

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Gary M. Klein

TITLE "Nelson Glueck: A Leader of Liberal Jewry"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒

Master's ☐ Prize Essay ☐

1. May circulate [☒]) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
 2. Is restricted [☐] for _____ years.) thesis

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

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

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.
- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| $\frac{\times}{\text{yes}}$ | $\frac{\quad}{\text{no}}$ |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|

April 7, 1975
Date

Jerry H. Klein
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed 7/14/75
Date

Melina Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

NELSON GLUECK: A LEADER OF LIBERAL JEWRY

By Gary M. Klein

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for Ordination.

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of
Religion 1975

Referee: Professor Jacob Rader Marcus

DIGEST

This is a study of Nelson Glueck's career as President of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. It presents a survey of his accomplishments as a leader and it attempts to offer insights into his motivation and methodology.

This thesis is divided into seven chapters and an introduction which provides a general overview of Dr. Glueck's activities, skills and beliefs. Chapter One examines his early years in an attempt to determine how his background and particularly his days as a Biblical archaeologist influenced his later life.

Chapters Two and Three contain his feelings about the history of the Jewish people, the Jewish religion, and the responsibilities of the Rabbi. Dr. Glueck felt that the Rabbi must lead the Jewish community and he offered the compulsions of past and future as a justification for that belief.

Chapter Four traces the development of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion under Dr. Glueck's leadership. Chapter Five endeavors to determine the methodology he employed as a leader.

Chapter Six is an analysis of the difficulties he encountered while President. It consists of an account

of the incident, Dr. Glueck's eventual response, and perhaps the thinking that motivated the response. The final chapter delves further into his motivation and arrives at the conclusion that Dr. Nelson Glueck was a man of great strength and sensitivity who felt a need to serve Mankind.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Ilene, my brother Allen, and my parents, Joseph and Sylvia. They have provided the most important element of my Rabbinic training, their love.

Gary M. Klein
April 2, 1975

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Mrs. Myra Yedwab, who offered me the original idea for this project, to Rabbi Stanley Yedwab who has been a constant source of inspiration and has guided me through this and many other endeavors, to Dr. Helen Glueck for graciously sharing her recollections of her husband, and to my advisor, my teacher, and my friend, Dr. Jacob Marcus, whose warmth, devotion and understanding have nurtured this thesis. I cherish my relationship with Dr. Marcus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE:	THE BACKGROUND OF NELSON GLUECK	PAGE	1
CHAPTER TWO:	NELSON GLUECK'S CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP AND HIS VIEW OF HISTORY	PAGE	8
CHAPTER THREE:	NELSON GLUECK'S EXPECTATIONS OF THE RABBI	PAGE	22
CHAPTER FOUR:	THE ROLE OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE	PAGE	29
CHAPTER FIVE:	NELSON GLUECK'S APPROACH TO COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION	PAGE	78
CHAPTER SIX:	CONFLICTS GLUECK ENCOUNTERED AS PRESIDENT	PAGE	98
CHAPTER SEVEN:	CONCLUSION	PAGE	114

INTRODUCTION

A man's philosophy can be expressed at a most unlikely setting. In a report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, on the occasion of his fifteenth anniversary as President of the College, Nelson Glueck revealed some of his deepest feelings about Judaism. While referring to the American Jewish Archives, he said,

We established the American Archives documenting in wonderfully organized fashion the history of American Jewry which contains thus the outlines of our future development in this beloved country of ours and in the world at large.

Glueck saw the connection that exists between the forces of history and his responsibility as a leader. He realized that past experience dictates our response to present and future needs. As a Jewish leader, he saw in his people's past, both a rich tradition that would enhance the lives of its adherents, as well as many events that led people and tradition perilously close to destruction. Hence, his statement about the Archives means that we can influence our future only by being aware of all our past experiences, which in the case of the Jews, includes both positive elements such as the united, strongly identified community of Eastern Europe, where the scholar was the leader, and negative elements such as the destruction per-

petrated by the Nazis, or the alienation engendered by twentieth century technological and secular society.

The Jews of Eastern Europe were strongly identified and united around the scholar, the rabbi. The school and the rabbi were seen as authoritative teachers and interpreters of the religious tradition which served as a relevant code for living. Hitler, and past persecutions in the physical sense and the forces of modernity in the spiritual sense destroyed this Jewish community identity. The Jewish scholars and their followers of Eastern Europe are dead and the American Jewish intellectuals have a disdain for Judaism and Jewish communal life.

Glueck was deeply touched by the tragedy that these two aspects of Jewish history brought upon his people, yet he was aware of the potential for rebirth and advancement of which they were also harbingers. He saw that the impact of the Holocaust created a group of sensitively conscious Jewish philanthropists and lay leaders whose human and financial resources he could tap to aid him in his mission, and he was aware that the values, attitudes and modes of observance presented by Reform Judaism which was a product of modern knowledge and culture, were tools with which he could approach modern sophisticated and secular Jewry and offer a relevant version of tradition for the good of the Jewish people and for mankind.

It was his plan to use these two assets, the Hebrew Union College Board and Reform Judaism, to develop the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in such a way that it would provide learned, creative, sophisticated and sensitive rabbis who would be able to serve as leaders of today's Jewish community. He wanted to place the rabbi at the center of the community, and he confronted this challenge in two levels. Aware, since his days as an archaeologist of the significance of demographic changes, he set out to establish a center of Jewish study in each of the most significant of the world's Jewish population centers and he succeeded by leaving a rich legacy of schools in Cincinnati, New York, Los Angeles and Jerusalem. Furthermore, he sought to broaden and intensify the educational experience of his students. Academic standards were raised and curriculum was diversified in order to prepare a generation of Jewish leaders who were both sensitive and able to respond professionally to human needs. In New York and Cincinnati, schools of education were built so that modern pedagogical methods could be employed in the enlightened transmission of the Jewish heritage to children and parents alike. Aware of the need for a rabbinate that could relate, if not contribute, to people of the highest levels of intellectual life in the community, he encouraged the establishment of programs in the humanities.

Glueck's career as President of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion illustrates the complexities of his personality. He was a skillful leader who influenced and perhaps controlled his board. He won their approval for nearly all his plans. He had a desire to be loved by his students and colleagues and gave freely to them of his own admiration and respect. Although he held his peers, men of intellect and sensitivity, in high regard, he feared competition. Furthermore, there seemed to exist within him a tension between his desire to respond to needs of his geographically dispersed people and his intent to maintain centralized control over the cultural and intellectual institutions of Progressive Judaism. This ambivalence was reflected in his attempt to restrict the activities of the New York Rabbinical School to those of a preparatory academy, and his continued conflict with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Nelson Glueck accomplished a great deal as President of the Hebrew Union College. This study will trace those accomplishments, and analyze Glueck's motivation and his methodology.

I. THE BACKGROUND OF NELSON GLUECK

Dr. Nelson Glueck was born on June 4, 1900 in Cincinnati, Ohio.¹ His parents, Morris and Anna Glueck were immigrants from Lithuania.² Glueck was proud of his Eastern-European Jewish heritage.³ He was strongly influenced by its emphasis on education and by its concept of the scholar as leader of the Jewish community. These values must have been transmitted through his family as his father was a fine Talmudist, and his uncle, Bernard Revel, was the first president of Yeshiva University.⁴

Glueck entered the Hebrew Union College at the age of fifteen and obtained a Bachelor of Hebrew Letters Degree three years later.⁵ In 1920, he received a Bachelor of Arts Degree from the University of Cincinnati.⁶ He was ordained

28. 1"Nelson Glueck," Current Biography, (July, 1969),

2D. Syme, Interview with Helen Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio, March, 1975.

3Ibid.

4G. Klein, Interview with Jacob R. Marcus, Cincinnati, Ohio, July, 1974.

28. 5"Nelson Glueck," Current Biography, (July, 1969),

6Ibid.

Rabbi in 1923⁷ He was granted the College's first Morgenthau Fellowship and continued his studies at the Universities of Berlin, Heidelberg and Jena where he received his Doctor of Philosophy Degree in 1927⁸ During the fall of that year, he went to Jerusalem to study with William F. Albright, Director of the American School of Oriental Research.⁹ In 1928, he was appointed to the faculty of the Hebrew Union College and from then on, he divided his time between America and Palestine. He continued his archaeological work and served as Director of the American School of Oriental Research during 1932 and 1933, and 1936 through 1940.¹⁰ In 1941, he was appointed Director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations which was at that time located in Cincinnati; but Glueck resigned and was proceeded by Maurice Eisendrath when Glueck was called to serve the United States Office of Strategic Services as a field agent in the Near East for the agency's World War II operations.¹¹ In 1947, Glueck was appointed President of the Hebrew Union College.¹²

7Ibid.

8G. Klein, Interview with Jacob R. Marcus, Cincinnati, Ohio, July, 1974.

9Ibid.

10Ibid.

11Ibid.

12Ibid.

The pressures of the presidency forced him to curtail his archaeological work, but he attempted to engage in it whenever possible.

Early in his archaeological career, Glueck became skilled in dating ruins by classifying the pottery that he found on the surfaces of sites.¹³ This knowledge enabled him to conduct scientific explorations of large areas and thereby obtain information about entire societies and eras.¹⁴ Prior to Glueck's time, archaeological exploration of the Bible lands consisted exclusively of in depth studies of particular sites.¹⁵ Using the Bible as his guide, during the 1930's, he explored almost the whole of TransJordan and uncovered King Solomon's copper mines at Timma and his seaport at Ezion Geber.¹⁶ During the 1950's, when hostile governments prohibited Glueck from continuing his work in Jordan, he traced the civilizations of the Negev.¹⁷ He discovered, again with the aid of the Bible, that Israel's

28. 13"Nelson Glueck," Current Biography, (July, 1969),

14Ibid., 28.

15Ibid., 29.

16Ibid.

17Ibid.

Negev once supported fairly dense population.¹⁸ He charted ancient roads, cisterns, gardens and settlements.¹⁹ These discoveries have greatly aided the modern Jewish State in its efforts to resettle the area.²⁰

Nelson Glueck claimed that he did not want to be a rabbi.²¹ Archaeology and advanced Biblical research were his first loves.²² A question posed by this study is why did he give up a career as an archaeologist in favor of the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College? Why did he consent to devote his life to issues involving rabbis and their training? One of the answers lies in his view of archaeology.

Glueck sought knowledge of the history of his religion, of the development of its ethical precepts and their application.²³ He felt that such a knowledge was an indispensable factor in transmitting that religion.²⁴ As a basis for that

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio, March, 1975.

²²Ibid.

²³F. Bamberger, "The Mind of Nelson Glueck", (1970) reprinted from Near Eastern Archaeology in the 20th Century, edited by James A. Sanders.

²⁴Ibid.

study, he went to Judaism's source, the Bible.²⁵ He studied it at the Hebrew Union College, and pursued more advanced inquiries in Germany.²⁶ One of the methods he employed was to take a Biblical concept and trace its development in the text.²⁷ Glueck's doctoral thesis is an example of such an endeavor and deals with the concept of Hesed.²⁸ He followed the ideas development as it paralleled the Biblical writer's developing insights into relationships between men and their fellow men and God.

Another methodological approach to Biblical study employed by Glueck was archaeology.²⁹ He used it as an aid to learn the history of the Biblical periods.³⁰ He believed that archaeology could provide more historical information than the Bible would furnish, as the Bible was primarily a religious text not a history.³¹ About archaeology he

25Ibid.

26Ibid.

27Ibid.

28Ibid.

29Ibid.

30Ibid.

31Ibid.

said:

"I am interested in archaeology because it is a branch of history . . . it makes the ground reveal the secrets of buried civilization . . . it is . . . one of the tools of history."³²

Glueck made great use of archaeology, but only as a tool for obtaining the knowledge of the history that would enhance his understanding of the surroundings in which the religion

developed. He suggested limits to the use of archaeology.³³

He never used it to prove or disprove the truths of Judaism.³⁴

He stated:

"The truths of the Bible . . . can neither be buttressed nor invalidated archaeologically. New discovery may perhaps modify or fill out or make clear a particular account in the Biblical annals but it can never replace or refute or corroborate its religious worth."³⁵

Archaeology could substantiate Biblical truths, but it would also link Glueck emotionally to his religion's history.³⁶

Glueck dearly valued that link, as we see in the following passage:

"I have never travelled through this part of the world without being seized by a sense of excitement. I have never wandered about across its spaces, knowing that I

32Ibid.

33Ibid.

34Ibid.

35Ibid.

36Ibid.

was treading ground where the Patriarchs and the Prophets had lived, without wondering what new view of the miraculous might possibly be unrolled before me. I have never explored the Negev or Sinai without realizing that in those lands God's will was revealed to mortal men, giving them the possibility of a status little lower than the angels. I have never paced up and down the banks of the Jordan without in my mind's eye seeing the people of Israel cross over into the promised land and wondering what the spiritual equivalent of the promised land might be in our time."³⁷

Archaeology and Biblical studies brought Glueck his pleasure, for they enabled him to relive the unfolding of the Jewish genius. The Nazis brought Glueck his responsibility for they forced him to carry on the unfolding of the Jewish genius, to assume the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College.

³⁷Ibid.

II. NELSON GLUECK'S CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP AND HIS VIEW OF HISTORY

Nelson Glueck's accomplishments were largely the result of his belief that the leaders of the American Jewish community possess great power to influence their people and bear immense responsibility to do so. Glueck came to this view, at least in part, as a result of an historical process that began long before his birth, for as a Jew he fell heir to a tradition that was to serve him well all his life.

Glueck's childhood as a member of an immigrant family enabled him to see both the depths of poverty and the vastness of opportunity that awaited the young Jew in America. As a youth, Glueck sold newspapers on a corner in Cincinnati, a community where many Jews were already quite wealthy.³⁸

Coming from a home where a high value was placed upon Jewish learning, Nelson at the age of fifteen, entered the Hebrew Union College.³⁹ The course of study there made him aware of the roles that scholars and religious leaders had played throughout Jewish history. From the time of the

³⁸D. Syme, Interview with Helen Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio, July, 1971.

³⁹G. Klein, Interview with Jacob R. Marcus, Cincinnati, Ohio, July, 1974.

patriarchs, Jews followed the command and example of their religious leaders. The curriculum emphasized the roles of Abraham, of Moses of the Taanaim, the Amoriam, the academicians, the judges, the poets, the philosophers, and the rabbis in Jewish communal life. And life at Hebrew Union College reminded him daily of the importance of modern Jewish scholar-leaders; men such as his teachers and Isaac Mayer Wise.

Secular university studies impressed upon him the value of modern knowledge. Later archaeological studies helped develop his respect for science.

The tragedy of the Holocaust left its mark on Nelson Glueck. The massacre of the six million impressed upon him an image of the potentially destructive power of man. The memory of Hitler as we shall see throughout the study, haunted Glueck. Yet the void in Jewish life created by the destruction of European Jewry helped to propel Glueck to his greatest accomplishment.

The development of modern Israel reassured the remainder of world Jewry that man still possessed the ability to create a positive environment. Glueck saw in the rebirth of the Jewish state an opportunity for a new type of Jewish existence.

It was in part those factors, his background, the Holocaust, and the establishment of Israel that led Glueck to

view the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College as an opportunity to bring this new type of Jewish existence into reality. He believed this to be a historically defined imperative; Dr. Glueck felt he was responding to the forces or "thrust" or "compulsion" of history.⁴⁰ As President he would open what he believed to be "an entirely new chapter in the history of Jewish life."⁴¹ He would create an American spiritual and intellectual center of Judaism to fill the void the Nazis left. He had to reconcile the forces of modernity that characterized the American Jewish community with the religious heritage of their forefathers. To do this he would employ and adapt the legacy of Reform Judaism bequeathed him by Isaac Mayer Wise and Stephen S. Wise. Eventually he would establish a mutually fulfilling relationship between that American Jewish community and their Israeli brethren.

Nelson Glueck assumed the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College shortly after the Holocaust. He believed it thrust a unique responsibility upon the American Jewish community to become the intellectual and spiritual center of Judaism.⁴² He told the Board of Governors in October,

⁴⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 14, 1957, p. 14.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid., October 27, 1954, p. 1.

1954:

The frenzy of totalitarian destructiveness has added to [our] burden and challenge of maintaining and strengthening and transmitting a vigorous and modernly meaningful Judaism for ourselves and our world.⁴³

Furthermore, in June, 1961, noting the dedication of the library, Rare Book Room, and the new dormitory on the Cincinnati campus, Dr. Glueck stated that the construction:

. . . conveys part of our answer to the executioners of millions of our brethren, both to those who committed and those who tolerated the crime of genocide or who did little or nothing to stay its course when it was still possible to do so. It dramatizes our determination to be not less but more Jewish, to be ever more knowledgeable of the deepening religious philosophy of Judaism and ever more warmly observant of its God sanctioned moral principles and ethical imperatives.

. . . It buttresses the contribution of religious idealism that we as Americans can make to the continuation of the American philosophy of life, which is based on the searchings of the Bible.⁴⁴

Dr. Glueck concluded by eloquently telling the Board:

History has thrust responsibility into our hands . . . of raising up rabbis and all those associated with them for . . . ourselves and our children.⁴⁵

Dr. Glueck believed that the future of his people depended upon the fulfillment of this responsibility.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid., June 3, 1961, p. 3.

