 (but not nearly so far as in 1921), rises again in 1925 and

1926, dips momentarily but slightly toward the end of 1927, and then zigzags up to a perfect Everest of prosperity in 1929 -- only to plunge down at last into the bottomless abyss of 1930 and 1931."²⁰

An analysis of the causes for the plunge is not within the scope of this consideration -- that can be left to a purely economic treatise on the twenties. It is relevant to our theme only to state that during these years

"The business man was, as Stuart Chase put it, 'the dictator of our destinies,' ousting 'the statesman, the priest, the philosopher, as the creator of standards of ethics and behavior' and becoming 'the final authority on the conduct of American society.'"²¹

The veneration which business received elevated it to the position of national religion. To be called a good business man was to be paid the highest compliment. Indeed it was Bruce Barton's contention that Jesus was a great executive having forged twelve unknown men into an organization that conquered the world. In fact, he was "the founder of modern business." The association of business with religion in all quarters was indeed phenomenal.

As for religion itself during this decade, although there are no specific figures on church attendance, the feeling was widespread that religion was losing ground. The spiritual loss was ascribed to many sources: the general let-down in moral energy which followed the war; the prosperity that put the automobile at the head

of the values of life; the popularity of Sunday golf; and the disapproval in some quarters of political lobby and Klan participation by some churches. None of these causes however were nearly as potent as was science in its effect upon the churches. The prestige of science during this era was immense. Men and women were ready to believe that science could accomplish almost anything and the presses were deluging them with scientific information and theory. Outlines of knowledge poured from printing houses, newspapers were devoting front pages spaces to the latest discoveries as well as feature space to popularizers such as Wiggam. Millions were being introduced to evolution for the first time now.

Anthropology helped de-glamorize religious teachings nearly as much as evolution. And reigning over all the sciences as king was psychology.

So powerful was the effect of scientific ideas that the Protestant churches of America were broken into two warring camps: Modernists vs. Fundamentalists. The Fundamentalists who began to call themselves by this name in 1921, went to the extreme right in their reaction against science declaring belief in the letter of the Bible, while the Modernists tried hard to reconcile their beliefs with scientific thought. The tide of the times seemed to be running against the Fundamentalists but they were numerous (and would continue to be so, for what they had to offer was of recurring value to great segments

of the population) and so they fought strenuously. The famous Scopes trial in Dayton, Tennessee in 1925 on the issue of teaching evolution in the schools was the most colorful manifestation of this clash. Science was focusing a strong spotlight on religion and wherever the latter was not totally blinded it was at least undergoing great discomfort in adjusting to the glare.

The Post-War reaction of the American middle class which had resulted in the Red Scare, racialism, vulgarity, and the deification of business brought about a reaction of its own, this one on the part of the intellectuals. Their full disenchantment with the Peace of Versailles was expressed in such novels as Three Soldiers by John Dos Passos and The Enormous Room by E. E. Cummings. Their disgust for the cultural poverty, the mass prejudices and the smugness of small town life as well as for the immoral standards of the "business" orientation was bitingly demonstrated by Sinclair Lewis in Main Street and Babbitt. The most energetic of the intellectuals was H. L. Mencken whose name became synonymous with "the revolt of the highbrows." Walter Lippman called him "the most powerful personal influence on this whole generation of educated people." A tremendous individualist, Mencken indulged in the narcissism and snobbism that became a trademark of the highbrows to an excessive degree, deriving great satisfaction from ridiculing the "homo boobiens" and the "mob" and citing results of the

mental tests given recruits during the war to prove the inherent inferiority of the plain people. One of the great campaigns he carried on in his American Mercury was the war against the enforcement of propriety whether by censorship or prohibition and against "Puritanism" which term for Mencken included almost all kinds of personal inhibitions. And there was never a shortage of recruits in the waging of this war. Intellectuals by the score rallied to the ranks, and other periodicals such as The Nation and the New Republic (1914) kept the cause alive as well.

While Mencken was enjoying his battle there was a considerable group of his intellectual confreres who while preoccupied with the same rejection were finding their lot a depressing one. These were the members of the group of literary expatriates, living self-exiled in Europe during the twenties to whom Gertrude Stein applied the epithet "The Lost Generation." To these men, among them Ernest Hemingway, John Dos Passos, F. Scott Fitzgerald and T. S. Eliot, disillusionment had become so intense that they felt they could no longer endure society; life had lost all purpose and direction. All the grand certainties of the optimistic liberals were gone.

"Their enthusiasm for a just social order had waned and in its place came an intense preoccupation with self rather than with the common good. Society was past redemption and no group was as important as the individual. The men of the Lost Generation, like Narcissus of the Greek legend, were absorbed in contemplating their own image."²²

But despite the futility felt by writers and artists themselves the decade which had produced such creative figures as Eugene O'Neill, John Dewey, T. S. Eliot, Theodore Dreiser and Sinclair Lewis could hardly be looked upon as a futile one.

In October and November^{of} 1929 came the crash. Business declined at an alarming pace and by 1932 the national income had fallen below that of 1912 when the population was less by thirty million people. Unemployment reached staggering proportions and communists and fascists weren't the only ones declaiming about the doom of capitalism. People began to look frantically to the Federal government for help but the Republican administration failed to produce any new or imaginative approach and so was voted out of office to make way for the New Deal.

The New Deal, although one of its effects was to elevate labor to a position of unprecedented power, was at the outset essentially concerned with getting business back on its feet. Franklin D. Roosevelt reiterated constantly that his purpose was to preserve capitalism. Business was consulted in the writing of the NRA in 1933. Dominant corporations wrote the "codes" that fixed prices intended to stabilize business. In effect, immunity from anti-trust laws was conferred upon these firms. But as the NRA turned out, the unions were the ones that profited from the key Section 7A effectively guaranteeing collective bargaining free from employer intimidation.

Thereafter the power of labor swelled to such proportions that employers found little that was good in the New Deal.

The depression and the New Deal philosophy of social planning eventually focused great interest on the consumer rather than upon the competitive businessman. There came a demand for more consumer protection through legislation. The federal government issued a Consumer's Guide and private groups published Consumer's Research and Consumer's Union pamphlets. Economists gave college courses on consumer education while women's clubs sponsored lectures on the subject.

Meanwhile American domestic life was suffering the greatest shock in its history. Divorce, desertion, a general breakdown of morals, suicide, child labor -- all increased and Federal Aid was only partially able to combat the situation. The school was an easy victim of the depression. Teachers had to be discharged, classrooms were overcrowded and terms shortened. Federal aid was applied but the census of 1940 showed that ten million adults had so little education as to be practically illiterate and that three million children were still not attending school at all.

During the early years of the depression, newspaper subscriptions dropped sharply. Newspaper bankruptcies brought about a period of mergers and consolidation with the result that a single holding company dominated by bankers might own competing papers in the same city. The

great newspapers that survived the depression became ever more conservative in outlook reflecting the financial pressures that bore upon them. The overwhelming majority of American newspapers were anti-New Deal throughout all of Franklin Roosevelt's incumbency.

The radio which, more than any other new development with the exception of the automobile had revolutionized the mores of twenties, was a common commodity by the mid-thirties. And it too showed a good deal of conservatism ~~but~~ due to its advertising sponsorship and corporate ownership.

The depression drove away about a third of the usual motion picture audiences. Hollywood was forced to fight for its life on the foreign market as well as the domestic. To avoid giving offense the industry did away with the social message for all intents and purposes and concentrated on lust, violence and penthouses. This raised a storm of protest in certain quarters giving rise to such organizations as the Catholic Legion of Decency. Hollywood fearfully hastened to correct matters, setting up its own internal censorship office. By the end of the thirties prosperity was returning to Hollywood. Though the industry was basically conservative in Social outlook, its leaders appeared far more friendly to the New Deal than did the press and the radio and it was possible to produce an occasional picture of social protest such as John Steinbeck's The Grapes of Wrath.

The theater suffered severely during the early years of depression but it too began to recover by the end of the decade. Quite unlike the theater of the 1920's, the Broadway of this decade seemed more willing to experiment with themes of social protest, anti-fascism, and controversial philosophic ideas. Among the leftist themes were those of Clifford Odets' early plays, especially Waiting for Lefty and Awake and Sing.

A heightened social consciousness began to take hold among writers of the first rank under the pressure of social crisis. The leading critical magazines, such as The Nation and the New Republic, turned from their Puritan-baiting to themes of social significance. For the roar of communist and fascist propaganda (wishfully) blaring the swan song of democracy had risen to maddening proportions during the depression years. Some reaction had to result. The Marxist line, particularly the economic interpretation of society, seemed convincing during the early thirties to a great number of the intellectuals -- even to Hemingway and Dos Passos, and, to some extent to James T. Farrell and John Steinbeck. In Hemingway and Dos Passos especially this marked a sharp reversal of form -- they had been among the most socially disinterested members of the Lost Generation.

It has often been asserted that Hitler did as much to snap the country out of the depression as did the New Deal. Whether this be true or not, it is quite

apparent that he did play a primary role in snapping Americans out of the modes of thinking engendered by the crash and the early years of depression. At the height of the New Deal era of social experimentation for instance, philosophy seemed more tightly bound by the teachings of pragmatism, than in the days of William James. Fascism was itself however an extreme variety of pragmatism and so the ideological opposition which sprung up against fascism also led to a certain amount of revulsion against pragmatism. The lessons of Hitlerism were causing men to re-examine their views in a new perspective and to search for more enduring certainties than the relativistic formulations of pragmatism. Thus a "neo-orthodoxy" gained ground among American Protestants. Reinhold Niebuhr, a former liberal theologian, was the most important convert to this religious view.

"He was no longer optimistic regarding the lasting results of social panaceas. Man was driven to sin by his sense of psychological insecurity derived from a feeling of his consequence in an infinite world. Against this powerful sinful drive, man must struggle all his life by putting his faith in God. Thus the theological pendulum was swinging back to traditionalism if not exactly to original sin in its literal meaning."²³

The Second World War was the climax to all that diplomacy, depression and Adolf Hitler had wrought. It ended in the defeat of the latter, the establishment of the United Nations and the emergence of the United States and the U.S.S.R. as the leading and contending powers of

the world. The result has been the "Cold War" with a recurrence of the cyclical Red Scare going this time by the name of "McCarthyism" after Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin.

The statement that history repeats itself is a commonplace and not unqualifiedly true, but the patterns in post-World War II America, shuddering under the shadow of atomic warfare, had uncomfortably familiar outlines.

CHAPTER II

Horace Meyer Kallen

In the absence of any biographical work on Kallen we must rely entirely on the sequence of his writing, to gain insight into his growth as a thinker. A few facts from Who's Who in America, volume 25 must suffice to establish his background.

Kallen was born in Silesia, Germany in 1882 and was brought to America at the age of five. He had a long student career both in America and abroad culminating with a Ph.D. from Harvard in 1908. He immediately entered the field of education, which field he has never forsaken, as assistant and lecturer in philosophy at Harvard, where he stayed three years. He held a simultaneous teaching position at G. Stanley Hall's Clark College in Worcester, Massachusetts in the year after Freud's visit, in 1910. Subsequently he lectured in the philosophy and psychology departments at the University of Wisconsin 1911-1918 and from here came to the New School for Social Research in New York with which institution he has been associated ever since.

Throughout his teaching career he has been a writer of amazing productivity both of books and of periodical contributions. It is to the area of his writing that we now turn.

It is best for our purpose to divide Kallen's work into two sections and to consider them one at a time. First his writing in non-Jewish realms and then his grappling with Jewish issues. While this method is chosen for purposes of methodological convenience it must be remembered that this does not mean that Kallen had two separate phases. On the contrary he wrote in both realms simultaneously and his thinking is of one piece as he applies himself to both types of writing.

Kallen's indebtedness to William James is the first fact that strikes one upon examining the record of his writings. A most talented disciple of James, Kallen was chosen by the master to finish the writing of some of his own uncompleted works. Kallen's earliest writings from 1908 when he received his Ph.D. through 1914 are overwhelmingly devoted to purely philosophical problems centering around pragmatism.

It is noteworthy that the only exceptions to this rule are a few articles on Hebrew themes -- virtually nothing on politics, world affairs or the practical life.

By 1915, stirred by the European War, his attention had begun to shift from the academic to the field of practical affairs. He became a consistent contributor to The Nation magazine and wrote a series of two very important articles entitled Democracy Versus the Melting Pot²⁴ in which he sets forth the doctrine which is to characterize so much of his subsequent thinking. That is the

doctrine of "cultural pluralism." These articles were evoked by the challenge presented by the "America Firsters" of the day: The Daughters of the American Revolution, The National Security League and others, in their highly nationalistic and racist dogmas. For Americans who adhere to such groups Kallen has nothing but eloquent contempt. The only true democracy is one in which men are free to be themselves -- where assimilation is not forced on them. "Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, in order to cease being Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, would have to cease to be, while they could cease to be citizens, or church members or carpenters or lawyers without ceasing to be, the selfhood which is inalienable in them, and for the realization of which they require 'inalienable' liberty is ancestrally determined, and the happiness which they pursue has its form implied in ancestral endowment. This is what actually democracy in operation assumes." Thus for American civilization Kallen envisions that

"The common language of the commonwealth .. would be English, but each nationality would have for its emotional and involuntary life its own peculiar dialect or speech, its own individual and inevitable esthetic and intellectual forms. The political unit and economic life of the commonwealth is a single unit and serves as the foundation and background for the realization of the distinctive individuality of each nation that composes it and of the pooling of these in a harmony above them all. Thus, "American civilization" may come to mean the perfection of the cooperative harmonies of "European civilization" -- the waste, the squalor and the distress of Europe being eliminated --

a multiplicity in a unity, an orchestration of mankind. As in an orchestra every type of instrument has its specific timbre and tonality, founded in its substance and form; as every type has its appropriate theme and melody in the whole symphony, so in society, each ethnic group may be the natural instrument, its temper and culture may be its theme and melody and the harmony and dissonances and discords of them all may make the symphony of civilization. With this difference: a musical symphony is written before it is played; in the symphony of civilization the playing is the writing, so that there is nothing so fixed and inevitable about its progressions as in music, so that within the limits set by nature and luck they may vary at will, and the range and variety of the harmonies may become wider and richer and more beautiful -- or the reverse."²⁵

The doctrine of cultural pluralism is typical of virtually all the liberal intellectuals during the period especially of The Nation "school" in the fight they waged against the Americanization hysteria.

The apt figure of the symphonic orchestration is a recurring one in Kallen's writing and is typical of his most impassioned moments.

During the first World War Kallen considered himself a pacifist, though it must be noted his pacifism was of an unusual variety. He endorsed an organization called the "League to Enforce Peace". The program of this organization as he outlined it²⁶ deplored the methods of organized or rather "disorganized" pacifism which attack symptoms and not causes. It called on pacifists to let the war be finished so that secure peace could be won and to support conscription -- conscription through for non-military

purposes -- for all the indispensable activities of human life such as farming, mining, etc. It advocated a court of justice with adequate police powers above the state. For, as Kallen states, human nature contains impulses that should naturally end in war if not for police. He continues on the subject by urging that the selfishness of dynasties, the illusions of sects, (he means religious sects) and the greed of capitalism must be curbed and the democratization of industry must be sought. Here, it is apparent, is ^aKallen, basically the idealist, believing in peace, hoping for the reforms which may bring about lasting peace, yet caught up in conflict with his pragmatist convictions to a degree where he must disavow traditional pacifist activities; ^{a Kallen} forced to face what he considers the realities of human nature to the extent that he must advocate police force in maintaining the peace. This conflict is not surprising Pragmatism and Pacifism were both at the height of their power in America at the same time during the first decades of the twentieth century -- no less a person than the leading Pragmatist, James himself, had contributed "The Moral Equivalent of War" to the Pacifist movement.

