

Trends in Modern Orthodoxy As Reflected in the Career of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung

Maxine Jacobson

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Religion

Presented in Partial fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

October 2004

© Maxine Jacobson, 2004



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-04052-1

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-04052-1

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

Trends in Modern Orthodoxy As Reflected in the Career of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung

Maxine Jacobson, Ph.D.
Concordia University, 2004

This thesis presents the norms and issues of Modern Orthodox Judaism in America, from the decades of the twenties to the sixties, by looking at the activities and involvements of one of its leaders, Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung. The phenomenon of Modern Orthodoxy will be examined in the context of Orthodox invigoration and change. The reasons for the changes will be explored. Modern Orthodoxy went from being a threatened entity on the American scene to a well-recognized, respected force in Judaism.

Modern Orthodoxy in the twenties lacked hard lines and clear concepts and was floundering as it tried to adjust to its new environment. For the most part, its adherents were transplanted East Europeans, religiously uneducated, unobservant, and in awe of America and the modern world. Rabbi Jung's presentation of Modern Orthodoxy demonstrated that it was relevant and compatible with America and modernity. Modern Orthodox institutions were weak; there was a lack of adequate facilities necessary for an Orthodox community to exist and a lack of adequately trained educators. This thesis will monitor the efforts to develop and improve facilities and conditions and the responses to political, economic and social situations that impacted on Modern Orthodoxy.

By 1960 a foundation had been laid for a movement to the "right" which was marked by the tightening of religious standards, more identification with the tenets of Halakhic Judaism, stricter piety and more distrust of the secular world. Rabbi Jung served as a bridge between the old Eastern-European Orthodoxy that did not develop in America

beyond the immigrant generation and the Modern Orthodoxy of today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I returned to school after I was married and had children and I have never taken the opportunity for granted. I have a profound appreciation of the education that I have received. I am proud to have been associated with the Department of Religion at Concordia University and have the greatest respect for the many professors who have taught me over the years.

It has been a privilege to have Dr. Ira Robinson as my thesis supervisor. He has shared his wide knowledge base with me, has introduced me to other scholars of Orthodox Judaism, has given constructive criticism and made the most helpful suggestions. He has never been too busy to meet with me to discuss issues pertinent to the thesis. He always read and corrected my work most promptly, paying attention to the smallest details. I enjoyed his humour and kind ways. He has made the experience of writing a thesis challenging and exciting.

I also thank Dr. Norma Joseph and Dr. Michael Oppenheim, each of whose suggestions provided other approaches and perspectives. Their critical appraisal of my work assisted me greatly in thought and mechanics. Their input is most appreciated.

Shulamith Berger, chief archivist at Yeshiva University, was an invaluable help. She was there to guide me, to make suggestions and to answer questions whether I was at the Archives in New York or in Montreal. Shelley Helfand, of the JDC Archives, also gave of her time and was very helpful, as she knew Rabbi Jung personally.

My husband Stephen has been a fine example in his devotion to on-going learning and professional excellence. He has always been patient, encouraging and has taken pride

in my accomplishments. My children's educational achievements have also stood as additional stimulus to my studies. I am grateful for their love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. PROBLEMATIC.....	1
2. WHAT IS MODERN ORTHODOXY?.....	3
3. WHAT THIS THESIS WILL DEMONSTRATE.....	12
4. METHODOLOGY.....	15
5. OUTLINE OF THESIS.....	20
6. BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS: EARLY INFLUENCES	22
7. ORTHODOXY CONFRONTS AMERICA	27
MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE TWENTIES	43
1. INTRODUCTION.....	43
2. THE STATE OF ORTHODOXY	44
3. ISSUES THAT HELPED DEFINE MODERN ORTHODOXY.....	50
4. SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS	57
5. MODERN ORTHODOXY: POSITION ON ZIONISM	81
6. TRENDS AND ISSUES: CONCLUSION	85
MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE THIRTIES	106
1. INTRODUCTION.....	106
2. STATE OF ORTHODOXY	108
3. AMERICAN ZIONISM.....	123
4. EDUCATION	126
5. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITY -ISSUES OF CONCERN	141
6. WOMEN	149
7. CONCLUSION	152
MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE FORTIES	175
1. INTRODUCTION.....	175
2. WAR EFFORT.....	179
3. JUNG’S RESPONSE TO WORLD WAR TWO.....	190
4. EFFECTS OF MODERN ORTHODOX PRESENCE IN THE WAR EFFORT AND TRENDS COMING OUT OF WORLD WAR TWO.....	195
5. EDUCATION	203
6. ZIONISM	212
7. HALAKHIC ISSUES.....	220
8. CONCLUSION	227
MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE FIFTIES	254
1. INTRODUCTION.....	254
2. RABBI JUNG’S ACTIVITIES	256
3. WHAT FACILITATED THE MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT	258
4. EXAMPLES OF MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT	274
5. CONCLUSION: THE FIFTIES	304
CONCLUSION OF THESIS	327
1. THE NORMS OF MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE DECADES UNDER DISCUSSION AND HOW JUNG’S ACTIVITIES AND PHILOSOPHY HELPED CLARIFY WHAT MODERN ORTHODOXY STOOD FOR.....	330
2. MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT	341

3. SOME ANECDOTES THAT GIVE A GLIMPSE OF WHAT BECAME OF THE MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT THAT HAD BEGUN IN THE FIFTIES	344
4. CONCLUSION	346
5. THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS THESIS IN A WIDER CONTEXT.....	349
BIBLIOGRAPHY	355

INTRODUCTION

1. PROBLEMATIC

This research monitors trends and examines changes in Modern Orthodoxy in America, from 1920 to 1960, through an examination of the career of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung. Rabbi Jung's career as a pulpit rabbi, community leader and popularizer of ideas spanned over sixty years, beginning in the 1920s. The goal is to understand the norms of Modern Orthodoxy in each decade. To do this an understanding of the economic, social and political influences on the Jewish world at this time is necessary. The research presents Rabbi Leo Jung's activities and philosophy in the greater context of historical, social, and religious events that impacted on Modern Orthodoxy. He is a fulcrum around which many issues can be explored. This thesis does not focus on Leo Jung exclusively, but rather on the significance of his interests and activities and its impact on his surroundings. Rabbi Leo Jung was a voice of Modern Orthodoxy, though certainly not the only one; he was involved in almost everything that was going on in Modern Orthodoxy, either in a major or minor way. He was involved in institutions that articulated the Modern Orthodox position; these organizations are part of the history of American Orthodox Judaism. He also represented Orthodox Judaism to the larger community. Rabbi Jung recognized that changes had to be made; he initiated some of the changes.

As noted by Samuel Heilman, "the notion of using the rabbi as an indicator of the Jewish state of being is useful as a tool for tracing the development of Orthodoxy."¹ Each Jewish group, whether it is Modern Orthodox, Hasidic, Conservative or Reform, looks to rabbis to fulfill its needs. In the twenties, rabbis were needed to deal with the

“marginally” Orthodox, giving attention to their modern and secular tendencies and lack of Jewish education. America was a land where respect for Torah scholarship was lost and emphasis in Modern Orthodox circles was on the rabbi being a good English speaker.² Rabbi Jung, an articulate, English speaking, Orthodox, bearded rabbi, with a PhD, proficient in Talmud and Kant, was a new and respected phenomenon in the Modern Orthodox milieu. He was knowledgeable in the ways of the secular world and the ways of America.

This is a story of how a religious group adjusted to the challenges of modernity and a new environment. Jung was equipped to meet the different and expanded role of the rabbi in America. Many rabbis who had come from Europe were ill equipped, as the role of congregational rabbi in America differed greatly from the role of the rabbi in Europe. Jung’s Torah education, secular education, social skills and his mastery of speaking made him able to compete with Conservative and Reform rabbis, and to influence Jews in America. Jung was thus able to appeal to the large group of Jews who rejected European-style Orthodoxy, who were more interested in what America stood for than in Jewish learning, but who still preferred to call themselves “Orthodox.” Rabbi Leo Jung was a spokesman for an American style Orthodoxy; he combined the religious faith of Orthodoxy with the American way of life.

Jung’s Jewish Center Synagogue in New York represented something new, with its varied educational, cultural and social activities. As New York was and still is, the heart of American Jewry and the pulse of its Jewish life, Rabbi Jung was thus in a position to influence all American Jews.

This thesis will attempt to understand what Modern Orthodoxy stood for during the decades of the twenties to the sixties. Leo Jung helped to define the differences and issues that still separate Modern Orthodoxy from other Orthodox groups. Modern Orthodoxy in America started out with blurred and indefinite concepts; these concepts became somewhat clearer over time. What Modern Orthodoxy stood for has changed over the decades and continues to change.

One major change in Modern Orthodoxy concerns the level of observance. There was a widespread laxity in observance of the most basic Judaic laws among Jews espousing Modern Orthodoxy in the early part of the twentieth century. This laxity has been replaced gradually since the fifties by efforts to observe Halakhah, or Jewish law, in an optimal manner. Though this pursuit of stringency rather than leniency, known as the movement to the “right,” has been noted by thinkers, such as Saul Bernstein and Haym Soloveitchik, this thesis will try to make clear some of the factors leading to this shift.³ This activity in Modern Orthodoxy has spurred a new interest in the movement. The thesis begins in the twenties when the group is known for lax observance and lack of Jewish knowledge, but ends as it develops into a more zealous, committed group. The period 1920 to 1960 is one in which Orthodoxy went from a powerless, timid, uneducated, unobservant group to an assertive, proud group, which has risen in strength and status.

2. WHAT IS MODERN ORTHODOXY?

Jung described Modern Orthodoxy as Torah im derekh erez offering all the intensity and true beauty of true Judaism, plus decorum and system of modern method;

that was the goal to which he devoted his life. Jung's response was not unique; his responses and attitudes are typical of a given group, which is widely known as Modern Orthodoxy.

Only in response to the Reform movement did Orthodoxy, as a whole, have to think about defining itself. One of the results was Modern Orthodoxy. The father of Modern Orthodoxy, Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch, favoured emancipation, but at the same time defended Orthodox Judaism. His book, Nineteen Letters, first published under the pseudonym "Ben Uziel" in 1836 and first translated into English by Rabbi Bernard Drachman in 1899, was written in defence of Orthodox Judaism and addressed to those who were turning to Reform. In this book, Hirsch showed how modernity could be reconciled with Judaism and he welcomed emancipation. The Nineteen Letters offered an alternate to the Reformers' approach with the Torah im derekh erez philosophy, which stated that Jews must not only live among Gentiles, but with them, and that they must learn the language and adopt the culture of the land, while keeping intact the Halakhic tradition.⁴ Derekh Eretz philosophy is associated with the battle of Hirsch for "Torah-true" Judaism in the nineteenth century, when the emancipation of Western European Jewry confronted Jews with unprecedented challenges and dangers.⁵

Hirsch introduced changes in the synagogue, including aesthetic changes, in keeping with some of the modern demands, which had been attractive to Reformers. Hirsch felt that isolation from worldly activities was not a Torah precept, and was therefore unjustified.⁶ The philosophy applied to an educational system established by Hirsch; Jewish studies could exist alongside secular studies.⁷ Torah scholarship could not

be divorced from life. The Hirschian philosophy of Modern Orthodoxy is that interpretation of Jewish Law is nourished when drawn from life's experiences.

Hirsch's Orthodox group abandoned special Jewish dress, speech and mannerisms. In Frankfurt am Main, Hirsch had a devoted following, who remained loyal and apart from other Modern Orthodox groups, even when they came to America. To this day they are known as the Breuer Community. Rabbi Jung befriended this group when others did not.

Samson Raphael Hirsch's philosophy was a new interpretation of tradition, reflecting bourgeois norms, universal aspirations and a worldly emphasis. This type of Orthodoxy was presented as compatible with the modern values of individualism, autonomy and tolerance. Hirsch had a Kantian understanding in keeping with nineteenth century moral sensibilities. He affirmed free will and felt humans had the ability to decide between good and evil.⁸ He explained that a deed represented something beyond itself and served as a symbol, not an end in itself. He emphasized human ability to decide between good and evil and negated the virtue of pure literalism.⁹ For him, Judaism was fully up to the most advanced standard of modern thought. Hirsch affirmed the need for the rejuvenation and reformulation of Judaism, while maintaining the Jew's commitment to Halakhah.

Ezriel Hildesheimer continued Hirsch's work. Though both men were strong opponents of Reform and both felt that without adjustments and innovations in Orthodox practice, Orthodoxy would not survive the onslaught of modernity, there were significant differences between Hirsch and Hildesheimer.¹⁰ For Hirsch secular and religious studies could only exist side by side; however, unlike Hirsch, Hildesheimer integrated or

synthesized secular and religious studies.¹¹ Hirsch advocated co-existence, not synthesis. In other words, the Modern Orthodox individual lives in two civilizations by either synthesizing secular and Torah learning or by assigning each to a specific area of thought and action. Since Yeshiva University, which represents Modern Orthodoxy in America, strives to synthesize secular and religious studies, Hildesheimer is a more accurate model for Modern Orthodoxy in America than is Hirsch.¹²

Hirsch was a non-Zionist; however, Hildesheimer was an active supporter of the idea of Jews working for Eretz Israel. For Hirsch, Jews were exiled from the Holy Land to enable them to perfect themselves and to fulfill the mission of the “chosen people” by remaining faithful to Torah and God. Hirsch felt that this mission could only be accomplished when Jews were dispersed throughout the nations.¹³ Hirsch would not meet with non-Orthodox Jews to discuss issues of concern to all, as he felt that this accorded them legitimacy; Hildesheimer thought that this was necessary.¹⁴

Some of the differences between the two men are mentioned because the dilemmas persist and are examined throughout the thesis. For example, Orthodoxy’s relationship with non-Orthodox Jews has never been completely solved. The problems concerning how to integrate Judaism and modernity and how to integrate sacred and secular studies have never been completely resolved.

For Leo Jung, Orthodoxy was the only legitimate form of Judaism.¹⁵ However, he felt that Orthodoxy was not monolithic, having one fixed philosophy. There were different modes of Orthodox thought and practice. Modern Orthodoxy has core beliefs that distinguish it from Orthodoxy generally. The issues that are common to all Orthodox

Judaisms include the belief in divine revelation, the dual Torah, written and oral, and the observance of Halakhah, or Jewish law.

The goal of Modern Orthodoxy is to harmonize the secular and religious aspects of life in ways that are compatible to both.¹⁶ Modern Orthodoxy tries to respond to the needs of modern times within the boundaries of Halakhah. The Modern Orthodox movement feels that it can accommodate to Halakhah, as well as to the modern world; there is recognition of the mutual demands of Judaism and modernity.

Modern Orthodoxy has no main authoritative body. It has been argued that because it lacks a clear authority structure it may not in fact be a movement.¹⁷ Rabbi Emmanuel Rackman pointed out that there are certain freedoms in Modern Orthodoxy because of its lack of a central authority.¹⁸ Rabbi Rackman described Modern Orthodoxy as a coterie of rabbis in America and Israel whose interpretation of the tradition has won approval of Orthodox intellectuals, who are knowledgeable in both Judaism and western civilization. Jenna Joselit said, “Modern Orthodoxy was a less coherent ideological or intellectual statement than a system of expressive religious behaviors.”¹⁹

Orthodoxy contains many groups that are far removed from one another; however, there are two broad groups in Orthodoxy, Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy, which include the Yeshiva Orthodox and Hasidic groups.²⁰ Within the Orthodox movement in America, Modern Orthodoxy prevails, although the Traditional Orthodox, newer on the scene, is making its mark.

Traditional Orthodoxy uses other survival strategies, which, in many cases, result in stricter techniques and piety. The Traditional Orthodox group seeks to exclude modernity. At one end of the spectrum, is the insistence on the meticulous and

punctilious observance of the commandments and insistence on separate and segregated communities shunning, in principle, all contact with modern culture. Unlike Modern Orthodoxy, the Traditional Orthodox usually avoids working and cooperating with other Jews. This group feels that it cannot be true to Judaism while being open to modern thought. For them there is conflict between commitment to Torah and full participation in the scientific and cultural activities of modern society. The Traditional Orthodox group often feels that Modern Orthodox Jews are willing to make concessions in their religious observances.

Most traditionalists believe in the self-sufficiency of the Torah and that secular learning is a waste of time and dangerous, as secular ideas are incompatible with Jewish beliefs. For these groups, individual autonomy is denied and decisions rest with the religious leaders. Traditional Orthodoxy emphasizes the glorious past and their own leaders' interpretation of Torah.

Historically there have always been some Jewish scholars opposed to co-mingling of sacred and secular learning. The lines of the division between groups are not so simply marked, as there are degrees, in each group, as to how much modernity is accepted or rejected, and as to how much co-existence or synthesis there should be between the secular and the sacred.

In America the traditionalist "right" was formed in 1902 and was originally represented by the Agudat Harabbonim. (Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada) It spoke mostly for first generation European rabbis, unwilling to accommodate to the American environment. The Agudat Harabbonim tried to curb the influence and growing power of the American Orthodox rabbinate. The Agudat

Harabbonim felt that American Modern Orthodox rabbis were not up to the required standards of Judaic knowledge acquired by the European- trained rabbis, such as themselves. At the same time, the Reform movement felt that all groups of Orthodox Jews were out of step in the modern world.

There is no agreement in the sources on the use of the term Modern Orthodoxy. Jung himself felt uncomfortable using the term Orthodox, as the word had a Christian connotation, referring to those who clung to the official tenets and dogmas of their respective churches. He preferred the term “Torah-true Judaism.”²¹ Jacob Breuer, in his introduction to Nineteen Letters, by Samson Raphael Hirsch, said that the term “Torah-true” had been used to refer to this group and only later when their opponents called them “Orthodox Jews” was that term used.²² Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, as well as others, used the term Neo-Orthodoxy because they felt that the Torah im derekh erez philosophy deviated from traditional, premodern Judaism. This conception of Judaism was, in fact, different from traditional practices of preceding generations. The term “Jewish Jews” was also used, but infrequently. The cover of Jung’s book, Living Judaism, dated 1922-1923, states that he is the rabbi of the Jewish Center, a synagogue for “Jewish Jews.” Jung begins an article, “Modern Trends in American Judaism,” written in 1936, with the motto for “Jewish Jews.”²³ Jenna Joselit Weissman, author of New York’s Jewish Jews said that the term was used to show that this group was superior, as well as in a defensive way, so its usage was private and not often found in print.²⁴

The term Modern Orthodox will be used for the purposes of this dissertation as it is the most descriptive of the dilemmas that will be discussed and because it is most commonly used and recognized. The combination of words does convey the potential

tension between the will to maintain Jewish integrity and the will to play a full part in the world. Modern and Orthodox seem to be a contradiction in terms, because Orthodox bespeaks traditional and therefore not modern.

The Modern Orthodox Jew has been pulled in two directions: the direction of the secular world and the direction of the religious world. Opposing sides, the religious and the modern, were both critical of Modern Orthodoxy; one side felt that it was not religious enough; the other side felt that it was not modern enough. Jung reported, “as we proceed to the right, we will be told that Torah-true Judaism is dead, and on the left that it is not fit for modern life...”²⁵ The word “modern” evokes negative reactions for Traditionalists, as modernity negates the traditional worldview; the absolute status of religious norms and values are challenged. The concept of “Orthodox,” which confirms, without debate, the Divine revelation at Sinai, of Torah and Oral Torah, can be a problem for “Moderns,” who are Orthodox.

Modern Orthodox Judaism is very much this worldly with its validity determined by its personal and social significance in the here and now, but conversely with the premise that all the law is God’s revealed will. Jung thus addressed real and rational this-worldly issues such as, “honesty in business, ritual food, sexual purity, industrial fairness, commercial integrity”.²⁶ He said that Judaism even promised prosperity.²⁷ Its laws were not concerned with some metaphysical idea. There is a respect for human reason along with the acknowledgment of faith. Being modern gives certain personal autonomy; human responsibility and activity rather than passive submission and fatalistic resignation are stressed. Jung thus presented Modern Orthodoxy as a religion of reason and he denied that it conflicted with the findings of science.²⁸ He wrote that superstition was opposed to

the meaning of Judaism.²⁹ One had to take every advantage of science and the ingenuity of the human mind.

In Modern Orthodoxy, there was an effort to reconcile cognition and emotion, autonomy and authority. The emphasis on personal autonomy and openness to Jewish tradition is subject to multiple interpretations. Openness to new interpretations is one of the things that separate Modern Orthodoxy from other groups within Orthodoxy. Jung's modern message was that, "on every occasion we must contribute our own endeavour first and only after we have done all in our power to get well, should we beseech God to aid our work."³⁰ Jung wrote, "human history is the plan of God for the perfection of man by his own free will."³¹ Jung stated that a, "true Jew believes in revelation, the divine origin of the Torah."³² However, Rabbi Jung pointed out that, "interpretation has been not only a privilege, but, a duty."³³ He also said, "when practice is not undermined, interpretation is a religious duty."³⁴ No interpretation is definitive and as Rabbi Jung said, any worthwhile interpretations that shed new light on the scriptures are, "welcomed by modern rabbis as long as they are based on the unchanging foundation of Jewish life-the belief in Torah min-Hashamaim, or the divinely revealed Torah."³⁵

Jung felt that interpretation of difficult passages of the Bible, as long as consistent with the doctrine of the Divine Origin of the Torah, was legitimate in Judaism. That does not mean that any such interpretation is the only right one, or that we must be so completely sunk in the contemporary scene as to accept any of the working theories of its science as the last word on the subject. Jung pointed out that the first verse of the Bible, "In the beginning when the Lord had created heaven and earth," did not exclude the possibility of millions of years between the beginning of the creation and the first day of

which Genesis speaks.³⁶ Jung said that through interpretation and re-interpretation of the Divine Torah, progressive revelation of the will of God and His guidance has been maintained.³⁷ In other words the Bible is subjected to new interpretations; interpretations are made in keeping with the modern disposition. This helps to keep the Torah “a Book of Life” relevant to all ages. Jung wrote that through reinterpretation, the inheritance remains young and dynamic.³⁸ Diverse positions are possible and valid when they emerge from traditional sources and rabbinic precedent.