⁴⁵Ibid., June 3, 1961, pp. 19-20.

Glueck saw that history thrust this ominous responsibility upon a community that was born receptive and yet possibly somewhat alien to its charge. The traditional ideals of American society were compatible with the tradition of Biblical religion.⁴⁶ Furthermore, America offered the intellectual and religious freedom so necessary for the survival of Judaism. Dr. Glueck often spoke of the importance of America as a "great democratic commonwealth."⁴⁷ It was here in America that Dr. Glueck found a highly developed Jewish institutional structure, complete with the manpower and financial means necessary to assist him in the fulfillment of his mission. The destruction of the European centers left Hebrew Union College as "the oldest and largest school in the world devoted to the training of Rabbis."⁴⁸ This destruction in Europe and Dr. Glueck's accession to the Presidency of the College coincided with the increase in wealth and the strengthening of Jewish commitment of the American Jewish community in the post-war, post-Holocaust world. Sadly, only in America was there a potentially

⁴⁶Ibid., June 3, 1961, p. 3.

⁴⁷Ibid., May 4, 1949, p. 8.

⁴⁸Ibid., February 1, 1962, p. 10.

significant source of recruitment for service to the Jewish community. Thus, the development of Reform Judaism in America was to be the focus of Glueck's administration. America was to become and would remain a significant center for Jews. In November, 1970 after reporting on the Jerusalem School - which he referred to as his fondest child - Glueck concluded his final address to the Board of Governors by proclaiming:

Our future for the overwhelming majority of us is here in America. It is here that we must continue to place the chief accent of our total program . . .⁴⁹

The Holocaust and the existence in America of a vibrant Jewish community directed the Presidency of Dr. Nelson Glueck toward a focus on the American Jewish community.

America offered many opportunities for the further development of Jewish life. But Dr. Glueck realized that the modern age was a revolutionary one, and as such, challenged the very foundations of hallowed institutions and beliefs. He told the Board of Governors, in June, 1962:

Ours is a period of pressing problems . . . violent storms shake old institutions and beliefs to the very foundations and overturn many of them overnight. New facts and forces, submerged needs and unsuspected

⁴⁹Ibid., November 12, 1970, p. 18.

strengths keep emerging . . . If ever there were a revolutionary age, this one merits the adjective.⁵⁰

Dr. Glueck feared that the Jewish religion and its institutions would fall victim to certain forces that were part of the revolutionary age. He foresaw the possible failure of traditional Judaism and its leadership to confront problems engendered by nuclear development and other scientific advancement. Traditional Judaism based upon a system of ritual instructions regarding daily behavior in a simple society offered little guidance for the modern man. His concern was that secular studies in science and the humanities and the teachers of those disciplines should take precedence over Judaism and its Rabbis as guides of the Jewish community as it became increasingly sophisticated. Dr. Glueck often stated, as he did in October, 1950:

. . . If Judaism is to live and expand here in America, it must be open to every positive influence of modern thought, must square itself with every advance in scientific understanding, must integrate progressively its spirit and tradition with the spirit and culture of America, and must engender that type of religious devotion that will uphold and advance the humanitarian ideals of America and the world.⁵¹

One year later, Dr. Glueck reiterated this view and added that if his words were not heeded, Judaism would "waste and

⁵⁰Ibid., June 1, 1962, p. 1.

⁵¹Ibid., October 11, 1950, p. 1.

wither."⁵² Aware of the relevance of studies in the humanities for the training of Jewish leaders, Dr. Glueck stressed the role he wanted it to play at the Hebrew Union College:

The . . . excellence of our rabbinical instruction depends . . . upon our pursuit of this kind of learning. . . Direct contact with . . . brilliant (secular) Jewish scholars could be mutually helpful.⁵³

Nelson Glueck saw the ethical teachings of Judaism as the religion's essence. Reform Judaism, to him, was the application, on the part of intellectually astute Jews, of this traditional religious ethical imperative to the contemporary world with its array of political, social and moral problems. This application, which would lead to involvement in social action required a faith, about which Dr. Glueck was not explicit, and a familiarity with the literature of Jewish tradition as well as modern disciplines. To Nelson Glueck, this was the only "living" Judaism. He viewed Orthodoxy, with its narrow dogma, as an invalid form. The following survey of the most significant of Dr. Glueck's remarks to the Hebrew Union College Board of Governors concerning the meaning of Reform Judaism will indicate that

⁵²Ibid., October 16, 1951, p. 1.

⁵³Ibid., October 14, 1957, p. 9.

although the President was by no means a competent theologian, his understanding of Reform Judaism was a significant and positive aspect of his world view and it played an important role in his decision-making process. In October, 1950, Dr. Glueck stated that the Hebrew Union College was:

Dedicated to the preservation of Judaism, its great historic ideals, and its traditional institutions. It holds that Judaism is both spirit and fact, a continuously progressing religious discipline and that it should be kept constantly liberal and spiritually alert.⁵⁴

One year later, Dr. Glueck proclaimed that his Judaism was "reform in practice,[and] progressive in faith." It was characterized by freedom of thought and flexibility of practice; it was as Dr. Glueck stated, "unfettered by the establishment of hierarchial authoritarianism."⁵⁵ Stressing the importance of the ethical imperative for American Jews, Dr. Glueck said that our future as Jews and as citizens is in America and in the moral law.⁵⁶ After a decade as President, he spoke of the "broad gauged religious humanitarianism and spiritual idealism of Reform Judaism."⁵⁷ We

⁵⁴Ibid., October 11, 1950, p. 1.

⁵⁵Ibid., October 16, 1951, p. 1.

⁵⁶Ibid., May 16, 1951, p. 1.

⁵⁷Ibid., October 23, 1956, p. 1.

see that Dr. Glueck's concept of Reform Judaism remained somewhat constant throughout his career. In 1964, he reported to the Board:

I speak of studies and reading and practical work which must be engaged in . . . to achieve a deep understanding of the ethical imperatives of Judaism on one hand and their relationship on the other hand to the . . . problems and conditions of the world around us. I speak of the necessity of making the ethical content and commandments of Judaism intelligible and applicable to modern life . . . 58

Although his public view of Reform Judaism may not have been very sophisticated, Dr. Nelson Glueck believed strongly that the development of Reform Judaism and its institutions in this country was the basis for the future development of a vibrant American Jewish community.⁵⁹

America was a major focus of Glueck's efforts but so was Israel. He envisioned a mutually beneficial relationship between the two Jewish communities. He dreamed of Israel serving as a source of great enrichment for American Jewish life; yet, he was cognizant of Israel's need for a relevant religious form. Dr. Glueck believed that he and the Hebrew Union College could help Israel develop that

58Ibid., October 22, 1964, p. 7.

59Ibid., June 2, 1967, p. 12.

form. He implied this belief when he said, "Israel has much to give us . . . but, by the same token, we feel that we have much to give Israel beyond dollars and empirical skills."⁶⁰

Israel would provide a link between American Jews and their heritage. They would once again walk the same soil as did the patriarchs, growing closer to the rich legacy of spirit and culture to which they fell heir and which was once again thriving in its homeland. Reporting on the Israel experiences, Dr. Glueck commented that it was an inspiring one that enhanced life and provided an understanding of our faith.⁶¹ Shortly before the dedication of the Jerusalem school, Dr. Glueck reminded the Board that it would be a glorious occasion for them as leaders of American Jewry:

Glorious for the opportunities it will afford to deepen our knowledge and appreciation of the lore and literature of Judaism and the backgrounds of their origins in the Holy Land . . . ⁶²

Following the Six Day War, Dr. Glueck noted that the Hebrew Union College family in Jerusalem remained there

⁶⁰Ibid., February 1, 1962, p. 6.

⁶¹Ibid., February 7, 1962, p. 13.

⁶²Ibid., February 7, 1963, p. 12.

throughout the war and that Hebrew Union College facilities housed Israeli policemen and soldiers during the conflict.

He continued:

The importance of our school for the relationship between the people of Israel and American Jewry transcends any physical circumstances. More than ever before it symbolizes the unbreakably deep connection between American Jewry and the people and land of Israel. . . . There must be the closest possible connection between our American centers . . . and the Holy Land.⁶³

Dr. Glueck was certain that Israel provided the American Jew with living evidence of the relevance of his history.

On a more practical level, Dr. Glueck, as President of a rabbinical school, saw in the Israeli environment a pedagogical tool. Referring to the future development of a mandatory program of study in Israel for all American Reform rabbinic candidates, he noted a main reason for the establishment of this program was that it would facilitate the indispensable advanced study of Hebrew.⁶⁴ Dr. Glueck believed the use of this tool would enable him to impart the high levels of learning that were required of contemporary American Jewish leaders.

Nelson Glueck wanted to assist Israeli Jews in developing their own religious forms that would be relevant

⁶³Ibid., October 24, 1967, p. 21.

⁶⁴Ibid., June 3, 1965, p. 8.

in the modern Jewish state. Such a religion would have to grow out of the Israeli experience. The Israeli form of religious expression would not parallel American Reform but it would be based upon the same principles of critical analysis, progressive adaptation, and liberal interpretation that characterized American Reform Judaism. Nelson Glueck wanted to use American Reform Judaism and its institutions as a source for the Israeli movement and was prepared to fight for the principle of religious freedom in Israel. He felt that many Israeli's desired that opportunity. In a prophetic statement about the role of a Hebrew Union College chapel in Israel, he pointed out:

There is much reason to believe that this Hebrew Union College chapel in Jerusalem will serve as a model for other temples and synagogues like it . . . and will mark the beginning of the development of an Israeli type of reform or liberal Judaism for which we believe very large numbers of Israelis are hungering.⁶⁵

In 1956, Dr. Glueck again assured the Board that there were many Israelis who would welcome liberal Judaism. He said:

. . . The vast majority of the people in Israel are determined that there shall be religious freedom in Israel . . . (they) are seeking a modern meaningful form of Judaism. . . ⁶⁶

American Reform Judaism and modern Israel were to play

⁶⁵Ibid., October 27, 1954, p. 6.

⁶⁶Ibid., October 23, 1956, p. 23.

reciprocal roles. By bringing a vibrant American based Reform Judaism, nourished by the existence of the State of Israel, to the Jews of both lands, Nelson Glueck hoped to help create a uniquely rich form of Jewish existence. This was his answer to Hitler.

III. NELSON GLUECK'S EXPECTATIONS OF THE RABBI

Dr. Nelson Glueck believed that the primary responsibility for insuring the survival of the Jewish community lay with the Reform Rabbinate.⁶⁷ He felt that the Jewish community would survive only if it were strengthened. He would frequently remind the Board that American Judaism must either move ahead of retreat; standing still was not possible.⁶⁸ Glueck's view of leadership gave him confidence that strong Jewish community leaders could induce the members of their communities to make Judaism a more important part of their lives and lead them to devote more of their physical, financial and spiritual resources to the Jewish community and its institutions, thus strengthening Judaism.

Dr. Glueck wanted the Rabbi to be that strong leader. In order to lead effectively, the Rabbi had to become preeminent in his community. He had to have the command of his congregation and had to merit the respect of the entire Jewish community. Dr. Glueck often reflected upon the periods in our people's history when the Rabbi was the leader of the Jewish community. As recently as his

⁶⁷President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 4, 1949, p. 14.

⁶⁸Ibid., October 16, 1951, p. 1.

his grandfather's time in Eastern Europe, Jews sought the Rabbi's counsel for the enrichment and guidance of their lives. It was Dr. Glueck's hope that the properly trained Reform Rabbi would acquire comparable stature in the American Jewish community. He stated:

The properly trained rabbi was the leader of the community, the guide of its activities, the arbiter of its practices, the guide of its morals. He was teacher and priest and spiritual leader. He was in a word the person whose role was preeminent in the Jewish community, whose knowledge of Jewish traditions and religious teachings was the mainspring of all communal endeavors. No attempt was made to relegate him to the background or to restrict his role to the most formal ones connected with the synagogue itself and to that of delivering opening invocations and closing benedictions at public affairs, and serving as a religious functionary on various occasions. He was all that and much more and must become that again.⁶⁹

Dr. Glueck placed great demands upon the American Reform Rabbi.

Nelson Glueck realized that if American Reform Rabbis were to become important figures in their communities, they would have to be capable teachers, religious activists and spiritual guides. He stressed the importance of pedagogical pursuits noting that Reform Rabbis:

must be thoroughly equipped to help create and teach and direct religious school and general educational

⁶⁹Ibid., January 22, 1958, p. 2.

programs for the upbuilding of a vital attractive American Judaism.⁷⁰

Regarding the role of rabbi as counselor, Dr. Glueck proclaimed:

Our rabbis need to know how to deal on the basis of knowledge with personal situations involving life and death, birth and marriage . . . (and) personal counseling.⁷¹

Dr. Glueck demanded that the rabbi be involved in the world around him.

Neither our faculty nor our students live in isolated ivory towers away from direct connections with the local and national scenes and communities . . . with individual human beings and with larger public groups and with the issues that confront America and Israel and the world today.⁷²

Dr. Glueck believed that involvement with the daily affairs of the local community was as important as concern for national issues. He saw it as being incumbent upon the Rabbi to gain the knowledge necessary to enable him to function as a Board member and leader of local agencies.⁷³ The Rabbi was to be an informed and active member of the community.

⁷⁰Ibid., May 4, 1949, p. 2.

⁷¹Ibid., February 8, 1968, p. 3.

⁷²Ibid., October 24, 1967, p. 12.

⁷³Ibid., February 2, 1967, p. 8.

Dr. Glueck cautioned, however, against over-involvement in community affairs, teaching and counseling at the expense of the fulfillment of spiritual responsibilities. He viewed synagogue worship as a viable form of expression in modern society. Dr. Glueck demanded that Rabbis make religious services appealing and satisfying to their congregants. In response to those who predicted the demise of the synagogue, he stated:

I think that the synagogue and temple will long remain with us, requiring changes of form and substance to keep the worship within them meaningful for Jews of the modern world . . . I foretell the rise of synagogue worship . . . particularly in those synagogues whose Rabbis are in the vanguard of modern theological and philosophical thinking.⁷⁴

Nelson Glueck, then, saw the Rabbi as a spiritual guide, a community activist, a counselor and a teacher.

To execute his charge, Dr. Glueck felt the Rabbi must have a command of the techniques of public speaking; be able to interpret Jewish tradition liberally; and relate sensitively to those around him. In May, 1952, Dr. Glueck approached the Board for funds that would enable Rabbinic students to take courses in public speaking at the University

⁷⁴Ibid., February 6, 1969, p. 19.

of Cincinnati.⁷⁵ On another occasion, he said:

. . . pulpit delivery and public appearance are a Rabbi's 'stock-in-trade' . . . a Rabbi is well on the way to failing in his mission, whatever sincerity or piety he may have if he cannot read the ritual effectively, or cannot get his ideas and ideals across to his congregants in an interesting and competent manner.⁷⁶

Dr. Glueck emphasized the importance of sensitive expression on the part of the Rabbi. He also realized that an effective congregational leader in twentieth century society must always be able to analyze and interpret the Jewish tradition and make it relevant, and hence, continue the process of reform. He viewed study on the part of the Rabbi as an obligation and expressed confidence "that the accurate and affirmatively critical and free study of our tradition will ensure its survival and enhance its sanctity."⁷⁷

Dr. Glueck required that the Rabbi place a high value upon Jewish and secular intellectual pursuits. He also sought rabbinic candidates who were "devoted to the service of God" and to their fellow man.⁷⁸ He desired that

⁷⁵Ibid., May 15, 1952, p. 12.

⁷⁶Ibid., October 23, 1948, p. 6.

⁷⁷Ibid., January 27, 1954, p. 9.

⁷⁸Ibid., May 16, 1951, p. 9.

the Rabbinate consist of a selfless group of idealists worthy of membership in an organization that would merit the title "religious peace corps."⁷⁹ In an effort to translate these ideals into tangible deeds, Dr. Glueck encouraged each graduate of the College to enter the Chaplaincy.⁸⁰

There were certain men whom Nelson Glueck held in high esteem. One of them was Rabbi Leo Baeck, whose conception of the men of the Rabbinate had a profound influence upon Glueck's own views. I conclude my discussion of Nelson Glueck's view of the Rabbi by sharing, as Dr. Glueck did, the words of Leo Baeck:

The Rabbi must be of honorable character, speaking with thorough knowledge and clear understanding, a man who avoids the cliché . . . above all he must be a man inwardly free.⁸¹

⁷⁹Ibid., October 26, 1964, p. 3.

⁸⁰Ibid., January 24, 1951, p. 3.

⁸¹Ibid., June 1, 1962, p. 2.