The problem of peace occupied Kallen's energies in a series of ten articles published serially in The Dial from October 1917 through February 1918. Here he expounded on a favorite concept -- the meaning of nationality.

Nationality as Mazzini conceived it in the nineteenth century, as the free right of national groups to express themselves is a beneficent ideal. It is only when nationality is coupled with the idea of "exclusive sovereignty" that it gets the world into trouble. This idea of beneficent nationality is used time and again by Kallen as the main justification for the Zionist movement. In this series of articles his point was that in the Germany of World War I, we had a "misapplication" of nationality. He was extremely harsh on Germany and its ruling classes, justifying the payment of reparations and indemnities by that country. He admitted that the secret treaties brought to light by the Russians after Brest-Litovsk showed the allies to be as imperialistic as the Germans, still he seemed to prefer to overlook this evidence, and maintained an unyieldingly harsh attitude toward the Germans. He had great faith in the ability of the League of Nations to work. He felt, optimistically, that all problems could be solved by molding public opinion, by enlightening people so that they might have their will expressed by their statesmen, and that all that was needed to assure success was coercive police power. This coercive police power he admitted would have to be set by law but he made no mention of who might make the law.

He recognized that there was an economic aspect to the problem of peace but felt that these problems could

be coped with by simply doing away with protective barriers to trade -- other than this he advocated no economic changes. In recognizing that protective barriers do breed war he does not realize that free laissez faire competition for materials on the world markets, constitutes no freedom at all for smaller powers. Commerce between the allies during the war was an example of free trade according to Kallen -- it's only a shame it took a war to force us to it; if we could do it in peace, how wonderful it would be! He was apparently unable to realize that only war with its great consumption of materials can permit this free trade among capitalist economies. It would be impossible in peace time without some sort of planning which would smack of socialism. ?

There is no question about his attempt to be pragmatic in this series, to treat the many practical problems realistically, at which task he succeeds much of the time. His short sightedness in a few particulars is not due to any flaw in the methodology of pragmatism but perhaps due to the fact that within Kallen pragmatism was too much in contact with patriotism and optimistic idealism.

In other articles of the war period Kallen dealt with the "Psychology of War"²⁷ in which he displays the analytic abilities which are later to give him a brilliant reputation and establish him as a leader in the ranks of

American psychologists. He differentiated between the "war-mind" and the "conflict-mind" which is the normal social expression of the combative instinct of man. The "war-mind" is limited to a small class who have the power to compel other men to carry out their purposes. Since war is not the inevitable expression of human nature, like for example mating or food getting, either the destruction of this class or the destruction of their power will be sufficient to prevent war. The combative appetites of the masses of men are sufficiently satisfied in the normal conflicts of daily life. Again we find a noticeable lack of realism but it is nonetheless a significant article in that it is one of his first public ventures into the realm of psychology.

Another article at this time dealt very warmly and sympathetically with the problems of labor,²⁸ calling on capital to offer labor better conditions. "Labor must not be looked upon as a commodity," he wrote, "but as human beings. Thus there must be a minimum wage independent of the law of supply and demand." He also called for labor to share in profits and for compulsory education for laborers under twenty-five. Kallen maintained his friendly attitude toward labor throughout all the time when the labor movement was not a popular cause in America as did so many of the liberals associated with the critical magazines of the time.

With the war over and the even greater spread of the eugenics cults Kallen once again leapt to the attack on racialism. In an article in The Dial of January 11, 1919, he bitterly scored the theory of "Aryan superiority," calling it "the logic of passion (not anthropological and archaeological fact) which the professional patriots and the protagonists of American Junkerism have standardized for the American reading public."

At the height of the eugenics cult movement in 1924, Kallen issued in book form a collection of essays, which had previously appeared separately in periodicals under the title Culture and Democracy in the United States, in which he attempts to muster all his arguments comprehensively against these cults of "Know-Nothingism". His thesis is again "cultural pluralism" -- one of the articles reprinted is "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot" to which allusion ^{reference} has already been made. He continued to make good use of the psychological technique in analyzing the mania for "Americanization." He takes time to snipe at Mencken for his reactionary aristocratic ideas on American values (the American Mercury had just reached the public at the end of 1923) and in a vitriolic post-script makes the Ku Klux Klan the object of his spleen.

During the early twenties humanism was having one of its cyclical revivals in the United States. Kallen declared himself to be all for true humanism but had little patience with the academic, unproductive sort of humanism

being preached by conservative thinkers like Paul Elmer More. Kallen instead described a valid new humanism, the ground or potential for which exists in industry,²⁹ -- that potential is science. In the domain of science all items of experience, regardless of their status in the other institutions of society, receive equal regard, equal recognition of their integrity. If people could but look upon the positive side of industry not just the negative ... "could they without distorting accept its promptings toward associative form and personal integrity, substituting intelligent self direction for passional response -- the humanization of industry would be more like a free adjustment and a happy growth than a foolish struggle and a deformed urge toward the boundless air and the sun."

At this stage it seems clear that Kallen is impressed by the achievements and potentialities of American industry as are most Americans, it may be significant that the date of this writing is the beginning of 1923. The year 1921 was one of dismal depression -- hopeful improvement had taken place in 1922 and by 1923 a rushing revival had begun to take place. It looked indeed as though industry bore the potential for a better life. Kallen admitted that "excrecences occur in times of readjustment such as these" but these excrecences are not to becloud the good that lies in industry. He was a bit behind Sinclair Lewis but within a relatively short time Kallen was to become as harsh a critic of the indus-

trial and business mentality as any of the liberal intellectuals.

Like Dewey, Kallen applied himself diligently to the problem of education in America, as both critic and philosopher. Criticizing the American public school³⁰ he wrote, "the effect of the social economy on education has been to impose upon its products reverence for the past and idealization of the present. It envisions the future as a perpetuation of the past, not as a new creation out of it. It is Main Street's most powerful instrument of self-reproduction without variation." Here he has already taken up the Lewis line, lashing industry as well as another particularly favorite hatred of his, the church (which is a popular target for intellectuals at this time) for their influence on education. Kallen's aversion to religion dates back to his earliest writing and is consistently maintained up to the present time.

He reached the apex of his anti-religiousness in the elaborate and psychologically pretentious work Why Religion published in 1927 when the scientific attack on religion was at its height.

His indebtedness to James and his relationship to Dewey was more strongly established than ever by this volume. He expands the Jamesian idea that religious belief emerges and becomes important in times of personal and social crisis leading to the reformation of old cults, and the beginnings of new ones, and shares the Deweyan

differentiation between religions and the religious aspect of experience.

He exposed the making of the gods in terms of the Oedipus complex, fear of paternal authority, and other psychological phenomena.

He pointed out ably the interesting relationship between property and church doctrine throughout history and excoriated religion for its role as a vested interest standing in the way of progress.

The same burden was taken up again four years later in a Haldeman-Julius "Little Blue Book" entitled "The Warfare of Religion Against Science," and it continued to occupy Kallen's attention as late as 1941,³¹ especially with reference to the famed Bertrand Russell case where the latter was prevented from succeeding to Morris Raphael Cohen's seat at C.C.N.Y. due in large measure to Clerical protest to Russell's views.

Kallen while not himself an expatriate, was certainly in sympathy with them and was Europe-minded. He made a trip to that continent during the twenties and visited at length in Italy and Russia. In this decade Kallen was infected with premature enthusiasm for the accomplishments of the Soviet Union. He recognized that the Soviet state is a dictatorship but he apparently regarded it as necessary and benevolent in raising the standards of the country. Writing in the New Republic on November 2, 1927, he observed that the communists permitted full freedom of

religious expression since they realized that the people are naive and their folkways would be hard to change abruptly. What they have done is to set communism itself up as a new religion with confidence that if left alone the people would eventually change to it exclusively on its own merits. "Not since Christianity became the official faith of the western world has such a liberal attitude toward rivals gone with such a firmness of belief in the infallibility and salvational power of the faith. Russia for the first time in her history is enjoying the rare modern privilege of religious tolerance. Her hundreds of sects are professing their faiths and practicing their ceremonies free and unafraid at last."

Pretty much the same evaluation of Russian communism was set forth in an article a year later,³² when he compared the two dictatorships - ^{1st} Russia and ^{2nd} Italy. He drew the following great contrast between the two. In the Italian dictatorship individuality, and thus art is stifled, in Russia, however, "the individual is far freer in his person~~ne~~ and in his thoughts than ever before in his country's history. Therefore the form of government can neither hinder nor accelerate the attainment of excellence in art. The will of a government can do either, or it can cut it off ... Not dictatorship, not democracy, but the intent of dictatorship or democracy is what determines the event. Communism and Fascism tell the tale."

Kallen's warmth for communism at this time

follows the pattern of the larger segment of honest American intellectuals, who, disillusioned with what the war had wrought among the capitalistic countries and impressed with the seemingly proletarian-oriented forms of the Bolshevik regime, began a flirtation with communism whose lastingness varied, but for the most part was over by the mid-thirties, certainly by the time of the Moscow trials of 1936 and 1937, as was the case with Kallen.

In 1930 Kallen published a book of purely critical essays, Indecency and the Seven Arts in which he showed himself quite capable of "out-Menckening" Mencken. Unlike Mencken however, Kallen picks on his equals as the objects of his sarcasm (one not infrequent object is Mencken himself) rather than on the mob. The book is intended to apply the principles of pragmatism to the field of esthetics. Starting with the premise that life is all change and flux, that nothing is permanent, thus there are no absolute values only relative, empirical ones, he proceeds to evaluate the field of criticism and censorship (the latter is becoming quite an issue at this time especially in Hollywood). the arts with relation to society, the place of style in art and the nature of comedy and tragedy. This relatively little known volume is deserving of an important place in American critical literature.

Kallen's major concerns starting in the thirties were the problems of "individualism" and consumer protection. These problems it is clear were brought into focus

by the great depression and the war.

Writing in the Christian Century in 1933³³ Kallen traced the rise and fall of individualism. As the commoners, i.e. the producing class, gained wealth by lending the fruits of their produce to the non-productive upper classes in Feudal times they were able to get rights for themselves. The result of this development is individualism or laissez-faire which in itself would constitute a good if it were self-conscious and cooperative. But this individualism which expanded business, resulted in selfish corporations which now in their turn oppress the individual. The individual is again dissatisfied and withdraws his consent from our institutions and joins socialist forces and the like, which ~~also~~ deny individualism and thus cannot be the answer to the problem. Kallen foresaw as at least a partial answer, the inevitable "Democratization" of the economy of industry just as the economy of agriculture was democratized in the French Revolution. This prediction has of course been totally unfilled so far, and it seems likely to continue unfulfilled, the aims of privately owned industry being what they are and the material substratum on which said industry rests remaining relatively undamaged.

The following year, 1934, Kallen began a series of articles in the Christian Century³⁴ on Consumer Cooperation which system became his pet economic theory, forming the subject for many subsequent writings including a

style

lengthy book on the subject published in 1936.³⁵ Kallen advocated the extension of the experiment in consumer cooperation successfully carried out by the Rockdale Society of Equitable Pioneers in England in 1844 to apply to all of international economy. This is the way to overcome both Communism and Fascism and maintain democracy according to Kallen. It is not illogical that Kallen should come to such an economic conviction at just this time ~~when~~ Both Fascism and Communism have come into disrepute among the keen intellectuals, yet capitalism is anything but dear to them in this time of depression and as was pointed out in the first chapter a great deal of popular attention was being focused on consumer protection after the disastrous years of "let the buyer beware." The ramifications of such a system are spelled out in detail by the enthusiastic advocate and they are admirable indeed but the hope for widespread adoption of this idea is also quite unrealistic given the present structure of industry.

Hitler^{va} Germany did not leave Kallen unaffected. He had of course been an articulate anti-fascist in the twenties and his intellectual hatred was heightened with respect to Nazism by the magnitude of the crime. It must be said however that here too Kallen was unable to bring himself to a realistic understanding of the political and economic bases for Nazism. He, (and he was not alone among the intellectuals) preferred psychological and

cultural explanations of Nazism -- explanations which were not without keenness and truth, but which didn't get down to the essentials. In one article ³⁶ as late as 1943, he still felt that there was a surviving culture of the people which was free of Hitlerism and could overcome it and rehabilitate the land when the time came. He refused to believe that there could be a time of shock and crisis when Hitler might be truly expressing the culture of the German people. It should be said in this connection, that by this time a noticeable and repeated lack of realism seems to characterize Kallen, but only in his approach to problems requiring a political or economic approach. Where a psychological sociological or philosophical approach is called for, his powers are quite unsurpassed.

This should have been elaborated.

Since the second war Kallen's secular attention has been devoted to such favorite causes as the separation of church and state, the labor movement and the support of UNESCO projects.

Turning now to Kallen's Jewish centered writings we find, not unexpectedly, that in his earliest efforts he tries to interpret Hebraism in the light of pragmatism. In an essay written in 1909³⁷ and titled "Hebraism and Current Tendencies in Philosophy" he states that all philosophy (including the Jewish philosophers from Philo to Mendelssohn) has been Hellenistic rather than Hebraic. Hellenism is concerned with order, structure, with perfection, the model is Plato's Republic. Hebraism is con-

cerned with making the best of a bad job -- the model is Job (who is Kallen's favorite Hebrew personality) -- "I know that he will slay me; nevertheless will I maintain my ways before him." The aim here being righteousness rather than perfection.

It is a less civilized, less intellectually efficacious approach. And so Jewish philosophers later accepted the Hellenic standards and attempted to harmonize revelation with it. So it was, till the middle of the nineteenth century and Darwin. Now growing out of Darwinism came William James and Henri Bergson with pragmatism, which says "A thing is what it does" -- an idea is true if it has survival value in the flux. The world is all flux and conflict, but not eternally so -- man's genuinely free and can change his world. Here is the modern way of saying: "I know that he will slay me, nevertheless will I maintain my ways before him." The very act of maintaining one's ways may render the slaying impossible. Faith and works even of so small an item as man may be pregnant with tremendous human and even cosmic consequences. Thus a new vista in philosophy is potentially opened up in which Hebraism can come to the fore and no longer be subordinated to Hellenism.