A key issue in Modern Orthodoxy is the belief that Jewish studies can exist harmoniously with non-Jewish studies. This facilitated the possibility of integrating Jews into modern society. For many Orthodox Jews there is no attempt to integrate secular and religious studies; for others the challenge is to integrate the two in a creative, fruitful way. The provision of secular education alongside of Torah education is common to all Modern Orthodox.

Jung was sensitive to modernity and aware of his mission, which was to show that Orthodoxy could hold its own in the modern world. He worked at developing an Orthodoxy that would be acceptable to Jews “outside the ghetto,” of presenting a modern interpretation of Torah im derekh erez that would appeal to the American psyche or consciousness. For Jung, “Orthodox Judaism... is part of the cosmopolitan society and modern culture.”³⁹

3. WHAT THIS THESIS WILL DEMONSTRATE

3.i. Rabbi Jung’s attitudes served to more clearly define the parameters of Modern Orthodoxy. He helped define modern Orthodox practice, style and ideology for his

congregants and the community at large by his various activities, and through his writings and sermons. This thesis will argue that his involvement and activities in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, his responses to Israel, to women's issues, and his philosophy helped to clarify what American Modern Orthodoxy stands for. In his role as organizational worker and community leader, he served as an example. He felt that providing only a one-sided education, which meant only a religious education or only a secular education was a violation of individual and communal responsibility. He deeply respected cultural pluralism, was a Zionist, though not an uncritical one, was involved in interfaith dialogue, worked for Jewish unity and a more significant role for women. Jung was thus involved, either directly or indirectly, with a range of issues that served to better clarify what Modern Orthodoxy is. These issues will be identified and examined.

3.ii. Before Modern Orthodoxy could develop and define itself, it had to adjust to modernity and Americanism. This thesis will examine how Rabbi Jung helped Orthodoxy adjust to America, and rendered traditional Judaism attractive to native-born American Jews. He had a well thought-out "blueprint" how to make Orthodox Judaism attractive. He helped change the presentation of Orthodoxy with some new initiatives. He was involved in the struggle to give Orthodoxy a new, appealing image, and to reinterpret concepts so as to make Orthodoxy compatible with modernity and with American life. As norms and expectations changed; so did his presentation change over the decades.

He had a role in remedying American misconceptions of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy, in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, was not seen by many Jews as relevant to the Jewish tradition's confrontation of the challenge of modernity; it was not

widely seen as responding to the demands of modernity. Rabbi Jung touched the pulse of the time when he presented Judaism as a this-worldly, religion of reason. Jung said that:

The Jewish religion does not come from within, as the issue of our reflections and feelings. Judaism offers its historical documents, the clear evidence of this historical fact. Judaism bids us study these illuminating texts with a penetrating mind; it bids us read them with open eyes. Judaism wants us to recognize its nature and its truth through searching intelligence...⁴⁰

3.iii. A most important trend in contemporary Modern Orthodoxy is the movement to the “right,” a movement in this case, to a population better educated in Jewish studies, to more observance of Halakhah, and to more ardent commitment to this observance. It could be said that the movement to the right makes Modern Orthodoxy more closely aligned to Traditional Orthodoxy, but certain philosophical differences must remain if this group is to come under the rubric of Modern Orthodoxy. Rabbi Jung’s achievements serve as benchmarks in an ongoing effort to revive Torah observance in North America. There have been many explanations of what the meaning is of “movement to the right.” Charles S. Liebman has given a good definition:

Jews on the right interpret Jewish law more rigidly and prohibitively than Jews on the religious left. Secondly, they are less tolerant of deviations from Jewish law than those on the left.⁴¹

There was a diminution of traditional Jewish influence at the beginning of the twentieth century; in many cases, individuals in the Orthodox group had no knowledge of Judaism, or were out of step with American ways, unobservant or uncaring. Rabbi Jung was one of the first to help turn the tide, but was only one of many people to work for this cause. He had a role to play in the development of a new vigour in American Orthodoxy, in its maturation and growth. He said, “Orthodoxy was a bad joke in America,” as education, observance and facilities were at such a low level, it seemed the situation

could not be true. He also talked about the last stage when Orthodoxy “wins.”⁴² Orthodox influence has grown. Since the nineteen fifties, there has been a growth in numbers of Sabbath observers, mikvehs, programs of study and kollels.⁴³ Rabbi Leo Jung’s education, religious, political and organizational agenda will be seen to have played a part in this development, although Jung might not have approved of all aspects of this rightward move. He worked for better kosher facilities, mikveh facilities, and for better Jewish educational opportunities. Rabbi Jung brought the movement to a certain point; then it will be seen how other younger rabbis took over in bringing about the movement to the “right.” However, Jung helped prepare the movement and enabled it to get to that point.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.i. Archival Material

The Yeshiva University Archives housed many collections that were studied. The Leo Jung Collection reflected Jung’s many activities and concerns. The material illustrated his work on behalf of various organizations in America, Israel and Europe, his involvement in proper kashrut enforcement, his role in Jewish education, the land of Israel, the status of Judaism and Orthodoxy in America. The issues that were most salient and relevant to the development of Modern Orthodoxy were selected. The correspondence from pupils, colleagues, and lay people told of their gratitude to him as a teacher and inspiration. He interacted with many of the giants of the Jewish world, people such as Rabbi Aaron Kotler, Dr. Albert Einstein and the Chief Rabbi Of Israel, Rabbi Isaac Herzog, in the effort to confront his tasks.

As well I examined the Bernard Revel files, Samuel Belkin files, Koenigsberg files, and Public Relations files, all of which included correspondence to and from Leo Jung, information about activities and concerns in which Jung was involved. The Benjamin Koenigsberg file had a lot of information about the Kashrut Committee that Jung served on.

There is material in the Jung Collection and the Benjamin Koenigsberg Files about organizations such as the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJCA) established in 1898, the Young Israel movement established in 1912, and the Rabbinical Council Of America (RCA) established in 1935, all of which Jung was involved in. These organizations are fundamental to the existence of a Modern Orthodox community and so their history was followed. The aims of the organizations serve to identify issues, concerns and needs of the times. These institutions help maintain and strengthen Orthodox identity by working to ensure that necessary facilities, educational and cultural programs are available. Orthodoxy to exist has to be concerned with Sabbath observance, kashrut, and with Jewish education in its broadest terms, which includes, besides formal schooling, sermons, literary output, lecture series, and a well trained religious and lay leadership; the availability of these things was followed as an indicator of Orthodox conduct.

Yeshiva University newspapers, the Commentator, Yeshiva News, News and Views, which can be found at Yeshiva University Archives, enabled an examination of the progress of Yeshiva University and a look at what its leaders had to say. The story of American Modern Orthodoxy cannot be told without tracing the progress of the Yeshiva, whose leaders disseminate the philosophy of, and practical approaches to Modern

Orthodoxy. Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary founded in 1897, and the new entity Yeshiva College, joined together in 1928. Yeshiva University, taken in its entirety, is a model in which one is able to view the development of Modern Orthodoxy; at its inception, it had as its object "Orthodox Judaism and Americanism."⁴⁴ The aim of Yeshiva University is to synthesize secular and religious studies.

In America there were traditional Yeshivas, but the term Yeshiva, as applied to Yeshiva College, was used in a new and different sense, as the college included general secular studies along with religious studies. Yeshiva College became the first college of liberal arts and sciences under Jewish auspices and the first college to become associated with twofold education, secular and religious. In America the project was taken by Orthodox Jewry, wishing to embrace modernity but also not wanting to abandon religion.⁴⁵ Leo Jung was a trustee of Yeshiva University and was a professor of ethics and Jewish philosophy at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary.

Jung's involvement in The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee provided an avenue for him to plead the case of worldwide Orthodox Jews and so the archives of this organization were consulted. Jung was active in non-Orthodox Jewish organizations and this is also significant, as this is a characteristic of his outreach to all Jews. This served to illustrate another important aspect of Modern Orthodoxy.

The Jewish Center Synagogue was a place for the cultivation of Rabbi Leo Jung's ideas. He made the Center a model institute. With this in mind, The Jewish Center Synagogue's annual minutes were studied, as well as the Jewish Center Bulletins, to see the development of the interests and concerns of the congregation and the type of programs and activities that were held. Issues and concerns are reflected in programming.

A comparison of Jewish Center Activities and the profile of the congregants will be made throughout the decades.

4.ii. Interviews

Interviews were sought with those who knew Leo Jung, family, colleagues, congregants and students, as well as with scholars in the field of North American Orthodox studies. Jacob J. Schacter and Norman Lamm, rabbis that came to the Jewish Center Synagogue, years after Leo Jung, shed light on the different approach and view of the newer generation of Modern Orthodox leaders and gave a first hand account of the different issues each generation had to contend with. Rabbi Schacter said that three quarter of the existing members of the Jewish Center Synagogue joined after Rabbi Jung died and many never heard of him. However, finding older members was not a problem; they were very helpful in highlighting what was important to Jung, the issues that he stressed, the changes that have occurred and the changed profile of the synagogue membership. It appeared that all were forthright and honest in their evaluation of Rabbi Jung. A list of these interviews is included in the bibliography section.

4.iii. Writings by Leo Jung

Leo Jung was a prolific author who wrote books, sermons, and wrote many articles. Rabbi Jung wrote five books with his sermons, addresses and studies. Many of his sermons also appear in The Jewish Forum. His philosophy, the themes of his messages, his goals, his values, and the issues of the day became clear from these works. All his writings were thoroughly examined to demonstrate how his philosophy influenced and represented American Modern Orthodoxy. The writings in the books that Jung

authored or edited have also been used for historical information on the development of Modern Orthodoxy. As a given decade was approached all Jung's books and articles that were written in that time frame were examined to get insight into the era being discussed and to know the issues, challenges, that were important in the Modern Orthodox world. This chronological element painted a slowly changing picture.

4.iv. Secondary Sources

Historians of American Modern Orthodoxy, such as Jeffrey Gurock and Louis Bernstein helped to provide background information on institutions and issues pertinent to Modern Orthodoxy. Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff's biographies of Bernard Revel and Eliezer Silver provide another picture of the problems, issues and the times that this thesis deals with. William Helmreich and Gilbert Klaperman's research on Yeshiva University was very useful. Saul Bernstein, Herbert Danzger and Lionel Kochan wrote on a renaissance in Judaism, an important issue that this thesis dealt with.

Rabbi Jung was on the editorial board of the Jewish Forum, an intellectual journal that represented and influenced Modern Orthodox views in an American environment. Jewish Forum, which published from 1918 until 1962, voiced the concerns of Jung's type of Orthodoxy. It always represented the observant, help for Sabbath observers, fixity of the Sabbath against encroachment by calendar reform, the Orthodox who insisted on kosher banquets in Jewish public life, the need for Jewish education, and the need for Jewish law such as family purity. The Jewish Forum followed closely the progress of Modern Orthodox organizations. These writings were examined to seek out consistent and changing themes at different periods of time, and to note if there were changing

approaches to these issues. For the decades of the twenties, thirties and forties the content of the Jewish Forum was very useful.

Other Jewish periodicals, such as The Jewish Tribune, American Jewish Chronicle, Commentary, Judaism and Tradition from the twenties to the sixties, were studied, noting changes in interest, attitudes and approaches.

The thoughts and activities of other Modern Orthodox figures, such as Rabbis Herbert Goldstein, Bernard Drachman, David de Sola Pool, Bernard Revel, Samuel Belkin, Joseph Lookstein, and Emmanuel Rackman to name a few, were studied, to show that Rabbi Jung was part of a certain Orthodox group, which shared common thoughts and activities. In this way trends and issues become clearer. Rabbi Jung did his share but he did not work alone.

5. OUTLINE OF THESIS

In order to understand the challenges, problems and achievements of Modern Orthodoxy the thesis begins with a background dealing with two topics, the early biography of Rabbi Jung, and the characteristics of America that were influential in the development of Modern Orthodoxy. The following chapters foreground Rabbi Jung's activities and their significance is explored. Leo Jung's activities give us a perspective on the particular time periods.

The chapters deal with progress in organizational activity, educational programs and tools, and capable leadership. They are instruments of developing Modern Orthodoxy and reflect progress in the movement.

The chapters appear in chronological order, beginning with the decade of the twenties. Though time frames can be artificial and certain issues are ongoing, chronological treatment does give a full picture of the movement, its involvements, concerns, and achievements, at a given time. It clearly conveys how current and changing political, economic and social forces impacted on the movement, as well as varying responses to the same stimuli, which tend to define the movement. Using chronological order portrays in a gradual manner the development and maturation of the movement in various areas.

To quote Rabbi Jung, “the story of Torah-true Judaism in the last century of our country has been one of grave danger, hard effort and considerable advance.”⁴⁶ The problems, as Jung described them, were lack of decorum, lack of message, lack of intelligent education, a thoroughgoing passivism in national Orthodoxy and disorganization in communal and organizational activities.⁴⁷ In America, Modern Orthodoxy changed its East European ways for a new Modern American Orthodoxy. Each chapter monitors the advances and evaluates the reasons for those changes.

The twenties were concerned with making social changes while keeping Halakhah intact. The advent of Yeshiva College enabled the start of the development of an educational system, policies, and leadership. In the thirties groundwork in educational and organizational activities continued. The advent of the Rabbinical Council of America took place. This organization helped to define, defend and represent Modern Orthodoxy and what it stood for, and in doing so, added prestige to Modern Orthodoxy. The trend in that decade was social activism; Modern Orthodox leaders began to be more involved in Jewish and non-Jewish community activities. This enabled them to present and

implement the ideas of Modern Orthodoxy and to make demands to render the observance of kashrut and the Sabbath possible. In the forties, the Holocaust was the ultimate example that modernity had failed. This event gave Modern Orthodoxy and all religion a new and more important role. There was expansion of and further development in educational and kashrut facilities, as well as in social, political and cultural endeavours. By the fifties new and capable leadership was in place or developing. The State of Israel, and its policies in the area of religion and culture, had important impact on Modern Orthodoxy. Organizational and educational facilities continued to expand and became more efficient. There was beginning to be less accommodation to Americanism and more interest in religion, Jewish knowledge and adherence to Halakhah. A new model of scholar-rabbi emerged and Modern Orthodoxy became a more defined entity. The story is taken up to the end of the fifties at which point the foundation was laid for Modern Orthodoxy's further development.

6. BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS: EARLY INFLUENCES

The following is not intended to be a complete biography of Rabbi Jung. The thesis presents only the background necessary for understanding the philosophy to which Jung was devoted and to understand the context of his involvements. The social, communal and intellectual aspects of his life from the twenties to the sixties are discussed as the thesis progresses. His family members are referred to in the context of their activities as they relate to the intent of this work. His full personal biography is not relevant to the problematic of this dissertation and so is not included. However, Reverence, Righteousness and Rachmanut: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Leo Jung, edited

by Jacob Schacter, and The Path of a Pioneer: The Autobiography of Leo Jung, can be referred to for a more complete biographical sketch.⁴⁸

Leo Jung was born on June 20, 1892 in Ungarish-Brod in Moravia, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and he died in 1987 at the age of ninety-five, in New York. His father Rabbi Dr. Meir Tsevi Jung had been elected Rabbi of Ungarish-Brod in 1890.⁴⁹ Rabbi Meir Tsevi Jung believed in Torah im derekh erez, which is the philosophy of Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch and exemplifies important aspects of Modern Orthodox Judaism. The Torah im derekh erez philosophy enabled the elder Jung to combine his Talmudic and classical education to accomplish his goals, setting a personal example and inspiring his family to do the same. Rabbi Meir Tvezi Jung received his secular education side by side with his traditional Yeshiva education. He attended two different schools. This was not completely unprecedented in Western and Central European Orthodoxy. He was a student of the gymnasium and subsequently proceeded to Marburg and Leipzig Universities. Rabbi Meir Tsevi Jung felt that secular and religious education together had much to contribute to Judaism.⁵⁰ Leo Jung's father held rabbinic posts in Mannheim, Ungarish Brod and London; in these places he was an active participant in Jewish communal activities. He founded schools in Ungarish-Brod, Cracow and London, where both religious and secular learning took place. He tried to establish a trade school in London in order to make employment possible for Sabbath observers. Though this attempt was a failure, it represented an approach that would again be tried in America. The secular environment that Anglo-Jewry faced was probably the reason for the failure.⁵¹ Many of Rabbi Meir Tsevi Jung's obituaries refer to the difficult times and environment in England; one writer wrote that it was a, "time when

compromise is raised to the level of virtue and do as you please and go as you like are the fashion.”⁵²

In London Rabbi Meir Tsevi Jung was a leader in Agudat Israel, and the Sinai Movement. The Agudat Israel was founded in 1912 by European Orthodox leaders, including followers of Samson Raphael Hirsch, heads of yeshivoth, and Hasidic rebbes, all of whom felt that there was no need for a Jewish state and that if there was to be a Jewish state, it had to be ruled by Torah and certainly not by secular Zionists.⁵³ The Sinai Movement was a movement in which young men would meet for the purpose of studying Talmud and socializing.

At his death, in June of 1921, Rabbi Jung was the Chief Minister of the Federation of Synagogues in England, an appointment he had held since 1912.⁵⁴ This organization was established in 1887 to coordinate the many small synagogues set up by the Eastern European immigrants in competition with the “aristocratic” Orthodox United Synagogue, which had been founded in 1870.⁵⁵ The congregants, including the congregational leaders, of the more senior organization were not necessarily observant, and those dissatisfied with their level of religious observance founded the Federation of Synagogues.⁵⁶

Rabbi Leo Jung followed the path set out for him by his father. His father’s ideology regarding Eretz Israel followed the philosophy of Agudat Israel, which was uncomfortable with a secular component in the development of Israel; this stance had appeal for Leo Jung until the early forties. In 1916, Leo Jung became the director general of the Sinai League of which his father was founder and president.⁵⁷ Rabbi Meir Tsevi founded the journal, “The Sinaist,” based on the Torah im derekh erez philosophy. His

son, Leo Jung, became the editor of this bi-monthly journal, which he claimed expressed his father's philosophy, "study is great, for it leads to (right) action."⁵⁸

Rabbi Jung, like his father, also received a secular and Talmudic education. Cambridge was his alma mater and he received his doctorate from University of London.⁵⁹ In 1910 he attended the Yeshivas of Eperies and in 1911 he went to study in Galanta, Hungary. He also attended the Hildesheimer Rabbinical Seminary in Berlin, the prized enterprise of Rabbi Ezriel Hildesheimer, which was the first Yeshiva with a secular component and the first Modern Orthodox rabbinical seminary. Jung claimed that he received three rabbinic ordinations, from Rabbi Mordechai Zevi Schwartz, Rabbi Abraham Isaac Hakohen Kook and Rabbi David Zevi Hoffmann of Berlin.⁶⁰ He regarded his semikhah, or rabbinic ordination, from David Hoffman as, "his last and most cherished semikhah."⁶¹ These luminary figures were Jung's mentors, along with Samson Raphael Hirsch and Ezriel Hildesheimer, all regarded by historians as founders and leaders in the Modern Orthodox movement. Their writings and philosophy served as Rabbi Jung's examples and he helped spread their influence in America.

Rabbi Jung was also a pupil of Rav Abraham Isaac Kook. Rav Kook, who became the first chief Rabbi of Palestine, had worked together in London with the senior Rabbi Jung. Rav Kook was president of Kenethiyoth Hayiroelis, an organization to further the interests of Orthodox Judaism in London and Great Britain, of which Rabbi Meir Jung was the vice president.⁶² It was one of their joint efforts.⁶³ Rav Kook's religious philosophy was one of tolerance; he extended a hand of friendship to all, including his ideological adversaries. Though Rav Kook was a product of Eastern European Orthodoxy, his writings are a guide pointing the way toward a synthesis

between Orthodox tradition and secular values. Modern Orthodoxy, which developed in Germany and Hungary, did not develop in Eastern Europe until a later time. However, certain attitudes and perspectives emerged from the works of Rav Kook that influenced Jung and Modern Orthodoxy. Jung also worked with ideological adversaries in a productive and amicable way extending his philosophy of “consideration without compromise.”⁶⁴

Rav David Hoffman, a native of Hungary, and Germany’s leading Halakhic authority in the early 20th century, was Jung’s, “guiding light at the Hildesheimer Seminary in Berlin before the First World War.”⁶⁵ Hoffman studied at the Hildsheimer Yeshiva in Eisenstadt and there was exposed to a combination of Torah and secular learning. He also studied in Vienna, Berlin and Tübingen and acquired the title “Professor” from the German government. He wrote his doctoral thesis at the University of Berlin. Hoffman also studied with Abraham Sofer, son of Rabbi Moses Sofer, a model rejecter of modernity. Thus he was in a position to evaluate both points of view. His choice was Modern Orthodoxy and Hoffman became a major figure in that wing of Orthodoxy.⁶⁶ When Ezriel Hildsheimer established an Orthodox rabbinical seminary in Berlin, Hoffmann joined the faculty and became the rector in 1899, the year that Hildsheimer died, until his own death in 1921. Hoffman was a leading advocate of the Torah umadda (Torah and science) philosophy. Hoffman was for critical Talmud study and he was an, “outstanding practitioner of Wissenschaft des Judentums,” though he was an opponent of the theories of Wellhausen.⁶⁷

In London, Rabbi Leo Jung was able to earn his reputation as a wonderful English-speaking orator and he was sought after to fill an American pulpit in Cleveland,

where he arrived in January, 1920. At this time American Jews were still going to Europe to look for their rabbis. In Cleveland he was an, “utterly novel phenomenon, the first English speaking Orthodox rabbi, bearded and a Ph.D.”⁶⁸ After serving in Cleveland, at the Knesset Israel congregation, for two and a half years, he was asked, in 1922, to be the rabbi at the prestigious Jewish Center Synagogue, in New York, where he went with his bride, Irma Rothchild, of six months.