IV. THE ROLE OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Nelson Glueck wanted the Hebrew Union College to produce the leadership that would guide and assist the Jewish community in achieving the new kind of Jewish existence that the forces of history demanded.⁸² That new form of Jewish life would involve a synthesis of Jewish tradition and modern knowledge. The leaders produced by the Hebrew Union College would have to be knowledgeable in both areas of academic endeavor. Hence, Glueck successfully attempted to offer instruction into a variety of fields including traditional Jewish studies, modern social science and the humanities. He stated:

Our major emphasis . . . is and must always be concerned with the array of studies dealing with religion in general and Judaism in particular, with the clearest possible relationship of our religious orientation and theological position to the ethics of Judaism and their translation into innermost attitudes and tangible actions, with their application to modern cultural, social, and political conditions as they effect the physical welfare and spiritual health of our people and all humanity.⁸³

Glueck's task necessitated the physical expansion of the College-Institute so that it would have influence in most of

⁸²President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 7, 1963, p. 1.

⁸³Ibid., October 22, 1964, p. 6.

the major Jewish population centers. He told the Board:

We are called upon to enlarge our structure, widen the scope of our activities, and multiply the numbers of our graduates.⁸⁴

Finally, the expansion required that Glueck find the means with which to make what, as we shall see, were massive changes in the Hebrew Union College.

There is much to indicate that when Nelson Glueck assumed the Presidency, the College was without effective administration.⁸⁵ Its funds were severely limited. Its total endowment in 1947 was only approximately \$500,000. Glueck's predecessor, the brilliant scholar, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, apparently failed in his attempts to enable the College to overcome a number of financial handicaps. The College had not been chartered as an institution separate from the Union of American Hebrew Congregations until late in its history. Prior to 1926, it was incorporated as a department of the Union and hence was unable to obtain any private donations.⁸⁶ Furthermore, although its new charter

⁸⁴Ibid., June 1, 1956, p. 17.

⁸⁵Dora Aaronsohn, "The History of the Hebrew Union College," Cincinnati, May 14, 1963, American Jewish Archives, Tape 13.

⁸⁶Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College), p. 62.

enabled it to solicit some funds on its own, Dr. Morgenstern was unable to take full advantage of this new opportunity. In 1926, the "Five Million Dollar Fund Campaign" was begun under the direction of Adolph S. Ochs, and Julius Rosenwald. It raised \$3,200,000. The "fund", however, did not permit the money to be used for a perpetual endowment. Rosenwald, who felt that each generation would know its own needs and should spend its own funds, stipulated that a minimum of \$90,000 from the fund be spent each year.⁸⁷ Finally, Dr. Morgenstern was not so skillful a fund raiser as to mitigate the effect of the depression by encouraging charitable gifts of the wealthier segments of the American Jewish community.⁸⁸

Prior to Nelson Glueck's administration, the academic programs of the College were limited. The nearly exclusive role of the School was the training of rabbis and even this endeavor was inadequate. Programs in the humanities, human relations, education, speech and practical rabbinics were not sufficient for the training of Glueck's modern rabbinate. Furthermore, the College did not yet have a School of Biblical Archaeology or a School of Sacred Music. The Christian Fellows Program and the Graduate Department for Jewish candidates

⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 52-53.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 63.

had only been suggested.⁸⁹ Plans for merger with the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York were in their earliest stages and the Hebrew Union College had not as yet extended its influence to the West Coast.⁹⁰ There were no plans for a branch of the school in Jerusalem as the College maintained an anti-Zionist stance.⁹¹

One of Dr. Glueck's first accomplishments as President of the College was the establishment of a Graduate Christian Fellows Program which offered courses in Bible, Jewish History, Jewish Philosophy, and Theology, and American Jewish Life for graduates of Christian seminaries.⁹² Dr. Glueck had long believed in the value of "intercultural scholarly contact." He felt that the presence of Christians on the campus of a Jewish seminary would offer many benefits to both groups. He wrote to Louis Caplan of the Horowitz Foundation which later funded a large segment of the program in search of funds in May, 1947, contending that his experience as Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem

⁸⁹Ibid. Suggested in 1945 by Board member, Rabbi Samuel Wohl of Wise Temple, Cincinnati, p. 67.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 69.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 61.

⁹²Nelson Glueck, Letter to Mr. Louis Caplan, May 19, 1947.

where he taught many graduate Christian theological students convinced him of the "values of such intercultural contact."⁹³ This contact at Hebrew Union College, besides benefiting the individual students involved in the program, would serve to improve Christian-Jewish relations in America. If Glueck's rabbinic students were to become key figures in the secular community, the experience of studying and living with Christian ministers would offer invaluable insights.⁹⁴ The Christian student would benefit from the academic excellence of Hebrew Union College faculty and program and from living and studying in a Jewish environment. This cultural contact would be very important for the entire community. Dr. Glueck wrote:

These men, when they enter upon their own Christian ministry, will thus be uniquely equipped for positions of leadership in the respective communities for the tasks of intercultural education and community integration.⁹⁵

This program would encourage a positive Christian interpretation of Judaism and aid in at least the local development of a relationship between Christians and Jews "based on knowledge and friendship, rather than upon propaganda and heresy."⁹⁶ Dr. Glueck pointed out, however, that the

⁹⁴President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 14, 1952, pp. 13-14.

⁹⁵Nelson Glueck, Letter to Mr. Louis Kaplan, May 19, 1947.

⁹⁶President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 23, 1948, p. 4.

program was neither a publicity gimmick nor an attempt to proselytize. Rather, its purpose was to improve relations between the two groups and to make available the Hebrew Union College's unique academic resources to a widening community of interest.⁹⁷ Dr. Glueck proposed the program in 1947, immediately after the decision to accept the offer of Presidency and established the program a year later. He brought it to existence, expanding it throughout the years of his administration. By 1964, the program had an enrollment of twenty-five, three of whom received their Doctor of Philosophy degrees that year.⁹⁸ Enrollment increased to 35 in 1966, when five degrees were awarded.⁹⁹ In 1967, Nelson Glueck's twentieth year as President, the Hebrew Union College awarded its twenty-first Doctor of Philosophy degree to a Christian theologian.¹⁰⁰

Glueck's concept of the importance of this program and his pride in it were frequently reinforced by the accomplishments and responses of its graduates. In June, 1966, Dr. Glueck told the Board of a letter he had received from

97Ibid., May 27, 1959, p. 15.

98Ibid., January 30, 1964, pp. 5-6.

99Ibid., June 7, 1966, pp. 2-3.

100Ibid., October 24, 1967, p. 11.

Father Jean Ouellette S.J. in which the priest who recently received his Ph.D. from the College expressed his gratitude and that of the Superior of the Jesuits of Montreal "for the immense advantages (he) . . . found during the course of (his) studies." Included with the letter was a donation from the Superior of the Jesuits of Montreal for the amount of one hundred dollars. Father Ouellette requested that the money be used for the Library of the Jerusalem school.¹⁰¹

Another graduate of the program, in whose activities Dr. Glueck found great pride was James A. Sanders, a faculty member at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. Sanders edited a major volume of archaeological essays published in honor of Glueck's seventieth birthday. In the introduction to the book, Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century - Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck, he eloquently professes his feelings for Glueck, and in so doing, conveys the significance of the interfaith program.

It is a distinct honor for me to be associated in this manner with my teacher, Nelson Glueck . . . Being a student of Nelson Glueck, I could not refuse an opportunity to honor him . . . our volume is intended as a zikkaron: a celebration of the lifelong labor of Nelson Glueck, who has made the background of the of the Bible a reality for himself and for others . . .¹⁰²

¹⁰¹Ibid., June 2, 1966, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰²James Sanders, Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century - Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck, (Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), Introduction XIV.

Nelson Glueck brought the beauty of Judaism to Christian scholars.

The development of a Ph.D. program for Jewish scholars was another of Dr. Nelson Glueck's immediate goals. He believed that it was imperative that the Hebrew Union College become a significant center for the training of doctoral candidates to fill professional positions in Judaism at the Hebrew Union College as well as at universities and colleges throughout the world. Glueck felt that the destruction of European Jewry and its centers of Jewish scholarship placed this burden upon the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. In December, 1948, Dr. Glueck suggested that the College establish a program for the training of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Hebraic and cognate studies.¹⁰³ He hoped to supplement this new program by providing fellowships for rabbinic graduates of the College-Institute to study for advanced degrees at other universities.¹⁰⁴ One month later, Glueck recommended the school apply to the State of Ohio for

¹⁰³President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, December 29, 1948, p. 3.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., June 2, 1966, pp. 2-3.

permission to grant Ph.D. degrees.¹⁰⁵ In May, 1950, Dr. Glueck announced that students could now take courses in abstentia and told the Board that this was one of the steps "methodically being taken to introduce with graduate students the methods and procedures of a graduate school."¹⁰⁶ A year later, in his report to the Board of Governors, the President again emphasized this program:

It must remain one of the most important considerations of the plans for the continuous building up of the College-Institute to encourage and provide opportunities for qualified graduates to engage in graduate studies and prepare themselves for academic careers at the College-Institute and elsewhere.¹⁰⁷

At the same meeting, Dr. Glueck proudly announced that at the forthcoming graduation exercises (Spring, 1951), the Hebrew Union College would grant its first Ph.D. degrees to Jews. The initial recipients were to be Hillel A. Fine, Ezra Spicehandler and Stanley Dreyfus.¹⁰⁸ Throughout Glueck's administration, the program continued to expand. The Ph.D. program was important to Dr. Glueck who knew that the Hebrew Union

¹⁰⁵Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of January 12, 1949, Appendix B, p. 1.

¹⁰⁶President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 1, 1950, p. 7.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., May 16, 1951, p. 5.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., May 16, 1951, p. 2.

College had to train modern Jewish scholars if Judaism was to thrive. He repeatedly stressed the importance of this program. In May, 1959, he again reported to the Board of the College-Institute, as he had done many times before, on the importance of the program. Noting that in spite of his accomplishments during the past eleven years, he was not satisfied with the number of graduate fellowships available at the College-Institute and reminded the Board of the importance of the program. Looking towards the expansion of the College-Institute faculty and foreseeing the expansion of Judaic studies at secular universities and colleges throughout the country, he told them that the graduate program must be, along with rabbinic training, one of the College's primary aims.¹⁰⁹ In June of 1963, the program thriving, Dr. Glueck looked to the establishment of a separate division of graduate studies. After proclaiming once again that the Holocaust had thrust upon the College-Institute the responsibility to train specialized scholars, he pointed out that since its inception, the program had been administered and funded as part of school's ongoing rabbinic program. Without as yet making a formal proposal, Dr. Glueck noted that this could not continue much longer and warned the Board that they were soon to

¹⁰⁹Ibid., May 27, 1959, p. 14.

face the problem of reorganizing the graduate school as a distinct entity within the College family but with its own administration and section of the budget.¹¹⁰ One year later, Dr. Glueck briefly but eloquently reviewed the development of the program.

Twenty years ago, we did not have a graduate program of the kind we now have. We had sporadic graduate students but no integrated concerted program. The rich program which we have developed has come about without any special budgetary allotment from the Board of Governors. It has been carried as part of the expense of running the rabbinic program. The vital importance of this graduate program should be self evident. Hitler brought it about that there is no longer a reservoir overseas from which our faculty, the men who will train rabbis, can be recruited . . . we must train these scholars ourselves.¹¹¹

In June, 1966, noting that the College-Institute Ph.D programs had become one of the largest of its kind, Dr. Glueck formally proposed the establishment of a separate graduate department with its own administration but not necessarily with its own faculty.¹¹² Furthermore, noting the proliferation of Judaic studies at universities throughout the country and the competition for graduate fellows and faculty that would result, Dr. Glueck recommended later that all Ph.D. fellowships be increased to \$4,600 for a married man

¹¹⁰Ibid., June 7, 1963, p. 4.

¹¹¹Ibid., June 4, 1963, p. 6.

¹¹²Ibid., June 2, 1966, p. 2.

and \$4,000 for a single man, from which the \$600 yearly tuition fee would be deducted.¹¹³ Throughout his career, Dr. Glueck labored for the growth of the Ph.D. program which, within a period of twenty years, had awarded nineteen degrees.¹¹⁴

The Graduate Interfaith Program and the Ph.D. program would produce faculty for religious schools. The transmission of the Judaic heritage from generation to generation required the services of competent, properly trained religious educators. Nelson Glueck expressed his interest in the field early in his Presidency by repeatedly stressing the need for rabbinic candidates to possess such expertise. He said:

The Department of Education . . . should stand as second to none . . . our graduates must be thoroughly equipped to help create and teach and direct religious school and general educational programs for the upbuilding of a vital, attractive American Judaism.¹¹⁵

Even before his formal inauguration as President, he told the Board he was looking for someone to take charge of the Department of Religious Education at the College! The Cincinnati position became vacant after the appointment in 1946 of Dr. Abraham Franzblau as Director of the Hebrew Union School of Religious Education in New York City.

¹¹³Ibid., November 3, 1966, p. 11.

¹¹⁴Ibid., October 27, 1967, p. 11.

¹¹⁵Ibid., May 4, 1949, p. 2.

In 1923, the Hebrew Union College School for Teachers had opened in New York under Dr. Franzblau's direction. The school was closed as a result of financial problems in 1932. Shortly before that, in 1931, Franzblau joined the faculty in Cincinnati as head of the Department of Religious Education. The New York School reopened as the Hebrew Union School of Religious Education in 1946, again under the direction of Franzblau, leaving the Department of Religious Education in Cincinnati without a director.¹¹⁶ Glueck hired an instructor for the department during the first year of the Presidency, and a professor, Rabbi Sylvan D. Schwartzman during the academic year 1950-1951.¹¹⁷ That year, he announced his plans to establish a program for the training of nonrabbinic religious educators at the Cincinnati school.¹¹⁸ The program which was approved by the Board on May 14, 1952, awards a masters degree in religious education.¹¹⁹ The

¹¹⁶Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972), p. 68.

¹¹⁷President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 30, 1948, p. 1, President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 11, 1950, pp. 2-3.

¹¹⁸Hebrew Union College Administrative Board Meeting, November 21, 1951, p. 1.

¹¹⁹Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of May 14, 1952, p. 2.

first recipient of the degree was Rolf Schickler.¹²⁰ In 1967, Dr. Glueck attempted to convince the Board to expand the faculty of the department.¹²¹ Apparently, he was not successful, as Dr. Schwartzman remains as its only professor. Glueck built a third school for religious educators, at the Los Angeles campus of the Hebrew Union College, which opened during the 1956-1957 academic year and will be discussed later.¹²²

Glueck also established the Hebrew Union School of Sacred Music in New York City which opened its doors on October 16, 1948.¹²³ Glueck felt that the College-Institute had a responsibility to promote the learning of Jewish music and culture which is an important component of a vibrant modern Jewish religious experience. He felt this task to be uniquely that of the Hebrew Union College as both this endeavor and the College-Institute's entire program were spearheads of the movement to make Judaism relevant to the modern world.¹²⁴ He reminded the Board that their school

¹²¹Ibid., June 2, 1967, p. 8.

¹²²Ibid., June 1, 1956, p. 9.

¹²³Ibid., June 7, 1948, p. 5.

¹²⁴Ibid., October 27, 1954, pp. 15-17.

was the first school of Jewish Sacred Music in the history of Judaism and he referred to its opening as marking a new chapter in the history of Jewish religious and cultural life.¹²⁵

It was not until the late 1960's that Nelson Glueck succeeded in his attempts to establish the School of Jewish Communal Studies in Los Angeles, California. But doing so had long been his desire. We see his concern, that Jewish communal workers be properly trained, expressed as early as January, 1948, when he announced to the Board that the Hebrew Union College School of Religious Education in New York City would train B'nai Brith Anti-Defamation League personnel.¹²⁶ Dr. Glueck believed that Jewish communal workers must possess "a deep familiarity with the background and philosophy and religious and social ideals of Judaism."¹²⁷ He proposed the establishment of the School of Jewish Communal Studies to the Board of Governors on February 2, 1967 and at that time proposed that a feasibility study be made.¹²⁸ The study was completed by June of that year and one year

¹²⁵Ibid.

¹²⁶Ibid., January 20, 1948, p. 7.

¹²⁷Ibid., February 2, 1967, p. 5.

¹²⁸Ibid.

later, Gerald B. Bubis was nominated to serve as the school's first director.¹²⁹

Nelson Glueck realized that there exists a powerful connection between the forces of history and the activities of the College-Institute. Glueck responded to the suggestion of his close friend and advisor, Dr. Jacob R. Marcus to create the American Jewish Archives. Dr. Marcus actually built the Archives, beginning with only \$5,000, with Nelson Glueck's support probably an important factor. Glueck conveyed his view of the Archives in May of 1949 when he said:

The Archives emphasize the rooting of our American Jewish Community in the soil and fate of America and underlines our role in the establishment and preservation and continuous strengthening of this great democratic commonwealth of America.¹³⁰

Dr. Glueck's interest in archaeology was also indicative of the importance that he placed upon history, and one of his reasons for building the Biblical Archaeology School in Jerusalem was to establish a means for creating an empirically verifiable link between modern Jewry and the history of Bible.¹³¹ The Hebrew Union College was to be an

¹²⁹President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 2, 1967, pp. 7-8, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of June 7, 1968, p. 6.

¹³⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 4, 1949, p. 8.

¹³¹G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March 19, 1975.

institution where both Jews and Christians could study Biblical history scientifically.