The use of the term "Hebraism" is most significant; the contrast between Judaism (of which he does ^{not} approve) and Hebraism (of which he does) is one of Kallen's most

constant refrains. To him:

"Hebraism is the vast culture which Jews have contributed to the world -- not merely the religion but wisdom and the arts. Hebraism is not Judaism, and to be a lover of Hebraism is more than to be a Judist ... Hebraism is the whole life of the Jews. Judaism is only that aspect which comprises the sentiments, theories, doctrines and practices which relate to God ... Judaism as a sect must pass. As a life it will endure."³⁸

This distinction flows naturally given Kallen's pragmatism and passionate anti-religionism which sees all sects as materialistic and evil. For some reason however he is not able to apply his abhorrence of religion to Judaism with the same methodical ruthlessness as he ^{does} ~~is~~ to Christianity. He salvages "Hebraism" which according to his description is pragmatically acceptable. Yet we often find Kallen himself unwittingly admitting that what he would call Hebraistic culture and Judaism are quite inseparable. For instance, he writes concerning the orthodox Jew (and what other kind was there throughout most of the time that Kallen's Hebraism was laying down the great patterns of its culture):

"All his enterprises, all his businesses, all his pleasures, in all their minutiae, are attached to divinity ... religiously regulated "³⁹

In view of such a statement Kallen's differentiation seems arbitrary and inconsistent. But be that as it may, Kallen conceives as Hebraism as one of the many items which must be orchestrated into our culturally pluralistic democracy and identifies himself with it. To forsake

being a Jew would be to forsake the democratic principle and would mean self destruction. For:

" ... you cannot cease to be a Jew without ceasing to be. The Jewish group is the natural group to which you belong, ... a natural group is one which cannot be destroyed without destroying the individuals that belong to it ... The fact of being a Jew may be repressed, if it is, it becomes your nemesis, for it is the root of your nature and character ..."⁴⁰

The theme that Judaism as a sect must pass is part of Kallen's oft-repeated prophecy that all religions will pass -- an idea which as has been pointed out he shares with John Dewey and which is notable for its lack of fulfillment. In the article entitled, "Judaism by Proxy" (1916)⁴¹ he reiterates, "In merely its religious aspects, the future of the Jewish spirit in this country and anywhere in the western world strikes me as being very dark. Nor the future of Judaism merely; the future of all religions. On the whole, supernaturalism cannot maintain itself against a practical intelligence ... "

The fallacy in the reasoning of such men as Kallen and Dewey is not to be found in their concept of religion. They understand quite correctly, with James, the resurgent power of religion in time of crisis. It is rather to be found in their concept of ~~history~~ history. In their unshakable optimism they regard history as a cumulative growth, when actually it is a pattern characterized by periods of growth and decline. Growth may seem inevitable and

cumulative under the aspect of eternity but eternity always remains a long way off, and in the lives of men futility and regression loom as large as progress. Insofar as history is the story of progress, it depicts progress in constant struggle with darkness, winning the day only to be set back and forced to start the struggle again. Given the growth and decline pattern of history, supernaturalism will ever maintain itself. For as Kallen would be quick to agree, when decline sets in, men become insecure and the deepening of insecurity leads to the regrowth of religion. ~~for~~ In critical times the need for a stabilizing, unchanging force around which man's failing spirits can rally is greatest, that force, of course, is the church. This has been more pathetically true than ever in the twentieth century when to so many it has seemed that science, the very agent which was to bring peace is now inextricably bound up with the chaos of the age. It is to a great extent the explanation for the strength of neo-orthodoxy among the Protestants today.

Also responsible for the endurance of religious institutions is their great adaptability. Today churches have incorporated into their catalogues the very scientific ideas against which they once led the fight. Churches have had the sense to realize when they were fighting a losing battle and have learned the art of graceful compromise. Parochial schools adopting the latest of scientific and psychological techniques are a common sight

today indicating the ability of religions to perpetuate themselves.

While he has no great love for any strictly religious interpretation of Judaism, he reserves his choicest barbs for Reform Judaism. The only worthwhile thing Reform has achieved is the enfranchisement of women; other than this Reform has succeeded only in making of Judaism a dogma and taking it out of the lives of Jews. Calling it "Judaism by Proxy"⁴² Kallen compares the Reform rabbinate to the Roman Catholic clergy in that it does all the work and the laymen do nothing also in that the Reform rabbinate is ascribed some degree of infallibility as is the Roman Catholic clergy though in the former it is more anarchic. He has only contempt for the doctrines which Reform has adopted such as "Universal Judaism" and the "mission of Israel" which he considers to be paradoxical, imperialistic and indicative of sickness and fearfulness. He accuses Reform of the intention to become assimilated to western culture rather than assimilating that culture to itself.⁴³ The latter could not take place in western Europe, that is in Germany, because the Jews were too few in number, thus the Jews here tried to be like the Gentiles. In Eastern Europe however, since there were so many Jews it was possible for the Jewish community as a whole to assimilate the new learning and make it a part of its own mind. In Germany, the Jews were minorities of inferior culture amid majorities of superior

culture. In the east they were culturally superior to their neighbors and numerically self-sufficient. Thus the Haskalah took place, slowly and steadily absorbing the historic culture of Western Europe until it becomes quite Jewish. The Eastern European Jewish community did not lose its community character, did not disintegrate. Haskalah is the true reform, the actual reform of Jewish life in Eastern Europe. ¶ This analysis reflects a total misunderstanding of the Haskalah movement. The Haskalah is not to be compared with the German Reform movement at all. The latter took place only after many decades of assimilation and contact with Western culture. The Haskalah movement is comparable rather to the early Mendelssohnian developments in Germany. Reform grew out of these developments years later because the Jews of Germany were able to obtain emancipation. Had emancipation followed in the path of the Haskalah movement it is likely that the same type of reform would have ensued in Eastern Europe as did in Germany. But the Eastern Jews were thwarted in their emancipations by the reactionary laws of the 1880's and so they became Zionists. ¶ As for inferiority or superiority of culture, it is quite meaningless to compare the 'maskilim' to the masses of Russia and Poland. Of course they were superior to the masses. So was Mendelssohn superior to the German masses. No, the test comes in comparing the 'maskilim' to the *Gentile intelligentsia* of Russia and Poland. How do they measure

up to Tolstoi and Turgenev? And here we find that there is a definite basis of comparison, the criteria of which have nothing to do with Jewishness, but rather with pure intelligence applied to the ideas current, for one reason or another, at the time -- just as there is a valid comparison between a Mendelssohn and a Kant. This argument concerning the superiority of Jewish culture to the masses in the East is further unsound in explaining the Haskalah when we consider the fact that the early Maskilim rejected and even made fun of Rabbinic culture in their writings -- there was nothing Jewish about this phase of Haskalah at all. It was only after the reactionary developments of the 1880's that a disillusioned Mendele Mocher Seforim disclaimed this phase and embraced Rabbinic culture once again.

(Kallen's)

His misunderstanding of the Haskalah movement is only incidental however. The important point lies in the fact that he feels moved to defend the culture of East European Jewry time and again. This fact is significant in the struggles which ensued in the twenties and thirties between the advocates of the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee. For Kallen, German born himself, aligned himself early with the Zionistic East European forces which advocated the Congress movement.

The Committee was organized in 1906, the first of the modern American Jewish defense organizations, by and for the upper middle class German Jews of America, with

emphasis on America -- they were interested in Jewish welfare and defense in this country, and unchallenged for many years they achieved a monopoly of funds for philanthropy and defense which they guarded zealously. The Congress movement was designed and fashioned as an instrument for propagating Zionist ideology among American Jews and was composed primarily of East European Jews who were now beginning to come of age in America. The Committee opposed this movement in order to protect its heavy investment in the "status quo" structuralization of American Jewish life.

Kallen was one of the most articulate voices speaking in behalf of Zionism and the Congress movement as early as 1915. One of the criticisms of Reform Judaism that he constantly harps on is the fact that its ranks are composed predominantly of "prosperous Jews of west European Origin" who of course are also anti-Zionist (and presumably pro-Committee). He speaks of the conflict between the Congress and the Committee as being similar to that which took place between the prophets of old and the entrenched priesthood. The committee may have gotten into power by virtue of service but now it seeks to maintain it just for the sake of power. The Congress according to Kallen is dedicated to democratic leadership and expresses the will of the people whereas the Committee opposes it. Kallen is

one of many calling for unity under the Congress's platform. This agitation is carried on well into the thirties. In 1935 in the pages of the Congress Bulletin⁴⁴ it flares up at its most violent when Kallen in response to Joseph M. Proskauer's label of "un-American" with reference to the plan for holding a World Jewish Congress he writes: Such attacks constitute: "..... an old, familiar, custom of special interests, such as munitions makers, power magnets, and money changers to raise a smoke screen of patriotism to distract attention from their own activities." He attacks Proskauer viciously as the speaker for vested interests of Jewish financiers, industrialists and corporations lawyers who make up the "conservative group" of Jews.

We have already mentioned in passing that Kallen was articulate in the Zionist cause. We must now examine ~~to~~ his immense Zionist output in some detail. Most notable is his imposing volume Zionism and World Politics⁴⁵ in which he traces the complete history of the movement and closes with a program of action.

Kallen's Zionism, too, flows from his concept of democracy and cultural pluralism. Zionism's aim is the preservation of Hebraic culture as ^a worthwhile item in the democratic symphony of national cultures.

"Historically the basis of culture has always been ethnic and geographically political. Judaism was always thus even in the diaspora until up to within a century ago and that's why it was always worth preserving. It can only remain worth preserving if it returns to an organic

social life rooted in ethnic solidarity and geographical concentration. This is possible only in Palestine ...⁴⁶

Zionism is true democracy in that it is anti-assimilationist, tries to preserve ^{the} distinctive integrity of Jews, in opposition to totalitarianism which attempts to force assimilation and sameness on people. The right of the individual to be free and different can only be grounded in that of his group or nationality to be free and autonomous, and Zionism works for the autonomy of the Jewish group. It does not believe that the Jewish group is superior, only that it must be free.

Kallen sees many problems facing the Jews in Palestine and attempts to provide ^{pragmatic} guidance in meeting them. Among these problems is the imperialism of France (not Britain). Another is Arab-Jewish relations and Kallen calls for these relations to be friendly and close. Jewish facilities must be opened to the Arabs to raise their standard of living for the sake of the entire land. Kallen calls for the nationalization of property and utilities. There must be no private ownership -- we cannot afford to have a class struggle in Palestine. To implement nationalization successfully the cooperative principle should be applied in the organization of all economic undertakings, and he gives specific plans for its application. All in all, these principles are embodied in the Pittsburgh Program adopted by the ZOA in 1918.

He goes into great detail in attempting to supply

specific, pragmatic suggestions for coping with the physical problems of the land. In this he shows an unmistakable knowledge. But Kallen is destined to undergo gradual and painful disillusionment as he watches the Jewish situation in Palestine and this is due to an inability to grasp the motivations shaping British policy in Palestine.

As late as 1943⁴⁷ Kallen still refused to be disillusioned with what he called the "liberal" factions of England. It is only the evil colonialist conservatives who are obstructing the carrying out of the Balfour Declaration and responsible for all the trouble in Palestine according to Kallen. Jews must take their case to the Labor Party and the virtuous conservatives like Churchill.

Of course Churchill was in power through the war and did nothing and lest it be argued that this was due to the conservative make-up of Parliament, surely there might have been enough "virtuous conservatives" to form a coalition with Laborites and create a majority. And even if this not be the case, the Labor party itself gained power in 1946 and it too did absolutely nothing.

As for the virtuous Mr. Churchill, perhaps the following excerpt from an article in The New York Times of as recent date as December 4, 1952, concerning an attack made by Churchill on the Jewish Laborite Emanuel Shinwell in an unguarded moment is not entirely without significance:

CHURCHILL STIRS ROW BY GIBE AT SHINWELL

by Raymond Daniel

London, December 3 -- An exasperated and tired House of Commons that had been up half the night went into a series of verbal explosions today after Prime Minister Churchill had impugned the patriotism of Emanuel Shinwell, a former Labor Defense Minister, in terms that unintentionally smacked of East European totalitarian phraseology.

The Prime Minister refused to apologize to Mr. Shinwell because, he said, his implication of a lack of patriotism might have been even more unparliamentary than the original charge, and he used the words "cosmopolitanism" and "internationalism" in reference to Mr. Shinwell. Immediately thereafter he looked as if he could have bitten off his tongue.

These are the words that Hitler used. They are the terms of approbrium now being used by prosecutors in the Communist satellite countries against so-called enemies of the state. There they generally mean that the target of the attack is a Jew and Mr. Shinwell is a Jew

..... Shaking a finger at Mr. Shinwell he (Churchill) warned him against being "too prophetic about the way things are going because they may not be as unfortunate for this country as he would no doubt wish." To the demands that he withdraw his remark about Mr. Shinwell, Mr. Churchill replied that he refused to concede that "an imputation of want of patriotism is necessarily unparliamentary because it might be urged that cosmopolitanism and internationalism cover even wider spheres"

The fact of the matter is that the cleverly worded Balfour Declaration was simply an instrument of British imperialist policy in the Near East. Britain's motives in issuing it were completely those of self-interest. Her hope was to shatter the Turkish Empire in the Near East and help herself to the pieces, and so

she attempted to create pro-British sentiment in the influential Jewish community of America and the large Jewish community of Russia by dangling Palestine before them.

At the very same time the British through the activities of Lawrence of Arabia among others were making overtures to the Arabs who were also under Turkish domination, dangling the promise of a sovereign state in the Near East before them too, with the hope of watching developments and playing off Arab against Jew if necessary in order to maintain her position. This is exactly what she did, much to the shock and amazement of Jews who had failed ^{to understand} the Balfour Declaration and could not see through the double diplomacy of Great Britain.

Kallen spends a great deal of effort on the problem of anti-semitism. He recognizes correctly that anti-semitism has always reached a peak in time of crisis and subsided in prosperity and that anti-semitism has largely been an instrument of the upper classes.⁴⁸ But he does not infer from this what seems obvious, namely that anti-semitism is caused by the fact that in time of economic crisis the upper classes must divert the attention of the impoverished masses to any convenient scapegoat. He is misled by his penchant for psychologizing and his hatred for the church. He says the Jews are eternally persecuted because of their central role in Christian drama of salvation as the rejected people who had once been

chosen, who had denied the savior and crucified him and who are thus the enemies of God and mankind.

If this were so how could we account for the persecution of Jews in pagan Germany. If the role of the Jews in the drama of salvation is the reason for anti-semitism then why has the church ever treated the Jews well ~~in~~ in time of prosperity, as it did in ^{the} ~~fourteenth~~ century Spain? Neither does Kallen's explanation account for the racist anti-semitism of Hitler Germany.

It would seem more accurate to say that the Christian drama of salvation creates a ground for the potential rationalization of anti-semitism when it occurs, but that its occurrence is dependent on the political and economic well being or lack of well being of the state and the needs incurred thereby.

Kallen the educator has applied himself conscientiously especially of late to the problems of Jewish education and the Jewish Center movement. He advocated a re-orientation of Jewish education away from traditional synagogal content to a new content based on the needs and realities of the modern Jewish community, promoting and conserving Hebraic culture and ideals in, for, and through the larger processes of democracy. Too, Jewish education should help our children understand anti-semitism. From the knowledge of anti-

semitism the step is inevitable to a similar scientific knowledge of the positive Jewish values.⁴⁹ He called for a thorough modernization of techniques as well as curriculum and was not averse to having the Jewish Center copy all the techniques and activities of the YMCA in the highly competitive game of training and keeping Jews.

Rounding out the consideration of his Jewish literary activities it must only be added that his talents as a critic did not remain unexercised in the realm of Jewish literature. And here, too, he remained true to the pragmatic principle, which is the most constant element in his thinking, from beginning to end.

CHAPTER III

Ludwig Lewisohn

We are able to gain much insight into Lewisohn's early development from his sensitively introspective autobiographical works, Upstream, written in 1921, (published in 1922), and Mid-Channel, written in 1928, (published in 1929).