7. ORTHODOXY CONFRONTS AMERICA

This dissertation will analyze the interaction of Modern Orthodox Jews and their environment and look at the effect that America had on the type of Judaism they practiced. America was a land of freedom of religion and freedom from religion. The commitment to freedom of religion made Americans sympathetic to those escaping persecution and in return the Jews were very appreciative of American liberties. Jung wrote that it was, “a story of Jewish readjustment in a country as young in tradition as the U.S.A.... in flight from tyranny of a continent of old patterns, both of individual grace and of communal evil.”⁶⁹ As the immigrant changed his geographical location he tore himself away from an established order of living where he had his spiritual and cultural roots. His or her story was one of Jewish readjustment in a country very young in tradition. Jung pointed out that social conduct had always changed in new conditions, and that there had always been new explanations, derived from the experience of each generation.⁷⁰ Accord between Torah and daily life had to constantly be created in times of changes in social conditions.

Jews had lived in lands where they had been mistreated and where they had no opportunity to advance economically, socially and intellectually. Jews came to America because they treasured what America stood for and for what they could achieve there. America constituted potentially another promised land; certainly the East Europeans had known the opposite. Jung wrote:

What is America but man's second opportunity, the second chance for culture?
What is America but another effort of God's to let man find himself free from the ballast of past wrongs, free for the glory of self worked salvation.⁷¹

Jung was certain that Orthodoxy could and should adapt to America. Jung reminded his congregants that the welfare and ways of the country were binding where they did not interfere with religious principles.⁷² Jung hoped that the Modern Orthodox could contribute to the American scene.

America stood for the ideals of enlightenment. America, the nation state, was the product and agent of the process of modernity. Orthodoxy in America had to confront a new environment, which was "modern," materialistic, and secular in nature. The "new gods" were democracy, equality, justice, and progress. These concepts were the basis of modernity. For Jung, American democracy and the basic ideals of Judaism coalesced. In America religion was considered a good thing. America stood for cultural pluralism.

There was freedom to choose and religious leaders had to win over adherents through intellectual, emotional and practical appeal. One had the right to arrive at one's own religious belief independently and to practice religion as one felt correct.

Life in America however, presented certain problems. Jung appreciated both the virtues and dilemmas of America. Though America was the Promised Land, there was a fear of the loss of Jewish feeling and devotion. Many did not wish to maintain their

religious way of life.⁷³ Some had come to America seeking change, wanting to throw off what they saw as the yoke of their old life style. They did not wish to preserve their religion. There was an eagerness to assimilate and to part with customs that were identified as different. America was everything to them and the Jewish past was little. Jewish education was swept away as the value of material achievement was ranked higher. The demands of Torah scholarship were neglected in deference to the demand of secular education. Jung wrote:

When I arrived in New York, I discovered that Judaism (I prefer that term for the classic faith of our people in preference to Orthodoxy, which is a Christian term, or even to Torah-true, a term which I introduced in the United States of America) was generally unknown in theory and too often seen in deplorable practice, a combination of Eastern European culinary habits, considerable superstition, and disorganized unharmonious, often unintelligent presentation. There was an almost complete lack of available information about the Jewish solution of modern problems.⁷⁴

Both Jews and non-Jews saw Orthodoxy as a product of East Europe, un-American and alien.⁷⁵ America was not friendly to the concept of "Orthodoxy." In America, Orthodox Judaism was associated with the, "grotesque panorama of unsightly mass habitation".⁷⁶ Orthodoxy was not felt to be "modern," it was seen as medieval; it was designated as out of date. New notions were held in the name of modernity. Orthodox Judaism was associated with the past, with old ways. It was associated with the immigrant experience and it was felt that it would appeal only to the old, the poor, and the unacculturated.⁷⁷ Orthodoxy thus had to be presented in a different way, in keeping with the times. It is American conditions that developed the anomaly of the "Orthodox Jew" who did not observe the Sabbath, follow the dietary laws or any other commandments. Jung wrote:

In this country one may be Orthodox although the Sabbath has departed from one's life and trefa (unkosher) food is one's daily fare, the use of this term to designate the law observing Jew, is at least very curious.⁷⁸

Judaism did not seem to have much to do with observing the mizvoth (Jewish Laws). At the beginning of the East European immigration in the 1880s, the term "Orthodoxy" in America was applied to the streams of immigrants; whether the streams were, in fact, Orthodox is debatable. Orthodoxy was used inaccurately in many cases and labels can fail to describe groups as they were.

Status and adjustment in America was associated with the amount of Americanization and the amount of financial gain. For many the "American dream" was attaining wealth. Materialism was a characteristic of modernity itself; Americans were not worried about their souls.⁷⁹ Jung wrote that there was a, "continual looking for... gold."⁸⁰ There was rampant disloyalty to Jewish tradition, not because of modern science, according to Leo Jung, but because of pleasure seeking.

No more was God the theme, but, man, no more perfection, but, enjoyment the aim of life. No more fidelity to the ideal, but to the use of our opportunities. No more duty but right. Drink to the full the cup of pleasures, did this new life tell him. Drink and enjoy yourself; tomorrow you may be no more. The hereafter is no concern of yours.⁸¹

Dedication to material values deadened the capacity for religious experience. Observance of Judaism took lower priority than success and survival. Jung lamented, "Why indeed does this country save the man and destroy the Jew?"⁸² He wrote, "what boots it that we gain all the world if we lose our children; what if our children gain all the world, if they lose themselves?"⁸³ American society was pleasure seeking and indifferent to spiritual issues; there was a, "certain antagonism to recognized tradition."⁸⁴

However, America presented many challenges. Orthodoxy in particular had to

adjust to America and in the process of doing so continued to change. It was a tremendous challenge to partake and contribute to this society while holding on to Orthodox beliefs. Modern Orthodoxy in general had to develop ways to survive and thrive and to develop and affirm what it stood for.

Orthodoxy of the East European shtetl could not be transplanted intact. The Orthodox Jew had to absorb the demands of the environment in America, while holding on to religious belief. A Modern Orthodox philosophy was one approach to confronting the problems. The task of adjustment was so great that the survival of Orthodox Judaism in America occurred against repeated predictions that it would vanish from the scene.

Rabbi Jung felt that the best way Jews could contribute to the glorious new country was by being true to their own rich heritage and religion; “the Jew must be a Jew to be American.”⁸⁵ Jung felt that the Jew must maintain his Judaism to be a true American.⁸⁶ He wrote:

We shall not have done our full duty to America unless we have contributed our real selves, unadulterated Jewishness. We have our message for this country, but the message must come from the fullness of Jewish life. From the colourless abode of assimilation it has no meaning.⁸⁷

He reiterated this message many times through the years; “to the Jew this new America says your greatest contribution to the concert of nations is your religion.”⁸⁸ Another Modern Orthodox leader, Rabbi Bernard Drachman concurred that the ideal American Jew was one who was a complete Jew and a thorough genuine American.⁸⁹

America introduced many changes in Jewish life and with them the role of the rabbi changed drastically. The leaders had to stimulate the will to Jewishness. The message had to be appealing as there could be no coercion. There was also competition in

winning adherents and in effective religious leadership. Religious leadership had to keep these things in mind and the role of the rabbi had to change. Rabbi Jung was an example of a rabbi who not only adapted to the role; he mastered and expanded the territory of the rabbinate.

From the shores of America, the role of the old world rabbi seemed uncomplicated, static, clearly defined, and well respected. He was head of his community, and a last resort to whom all Talmudic and Halakhic problems were referred for final decision. The European rabbi's main function was solving questions of Jewish law. The rabbi did not experience the conflict of eastern and western culture or of secular and religious life. The community in which the old world rabbi lived did not seem to experience drastic changes, although in actuality change was inevitable. For the most part, the people believed in the authority of the laws. The premodern Ashkenazi rabbi was expected to deliver but two sermons a year, before Yom Kippur and Pesach. There were no courses in homiletics and practical rabbinics in Europe.⁹⁰ As a rule, he did not even attend synagogue, as he had a minyan in his own home. The community paid his salary and so he was not an employee of any particular synagogue. The rabbi spent most of his time in study and his home was a meeting place for scholars. People arose when he walked into a room and stood until he was seated, a sign of the utmost respect.⁹¹

In America the education of the Modern Orthodox rabbi had to be complex; he had to be equipped to master two spheres, the religious and the secular. The Rabbi could be called upon to be chaplain, scholar, educator, theologian, philosopher, preacher, preserver and interpreter of the law. In America a main function was speaking and organizing communal life. The rabbi in America could not confine himself at any time, to

Talmud study alone, as did the old world rabbi. The American rabbi had to be a preacher, giving weekly sermons and lectures at many other functions. He had to be social director, fund raiser, bury the dead, and visit the sick. He also was public relations person vis-a-vis the Gentile public.⁹² He had to battle for observance of the laws, which were either under attack or else not known.

The status of rabbi in America had thus changed. An ongoing problem, as Rabbi Jung pointed out, was how spiritual leaders could be authoritative.⁹³ No one had to listen to the Rabbi; certainly there was no social pressure to do so. Jung said, "be very patient with your flock but fight with grit and determination the destroyer of the faith."⁹⁴

The Modern Orthodox approach was that changes had to be made that were both acceptable to Orthodoxy and to American culture. The challenge in America for Jung was the

need of teachers who would transplant Judaism from the marshy grounds of Eastern Europe into the new American mentality, who would with love and foresight prepare young souls for the teaching of Torah, who would systematically sow the seeds of harmonization, recreating in a new unity a view of life forged out of the two poles of Occidentalism and Orientalism, of Jewish ideals and modern method, of Hebrew enthusiasm and Gentile accomplishment, of Torah and Derekh Eretz.⁹⁵

¹ Samuel C. Heilman. "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy, Part 1" Modern Judaism 2.1 (February 1982): 26.

² Harris I. Selig. "Is a Union of Orthodox Communities Possible?" The Jewish Tribune 25 Jun. 1926: 3.

³ Saul Bernstein. The Renaissance of the Torah Jew. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1985, 2-6, 54, 274-275. Herbert M. Danzger. Returning to Tradition The Contemporary Revival of Orthodox Judaism. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989, 1-3, 335-338. Ralph Pelcowitz. Danger and Opportunity. New York: Steingold Publishers, 1976, 20-26. Shlomo Riskin. "Conservatism and The Orthodox Resurgence." Jacob Neusner, ed., The Alteration of Orthodoxy 8. New York: Garland Publishers, 1993, 231-3. David J. Schnall. "Orthodox Resurgence," Jacob Neusner, ed., The Alteration of Orthodoxy 8. New York: Garland Publishers, 1993, 234-40.

⁴ Samson Raphael Hirsch. The Nineteen Letters. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969, 107-11.

⁵ Ibid. 112-6.

⁶ Ibid. 107-10.

⁷ Ibid. 123, 127.

⁸ Ibid. 45.

⁹ Ibid. 83-7.

- ¹⁰ Jacob Katz. A House Divided Orthodoxy and Schism in the Nineteenth Century European Jewry. Hanover and London: Brandeis University Press, Publishers University Press of New England, 1998, 125-6, 128.
- ¹¹ Ibid. 97-100. Michael K. Silber. "The Emergence of Ultra Orthodoxy: The Invention of Tradition." Jack Wertheimer, ed., The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era. Cambridge, Mass. ; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Harvard University Press, 1992, 31-2, 36-7.
- ¹² Marc Shapiro. Between The Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy The Life and Works of Jechiel Jacob Weinberg. London, Portland, Oregon: The Litmann Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 76-79, 130, 140.
- ¹³ Samson Raphael Hirsch. Nineteen Letters. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969, 62-64.
- ¹⁴ Ibid. 104. Jacob Katz . A House Divided Orthodoxy and Schism In Nineteenth Century Central European Jewry. Hanover and London: Brandeis University Press, Publishers University Press of New England, 1998, 103.
- ¹⁵ Leo Jung . "Of Orthodoxy in America." American Jewish Chronicle (1939): 6-7.
- ¹⁶ Jacob Katz."Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective." Peter Y. Medding. Studies in Contemporary Jewry. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1986, 3.
- ¹⁷ Chaim I. Waxman . "Dilemmas of Modern Orthodoxy." Judaism 42. 1 (winter 1993): 59.
- ¹⁸ Emmanuel Rackman . "Orthodox Judaism Moves With The Times; The Creativity of Tradition." Commentary 13. 6 (June 1952): 547.

- ¹⁹ Jenna Weissman Joselit. "Of Manners, Morals, and Orthodox Judaism: Decorum With in the Orthodox Synagogue." Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Ed. Jeffrey Gurock. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 1989, 28.
- ²⁰ Samuel C. Heilman. "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy, Part 1" Modern Judaism 2.1. (Feb.1982): 26. Samuel Heilman identified two trends in Orthodoxy, Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy, though he is not the first or the only one to do so.
- ²¹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 4.
- ²² Jacob Breuer. Introduction. Nineteen Letters. Samson Raphael Hirsch. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969, 4.
- ²³ Leo Jung. "Modern Trends in American Judaism." Leo Jung. Harvest Sermons, Addresses Studies. N.Y.: Philipp Feldheim Inc., 1956, 219. ("Modern Trends in American Judaism" first appeared in the Mizrahi Jubilee Publication, 1936 and is available at the Jewish Center Synagogue Archives in New York.)
- ²⁴ Jenna Joselit Weissman. personal interview. 11 November 1996.
- ²⁵ Leo Jung . "Jew and Jewishness in America." Jewish Forum 10.5 (July 1926): 132.
- ²⁶ Leo Jung. Toward Sinai . N.Y: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 27.
- ²⁷ Ibid. 218.
- ²⁸ Ibid. 23.
- ²⁹ Letter to Albert Einstein, 15 April, 1943. (in German) Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1. Y..U. Archives.
- ³⁰ Leo Jung. " Judaism and Health." Jewish Forum 7.5. (May 1924): 304.
- ³¹ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. The Jewish Library , vol..1. N.Y.: Jewish Center,

1923, 40.

³²Leo Jung , ed.. Essentials of Judaism. The Jewish Library, vol..2. New York: Union of Jewish Congregations of America, 1953c, 10.

³³Leo Jung. “The Rambam in True Perspective.” Jewish Forum 18.4(April 1935): 74.

³⁴Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol..8. London, New York: Soncino Press, 1980, xvi-xvii.

³⁵Letter from Jung to Mr Rosengarten , Editor of Jewish Forum, 16 March , 1937. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 4.

³⁶Letter from Jung To Mr. Rosengarten, Editor of Jewish Forum, 16 March 1937. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 4.

³⁷Leo Jung. “The Rambam in True Perspective.” Jewish Forum 18.4(April, 1935):74.

³⁸Letter to Albert Einstein, 15 April 1943. (in German) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1 Folder 4.

³⁹Leo Jung. “What is Orthodox Judaism?” Jung Leo, ed. Essentials of Judaism. The Jewish Library , vol. 2. N.Y.: Union of Jewish Congregations of America, 1953c, 115.

⁴⁰Leo Jung . Toward Sinai . N.Y.: Pardes Pub. House, 1929, 26.

⁴¹Charles S. Liebman. “Orthodox Judaism Today.” Midstream 25. 7(Aug/Sept 1979): 19.

⁴²Leo Jung. Living Judaism. New York: Night and Day Press, 1927, 224.

⁴³Shomrei Shabbat refers to Sabbath observers among Orthodox people. Mikvehs are the ritual baths that are necessary in Jewish laws governing sexual relationship between husband and wife. Kollels are where adult men continue advanced Jewish learning.

- ⁴⁴Samuel C. Heilman. "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy, Part 11" Modern Judaism 2.2 (May 1982):185.
- ⁴⁵Jacob Harstein. "Yeshiva Education in America." Israel of Tomorrow. Ed. Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press,1946. 474.
- ⁴⁶Leo Jung .The Path of a Pathfinder the Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8. London, New York: Soncino Press,1980, 84.
- ⁴⁷Leo Jung. "Some Aspects of Judaism." Y.U. Archives, Sapphire Papers, Box 14 Folder 30/2-55. Leo Jung. The Path of a Pathfinder The Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library , vol.. 8, London, New York: Soncino Press, 1980, 134.
- ⁴⁸Jacob Schacter, ed. Reverence Righteousness and Rachmanut: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung. New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson Inc., 1992; Leo Jung, The Path of a Pathfinder: The Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London and New York: Soncino Press, 1980.
- ⁴⁹ Obituary Notices, 17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7, Folder 12. (For further reading about Rabbi Meir Tsevi Jung, refer to Gershom Bader, Moses Jung. "Meir Tsevi Jung." Jewish Leaders 1750-1940. Ed. Leo Jung. Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1964, 295-316.)
- ⁵⁰Obituary Notices, 17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7, Folder 12.
- ⁵¹Obituaries, Further Tributes 2 , J.C. Editorial 17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7 , Folder 12.
- ⁵²Obituary Notices, Further Tribute 2. J.C. Editorial 17 June 1921.17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7, Folder 12.

- ⁵³ Obituary Notices, 17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7, Folder 12.
- ⁵⁴ Obituary Notices. Further Tributes 2 J.C. Editorial 17 June 1921. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 7, Folder 12.
- ⁵⁵ "The 19th Century England." Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Publishing House Jerusalem Ltd., 1972, vol. 6, 758.
- ⁵⁶ "Orthodoxy." Encyclopaedia Judaica. Vol. 12, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd., 1972, 1491.
- ⁵⁷ Biography of Dr. Leo Jung." Y.U. Archives, Bernard Revel Papers , Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.
- ⁵⁸ Menachem, Mendel Kasher, Norman Lamm, Leonard Rosenfeld. Leo Jung Jubilee Volume Essays in Honor on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday N.Y.: The Jewish Center Synagogue, 1962, 6. (Comes from Pirkei Avot)
- ⁵⁹ Milton R. Konvitz. "Leo Jung-Rabbi For All Jews." Midstream 39.6 (Aug/Sept 1993): 38.
- ⁶⁰ Rabbi Jacob J. Schacter. "Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung: Reflections on the Centennial of His Birth." Jewish Action. 22. Y.U. Archives, P.R. File, Leo Jung, 1985-1988. Milton R. Konvitz , "Leo Jung---Rabbi For All Jews," 38.
- ⁶¹ Leo Jung., Guardians of our Heritage. The Jewish Library, vol..7, N.Y.: Kymson Publishing Co.,1964 , preface; v.
- ⁶² Notice of a rabbi' s conference in conjunction with Kenethiyoth Hayiroelis. (That is the spelling on the stationary-Kenethiyoth Hayiroelis) President is Rav Kook, Vice president is Rabbi Dr. Meir Jung. (Chief Minister Federation of Synagogues of London) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Leo Jung. "The Modern Program For 5701," B'nai Brith Messenger combined with the Jewish Community Press, Friday, 27 September 1940, 25. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 23, Folder 2.

⁶⁵ Letter from Rosalie Rosenfeld (Jung's daughter) to Maxine Jacobson. 29 Oct., 1997. (in the possession of Maxine Jacobson)

⁶⁶ Samuel C. Heilman . "The Many Faces Of Orthodoxy." Modern Judaism 2.1 (1982) 44.

⁶⁷ Marc B. Shapiro. "Rabbi David Zevi Hoffman on Torah and Wissenschaft." Torah U-Madda Journal. 6.(1995-6): 129; Marc Shapiro. Between The Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy The Life and Works of Jehiel Jacob Weinberg 1884-1966 .London, Portland, Oregon: The Littmann Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 78 . (Julius Wellhausen, biblical scholar, in the 1870s, developed a system to substantiate his theory which rejected divine revelation and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.)

⁶⁸ Leo Jung . The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8. ,London, New York: Soncino Press, 1980, 47.

⁶⁹ Leo Jung. Excerpt from sermon Second Day Rosh Hashonna. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 21, Folder 11.

⁷⁰ Leo Jung. "Modern Trends in American Judaism." Reprint from Mizrachi Jubilee Publication. New York: 1936, 2. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

⁷¹ Leo Jung. Foundations Of Judaism. The Jewish Library, vol. 1. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 99.