Dr. Nelson Glueck desired that the graduates of the rabbinical school keep pace with the scientific study of Biblical history, as well as with other developments in Jewish learning. To this end, he established regular classroom programs for rabbis in the field at all three campuses. Completion of specified academic requirements would lead to the granting of a Doctor of Hebrew Letters degree.¹³²

Glueck also felt that the College-Institute should provide university level courses in Judaica for non-rabbinic, undergraduate students. He stated in the Opening Day Address in October, 1947, that the College would inaugurate a separate program for Jewish lay students enabling University of Cincinnati students to augment their studies at their school with special courses in Judaism at the Hebrew Union College.¹³³ Glueck was aware of the unique nature of this program and soon after its inception, he told the Board:

¹³²Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of May 18, 1955, p. 2.

¹³³President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1947, p. 2.

It may take years to gain nationwide acceptance of the idea of college-level training in Jewish studies but the objective is well worth the effort; a well informed laity is unquestionably one of the goals of the College and of Reform Judaism. We shall expand this program in the sense of university accreditations in our New York and Los Angeles schools.¹³⁴

Years later in 1964, Dr. Glueck announced that the Los Angeles School and the University of Southern California had agreed to a program whereby University of Southern California students could receive credit for courses at the Hebrew Union College.¹³⁵ Glueck exhibited much foresight in developing the lay students programs, as today, many universities have Jewish study programs. When Dr. Nelson Glueck inherited the responsibility of leadership, the Hebrew Union College was a small midwestern Rabbinic school. He transformed it into a major institution that offered programs for the instruction of Christian clergy in Judaism, Jewish academicians, musicians, educators, archaeologists and laity, as well as rabbis.

Glueck also improved the rabbinic training offered at the college. He increased the number of course offerings for rabbinic students and instituted programs that would

¹³⁴Ibid., October 23, 1948, p. 7.

¹³⁵Ibid., October 23, 1964, p. 8.

provide the students with practical experience. In 1952, an orientation course was introduced into the curriculum that would provide insights into the ideology of the reform movement for first-year students.¹³⁶ Two years later, an advanced orientation course was initiated for third year students.¹³⁷ That same year, a summer course in the Hebrew language was begun for entering students.¹³⁸ Glueck looked very favorably upon the summer Hebrew program, which bore the name, Towanda Program (after the lodge in which it was held) as he knew that a good background in Hebrew was a prerequisite for mastering the classical rabbinic texts.¹³⁹ Glueck believed that a rabbinic education must do more than insure competence with Hebrew texts. He also required the rabbi to possess a good general intellectual background. He felt that the Jewish religion had much to offer the intellectual members of the Jewish community in this age of scientific advancement. Although a scientist himself, Glueck expressed concern regarding an overemphasis upon scientific achievement in

¹³⁶Ibid., May 14, 1952, p. 12.

¹³⁷Ibid., January 27, 1954, p. 2.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 5.

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 5.

the absence of the ethical influences of religion. He stated,

How helpful the perceptive study of the past could be to guide mankind as it gropes its way through a present and a future in which scientific achievement seems hopelessly to have outstripped moral judgment and ethical religious behavior.¹⁴⁰

Glueck realized that contact with the temple would greatly benefit Jewish intellectuals, yet he was also aware that many of them were indifferent if not antagonistic to Judaism.¹⁴¹ Glueck saw the primary remedy to be the training of rabbis in many of the modern disciplines. He felt that the College should offer courses in art and music, political science and anthropology, the history of cultural thought, and the philosophy of religion.¹⁴² Such training would enable the rabbi to relate to the most highly educated members of the community and would hopefully narrow the gap between them and liberal Judaism.¹⁴³ To this end, he brought some of the best minds in the American Jewish community to participate in numerous colloquia.¹⁴⁴ He even sought the establishment of chairs in the History of Critical Thought

¹⁴⁰Ibid., October 24, 1963, p. 16.

¹⁴¹Ibid., February 1, 1962, p. 11.

¹⁴²Ibid., October 24, 1963, p. 15.

¹⁴³Ibid., October 14, 1957, p. 9.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 9.

and Comparative Religion as part of the regular curriculum.¹⁴⁵ He did not meet with full success in this area, as those professorships were never established, but he made significant advances in providing the students of the College with programs of learning dealing with the humanities. The most noteworthy being the annual Frank L. Weil Institute for Studies in Religion and Humanities which was established under Glueck's insistence and which brings an eminent professor to the campus each year to give a series of lectures on a topic related to religion and the modern world.¹⁴⁶

Glueck wanted the graduates of the College to be equipped to aid their congregants in dealing with the mass of personal and social problems encountered in the modern age and to be acquainted with the resources available for their resolution. He wanted them to counsel those in need and to serve effectively as members of Jewish communal organizations. In his first report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, he recommended the establishment of a Department of Human Relations.¹⁴⁷ He

¹⁴⁵Ibid., October 24, 1963, p. 15.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., June 2, 1966, p. 8.

¹⁴⁷Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of July 7, 1947, p. 1.

also initiated an Institute on Psychiatry and Religion which sponsored lectures on subjects related to the common goals of both endeavors.¹⁴⁸ This and other lecture series were held in anticipation of the development of the department. In 1950, Dr. Henry Lederer, assistant professor of Psychiatry at the College of Medicine of the University of Cincinnati, was appointed lecturer in the department of Human Relations and Rabbi Robert L. Katz was named acting coordinator of the newly founded department.¹⁴⁹

The Human Relations curriculum grew to include numerous courses, two of which were Pastoral Training Programs offered during the summer at Bellevue Hospital in New York City and at Cedar Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles.¹⁵⁰ The Human Relations Department eventually sponsored research projects in the opinions, beliefs, attitudes and religious convictions of contemporary Reform Jews.¹⁵¹ Its staff has edited case books to aid Rabbis involved in counseling

¹⁴⁸President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 30, 1948, p. 7.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., May 30, 1948, p. 9.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., October 27, 1964, November 3, 1966, p. 15.

¹⁵¹Ibid., May 18, 1955, p.12.

situations.¹⁵² It has brought numerous speakers to the campus, one of whom was Eric Fromm.¹⁵³ Throughout his career, Glueck strove for expansion of the program and in 1964 successfully solicited a gift of \$500,000 from the Joseph and Helen Regenstein Foundation of Chicago to set up a "broad gauged chair in the field of Religion, Ethics, and Human Relations."¹⁵⁴ The program continues at all three American campuses.

As was mentioned earlier, Dr. Glueck placed a great emphasis on the rabbi's role as educator, and he increased the opportunities for rabbinic students to gain expertise in this area. Education involves the sharing of one's knowledge and beliefs. Public speaking is similar to education as it, too, affords an opportunity to enlighten and influence. Aware of the similarity between these two disciplines, Glueck stressed the importance of both as part of a rabbinic curriculum.

. . . The transmission of our ideas, ideals and heritage to our children is still the basic task of the rabbi. We shall not relax our efforts until our graduates are superbly equipped to fulfill this role . . .
 . . . Pulpit delivery . . . (is) a rabbi's stock

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 12

¹⁵³Ibid., June 1, 1956, p. 6.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., October 22, 1964, p. 7.

in trade, a rabbi is well on the way to failing in his mission . . . if he cannot read the ritual effectively, or cannot get his ideas and ideals across to his congregants in an interesting and competent manner.¹⁵⁵

Dr. Glueck expected the rabbinic graduates of the College to be effective speakers and teachers.

Each rabbinic student was given an opportunity to develop his rabbinic skills through a program of practical training. Dr. Glueck heartily supported this program and worked toward its development. Students served small congregations from Friday through Sunday on a bi-weekly basis. Upon their return to the campus, they would meet with a faculty supervisor to discuss problems associated with preachings, programming, counseling, and community relations.¹⁵⁶

Dr. Glueck viewed the field work program, and the human relations, humanities, speech and education courses that were related to it as important elements in rabbi's training. He maintained, however, that a rabbi's legitimacy depended upon his knowledge of Judaism and its sources.¹⁵⁷ It was toward that goal that he directed the primary focus

¹⁵⁵Ibid., October 23, 1948, pp. 3-6.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., October 26, 1955, p. 13.

¹⁵⁷G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

of the College's academic endeavors.¹⁵⁸ In order to produce rabbis who were learned in Bible, Talmud, Midrash, Jewish History and Philosophy, Glueck raised the academic standards of the school, hired faculty members who were considered to be the best in their fields, and initiated a program of recruitment through which he could attract some of the most promising Jewish youth for his student body.

Dr. Glueck commenced his efforts to raise academic standards at the College long before he became President. Students in his Bible classes during the 1930's were subjected to rigorous demands for academic excellence. Early in his Presidency, he prevailed upon the Board to separate the granting of the Master of Hebrew Letters degree from rabbinic ordination, and institute the additional requirement of a comprehensive examination for obtaining the degree.¹⁵⁹ He referred to this change in policy as "one of those (steps) methodically being taken to introduce, with graduate students, the methods and practices of a graduate school."¹⁶⁰ As part of the Merger with the Jewish Institute

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 1, 1950, p. 1.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

of Religion in New York, he raised the requirements for ordination there, from 130 credit hours to 176, which was the number required at the Cincinnati school.¹⁶¹ The Towanda summer Hebrew program and the compulsory first year in Israel program would also raise academic achievement as they would provide a background in the Hebrew language, thus permitting more intensive study of the texts. Glueck was proud of the academic accomplishments of the students and made frequent note of such achievement in his reports to the Board.¹⁶²

Dr. Glueck also built a high calibre faculty and administrative staff. He believed that the College required such faculty and administration if it were to become a great center for Jewish learning. He referred to the appointment of faculty members as his "most important task."¹⁶³ He felt that the future of the school depended more upon the calibre of its faculty than upon anything else.¹⁶⁴ As I noted earlier, one of the reasons for the development of the Ph.D. program was to produce qualified faculty for the College.

¹⁶¹Ibid., Januar, 24, 1951, p. 1.

¹⁶²Ibid., May 5, 1954, January 26, 1956, p. 11.

¹⁶³Ibid., May 15, 1952, p. 7.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 7.

Glueck's requirements for faculty members were that they be brilliant scholars, they publish, they stimulate the students, and they be able to relate Judaism to the modern world.¹⁶⁵ In his appointments, he sought men who were of the same intellectual stature as Leo Baeck and William F. Albright. Eventually, he was even able to bring Baeck and Albright to teach at the school, and this brought him great joy.¹⁶⁶ He held little respect for faculty members who did not publish.¹⁶⁷ He supported the continuation of the Hebrew Union College Annual and urged the creation of a Hebrew Union College Quarterly Review which he hoped would be "on the level of the Yale Review or the Hibbert Journal."¹⁶⁸ Although he demanded high educational standards, he did not want the instruction to be dull.¹⁶⁹ He was disturbed by those faculty members whom he believed were committing an injustice to the students as well as to the legacy of Judaism

165G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

166G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975, and President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 27, 1959, p. 12.

167G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

168President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 24, 1963, p. 16.

169G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

when they taught the tradition in a dull manner.¹⁷⁰ One of the ways they could make it interesting was to make it relevant to modern life. Hence, he sought young men who were steeped in the American experience.¹⁷¹

Dr. Glueck maintained high qualitative requirements for the professors at the College, but offered nearly complete intellectual freedom. He felt that such freedom was required in a Reform institution. Mrs. Glueck said,

He was willing to appoint all kinds of faculty, even if he didn't agree with their philosophy, if he thought they were scholars of integrity . . . He used to say there was room for all kinds of people and that's the difference between Reform and Orthodoxy.¹⁷²

His concern for intellectual freedom led him to appoint as faculty men of varied backgrounds. His first appointment was Ellis Rivkin, a brilliant historian with an Orthodox Jewish background.¹⁷³ Two years later, Dr. Sylvan Schwartzman, an avowed Reform Jew was hired to teach education. Later, other men were added and the faculty grew to include professors of widely varied backgrounds and beliefs. Glueck created an atmosphere in which men like Jacob Petuchowski, a traditional theologian, and Alvin Reines, a radical

¹⁷⁰Ibid.

¹⁷¹Ibid.

¹⁷²Ibid.

¹⁷³Ibid.

philosopher could teach and learn and grow with each other. Many of the faculty members and administrative personnel who serve the College today were appointed by Glueck. Included in this roster are Professors Lowell G. McCoy, Eugene Mihaly, Samuel Sandmel, Robert Katz, Ben Zion Wacholder, Paul Steinberg, Eugene Borowitz, Fritz Bamberger and librarian Herbert Zafren.

During the Glueck administration, the College embarked upon an extensive program of recruitment. Glueck wanted to attract larger numbers of students to fill positions in new congregations that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was developing. He also wanted to improve the calibre of the students who came to the College. As I noted earlier, he felt that the future of Judaism depended, to a large extent, upon the abilities of its rabbinic leadership, and Glueck had had doubts regarding the abilities of some of the students he encountered at the College. He thought of them as "provincial" and feared that they might encounter difficulty in their efforts to translate Jewish tradition into a relevant guide for modern life.¹⁷⁴ The recruitment program, which he developed, eventually helped to alleviate this problem by increasing the pool of Jewish youth from among which the College chose its students. The

¹⁷⁴Ibid.

program exposed large numbers of young Jews to the College; and it provided remedial or pre-rabbinic courses in the Hebrew language for those students who were well suited for the rabbinate, but had deficient Hebrew backgrounds. To Glueck, it was the responsibility of the Hebrew Union College, as a Reform Rabbinic school, to offer the pre-rabbinic courses. He knew that most graduates of Reform religious schools, where Hebrew was seldom taught, had no knowledge of the Hebrew language. Without a pre-rabbinic program, they would be unable to study for the rabbinate.

In 1947, Dr. Glueck called for the establishment of a pre-rabbinic Department at the Hebrew Union College School of Religious Education in New York.¹⁷⁵ That program was initiated during the academic year 1948-1949 and consisted of the equivalent of the first year of the rabbinic curriculum.¹⁷⁶ He developed a similar program in Los Angeles during the early 1950's, and reestablished in Cincinnati in 1957, a program that had been in existence during his student days.¹⁷⁷ Participants in each of these pre-

¹⁷⁵President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1947, p. 2.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., May 30, 1948, p. 5.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., June 7, 1948, p. 2.

rabbinic programs would be enrolled as full-time students in local secular universities and would study at the College on a part-time basis. Glueck also viewed the Towanda program as a recruitment tool. This summer program served the same purpose as the pre-rabbinic program.¹⁷⁸ He also saw great recruitment value in the activities of the National Federation of Temple Youth. He viewed their "pilgrimages," weekend trips to the campus, as especially worthwhile. He referred to the pilgrimages as " . . . a crucial part of . . . our recruitment for future rabbinical students."¹⁷⁹ He appointed Directors of Recruitment for all three campuses and also sought to recruit students from liberal Jewish communities abroad.¹⁸⁰ Aware of the financial hardships for students enrolled in the rabbinic program which is a five year post-graduate course, Dr. Glueck strove to acquire financial aid in increasing amounts for those students.¹⁸¹

Nelson Glueck knew that the College's expanded academic and recruitment programs had to be complimented by a campus structure that would facilitate a great amount of

¹⁷⁸Ibid., May 15, 1957, p. 30.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., June 4, 1970, p. 14.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., February 4, 1965, pp. 1-3.

¹⁸¹Ibid., February 4, 1965, pp. 1-3, June 1, 1956, p. 7, October 19, 1949, p. 9, February 5, 1970, p. 14.

learning. From his early days as an archaeologist, Glueck exhibited a keen perception of demographic trends and a strong concern for their implications for modern life. This perception and concern was reflected in his leadership of the College. He transformed it from a midwestern rabbinic school with only one small campus to an international institution with four splendid campuses whose presence was felt in most of the world's major Jewish population centers. This process of transformation consisted of enlarging the Cincinnati facility, merging the Hebrew Union College with the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City, and opening branches of the merged institution in Los Angeles and Jerusalem.

Glueck expressed his desire to improve the physical plant in Cincinnati as early as January, 1948, when he requested that the Board make provisions for the renovation of the Chapel and dormitory.¹⁸² The following year he noted the need for construction of a married students' dormitory. In 1957, as part of the 5.36 million dollar "Master Plan" for the expansion of the three American campuses, he called for additional development in Cincinnati which would include the construction of a new library, rare book room, dormitory, administrative center and classroom

¹⁸²Ibid., January 20, 1948, pp. 3-4.

building, as well as the renovation of the already existent classroom building, Sisterhood Dormitory and American Jewish Archives building.¹⁸³ Glueck met with a great deal of success in his attempts at expanding the Cincinnati campus. On June 1, 1964, the David W. Klau library, the Hugo and Helen Dalsheimer Rare Book building and the new dormitory were dedicated.¹⁸⁴ Renovation of previously existent buildings was also completed. The married students' dormitory, and the additional classroom and administrative facilities that Glueck called for were never built, and the renovation of the Chapel is now in process under the sponsorship of Mrs. Glueck and others.

Following the construction of the early 1960's, Glueck continued to call for further facilities, and in 1967, a revised "Master Plan" was presented which called for further building in Cincinnati and New York at a cost of six million dollars.¹⁸⁵ Included in the master plan was the construction in Cincinnati of a multi-purpose classroom building, additions to the library, rare book and archives buildings, increased museum space, improved dormitory and recreational facilities,

¹⁸³Ibid., May 15, 1957, p. 15, January 22, 1958, p. 8, October 21, 1959, pp. 2-4.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., June 3, 1961, p. 3.