Born in Berlin in 1882, Lewisohn was the product of a non-mixed Jewish marriage. His parents, however, were practically non-observant. His father, financially ruined, partially because of depression and partially because of foolish investment and handling, brought the family to America in 1890.

They settled with much difficulty in South Carolina where an uncle lived. Life in the small village which Lewisohn calls "St. Mark" was dull and lonesome. Lewisohn was taken under wing by a gentile woman and became quite unquestionably a Methodist in outlook although he was not formally converted. The family spent only two years in "St. Mark" (1890-1892) and then moved to Charleston, South Carolina.

In Charleston they did not identify themselves as Jews but led an isolated existence. Here Lewisohn was taken to a Catholic church with which he was very

impressed. He entered high school and excelled in literature. He began during his last year of high school to become aware of sex, and fell into the conforming pattern which regarded sex as sin, a pattern against the hypocrisy of which he was later to rebel so violently, and which was to be a central obstacle in his personal life. At the age of fifteen in his own words, he was "an American, a Southerner and a Christian." Upon graduation from high school he determined to become a professor of English literature.

At the College of Charleston his development in English Literature continued at an unusual pace. He attended the Methodist Church, taught Sunday School and was a leader in the Epworth League during these years -- his Christian faith, though cooler, was still unshaken up to his junior year. His experiences at college were happy. He was elected to honored student offices, but there was always a sense of exclusion which Lewisohn called instinctive. In his eighteenth year he began to see things more clearly and became utterly fed up with the intellectual inanity of the local culture. He graduated from the College of Charleston with many honors. He met his first rebuff, however, when he was promised then refused a chair in English at a local Episcopalian Academy, on personal grounds. But he was only nineteen and hadn't really wanted it that badly, so he didn't make too much

of it. He then applied to teaching agencies for a job, got no results, and so stayed at home for a year after graduation. At the end of this time he applied for a fellowship at Both Harvard and Columbia. Neither would give him a fellowship or a scholarship. This was a bitter blow. But he enrolled at Columbia despite his financial handicaps.

At Columbia he was introduced to modern German Literature, and the love he developed for it was to cause him trouble during World War I. His thoughts on the "ethical dualism" of the English mind with reference to love and passion began to crystallize. "Passion except within marriage, is the most degrading of sins. Within marriage it is forgiven but never mentioned as being, even there, unmentionable. This is the Law." This is told to American youths who then slink off into dark alleys for their love. They cannot deny their nature and they cannot legitimize it either.

At the end of the first year he took his master's and then applied for a fellowship. This was denied him. He felt bitter but still was not perfectly aware of the nature of the hostility involved. He went back for a second year and was enabled to continue by a loan which a friendly member of the faculty arranged for him. At the end of this year his class applied for teaching jobs, but there was no job for him and finally it was

made clear to him that the reason for his exclusion was his Jewishness. He realized now for the first time what the Jewish "exile" means. "So long as there is discrimination there is exile. And for the first time in my life my heart turned with grief and remorse to the thought of my brethren in exile all over the world" He had not been elected to his college fraternity either and now this fact together with all the subtler hints and warnings came home to him. All this was particularly bitter for him in the light of the beliefs which his father and mother, and through them, he had held about equality in a democracy and especially in the new world America. Thus he found the same duality of conscience in the matter of equality and democratic justice in the Anglo-American world as exists in the matter of love and sex. Anglo-Americans speak volumes about freedom and democracy, ~~but there is a sharp dichotomy between~~ ~~and they may even be filled with genuine~~ word and act. This is one of the grave danger points in the Anglo-American civilization.

Having failed to obtain a teaching job he went to work as a hack writer for Doubleday, Page and Company (1904-1905). He referred bitterly to the commercialism of the day which saw to it that all manner of trash was published as long as it would sell. This sickened Lewisohn and he indulges in ^{frequent} ~~A~~ diatribes against our predatory economic system which permits such things and which by

means of this enslaves promising human beings if not in body then certainly in soul. He toyed with the idea of using a pseudonym to cover up his Jewish name, but decided against it. He married Mary Arnold Crocker, and for a time seemed happy enough with his marriage. But later he divorced her and this divorce was at the center of one of the greatest pains of his life. He wrote all kinds of short works, serialized stories etc. which were so popular at the time, in order to keep alive. These went against the human and artistic instincts of his nature. His first novel was written at this time and it got a few good reviews but was generally attacked by what he calls the "proponents of ethical duality." He once more tried to get a teaching job through Columbia but was everywhere refused because he was a Jew. Finally he got an instructorship at Wisconsin in 1910, but it was in the field of German, not English.

At the University of Wisconsin he was happy and successful but he stayed only two years. For financial and other reasons he left and went to teach at Ohio State University where he stayed for six unhappy years.

His mother died during his first year at Ohio State (1912), and at this time the "tentative and half-prayerful aspiration toward some extramundane source of power and good which had remained with me from my Christian youth died out entirely." " In a word, I

abandoned all faith in any form of personal and transcendental idealism and gradually adopted the hope for economic security and personal freedom embodied in the revolutionary movement of our period. No, I am not, like a good many liberals shirking the name of Socialism. But I would break with Socialism as swiftly as with any other system, if it were not to confine the power of society over the individual strictly to the sphere of economics, hygiene and the necessity -- not the character! -- of education; if it were not to leave the personal and moral life of the individual absolutely free." He evidenced a greatly increasing concern with society now: and continued to harp on the distorted notions of morality in our dualistic puritan society.

During the first World War, Lewisohn rebelled against what he termed the "vicious prejudice and distortions built up by propaganda." He spoke up fearlessly in defense of German culture. He looked upon our propaganda as a sublimation of our frustrated sexuality -- phrases like "The Rape of Belgium" etc. He was brought before the District Attorney in Columbus, Ohio, on suspicion of sedition, but he was not prosecuted. His sabbatical year was due now (1919) and so he took it and did not come back afterwards.

He went to New York where he taught English and Latin to teen-age Nouveau upper-middle class boys

in a private school. But he couldn't take this either because of the contempt for learning, the arts and reflection which these boys brought from their homes. They were interested only in money and machines. The whole society was this way and the effects of the war were making it worse.

He looked upon the Versailles Peace Treaty as a sham and a trick. He declared that the war left us in utter reaction -- and he rallied against the Klu Klux Klan and one-hundred per cent Americanism, which turn all national and religious groupings (including Jews) to apologetics. Americanization means assimilation. This might be all right he maintained, if we in America had something of true value to which to assimilate. But the only things which engage the passions of the Anglo-American stock are: baseball and the prohibition of wine, love, speculation and art. Actually the friend of the Republic, the lover of those values which alone make life endurable, " must bid the German, and the Jew, the Latin and the Slav to preserve his cultural tradition he must plead with him to remain spiritually himself until he melts naturally and gradually into a richer life, a broader liberty, a more radiant artistic and intellectual culture than his own."

Concerning Russia he writes, "When the great revolution broke out in Russia I felt a glow and a brief hope. But that glow and that hope are also fading.

For the purpose of an economic revolution is to release man from physical suffering and uncertainty and the resultant slavery in order that the individual may be set wholly free; it is not to cage and herd him into another exclusive ideology with its dogmas laws and prophets. The aim of ultimate revolution must be to destroy the herd and the herd mind and the herd mind's hardening into that moral faith from which are born persecution and disease and war."

In Lewisohn, we are enabled clearly to see the growth of the intellectual pattern that has already made itself so familiar to us. Pacifism and disapproval of war aims, contempt for the business mentality and the recreational standards of the mob, hatred of racialism and the Ku Klux Klan, espousal of the idea of Cultural Pluralism, abandonment of religion, early socialism, friendliness to the Russian Revolution, and Puritan-baiting -- all these tie him ⁱⁿ rather tightly ~~in~~ with the mainstream of early twentieth century American liberal thought.

It must only be said, to Lewisohn's credit, that he began to gain at least some insight into the true nature of the Bolshevik revolution at a phenomenally early date, at a time when it was still succeeding fairly well in disguising itself as to be accepted to most honest intellectuals. He did retain a certain amount of

patience with Russia throughout the twenties. It was not until the mid-thirties that he, like most of the rest of the liberal intellectuals, rejected it completely and condemned it viciously.

Turning now to the second part of his autobiography, Mid-Channel, we find Lewisohn taking us back from the time of writing (1928) to the World War.

He referred to the war as the great event which roused him from his fool's paradise and made him see the trend of our civilization. According to his new vision, the world needed to be rebuilt after another pattern of thought and aim. The very source of men's emotional responses needed to be changed and nearly all fundamental traditions to be reversed in order that we survive. Not too surprisingly he went to work as an associate editor of The Nation (1920-1924), and was quite happy here though not completely satisfied. He became sick of his puritan baiting, or so he claimed, because actually he in his own person had no clue to the Puritan mentality or modes of feeling. He was alien to the Puritan culture whereas his contemporaries like Mencken and Lewis who were baiting them were at least a part of the culture and had insight into them.

If Lewisohn really did become sick of his Puritan baiting he certainly exerted a superhuman effort in overcoming his sickness by 1932 when he published Expression

in America. This is an excellent survey and evaluation of American literature but it reflects an almost psychopathic preoccupation with Puritanism and sex. Lewisohn sees puritanism in all evils and finds in puritanism the source for all subsequent prudery and benightedness in America with respect to sex. One reviewer⁵⁰ was moved to coin the term "Puritaniphobia" with regard to this book.

Furthermore, Lewisohn's closeness to Mencken was cleverly depicted in an informal conversation between the two which was transcribed in Living Age on March 1, 1930,⁵¹ in the course of which they dissect American mores with deft strokes of the tongue. As a matter of fact, Lewisohn's change of heart toward America upon his return to this country in 1934 is most significant in the light of his thoroughgoing disapproval as late as 1930.

One item more in passing concerning Expression in America is his undisguised passion for psychological jargon so completely reminiscent of Kallen's style in Why Religion and so much related to the scientific temper of the decade.

Returning to the autobiography we find that Lewisohn now begins to disclose the events which led up to what he called his Teshuvah -- the effects of which, so he claims, are primary in shaping his literary and intellectual accom-

plishment from the mid twenties on.⁵²

In the fall of 1919 he received an invitation to give a series of lectures in the large mid-western cities. With two exceptions all were before Jewish groups. On this tour for the first time he became aware of an attachment and a common ground that he must hold with his fellow Jews. They helped him immensely, he writes, "by just being what they were." The meditative results of these contacts were a repudiation of the "unreal, misleading liberalism of the nineteenth century." In his later writings, Lewisohn is destined to negate completely the emancipation and the liberalism of the nineteenth century which said too simply that everybody was exactly the same. " Men are different, belong to different families and are known primarily and recognized primarily by the family or race from which they come. Liberalism does not consist in blinding oneself from this fact -- such a course usually results in greater disappointments and frustrations. True liberalism consists in recognizing this fact, actually encouraging each group to its own individual and different way of developing, upholding the right for it to so do, and welcoming it for its very differences into the democratic association so that it may in its own way enrich the democracy."

"The conclusion, then which my contact with Jews justified and confirmed was this: to rise from my lack and confusion into a truly human life, a life with its

right relation to man and God, to the concrete and the universal; it was necessary for me to affirm in quite other fashion than I had yet done the re-integration of my entire consciousness with the historic and ethnic tradition of which I was a part. My Gentile friends ~~and~~ and comrades were instinctively integrated with their own. That completeness and assurance could, alas, never be the portion of my Jewish generation. But I believed that, when I had achieved that integration as far as possible, I would no longer need or want to ask: What do you live by? What ultimate satisfaction sustains you? I would not ask. I would know. I would live the secret and it would be mine too. And I may say at once that belief has proved itself to be wholly true."

He continued to rail against the pseudo-liberalism of the nineteenth century from the point of view that it caused Jews to outrage a set of venerable instincts proper and native to their kind. The instincts of one's blood were treated as mouldy ghetto prejudices, Gentile traits were always preferred to one's own. This led to Jewish anti-semitism of which Lewisohn admits his own guilt. He has hours in which he has been ready to "curse the day on which the magnanimous Lessing patted on the crooked shoulder a certain Moses Mendelssohn."

In the meantime his whole personal life was being tortured by the divorce process. This apparently was a very rancorous affair, and it so affected Lewisohn

as to become the theme for many novels and short stories -- most notably The Case of Mr. Crump (1926), and it is tempting to speculate as to the effect of this unhappy adventure in matrimony on Lewisohn's headlong rush back to religion.

Sometime around 1920 or 1921 he met Kurt Blumenfeld, head of the German Zionists at a Menorah Banquet in Boston. The latter made a great impression on him not only as a person but as a symbol that Jews are at last banding together for common action as Jews, not as assimilationists. Through Blumenfeld he met Weizmann. It was soon agreed that at the earliest possible moment Lewisohn was to go to Poland and thence to Palestine to do a series for The Nation. Lewisohn welcomed the thought. He was perfectly willing to get out of the country at least for a while. He was to bring his espousal of the Zionist Cause to full expression in Israel (1925).

This book is his first post-Teshuvah Jewish work of major proportions. In it he incorporates some moving descriptions of Jews and their communities as he has seen them in Europe and Palestine but he is mainly interested in preaching and the burden of his preaching is aimed against assimilation. With mystic sadness he warns that "the cause of modern anti-semitism is assimilation."⁵³ He assumes, whether intentionally or not, the mantle of a Hosea, explaining anti-semitism as Yahweh's punishment for the syncretism of Israel as it

were. This of course makes for powerful writing but it completely overlooks the historical facts.

Assimilation has always accompanied the integration of the Jews into the economy of a land, said integration taking place in time of economic well-being and prosperity. But prosperous economies have gradually crumbled one by one, and once the economic sub-stratum of a land begins to contract and no longer permits of integration, the Jews, who have become assimilated are squeezed out. Thus it may be accurate to say that anti-semitism has followed assimilation -- this is the superficial truth, but to say that "the cause of modern anti-semitism is assimilation" goes beyond the limits even of poetic license and such a misleading idea is all the more pathetic coming from one whose avowed purpose is to try to allay the suffering of Jews and prepare them to meet their problems.

In Israel, he enunciates a doctrine that is to recur in a hundred guises in his later writings in all media, the doctrine of "Christian Paganism." There would be nothing wrong with Christianity had it not been corrupted by the post-Paulinian pagans. The teachings of Jesus are moral and ethical, of the same cloth as Jewish teaching.

"Primitive Christianity is Jewish ..." but it "... has never converted the Gentiles. The pomp of Rome and her gods is in the South; Germanic festivals and legends and epics rule

the North the chivalric warlike Gentile does not find himself in the Gospel. He has to be converted again and again. When it suits him he abrogates the teachings of his faith, and preaches hate in the name of Jesus⁵⁴

" Christianity has never changed the real character of the pagan world. The broad masses of mankind are still pagan barbarians."⁵⁵

If Christianity were to return to the ideals of Jesus and actually Christianize (or rather Judaize), the world which is now Pagan and ~~unde~~^{re}deemed might attain salvation.