- ⁷² Leo Jung . “Orthodox Judaism.” Charles Samuel Braden ed., Variations of American Religion. Chicago, N.Y.; Willet, Clark and Co.,1936 , 242.
- ⁷³ Samuel Heilman. “The Many Faces Of Orthodoxy.” Modern Judaism 2.2 (May 1982): 186.
- ⁷⁴ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press,1980, 126.
- ⁷⁵ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 105.
- ⁷⁶ Leo Jung .Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 5.
- ⁷⁷ Jenna Joselit. “ Modern Orthodox Jews and the Ordeal of Civilization.” American Jewish History 74.(1984) 133.
- ⁷⁸ Leo Jung.“Agudath, Zionism and a Modus Vivendi.” Jewish Forum 7.11 (Nov. 1924) 715.
- ⁷⁹ Leo Jung . Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 14.
- ⁸⁰ Leo Jung . Toward Sinai. N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 178.
- ⁸¹ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 46.
- ⁸² Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 80.
- ⁸³ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism . N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 81.
- ⁸⁴ Maurice Farbridge. Judaism and the Modern Mind. N.Y.: The Macmillan Company, 1927, 287.
- ⁸⁵ Leo Jung . Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 101.
- ⁸⁶ Leo Jung . Foundations of Judaism. N.Y: Night and Day Press, 1927, 101.

- ⁸⁷ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 100.
- ⁸⁸ Leo Jung. "The Modern Program for 5701." (1941) Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 23, Folder 2.
- ⁸⁹ Bernard Drachman. "Jewish Educational Problem in America." Jewish Forum 3.9 (Nov. 1920): 515.
- ⁹⁰ Judah Stampfer. "What is the American Yeshiva." Hazedek(Yeshiva newspaper) April 1945, 10-11. Yeshiva University Archives, Box 19, Folder 4.
- ⁹¹ Max Drob. "The Rabbis Role in Jewish Life." Jewish Forum (June 1941)132.
- ⁹² Arnold Eisen. The Chosen People in America. Bloomington: Indiana Press, 1983, 9.
- ⁹³ Leo Jung. "Modern Trends in American Judaism." Mizrahi Jubilee Publication, N.Y.: 1938, 6. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.
- ⁹⁴ Leo Jung . Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 132.
- ⁹⁵ Leo Jung." The Modern Program For 5701 (1941)," B'nai Brith Messenger combined with Jewish Community Press, Sept., 1940, 92. Yeshiva University Archives. Leo Jung Collection, Box 23, Folder 2.

MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE TWENTIES

“What are the roots that clutch, what branches grow out of this stony rubbish?”
 (“The Wasteland,” T.S. Eliot¹)

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will demonstrate how American Modern Orthodoxy began in this decade with the development of its landmark organizations and institutions so that the proper facilities necessary for an Orthodox community would exist.

The twenties was a period of responding to outside criticism, diagnosing the problems and developing solutions. The new leaders articulated an effective response to the criticisms of the movement and thereby begin to define what Modern Orthodoxy is. Successes were few; new institutions, and new leaders represented only the beginning of the work. The foundations had been built and Rabbi Jung felt that though the groundwork was laid; the twenties was an “uphill road.”² Modern Orthodoxy was adjusting to the modern American scene.

In the 1920s Rabbi Jung joined the battle against ignorance, compromise and spiritual oblivion to revive and promote Orthodox Judaism. Rabbi Jung began his involvement with his synagogue, The Jewish Center, and with Yeshiva College. He became active through his organizational work, in ensuring proper kosher facilities, rights for Sabbath observers, updated educational programs and facilities, and support for Eretz Israel. His first challenges were to ensure proper facilities for Sabbath observance, basic kashrut, and family law.

He presented a platform of “Torah-true” Judaism; in his view, “Orthodoxy was the only legitimate form of Judaism,” and those who were not Orthodox were dissenters

and misguided and it was their lack of knowledge that led to this dissension, to attraction to the newest fads, one of which was Reform.³ By the twenties Reform was far from being a fad, but this was Jung's description.

Always sensitive to American needs and determined to preserve Torah-true Judaism, Jung presented Orthodoxy as compatible with modernity and with America. The presentation, not the tenets, of Orthodoxy had to change from the spectacle of disorder associated with the ghetto-style Eastern European service to an aesthetic Americanized modern presentation. He worked to enhance Orthodoxy's image through decorous synagogue service, and a "modern," "harmonious" education that would teach, inspire, and reclaim Jews.

2. THE STATE OF ORTHODOXY

American Orthodoxy in the twenties was undefined. It appeared unlikely to many observers that Orthodox Judaism would remain an important factor on the American scene.⁴ By force of numbers Orthodox Judaism was important; its staying power was nonetheless in question. By the 1920s East European Jews had been in America long enough to begin to assimilate and as they Americanized, European Orthodoxy, transplanted from Europe, lost its hold as respect for religion weakened.⁵

Non-Orthodox opinion was that Orthodoxy was disappearing: "in fact voices are being heard in the Jewish press, and especially in the Zionist press (Der Yiddish Folk) that Orthodoxy is disappearing, that whoever speaks in the name of Orthodox Jewry speaks in the name of fiction."⁶ For Rabbi Jung, on the contrary:

Orthodoxy was in “winter’s laboratory” in its embryonic stage. To the one, winter’s snowstorms convey enduring decay; to the other, the most ferocious snowstorm is but the forerunner of spring. The one sees the disintegration of a nation in the coldness of its members, in the indifference to the holiest ideals of their people; the other views such periods from a perspective which reveals bright vistas of revived energies, of reawakened love, of a nation again aware of its soul, again alive to its historic past.⁷

Though prospects for Orthodoxy’s future in America were grim, Jung remained optimistic that the future would rest with Torah-true Jews.⁸ He felt that America was a wonderful country in which to fight intolerance, prejudice and arrogance; and that Jews had a future there. Jung wrote:

It hasn’t even begun to appear in its clear light. American Jewry has never rejected Orthodox Judaism for American Jewry has never seen what Orthodox Judaism is.⁹

The common complaints of Orthodox leaders were that there were few knowledgeable, inspiring Orthodox leaders, and they lacked proper educational facilities to produce more Orthodox leaders in America. At this time there were no big centres of Jewish learning in America though there had been a shift in Jewish settlement. New immigration laws halted immigration after World War One with great effect on education, as religious and intellectual leaders were not able to come to America.¹⁰

Jung was not alone in his profound dissatisfaction with the standards of religious schools.¹¹ There was no harmony or coordination between secular and religious teaching; the Hebrew schools were, “dusty, malodorous and utterly unattractive” and were not up to the standards of public schools.¹² Hebrew school teachers, inadequately trained, were pedagogically generally inferior to those in public schools.¹³ Hebrew teachers often were uncommitted to what they taught; teachers in sympathy with the teachings of Judaism and the culture of America were required. If Yiddish was the language of instruction then

the students could not understand the teachers and thus the teachers were out of touch with the young people.

The question of Jewish education included the problem of adjustment and harmonization, including Americanization.¹⁴ That fact, in addition to outdated and incompetent teaching methods meant that the youth were not learning what was being taught. With the exception of New York, there were few parochial schools and in an average community, only 25% of the children received any Jewish education at all.¹⁵

Lack of Jewish knowledge and educational facilities, as well as the difficulty of living an Orthodox life in America resulted in many members of Modern Orthodox synagogues being unobservant. Religious commitment and observances were at a low level and non-observance of the Sabbath was the norm.¹⁶ These second generation Jews, in this respect like the first generation, were not Orthodox in any ideological sense. According to Jung they were attached sentimentally to Jewish tradition but lacked a clear identity.¹⁷ Choosing between earning a living or observing the Sabbath meant that a tremendous number of Jews, even the ones who desired to observe the Sabbath, succumbed to the temptation of working on the Sabbath.

The congregants of The Jewish Center Synagogue in Manhattan, where Jung was rabbi, were representative of this trend. Affluent suit and cloak manufacturers from Orthodox immigrant families started the synagogue. The congregants had limited religious and secular educations, but retained a respect for Orthodox Judaism. The congregants remained affiliated with an Orthodox synagogue as a reminder of the Jewish traditions of their parents.¹⁸ Jung recognized the importance of the synagogue and began to work very hard to create appropriate programming.

Orthodoxy lacked organization, unity, leadership, institutions, financial support and this added to its decline. Jung wrote that Orthodoxy, “had a genius for escaping organization.”¹⁹ Similarly, the Jewish Forum lamented that, “all parties in Israel have a united front except Orthodoxy.”²⁰ The different factions, Vaad Harabanim, Rabbinical Board of Greater New York, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and Mizrahi, were not united. Disorganization resulted in powerlessness and replication of services, which in turn led to extra financial burdens. The chaotic kashrut situation was an example of this lack of organization. Without kosher facilities there could not be any Torah-true Jewish community and so this was a serious problem.

Orthodoxy did have a central lay organization, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, but, unlike the Reform and Conservative movements, the Orthodox group had several seminaries and several Rabbinic conferences.²¹ The UOJCA was not as intimately related to Yeshiva College and RIETS as was the case with the lay-seminary relationship in other movements, because it had several other seminaries to train rabbis.²² In contrast, the Reform and Conservative movements each had a central organization with its representative Rabbinical seminaries and Rabbinical conferences with one seminary each to train rabbis.

Orthodoxy’s factions were divided and they did not have experience in much needed long-range planning for the future of the Jewish community.²³ Its influence was not felt in national movements; Orthodox leadership was relatively absent in Zionism, Central Relief and The American Jewish Congress.²⁴ Orthodox Jews did not direct major Jewish institutions and the institutions were, “at best neutral at worst uncompromisingly hostile to the principles and obligations of Torah-true Judaism.”²⁵ The Orthodox

movement also lacked financial support.²⁶ Many Orthodox Jews lacked financial resources and many others lacked commitment to giving to its institutions.

Orthodoxy had to compete to exist. Historian Jeffrey Gurock stated that denominational competition began in earnest in the twenties, and the rhetoric grew stronger.²⁷ Jews became Americanized and sought alternatives to religious practices they perceived as outdated and un-American. They sometimes created Conservative synagogues, which they felt had adjusted better to American ways.²⁸ The boards of Orthodox synagogues often had to fight to remain Orthodox but still numerous Orthodox community synagogues converted to Conservatism in the 1920s and thereafter.²⁹ Competition between Orthodox and Conservative Judaism intensified in the twenties but Reform Judaism was an even greater enemy. Reform Judaism was powerful in the United States, even in the East, Orthodoxy's stronghold. Rabbi Jung 's comments regarding Reform were vitriolic and this was quite representative of the Orthodox rhetoric. Jung said that Reformers, "have reformed Judaism until there is nothing left."³⁰ Rabbi Dr. David de Sola Pool, of Congregation Shearith Israel, also felt that Reform represented, "all kinds of dangerous innovations and amputations by irresponsible surgeons, who did not know, nor did they care to know, what is vital to Judaism."³¹ Likewise, Modern Orthodox leader, Rabbi Dr. H. Periera Mendes referred to Reform as a tide of evil that had to be stemmed.³² The editorial board of the Jewish Forum wrote that Orthodox Jewry was responsible for Reform because it was not organized to cope with modernity.³³

However, though competition was evident between Conservative Judaism and Orthodoxy, Conservative Judaism was widely perceived to be similar to Orthodoxy and perhaps that is why it was easy for some to change allegiance. The separation of

Conservatism and Orthodoxy was a slow process that began in the twenties. Initially Conservative did not denote a movement but a type of “Orthodox” congregation that was more decorous in form and more American in appearance. Their social agendas were similar and legal disagreements were often more theoretical than practical. Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the Conservative Jewish Theological Seminary, was adamantly opposed to mixed seating in synagogue, as was Professor Louis Ginzberg; Chairman of Rabbinical Assembly’s Committee on Interpretation of Jewish Law.³⁴ Nonetheless congregations in the movement overwhelmingly adopted mixed seating. Adler believed that the designation Conservative applied to congregations that had departed somewhat in practice from Orthodox, but not in theory.³⁵ Jung referred to Conservatism as, “the other kind of Orthodoxy.”³⁶ Jung maintained that the JTS was originally conceived and conducted along the lines of Orthodox Judaism, but had continued along a somewhat different course.³⁷

There are many examples of the overlap of Conservative and Orthodox Judaism. Rabbi Joseph Hertz, later the Chief Orthodox Rabbi of England was a JTS graduate prior to the Solomon Schechter era, which is significant because Solomon Schechter introduced important changes in philosophy in the seminary. Orthodox rabbis Henry Pereira Mendes and Bernard Drachman had been members of the JTS faculty in the pre-Schechter period and they later joined the faculty of Yeshiva College and RIETS.³⁸ The faculty and alumni of JTS founded the Orthodox Young Israel movement. Symbolizing this confusion, there were some Orthodox teachers at JTS and some JTS graduates who were placed into Orthodox pulpits.³⁹

3. ISSUES THAT HELPED DEFINE MODERN ORTHODOXY

3.i. Provocative Beginning To The Twenties: Mordecai Kaplan's Plan To Reconstruct Judaism and Leo Jung's Response

The twenties began with Mordecai Kaplan publicly presenting his program for the reconstruction of Judaism, which appeared in The Menorah Journal, August 1920, and Rabbi Leo Jung's rebuttal in the Jewish Forum, April 1921.⁴⁰

Kaplan's proposals for the reconstruction of Judaism were a shock to Orthodox Judaism in that they were inconsistent with his previous position as an Orthodox rabbi. He wrote that

Orthodoxy is altogether out of keeping with the march of human thought. It has no regard for the world- view of the contemporary mind. Nothing can be more repugnant to the thinking man of today than the fundamental doctrine of Orthodoxy, which is that tradition is infallible.⁴¹

Kaplan believed that, "any religious idea that has come down from the past will have to prove its validity by being a means of social control and betterment."⁴² He maintained that belief in a supernatural God would destroy the Jewish people:

Unless its mythological ideas about God give way to the conception of divinity immanent in the workings of the human spirit, unless its static view of authority gives way to the dynamic without succumbing to individual lawlessness and unless it is capable of developing a sense of history without, at the same time, being a slave to the past, the Jewish people has nothing further to contribute to civilization.⁴³

Kaplan felt that Judaism had to be revised from a social viewpoint.

The adoption of the social viewpoint is an indispensable prerequisite to a thoroughgoing revision of Jewish belief and practice. That viewpoint will enable us to shift the center of spiritual interest from the realm of abstract dogmas and traditional codes of law to the pulsating life of Israel.⁴⁴

Kaplan wrote that to save Judaism from extinction Jews must recover their group consciousness. Kaplan felt that his main ideas, a naturalistic this-worldly “God idea,” and his concept of Jewish peoplehood were congruent with modern scientific reasoning and with American ideals and culture.

Jung took a very hard line against Kaplan and called Kaplan’s plan, “downright epikorsuth” (heresy). For Jung the existence of God and His divine revelation were irrefutable, so Kaplan’s theology and denigration of Jewish Law was totally unacceptable. Jung’s article in the Jewish Forum in April 1921, had strongly rebuked Rabbi Kaplan for his plan to reconstruct Judaism and for his critique of Orthodoxy. It had also catapulted him into the role of rabbi of the Jewish Center Synagogue, replacing Kaplan, who had resigned in 1922.⁴⁵ Jung then had the opportunity to be rabbi of a prestigious congregation in the geographical heartland of Modern Orthodoxy, where his ideas had more fertile ground to grow, than when he had been rabbi at Cleveland’s Knesset Israel Congregation.⁴⁶

Kaplan’s plan to reconstruct Judaism led to an evaluation of what Modern Orthodoxy was because Orthodox rabbis were obliged to take stock and consider fresh methods or approaches that would become characteristic of Modern Orthodoxy. Kaplan’s challenge obliged the Orthodox to think about a clearer definition of what it meant to be Orthodox.⁴⁷ Kaplan thus became a defining issue for Orthodoxy. Kaplan’s ideas had a significant impact on Jung who wrote that a new epoch for Orthodoxy began when the Jewish Center Synagogue, “rallied round the flag of Torah to defend it against the pompous folly of its betrayers”; the betrayer, of course was the rabbi of that synagogue,

Mordecai Kaplan.⁴⁸ We can only assume that the congregants rallied around their leader, Rabbi Jung, who initiated this activity.

It should be noted that Jung was not alone in his condemnation of Kaplan; Rabbi Bernard Drachman had also called for his resignation from the Jewish Center Synagogue.⁴⁹

Jung vehemently rejected Kaplan's non-theistic stance and endorsement of "folkways" or customs of the people as authoritative. Also, Jung maintained that Judaism was not merely a national or racial attitude. For Jung and for Orthodox Judaism the religious connection to Palestine was essential. Palestine could not merely be a national centre, as Kaplan had proposed; it had to be a centre of Torah Judaism. Cultural or national aspects of Zionism were not sufficient. Jung wrote:

Nationalism with its brutal Torahlessness is the worst possible kind of assimilation. It reduces God's chosen people in principle to the level of the Eskimos, the Poles or the Magyars. We are no more a people created by God for His purpose, as a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, but just a nation among many, endowed with wonderful capacities. Palestine is no more the land where Torah and Abodah are to be given an example to all mankind but the center, where we are to express ourselves by some concoction of Cincinnati plus Shemaryah Levin. Nationalism in its radical form is so absurd a phenomenon, so tactless a joke of history, that it was bound to go down as soon as our people would see clearly through its supermodern phraseology.⁵⁰

Jung shared Kaplan's worry that, "Judaism in America has not given the least sign of being able to perpetuate itself," but he found that Kaplan's solution was destructive.⁵¹ Yet Kaplan had defined something that needed attention in America. For Jung, Kaplan's challenge was a call to action, "the only answer to Kaplanism is: the immediate convention of a living Orthodox body to work out a systematic educational scheme for the re-assertion of Orthodoxy, absolutely faithful in principle, absolutely fresh in method."⁵² Jung considered that, "any rebel might make Orthodoxy more aware of their

duties.” He believed that Kaplan was correct in believing that social changes were needed. For Jung the solution to the problems was Orthodoxy plus decorum and a modern education of Torah im derekh erez. Decorum particularly was the key to halting the erosion of Orthodoxy.⁵³

When Kaplan left the Jewish Center in 1922 to become Rabbi of the Society for Advancement of Judaism, a block east of the Jewish Center, half the families in the synagogue left with him. Jeffrey Gurock and Jacob Schacter maintain that both Kaplan and Jung had reason to fear each other’s influence since amalgamation of the two synagogues was discussed in 1928 and remained a live issue even later on. This heightened Jung’s resolve to stop the spread of Kaplanism, for Orthodoxy and for his own sake.⁵⁴

There was an added effect of Kaplan for the Jewish Center Synagogue and other synagogues.⁵⁵ The congregation accepted Rabbi Jung’s demand that he have complete authority in matters touching the school and synagogue services and that religious activities would conform to *Halakhic* ideals.⁵⁶ Dr. Kaplan had affiliated the Jewish Center with JTS and one of the first acts taken by Dr. Jung was to replace it with affiliation to the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Yeshiva.⁵⁷ This avoided any change of the Center’s mode of worship. Other Orthodox synagogues followed his example.⁵⁸ Jung wrote that:

The fight for Torah in which the Center leadership had earned triumphs and scars, evoked profound interest throughout the country and served as a spark plug for the reassertion of Torah-true Judaism throughout the country. Although the congregation avoided the fanfare of publicity, its insistence on time hallowed principles, its willingness to ignore every handicap and inconvenience in the process, and the fact that its leaders represented socially and financially successful personalities, lent it a significance which is hard to exaggerate.⁵⁹

It was important that not only the old, poor, and uneducated, support Orthodox Judaism. The victory had been for Orthodox Judaism and for the image of Orthodox Judaism. According to Jung, it was important that the leaders of the Jewish Center Synagogue had stood up to the non-theistic tendencies of Dr. Kaplan in 1921.⁶⁰

Reaction to Kaplan's philosophy thus helped define Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy; in some cases it was a point of departure for Orthodoxy.⁶¹

3.ii. Meeting A Threat: Merger Proposal

The proposal for the merger of the Jewish Theological Seminary and RIETS was another thought- provoking, defining event. It is an example of how fluid the lines between Orthodox and Conservative were in the twenties, as well as how undefined the parameters of Orthodoxy were. The proposed merger led to better articulation of the position of Modern Orthodoxy. Philanthropists and business people, pragmatists, felt that a union between the two schools, both then embarking on fundraising campaigns, had financial advantages.⁶² Another advantage would be avoiding a split along sectarian lines. Those against the merger were obliged to provide convincing arguments why it should not occur. This led to a profound examination of what Modern Orthodoxy stood for. The solution was the idea of "harmonious" education with Jewish studies existing compatibly with non-Jewish studies under the rubric of an Orthodox educational institution.