¹⁸⁵Hebrew Union College Board of Governors, Minutes of Special Meeting to Discuss Master Plan, February 7, 1968, p. 4.

as well as additional facilities in New York.¹⁸⁶ This construction never occurred, and Glueck's reports to the Board suggest that he might not have shared the enthusiasm for this program that he had for the others. When he approached the Board in reference to previous construction, he admonished them to build, whether or not they had the funds, but in regard to this second master plan, he cautioned them to find the money first.¹⁸⁷ Perhaps he was uncertain as to the need for the new construction.

There is no doubt, however, of Glueck's certainty that the merger of the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Institute of Religion had to occur. Although initial discussion of the merger of the two American institutions for the training of liberal rabbis began before Glueck took office, he strongly believed that the recent historical events of the Holocaust necessitated it.¹⁸⁸ In reference to the merger, he repeated the words which Stephen Wise,

¹⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 10 & 11.

¹⁸⁷President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 5, 1970, p. 14.

¹⁸⁸Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972), p. 69.

the Jewish Institute of Religion's founder, first uttered on January 17, 1940:

In this hour of illimitable need on the part of our brother Jews throughout the world, it is the duty of those charged with the management of Jewish affairs in this country to effect every possible economy and to avoid such expenditures as inhere in partial or complete duplication.¹⁸⁹

Glueck was equally certain that it was his responsibility to execute the merger and to lead the combined school. He told the Board:

I know that I was asked to assume the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College with a view to . . . my subsequently assuming the Presidency of the Jewish Institute of Religion.
. . . I would never have accepted this additional Presidency if it were not predicated upon achieving its single purpose, namely of creating one student-body, one faculty and one curriculum, and one diploma based upon the developing and deepening philosophy of liberal, progressive, American Reform Judaism.¹⁹⁰

Glueck would create that unified student body, faculty, curriculum, and diploma. But the process of unification brought Dr. Glueck many problems. I shall discuss those conflicts in Chapter Six.

On October 22, 1947, in his second report to the Board of Governors, Dr. Glueck announced that during the

¹⁸⁹President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1956, p. 2.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., January 26, 1956, p. 3.

previous June the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Institute of Religion agreed to a merger.¹⁹¹ The formal merger occurred on January 25, 1950 when for the first time, the combined Board of Governors met.¹⁹² The actual implementation of the merger required over a decade to complete. It resulted, however, in the transformation of a small financially troubled school in New York with inadequate facilities, a small, predominantly part-time, faculty, few students, and low academic standards into a high calibre center of Jewish learning with improved facilities, larger faculty and student body, and increased financial backing.

The branch of the Hebrew Union College that Dr. Glueck built in Los Angeles was nurtured by the Los Angeles College of Jewish Studies which had been established in 1947 by the Union of American Hebrew congregations. The purpose of this original College was to train teachers, provide adult education and offer religious studies for high school students.¹⁹³ In 1948 at the request of Dr. Glueck, the Hebrew Union College became involved with that school. The name of the

¹⁹¹Ibid., October 22, 1947, p. 4.

¹⁹²Ibid., January 25, 1950, p. 1.

¹⁹³Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972), p. 5.

institution was changed to the Los Angeles College of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.¹⁹⁴ The school was then under the joint auspices of the Union and the College, with the College being responsible for the supervision of faculty and curriculum.¹⁹⁵ Glueck also began sending members of the faculty from Cincinnati to lecture in Los Angeles. He referred to those visiting lectureships as enhancing the reputation of the Los Angeles school and as enabling Hebrew Union College faculty members to exercise direction for the activities of the California school.¹⁹⁶

Glueck first approached his Board requesting the establishment of a branch of the Hebrew Union College for rabbinic studies on the West Coast in 1951.¹⁹⁷ A pre-rabbinic program had been established in 1948. His request stressed Jewish demographic shifts to the West Coast as

¹⁹⁴President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 23, 1948, p. 2.

¹⁹⁵Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, May 30, 1948, p. 2.

¹⁹⁶President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 23, 1948, pp. 2-3.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., May 16, 1951, pp. 9-10.

necessitating such expansion.¹⁹⁸ Noting those factors once again in October, in 1953 he admonished the Board to find the funds necessary to support a program comprising the first two years of rabbinic training and offering the Degree of Bachelor of Hebrew Letters.¹⁹⁹ Four months later, the Board appropriated \$10,000 to initiate the two-year program and provided funds for the establishment of a Los Angeles School of Sacred Music.²⁰⁰ At that time, he also suggested a joint academic program with the University of Southern California.²⁰¹ Formal agreement regarding that program was reached in 1963.²⁰² During the academic year 1956-1957, a Master of Religious Education program was established, as was a Doctor of Hebrew Letters course for alumni; and by 1960, courses of study leading to degrees of Associate and Master of Arts in Judaic Studies were in operation.²⁰³ In 1968, the College of Jewish Communal Service came into

¹⁹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., October 7, 1953, p. 11.

²⁰⁰Ibid., January 27, 1954, p. 12.

²⁰¹Ibid.

²⁰²Ibid., October 24, 1963, pp. 6 & 7.

²⁰³Ibid., June 1, 1956, p. 9, October 21, 1960, p.

being.²⁰⁴ In 1958, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations took control of those departments of the Los Angeles school that originally comprised the College of Jewish Studies, and did not return them to the College's jurisdiction until 1968.²⁰⁵ This left Hebrew Union College with no control over teacher training, adult education and high school programs in Los Angeles. The situation led to considerable tension between Dr. Glueck and the Executive Board of the Union. I shall deal with that conflict in Chapter Six.

The Los Angeles school's first building was dedicated on September 8, 1957.²⁰⁶ Prior to that time, classes were held in the facilities of local congregations. The College outgrew the first campus in less than a decade, and on November 9, 1967, Dr. Glueck announced that ground had been broken for a new campus adjoining the University of Southern California.²⁰⁷ Unfortunately, Dr. Glueck did not live to

²⁰⁴Ibid., June 6, 1968, p. 9.

²⁰⁵President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 22, 1958, p. 2, and Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, July 7, 1968, p. 6.

²⁰⁶President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 14, 1957, p. 9.

²⁰⁷Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, February 5, 1970, p. 10.

see the dedication of that campus, as it occurred after his death.

Dr. Alfred Gottschalk was appointed Director of the California School upon his ordination in 1957.²⁰⁸ Shortly thereafter, he was promoted to Dean of that school.²⁰⁹ Glueck recognized Gottschalk's leadership potential early. His reports to the Board indicate that Glueck may have been considering Gottschalk as his successor for many years.²¹⁰ It was Gottschalk who actually executed many of Glueck's plans for California. Under Glueck's influence, the California school grew and developed and so did its leader.

Nelson Glueck believed that his greatest accomplishment as a leader of Jewry was the building of the Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem.²¹¹ By any historical criterion, it was a magnificent achievement. He left a Reform presence in Israel and a school which offered programs through which diaspora Jews could move closer to their roots. But the development of this school was an extremely difficult task.

²⁰⁸Ibid., May 15, 1957, p. 6.

²⁰⁹Ibid., January 22, 1958, p. 8.

²¹⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 22, 1958, p. 11, January 27, 1960, p. 2, May 20, 1960, p. 6, June 4, 1964, p. 1, June 3, 1965, p. 7.

²¹¹G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

It required that an anti-Zionist attitude in Cincinnati be overcome.²¹² It involved Glueck in protracted struggles with the Israeli religious establishment and it forced him to embark almost single-handedly upon a massive campaign of fund raising.²¹³

The Jerusalem achievements formed part of a long list of Glueck's accomplishments, but those in Jerusalem were especially appropriate. Glueck had always loved the land of Israel. Shortly after his return to the United States to assume the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College, he wrote to Gershon Agronsky of the "Palestine Post":

Palestine never loses me as long as I have a breath in my body. I would rather be there . . . I shall surely return to Palestine.²¹⁴

To an acquaintance at the Hebrew University, he wrote: "I miss Jerusalem so much that life at times seems unendurable without it."²¹⁵

²¹²Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972), p. 61.

²¹³President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 26, 1956, pp. 20-38, and G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²¹⁴Nelson Glueck, Letter to Gershon Agronsky, June 2, 1947.

²¹⁵Nelson Glueck, personal letter, June 19, 1947.

Glueck was a Biblical archaeologist nearly all his life. He placed great value upon that discipline as an aid in the scientific study of the Biblical period.²¹⁶ The Arab takeover of the eastern sector of Jerusalem in the aftermath of the 1949 war, brought an end to Israeli access to the American School for Oriental Research, of which Glueck was once director and which was a major center for the study of Biblical Archaeology. Glueck wanted to replace that school with something similar in the Jewish part of the newly divided city.²¹⁷

Glueck knew that an academic experience in Israel would enable rabbinic students to achieve a better knowledge of the Hebrew language.²¹⁸ He also believed that living in Israel would "enrich (the students') lives and give them an understanding of (their) faith that nothing else could do."²¹⁹ Study in Israel would produce rabbis who were more strongly identified Jews, and more proficient Hebrew scholars.

²¹⁶G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²¹⁷Ibid.

²¹⁸President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 7, 1963, p. 13.

²¹⁹Ibid.

Dr. Glueck also felt that it was his responsibility as President of the world's leading seminary for liberal Judaism to bring the seeds of modern religion to Israel. As noted previously, Glueck viewed Orthodox Judaism as being an ineffective religious form for modern man. Prior to the establishment of the Hebrew Union College-Biblical and Archaeological School, the Israeli who desired a religious experience had no alternative to Orthodoxy. Hence, many Israeli intellectuals were alienated from the synagogue. In reference to those Israelis, Glueck would say, "I can't expect them to come to synagogues, look what they have to come to."²²⁰ The situation troubled Glueck because he believed that Israel, the birthplace of Judaism, and a recently reinstituted physical center of Jewish life, should also be in conjunction with America, a spiritual center. Israel had to supplement America and replace the European communities which had been destroyed by the Nazis.

Glueck envisioned the establishment of a Jerusalem school early in his career. Mrs. Glueck remarks that during the first days of his Presidency, he stressed the importance of such an institution. He said that:

There was no real connection with Israel. He talked about that incessantly. (He said) there had to be a

220G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

school in Jerusalem. There had to be a way for our young people to understand Israel. The Jerusalem school was in his mind from the moment he took over the Presidency.²²¹

In his first Opening Day address, he shared this vision with the College community:

It is part of our program for the training of rabbis that every student of the Hebrew Union College shall spend a year in Israel.²²²

In that 1947 address, he said every student of the Hebrew Union College, and he meant it. When the Hebrew Union College-Biblical Archaeology School was established in 1963, as a school for training archaeologists, he told Mrs. Glueck, "It will take me about ten years and the boys (rabbinic students) will come here."²²³ Glueck was determined to have Reform Rabbis study in Israel.

On November 11, 1952, he announced to the Board of Governors that tentative arrangements for a biblical and archaeological center in Jerusalem, had been made with David Ben Gurion.²²⁴ He noted at that time that the Israeli government would "defray part of the labor expenses if we

²²¹Ibid.

²²²Nelson Glueck, Opening Day Address, given at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 4, 1947.

²²³G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²²⁴President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 19, 1952, p. 2.

engaged in archaeological activities."²²⁵ A year later, Glueck called for the establishment of "a small branch of our school in Jerusalem."²²⁶ By October, 1954, the lease for the land upon which the school would be built had been negotiated with the Israeli government.²²⁷ The rent would be the symbolic amount of one Israeli pound per year.²²⁸ Glueck's involvement in Israel as an archaeologist and his warm personality enabled him to gain the close friendship of many of the leaders of the Israeli government.²²⁹ One of the results of that friendship was the gift to the College-Institute of the choice piece of land upon which the school now stands.²³⁰

Plans for the Jerusalem school included a dormitory, apartments for faculty, classrooms, archaeological workshops, and a Chapel.²³¹ Glueck's insistence that the chapel be built led him into direct confrontation with the Orthodox

²²⁵Ibid.

²²⁶Ibid., October 7, 1953, pp. 1-2.

²²⁷Ibid., October 27, 1954, p. 4.

²²⁸Ibid.

²²⁹Ibid.

²³⁰Ibid.

²³¹Ibid., October 7, 1953, p. 2.

Rabbinate, which delayed the construction of the building, but which also made a nationwide issue of the question of religious freedom. I shall discuss the fight over the chapel in Chapter Six. The Jerusalem School was formally dedicated on July 5, 1963.²³² Less than three years later, Glueck called for additional facilities to be constructed at the Jerusalem campus.²³³ Those facilities, which included more classroom and work space, a student lounge, and an apartment for Dr. Glueck who, did not live to occupy it, were dedicated on October 13, 1970.²³⁴

Dr. Glueck raised most of the funds for the Jerusalem school himself.²³⁵ During the academic year 1954-1955, he and Board member, Herbert R. Bloch, hosted a fund raising brunch at which they raised \$100,000 from eighty donors.²³⁶ Shortly thereafter, he raised an additional \$200,000 from twenty additional donors.²³⁷ In 1958, it was announced that the Israeli government had given 25,000 Israeli pounds

²³²Ibid., October 24, 1963, p. 11.

²³³Ibid., June 2, 1966, p. 5.

²³⁴Ibid., November 12, 1970, p. 16.

²³⁵G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²³⁶President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1955, p. 9.

²³⁷Ibid., October 14, 1957, p. 11.

for archaeological work at the school.²³⁸ That same year, the alumni of the College-Institute contributed \$35,000 in honor of Dr. Glueck.²³⁹ These were great sums, but they were hardly adequate. The magnitude of the Jerusalem project necessitated that Glueck raise much more. Among the additional monies that he procured were a \$200,000 gift from Mrs. Meyer Feinstein of Philadelphia for the additional facilities that were built during the late 1960's and a one-half million dollar archaeological grant from the Smithsonian Institution.²⁴⁰

The first academic programs initiated at the Jerusalem school were those related to the study of Biblical archaeology. The Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological School in Jerusalem sponsored excavations and offered programs for advanced Biblical research. Its development precipitated the establishment of a Consortium of American Institutions of higher learning which support the archaeological endeavors of the College.²⁴¹ Membership in the consortium includes Harvard, Brandeis, New York University, University of Wisconsin, University of Cincinnati, Xavier

²³⁸Ibid., May 28, 1958, p. 20.

²³⁹Ibid., November 1, 1958, p. 2.

²⁴⁰Ibid., June 2, 1967, pp. 3 & 16.

²⁴¹Ibid., January 30, 1964, p. 9.

University and others.²⁴²

Rabbinic students from the College had been studying informally in Jerusalem prior to the opening of the school there.²⁴³ Glueck viewed this activity positively.²⁴⁴ When the College opened, he arranged for a few rabbinic courses to be taught there.²⁴⁵ Eventually, he prevailed upon the Board to institute a mandatory first year in Israel as part of the rabbinic training. The program began in 1970 and continues today.²⁴⁶ As a result of the year in Israel, the rabbinic student would learn the Hebrew necessary to master the ancient texts and be " . . . touched by the mystery and miracle and traditions and challenges of (his) total past and its thrust for (his) future . . ."²⁴⁷ Glueck knew that the Israel experience would be of great benefit to the students of the Hebrew Union College and he also knew that the College could do much for Israel.

²⁴²Ibid.

²⁴³Ibid., January 20, 1948, p. 3.

²⁴⁴Ibid., February 7, 1963, p. 13.

²⁴⁵Ibid., November 3, 1966, p. 19.

²⁴⁶Ibid., February 15, 1970, pp. 3-5.

²⁴⁷Ibid., October 23, 1969, p. 3.

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion would bring modern Judaism to Israel. Its chapel would provide Israel's first Reform service and its faculty, Glueck hoped, would train rabbis for liberal Israel congregations. More than ten years before its dedication, he shared his visions for the chapel with the Board:

Our students and graduates would conduct religious services in our own chapel . . . a completely Hebrew service . . . to which all who cared to attend would be welcome . . . such a service would attract Israeli visitors who might use it as a model for the establishment of similar religious services of their own elsewhere.²⁴⁸

Glueck wanted to provide a model for Israeli Reform Judaism, but he did not want to transplant American forms. He recognized differences in the two Jewish communities and was aware that the Israelis needed to create their own forms.²⁴⁹ He also envisioned a time when Reform rabbis would be granted the right to perform marriages and officiate at funerals and at other life-cycle events.²⁵⁰ To date, such privileges have not been granted, but there are a number of Reform congregations in Israel.

Dr. Nelson Glueck built a college in Israel which affords Israelis a link with their future and more

²⁴⁸Ibid., November 19, 1952, p. 3.

²⁴⁹Ibid., October 27, 1954, p. 6.