The book is highly pacifistic. One of the greatest laurels he can place on the head of Polish Jewry is the fact that "they fought conscription by passive resistance." Lewisohn, like Kallen, has a strong bias for East-European Jews despite his German birth. He became pro-American Jewish Congress later on, and he was victim to the identical misunderstanding of East-European Jewish developments, as was Kallen, going on to make the rather absurd statement: "They (East-European Jews) fought Russification and Polonization in the same manner (i.e. passively)."⁵⁶

Also interesting is Lewisohn's formulation of the "Jewish Ethos" which is the pure and spontaneous expression of the unique Jewish character and destiny. He speaks of this Jewish Ethos as a new humanism, compounded of knowledge and peace, ethics and morality. Any attempt to explain the roots of Jewish character

as being even to the slightest degree due to external factors is angrily dismissed by Lewisohn as anti-semitism if by Gentile and self-hatred if by Jew.

At any rate, his trip to Europe strengthened his anti-assimilationist and anti-Christian feelings and set him more surely on his path than ever before. ~~He~~ He had no great sympathy for the American literary expatriates of this period,⁵⁷ claiming to be different from them since he wants more, not less bourgeois responsibilities, more, not less order and dignity of life even in external things. He wants to be more bound -- though the bonds be rationally chosen -- never less.

Lewisohn went to Poland and Palestine at the end of 1924. He made a trip to North Africa and the Jewish communities there sometime in 1926 or 1927, for the purpose of observing the fate of Judaism in a totally different civilization. *He differentiated between the wholesome oriental civilization* of the Jews and the nihilistic oriental civilization of the rest of the orient. He began to study the rabbinic sources, Talmud and Midrash at this time.

Lewisohn and his second wife (Thelma Bowman Spear) " ... do not practice the mitzvot and halakhot in (their) home. But (they) are very sure that the spirit of the decisions of the sages, profoundly applicable to modern life as it happily is, is the dominant spirit of (their) house." As for his God-concept: "If then, I say God, I name by that name a concept implicit in

always recurrent modes of Jewish thinking, the concept namely of a force, trend, direction within the universe which we continuously fortify by our cooperation, though we are free to keep as a last, faint, metaphysical hope the notion that it is anterior to us. The continuous creation by ourselves of that immanent force is the ultimate meaning of the famous phrase of Kiddush haShem."

In an article in The Nation in 1924⁵⁸ he becomes more specific about his concept of Kiddush haShem. "If we are martyred because we are for peace when all are for war, when we are internationalist in the face of nationalism then we will author our own inner salvation for we will be embracing our fate." While he is not yet a proponent of formalistic religion (actually rejecting rituals and metaphysical assumptions in this article) he is tolerant of organized Judaism saying let there be rabbis -- but let them preach peace.

Allusion must be made to one more very important periodical article by Lewisohn which appeared at the end of the period covered by Mid-Channel in which he states his political faith as an artist.⁵⁹ "The man of letters," he writes, "does not look upon literature as a mere art, he is a 'weltverbesserer,' a very political animal." This is an especial necessity considering the crucial period through which the world is going today (1928).

For instance, so many people at this time are praising Mussolini for bringing order to Italy that the man of letters must speak out against this. "The Fascist regime is an image of disorder, if order means harmony and peace, if it means that a people's political institutions must be a development and projection of its character and needs. (Underlining belongs to author -- note again the idea of the ethos of a people stemming from its "unique character"). Imposed uniformity is not order."

If this be so, then the man of letters will be challenged as to why he is kinder to the Soviet dictatorship. Lewisohn admits that the man of letters has a tendency to be a parlor Bolshevik despite the fact that he has knowledge of conditions in Russia that would be unendurable to any libertarian. But this is because with the Soviet society there is at least the hope that it will change -- that it will re-admit liberty and flexibility. If it doesn't it will perish. Meanwhile like all revolutions it is intolerant in defense of a central idea. This is rationalized by the fact that American rebels weren't kind to the Tories either. At least, says Lewisohn, the Soviet government hasn't sought wealth or power, it has overthrown these and sought to raise the lowly, it has permitted the various republics withⁱⁿ the USSR to maintain their

own speech and traditions. Russia today is far from the ideal of the man of letters, but if he had to live there he would try to cooperate patiently and hope. What would there be with which to cooperate or be patient in Italy or Rumania which are steeped in Paganism, land-grabbing and empire building.

He comes out against so-called "practical politics" or business politics. Balance of power, protection of exported capital, restrictive laws -- all these are literally futile. They have no connection with the aim of every social order, which is to permit the individual to lead the good life. "Economic security is necessary to this end, but not wealth; freedom not power; brotherhood not dominance. And the good life is not an enforced way of life; it has nothing to do with any man's theories concerning his fellows; it consists in the freedom of a disciplined will -- therein also consists true order. Freedom is order; variety ... is order."

The aim then of all the political thinking and acting of the man of letters is for "security to live the good life within society."

What is perhaps Lewisohn's best novel falls into this Mid-Channel period ending with the close of the twenties -- that is The Island Within (1928). In this book we find for the first time the Jewish polemics which are to characterize all of his subsequent fiction works. He traces a Jewish family through three genera-

tions from Vilna to America, from Rab Mendel ben Rab Yitzchock who suffered to preserve his Jewishness to Arthur Levy who tries to cover his Jewishness, becomes a psychiatrist and intermarries. But Levy somehow cannot forget his racial background and in the end leaves his wife to go on a Jewish mission to the Balkans. Lewisohn's primary theme is that the Jew cannot live a full life, cannot feel at home on earth if he repudiates his heritage and tries to assimilate himself. There can hardly be any question as to who the main character of Island Within is -- Arthur Levy is Ludwig Lewisohn, just as Herbert Crump was Ludwig Lewisohn. There is almost as much autobiography as fiction in Lewisohn's first two important novels.

We turn now to Lewisohn's activities in the time since Mid-Channel, -- the thirties and forties. During this period Lewisohn's preoccupation with Jewish themes most specifically with Zionism took on an almost obsessive character. After writing a handful of articles on general political and philosophical themes during the early thirties, he plunged into purely Jewish problems to the exclusion of virtually all else. Even as literary critic he is interested primarily in Jewish literature from this point on. Hitlerism, as we shall see, is one of the keys to this development in Lewisohn.

The few articles that Lewisohn did write on non-Jewish subjects in thirties are ~~mostly~~ significant in terms

of his philosophical development and should be considered first.

Writing in Harper's Magazine in 1930⁶⁰ he comes to the conclusion that the purely critical age in American writing, whose attitude was that life is "ridiculous and disgusting" is drawing to a close. There is necessity for new values, new affirmations, out of which to create and guide both life and art. This is not generally recognized yet, he fears. "The moral and spiritual nihilists are playing into the hands of all whom they hate and dread, of all the forces of darkness and intolerance ... We shall not return to the soggy self-complacency and rosy optimism of Ruskin. Nevertheless (Ruskin) had hold of a fundamental truth. Sound art requires strong affirmations; great art stands in the service of man and God Babbitt has been taught to know himself for what he is. He reads, I strongly suspect, The American Mercury; he and his children begin to demand the bread of art if they are denied the nourishment of sound ideas they may turn to delusions more menacing than those from which the writers of the critical age succeeded in rescuing them in the past fifteen years."

This article is the very earliest intimation, and it is only an intimation, of the approach of Lewisohn's reaction to the liberal scientific spirit of the twenties which is destined to culminate in a complete negation of

science and the enlightenment by the time of the second World War and a headlong rush into the arms of romanticism and neo-orthodoxy -- which movement as we have seen gained great impetus in the late thirties.

It is not until two and half years later in another article in Harper's⁶¹ that the intimation becomes a reality. Here he wrote that the "Machine Age" does not represent an age of progress. It has provided means that are different and new, but it has given us no new ends. The question, in fact, arises as to whether in our wonder over the new means we have not begun to forget the old, the eternal ends. Wisdom will lead us to our unchanging goals -- to progress -- not machines. Progress is possible only if we retrace our steps to where "machine ageness" struck us and revert to the old historic ways of thinking.

Just a few months later Lewisohn publicly disclaimed his former socialist leanings.⁶² He stated his faith in the middle class and presented his case for the dignity and worth of the bourgeois. The bourgeois, he rationalizes, is eternal. He is not just a product of industrialism. It is he who has conserved civilization, ~~not~~ ~~the masses~~, not the masses who rush to enlist in armies, white or red, and not the oligarchs. Surplus profits may be unethical and private property may have to be destroyed as an economic technique. But "bourgeois ideology" must never be destroyed. Events in Europe involving the extremes of both the right and the left have moved

Lewisohn directly into the middle of the road.

A year later in 1934 Lewisohn came back home after having spent ten years in Europe. He celebrated the occasion with a glowing tribute in Harper's Magazine⁶³ to the American system interspersed with contempt-laden stabs at both Communists and Fascists. He upholds President Roosevelt and the New Deal in this article saying the menace of this age lies not in a change of economic technique kept strictly on its own plane and dealing strictly with what comes within its framework. The menace of this age is that "both Fascism and Communism seek not to regulate the body but to murder the soul". The New Deal's virtue is that it works in the realm of economic technique and does not tamper with the soul.

This article was of further significance in that in it Lewisohn "refuted" the theory of economic determinism and established the innate character of the American people with the following statement, "We have depression here in America and still our life is moral ... Our people have moral qualities." Subsequent statistics had an interesting story to tell of the effects of the depression on morals. Some of these have already been mentioned in the first chapter. Furthermore any analogy between the effects of the depression on the American economic structure and on the European is quite absurd to begin with.

The return of the prodigal Lewisohn to America and the bourgeoisie is completed with an article in the

Forum in April of 1936 entitled "In Defense of the Acquisitive Instinct." Here he wrote that "the acquisitive instinct is closely integrated with the creative instinct." It is an instrument of human individuation. People should have the sound sense to admit, "certainly I work for money, for money is convertible into those rewards which are symbols within a genuine hierarchy of common human worth." Lewisohn admits that of course the acquisitive instinct shouldn't be abused. But in his enthusiasm he overlooks the extent to which it has been abused -- not just by captains of industry but by an entire generation of common men who all through the twenties knew no other values but the values of acquisition. He forgets the feelings of revulsion he himself had, as he wrote in Upstream, for the upper middle class New York families whose sons he unsuccessfully tried to tutor. Lewisohn's return to America indeed represents a long road back.

It remains only to consider Lewisohn's Jewish writing in the time since Mid-Channel.

It was ~~probably~~ during the ^{late twenties} ~~very early thirties~~ that Lewisohn came into contact with a distinctively Jewish expression of the romantic reaction to rationalism as embodied in the thinking of Martin Buber. This contact was of great consequence to Lewisohn as he himself admits, and as evidenced by the temper of virtually all his writing from the late thirties onward. But it is quite probable that Lewisohn would eventually have arrived at the same destina-

tion even without the help of Buber. The effect of the devastating events of the thirties on this personality which had already experienced the need for a Teshuvah in the early twenties could hardly have been otherwise.

Lewisohn was one of the contributing editors of Opinion from the very inception of that periodical in 1931. In it appeared numerous short stories and short novels in serialized form the burden of which was anti-assimilationism.

The few non-fiction articles he published in Opinion are mostly on the same subject or on other well known Lewisohnian subjects such as doctrine of Christian paganism or else on Zionism.

Three items in Opinion are of special significance however. In a series of character sketches entitled "Prologue to a Novel"⁶⁴ he introduces us to a Jew named Jehuda Brenner whose resemblance to Lewisohn is hardly accidental. He is a free-thinker, he eats "treffe" but he wears phylacteries and a "yarmulke" and he finds a "great essence" in Chassidism despite its corruptions. "I believe," Lewisohn says through Brenner, "in the belief of these poor men in Israel their belief brings them near to the central truth of things and of the universe and of God" "The learned and wise of the world should add this to their own belief." Lewisohn's new-orthodoxy or new-Chassidism is not yet fully developed however. It will reach its climax in The American Jew (Farrar, Straus 1950)

as we shall see.

A second important item is a poem entitled "There Is No Peace."⁶⁵ Lewisohn who has been as consistent and outspoken a pacifist as any of his contemporaries even past the depression into the early thirties, has by this time rejected his pacifism, but with a vengeance.⁶⁶ He is sick of running, he writes. He would join the battle and pour out our blood to mix with the poison of our enemies. We must defy them now or else go down through the ages as slaves or worse yet as clowns.

One more poem appearing in Opinion⁶⁷ in 1941 is noteworthy. In it Lewisohn expresses for the first time his cynicism and loss of faith in Britain and the Balfour Declaration. His anti-British views are not softened by the fact that Britain is fighting Hitler Germany practically single-handedly at this time. It seems as though he has finally gotten clear insight into the true nature of British Near East policy.

While in Europe in the early thirties Lewisohn got a close view of Hitlerism and spoke out against it fervently. He was one of the first to predict the true intent of Hitlerism which is the extermination of all Jews irrespective of political affiliations.⁶⁸ He did this at a time when most Jewish leaders were still wishfully maintaining that Hitler wasn't really serious. Despite his accurate prediction however one gets the impression that he did not actually have full insight into the basic causes

and the true nature of Hitlerian anti-semitism. He contended⁶⁹ that this persecution was unparalleled in history. It was the first one where the persecuted have sold out spiritually (i.e. assimilated) to their oppressors at the latter's invitation and command. And he pointed out the fact that he had warned of the consequences of assimilation in Israel but no one would heed.

The fallacy involved in this sort of writing must be pointed out. Not only does the Hitler brand of anti-semitism have parallels in history, but it is in its fundamental outlines, a near perfect replica of virtually every movement of organized anti-semitism that has seen and darkened the light of day. The Jews of Germany in the twelfth century were given special protection, by the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV. They were invited in to Court positions and not a few of them completely assimilated themselves. Within a century however the social and economic situation had so deteriorated in Germany that the very same ruling house that had invited them in now confiscated their property and even lowered them to the unprecedented degradation of being sold into serfdom.

The Jews in the twelfth and thirteenth century Spain under the early Christian kings were the royal favorites. Many of them were the tax collectors for the kings; their situation was prosperous. Many of them actually converted voluntarily, more of them assimilated. By the end of the fourteenth century and throughout the

fifteenth century, the same type of disintegration had attacked the Spanish social and economic structure and not only the assimilated, but even the converted became victims of the infamous inquisition. The pattern is analogous later in Poland -- adequately documenting the fact that Hitlerian anti-semitism is basically like all other anti-semitisms.

With the expansion of the German economy in the latter half of the nineteenth century, emancipation was granted the Jews and they were easily integrated into the business and professional life of that land -- often attaining to positions of great prestige. The first World War marked the beginning of the end of an independent German economy. Jews were beginning to feel pressures even in the twenties. The great depression was the crowning blow and Hitler's rise was not long in coming.

To repeat, anti-semitism arises in answer to the needs of a society in crisis not in answer to assimilation -- though assimilation has usually taken place wherever the Jews have successfully integrated themselves into the economy of a country in the periods of prosperity which precede crisis. No other explanation can account for the complete reversal of attitude in the same places toward the Jews, and take so completely into account the known facts of economic and social history.

Lewisohn's accuracy regarding Nazism seems to stem from his passionate almost mystic belief in the

punishment that assimilation reaps, which belief he feels must be vindicated for all to see, *rather than from true understanding.*

In an article in The Nation in 1933⁷⁰ he continues his anti-Hitlerian agitation with a psycho-analysis of Nazi behavior in which he finds the characteristics of homosexuality and homo-centric eroticism.