JTS had been on the brink of bankruptcy in 1921, and Cyrus Adler, president of the Seminary since 1915, hoped for an enduring arrangement with the Orthodox. Cyrus Adler requested in 1926, "steps [be] taken by which the Seminary and the Yeshiva could work together for the advancement of Jewish learning."⁶³ Jung was part of the negotiating process for the proposed merger because he had contacts in both camps and was a good

back room player. Jung had worked with Louis Marshall, an active negotiator for JTS and president of the JTS board, on the American Jewish Relief Committee and on the Cultural Committee of the Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) of which Cyrus Adler was chairman.⁶⁴ During negotiations Rabbi Jung most probably had an influence; Jung was quick to express his opinions and many of his devoted congregants were on the board of Yeshiva. In his efforts on behalf of Yeshiva, Jung called himself a “trouble shooter.”⁶⁵

In retrospect the efforts for a JTS and RIETS merger appear futile. The spokesmen for the Board of Directors of the Yeshiva clearly stated from the start that they at the time saw no basis for co-operation but had appointed a committee to confer with representatives of the Seminary. Cyrus Adler in his correspondence referred to the lack of action on the part of the Board of Yeshiva.⁶⁶ Yeshiva continued with construction plans during the negotiations and this in itself did not show good faith.⁶⁷

The issues raised at the meetings were not revealed but the talks probably foundered on both practical and ideological grounds.⁶⁸ Dr. Revel opposed the union because JTS veered from the standards of Orthodoxy, and Dr. Mordecai Kaplan, an “articulate stray from Orthodoxy,” was an influential member of JTS. The JTS while offering excuses, allowed him to remain on the JTS faculty.⁶⁹ Jung had joined the battle to have Kaplan dismissed from JTS.⁷⁰ Bernard Drachman objected to Cyrus Adler allowing Kaplan to continue to, “poison the minds of the teachers of the coming generation...”⁷¹ On the other hand, Louis Marshall, an outspoken critic of Yeshiva, felt that those affiliated with Yeshiva, “were so ultra-Orthodox,” that their conditions could not be met.⁷²

From the perspective of Bernard Revel JTS and RIETS were very different, but for some lay people at Kehillath Jeshurun on the East Side and The Jewish Center on the West Side the merger made sense. To the uninformed eye the schools appeared to be doing the same thing. Though it was known that Yeshiva men knew more Talmud, knowing Talmud was not absolutely necessary to a good American rabbi in the eyes of the laymen. Dr. Jeffrey Gurock suggests that the article, "Yeshiva College," by Bernard Revel, President of the Yeshiva, articulating the goals and purpose of Yeshiva, was a response to why JTS and Yeshiva should not merge.⁷³

In that article Revel articulated the goal of the Yeshiva College providing "harmonious" education, not only the acquisition of knowledge and skill, but for the development of all the faculties of man, including the spiritual. Its curriculum should not be just for the training of rabbis and teachers, it should teach about Jewish life and culture and for a system of Jewish education in harmony with America. Revel's message was that the Yeshiva was not "merely a theological seminary"; it also graduated doctors, lawyers, businessmen, and rabbis.⁷⁴ Revel wrote:

But the Yeshivah does not exist merely for the training of rabbis and teachers... the Yeshivah looks beyond those fields of service to the general development of Jewish life and culture, to the evolving of a system of Jewish education that will bring harmony into the life of the American Jewish youth and will develop not only his usefulness as a member of his community, but his Jewish consciousness and his will to live as a Jew and to advance the cause of Jewry and Judaism; an education through which the human conscience and the Jewish conscience develop harmoniously into the synthesis of a complete Jewish personality, that indicates the guiding laws of life in accordance with the immortal truths of Judaism in harmonious blending with the best thought of the age and the great humanitarian ideals upon which our blessed country is founded.⁷⁵

Revel's was not the only response to the merger proposal. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America issued a press release supporting the ideals of Yeshiva

College, which claimed that unlike some of its predecessors, it did not create a chasm between the “old and the young.” It was modern and not like the old Eastern European Yeshivas and it was also different from JTS. Rabbi Jung was vice-president of the UOJCA at this time.

4. SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS

The efforts began to modernize the synagogue, educational institutes and materials, strengthen organizations and to present Halakhah as compatible with modernity in America.

4.i. The Synagogue

The twenties saw the redevelopment of a number of America’s synagogues to become “synagogue centers” and Modern Orthodox synagogues followed suit. Orthodox synagogues accommodated secular undertakings and Americanism, which were the marks of Modern Orthodoxy.

Mordecai Kaplan had tried to make the synagogue more suitable to American needs and Leo Jung continued this trend. The Jewish Center synagogue and its activities responded to American needs. It served as a prototype for hundreds of Orthodox Jewish Synagogue Centers over the following decades.⁷⁶ The Jewish Center Synagogue was as the name indicated, a centre for all activities, sports, social, educational, and religious. It had a gymnasium. The synagogue was completed in 1920, had eight stories and was known as, “the shul with a pool and a school,” and also the, “rich man’s club.”⁷⁷ All these

varied activities, introduced a secular component; that was in addition to its express purpose designed to develop a sense of camaraderie and a spirit of tradition.

Synagogues and schools often shared quarters for efficiency but mostly for their shared purpose of perpetuating Judaism.⁷⁸ The Jewish Center Synagogue housed a day school and afternoon school; its programs were pragmatic, well rounded and varied. In the early twenties Jewish Centers proliferated.⁷⁹ However, while the majority of synagogues in general were Orthodox the majority of synagogue centers were Conservative.⁸⁰ This is indicative of the fact that the Conservative movement adapted more quickly than the Orthodox movement to American conditions, and that the Jewish Center Synagogue was ahead of its time for Orthodoxy.

4.ii. Decorum

Americanized, English-speaking Jews perceived the Orthodox service as antiquated, noisy, indecorous and unaesthetic. The concern for decorum during worship blossomed with the Jewish Synagogue Centers.⁸¹ Decorum, which can be defined as a proper mode of conduct, mannerism, demeanour and presentation, was adopted by the Orthodox synagogue in an attempt to meet American needs and to halt the loss of congregants to Conservative and Reform synagogues. Reform Judaism initiated the idea of the quiet, dignified and orderly service in an attempt to develop a modern form of Judaism. Decorum in the twenties was also more prevalent in the Conservative synagogue services. Jung felt that the Modern Orthodox movement could learn from its greatest adversaries. He approved of the institutional models of Conservative and Reform, as he stated that, "every dissenting point of view deserves some gratitude."⁸² He did appreciate that Reform stressed an aesthetic Judaism, and that this aspect of Judaism

was attractive to American Jews, though Modern Orthodox leaders agreed that Reform, unlike Conservative Judaism, was totally unacceptable.⁸³

Decorum in the synagogue was an example that Orthodoxy could adapt to the modern cultural patterns and remain Orthodox. This was a mark of Modern Orthodoxy. Decorum held an inherent value for Jung.⁸⁴ It was a pivotal concept, and decorous services would be one thing that would characterize Modern Orthodoxy in contrast to the services of the Eastern Orthodox shatebels, the name used to describe the small Eastern European synagogues. Social changes, not religious changes were needed.

Jung felt that the gloomy situation in Orthodox synagogues was caused by a lack of decorum and not anything inherent in Orthodoxy itself.⁸⁵ He wrote, “the most perfect dish will become repulsive if it served on a musty plate. The most soul stirring melody will fail on a defective instrument.”⁸⁶ Jung understood that the Orthodox synagogue was not attractive to American Jews because it was disorderly. Jung believed that Jews were not rejecting Orthodoxy itself but the non- Orthodox elements of the service. The old tradition he advocated had to be presented in new garb that was not foreign to American life; the tradition had to be, “administered to the student under a true American environment.”⁸⁷ Maurice Farbridge, sociologist and contemporary of Rabbi Jung, who contributed articles to Jung’s Jewish Library, likewise stated that aesthetics could bring people to true religion and that the modern young Jew could not accept an Orthodoxy that was offered in an unacceptable manner.⁸⁸

Rabbi Jung arranged that services be conducted in an innovative way that infused new energy into the movement, helping American Orthodoxy. Jung’s Jewish Center Synagogue represented a dignified Orthodoxy with a decorous service.⁸⁹ Everything was

designed to maintain decorum, aesthetic appearance and conduct. Children could not be brought into services because they might be disruptive.⁹⁰ Rabbi Jung believed the physical appearance of both the synagogue and the worshippers should manifest the sanctity of beauty. The dress code was formal as were the services. The clergy and officials wore top hats and frockcoats during the winter and homburgs in the summer.

Things associated with the shtebel were eliminated. Honours were not to be auctioned off from the pulpit and there was to be no “swaying” while praying as this was considered old fashioned, undignified and un-American. Rabbi Jung gave his sermons in English, not in Yiddish; he spoke to the congregants about things to which they could relate. He wrote, “the Jewish message came in a foreign method, and therefore did not reach the youth... Our youth here drift away not because the message is distasteful to them, but because they have never received it.”⁹¹ The East European rabbi’s sermon, so idealistic, built a chasm between the life of the congregant and the rabbi’s sermon keeping the Orthodox congregants away.⁹²

There were to be no disorderly long drawn out services, where individuals prayed at their own speed and to their own tune. The rising generation needed innovations in practice and up-to-date interpretations of Jewish doctrine.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJCA), in which Jung was active and influential, endorsed a decorous service and English-language sermons. UOJCA was established in 1898 for the purpose of strengthening Orthodox Judaism and thus as Marc Raphael said, self-conscious Orthodoxy began with the UOJCA.⁹³ It supported Yeshiva College and The Young Israel movement, which promoted the Sabbath, synagogue attendance, charitable work, Zionist and educational

interests, and decorum in conducting services. Membership of the UOJCA feared the lack of a modern approach would lead to disaffection.

The hallmark of the Young Israel Movement, another Modern Orthodox organization, was also its insistence on decorum. Young Israel, a product of the American scene, was known for its innovations in Orthodoxy such as sermons in English, congregational singing and orderly services. Young Israel also demonstrated that it was possible to make the services attractive and inviting without departing from tradition.⁹⁴

In the Jewish Forum it was written that, “hope for Judaism in America lays in Young Israel,” which was seen as the answer to Reform Judaism, a great threat to Orthodoxy.⁹⁵ Rabbi Jung said that he looked upon this independent Orthodox young people’s movement, “as one of the most potent factors in the revival of Judaism in this country. Young Israel to me represents the conscious revolt of the loyal Jewish youth both against the negligent Orthodox and the active semi-reformed congregations.”⁹⁶

The development of the Young Israel Synagogue was originally a project of the faculty and students of the Jewish Theological Seminary.⁹⁷ With the help of Rabbi Judah L. Magnes, well-known community leader interested in revival of cultural life among American Jews, ordained at the Hebrew Union College, and Israel Friedlander, Professor at JTS, they organized for the purpose of Friday night lectures in English. Though these men did not consider themselves Orthodox, they felt that these Americanized services would have to be Orthodox to be accepted by the downtown society.⁹⁸ In 1915, fifteen young people from the Lower East Side of New York wanted to provide for their own spiritual and social needs so they formed a new organization to conduct a model synagogue under the name “Model Synagogue” but the name soon changed to the Young

Israel Synagogue. In 1918 the two organizations, Young Israel and the Young Israel Synagogue merged into the Young Israel Synagogue to provide proper facilities for study. During the twenties Young Israel programs expanded, and, as members moved to different areas, more of these organizations were established across New York City. In 1922, a Council of Young Israel, made up of several Young Israel organizations, was formed to work for Orthodox Judaism “in the American temper,” which included decorum in synagogue services.⁹⁹

4.iii. Modern Education: Another Solution

Modern Orthodox Jewish leaders advocated education in sympathy with the culture and spirit of Judaism and Americanization.¹⁰⁰ Jung felt that Jewish education was essential for Judaism but also a benefit for true Americanism. Jung wrote that, “whatever else we have contributed to this country, industrial genius, scholarly ability, we shall not have done our full duty to America unless we have contributed our real selves, unadulterated Judaism.”¹⁰¹ Rabbi Bernard Drachman felt that the Jew must be a Jew to be an true American and the man without faith was usually a bad citizen. This was a theme presented to sell the idea of parochial schools, or “day schools.”¹⁰² Rabbi Meyer Berlin, president of Mizrachi commented that in America, however, the question in connection with Jewish education, is not only of different departments of knowledge but directly one of Americanism and Rabbi Bernard Drachman echoed the same sentiment.¹⁰³ Modern Orthodox proponents defined this as “harmonious” studies and it was another issue that separated Modern Orthodoxy from other Orthodox groups.

4.iii.1. Yeshiva College

The development of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary and the founding of Yeshiva College provided a foundation for Modern Orthodoxy. Yeshiva College represented the evolving philosophy of Modern Orthodoxy and provided an environment for it to develop and thrive. RIETS and Yeshiva College were essential for Modern Orthodoxy in America. Jung felt that the new Yeshiva represented hope in the rebirth of American Jewish consciousness and felt that the plan itself was an indication of some re-arousal. As he stated the problem:

Torah-true Judaism... in the mind of the average American Jew, was defined or thought of, as kind of medieval superstition removed from the reality of general science and culture—a product of East European, curiously unAmerican, alienism.¹⁰⁴

Yeshiva College and RIETS began to change this idea and began to define what Modern Orthodoxy stood for.¹⁰⁵

RIETS, named after Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Spektor of Kovno, was founded in 1897 and reorganized in 1908, following a student demonstration which began the process of redefinition of RIETS as an institution of “Torah and Hakhma,” religious and secular education. The institution absorbed Yeshiva Etz Hayyim in 1915. In 1921 RIETS opened its new expanded headquarters on East Broadway.¹⁰⁶ It was a critical turning point for Orthodox Judaism. Jung hailed the opening of RIETS as a trail blazing for the new era. Jung said that, “the rabbi trained in the new rejuvenated seminary will be eminently fit to inspire the young (American) Jew with the glory of Judaism.”¹⁰⁷ RIETS was perceived as a, “new vessel in which to preserve and recreate on American soil the old, rich vintage of Judaism.”¹⁰⁸ The teachers, the students and rabbis of RIETS would be the interpreters, creators and initiators of Jewish thought and Jewish values in America.

With the Yeshiva, American Jewish youth could be educated and rabbis would be trained to meet their needs.¹⁰⁹

A pivotal issue for Modern Orthodox education is a combined school, where both Jewish and general subjects are taught, as mentioned, in sympathy with the culture of Judaism and Americanism. Yeshiva College, launched in 1924, was founded as an adjunct to the RIETS. It was the first college of liberal arts and sciences under Jewish auspices that became associated with twofold education.¹¹⁰ From the onset, its president, Bernard Revel, said that the Yeshiva was to be unique, in providing a dual curriculum allowing the students to receive a higher secular education in an atmosphere harmonious with their religious teachings and commitments. European Yeshivas had been dedicated to rabbinic studies exclusively. Jung praised this approach to education and the educators, "...through teachers, laymen and rabbis who will in themselves embody the harmonious synthesis of western achievement... a Jewish asset."¹¹¹ Though the curriculum would be the study of liberal arts, the ultimate aim was Revel's idea of a, "harmonious education."¹¹² Traditional Judaism would thus be harmonized with modern thought.¹¹³

The fund raising for the Yeshiva's new campus has been described as a "coming of age" by sociologist Jenna Joselit.¹¹⁴ Orthodox Jews were behaving as Americans with resources. Leo Jung was intimately involved in fund raising for the Yeshiva, arranging staff appointments, and working on committees. He spent time away from his synagogue, with the approval of his board, serving the institution that he felt was so crucial.¹¹⁵ Many Yeshiva supporters were also members of the Jewish Center so he was well placed to fund raise.¹¹⁶ Jung worked closely with Dr. Bernard Revel, Rabbi Herbert

Goldstein, Rabbi Moses Sebulun Margolies, Rabbi David de Sola Pool and other major Orthodox figures in the twenties in these undertakings.

The Jewish Center Synagogue was for several months the temporary home for the freshman classes of the Yeshiva College until the school was able to move into its own quarters in 1928. Revel wrote to Leo Jung that, “it is fitting that the center which has taken the initiative... in every phase of harmonious Jewish education... so fully in sympathy with the yeshiva ideal” should house the school.¹¹⁷

Incorporated into Revel’s Yeshiva for the first time was a Teacher’s Institute. It represented Modern Orthodoxy in America. In 1920 the school opened under the auspices of Yeshiva and Mizrachi providing a course of study leading to Hebrew teacher’s diplomas, bachelor and masters of religious education degrees.¹¹⁸ The Yeshiva differed from East European Yeshivas and other types of Orthodoxy in that it was designed to train rabbis and teachers knowledgeable in American ways and it educate them in “the mould of true Americanism.”¹¹⁹ Clearly this was Rabbi Jung’s goal as well.

4.iii.2. Young Israel: Involvement in Education

The Modern Orthodox movement supported Friday night lectures held in the synagogue as a legitimate American activity as long as the lectures did not interfere with the traditional Friday night and Saturday morning worship services.¹²⁰ As was mentioned, the Young Israel movement, which organized originally for the purpose of Friday night lectures, sponsored several lecture series. Jung was involved in many of them, which were presented after Friday night services at various synagogues. Once he gave a lecture on a favourite topic, “Marriage, The Problem of Problems.” Other guest lecturers included Herbert Goldstein, Maurice Farbridge, and later on, Joseph Lookstein.¹²¹

The lectures dealt with a range of topics including non- religious subjects. The lectures were held in the synagogue and attended by many young, intelligent Jews, who in some cases were traditionally observant. In an age of growing prejudice against Jews in universities, with quotas for Jewish students, and when many did not even have a chance to aspire to go to university, these lectures fulfilled the need for education.¹²² Though they were no substitute for university, the lectures satisfied a desire to learn and served as vehicle to teach about Judaism. Late Friday night services and lectures were common in Conservative synagogues and especially in Reform synagogues in this period.

4.iii.3. Jung's Writings: Another Means to Help Modern Orthodoxy Adjust

Just as organizations and educational institutions can be useful tools to educate and influence, so is the pen. Jung was one of the first to write about Orthodox Judaism in English to an audience uneducated in Judaism.¹²³ He believed that the theory of "Torah-true" Judaism was unknown and lamented its, "disorganized unharmonious, often unintelligent presentation."¹²⁴ His writings were guides to his understanding of Jewish law and to living appropriately in America. He strove to open up communication with the contemporary generation; his mission was the promotion of the knowledge and the practice of Torah and he wrote about how Orthodox Judaism could coalesce with modern American ideals. In his autobiography Jung described the situation when he came to New York in 1922.

There was almost complete lack of available information about the Jewish solution of modern problems. The rabbinic monthlies and quarterlies too often dealt with praiseworthy but too often out of date problems, a great deal of ingenuity, learning, and hard work concentrating on questions which were far removed from the contemporary scene, while shying away from problems that

were uppermost in the minds of men and women of our age. Traditional Judaism was found unrepresented, and that vacuum gave rise to all sorts of unjustified views of our holy Torah.¹²⁵

Jung wrote Foundations Of Judaism in 1923, Living Judaism in 1927, and Toward Sinai in 1929. These books, largely a collection of his sermons, provide a clear picture of the situation of Orthodoxy in the 1920s and clarify the reasons for the grim situation. Not only were the problems pointed out, so were the solutions, as he saw them. In 1924 he began the first of many volumes that he edited for The Jewish Library, with The Essentials of Judaism. The Jewish Library series enabled its audience to read the writings and sermons of Leo Jung and the views of other prominent Modern Orthodox philosophers, rabbis, historians, sociologists and to be updated on current and historical issues in America, Europe and Eretz Israel.

In Foundations of Judaism, Jung records the material successes of Jews in America at the expense of moral and spiritual failure and he presents his blueprint for the rehabilitation of Orthodoxy in America, for which he has only praise: "...what is America but another effort of God's to let man find himself free from the ballast of past wrongs, free for the glory of self-worked salvation?"¹²⁶ The book is a plea to return to Jewish living in the wonderful America where Jews are free to practise their religion and live in peace.

In Living Judaism he again presents a grim picture of the state of Orthodox Judaism, along with suggestions on how to improve the synagogue, school and home, three channels by which the Jew can express his Jewishness. The book also defines what Judaism stands for from the Modern Orthodox perspective; for him there is no problem of science versus faith, both are essential for each other.¹²⁷ He defends "chosenness,"

probably because it was being criticized by Mordecai Kaplan; and refers to it as a duty, a task and a source of pride.¹²⁸ Eretz Israel is important to Jewish life; "...that Palestine is the best opportunity for the Jew to attain the ideals for which he was created."¹²⁹

He wrote many articles for contemporary journals and was on the editorial board of the Orthodox English language journal Jewish Forum which represented the sort of Orthodoxy that Jung endorsed. That journal was supported by Mizrahi, Young Israel and UOJCA and was an important tool in presenting Modern Orthodox philosophy to the public at large.

4.iv. Strengthening Organizations: Avenues of Influence and Enablers

As organizations became stronger and more focused so did Modern Orthodoxy. Organizational affiliation became an important basis of Modern Orthodoxy as the goals of Orthodox organizations were to enhance Jewish life, retard assimilation while fostering Americanization. This challenge was one of the dilemmas of Modern Orthodoxy. This work was vital in the twenties as denominational competition began for the Eastern European Jews and their children. An uneducated population with flagging allegiances was being attracted to the Reform and Conservative movements that challenged what Orthodoxy stood for.¹³⁰

An Orthodox community requires certain things, one of which is kashrut facilities as observance of the kosher laws is a basic tenet of Judaism. Available kosher products necessitate having properly trained personnel knowledgeable in proper preparation of kosher food, proper facilities for its preparation, and personnel capable of enforcing the kosher laws. Conditions in America were more complicated than they had

been in Europe and maintaining kashrut facilities now required American methods of organization.

Just as proper kosher facilities enable a Jewish community to exist, it is also necessary to establish conditions that enable Sabbath observance. Torn between the demands of earning a living and observing the Sabbath, Jews often had to take the first option. American Orthodox organizations had to involve themselves in activities that ensured economic opportunity for Sabbath observers.