²⁵⁰Ibid., October 7, 1953, p. 1.

importantly, enables the leaders of American Jewry to understand and benefit from their past. The primary thrust of Glueck's efforts was on behalf of American Jewry. The following excerpt from his address at the dedication of new facilities on the Jerusalem campus and on the occasion of the bestowal of an Honorary Degree to then Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir, offers support for this view:

The Jerusalem program must strengthen all our endeavors in America . . . Our future for the overwhelming majority of us is here in America, and it is here that we must continue to place the chief accent of our total program . . . 251

Although Glueck stressed the importance of America, he expanded the sphere of influence of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, making it an international institution. His endeavors enabled it to touch more lives in a more significant manner than it had done in the past. He believed he answered the call of history - the call of modernity and the call of the victims of the Holocaust by bringing the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion to occupy a stellar position in Jewish life.²⁵²

251 Ibid., November 12, 1970, pp. 16-18.

252 Ibid., January 24, 1958, p. 2.

V. NELSON GLUECK'S APPROACH TO COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Nelson Glueck's success as President of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion can be attributed in a large measure to his approach to college administration. That approach, which was guided by a keen perception of human behavior, consisted of building a strong base of support among influential people, raising large sums of money and forging ahead with programs whenever they proved feasible.

Glueck won the backing of many important people. His supporters ranged from students at the College, to faculty and alumni, to board members, to Israeli Prime Ministers. His methods for winning their support were at times unorthodox.

Early in his career, he instituted a tuition fee.²⁵³ Prior to his administration, students attended the College free of charge.²⁵⁴ The tuition fee brought additional funds to the College's budget.²⁵⁵ Glueck, however, viewed the tuition as serving a more important purpose.²⁵⁶ It would aid in training the students to be benefactors of the College in

²⁵³President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 16, 1951, pp. 5-6.

²⁵⁴Ibid.

²⁵⁵Ibid., November 19, 1952, p. 4.

²⁵⁶Ibid.

later life.²⁵⁷ He wanted to take advantage of the psychological effect of having to pay for one's own education.²⁵⁸ He told the Board,

More important than the monies . . . raised are the psychological values achieved. The students are given an opportunity to participate in however relatively small a fashion, in paying for their training and in supporting their school.²⁵⁹

The existence of a tuition also afforded Glueck an opportunity to exhibit his concern for students' well-being.²⁶⁰ He repeatedly stated, "No worthy student will ever be denied the opportunity for study because of lack of funds."²⁶¹ Whatever his reasons, he kept that promise. Glueck also increased student support by making himself accessible to the student body. He met individually, and with the entire group at regular intervals.²⁶²

Glueck assumed the Presidency of the College at a time when the institution would soon be in need of additional faculty. Many professors were approaching retirement age, and the student body was increasing in size. Glueck availed

²⁵⁷Ibid.

²⁵⁸Ibid.

²⁵⁹Ibid.

²⁶⁰Ibid., May 14, 1952, pp. 18 & 19.

²⁶¹Ibid., October 16, 1951, p. 5.

²⁶²Ibid., January 24, 1951, p. 3.

himself of the opportunities created by these circumstances, and hired men who shared many of his goals and beliefs; men who would be loyal to him. He established a Doctor of Philosophy program with which the College would produce some of its own faculty and he also recruited qualified professors who were graduates of other institutions. He required that these new faculty members exhibit significant academic potential and that they be dedicated to the liberal interpretation of Judaism.²⁶³

Glueck quickly won the allegiance of the new members of the faculty by laboring diligently for increases in the salaries and benefits; and by publicly showing his pleasure in their accomplishments and his concern for their rights.²⁶⁴ He considered academic freedom to be an inalienable right of faculty and a necessary element in an educational environment.²⁶⁵ He expressed these feelings to the Board in 1962 in response to accusations that a professor at the College was teaching atheism.²⁶⁶ He reminded them that "the goal of all true education is to promote inner freedom for ourselves and others, to help make men inwardly free and keep them also

²⁶³Ibid., May 16, 1951, p. 9.

²⁶⁴Ibid., November 11, 1965, p. 4. February 7, 1962, p. 9, June 3, 1965, p. 1.

²⁶⁵Ibid., June 1, 1962, pp. 1-5.

²⁶⁶Ibid.

outwardly free in mutually responsible relationships to each other."²⁶⁷ He defended that professor's right to teach whatever he personally believed to be in the best interests of the Jewish people and cautioned the Board of Governors against infringing upon that freedom.²⁶⁸ He said,

Woe unto the development of American Reform Judaism, -- woe unto the genius of our religious and academic tradition -- if the kind of freedom under which alone the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion can thrive, is encroached or inhibited . . . as far as its faculty [is] concerned.

These, and other similar efforts endeared Glueck to the faculty of the College.

Dr. Glueck also valued the support of the College-Institute alumni. He told the Board,

Without [the alumni's] fullest support your president cannot possibly do the job assigned to him.²⁶⁹

In an effort to gain that support, he visited groups of alumni and eventually established an Alumni Board of Overseers to the College.²⁷⁰ He called upon alumni for direct financial support and also asked them to raise funds.²⁷¹ Glueck was

²⁶⁷Ibid.

²⁶⁸Ibid.

²⁶⁹Ibid., January 20, 1948, p. 6.

²⁷⁰Ibid., October 12, 1961, p. 11.

²⁷¹Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meeting of the Alumni Board of Overseers, February 5, 1970, pp. 9-10.

a motivating force in the establishment of the Central Conference of American Rabbis Placement Commission.²⁷² The existence of this organization removed many of the difficulties previously encountered by Rabbis in search of positions.

Glueck also recognized the importance of a devoted administrative staff.²⁷³ He maintained a qualified staff of administrative assistants to the President, a provost and deans and was as aware of their needs as he was of the faculty's.²⁷⁴ He chose some of the staff from the faculty, some from the practical rabbinate, and others from the student body. A most noteworthy example of a choice from this last group is Alfred Gottschalk who was appointed Director of the California School upon his ordination.²⁷⁵ Gottschalk, as we have previously mentioned, succeeded Glueck as President of the College-Institute.

Glueck also sought the support of American Jewish laity. In 1958, he called for the organization of a Council of Associates.²⁷⁶ The Council would consist of 150-200

²⁷²President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 30, 1948, p. 16.

²⁷³Ibid., February 7, 1963, p. 8.

²⁷⁴Ibid., June 7, 1963, p. 8, February 5, 1970, p. 13.

²⁷⁵Ibid., November 12, 1970, p. 3.

²⁷⁶Ibid., January 27, 1958, p. 5.

laymen who would further the cause of the College-Institute throughout the country.²⁷⁷ Dr. Glueck suggested that the Council be similar to the Brandeis Group.²⁷⁸ The Council was never established but a "President's Advisory Council" which occasionally brought small groups of laymen to the campus, was instituted for the purpose of increasing the College's support.²⁷⁹

There is no doubt that Nelson Glueck enjoyed the support of the Board of Governors of the College-Institute. Mrs. Glueck said, " . . . he had them mesmerized. They would do anything he asked them to . . . they used to say he is crazy, but he would convince them."²⁸⁰ He prevailed upon the Board to follow his wishes by admonishing them to be responsible to the needs of the College-Institute and its constituency.²⁸¹ He said,

The decisions which [you will arrive at] . . . are of much consequence for the entire future of our great institution of Jewish learning, and, . . . for the basic welfare of American Reform Judaism whose responsibilities are now international in scope.²⁸²

²⁷⁷Ibid.

²⁷⁸Ibid.

²⁷⁹Ibid., June 4, 1970, pp. 14-15.

²⁸⁰G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²⁸¹President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 21, 1959, p. 1.

²⁸²Ibid.

He clearly defined the Board's role. He told them that, "It is the job of the Board to furnish the space and the means to do [our] job properly."²⁸³ Glueck also made them clearly aware of his role in the administration of the College. He said,

. . . It is my job . . . to appoint faculty, see that the proper courses are instituted and maintained, to get students [and] to run the institution in an efficient manner.²⁸⁴

He cautioned the Board, whom he saw as being in a position of leadership in the Jewish community, against the misdirected priorities of that community by saying,

It is an inexorable anomaly to me to see how the wealth in the horn of plenty of our American Jewish community . . . is poured out with such amazing generosity for so many worthwhile causes but not for the support of Jewish scholarship and the training of rabbis. It should be clear that without such rabbis in sufficient numbers there is no future for us as proud and knowledgeable Jews with a deep commitment to the Judaism that is the sole warrant of survival for ourselves and our children as Jews even as it was for our fathers.²⁸⁵

Glueck let the Board know he was concerned that the majority of American Jews would sacrifice the legacy of their fathers and bequeath nothing to their children. He did not despair however, as he felt that accomplishments were being made and he gave the Board credit for many of those accomplishments.²⁸⁶

²⁸³Ibid., January 30, 1957, p. 4.

²⁸⁴Ibid.

²⁸⁵Ibid., November 11, 1965, p. 8.

²⁸⁶Ibid., May 26, 1960, p. 13, November 11, 1965, p. 10.

He often praised the Board, referring to them as being courageous, far-sighted, talented and generous.²⁸⁷

Glueck also exhibited great skill in manipulating the Board. At times, he would convince them to approve his programs by offering justification that would impress them, even though he gave little credence to those justifications. An example of his use of such a tactic was his successful attempt to institute the First Year in Israel Program.²⁸⁸ It is my contention, as I explained in Chapter Four, that Glueck's primary goals for all College-Institute programs in Israel were to bring modern Judaism to Israel, and to create a close bond between the American and Israeli Jewish communities. The learning of the Hebrew language on the part of rabbinic students was of secondary importance. Yet, when he spoke to the Board, he stressed the benefits that a year of study in Israel would provide for the student seeking a knowledge of Hebrew.²⁸⁹ Perhaps he felt that such an approach would be a more effective means of convincing the Board to institute the costly program. Many of the board members were businessmen who might be more willing to

²⁸⁷Ibid., Octobe. 22, 1964, p. 4, November 11, 1965, p. 1, November 3, 1966, p. 5.

²⁸⁸Ibid., June 5, 1969, pp. 7-8.

²⁸⁹Ibid.

to invest their resources in a venture that would produce tangible results, such as the knowledge of a language. Furthermore, some Board members did not favor strong emphasis upon relations with Israel.²⁹⁰ There could be no way, Glueck reasoned, that they would object to aiding rabbinic students in their efforts to learn Hebrew.

Glueck introduced the First Year in Israel Program carefully. Initially, he insisted that the present program of five years of training in America was producing rabbis who had inadequate Hebrew skills.²⁹¹ Then he instituted a remedial first year Hebrew program at the American campuses.²⁹² This program would increase the period of study from five to six years and thereby increase costs. Conducting the first year in Israel would, he contended, probably enable most students to achieve the necessary knowledge of Hebrew and still complete the course in five years, thus offsetting some of the additional cost incurred by the necessity of expensive transportation and additional faculty and facilities in Israel.²⁹³

²⁹⁰Ibid., June 4, 1970, p. 7.

²⁹¹Ibid., June 5, 1969, pp. 6-11.

²⁹²Ibid.

²⁹³Ibid.

Glueck further insured Board approval by specifying that the year in Israel occur during the first year of study, the time when students most need the additional Hebrew training.

Glueck viewed the Year in Israel Program as a necessity, and, as we have seen, withheld his opinions in the cause of its establishment. Once the program was out of danger, he expressed his views emphatically.²⁹⁴ This statement of opinion is seen in Glueck's response to a letter from honorary Board member Fred Lazarus, Jr. Lazarus criticized the proposed program contending that graduates of the College knew a sufficient amount of Hebrew, and that the College was already creating a rabbinate that was "too Israel-oriented."²⁹⁵ Glueck answered Lazarus by saying that the men of this "Israel-oriented" rabbinate were some of the most qualified he had ever encountered; and Glueck completely ignored the issue of Hebrew training.²⁹⁶ Glueck's treatment of the year in Israel issue illustrates his talent for persuasion. He was firm when circumstances permitted and he employed restraint when necessary.

²⁹⁴Ibid., June 4, 1970, p. 9.

²⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 7 & 8.

²⁹⁶Ibid., p. 9.

Glueck's use of restraint helped him gain the favor of high officials in the Israel government. Their support was a major factor in the establishment of the Jerusalem school. As we shall see later, there was strong opposition on the part of the influential Orthodox Rabbinate to the existence of a Reform seminary and chapel in Jerusalem. Yet, the school was built with the blessing of the Israeli cabinet.²⁹⁷ One of its most prominent members Golda Meir, accepted an honorary degree and the first Prime Minister of the Jewish state, David Ben-Gurion, lectured at a meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis held in Jerusalem under the auspices of the College.²⁹⁸ These people supported the endeavors of the College-Institute because of their fondness for Glueck. Mrs. Glueck recalled,

Golda, Ben-Gurion, the Finance Minister, Gershon Agron, they all loved him. They trusted him because he did not come in and tell them what to do . . . He did it in stages.²⁹⁹

Glueck gained the respect of these leaders of the State of Israel by exercising restraint as he sought to

²⁹⁷G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

²⁹⁸President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 12, 1970, p. 13.

²⁹⁹G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

institute his controversial program.³⁰⁰ An example of his awareness of the importance of restraint was his decision to forego groundbreaking ceremonies on the site of the Jerusalem campus.³⁰¹ He explained his decision to the Board,

We purposefully avoided groundbreaking exercises this summer . . . In this exercise of restraint we were applauded by responsible friends and officials in Israel.³⁰²

Glueck was successful in achieving the support of influential people. He was also successful at raising large sums of money.

Nelson Glueck never ceased his efforts to raise funds for the school. He knew that without adequate financial support, the College-Institute would never be able to meet the mandate of history which required that the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion become the greatest center of Jewish learning in the world. So great was his desire to reach that goal that this man who hated fund raising, became a fund raiser par excellence.³⁰³

300 Ibid., October 14, 1957, pp. 11-12.

301 Ibid.

302 Ibid.

303G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

When Glueck assumed the Presidency, both the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Institute of Religion were faltering.³⁰⁴ By the end of his career, their stability was unquestionable.³⁰⁵ The fund raising approach that brought Glueck his greatest successes was personal contact with small groups of wealthy people.³⁰⁶ He was far more effective in these situations than at large banquets or meetings.³⁰⁷ He made good use of the Board of Governors and the Alumni as fund raising assistants.³⁰⁸ The most significant accomplishments, however, were those he made by himself.

When Glueck assumed the Presidency in 1947, the College had an annual budget of \$383,000.00.³⁰⁹ The 1967

³⁰⁴Daniel Syme, "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and Abroad" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972), p. 74.

³⁰⁵Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of October 24, 1967, p. 5.

³⁰⁶G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

³⁰⁷Ibid.

³⁰⁸Ibid.

³⁰⁹Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meeting of October 24, 1967, p. 5.

budget for the College-Institute was \$2,357,000.00.³¹⁰ In 1947, there were 64 rabbinic students enrolled at the College which had a full time faculty of 14.³¹¹ The rabbinic student body numbered 221 in 1967 and the College-Institute employed 45 faculty members on a full time basis and 32 on a part time basis.³¹² As I stated previously, the College had only one campus in 1947 and four campuses in 1967. Such expansion required funds and whenever possible Glueck found them.

Glueck succeeded in personally obtaining a number of sizeable donations from wealthy members of the Jewish community. In his first speech to the College family, his opening day address in October, 1947, he announced that he had found the funds for two graduate fellowships for Christian scholars for the coming academic year.³¹³ Other gifts that Glueck personally raised during his career included a \$500,000.00 Chair in Human Relations; \$275,000.00 from Mrs. Milton Kutz for a Chair in American Jewish History; \$250,000.00 from friends of Dr. Nelson Glueck for a Nelson Glueck Chair of

310Ibid.

311Ibid.

312Ibid.

313Nelson Glueck, "Opening Day Address" Given at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 4, 1947.

Bible; 6,000 shares of stock in the Gillette Company from Walter S. Hilborn; \$250,000.00 for the California School from Mrs. B. Joseph Hammond; most of the funds for the Jerusalem school; \$500,000.00 from Mrs. Arthur Hays Sulzberger for a Chair in the name of Effie Wise Ochs.³¹⁴

Glueck sought aid from the Alumni and Board as well. He requested that they raise and contribute funds for the College-Institute.³¹⁵ He outlined numerous programs for development and when he felt that the Board was not doing its share, he would remind them of the demands of history and of their responsibility and ask them, " . . . Where is the money coming from?"³¹⁶ He began presenting those programs in 1947 when he offered "Blue Print for Growth", and continued those efforts through 1970 by which time he succeeded in prevailing upon individual rabbis and congregations to offer scholarships for rabbinic students to study in Israel.³¹⁷

³¹⁴President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1964, p. 7, June 2, 1967, p. 3., February 5, 1970, p. 20, and Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Meetings of February 4, 1965, p. 9, June 3, 1965, p. 5, February 10, 1966, p. 7, June 2, 1966, p. 5.

³¹⁵President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 30, 1957, pp. 3 & 4.

³¹⁶Ibid.

³¹⁷Ibid., October 22, 1947, pp. 1-4.

Glueck augmented his administrative endeavors with a program of public relations. If the Hebrew Union College was to become a center of Jewish learning, then the world would have to be informed about its programs and its reputation. A public relations program would improve the image of the College and thereby have a positive effect upon endeavors to recruit students and faculty, and to raise funds.