In Harper's the same year⁷¹ he shows signs of getting on the historical track of German behavior only to become sidetracked by psycho-analysis before he can carry it through logically. He writes that perhaps the present German character can be traced back to the inability of the Germans to unite in the eighteenth century the way the English and French did, and to get into the empire building game. Thus, he deduces, the Germans feel left out and inferior and seek to compensate for those feelings of inferiority as does any neurotic.

It must be made clear that the role of psychology is not to be dismissed in any consideration of anti-semitism. But this role can be played only after the need for it has been established, just as the individual psychotic develops a certain syndrome of behavior patterns in response to pressures which cause in him a psychological need. Mob psychology is indeed a potent weapon in the hands of the anti-semite, but the causes of anti-semitism cannot be explained in terms of it.

Of the many novels Lewisohn wrote during the thirties, one must be mentioned. That is Trumpet of

Jubilee.⁷² This novel is deeply escon^ced in neo-orthodoxy. He has the same view of Christianity as having been too much influenced by paganism. He looks upon the true Christianity as a part of the ancient Hebrew faith and calls upon the religious forces of the Judaeo-Christian world to defend themselves against all man made faiths, including Capitalism, Bolshevism, Fascism and Nazism.

In order that his religious faith shall triumph he is willing to see all of civilization destroyed -- a prospect he actually conceives of in the epilogue of this novel. Somehow, throughout an age of total chaos, the spirit of God manages to hover and is finally perceived again by a re-emerging humanity. This is a Lewisohn totally repelled by contemporary civilization, one who has completely rejected his pacifism (he calmly sends his hero into the final battle, on the side of the forces of righteousness at Armageddon) and who no longer has faith in any type of human effort in attaining righteousness. Civilization as we know it must be destroyed before any new building can be done.

Between 1934 when he returned from Europe, and 1941, Lewisohn spent a good deal of his time as a Zionist lecturer speaking before some four hundred and fifty groups. His Zionism as we would expect is of a fiercely militant brand.

In 1939 he published a full length non-fiction

work, The Answer,⁷³ which was a typical display of fanatical Lewisohnian Zionism.

Lewisohn became editor of the ZOA publication New Palestine, in 1943, after having been a frequent contributor for several years before, and retained that position until 1948. His polemicizing hewed to the old familiar lines:

"Zionism is among other things, a total implicit negation of eighteenth century enlightenment and nineteenth century materialism."⁷⁴

These, of course, are the sources of all evil, which makes Zionism an even more worthwhile cause.

The integrity of Lewisohn's devotion to the Zionist cause was unquestionable. He was consistently anti-Communist⁷⁵ and anti-British⁷⁶ throughout the war years when Russian and Britain were allies of the United States and it might have been better public policy to mitigate his animosity toward them.

He was not totally neglectful of the need for harmonizing Zionism with Americanism however. He goes to great lengths to prove that there is no incompatibility between being a Zionist and being an American not only in the pages of New Palestine⁷⁷ but also in his 1950 attempt to write a "Moreh Nebukhim" for our time, The American Jew.⁷⁸ In this book he takes cognizance of the general state of anxiety in which western man finds himself.

← Lewisohn places the blame for this anxiety not

surprisingly at the feet of nineteenth century godlessness, which is nothing less than the whole of the scientific movement. Man put his entire faith in the promises of science and his faith has been repayed with the rise of totalitarianism on every front.

In the Jewish case specifically, it is the godlessness of the so-called emancipation which attempted "to emancipate us not as ourselves but from ourselves,"⁷⁹ that is at the root of all our anxiety. The only Jews who refused to succumb to the false emancipation were the Orthodox and later the Zionists. He restates the case against assimilation which is the result of the emancipation and which brings in its wake anti-semitism and Jewish self-hatred.

What shall the American Jew do in the face of his anxiety to attain salvation? The American Jew must re-Judaize himself, he must return to the God of his fathers and the faith of his fathers. This must be a complete return. The traditional forms have been the sole instrumentality of preserving the Jewish people across the ages. These forms must be revitalized in order that the Galuth community in America be enabled to transcend. In the culturally pluralistic American emancipation. The assimilatory subservience of the Galuth communities under the old democracy the Jew can affirm his patriotism with absolute consistency by being a good Jew. In fact, as we shall

soon see, Lewisohn unmistakably implies that re-Judaization is indispensable to America -- to refrain from Judaization would be unpatriotic.

At any rate, to be a good Jew one must not only profess his Jewish faith but must keep all the traditional observances, (Kashrut, Shabbat, prayer three times per day, etc.), perform all the mitzvot prescribed in the Torah and immerse himself in Jewish knowledge.

The American Jew must re-Judaize himself for the sake of Israel, for without re-Judaization there is no healthy Zionism. But above all (and this is an interesting insight) he must do so for the sake of America. For if he assimilates here in America, then according to the Lewisohnian teaching anti-semitism will have to arise here to punish him.

Under the reign of anti-semitism America will become a slave state, and the last bastion of liberty will crash into chaos. If this happens all of the free world, including Israel and world Jewry, is of course doomed.

This is an awesome power we Jews apparently have, but then it is not really too surprising to hear such grandiose (and erroneous) ideas from Lewisohn who has as of now identified himself so completely with Orthodox Jewish thinking that he can only conceive of the Jewish people in eschatological terms.

CHAPTER IV

Morris Raphael Cohen

Morris R. Cohen's autobiography, A Dreamer's Journey,⁸⁰ published posthumously is a rather reliable document despite the hazards of writing in the first person. Cohen had few axes to grind. If there was any cause to which he was passionately devoted it was only to the cause of the critical scientific method which was to him the essence of liberalism. His life remained relatively free of political entanglements and it was a point of his to remain completely free of intellectual entanglements -- no system of philosophy wholly escaped criticism at his hands. At any rate, the memories and reflections in Cohen's autobiography are invariably corroborated, as we shall see, by articles and essays written during the time of reference, so we may approach it without too many reservations.

Cohen was born in Russia and lived there the first twelve years of his life (1880-1892). During this time his training was that of the normal orthodox youth. He received an education in Talmud that was never to desert him and acquired a love for Yiddish that he never lost.

His orthodoxy was an unquestioning one throughout all the years in Europe, in fact he expressed great fears about coming to America and being unable to maintain the

orthodox ways. He thanks his grandfather for the first stimuli that awakened in him the love of wisdom when on long walks together his grandfather would talk to him about Maimonides and the Book of Khuzari. This stimulated an interest in the philosophy of religion that never waned.

In 1892, he, his mother, and his sister set out for America to join his father and two brothers who were among the great masses of East European Jews seeking haven in this country from the Romanoff regime during the eighties and nineties of the last century.

It did not take long for the young Cohen to drift away from his orthodoxy once he came into contact with the social ferment taking place on the East Side of New York at the turn of the century. While still in his early teens he became a constant reader of the Arbeiter Zeitung, the Yiddish organ of the Socialist Labor Party and socialism came to mean something more to him now than just opposition to the Czar's oppression as it did among the socialist Jews of Russia. He began to see "the reality of class oppression and the consequent class struggle."

"I have never ceased to be grateful for the illumination which I found in studying Marx's Das Kapital," he wrote in later years. "It not only helped me to recognize the poverty of most non-economic interpretations of history, but also prepared me to see that the recurrent breakdowns of capitalist economy are not unforeseeable accidents but a consequence of the private ownership of the machinery of production, whereby the processes of industry are directed for the profit of individual capitalists rather than for the satisfaction

our common needs. It helped me to see that the old optimistic but essentially anarchistic notion that the good of all will best be promoted by 'rugged individualism,' by each pursuing his own selfish economic gain, is a cruel superstition which men possessed of both reason and a decent amount of human sympathy cannot long maintain in the face of the hideous miseries that flourish in the shadow of man's mighty productive powers."⁸¹

Though he thus acknowledged his debt to Marx, however, the mature Cohen was constrained to add,

"On the other hand I was troubled by the exaggerated materialism that pervaded Marx's thinking. This was evidenced in his concentration on the production of commodities and his ignoring of the immaterial services of scientists, inventors, doctors and other non-proletarian groups. It was even more evident in the Marxist boast, which I could not swallow, that Marx never spoke of justice. Without an appeal to hatred for the injustice of the prevailing economic order, would we not be dumb and ineffective exponents of the socialist message?"⁸²

His precious teen-age socialism did not show signs of the presence of any such critical reservations, however, till he met an individual who was to have a great influence on his life, -- Thomas Davidson.

During the twenties Cohen still fits in with the ~~and~~ intellectuals who are displaying a good deal of sympathy and patience toward Russia. In an article in The Survey⁸³ in 1923, Cohen psychologizes away the lack of liberalism in Russia by explaining that they came into contact with the west at a late stage in history and even then they were ruled by despotisms and authoritarianisms, thus they have no experience in the art of compromise and

accomodation. Russia's people have had to accept everything the government said or else be considered revolutionaries. Revolutionaries of course must go to extremes since they must be secret and absolutist, trusting their leaders implicitly. In either case -- monarchist or revolutionist -- the government was not based on free discussion. We in the west have at long experience at free discussion and at that we haven't been able to avoid wars -- what should we expect of the inexperienced Russians?

By 1934⁸⁴ Cohen had thoroughly rejected the communist regime in Russia.

But with this we have leaped almost forty years ahead of our story.

Returning to the years of Cohen's youth we find that he acclimated himself rapidly to the American school system and did well enough to be accepted in 1895 at the College of the City of New York. His name has since become inseparably linked with that institution.

Philosophy courses were meager when Cohen went to college -- in this realm he had to educate himself for the most part during these years. But his courses in history and science were of great help to him. He graduated CCNY in 1900.

In the meantime, he had met Thomas Davidson in the fall of 1898. Cohen went to hear Davidson lecture with the intent of heckling him, -- on his non-socialistic ideas on individualism and salvation by education. Despite the

heckling (or perhaps because of it) the two became fast friends. Under the stimuli provided by Davidson, which consisted of new opportunities for studying as well as teaching, Cohen's first love, philosophy, began to grow and flower. For seventeen years after Davidson's death (1900-1917) Cohen continued faithfully, under conditions of great hardship to keep alive the Thomas Davidson Society -- an association devoted to the free education of the inhabitants of the East Side who could obtain no regular academic training due to the exigencies of economic needs.

In 1902 he received a position teaching mathematics at City College and thus began an association which was to last thirty-six years. Teaching mathematics was most unsatisfactory to Cohen whose passion it had always been to teach philosophy. He felt sure that if he received a doctorate in philosophy he would succeed in obtaining a transfer to the philosophy department at CCNY.

He succeeded with difficulty in wangling a fellowship from the Ethical Culture Society whose head was Professor Felix Adler, who had befriended Cohen, and in September of 1904 began two very important years at Harvard Graduate School. It was here that he came into contact with Josiah Royce and William James of whom he wrote in his autobiography,

"The greatest teacher I had at Harvard was Josiah Royce, who had a marvelous capacity for concentrating all his learning and logical acumen on the point at issue. But the best

friend I found on the Harvard faculty was William James. No one could have come into contact with William James without being stirred by his gloriously fresh vision and amazingly daring honesty of expression. I could not however share his psychologic approach to philosophy. His psychologic explanations of necessary truth did not seem to me to bear on their logical nature Our intellectual disagreements were often violent. But as a human being James was not only a never failing source of warm inspiration but a trusted counsellor in all my difficulties of health and finance and in my lowest days of depression."⁸⁵

In a series of articles "On American Philosophy" written for the New Republic in 1919 and 1920 Cohen reflects the great love and admiration he had for these two men who indeed influenced him greatly but characteristically he still does not refrain from indulging in critiques of their work.

"In Cambridge I shared a room at 1707 Cambridge Street with Felix Frankfurter, and we spent many evenings together talking law and philosophy. I soon developed a profound interest in the theoretical side of jurisprudence, which was to prove one of the guiding threads of my future philosophical development."⁸⁶

So wrote Cohen of the beginning of a relationship that was to have unusual effect on the movement for "sociological jurisprudence" about which we have spoken in the first chapter. Cohen as we shall see, became one of the leading spirits of the movement.

He returned to CCNY in 1906 but the hope for a position in the philosophy department did not materialize. He was to spend six more miserable years in the mathematics department before receiving in 1912 the post of Assistant

Professor of Philosophy. During all these years from 1902 to 1912 he wrote a wealth of highly technical papers. He was not to become involved in social affairs until 1912 and after. Even then his efforts can hardly be called practical -- he was always to prefer the role of researcher even when emotionally involved in an issue -- to place the data in the hands of more energetic individuals who might then be able to concentrate their efforts on the sources of problems rather than on symptoms.

By 1912 his interest in jurisprudence and his recognition of the shortcomings of the profession in America had stirred him to activity. He began to polemicize against the prevailing view of the legal conservatives that we live under a government of laws and not of men, that judges can do nothing but abide by legal precedent. This view he scornfully calls the "phonograph theory" of jurisprudence. It was his contention that the judge had a creative function to perform in molding justice to the needs of contemporary issues.

"The phonograph theory has bred the mistake.. view that the law is a closed, independent system having nothing to do with economic, political, social or philosophical science. If, however, we recognize that courts are constantly remaking the law, then it becomes of the utmost social importance that the law should be made in accordance with the best available information which it is the object of science to supply. Law deals with human affairs, and it is impossible to legislate or make any judgment with regard to them without involving all sorts of assumptions or theories. The issue, therefore, is not between

a fixed law on the one hand, and social theories on the other, but between social theories unconsciously assumed and social theories carefully examined and scientifically studied ... Hence the lawyer who regards his work as a liberal profession rather than as a commercial trade, must not be satisfied merely guarding the works which have been handed over to him. He must study the stream of life and be constantly thinking of ways of improving the containing legal forms. We too are men, and now we will live not as pall bearers of a dead past but as the creators of a more glorious future. By all means let us be loyal to the past, but above all loyal to the future, to the Kingdom which doth yet appear."⁸⁷

In 1913 the Conference on Legal and Social Philosophy was born with John Dewey as chairman and Cohen as secretary.

Cohen's activity in the field of jurisprudence brought him into close friendships with Roscoe Pound and Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. The latter figured heavily in much of Cohen's subsequent writings.

The New Republic was founded in 1914 by some of Cohen's best friends. He claims that he was not always in sympathy with the "benevolent aspirations" of some of the editors of that periodical "to lead the American public in the paths of righteousness" but his disagreements could not have been too great. He was a regular contributor to its pages from 1914 to 1921 and continued to write for it, though more sporadically for many years after that.

During the first World War there was a notable silence from Cohen's direction on the issues of that war.

Not one article is published on the subject -- no mention of it is made in his autobiography. In one article published just after the war Cohen explained this phenomenon.⁸⁸

^{In it}
He defended himself against the charge of having been a slacker in the war effort and having dawdled away his time with subjects like symbolic logic and Plato. He admitted that all this was true but that he was not ashamed of it. "On the contrary when I look upon my professional colleagues who enlisted their philosophies in the war, who added their shrill voices to the roar of the cannons and their little drops of venom to the torrents of national hatreds, I feel that it is they who should write apologies for their course."