4.iv.1. Union of Orthodox Congregations of America (UOJCA)

Rabbi Jung was vice president of the UOJCA, which was founded in 1898, from 1926 to 1934. Jung commented that the UOJCA looked at the situation of Orthodoxy, “to see how low our level is at present, in order that we may strive toward achievement.”¹³¹

In 1920 Dr. H. Pereira Mendes, like Jung, urged the Union to expand its work and unite with others in that effort, meaning with Conservative, but not Reform organizations, which were perceived as a more dangerous threat.¹³² The Orthodoxy that was espoused by the Union was thus not an “insular Orthodoxy.” Jeffrey Gurock has written that the “hallmark of the Orthodox Union” activity was its efforts in the external community.

Jung wrote:

We do not want insular Orthodoxy! We are not divorced from Jewish law! We are not divorced from Jewish life!! And we must not be divorced from the Jewish people! Let our ambition be: to make of this Union the nucleus of a strong, virile, all-embracing Torah-Parliament of American Jewry.¹³³

The UOJCA program had to safeguard Orthodoxy and reach out to new recruits and had to be involved with “missionary work for Judaism among Jews.”¹³⁴ UOJCA had

to bring Jews back into the fold. Rabbi Jung while immovable in his own philosophy, was always able to reach out to those not in his camp.¹³⁵

Rabbi Jung felt that the UOJCA must reach out to all Jews:

As Torah-true Jews, we want to extend our brotherhood and respect to the old fashioned rabbi for whom American life is an unbroken series of disappointments and sorrow.¹³⁶

In its desire to reach English speaking young people, the UOJCA had alienated the Yiddish speaking Orthodox rabbis. The Yiddish old style European rabbis were becoming a relic of the past according to Jung and other UOJCA members; their role in education and the kashrut industry was being reduced and they were being replaced by English speaking, more Americanized Orthodox rabbis. Rabbi Jung founded the Rabbonim Aid Society headquartered at his synagogue to financially aid these Yiddish speaking rabbis.¹³⁷

In 1926 the UOJCA decided to become involved with kashrut supervision and certification.¹³⁸ There was no single body overseeing the kashrut industry as a whole; many individuals worked on their own, some of who were incompetent or dishonest. Jung said that kashrut was a “disheartening spectacle of disorder” and kashrut supervision was a disaster. He felt that the lack of kashrut enforcement and a lack of kosher facilities was a great handicap for Orthodox Judaism.¹³⁹ Recurrent fraud and scandal occurred at the expense of the observant.

Harold P. Gastwirt provided endless examples of fraud in this industry for economic gain; the offenders ranged from the Health Department to shohatim, butchers and rabbis. There was price fixing, raising prices before the holidays, and receiving bribes for false kosher certificates, among other offences. Gastwirth wrote that American

pluralism and voluntarism were the reason for the failures in the kashrut industry since people were free to observe as they wished but rules were unenforceable.¹⁴⁰ In Europe the rabbi of the town, a trusted leader, decided issues concerning kashrut. In America with its separation of church and state, there was no official community or authoritative structure. There was lack of cooperation among rabbis and the cost of effective law enforcement from American authorities was prohibitive. The situation was unprecedented and there was thus no tradition to fall back on.

In 1926 Jung organized The Rabbinic Council of the UOJCA and was its president for the following eight years. The Rabbinic Council was to assume the rabbinic functions of the Union, including kashrut supervision; the "OU" became its organizational symbol and trademark. For many years the UOJCA was called a "paper organization" until it came into importance when it developed the kashrut certificate department.¹⁴¹ As vice president of the UOJCA and organizer of its Rabbinic Council, Jung and others began a crusade to fight the corrupt "kashrut jungle" and replace it with a reliable system under the OU imprint.¹⁴²

In 1928 Jung sent a letter to the UOJCA, which presented a unanimous decision of the Executive Committee of the Rabbinic Council defining its role. The Council was to be the authoritative body with respect to all matters of Jewish law affecting the UOJCA, that all Halakhic questions were to be submitted to the council and that they were to be answered exclusively by the Council. All hechsherim, which were formal affirmations that products were kosher, past and present, had to be under the auspices of or approved by the Council.¹⁴³ The Council, under the chairmanship of Leo Jung, abolished individual

hechsherim for its members and this was very important as it was hoped that the council would be reputable and could be trusted.

The UOJCA lobbied politically in the area of kashrut. Laws were enacted by the state to see that neither butchers nor restaurants misrepresented as kosher, non-kosher food. The problem, however, was enforcement and the law enforcers often took bribes. In some cases, heavy fines were imposed and culprits were sentenced to jail. This did decrease the number of violations but the culprits were usually charged only after several warnings and many continued to disregard the law.¹⁴⁴ Proper kosher facilities would be an issue for a long time to come.

4.iv.2. Facilitating Sabbath Observance

Facilitating Sabbath observance was of great importance as the Orthodox leaders felt that the preservation of the Sabbath was a precondition for the preservation of American Jewry.¹⁴⁵ Jewish groups and individuals paid increasing attention to questions of the Sabbath in the twenties.¹⁴⁶ Jung wrote that that the Sabbath question was, “as important to American Jewry as ten colleges and a hundred drives and myriads of synagogues,” and he worked along with other Orthodox and Conservative leaders to ensure rights for Sabbath observers because lack of these rights made it difficult to observe the Jewish Sabbath.¹⁴⁷ One of the main differences in America was the loss of Saturday as the historical Sabbath. There was a six-day workweek and Sunday was the day off. This denied the Jews religious freedom and made Sabbath observance difficult.

In the twenties the Jewish Sabbath movements began focusing on the five-day week for social and economic concerns and supported the general labour movement in this demand.¹⁴⁸ It was mainly Orthodox organizations that fought for the five-day week.

This effort demonstrated social consciousness and was also a practical way to plead for the traditional Sabbath. Orthodoxy was committed to the ideal of the traditional Sabbath and the idea of social reform.¹⁴⁹ It combined religious reasons and social reform goals. Orthodoxy was in the forefront of demands for social, economic and moral reform though Reform and Conservative groups involved themselves with this issue too.¹⁵⁰ It was the Sabbath Alliance, which had been organized to promote the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and which worked in close co-operation with the UOJCA, that took the initiative and was the most active of all the Orthodox groups. Only when the Sabbath Alliance began to concentrate on labour reform was it able to make headway.¹⁵¹ Bernard Drachman, president of The Sabbath Alliance, supported local unions in large cities launching their campaign for a five and a half day week.¹⁵² This was a start, though still not ideal as the half-day had to be a Saturday.

In the 1920s there was a wave of “Blue Laws” passed which forbade businesses, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, to operate on Sundays. These Blue Laws, in many cases, had anti-semitic overtones, and they did contribute to the widespread non-observance of the Sabbath.¹⁵³ Hence, the Jewish Sabbath Alliance began a national campaign against Blue Laws saying that the Blue laws violated the philosophy of church and state separation.¹⁵⁴ Jewish groups felt that the Blue laws were un-American and repugnant to the fundamental concept of freedom and liberty of conscience.

On the assumption that there was separation of church and state, the Sabbath Alliance promoted the introduction of the Dickstein Bill in the New York legislature in 1919 and 1920.¹⁵⁵ The Sabbath Bill introduced by Samuel Dickstein, a member of the State Assembly of New York, proposed that those who could not work on the Sabbath be

allowed to work on Sunday. The Bill would have allowed Jews to open stores and work on the Sunday, but it had no chance to pass in the state legislatures that were passing new Blue laws in record number and they had little help from the courts.¹⁵⁶ Hence the first attempts were blocked. The Dickstein Sabbath Bill, though it never passed, demonstrates the effort to secure equal justice and equal opportunity in employment for Sabbath observers at this time.¹⁵⁷ This failure weighed heavily upon the Orthodox businessman.¹⁵⁸

Other groups were also active in Sabbath preservation. In 1926 the editorial board of the Jewish Forum recommended that all Jewish organizations have Sabbath observance as a fundamental purpose. The UOJCA instituted a Sabbath Committee, which included Rabbis Joseph Lookstein, Moses Sebulun Margolies and Leo Jung.¹⁵⁹ The committee's goal was to educate, to rally loyalty to the Sabbath and facilitate employment opportunities for Sabbath observers. The Young Israel Movement was active in defending religious rights and sponsored a bureau of employment for Sabbath observers.¹⁶⁰

In the late twenties a question of calendar reform was presented to the United States Congress that would have made observance of the Sabbath nearly impossible. The fixity of the Sabbath would have been nullified and the Sabbath would move to different days of the week. At the time this was considered a serious threat. This calendar was proposed for financial reasons and ignored religious concerns.¹⁶¹ Jung was part of the Jewish Sabbath Alliance Committee struck to prevent its adoption.¹⁶² The threat to the Sabbath was especially important for Orthodox Jewry and they continued to fight for religious and economic equality for many decades.¹⁶³

4.v. Approaches To Halakhah

Rabbi Jung did not espouse a hard line against lax observance. His view of Halakhah was not rigid; he felt this was necessary as the society in America was a working, as opposed to “learning” society.¹⁶⁴ Jung presented Halakhic ideas as compatible with modernity. For Jung Orthodoxy was modern and this worldly, and so were its laws. Jung maintained that Judaism wished control, “in such real things of life as honesty in business, ritual food, sexual purity, industrial fairness, commercial integrity.”¹⁶⁵

All Orthodox groups agreed that Halakhah, or Jewish law, was to be followed. Some Traditional Orthodox groups responded to modernity by enforcing a stricter piety and interpretation of the rules. Modern Orthodoxy considered that Halakhah had always been sensitive to the economic, social, geographical and psychological conditions of the period.¹⁶⁶ Those who held a modern approach to Orthodoxy felt that the customs of the people had to be considered.

A lack of proper facilities and the American environment sometimes made it difficult to observe the laws. Jung did not demand Shabbat observance, taharat hamishpacha (observance of Jewish family purity laws), or kashrut from his congregants. His role was to draw them back into the fold, to stimulate their will to Jewishness, educate them, make them feel comfortable and provide attainable goals. Martin Schwarzchild, a former president and member of the synagogue since childhood recalled: “What was important to him was ethics, morality and human decency.” Jung never said “thou shalt not turn on a light on Shabbos.”¹⁶⁷

His sermons placed more emphasis on ethics than on ritual.¹⁶⁸ His emphasis was not as much about mitzvot because the people to whom he was speaking found it easier to relate to ethics and he felt that, “the Jew puts his ethical ideals above all else.”¹⁶⁹ He focused on relations and honesty in business, since his synagogue was made up of mostly business people who were suit and cloak manufacturers.

Few men wore kipas, other than in synagogue, and fewer women covered their hair. Men covered their heads with a hat outdoors, as was the fashion of the day. Indoors they were bareheaded except when praying. In the face of anti-semitism, privatization of Judaism was the rule. This was reflected in the dress code where nothing distinguished the Jew from the non-Jew. Rabbi Jung’s four daughters were never asked to cover their heads, as they were about to marry.¹⁷⁰

Laws of Judaism had to be presented as compatible with modernity. It had to be demonstrated that Judaism put great emphasis on bodily health and physical well being and Jung felt it necessary to point out that modern medical science endorsed the hygienic and eugenic value of Jewish life and of, “scrupulous compliance with dietary and marriage laws.”¹⁷¹ Jung claimed that, “Jews never have been taught to know the health giving, health-preserving properties of Jewish life.”¹⁷² Rabbi Bernard Drachman also said that Judaism put, “great stress upon bodily health and physical well being.” He felt this was exemplified in the dietary laws.¹⁷³

Jung was appealing to an audience that looked over its shoulder for approval from its Gentile neighbours. Therefore Jung asserted that many Jewish customs were so positive that the “cultured gentile” accepted them. Gentile scientists said that the laws of kashrut were humane and their opinions were highly respected.¹⁷⁴

In keeping with the times, Rabbi Jung, one of the few advocates for the laws of family purity, presented the marriage laws, hilchoth taharah as compatible with what was going on in the modern world. Family law was a mission for Jung and he was determined to rescue the Judaic marriage laws from obscurity. These laws as he stated were, “utterly unknown to the majority of American Jews.”¹⁷⁵ He wrote:

It proclaims the duty to interrupt the love cycle when the menses are expected. It enjoins that it may not be taken up before the bath of immersion has been taken. And this bath of immersion is not legitimate for twelve days. Thus the twelve days of freedom through separation are guaranteed to the woman become self evident to the man and raise the level and the tone of their married life.¹⁷⁶

Jung felt that Jewish marital law protected the woman, elevated her and the status of the marriage; the laws provided a sense of holiness and spirituality and therefore kept the marriage on a high level.¹⁷⁷ It was felt that the spiritual benefits and religious reasons of the laws would not alone win adherents, so Jung combined modern reasoning with Jewish concepts, which was typical of Modern Orthodox thinkers of that time. According to Jewish law the ritual bath is more important than a synagogue, but this was not offered as a reason to observe the laws. In America, building a mikveh did not carry the same imperative as the establishment of a synagogue, cemetery, or attention to kashrut and the laws of marital purity through mikveh had been neglected.¹⁷⁸ American Jewish women lacked an understanding of mikveh, the ritual bath, which was a religious duty and requirement to fulfill the family laws. This lack of understanding was coupled with great apathy.¹⁷⁹ Therefore Jung pointed out that the laws had health preserving qualities, were good for romance, and emancipation of women because it gave women control of their own bodies.¹⁸⁰ Rabbi Emanuel Rackman has pointed out that Jung’s approach to religion is called the psychological approach as this approach analyses religion with, “peace of

mind,” and, “happy and noble living,” as its end.¹⁸¹ The twenties was an age of female emancipation with women fighting in the political arena for rights, so presenting the family law as preserving woman’s rights was a good approach. In the thirties the increased employment of women brought with it a serious threat to their health, so this approach went on into the thirties.¹⁸² The literature on this subject at this time depicted these laws as preventing promiscuity, suicides, neurosis, divorce and scandals. They also protected one from the loneliness of the modern world.¹⁸³ They were presented as a panacea for everything. The marital laws looked after the woman’s mental and physiological needs. Jung cited the article of Dr. Mary Stopes, called, “Married Love,” and Dr. Isaac Macht’s article, “Phyto-Pharmacological Study of Menstrual Toxins,” both in the Journal of Pharmacology 1924, which underscored the hygienic and eugenic basis of ritual purity. Dr. Stopes wrote that the systematic protection of a woman’s physical and soul welfare was found in family purity.¹⁸⁴ Science, as well as Torah, was given authority. The article, “Ritual Baths,” written by a prominent Orthodox Rabbi’s wife, Mrs. Moses Hyamson, states that, “these laws have the approval of scientific experts and the whole hearted support of eminent medical men.”¹⁸⁵

In the modern world aesthetics were important. Jung wrote about, “unsavory, unsanitary, unclean” mikvehs that alone caused a lack of observance.¹⁸⁶ Rabbi Oscar Fasman quoted Jung as saying “we cannot win women over to the observance of ritual laws if the mikveh in the community is a dingy, rundown, and unclean facility.”¹⁸⁷ One of Jung’s initial projects as a fledgling rabbi in Cleveland had been to build a new mikveh, “hygienically and aesthetically on the heights of Judaism.”¹⁸⁸ He continued the practice

of collecting money from his congregants to support mikvehs.¹⁸⁹ He was responsible for some fifteen aesthetic and modern mikvehs in America. He stated in “Rhythm of Life,”

I can remember a number of loathsome places... and I cannot criticize too sharply the carelessness, which made such conditions possible. Coupled with the inability of the rabbis to discuss this all-important subject and with a lack of informed rebellion among women (who should have refused to get married before the community established decent mikvath) the situation prevailed which rendered such hostility on the part of the half informed and uninformed young women more intelligible.¹⁹⁰

As we can see, Jung had a true concern for the welfare of women. In Orthodox circles there were latent and overt prejudices concerning the role of women. Jung held the modern attitude that women had a role to play in community affairs and he was especially uncomfortable in response to slurs about women’s intellect and their seclusion from the public arena.¹⁹¹ The subject in the twenties was broached in Modern Orthodox circles and this only began the discussion of the role of women and their more active participation.

Another important issue for the welfare and just treatment of Jewish women is agunot, women who have been deserted intentionally or unintentionally, whose husbands cannot be found, or women whose husbands will not give them a divorce. The second type of agunah, the woman whose husband will not give her a divorce has remained a terrible problem, for in Jewish law only the husband can grant a divorce. The American Modern Orthodox leadership tried to take a leading role in solving this important issue. Jung recognized this could be a tremendous contribution to American Judaism and he acknowledged that the agunah problem was one that, “interfered with my equanimity”; he felt that the law put women in an unfair, unjust position.¹⁹² The problem is that no authoritative Rabbinic body such as a Sanhedrin is in place to amend the law in any way.

It was requested that Rabbi Jung, as head of the Rabbinical Council of The Orthodox Union write to Rav Kook, who had been elected the first Ashkenazi chief rabbi of Palestine in 1921, urging the convening of a world Sanhedrin.¹⁹³ It is not known if Rabbi Jung wrote this letter but it is known that he felt that this would be, “one of the tremendous contributions to American Israel.”¹⁹⁴ Establishing a Sanhedrin was fraught with problems. Without an authority structure in Modern Orthodoxy it would be difficult to achieve agreement as to which rabbis would sit on this body. The lack of structure was a problem for Orthodoxy as a whole, but especially for Modern Orthodoxy. Also, the decisions of the Sanhedrin could not be enforced in America, where religion and government affairs are separated. The situation of agunot remains stagnant and pertinent in Orthodoxy to this day but the proposal is an example that women’s issues were beginning to be broached and that American Modern Orthodox rabbis were beginning to assert themselves.

Another modern Halakhic dilemma was the issue of mehitza that presented itself many times in the twenties. A mehitza is a partition in the synagogue that separates the men’s from the women’s area. This dilemma was an issue in Modern Orthodoxy and Conservative Judaism at the time; Reform Judaism had completely abolished it in America. Separate seating pitted modernity, Americanization and women’s issues against Jewish legal (Halakhic) practices.¹⁹⁵ Mixed seating represented local norms; its proponents portrayed it as fostering family togetherness, woman’s equality, a modern progressive image and attracting youth.¹⁹⁶ On the Conservative side there were congregations that maintained a mehitza and separate seating. In 1921 the question of family pews came up before the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative) Committee on

Interpretation of Jewish Law; Louis Ginzberg, chair of the committee felt that seating should be “separate but equal” but that the Jewish custom should be upheld.¹⁹⁷ The Conservative Congregational Association, called the United Synagogue of America did not sanction mixed seating. There were also Orthodox congregations without mehitzas. The issue fell into a grey area.

The trend to mixed seating met with opposition from Orthodox groups because they regarded the mehitza as a cardinal principal and a confirmation of preservation of the Orthodox character of the synagogue. However, according to Bernard Revel, who represented the Modern Orthodox position, a rabbi could take a pulpit in a non-mehitza synagogue as long as he worked to have one installed.¹⁹⁸ This compromise was also a dividing issue for Modern Orthodoxy and the Agudat Harrabonim that remained unresolved for decades. In Modern Orthodox synagogues modernity came to mean decorum, use of English language and weekly sermons.¹⁹⁹ But in the twenties this issue was another example of how Modern Orthodoxy had not yet clearly defined itself.

5. MODERN ORTHODOXY: POSITION ON ZIONISM

Support for Zionism was not unanimous in the twenties among Jewish people; it would always be problematic in the Orthodox world, but participation within the Zionist movement would be an identifying feature of Modern Orthodoxy. Zionism presented Orthodoxy with issues to consider, one of which was bringing redemption before its time. One of the tenets of Judaism is that when the Messiah comes then Israel shall be returned to the Jewish people; how to justify the return of the land through man’s efforts and through co-operation with secularists, thus negating the role of the Messiah was a

dilemma for Orthodoxy. However, Modern Orthodoxy, unlike other Orthodox groups, found a way to support Zionist organizations by perceiving Zionism as the first step towards redemption. For Modern Orthodoxy, Zionism was not only a movement to create a political haven for Jews; it also had a religious connotation. Jung, like most Modern Orthodox Jews, did not object to man's efforts to save himself, but rather to the secular emphasis of political Zionism. The UOJCA affirmed that Zionism conflicted with neither religious injunctions nor demands of loyalty to America.²⁰⁰ This reassurance was necessary as Jews had to be reassured that Zionism would not jeopardize their status in America and would not demand their aliyah. American Jews were still adapting to America, and America was their "promised land".