When Glueck assumed the Presidency, he was aware that public relations endeavors for the College were deficient. He immediately attempted to remedy the situation. He first called for a program of public relations for the College as early as May, 1947, when he wrote to Board member Robert Adler,

I am particularly anxious that we get the permanent advice and assistance of a high powered public relations group.³¹⁸

A public relations firm was hired in 1948, and immediately began to prepare a brochure about the College.³¹⁹ One of Glueck's early public relations efforts was the establishment of an academic program for lay students who were in residence at the University of Cincinnati.³²⁰ Glueck told the Board

³¹⁸Nelson Glueck, Letter to Robert Adler, May 23, 1947.

³¹⁹President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 20, 1948, p. 6.

³²⁰Ibid., October 22, 1947, pp. 1-2.

that it was his hope that those lay students would eventually become supporters of the College.³²¹ That year the "Message of Israel" radio program began nationwide announcements of the name of the College as a reference center for questions dealing with Judaism.³²² Glueck saw this as excellent publicity and immediately hired a publicity director to handle all inquiries.³²³

Glueck also saw the public relations potential of ceremony. He told the Board that it was to this end that formal installation exercises were held for him as President of the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York in 1948.³²⁴ He took similar advantage of the College's Diamond Jubilee Anniversary by organizing celebrations in fifteen Jewish communities in the United States.³²⁵ Those celebrations he hoped would bring its College to its constituency.³²⁶ Additional Diamond Jubilee celebrations included the tendering of invitations to various Jewish and Semitics learned societies to meet at the College.³²⁷ Such meetings he hoped would "focus the attention of American Jewry upon the College

³²¹Ibid.

³²²Ibid., January 20, 1948, p. 5.

³²³Ibid.

³²⁴Ibid., October 23, 1948, p. 2.

³²⁵Ibid., pp. 10-11.

³²⁶Ibid.

³²⁷Ibid.

as the outstanding center of Jewish learning in the country."³²⁸

Gueck also felt that College publications were of great importance for public relations. He took great pride in the Hebrew Union College Annual, the Hebrew Union College Bulletin, the Studies in Bibliography and Book Lore of the Hebrew Union College Library, and the American Jewish Archives Journal.³²⁹

Glueck employed the medium of presenting Honorary Degrees to well-known people to improve the image of the College. One of the notables to whom the College presented such a degree was United States Secretary of State, Dean Rusk.³³⁰ Glueck's words to Rusk indicate the kind of man he wanted associated with the name of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

Man of learning and statesman, motivated by a driving moral urge for creative peace, in whom far reaching, dispassionate and highly analytical knowledge of world affairs is united with the ability to separate the possible from the Utopian.

Glueck believed that expansion was a necessity of the College's survival. If the school was to remain a

³²⁸Ibid.

³²⁹Ibid., May 15, 1957, pp. 31 & 32.

³³⁰Ibid., October 24, 1963, p. 9.

significant institution, it could not stand still.³³¹ In 1959, he advised the Board to embark upon a program of expansion even though the funds were not immediately available.³³² He felt that the forces of history necessitated immediate expansion and he told the Board,

We cannot wait and dare not wait until we are assured that the necessary funds will be forthcoming . . . I believe I know something of the surge and significance of Jewish history, and I am convinced that the moment for us to act is now. I have confidence in our future.³³³

Glueck was speaking about the "Master Plan" construction of 1960.³³⁴

The "Master Plan," however, was never completed. In June, 1963, with only the Cincinnati dormitory and library built, he shifted his efforts to consolidation of what had thus far been accomplished. He stated,

Consolidation is a necessity, for expansion without consolidation can turn out to have been meaningless . . . consolidation implies the need to chart . . . the course we are to follow in the next years.³³⁵

Glueck went on to state that charting the future involves an analysis of three factors: the necessary activities of

³³¹Ibid., October 22, 1947, p. 1.

³³²Ibid., October 26, 1955, pp. 18-19.

³³³Ibid., October 21, 1959, pp. 4 & 5.

³³⁴Ibid.

³³⁵Ibid., June 7, 1963, pp. 2 & 3.

the institution; its financial potential and problems; and the distant future.³³⁶ He continued by saying that any future expansion must be immediately related to fiscal affairs.³³⁷ This statement was motivated by a deficit budget for the fiscal year 1962 and by Glueck's fear of future deficits.³³⁸ He concluded his report by cautioning the Board to embark upon no future construction unless the funds "were already in hand."³³⁹ He maintained the rule of no construction without funds when he proposed a new "Master Plan" during the late 1960's.³⁴⁰ Glueck's shift in policy from bold expansion to a more cautious form indicates the insight with which he led the College-Institute to have a multi-faceted campus, a large endowment, and a dedicated and powerful circle of friends.

³³⁶Ibid.

³³⁷Ibid., p. 7.

³³⁸Ibid.

³³⁹Ibid.

³⁴⁰Ibid., October 24, 1967, p. 16.

VI. CONFLICTS GLUECK ENCOUNTERED AS PRESIDENT

During his years as President of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Dr. Nelson Glueck encountered considerable opposition to his programs. There was a recurring conflict with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations which centered primarily around the question of role of each in the American Jewish community, a threat of the establishment of a separate reform rabbinic school in New York as a protest against Glueck's plans for the implementation of the merger of the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Institute of Religion, and a heated battle with the Chief Orthodox Rabbis of Israel over the issue of a chapel at the Jerusalem School.

Tension between Dr. Glueck and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations may have originated as early as 1941, when Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath displaced Glueck as Director of that body.³⁴¹ I am not certain, however, that the initial tension played a significant role in later conflicts between the two men and the institutions they led. The evidence indicates that Glueck felt that the College was more important to the survival and development of Judaism than was the Union, and that Eisendrath held an opposing

³⁴¹G. Klein, Interview with Dr. Jacob R. Marcus, July, 1974.

view. Each man behaved in accordance with his view.

In his second report to the Board of Governors on October 22, 1947, Glueck called for a re-examination of the financial agreement between the College and the Union.³⁴² Dr. Glueck wanted all funds raised by the Union or the College to be equally divided between the two institutions.³⁴³ When Glueck became President, there was an unequal distribution of funds in favor of the Union.³⁴⁴ That struggle continued until 1952, when agreement was reached that the College and the Union would henceforth divide Combined Campaign Funds, a major source of income on a fifty-fifty basis.³⁴⁵

In May, 1948 and in 1958, Dr. Glueck called for the transfer of the title of the Cincinnati campus, from the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to the Hebrew Union College.³⁴⁶ The deed was originally in the name of the Union because the College was initially incorporated as a department of the Union. In 1926, the College was incorporated as a separate body. Glueck reasoned that the Union no longer had the right to the title of the College which since its

³⁴²President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1947, p. 4.

³⁴³D. Syme, Interview with Helen Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio, July, 1971.

³⁴⁴Ibid.

³⁴⁵President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 14, 1952, p. 18.

³⁴⁶Ibid., May 30, 1948, p. 12, November 1, 1958, pp. 10-11.

incorporation in 1926, was an autonomous institution. Glueck lost this struggle, as the Union still holds title to the Cincinnati campus. Had Glueck prevailed, he would have had an additional source of collateral to aid in borrowing for expansion.

In 1948, Glueck became involved in another protracted conflict with the Union. This conflict would result in the extension of Glueck's influence to the West Coast through the eventual establishment of a branch of the College in California. In May, 1948, he recommended that the name of the College be associated with that of the Union in the College of Jewish Studies that the Union had established that year in Los Angeles.³⁴⁷ He also recommended that the curriculum of the College of Jewish Studies come under the supervision of the Hebrew Union College.³⁴⁸ By October, 1948, the name was changed to the Los Angeles College of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, and it was announced that Hebrew Union College faculty would supervise "the activities and curriculum of the Los Angeles College."³⁴⁹ Eventually, Glueck established

³⁴⁷Ibid., May 30, 1948, p. 5.

³⁴⁸Ibid.

³⁴⁹Ibid., October 23, 1948, pp. 2-3.

a Rabbinic School in California. But the Union wrested control of the College of Jewish Studies from him in 1957.³⁵⁰ The Union's rationale for removing the College of Jewish Studies from the control of the Hebrew Union College was that the training of religious school teachers requires different instructors than does the training of rabbis.³⁵¹ Glueck's response which he gave in his January 22, 1958, report to the Board was that the Union's assumption was incorrect, and pointed to the Hebrew Union College school for Religious Education in New York as an example of a case where the same professors successfully instructed both groups.³⁵² He went on to suggest that the Union limit its educational endeavors to those communities where there was no chartered school of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.³⁵³ He further admonished the Union to avoid using the word "college" in connection with its schools for the training of Hebrew teachers, as the word "college" connotes the granting of academic degrees which Glueck saw as "the sole prerogative in American Reform Jewish life

³⁵⁰Ibid., January 22, 1958, p. 3.

³⁵¹Ibid.

³⁵²Ibid., p. 4.

³⁵³Ibid.

of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion."³⁵⁴
 Glueck did not want the Union to take over the College's
 role as educator of the American Reform Jewish Community.

In the same report, Glueck spoke out against what
 he considered to be an unhealthy relationship between the
 College and the Union.³⁵⁵

There has been talk, ever since I returned to the
 United States to take over the Presidency of the
 Hebrew Union College, of the Union's relationship to
 the College being that of the Mother Church to a
 small college, with the College being under the com-
 plete control of the "Mother." Or, different
 language has been used, namely, that the relation-
 ship of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to
 the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
 is that of parent to the child and that the Hebrew
 Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion has been
 acting too independently, and must be brought in line.

That which can be said about this non-Jewish doctrine
 of the Mother Church applies equally well to the non-
 Jewish definition of what the relationship should be
 between the parent and the child. Since when must
 the child be utterly subservient to the parent, and
 what kind of parent attempts to exact that kind of
 obedience in this day and age, or ever could in any
 age? And besides, how long does it take for a child
 to grow up? This child is only three years younger
 than the parent and is now 83 years old. Some
 child!"³⁵⁶

Glueck went on to reassure the Board of his competence by
 reminding them that since his inauguration as President, he

³⁵⁴Ibid.

³⁵⁵Ibid.

³⁵⁶Ibid.

had raised three million dollars of permanent endowment funds.³⁵⁷

He suggested that a proper relationship between the Union and the College be one where the Union and College labor for common cause with the Union serving as a patron organization that supports the College but " . . . does not compete with it or try to cut it down to what it considers proper size."³⁵⁸ Glueck was unable to regain control of the College of Jewish Studies until 1968.³⁵⁹

An additional concern for Glueck was the moving of the headquarters of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations from Cincinnati to New York City. The Union's new office which was called the House of Living Judaism opened in October, 1951.³⁶⁰ In his reports to the Board, Glueck did not state opposition to the move. But it is a possibility that he may have been concerned about losing whatever influence he had over that body while it was located in Cincinnati, and about future neglect on the part of American Jewish donors of the interests of the College in favor of those of

³⁵⁷Ibid.

³⁵⁸Ibid.

³⁵⁹Ibid., June 7, 1968, p. u.

³⁶⁰Ibid., October 16, 1951, p. 2.

the Union. Immediately following the opening of the House of Living Judaism, he reminded the Board of Governors that the College-Institute is "basic to the entire structure of religious life in America."³⁶¹ He cautioned them that if the College-Institute were to "continue to fulfill its academic and religious functions," it would require "the wherewithal in materials and men . . . "³⁶² In that same speech, he clearly stated the importance of the College-Institute for American Jewry and inferred that the work of the College was more important than that of the Union.³⁶³ He told the Board:

In the records it preserves, the writings and books it generates, in the teachers and rabbis and educators and cantors and graduate students it trains, in the continuing development of Judaism it makes fundamentally possible, are to be found the basis of our security and serenity and the promise of our own and our children's survival.³⁶⁴

To Glueck, the College, an academic institution, would play a much larger role in insuring the survival of Judaism than would the Union.

Glueck believed that the College's effectiveness depended upon its autonomy. In 1961, Glueck came into conflict with the Union over the question of that

³⁶¹Ibid.

³⁶²Ibid.

³⁶³Ibid.

³⁶⁴Ibid.

autonomy.³⁶⁵ Since 1926, when the College became separately chartered, the Union acted in accordance with its legal right to appoint twenty-eight of the College's fifty-five Board members.³⁶⁶ At no time during that period, did the Union take more than three of its twenty-eight appointees from its own Board.³⁶⁷ In 1961, however, the Union attempted to add a fourth Union of American Hebrew Congregations Board member to the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion Board.³⁶⁸ The appointment was to fill a vacancy.³⁶⁹ Glueck wanted the Union to appoint an outsider to fill that position rather than a member of its own Board, as he felt that the presence of an additional representative of the Union would infringe upon the necessary freedom of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.³⁷⁰ In his January 26, 1961 report to the Board of Governors, Glueck criticized the behavior of the Union and requested that the

³⁶⁵Ibid., January 26, 1961, pp. 6-7.

³⁶⁶Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of Board of Governors, Goldman, Discussion of President's Report, January 26, 1961, p. G1.

³⁶⁷Ibid.

³⁶⁸Ibid.

³⁶⁹Ibid., p. G2.

³⁷⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1961, pp. 6-7.

number of Union members serving on the Board of the College be limited to three.³⁷¹ Glueck's request was denied. Glueck's concern was motivated by his awareness that the Union, a non-academic organization, might have some goals which would be in conflict with what Glueck believed to be more important priorities, the interests to the College-Institute.³⁷²

The issue of Board representation surfaced again in 1964. At that time, the College was seeking the right to solicit large gifts for itself while still sharing in the proceeds of the Combined Campaign. The Union responded with a letter from its Executive Board admonishing the Board of the College that if the College continued to seek such gifts, the Union would be forced to create conditions within the Board of the College that would render such activity impossible.³⁷³ The Union threatened to wrest control of the Board of Governors of the College from Glueck. Dr. Glueck, however, continued to seek gifts for the College.

In May, 1955, Dr. Glueck came under attack by the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues.³⁷⁴ The Federation

³⁷¹Ibid.

³⁷²Ibid.

³⁷³Ibid.

³⁷⁴Ibid., January 26, 1956, p. 5.

objected to his plans for the implementation of the merger of the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Institute of Religion.³⁷⁵ Glueck's proposals which were announced in 1953 under the title of the Integration Plan for the Merger, limited the program at the New York Rabbinic School to the first two years of study, with the remaining three to be conducted exclusively in Cincinnati.³⁷⁶ It forced those students who chose to begin their studies in New York to move to Cincinnati midway through their training, and it left small congregations in the New York metropolitan area without a pool of third, fourth and fifth-year Rabbinic students from which to draw their spiritual leaders. In response to this second problem, Glueck proposed a sixth year of residence in New York prior to ordination, in which all students would return to that city to serve as Rabbinic interns.³⁷⁷

Glueck's plans created a furor in the New York Reform Jewish community.³⁷⁸ Alumni and supporters of the Jewish

³⁷⁵Ibid.

³⁷⁶Ibid., March 26, 1953, p. 18.

³⁷⁷Ibid.

³⁷⁸Newman, "The Case Against the 'Unification Plan' Regarding the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion," Issued by Louis I. Newman, Rabbi of Congregation Rodeph Sholom, New York City, June, 1953.

Institute of Religion feared that the adoption of Glueck's program would lead to the eventual closing of the New York School, and that the absence of student-rabbinic personnel in New York would stifle the further development of the community.³⁷⁹ On May 23, 1955, the Assembly of Delegates of the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues issued a resolution criticizing Glueck for reducing the program at the New York School to two years.³⁸⁰ They demanded the resumption of a full school at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in New York.³⁸¹ In further opposition to Glueck's proposals, late in 1955, Rabbi Louis I. Newman, with the support of other New York Rabbis, founded the Academy for Liberal Judaism, a separate Reform seminary.³⁸² The Academy, which was operated under the auspices of Temple Rodeph Sholom in New York City was established for the purpose of motivating a revocation of Glueck's plans for the implementation of the Merger.³⁸³ Its leaders announced at the time of its founding that students at the Academy

³⁷⁹Ibid.

³⁸⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1956, p. 5.

³⁸¹Ibid.

³⁸²Ibid., p. 9.

³⁸³Ibid.

would return to the College-Institute upon the College's resumption of a full program.³⁸⁴

Glueck responded to the pressure that New York groups were placing upon him by changing his position.³⁸⁵ On January 26, 1956, he recommended the appointment of a committee of the Board to review the plan for the integration of the merger in light of changing circumstances in Jewish life in America.³⁸⁶ On May 31, 1956, the committee reported to the Board that certain changes in the integration plan, necessitated by new circumstances, were in order.³⁸⁷ It recommended that the sixth year be eliminated as it would make the Rabbinic training period too long in light of chaplaincy requirements; and that the operation of a full Rabbinic program be reinstituted in New York. Congregations recently established in the metropolitan area were producing an increasingly large pool of potential Rabbinic candidates.³⁸⁸ The Committee further advised that although the expanded program in New York appeared to be economically unfeasible

³⁸⁴Ibid.

³⁸⁵Ibid., p. 11.

³⁸⁶Ibid.

³⁸⁷Hebrew Union College, Report of Committee of the Board of Governors to Reevaluate the Merger, May 31, 1956, pp. 1-3.