Though he writes in obvious disenchantment of the war, he was not a pacifist. For he continues:

"As a citizen I should have been glad, if conditions permitted, to volunteer for military service. But though I could conscript my body I could not conscript my mind. As a philosopher I could never assert that the war was a clear issue between the powers of light and the powers of darkness I could never get myself to say that Japan had a better right to Shantung than Germany or that it was better that Poles should oppress Russians and Germans than that the latter should be the oppressors. I could never believe that the world's iniquity would end the moment the Kaiser (or any other "boss") should be overthrown."

In this last ~~statement~~^{sentence} Cohen evidences an understanding of history and present reality not shown by all of his idealistic intellectual contemporaries. This article

goes on to give amazing insight into Cohen's opinion of American mores and they do not surprise us.

"I am aware," he wrote, "that in my high valuation of purely theoretic pursuits I have the weight of contemporary authority against me. My fellow philosophers for the most part are too ready to assert that theoretic philosophy can justify itself only by its practical applications. But why the fundamental human desire to know the world is any less entitled to satisfaction than the desire for kodaks, automobiles, india-paper, or upholstered furniture, they do not tell us. Indeed, exactly what is practical, and what is the good of being practical at all, are just the kind of theoretic studies that they frantically refuse to undertake. I strongly suspect that in this they are influenced not only by the Puritanic aversion for the arts of free play, but also by the unenlightened prejudice that the bare necessities of life are more important than the "luxuries" which by giving life are more beautiful and more dignified and make the struggle for it worth while to free men I would contend that the really important issue before the American people today is not economic or political but moral and vital -- the issue of Puritanism. It is the Puritanic feeling of responsibility which has blighted our art and philosophy and has made us as a people unskilled in the art of enjoying life. (No one who witnessed our victory celebrations will here ask for proof.) By making daily existence dreary and depressed it drove people to strong drink, and now it deprives people of their drink without inquiring into its cause or function I know that Plato's otherworldliness is decidedly out of fashion. We believe nowadays that by progressive mechanical inventions and by some happy economico-political device we can bring about the reign of complete justice and happiness. Far be it from me to disprove this modern faith. As a great hope sanctified by the supposed evidence of "scientific" evolution, it is to many a real sustaining force in the presence of otherwise intolerable evil. But to fix all our hope on some temporal affair like the League of Nations is to leave us helpless when we come to the inevitable harvest of disappoint-

ment. We hold the benefits of civilization not in fee simple, to our heirs forever, but by knights' service. Much as we may leave to our successors, we can never manage it so that they shall be entirely free from toil, pain, and the agonies of death. Let us not, therefore, willfully impoverish their life by throwing away any of the things that have served as consolations to so many since the ancient days -- among which are the writings of the divine Plato and even of the altogether unheroic Cicero, who so tragically illustrates the failure of scholars in politics."

Cohen despite himself shows that he is definitely affected by the trend of ^{the} American mores and he demonstrates plainly that his sympathies on these matters belong for the most part with the liberal intellectual group to which Kallen and Lewisohn also belonged at this time. But, by and large, he remains remarkably faithful to his purpose of devoting himself to the theoretical aspects of the great human problems.

He tells us that as a citizen he was unable to maintain silence in the face of the hysterical one hundred per cent Americanism which gripped the land after the war and culminated in the racist immigration laws of 1922 and 1924. "Along with Jane Addams, Isaac Hourwich, Felix Frankfurter, Father John Ryan, and other unregenerate liberals, I joined in the battle to expose the false science on which this anti-semitism and anti-Catholic legislation was based."⁸⁹

There are other allusions to contemporary issues⁹⁰ but they are usually lacking in comprehensive-

ness. His writings remained singularly free from social and political agitation up the very last.

Probably the most significant periodical contribution that Cohen made was an article appearing in The Nation⁹¹ entitled, "What I Believe." In it he stated the essence of his humble faith in human progress. He wrote that:

" history shows the frailty of humans--each of us drops out before the end is in sight. Yet we are able to carry on. What makes us able to do so is not our guess as to the unknown goal, but rather the zest developed by our actual daily experiences. When zest is gone all words of comfort or exhortation are vain. But wise reflection may fan the flame when it is low. Thus recognition of our frailty leads not to despair but to wide eyed courage. It also points to an intimate connection between science and the liberal spirit. Science is not a new set of dogmas, it is rather a method based on a critical attitude to all plausible and self-evident propositions. 'To refuse to doubt one's own first principles is the essence of fanaticism.' He debunked the usual sentiments interpretation of the Golden Rule to love thy neighbor as thyself. My neighbor has a right to think that my love for myself is a foolish one. 'Civil society depends not on blindness to the loathsome traits of our fellow mortals, but upon respecting their rights without taking them to our bosoms.'"

As far as religion was concerned, Cohen was very tolerant. He could not affiliate himself with any synagogue or temple but felt that religious institutions might be very helpful to others.

He is in major disagreement with John Dewey on this point.

"Dewey dismissed philosophy which is naught but a distant vision and can serve only as a consolation or intellectual pastime."⁹²

Cohen feels that this is a grievous error. For not only do

"consolations and pastimes -- the essence of religion and fine art -- most directly minister to human welfare by bringing us relief from anguish and offering us positive joy, but no human work could long prosper without them. Industry recognizes the need for vacations. The founder of the school of pragmatism, Chauncey Wright, could still admit that religion and metaphysics had probably done more for human happiness than the narrow evidence of material science can well estimate."⁹³

Neither did Cohen agree with Dewey and Kallen and the other liberals that religious institutions are destined to disappear.

"I happen to be one of those," he wrote, "who do not expect the synagogue to go out of existence in any near future. It has weathered the storms of over two thousand years and it still has a great deal of vitality as a center for Jews -- just as the church is still a natural center of the social life of Christians."⁹⁴

Cohen gave much thought to the future of the Jewish people. He rejected both Zionism and its extreme opposite assimilationism as solutions. Writing in The New Republic as early as 1919⁹⁵ he criticized what he felt to be the shortcomings of the Zionist philosophy. He refused to lose faith in the enlightenment, admitting that the process of emancipation was slow but it could only have a good effect as far as Jews are concerned. No great culture was ever achieved, except by a mixed

people freely borrowing and this is true historically of the Jews, too, he maintained, pointing to Philo, Spinoza and Bergson as examples. In this article Cohen states that "a national Jewish Palestine must necessarily mean a state founded on a peculiar race, a tribal religion, and a mystic belief in a peculiar soil ... stressing group autonomy rather than individual freedom. Indeed how could a Jewish Palestine allow complete religious freedom, freedom on intermarriage and free non-Jewish immigration, without soon losing its very reason for existence?"

Cohen made a point of giving due credit to Zionism for what it has done. He can hardly be called anti-Zionist as ^{he was by} the New Palestine. ~~etc~~ 96 He was in sympathy with all the positive achievements of Zionism. In his 1919 article he paid tribute to the Zionists for increasing "self-respect where assimilation was degenerating into blind aping of Gentile ways." In a post-script written in 1945 when the article was republished in The Faith of a Liberal, Cohen expressed protest against British actions in denying Jewish immigrants entry into Palestine. But for this, Cohen claimed, it is not necessary to be a Zionist.

Cohen can most adequately be characterized simply as a non-Zionist. As a matter of fact, the deprecatory views he set down in The New Republic were called forth in response to the problems of American Jews. Zionism

was just becoming a great issue among American Jews and Cohen was mainly interested in suggesting to American Jews amid all the excitement and agitation that Zionism was not a realistic solution to their problems. His telling argument is, in fact, that Palestine cannot absorb enough Jews to eradicate the Jewish problem in diaspora countries anyway therefore we must need, ~~to~~ look for another answer.

While he does not look on assimilation as an evil, he rejects it too as a complete or immediate answer to American Jewish problems.⁹⁷

~~This is~~ ^{It is no answer} because on the one hand the world is in violent reaction against the liberal spirit and without the liberal spirit there can be no free cultural interchange between Jew and non-Jew. This only means of course that Jewish problems are actually inseparable from the problems of humanity. In the end, of course, assimilation (not the degenerate kind but that which follows logically from truly liberal enlightenment) or destruction is inevitable. "For no one can reasonably suppose that the present divisions of mankind will last forever."

An equally realistic reason for the inadequacy of assimilation as an answer is the group cohesion of Jews. Given the highest recorded rate of intermarriage in history it would take over two thousand years for assimilation to occur, Cohen points out.

What then are the answers. Of course, Cohen has no pat instructions but he points to certain areas where the Jewish position in this country can be made strong. First in the field of economics we should study the distribution of Jews in various fields as well as general economic trends, so that we may, facing the facts realistically, ^{and} make such adjustments as to avoid being bound up with the fortunes of one class or of one area of economic enterprise.

Second is the political problem. Cohen admits that:

"It is ~~possible~~ not at all certain that the liberalism of America will see us through. It is true, however, that the only friends we have in America today are the liberals, and if we should do anything to antagonize them by adopting an anti-liberal philosophy, we should certainly cut ourselves off from any possibility of having the cooperation of any part of the American public when we are in trouble.

"That is a real danger because our Jewish nationalists are adopting an anti-liberal policy. They are saying, for instance, that the philosophy of liberalism led to debacle in Germany, forgetting that to this liberal philosophy we owe the opportunities that we have enjoyed in this country and that if we deny liberalism, we ought to be willing to abandon the rights and privileges which we are enjoying today. It is stupid to believe that we can long enjoy the fruits of liberalism while we cut away its roots."⁹⁸

Above all, we must make provision for systematic study and research. We have neglected ^{not only} scholarly study which is important but also the ^{practical} research which is necessary for the intelligent management of Jewish affairs.

Cohen took himself seriously in the areas of Jewish research. He was instrumental in forming in 1933 the Conference on Jewish Relations. The urgency of the need for scientific knowledge of Jewish problems had been brought home to Cohen by the advent of Hitler. The Conference issued many studies on anti-semitism, it issued Jewish Population Studies which was designed to bring light to bear on the economic situation, present and future of the Jews.

Cohen was one of the founders of Jewish Social Studies the first issue of which appeared in January of 1939. This was a means of stimulating the production of scholarly studies by providing an organ for their publication, notice and review.

Early in the second World War the Conference on Jewish Relations began to concern itself with post-war problems -- the conditions of a desirable peace and the position of the Jews in it. Cohen realistically knew that "when the European war ends, Hitler's war against the Jews is not likely to be terminated. And in any case, acute problems of relief and migration will face us, for which preparatory studies must be instituted now."

This work turned out to be more than the Conference bargained for. But, Cohen writes,

"We were gratified when other organizations, better financed, notably the American Jewish

Committee, came to our aid and set up the Research Institute on Peace and Post-War Problems on a solid basis -- even though this meant abandoning my hope that our institute could function as an autonomous nonpartisan agency equally serviceable to all of the established Jewish organizations."99

It was natural for the Committee to come to the aid of the Conference and especially to make Cohen chairman of the Research Institute on Peace and Post-War Problems in view of Cohen's firm record of non-Zionism. It is plain, of course, that Cohen was not an overly enthusiastic partisan of the Committee's and had no investment in it either emotional or material. Nevertheless, the fact that he, the product of the East European immigration, could ultimately find much in common with the German-dominated organization, where as the German-born Kallen and Lewisohn were drawn to the East European dominated Congress presents a basis for some interesting speculation concerning the rejection of backgrounds as a factor in the development of the intellectuals.

Cohen was often attacked with the charge of negativism. He seems himself to have taken no small pride in referring to himself as "a stray dog among the philosophers." His guiding principle was that all problems and situations are resolvable into balancing or opposing elements (Polarity). The cause of all bad thinking is the stressing of one of these more than the other in the relationship. "The opposite of a false view may be every whit as false." Thus he rejected categorically

the possibility that any one philosophy could have the exclusive truth. Claims to truth, he felt, made by any philosophy no matter how benevolent at the outset could only result in totalitarianism if accepted, aside from the fact that such claims could never be supported by evidence. And so Cohen himself spurned the role of system builder. And remain the sharp critic of all systems.

Another term he loved to apply to himself for the very same reason was "the Devil's Advocate," and as such he forthrightly exposed the faults of everything and everyone who came within his view -- including his dearest friends among them William James and Justice Holmes.

But his ability to get to the heart of matters with keen criticism should not leave us with the impression that he was above the people and movements he criticized and unaffected by them. We have clearly seen that this is not so, (certainly ^{with relation to} the two men just mentioned for example) and his positive labors, theoretical though they were, in the pursuit of the liberal principle showed his connection and concern with the common life to be immense, ^{not} the least proof for which was his devoted performance in the field of Jewish affairs.

Footnotes

1. Wish, Harvey: Society and Thought in Modern America, pp. 302, 303. (*italics that of author*)
2. Ibid, p. 300.
3. Ibid, p. 313.
4. Dewey, John: A Common Faith, p. 29.
5. Beard, Charles A. and Mary R.: The Rise of American Civilization, II, p. 253.
6. Ibid, p. 792.
7. Ibid, p. 793.
8. Ibid, p. 370.
9. Ibid, pp. 373, 374.
10. Ibid, p. 629.
11. Ibid, p. 640.
12. Ibid, pp. 638, 639.
13. Ibid, p. 643.
14. Allen, Frederick Lewis: Only Yesterday, pp. 45, 46.
15. Ibid, pp. 47ff.
16. Ibid, p. 64.
17. Philipson, David: My Life as an American Jew, p. 362.
18. Allen, Frederick Lewis: Only Yesterday, p. 88.
19. Ibid, p. 120.
20. Ibid, p. 159.
21. Ibid, p. 160.
22. Wish, Harvey: Society and Thought in Modern America, p. 466.
23. Ibid, p. 551.

24. The Nation, February 18, 25, 1915.
25. Kallen, H.M.: Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 124, 125.
26. The Dial, May 3, 1917.
27. Ibid, November 16, 1918.
28. Ibid, June 28, 1917: "The War and the Labor Programme".
29. The New Republic, January 10, 17, 24, 1923: "Humanism and the Industrial Age".
30. Ibid, March 25, 1925: "The American Public School."
31. Kallen, H.M.: "Behind the Bertrand Russell Case" in The Bertrand Russell Case, Ed. by John Dewey and Horace M. Kallen.
32. Saturday Review of Literature, December 29, 1928, "Arts Under a Dictatorship".
33. Christian Century, April 26, 1933: "Can Individualism Survive?"
34. Christian Century, June 27, 1934: "Consumers, Organize!"
35. Kallen, H.M.: The Decline and Rise of the Consumer.
36. Saturday Review, May 29, 1943: "What Shall We Do With Germany?"
37. Included in the collection Judaism at Bay by Kallen.
38. "Judaism, Hebraism, and Zionism" 1910, in Judaism at Bay.
39. "Judaism by Proxy" 1916, Ibid.
40. "Jewish Quarrels and Jewish Unity" 1916, Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. "The Place of Judaism in the Jewish Problem" 1918, Ibid.
44. "The Rights of An American," February 15, 1935.
45. Doubleday, Page and Company, New York, 1921.