5.i. Mizrachi and Agudat Israel

The Orthodox supporters of Zionism organized as the Mizrachi movement in 1901. The movement saw Jewish nationalism as an instrument for realizing religious objectives, especially of enhancing the opportunities for the observance of the Torah by a Jewish society living on its own soil. Mizrachi focused efforts to rebuild a Jewish state and fought for the right of Orthodox Jews to autonomy in cultural and religious affairs within the Zionist movement. Mizrachi worried that secular Zionism did not do enough for religious institutions.²⁰¹ However, Mizrachi's role in the development of Israel reflected the role of Modern Orthodoxy itself as its program was not well organized and it had not established roots in American Orthodox life. Mizrachi had joined the Zionist movement, but was weak; the great masses of Orthodox had not been attracted, although most Modern Orthodox rabbis and organizations supported Mizrachi.²⁰² RIETS had

incorporated the Mizrahi's teacher's institute in 1921, signalling a strong Zionist orientation on the part of Modern Orthodoxy's flagship institution.²⁰³

Agudat Israel had been founded in 1912, nearly a decade after Mizrahi, by European Orthodox leaders, heads of yeshivot and Hasidic rebbes along with some followers of Samson Raphael Hirsch. They believed to various degrees, that there was no need for a Jewish state but if there was to be a Jewish state it must not be run by secular Zionists. When Agudat Israel was founded, it was felt that it would represent internationally, all Orthodox Jews.²⁰⁴ This was not to be, especially when anti-Zionism became one of its hallmarks. Jung affiliated with both organizations in the twenties; he was active in Agudat Israel, on the Rabbinic Council of Agudat Israel in America and was also a member of Mizrahi. Jung was a committed lover of Eretz Israel but his support for political Zionism was, at this time, ambiguous.²⁰⁵ This dual affiliation represented the Modern Orthodox dilemma about Zionism. Most Modern Orthodox leaders worked for Orthodox unity and followed a policy of co-operation.²⁰⁶ OIJCA leaders attempted, without success, to unite the two Orthodox movements to reinforce Orthodox cohesion.²⁰⁷

The question is how there could be affiliation with both Mizrahi and Agudat Israel, which were philosophically quite different on the issue of Zionism. Clearly there was an attempt by some Orthodox leaders to misrepresent the differences; in some instances they did not fully understand the differences themselves.²⁰⁸ The anti-Zionist philosophy of Agudat Israel was either not discussed or toned down in America. It did support religious institutions in Palestine. Agudat Israel had proposed cooperation with the Zionist organization based on the notion that religious education should be left to

Orthodoxy, while politics and economics could be in the hands of Zionists. For everything other than Jewish law they would cooperate with all Jews.²⁰⁹ The Zionist Organization would not accept these compromises but some Modern Orthodox followers could.

Jung also feared that nationalist Zionism was too powerful, that Eretz Israel went beyond a colonizing scheme or refuge. For him just as modern nationalism, which led to greed and brute force, had failed, so too would “Godless” nationalism in Eretz Israel fail.²¹⁰ Also, Jung at that time liked some Agudat Israel projects. In the twenties Agudat Israel adopted educational and economic programs which included work in Palestine, even as it fought Zionism.²¹¹ Agudat Israel was also involved in the sale of land in Palestine to a number of Americans.²¹² In defending Agudat Israel, Jung pointed to these land sales as an example that Agudat Israel did indeed work for the building up of Eretz Israel. Jung represented Agudat Israel and worked with Dr. Chaim Weizmann on the problem of Aguda’s participation in the Jewish Agency. The problem was never solved.²¹³

Agudat Israel’s philosophy became more unacceptable over time to the majority of Jews who supported the idea of a Jewish State, as its philosophy became better known. It did not want a state of Israel and it would not cooperate with the Jewish Agency. The desire for Eretz Israel as a Torah centre and the acceptance of a political reality was an obstacle to a unified front.²¹⁴ Jung’s affiliations with Zionism changed over the years; he, like American Jewry, was still feeling his way in the twenties. By the early forties, he quit Agudat Israel over its policy of non-cooperation with the Jewish Agency.

6. TRENDS AND ISSUES: CONCLUSION

What Modern Orthodoxy lacked in the twenties were hard lines and clear concepts. Modern Orthodoxy was making social changes while attempting to keep the Halakhic tradition intact. A new generation of rabbis was emerging with a positive attitude to Americanization. Rabbi Jung was one of these rabbis; he understood what needed changing in order for Orthodoxy to succeed in America and he advocated and involved himself in trying to implement these changes. The trend was towards modernization and Americanization of Orthodox Judaism to attract the American Jew. The emphasis was that Halakhah was relevant and compatible with Americanism and modernity. The ethical, this-worldly aspect of Judaism, congruent with modernity, was stressed; secular undertakings should accompany Torah living. This was reflected in “harmonious” education, the drive for decorum, and the attitude towards Zionism.

The establishment of Yeshiva College helped to define Modern Orthodoxy, as it would begin to establish policy and precedents. With the advent of the Yeshiva, differences between Conservative and Orthodox Judaism in the twenties became clearer and greater.

The Modern Orthodox leadership began to establish and develop institutions and organizations to educate the Jewish population and create the necessities for an Orthodox life. It began to reach out to all Jews vowing not to practise “insular” Orthodoxy. Modern Orthodoxy could be an inclusive denominational affiliation.

Modern Orthodoxy began to develop in the twenties; those were its formative years. Orthodoxy was beginning to tackle its problems. Rabbi Jung remained enthusiastic even though there were few accomplishments.

- ¹ T.S. Eliot. "The Wasteland." Maynard Mack, Leonard Dean, and William Frost, eds., Modern Poetry vol. V11, second edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1961, lines 19-20.
- ² Leo Jung. "Modern Trends in American Judaism." New York: Mizrachi Jubilee Publication, 1936, 5. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.
- ³ Leo Jung. Towards Sinai. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 78, 183.
- ⁴ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 208.
- ⁵ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Winnowing Of American Orthodoxy." Marc Lee Raphael ed., Approaches To Modern Judaism, 2. California: Chico Scholars Press, 1983, 42-44.
Leo Jung, Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 334. Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. Jewish Library Series 1. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 45.
- ⁶ Dr. Meyer Waxman. "American Orthodoxy -The Fifth Unknowable." Jewish Forum 7. 5. (Oct. 1924): 652.
- ⁷ Leo Jung. Toward Sinai. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 104.
- ⁸ Leo Jung. "What is a Better Year? A Rosh Hashona Sermon." The Jewish Tribune (10 Sept. 1926) 42
- ⁹ Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America," Jewish Forum 9.5 (July 1926): 133.
- ¹⁰ Harris Selig. "What Will The Yeshiva Do?" The Jewish Tribune (March, 1926): 46.
- ¹¹ David De Sola Pool. "A Glimpse into the Development of American Judaism," Jewish Forum 5.5 (June 1922): 212.
- ¹² Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 213.

- ¹³ Isaac Rosengarten. Editor of Jewish Forum. "Order Out of Chaos In Jewish Education." Jewish Forum 3. 9. (Nov. 1920) 520.
- ¹⁴ Jenna Joselit. New York's Jewish Jews : The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years . Bloomington: Indiana Press, 1990, 6.
- ¹⁵ Meyer Berlin . "Jewish Education in America." Jewish Forum 3. 9.(Nov. 1920) 588.
Cyrus Adler. "Dr. Solomon Hurwitz." Jewish Forum 6.5 (June, 1923) 370.
- ¹⁶ Leo Jung . Towards Sinai . N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 111.
- ¹⁷ Leo Jung. Towards Sinai . N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 244.
- ¹⁸ Jeffrey Gurock ,Jacob Schacter. A Modern Heretic and a Traditional Community. New York: Colombia University Press, 1997, 115.
- ¹⁹ Leo Jung. "Of Orthodoxy in America." American Jewish Chronicle (1939): 6.
- ²⁰ Editorial. Jewish Forum 10.11 (Nov. 1927) 547.
- ²¹ Maurice J. Karpf. "Community Organization in the United States. " American Jewish Year Book . 39.(1937-8) 70.
- ²² Maurice J. Karpf. " Community Organization in the United States." American Jewish Year Book . 39. (1937-8) 71.
- ²³ Jacob Katz. "Orthodox Jews From Passivity to Activism." Commentary 79.6 (June, 1985) 34.
- ²⁴ Meyer Waxman. " American Orthodoxy-The Fifth Unknowable." Jewish Forum 7. 10. (Oct. 1924) 650.
- ²⁵ Leo Jung, ed. The Path of a Pioneer The Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library Series. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 70.

- ²⁶ Bernard Drachman. "Plan For the Organization of a Society for the Promotion of Jewish Religious Life." Jewish Forum 3. 10.(Dec. 1920) 593.
- ²⁷ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Orthodox Synagogue." Jack Wertheimer, ed. The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Hanover, London: Brandeis University Press, University Press of New England, 1987, 60.
- ²⁸ Dr. Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview . 17 Dec. 1996.
- ²⁹ Jeffrey Gurock. American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Pub House, 1996, 91.
- David Kaufman .Shul With A Pool: The Synagogue Center in American Jewish Life 1975-1925, diss., Brandeis University, 1994, 355.
- ³⁰ Leo Jung . Towards Sinai. N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 13.
- ³¹ David De Sola Pool. "A Glimpse into The Development of American Judaism." Jewish Forum 5.5 (June 1922) 214.
- ³² Dr. H. Mendes Pereira. "Orthodox Judaism." Jewish Forum 3. 1(Jan. 1920) 33-34.
- ³³ Editorial. Jewish Forum 12.2 (Feb. 1929): 35.
- ³⁴ Samuel Benjamin. "The Cleveland Center Then and Now." Jewish Forum 10.12(Dec. 1927) 611.
- ³⁵ Herbert Parzen. Architects of Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Joonathan David Pub., 1964, 99.
- ³⁶ Leo Jung. "Orthodoxy ,Reform and Kaplanism." Jewish Forum 4.3(April 1921) 782.
- ³⁷ Leo Jung . Harvest ,Sermons Addresses Studies. N.Y.: Phillip Feldheim Inc., 1956, 229.

³⁸ Oscar Fasman. "After Fifty Years An Optimist." American Jewish History, Vol. 69, (Dec. 1979): 227.

³⁹ Samuel Benjamin. "The Cleveland Center Then and Now." Jewish Forum 10.12 (Dec. 1927): 611-612; Moses Hyamson. Hyamson's Sabbath and Festival Addresses. N.Y.: Block Publishing co., 1936.(Rabbi Samuel Benjamin, a graduate of JTS, became rabbi of an Orthodox synagogue in Cleveland, Rabbi Herbert Goldstein , a graduate of JTS, shared a pulpit with Rabbi Moses Sebulun Margolies, the Ramaz, a most prominent Orthodox rabbi who held many leadership positions in the Orthodox community , Rabbi Dr. Moses Hyamson, an Orthodox rabbi at the Orthodox synagogue Or Hayim, taught codes at JTS and told students not to accept pulpits with mixed seating.)

⁴⁰ Mordecai Kaplan. "A Program for the Reconstruction of Judaism." The Menorah Journal 6. 4 (Aug. 1920) 181-196; Leo Jung , "Orthodoxy, Reform and Kaplanism." Jewish Forum 4.3(April 1921) 778-783.

⁴¹ Mordecai Kaplan. "A Program for the Reconstruction of Judaism." The Menorah Journal 6.4 (Aug. 1920) 182.

⁴² Mordecai Kaplan. "A Program for the Reconstruction of Judaism." The Menorah Journal 6.4 (Aug. 1920) 187.

⁴³ Ibid . Mel Scult, ed., Communings of the Spirit The Journals of Mordecai M. Kaplan 1913-1934. Vol. 1. Detroit: Wayne State Univ Press, The Reconstructionist Press, 2001, 235.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 189.

⁴⁵ Letter to Jung from Joseph H. Cohen, President of Jewish Center, 18 August 1922. (expressing joy at his election) Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 2. Mel Scult, ed. Communings of the Spirit, The Journals of Mordecai M. Kaplan, 1913-1934. Vol 1., Detroit: Wayne State University Press, The Reconstructionist Press, 2001, 149.

⁴⁶ Jacob J. Shachter. "Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung: Reflections On The Centennial of His Birth." Jewish Action, (winter 1992-3) 22. Yeshiva University Archives, Public Relations Files, Leo Jung 1885-1988.

⁴⁷ Leo Jung . "Orthodoxy, Reform, and Kaplanism." Jewish Forum 4. 3 (April 1921): 778- 783.

⁴⁸ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 223.

⁴⁹ Bernard Drachman. "Reconstructing Judaism?" Jewish Forum 4. 1 (Jan .1921); 645.

⁵⁰ Leo Jung. "Orthodoxy ,Reform and Kaplanism." Jewish Forum 4. 3 (April 1921): 780. (Shemaryah Levin was a Russian revolutionist and political Zionist.) Mel Scult, ed. Communings of the Spirit The Journals of Mordecai Kaplan 1913-1934. vol. 1.. Detroit: Wayne State University Press ; The Reconstructionist Press, 2001, 235. (confirms Kaplan's view regarding Palestine)

⁵¹ Mordecai Kaplan. " A Program For The Reconstruction of Judaism." The Menorah Journal 6.4 (August 1920): 182.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Press Release 1925-26, "The Discovery of Orthodox Judaism in America. An Interview with Rabbi Leo Jung." 2-3. Y.U. Archives, Harris L.Selig Administration

Files, Box 12, Folder 2-29.

⁵⁴ Jeffrey Gurock, Jacob J. Schacter. A Modern Heretic and a Traditional Community. N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1997, 134, 130.

⁵⁵ Hyman B. Grinstein. A Short History of the Jews in the United States. The Jewish Library Series . vol. 7. Leo Jung, ed. London, New York: Soncino Press, 1980, 102-3.

⁵⁶ Leo Jung. The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library Series, vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 69.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 125.

⁵⁸ Hyman B. Grinstein. A Short History of the Jews in the United States. The Jewish Library Series. vol. 7. Leo Jung, ed. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 103.

⁵⁹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library Series , vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 67.

⁶⁰ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 74; Mel Scult, ed. Communings of The Spirit, The Journals of Mordecai M. Kaplan. 1913-1934 . Vol. 1 . Detroit: Wayne State University Press; The Reconstructionist Press, 2001, 150 (example that leading congregants did not support Kaplan)

⁶¹ Agudat Harabbonim's reaction was extreme; they wished to excommunicate him. The organization fortified by newcomers to America in the forties, did finally excommunicate Kaplan.

⁶² Gilbert Klaperman . The Story of Yeshiva University. London: MacMillan Co., Collier MacMillan Ltd., 1969, 160.

⁶³ Letter to Samuel Levy from Cyrus Adler, 15 Nov. 1926. Yeshiva University Archives, General Correspondence, 1926-1927, Box 12, Folders 2-40.

⁶⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series. vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 171.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 108.

⁶⁶ Letter to Mr Levy from Rabbi M.S. Margolies, 1 Dec. 1926; Letter to Mr . Levy from Cyrus Adler, 15 Nov.1926; Letter to Revel from Director of JTS, 13 June 1926. Yeshiva University Archives, Yeshiva University General Correspondence, 1926-1927. Box 12, Folder 2-40.

⁶⁷ Gilbert Klaperman. The Story of Yeshiva University. London: MacMillan Co., Collier MacMillan Ltd., 1969, 159.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 160.

⁶⁹ Gurock Jeffrey, Jacob Schacter. A Modern Heritic and a Traditional Community. N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1997, 142-3

⁷⁰ Ibid. 130.

⁷¹ Bernard Drachman . The Unfailing Light,Memoirs of an American Rabbi. N.Y.:The Rabbinical Council of America, 1948, 374.

⁷² Gilbert Klaperman. The Story of Yeshiva University. London: Mac Millan Co., Collier MacMillan Ltd., 1969, 160.

⁷³ Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.

⁷⁴ Press Release, “The Yeshiva” on UOJCA stationary. Yeshiva University Archives, General Correspondence, 1926-1927, Box 12, Folder 2-40.

- ⁷⁵ Dr. Bernard Revel. "The Yeshiva College." Jewish Forum 9.9 (Nov. 1926) 477.
- ⁷⁶ Mel Scult. Judaism Faces The Twentieth Century, A Biography of Mordecai Kaplan. Detroit: Wayne Stae University Press, 1993, 155.
- ⁷⁷ David Kaufman. "Shul With A Pool; The Synagogue Center in American Jewish Life: 1875-1925." Ph.D Dissertation, Brandeis University, 1994, 295.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid. 474.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid. 355.
- ⁸⁰ D.D.Moore. At Home in America Second Generation New York Jews. N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1981,138.
- ⁸¹ Leo Jung . "Modern Trends in American Judaism." Mizrachi Jubilee Publication, New York: 1936, 12. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.
- ⁸² Ibid. 7.
- ⁸³ Ibid.
- ⁸⁴ Leo Jung . The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library Series, vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 50. Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America." Jewish Forum (July 1926): 133. (This article also appears in Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927.)
- ⁸⁵ Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America,:" Jewish Forum (July 1926); 132-133.
- ⁸⁶ Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America," Jewish Forum (July 1926): 133.
- ⁸⁷ Leo Jung. "The Discoverery of Orthodox Judaism in America, An Interview with Rabbi Leo Jung." 2. Yeshiva University Archives, Harris L. Seligman Administration

Files, 2 December 1929, Press Releases, 1925-1926.

⁸⁸ Maurice Farbridge. Judaism and The Modern Mind. 272.(Farbridge was an - Orthodox sociologist and contemporary of Rabbi Jung, author of articles on the topic of Orthodoxy in America, and contributor of articles to Jung's Jewish Library series.)

⁸⁹ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol. 8. N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 102.

⁹⁰ Ibid. (Though Jung said that they could be brought in, his provisions make it most difficult to do so.) Rabbi Jacob Schacter. personal interview. 11 November 1996.(Rabbi Schacter said that children were not welcomed.)

⁹¹ Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America." Jewish Forum 9.5 (July 1926): 134.

⁹² Jenna Joselit, "Of Manners, Morals and Orthodox Judaism." Jeffrey Gurock, ed., Ramaz : School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing House, 1989, 24 ; Jeffrey Gurock. American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996, 36.

⁹³ Marc Raphael. Profiles in American Judaism. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984, 132.

⁹⁴ Hyman Goldstein. "History of the Young Israel Movement." Jewish Forum 9.10 (Dec.1926) 531.

⁹⁵ Editorial. Jewish Forum 9.10 (Dec.1926) 523.

⁹⁶ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 224; Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 18.

⁹⁷ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Orthodox Synagogue." Jack Werthheimer, ed .The American

Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Hanover, London: Brandeis University Press, University Press of New England, 1987, 56.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Orthodox Synagogue." Jack Wertheimer, ed. The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Hanover, London: Brandeis University press, University Press of New England, 1987, 529.

¹⁰⁰ Meyer Berlin. "The Educational Problem in America." Jewish Forum 3.9 (Nov. 1920) 587-589. (Meyer Berlin was President of Mizrachi Organization of America, at the time.)

¹⁰¹ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 100.

¹⁰² Bernard Drachman. "The Jewish Educational Problem in America." Jewish Forum 3.9 (Nov. 1920) 516.

¹⁰³ Meyer Berlin. "Jewish Education in America." Jewish Forum 3.9 (Nov. 1920) 587.

¹⁰⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series. vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 105.

¹⁰⁵ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 222.

¹⁰⁶ Isaac Rosengarten. "A Bulwark of Judaism in America." Jewish Forum 4.3 (Apr. 1921) 803.

¹⁰⁷ Leo Jung. "The Discovery of Orthodox Judaism in America. An Interview with Rabbi Leo Jung." 3. Yeshiva University Archives, Harris Selig Administration Files, Press Releases, 1925-26, Box 12, Folder 2-29.

¹⁰⁸ Gilbert Klaperman. The Story of Yeshiva University. London: MacMillan Co., Collier

MacMillan Ltd., 1969, 1.

¹⁰⁹ Isaac Rosengarten. "A Bulwark of Judaism in America." Jewish Forum 4. 3(April 1921) 804.

¹¹⁰ Jacob I. Hartstein. "Yeshiva Education in America." Leo Jung Ed., Israel of Tomorrow. Jewish Library Series, Vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 470.

¹¹¹ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 19.

¹¹² Bernard Revel. "The Yeshivah College." Jewish Forum 9. 9 (Nov. 1926) 477; Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. Bernard Revel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972, 78-79.

¹¹³ Bernard Revel. "The Yeshivah College." Jewish Forum 9. 9 (Nov. 1926) 479.

¹¹⁴ Joselit Jenna. New York's Jewish Jews: The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994, 54.

¹¹⁵ Letter to Revel from Jung, 26 March 1929.(one of many examples of Jung's fund raising)Letter to Revel from Jung, 19 April 1929(an example of Jung's involvement in administrative things.)Yeshiva University Archives, Bernard Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹¹⁶ Leo Jung. The Path of A Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series. vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 88.

¹¹⁷ Letter from Revel to Jung, 3 September 1928. Yeshiva University Archives, Bernard Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹¹⁸ Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. Bernard Revel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication society of America, 1972, 63. Hyman Grinstein. A Short History of the Jews In The United

States. The Jewish Library Series. Vol. 7. Leo Jung, ed., London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 79.

¹¹⁹ Bernard Revel. "The Yeshivah College." Jewish Forum 9.9 (Nov. 1926): 479.

¹²⁰ D.D.Moore. At Home in America Second Generation New York Jews. N.Y.; Columbia University Press, 1981, 139; Hyman Goldstein, "History of the Young Israel Movement." Jewish Forum 9. 10 (Dec. 1926) 529-531.

¹²¹ Young Israel Bulletin. Yeshiva University Archives. Koenigsberg Collection, Box 1, Folder 1.

¹²² Harry Starr. "The Affair at Harvard." The Menorah Journal 7.5 (Oct. 1922) 263.

¹²³ Israel Goldstein. "The Role of the Rabbi in World Jewish Affairs."; Hyman Rabinowitz. "The American Rabbi as Preacher." Gilbert Rosenthal, ed., The American Rabbi. N.Y, N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc.,1977, 98. (Isaac Leeser [1806-1868] was the first Jew to translate the Bible into English and his periodical the "The Occident And American Jewish Advocate" which upheld historical and traditional Judaism, was in English. Many of Leeser's sermons were printed in the English monthly "The Occident" ; they dealt with the fundamentals of Judaism, but were unrelated to the issues of the day which was Rabbi Jung's critique of such sermons .Jung's senior confrere Bernard Drachman shared Jung 's goals ; however, his book "The Unfailing Light" was not published until the forties.)

¹²⁴ Leo Jung. The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series. vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 126.