³⁸⁸Ibid.

at that time, the fiscal future appeared promising.³⁸⁹

In his discussion of the committee's suggestions, Glueck stated that he associated himself completely with those suggestions.³⁹⁰ In offering that support, he stressed the changing circumstances in American Jewish life and did not admit that he may have erred in suggesting the Integration Plan of 1953.³⁹¹ In fact, neither the suggestions of the 1956 committee nor Glueck's discussions of those suggestions dealt in any significant way with his rationale for the 1953 proposals for integration.³⁹² His reasoning in 1953 was that indispensable to the future of the American Reform Jewish community was a rabbinate trained by an institution with " . . . one faculty, one curriculum and one student body."³⁹³ He reasoned at the time that any duplication of faculty or courses would be economically detrimental to that

³⁸⁹Ibid.

³⁹⁰President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 1, 1956, pp. 16 & 17.

³⁹¹Ibid.

³⁹²Hebrew Union College, Report of Committee of the Board of Governors to Reevaluate Merger, May 31, 1956, pp. 1-3, and President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 1, 1956, pp. 16-17.

³⁹³Glueck, "The Present and Future of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion," (1953), reprinted from Yearbook, Vol. LXIII Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1953.

goal, and that a rabbinate trained at separate schools would engender divisiveness within the Liberal Jewish community.³⁹⁴

Glueck's appointment of the committee to reexamine the integration plan enabled him to turn a defeat into an apparent victory. The reasons presented by the 1956 committee for reestablishing a full Rabbinic program in New York offered Glueck an opportunity to change his plans for the New York School without changing his opinion regarding the issues that motivated his 1953 proposals.

Glueck achieved an unquestionable victory in his struggle with the Israeli Orthodox Rabbinate over the issue of a Reform Chapel at the Jerusalem School. During the summer of 1956, the Chief Ashkenazic and Sephardic Rabbis and the leaders of the Mizrachi Political Party and the Neturei Karta confronted Glueck with threats to oppose the granting of a building permit for the school.³⁹⁵ The Chief Rabbis claimed that the introduction of Reform Judaism in Israel would destroy Israeli society through its rejection of what they believed to be the essence of Judaism.³⁹⁶ The Orthodox viewed the laws of the Shulchan Aruch as supreme and contended that Reform practice which is at

³⁹⁴Ibid.

³⁹⁵Ibid., October 23, 1956, p. 31.

³⁹⁶Ibid.

times at variance with those laws would defile the Holy City.³⁹⁷ Reform's opponents launched a massive campaign in the Israeli press.³⁹⁸ Letters appeared in newspapers containing statements such as the following:

There is practically no tenet of historical Judaism left in common between religious Jewry and Reform, especially the obnoxious Cincinnati variety of it. For they have neither Written nor Unwritten Law, nor even Ten Commandments, nor even the very notion of the Almighty in common with historical Jewry.³⁹⁹

Or:

The God of the Hebrew Union College is a Deistic deity . . . more handicapped in its consciousness than a creature of the lowest order and as for its jurisdiction over mankind and the universe, well, it has got less of it than a country magistrate.⁴⁰⁰

The attacks were vicious but Glueck stood firm. He met with the Chief Rabbis, and did not alter his position.⁴⁰¹ He even rejected a compromise proposal that would have allowed the construction of a chapel at the School in the absence of a public statement by the College regarding it.⁴⁰² Glueck was fighting for the principle of religious freedom in Israel and knew he had the support of high Israeli government officials, especially the very important backing of

³⁹⁷Ibid.

³⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 32-34.

³⁹⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., p. 26.

⁴⁰²Ibid., p. 37.

Gershon Agron, the Mayor of Jerusalem.⁴⁰³ Glueck prevailed in testing the principle of religious freedom in Israel and concluded that,

Freedom of expression and freedom of religion are basic principles of this young and wonderful State which represents the only real democracy, as we understand that word in Western terms, in the entire Near East.⁴⁰⁴

More importantly, he succeeded in bringing the beginnings of progressive Judaism to Israel.

⁴⁰³Ibid., p. 36.

⁴⁰⁴Ibid., p. 38.

VII. CONCLUSION

Nelson Glueck was a man who achieved success in many areas. We have already noted his accomplishments as a leader of world Jewry, the administrative techniques he employed, and his expectations for the rabbi as the historically commanded guide of the Jewish community. We know that Glueck believed that we must turn to the past in order to chart our future and that it is the scholar, the rabbi, upon whom the responsibility falls for furthering the development of Jewish life by bridging ancient tradition and the modern world.

I conclude this study with an attempt to determine those characteristics of Glueck's person which had a most significant effect on Glueck's leadership activities.

Nelson Glueck enjoyed being President of the College because he liked the power afforded him; and the intellectual stimulation it offered through association with great minds.⁴⁰⁵ He also relished the opportunities it provided for him to relate in a most significant way to his fellow man, whom he strove constantly to serve. His endeavors as President of the College were motivated by his concern for humanity.

⁴⁰⁵G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

for humanity.

Those close to Glueck contend that he enjoyed being a leader.⁴⁰⁶ He felt that his ability to lead, which he viewed as a unique gift, gave him both the right and the responsibility to play a major role in determining the destiny of his people.⁴⁰⁷ Furthermore, he gained much satisfaction from being associated with the religious and intellectual leadership of Jewry and mankind.⁴⁰⁸ This satisfaction probably stemmed from the high value that he placed upon intellectual pursuits and the ethical teachings of Judaism. Those for whom he held the greatest respect were academicians whose energies were directed toward the betterment of mankind.⁴⁰⁹ His closest friends were Jacob Marcus and Judah Magnes, and he was most enamoured of Albert Einstein.⁴¹⁰ Mrs. Glueck recalled that when Glueck met Einstein at the home of Stephen Wise in New York, he was awe-struck and he referred to that day as one of the greatest of his life.⁴¹¹ She also feels that Jacob Marcus and Judah Magnes persuaded Glueck to assume the Presidency of the College; and she remembers that immediately upon

406Ibid.

407Ibid.

408Ibid.

409Ibid.

410Ibid.

411Ibid.

return to Cincinnati from any of his trips around the country or the world, Glueck would contact Marcus for aid in analyzing the results of the journey.⁴¹²

Glueck also enjoyed the company and friendship of students.⁴¹³ On the eve of Sukoth, 1954, a large group of students and their wives came to Glueck's home unexpectedly to serenade him.⁴¹⁴ Dr. and Mrs. Glueck welcomed the students, offered refreshments and joined the group in song.⁴¹⁵ In his October, 1954 Report to the Board of Governors, Dr. Glueck expressed his pleasure at having been involved in that experience.⁴¹⁶ He said,

Nothing in my entire experience as President of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion has made me feel better. The fact that our students felt so secure and at home with me that they could come over that way, late at night, represents to me, the finest accolade of distinction that could be conferred upon me.⁴¹⁷

Glueck was thrilled when he felt he had the admiration of students. The admiration of influential laity was also

412Ibid.

413President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 27, 1954, pp. 8-9.

414Ibid.

415Ibid.

416Ibid.

417Ibid.

very important to him.⁴¹⁸ In response to the establishment of the Nelson Glueck Chair in Bible and Biblical Literature, in honor of his sixty-fifth birthday, he said,

I am enormously grateful for the honor. Nothing more heartwarming could have happened to me for my birthday . . .⁴¹⁹

Glueck strove to be worthy of the respect of those whom he held in high esteem.

He was responsive to the needs of modern Jews. He believed he knew what kind of leadership they required and he strove to offer it. Three weeks before his death, Glueck, though very ill, told his wife that he wanted to live for three things: the rabbinic ordination of Sally Priesand; his grandson's bar mitzvah; and to settle in Jerusalem.⁴²⁰ Those wishes were not fulfilled. They represent, however, Glueck's phenomenal perception of the thrust of Jewish development and his desire to function in the mainstream of that development. In reference to the ordination of Sally Priesand, he said, "We have to show the world that we can be intensely Jewish [and still] . . . live in a modern world."⁴²¹ He understood the need of a woman to be a

⁴¹⁸Ibid., June 3, 1965, p. 2.

⁴¹⁹Ibid.

⁴²⁰G. Klein, Interview with Helen Glueck, March, 1975.

⁴²¹Ibid.

person and he said, "I think it's marvelous, it's terribly important."⁴²² His grandson's bar mitzvah would offer symbolic assurance that Jewish knowledge which Glueck so dearly prized, would be bequeathed to future generations of American Reform Jews. Settling in Israel, and serving as Director of the Jerusalem School, as Glueck would have had he lived, would have enabled him to play a continuing role in the further development of Liberal Judaism in Israel. Glueck's three wishes paralleled his goals as President of the Hebrew Union College which were to make relevant the ancient values of Judaism, to insure their future transmission, and to offer religious sustenance to the Jews of the State of Israel.

Glueck viewed the State of Israel as a symbol of Jewish physical survival. He was very sensitive to Jewish suffering and saw the importance of laboring in whatever way possible to alleviate it. He expressed his feelings about Jewish suffering, about linking the past and the Present, about the importance of Jewish learning, and about the mission of the Hebrew Union College in a beautiful statement to the Board of Governors on February 7, 1963.⁴²³

⁴²²Ibid.

⁴²³Ibid., February 7, 1963, pp. 15-16.

He closed his report that day with the following words:

We represent the continuum of a great, and I believe divinely guided and inspired process of history and faith. We have bridged the old world and the new with our study of Torah and our dedication to its imperatives . . . I know of no better way to bring home to you the importance, and beauty, and bitterness, and challenge, and mystery of our task than to read you the title of a book published by one of our youngest professors, Dr. Ben Zion Wacholder, who has been with us since his graduate student days and is now on our faculty, at the present at our California School. The title of the book is Nicolaus of Damascus. Nicolaus of Damascus was the scribe and aid of Herod the Great . . . a tutor of the children of Anthony and Cleopatra. He wrote a detailed account of Herod's reign, . . . a history of the world . . . and a semi-historical Collection of Remarkable Customs. Much of Dr. Wacholder's book was written for his Ph.D. at the University of California. He writes in the preface: 'To the Hebrew Union College and especially to Dean Alfred Gottschalk of the California School, I am grateful for aid and encouragement. The credit for making this study feasible belongs to my wife.' And there is a heartbreaking dedication which needs to be read and remembered and with the reading of which I close this report: 'Dedicated to the memory of Sarah Hendil, my sister, Pinhas Shelomoh, my father, Feiga, my mother, Aharon, my brother, Shifra, my sister, who, together with the entire Jewish community of Ozarow, Poland, were carried away to an extermination camp, October, 1942.' Bible and all Jewish literature dependent upon it is our guide, the teaching and transmitting of the Moral Law our mission. Our great Rabbinical School, through its professors and books, its governors and friends and above all through the Rabbis it trains, is dedicated to the Torah . . . , to the God of Israel and all Mankind.⁴²⁴

Nelson Glueck was dedicated to the Torah, the God of Israel and Mankind.

⁴²⁴Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaronsohn, "The History of the Hebrew Union College,"
Interview by Dr. Stanley F. Chyet et. al., Cincinnati,
Ohio, May 14, 1963, American Jewish Archives, Tape
No. 13.
- Bamberger, Fritz, "Nelson Glueck: 1900-1971 -- A Tribute,"
remarks at a memorial service at Temple Emanuel, New
York City, March 25, 1971.
- _____. "The Mind of Nelson Glueck," Near Eastern
Archaeology in the 20th Century, ed. by James A. Sanders.
New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- Brichto, Herbert, address delivered at Hebrew Union College-
Biblical and Archaeological School, Jerusalem, Israel,
February 14, 1971.
- Chyet, Stanley F. "Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute
of Religion, 1947-1967," Hebrew Union College Press,
Cincinnati, Ohio, 1967.
- Glueck, Helen. Interview with Gary Klein, Cincinnati, Ohio,
March, 1975.
- _____. "The Life of Nelson Glueck", Interview by Daniel
Syme, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 1, 1971.
- Glueck, Nelson. Address given at the Dedication Exercises of
the Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological
School in Jerusalem, Israel, October 13, 1970.
- _____. "Authority and Freedom," sermon delivered at
seventy-first annual convention of the Central Conference
of American Rabbis. Yearbook of the Central Conference
of American Rabbis, Vol. LXX. New York, New York: CCAR,
1960.
- _____. Biography (Current Biography) H. W. Wilson Co.,
July, 1969.
- _____. "Come, Let Us Reason Together," reprinted from
Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis,
Vol. LXII. New York, New York: CCAR, 1952.
- _____. Hesed In the Bible, trans. by Alfred Gottschalk.
Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1967.

- _____. Inaugural Address as Fourth President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, March, 13, 1948.
- _____. "New Frontiers -- In the Jerusalem School," (American Annual Manual) May, 1955.
- _____. "No Compromise With Principle," reprinted from Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. LXII. New York, New York: CCAR, 1951
- _____. Opening Day Message, delivered at the inauguration of the seventy-third academic year of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 4, 1947.
- _____. Official Correspondence 1947-1971, Hebrew Union College American Jewish Archives.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1947.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 2, 1948.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 30, 1948.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 23, 1948.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 1, 1949.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 4, 1949.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 10, 1949.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 25, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 1, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 11, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 24, 1951.

- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, May 16, 1951.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, October 16, 1951.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January, 1959.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, May, 1949.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, October, 1949.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, May, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, October, 1950.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January, 1951.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, May, 1951.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, October, 1951.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January, 1952.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, November, 1952.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January, 1953.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, January 16, 1952.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, May 14, 1952.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of
the Hebrew Union College, November 19, 1952.

- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 14, 1953.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 14, 1953.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 27, 1954.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 5, 1954.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 27, 1954.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1955.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 18, 1955.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 26, 1955.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1956.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 1, 1956.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 23, 1956.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 30, 1957.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 15, 1957.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 14, 1957.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 22, 1958.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 28, 1956.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 1, 1958.

- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 21, 1959.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 27, 1959.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 21, 1959.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 27, 1960.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, May 26, 1960.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 21, 1960.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 26, 1961.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 3, 1961.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 12, 1961.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 1, 1962.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 1, 1962.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 7, 1963.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, March 29, 1963.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 7, 1963.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 24, 1963.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, January 30, 1964.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 4, 1964.

- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 22, 1964.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 4, 1965.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 3, 1965.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 11, 1965.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 10, 1966.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 2, 1966.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 3, 1966.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 2, 1967.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 2, 1967.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 24, 1967.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 8, 1968.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 7, 1968.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, October 31, 1968.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 6, 1969.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 5, 1969.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, February 5, 1970.
- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, June 4, 1970.

- _____. President's Report to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, November 12, 1970.
- _____. Rivers in the Desert. A History of the Negev. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1959.
- _____. Rosh Hashanah Sermon, delivered at Temple Israel, Boston, October 3, 1948.
- _____. "The Lion of Judah," an address delivered at a "Memorial Hour" in tribute to Dr. Judah Leon Magnes, New York: American Friends of the Hebrew University, 1958.
- _____. "The Negeb in the Frame of History," Opening Day Address delivered at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati and New York, October, 1955.
- _____. "The Present and Future of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, reprinted from the Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. LXIII, 1953.
- _____. The River Jordan. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946.
- _____. "The Role of the Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem," off-print from the Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, (October, 1963), pp. 10-14.
- _____. "The Spirit and Purpose of Free Synagogue," sermon delivered at the Dedication of Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, New York, January 21, 1950.
- _____. "This is the Land," The Hebrew Union College Bulletin, Vol. IV, November, 1944.
- _____. "Yom Kippur Address," delivered at Temple Beth Elshim, Charleston, South Carolina, October 1, 1949.
- Gottschalk, Alfred. Eulogy for Dr. Nelson Glueck, delivered at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, February 14, 1971.
- Hebrew Union College, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, October, 1947.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, February, 1948.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1948.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1948.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
March, 1953.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1953.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1954.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1954.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1954.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1955.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1955.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1955.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1956.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1956.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1956.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1957.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1957.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1957.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1958.

- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1958.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
November, 1958.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1959.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1959.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1959.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1960.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
May, 1960.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1960.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1961.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1961.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1961.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1962.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1962.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
November, 1962.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1963.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
March, 1963.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1963.

- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1963.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
January, 1964.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1964.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1964.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1965.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1965.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
November, 1965.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1966.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1966.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
November, 1966.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1967.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1967.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1967.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1968.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1968.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1968.
- _____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1969.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1969.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
October, 1969.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
February, 1970.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
June, 1970.

_____. Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors,
November, 1970.

Marcus, Jacob Rader. Interview with Gary Klein, Cincinnati,
Ohio, July, 1974.

Mier, Golda. Address delivered at dedication of the Residence
Hall of the Jerusalem School and of Her acceptance of
an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters, Jerusalem,
October 13, 1970.

Newman, Louis I. "The Case Against the 'Unification Plan'
Regarding the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of
Religion." New York City: By the Author, 7 West 83rd
Street, 1953.

Roseman, Kenneth. Words Spoken at Memorial Service for Dr.
Nelson Glueck, delivered at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati,
February 15, 1972.

Syme, Daniel B. "The Growth of the Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion in the United States and
Abroad, (unpublished thesis from the Hebrew Union
College, Cincinnati, Ohio), 1972.