46. "Judaism, Hebraism, and Zionism" 1910, in Judaism at Bay."
 47. The New Palestine, November 12, 1943: "The Wish and Reality of Jewish Demands."
 48. The Nation, February 28, 1923: "The Roots of Anti-Semitism."
 49. Jewish Education, September 1941: "Judaism as Disaster."
 50. John Macy in The Saturday Review, March 12, 1932.
 51. Living Age, March 1, 1930: "Mencken and Lewisohn in Paris."
 52. Saturday Review of Literature, February 3, 1934: "In Reply to Bernard Smith"

" the view of life which is my mature view is a fundamentally philosophic and religious one and my critical theory and practice cohere with both my reintegration with my people and my return to the religion of my fathers."
 53. Lewisohn, L.: Israel, p. 71.
 54. Ibid, pp. 86, 87.
 55. The Nation, October 7, 1925: "Palestine or Russia". This is a letter to the editor containing a plea against Louis Marshall's J.D.C. plan to raise fifteen million dollars for assistance to Jews in Russia and other European countries. Lewisohn argues that there is no hope for Jews in Europe, where the Jews remain minorities in foreign lands -- only in Palestine we have hope. "We have the pledged honor of Britain that in Palestine we may some day become a majority."
- With this he shows the same lack of insight into British policy as did Kallen -- though it is only fair to add that he snapped out of the fantasy somewhat earlier than did Kallen.
56. Lewisohn, L.: Israel, p. 85.
 57. The Nation, October 14, 1925: "Can an Artist Live in America?" In which his answer to the question is, "Nowhere, else!"

58. Ibid, February 20, 1924: "The Jew Meditates."
59. Harper's Magazine, January 1928: "The Politics of a Man of Letters" (*italics that of author*)
60. Ibid. December 1930: "Blind Alley."
61. Ibid, June 1933: "The Fallacy of Progress."
62. Scribner's Magazine, August 1933: "A Bourgeois Takes His Stand."
63. Harper's Magazine, October 1934: "An American Comes Home."
64. Opinion, September, October, 1936.
65. Ibid, April 1939.
66. The first major document in which he rejects pacifism is the novel, Trumpet of Jubilee, 1937.
67. Opinion, October 1941: "1933 and After."
68. The Nation, May 3, 1933: "Germany's Lowest Depths"
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid, June 21, 1933: "The New Kultur".
71. Harper's Magazine, August 1933: "The German Revolt Against Civilization."
72. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937.
73. Lewisohn, L.: The Answer. In the January 1940 issue of Jewish Social Studies, Morris R. Cohen devastatingly reviewed this book of Lewisohn's. In just a few pages this review establishes, more decisively than could any lengthy comparison, the sharp contrast between the temper of Cohen, whom we are to consider next, and that of Lewisohn.
74. New Palestine, December 26, 1941: "History and the Human Mind."
75. E.g. Ibid, February 20, 1942: "When War's Fiery Curtain Lifts."
76. E.g. Ibid, January 8, 1943: "Vigilance and Vigilantes."
77. Ibid, December 10, 1943: "American Jewry and the

Commonwealth Ideal."

76. Lewisohn, L.: The American Jew, Farrar, Straus and Company, 1950.
79. Ibid, p. 13.
80. Cohen, M.R., A Dreamer's Journey, Beacon Press, Boston, 1949.
81. Ibid, pp. 166, 167.
82. Ibid, p. 167.
83. The Survey, March 1, 1923: "Liberalism and the Russian Mind."
84. Cohen, M.R., "Why I am Not a Communist" (1934) reprinted in The Faith of a Liberal (1946).
85. Cohen, M.R., A Dreamer's Journey, p. 132.
86. Ibid, p. 133.
87. Ibid, pp. 180, 181.
88. The New Republic, December 3, 1919: "A Slacker's Apology" reprinted in The Faith of a Liberal under the title "Philosophy in Wartime -- An Apologia."
89. Cohen, M.R., A Dreamer's Journey, p. 235.
90. E.g. The Dial, July 26, 1919: "Baseball," His speech at the banquet honoring the completion of twenty-five years at CCNY, and The Nation, December 23, 1931, in a book review of The Sacco-Vanzetti Case by Osmond Fraenkel. On one more occasion he did take the effort to write a thoroughgoing article on a matter of the movement and that is in his denunciation of those who attempted (successfully) to keep Bertrand Russell from succeeding to Cohen's own chair at CCNY after the latter's retirement in 1938.

"A Scandalous Denial of Justice" published in the symposium volume The Bertrand Russell Case, edited by John Dewey and Horace Kallen (1940).
91. The Nation, August 5, 1931: "What I Believe."
92. The New Republic, March 17, 1920: "On American Philosophy, III: John Dewey."

93. Ibid.
94. Cohen, M.R.: A Dreamer's Journey, pp. 239, 240.
95. The New Republic, March 8, 1919: "Zionism: Tribalism or Liberalism." For Horace Kallen's scathing reply see The New Republic, April 5, 1919: "Zionism: Democracy or Prussianism."
96. The New Palestine, February 6, 1942. Editorial.
97. Cohen, M.R.: "Roads for American Jewry" published in Reflections of a Wondering Jew, 1950.
98. Ibid, p. 20.
99. Cohen, M.R.: A Dreamer's Journey, p. 252.

Bibliography

Allen, Frederick Lewis Only Yesterday, New York: Blue Ribbon Book, Inc. 1931.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary R., The Rise of American Civilization, New York: The MacMillan Company 1927.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary R., America In Mid-Passage New York: The MacMillan Company 1945.

Cohen, M.R., "Zionism: Tribalism or Liberalism" The New Republic, New York, March 8, 1919.

Cohen, M.R., "Baseball" The Dial, New York, July 26, 1919.

Cohen, M.R., "On American Philosophy, I: Josiah Royce" The New Republic, New York, September 3, 1919.

Cohen, M.R., "On American Philosophy, II: William James" The New Republic, New York, October 1, 1919.

Cohen, M.R., "On American Philosophy, III: John Dewey" The New Republic, New York, March 17, 1920.

Cohen, M.R., "Liberalism and the Russian Mind" The Survey, New York, March 1, 1923.

Cohen, M.R., "Legalism and Clericalism" The New Republic, New York, November 26, 1924.

Cohen, M.R., "The Intellectual Love of God" Menorah Journal, New York, August 1925.

Cohen, M.R. Speech at Banquet in honor of his twenty-fifth anniversary at CCNY, in A Tribute to Morris Raphael Cohen, published New York by "The Youth Who Sat at his Feet" 1928.

Cohen, M.R., "In Dispraise of Life, Experience and Reality" The New Republic, New York, March 18, 1931.

Cohen, M.R., "What I Believe" The Nation, New York, August 5, 1931.

Cohen, M.R., "The Sacco-Vanzetti Case Reweighed", the Nation New York, December 23, 1931.

Cohen, M.R., "Prophet of a Great Hope" The New Republic, New York, September 28, 1932.

Cohen, M.R. "Justice Holmes" The New Republic, New York, April 3, 1935.

Cohen, M.R., The Work of the Conference on Jewish Relations, New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, Inc., 1937.

Cohen, M.R., "Philosophies of Jewish History", Jewish Social Studies, New York, January 1939.

Cohen, M.R., "A Scandalous Denial of Justice" in The Bertrand Russell Case, John Dewey and Horace Kallen, editors, New York: The Viking Press, Inc. 1940.

Cohen, M.R., "Jewish Studies of Peace and Post-War Problems" Contemporary Jewish Record, New York, April 1941.

Cohen, M.R., The Faith of a Liberal, New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1946.

Cohen, M.R., A Dreamer's Journey, Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949.

Cohen, M.R., Reflections of a Wondering Jew, Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950.

Daniel, Raymond, "Churchill Stirs Row by Gibe at Shinwell" The New York Times, December 4, 1952.

Dewey, John, A Common Faith, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1934.

Dewey, John, John Dewey's Philosophy, ed. by Joseph Ratner New York: The Modern Library.

Frank, Nino, "Mencken and Lewisohn in Paris", Living Age, Boston, March 1, 1930.

James, William, Varieties of Religious Experience, New York: Modern Library Edition (Original: New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1902)

James, Horace M., "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot" The Nation, New York, February 18, 25, 1915.

James, William, The Philosophy of William James, New York, Modern Library.

Kallen, H.M., "Nationality and the Hyphenated American" The Menorah Journal, New York, April 1915.

Kallen, H.M., "A Programme for Pacifists", The Dial, New York, May 3, 1917.

Kallen, H.M., "The War and the Labor Programme", The Dial, New York, June 28, 1917.

Kallen, H.M., "The Issues of the War and the Jewish Position", The Nation, New York, November 29, 1917.

Kallen, H.M., "The Structure of Lasting Peace", The Dial, New York, October 25, 1917, February 28, 1918.

Kallen, H.M., "The Psychology of War", The Dial, New York, November 16, 1918.

Kallen, H.M., "Eugenics -- Made in Germany", The Dial, New York, January 11, 1919.

Kallen, H.M., "Zionism: Democracy or Prussianism", The New Republic, New York, April 5, 1919.

Kallen, H.M., Zionism and World Politics, New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1921.

Kallen, H.M., "Humanism and the Industrial Age", The New Republic, New York, January 10, 17, 24, 1923.

Kallen, H.M., "The Roots of Anti-Semitism", The Nation, New York, February 28, 1923.

Kallen, H.M., Culture and Democracy in the United States, New York: V. Boni and Liveright, 1924.

Kallen, Horace M., "The American Public School", The New Republic, New York, March 25, 1925.

Kallen, H.M., Why Religion, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1927.

Kallen, H.M., "Religion in Russia", The New Republic, New York, November 2, 1927.

Kallen, H.M., "Arts Under a Dictatorship", Saturday Review of Literature, New York, December 29, 1928.

Kallen, H.M., Indecency and the Seven Arts, New York: Horace Liveright, 1930.

Kallen, H.M., The Warfare of Religion Against Science, Girard, Kansas: Haldeman, Julius "Little Blue Books", 1931.

Kallen, H.M., Judaism at Bay, New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1932.

Kallen, H.M., "A Revision of Christian Doctrine", Opinion, New York, January 11, 1932.

Kallen, H.M., "Can Individualism Survive?", The Christian Century, Chicago, April 26, 1933.

Kallen, H.M., "The Struggle for Jewish Unity," reprint of address before eleventh annual session American Jewish Congress, Washington, May 21, 1933, Ad Press, New York.

Kallen, H.M., "Consumers, Organize!", The Christian Century, Chicago, June 27, 1934.

Kallen, H.M., "Consumers' Economy", The Christian Century, Chicago, October 10, 1934.

Kallen, H.M., "The Rights of an American", Congress Bulletin, New York, February 15, 1935.

Kallen, H.M., The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

Kallen, H.M., "Democracy and the World Jewish Congress", Congress Bulletin, New York, May 29, 1936.

Kallen, H.M., "Problems Before the World Jewish Congress", Opinion, New York, August 1936.

Kallen, H.M., "Education of Jews in Our Time", Jewish Education, New York, September 1939.

Kallen, H.M., "Behind the Bertrand Russell Case", in The Bertrand Russell Case, ed. by John Dewey and Horace M. Kallen, New York: Viking Press, Inc., 1941.

Kallen, H.M., "Religious Education in Democratic Society", Jewish Education, New York, April 1941.

Kallen, H.M., "Judaism as Disaster", Jewish Education, New York, September 1941.

Kallen, H.M., "The National Being and the Jewish Community", in The American Jew, A Composite Portrait, ed. by Oscar I. Janowsky, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Kallen, H.M., "The New Education and the Future of Peace", Jewish Education, New York, January 1942.

Kallen, H.M., "National Solidarity and the Jewish Minority", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, September 1942.

Kallen, H.M., "What Should We Do With Germany?", Saturday Review, New York, May 29, 1943.

Kallen, H.M., "The Wish and Reality of Jewish Demands", The New Palestine, New York, November 12, 1943.

Kallen, H.M., "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews", Contemporary Jewish Record, New York, December 1944.

Kallen, H.M., "Labor's Stake in Education", Nation's Schools, Chicago, May 1946.

Kallen, H.M., "Education for American Jews", Congress Weekly, New York, January 8, 1951.

Kallen, H.M., "Whither Israel", Menorah Journal, New York, Autumn, 1951.

Lewisohn, L., Upstream, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922.

Lewisohn, L., "South Carolina", The Nation, New York, July 12, 1922.

Lewisohn, L., "The Jew Meditates", The Nation, New York, February 20, 1924.

Lewisohn, L., "On Love in Marriage", The Nation, New York, October 29, 1924.

Lewisohn, L., Israel, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "Hunger and Holiness", Menorah Journal, New York, February 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "The Art of Being a Jew", Harper's Magazine, New York, May 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "Silence in Central Europe", The Nation, New York, May 13, 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "Palestine or Russia", The Nation, October 7, 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "Can An Artist Live in America?" The Nation, New York, October 14, 1925.

Lewisohn, L., "Martin Buber", Menorah Journal, New York, February 1926.

Lewisohn, L., "Culture and Barbarism", Harper's Magazine, New York, November 1926.

Lewisohn, L., The Island Within, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928.

Lewisohn, L., "The Politics of a Man of Letters", Harper's Magazine, New York, January 1928.

Lewisohn, L., Mid-Channel, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1929.

Lewisohn, L., "Smith Versus Levy", Saturday Review of Literature, New York, March 9, 1929.

Lewisohn, L., "The Jewish World Crisis," Harper's Magazine, New York, November 1930.

Lewisohn, L., "Blind Alley", Harper's Magazine, New York, December 1930.

Lewisohn, L., "Germany's Lowest Depths", The Nation, New York, May 3, 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "The Fallacy of Progress," Harper's Magazine, New York, June 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "The New Kultur", The Nation, New York, June 21, 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "A Jewish Notebook", Opinion, New York, July, August, 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "The German Revolt Against Civilization", Harper's Magazine, New York, August 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "A Bourgeois Takes His Stand", Scribner's Magazine, New York, August 1933.

Lewisohn, L., "In A Pagan World", Opinion, New York, January, February 1934.

Lewisohn, L., "In Reply to Bernard Smith", Saturday Review of Literature, February 3, 1934.

Lewisohn, L., "An American Comes Home", Harper's Magazine, New York, October 1934.

Lewisohn, L., "Jews in Trouble", Atlantic Monthly, Boston, January 1936.

Lewisohn, L., "In Defense of the Acquisitive Instinct", The Forum, New York, April 1936.

Lewisohn, L., "Prologue to a Novel", Opinion, New York, September, October 1936.

Lewisohn, L., "The Liberal Cause," The Spectator, New York, December 1936.

Lewisohn, L., Trumpet of Jubilee, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1937.

Lewisohn, L., The Answer, New York, Liveright Publishing Company, 1939.

Lewisohn, L., "There is no Peace", Opinion, New York, April 1939.

Lewisohn, L., "1933 and After", Opinion, New York, October, 1941.

Lewisohn, L., "History and the Human Mind", New Palestine, New York, December 26, 1941.

Lewisohn, L., "When War's Fiery Curtain Lifts", New Palestine, New York, February 20, 1942.

Lewisohn, L., "Vigilance and Vigilantes", New Palestine, New York, January 8, 1943.

Lewisohn, L., "American Jewry and The Commonwealth Ideal", New Palestine, New York, December 10, 1943.

Lewisohn, L., The American Jew, New York: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1950.

Macy, John, "The Letters and the Spirit", Review of Expression in America by Lewisohn appearing in the Saturday Review, March 12, 1932,

Philipson, David, My Life as an American Jew, Cincinnati, John G. Kidd and Son, 1941.

Wish, Harvey, Society and Thought in Modern America, New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1952.