¹²⁵ Ibid. 126

- ¹²⁶ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. Jewish Library Series 1. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 99.
- ¹²⁷ Leo Jung. Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 14.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid. 156.
- ¹²⁹ Ibid. . 157
- ¹³⁰ Jack Wertheimer,ed . The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Hanover: Brandeis University Press, University Press of New England, 1987, 60.
- ¹³¹ Leo Jung. Toward Sinai. N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House , 1929, 268.
- ¹³² Dr. H. Mendes Peireira. "Orthodox Judaism." Jewish Forum 3. 1 (Jan. 1920) 33-36.
- ¹³³ Leo Jung. "The Place of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations in American Israel." Jewish Forum 10. 12 (Dec. 1927): 608. (Article also in Leo Jung. Toward Sinai Sermons and Addresses. N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House Inc., 1929, 266-282.)
- ¹³⁴ Ibid. 608.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid. Milton Konvitz. "Leo Jung, Rabbi For All Jews." Midstream.39.6 (Aug/Sept. 1993): 39.
- ¹³⁶ Leo Jung, "The Place of the Union of Orthodox Congregations in American Israel." Jewish Forum, (Dec 1927): 608.
- ¹³⁷ Mrs. Sadie Silverstein. (President of Rabbonim Aid Society for the last 20 years) personal interview .19 November 1997. (The organization still exists, but, it has outlived its purpose because of social welfare and the dwindling population that it first served., though thirty five Hassidic rabbis are still supported.)
- ¹³⁸ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking

Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers, Inc., 1982, 92.

¹³⁹ Leo Jung .Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 210.

¹⁴⁰ Harold P. Gastwirt. Fraud, Corruption and Holiness The Controversy Over The Supervision of Dietary Practicesw in New York City. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikatat Press, 1974, 189.

¹⁴¹ Hyman B. Grinstein. A Short History of the Jews in the United States. Jewish Library vol. 7. Leo Jung ,ed. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press ,1980, 99.

¹⁴² Leo Jung. The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library Series. vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 51. Leo Jung. “The Kashrut Jungle.”(“kashrut jungle” is a term that Jung used) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection , Box 46, Folder 4 .

¹⁴³ Letter to Rabbi B.L. Rosenbloom, from Leo Jung, President of the Rabbinical Council, 19 April 1928. Yeshiva University Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1.

¹⁴⁴ Harold P. Gastwirt. Fraud ,Corruption and Holiness: The Controversy Over The Supervision of Jewish Dietary Practices in new York City. Port Washinton, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1974, 129 . Bernard M.Patten. (Commisioner of Public Markets of the City of New York) “Enforcement of the Jewish Dietary Laws”or “Kosher Laws.” Jewish Forum 10. 5(May, 1927) 229.

¹⁴⁵ Mendes H. Periera. “Orthodox Judaism.” Jewish Forum 3.1 (Jan. 1920) 35; Bernard Drachman. “Plan For The Organization of a Society for the Promotion of Religious Life.” Jewish Forum 3.10 (Dec. 1920) 594.

¹⁴⁶ Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt. "The Jewish Sabbath Movement in the Early Twentieth Century." American Jewish History 69. (1979)196. Letter to Benjamin Koenigsberg from Bernard Drachman , 16 March 1923. (Example of increased attention) Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 11, Folder 5. Editorial. Jewish Forum 9.10. (Dec 1926) 525.

¹⁴⁷ Felix M. Warburg . "Problems Deserving Chief Consideration." (section by Leo Jung) Jewish Forum 9. 7.(Sept. 1926) 351. Leo Jung, Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927, 210.

¹⁴⁸ Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt. "The Jewish Sabbath Movement in the Early Twentieth Century." American Jewish History 69. (1979) 196.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. .200.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. 199-200.

¹⁵¹ Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt. "The Jewish Sabbath Movement in the Early Twentieth Century." American Jewish History 69. (1979) 203.

¹⁵² Ibid. 203.

¹⁵³ Ibid. 201.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid. 201.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. 201.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. 202.

¹⁵⁷ Honourable Samuel Dickstein. "The Sabbath Bill." Jewish Forum 4. 3 (April 1921) 784- 788.

¹⁵⁸ Meyer Kramer. "Is America A Christian Country?" Tradition 4.1 (Fall, 1961): 5-6.

- ¹⁵⁹ Letter to Benjamin Koenigsberg from existing committee members , 8 April 1929.
Yeshiva University Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 11, Folder 5.
- ¹⁶⁰ Hyman Goldstein. "History of the Young Israel Movement." Jewish Forum 9.10 (Dec. 1926) 529-532.
- ¹⁶¹ Samuel Friedman M.D. "The Five Day Week and The Proposed Calendar Reform." Jewish Forum 14.9 (Sept. 1931) 293.
- ¹⁶² Letter to Benjamin Koenigsberg from existing committee members, 8 April 1929.
Yeshiva University Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 11, Folder 5.
- ¹⁶³ Meyer Kramer. "Is America a Christian Country?" Tradition (Fall 1961): 5-15.
- ¹⁶⁴ Leo Jung. Harvest Sermons, Addresses Studies. N.Y.: P. Feldheim Inc., 1956, 208-210.
- ¹⁶⁵ Leo Jung. Towards Sinai. N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1929, 27.
- ¹⁶⁶ Bernard S. Jackson. Modern Research in Jewish Law. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980, .5.
- ¹⁶⁷ Martin Schwarzchild. personal interview. 11 Nov. 1996.
- ¹⁶⁸ Milton Konvitz. "Leo Jung Rabbi For All Jew." Midstream (Aug/Sept 1993): 38.
- ¹⁶⁹ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. The Jewish Library vol. 1. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 17.
- ¹⁷⁰ Letter from Rosalie Rosenfeld, Jung's daughter, 29 Oct.1997.
- ¹⁷¹ Leo Jung. Essentials of Judaism. Jewish Library Series 1., N.Y.: 1934, 7.
- ¹⁷² Leo Jung. Rhythm of Life Studies Addresses.N.Y., N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House Inc., 1950, 189.
- ¹⁷³ Bernard Drachman. "Tradition and Modern Thought." Sinaist 3.3 (August 1919) 2.

(Jung editor of The Sinaist) Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 3.

(Newspaper The Sinaist)

¹⁷⁴ Jenna Joselit Weissman . “Modern Orthodox Jews and the Ordeal of Civility.”

American Jewish History vol. 74. (1984) 133.

¹⁷⁵ Leo Jung .Living Judaism. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1927,. 22.

¹⁷⁶ Leo Jung .’The Jewish Way To Married Happiness.” The Rhythm of Life Studies

Addresses. N.Y., N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House Inc, 1950, 143. (This article also

appeared in Jewish Forum 13.1 (January 1930):.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. 143.

¹⁷⁸ Leo Jung . “The Jewish Way To Married Happiness.” Jewish Forum 13.1(Jan.1930)

157.

¹⁷⁹ Karla Goldman. Beyond The Synagogue Gallery. Cambridge, Mass., London,

England :Harvard University Press, 2000, 75.

¹⁸⁰ Leo Jung . “The Jewish Way To Married Happiness.” Jewish Forum 13.1(Jan.1930)

156.

¹⁸¹ Emanuel Rackman. “Orthodox Judaism Moves With The Times The Creativity of

Tradition.” Commentary 13.6 (June 1952) 546.

¹⁸² Else Rabin. “The Jewish Women in Social Service in Germany.” Leo Jung, ed.

Women. The Jewish Library . vol. 3, 189.

¹⁸³ Leo Jung. “The Jewish Way To Married Happiness.” Jewish Forum 13.1 (Jan 1930)

159.

- ¹⁸⁴ Leo Jung. "The Jewish Way To Married Happiness." Jewish Forum 13.1 (Jan. 1930) 157.
- ¹⁸⁵ Mrs. Moses Hyamson. "Ritual Baths (mikvoath)." Jewish Forum 10. 1(Jan. 1927) 22.
- ¹⁸⁶ Leo Jung., "Jewish Way To Married Happiness." Jewish Forum 13.1(Jan. 1930) 158.
- ¹⁸⁷ Oscar Z. Fasman. "After Fifty Years, An Optimist." American Jewish History .vol. 69, (Dec. 1979) 159-174.
- ¹⁸⁸ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library Series. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980,vol. 8, 48.
- ¹⁸⁹ Minutes of Board of Trustees, 20 Dec. 1931. Jewish Center Synagogue.
- ¹⁹⁰ Leo Jung Rhythm of Life Studies Addresses. N.Y., N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House Inc., 1950, 144.
- ¹⁹¹ Auther unknown. "Women as Voters." 5-7. Y.U. Archives,Jung Collection, Box 47, Folder 1.
- ¹⁹² Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 128.
- ¹⁹³ Letter from David deSola Pool to Leo Jung. "From The Shearith Israel Archives" Tradition 30:1, 1995, 18.
- ¹⁹⁴ Leo Jung. Harvests Sermons Addresses. N.Y., N.Y.: Pardes Publishing House, 1950, 216.
- ¹⁹⁵ Jonathan Sarna. "The Debate over Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue." Jack Wertheimer, ed ., The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. 363.
- ¹⁹⁶ Ibid. 378.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. 380.

¹⁹⁸ Aaron Rakeffet –Rothcoff. Bernard Revel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972, 227.

¹⁹⁹ Jonnathan Sarna. “The Debate Over Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue.” Jack Werthheimer, ed. The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Hanover, London: Brandeis University Press; University Press of New England, 1987, 379.

²⁰⁰ Melvin I. Urofsky. American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press; Doubleday, 1975, 101.

²⁰¹ Jeffrey Gurock. “American Orthodox Organizations in Support of Zionism.” Shmuel Almog, Jehuda Reinhartz, Anita Shapiro, ed., Zionism and Religion. New England: Hanover University Press, 1998, 226.

²⁰² Jeffrey Gurock. “American Orthodox Organizations in Support of Zionism 1880-1930.” Shmuel Almog, Jehuda Reinhartz, Anita Shapira ed., Zionism and Religion, 226.

²⁰³ Ibid. 224.

²⁰⁴ Marc Shapiro. Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy. The Life and Works of Yechiel, Jacob Weinberg. Portland, Oregon: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 67.

²⁰⁵ Leo Jung. “Agudath Israel and a Modus Vivendi.” Jewish Forum 7.11 (Nov. 1924) 718; 732.

²⁰⁶ Jeffrey Gurock. “American Orthodox Organizations in Support of Zionism.” Shmuel Almog, Reinhartz, Anita Shapira ed. Zionism and Religion. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press; Doubleday, 1975, 226-227.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Leo Jung. "Agudath Israel and a Modus Vivendi." Jewish Forum 7. 11 (Nov. 1924) 714-716; Shmuel Almog, Jehuda Reinhartz. Anita Shapiro ed., Zionism and Religion, Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1975, 226.

²⁰⁹ Leo Jung. "Agudath Israel and a Modus Vivendi." Jewish Forum 7.11 (Nov 1924) 720.

²¹⁰ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. 68. Leo Jung. "Orthodoxy, Reform and Kaplanism." Jewish Forum 4.3 (April 1921) 780.

²¹¹ Melvin Urofsky. American Zionism From Herzl To The Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1975, 41.

²¹² Letter to Dr, Ehrmann from Benjamin Koenigsberg. 14 November 1929. Some of the Americans defaulted on payments, so that the land reverted to the previous Arab owners. Other Americans had paid in full , but had not yet received their deeds. Jung was consulted about this problem.(copy of letter was sent to Jung) Yeshiva University Archives, Koegnisberg Papers. Box 14, Folder 1.

²¹³ Letter to Dr Weizmann from Leo Jung, 31 Oct. 1926. Yeshiva University Archives, Koenigsberg Papers, Box 1, Folder 4.

²¹⁴ Alan Mittleman. The Politics of Torah. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996, 53.

MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE THIRTIES

“What a dark place the world has become of late! How full it is of hopes thwarted, expectations disappointed”
(Leo Jung, “Sovietism, Gangsterism, Cynicism,” Jewish Forum, Sept. 1931, 303.)

1. INTRODUCTION

From 1929 on into the thirties, the situation for Orthodoxy remained gloomy. The Depression coloured all aspects of life as did the rise of Hitler. The thirties were troubled times when physical survival was paramount so progress slowed as effort went into maintaining what had already been achieved; there were no great advances or achievements. Orthodox organizations were obliged to postpone the development of new facilities as there was no money, but they did concentrate on new types of programs. However, commitment for proper kashrut, Sabbath observance and proper educational activities remained.

This chapter will demonstrate that, despite everything, seeds for progress in Orthodoxy were planted which only germinated in later decades. It will be shown that Modern Orthodoxy was brought into the realm of social activism that was necessary for its survival.

Rabbi Jung still talked about the, “painful inactivity in Orthodox endeavor,” and of people shying away from the work to be done.¹ Orthodoxy still had a bad image; Yeshiva men, the students at Yeshiva College, were seen to be, “timid and unaggressive.”² Oscar Z. Fasman, who graduated in 1929 and began as a rabbi in the thirties, remembered one of his confreres describing their role as, “being able to recite a generation or so later, the final kaddish for Orthodoxy.”³ This bleak prediction was to be

heard throughout the decades from various scholars; the death knell for Orthodoxy would sound many times.⁴

Rabbi Jung 's activities in the thirties were multi-faceted and a continuation of his involvements from the twenties. They highlight Modern Orthodox involvements, thought processes, and dilemmas of this difficult time. He emphasized that Judaism was a religion of social justice and this emphasis grew in importance during the thirties. Jung's "this-worldly approach" and ability to participate in the secular world became an important defining point for Modern Orthodoxy in the thirties. His philosophy of "cooperation without compromise" and of respecting differences was equated by him with true Americanism.⁵ Necessity made his role and the role of other Modern Orthodox leaders more pragmatic.

Rabbi Jung used every tool available to reach out to the community at large. His example demonstrated the expanded role that American rabbis had to assume. Rabbi Jung tried to save Jews and Judaism; he worked from his synagogue pulpit and boardroom, in organizations created for the rescue of Jews, educational activities, and Zionist efforts. Jung helped to bring European Jewish scholars to America where their influence would be felt in the future. The secular approach of Modernity was seen by him to be imperfect and he used his pulpit, and his writings to stress the virtues of Modern Orthodoxy. By the end of the thirties, American Modern Orthodox rabbis were beginning to have more influence, and Modern Orthodoxy was beginning to show more self-confidence.

2. STATE OF ORTHODOXY

2.i. Lack Of Religious Fervour

In 1931 the UOJCA identified a spiritual depression in American life.⁶ As Vice President of UOJCA, Jung joined in its effort to combat anti-religious activities. William Weiss, President of the UOJCA, called on the community to, “combat the spirit of religious indifference which had accompanied the economic depression.”⁷ Most Jews, however, ignored efforts to attract them to religious institutions.

There was so little support for Orthodoxy that in 1935 the OU willingly joined with its Reform and Conservative rivals in a “back to the synagogue” endeavour, which met with limited success.⁸ This project was intended to stimulate interest in synagogue and congregational membership, and was an example of the weakness of the religious community and its affiliations.⁹ Modern Orthodoxy was not alone in fighting for a religious life. Modern Orthodoxy usually co-operated with other Jewish groups on issues that affected all Jews and that had nothing to do with Modern Orthodoxy in particular. If it had been stronger, this project would not have been necessary.

Rabbi Jung convened a special committee to see that the practice of opening Jewish theatres on Rosh Hashona be stopped.¹⁰ Yiddish theatre was an important pastime for Eastern European Jews evoking nostalgia while expressing values and attitudes, and opening on Rosh Hashona purposely demonstrated an anti-religious position. Jung received support in this effort from various Jewish organizations including Mizrachi, the American Jewish Committee, B’nai Brith, The New York Board of Jewish Ministers and American Jewish Congress.¹¹ Rabbi Jung met with success in this endeavour; a general rule resulted that the Yiddish theatre would remain closed on Rosh Hashona.¹² It was a

small victory as Jung was able to convince the non-Orthodox to cooperate and religious values were upheld, strengthening Jewish life in America and eliminating a source of embarrassment to Jews on the American scene.

2.ii. Emphasizing Social Issues

Mainstream American religious movements began to emphasize social issues.¹³

Jung echoed this message. He wrote:

There are people who would like to confine religion to the dietary laws, the Sabbath, Jewish education and the laws of family purity, which of course are basic. They look with misgivings, however, upon any sermon on social justice and would advise the rabbi not to mix in politics. They have never arrived at an appreciation of the function of religion.¹⁴

Rabbi Jung believed that ensuring social justice was a function of religion and that the clergy should “mix into politics.” Rabbi Jung wrote, “the Jewish ceremonies are the wheels of the Jew’s progress towards social righteousness...”¹⁵ Throughout his career many of his sermons and writings focused on social justice. He wrote:

Religion as the Jewish tradition sees it, has to do with every aspect of life and with every class of every age, sex, occupation. Judaism is a social religion, interested in the poor, the laborer, the woman, the alien, the man in the dock.¹⁶

Jung reiterated throughout his career that the purpose of the Torah teachings was to bring “justice, righteousness, freedom.”¹⁷ He wrote in his synagogue bulletin: “...but its major purpose [the mitzvahs or laws] is to make us conscious of our social responsibility...”¹⁸ Torah laws prevented exploitation and oppression, and Jung pointed out that business ethics and morals were taught in the Torah: “...honesty in business is no achievement; it is a minimum contribution to social welfare as demanded by Jewish

law.”¹⁹ As pointed out in the previous chapter, many of Jung’s sermons focused on ethics and honesty and morality in business. Jung was not alone with this message; Orthodox Rabbi Moses Hyamson wrote that economic and social legislation was discussed in the Talmud and the Torah made provisions for the poor without inflicting humiliation and stigma. The laws of humanity came from Torah.²⁰ So many rabbinic sermons dealt with this theme that in one synagogue a congregant jokingly remarked, “how about some social justice for the congregation by preaching on a different subject?”²¹ Modern Orthodoxy thus attempted to function in both the sacred and the secular sphere.

2.iii. Modern Orthodoxy Involved in Social Issues

During the thirties Rabbi Jung participated, “in an utterly new kind of work,” as Orthodoxy in the United States became involved in, “every form of charitable activity.”²² Rabbi Jung’s efforts give a portrait of Orthodoxy at this time. Jung’s role emphasized religious leadership and the synagogue’s leadership in communal affairs. Rabbi Jung had to stop himself from total involvement in social service so as not to neglect, “teaching and preaching, on developing his knowledge of both Jewish law and modern disciplines.”²³ During the twenties he had concentrated on the conventional roles of teaching, preaching, writing, visiting the sick and comforting the mourners, but in the thirties this was not enough. The rabbis and teachers in Europe, those who could teach about Judaism and their pupils had to be rescued from danger. He became very active on the Cultural Committee of the Joint Distribution Committee, (JDC) with which he had been associated since 1926. The JDC was established in 1914 in a merger of three relief committees, the American Jewish Relief Committee, the Central Relief Committee and

the People's Relief Committee, as an organization for civil protection of Jewish people the world over. Its work included relief and reconstruction in places where this was necessary. It was the largest and most important organization of its kind. In addition to rescue and relief activities, JDC acted as a funding source for several groups including the maintenance of certain German Jewish Children's Associations, or GJCA. It built up social welfare institutions and trained local populations to run them.

During 1933, 1934 and 1935 its program abroad was seen, "as the greatest single effort on the part of the Jewish people of one country for the welfare of the Jews of other countries, recorded in Jewish history."²⁴ The Joint Distribution Committee took on new importance because of the situation in Nazi Germany. It became the representative agency for Jews in the United States and Canada in the fight to rescue Jews in Europe.²⁵ It inaugurated the beginning of a major role for American Jewry in world Jewish affairs.

The Cultural Committee's raison d'être was to meet cultural-religious needs.²⁶ Jung's involvement raised the profile of Modern Orthodoxy and he saw to it that Orthodox concerns were addressed. One of many examples of this is when Jung took exception to the small amount allotted Orthodox institutions in Poland in 1935, as against grants for Yiddishist and Tarbut schools in Poland.²⁷ Dr. Cyrus Adler, chair of the cultural committee also was unhappy that decisions were left with the European directors and he felt that they should be made in New York. It can be seen that American Jewry was beginning to take on a more responsible role in world Jewish affairs. Jung constantly worked to ensure the security of spiritual and cultural institutions. Proportionately very small amounts were being allocated to cultural-religious activities as physical needs were

being given primary consideration. Rabbi Jung repeatedly pleaded with American Jews to endorse the cultural activities of the JDC:

Physical relief is impossible with spiritual decadence... I call my people in this country... to make their contributions towards the survival of Judaism; that the cultural Committee of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee revive its essential work; that every shade of Jewish religious opinion... unite in a single effort to provide sustenance for the institutes of Jewish learning both here and abroad.²⁸

By 1940, The Cultural Committee gave assistance to more than one hundred school organizations, yeshivot and other institutes of learning in Eastern Europe, Palestine and South America.²⁹ Jung believed that schools and houses of prayer in Europe had to be kept alive. Jewish education was also essential for a continued Judaism. His work with the JDC enabled Jung to concentrate on this area, which was another key issue for Orthodoxy. Jung worked with Louis Marshall, New York Governor Herbert Lehman and Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of JTS. It is another example of Modern Orthodox involvement with the community at large. The cultural committee members throughout the thirties also included the Orthodox presence of Rabbi Herbert Goldstein and Morris Engelman.³⁰ Rabbi Jung later reminisced:

The cultural work of the JDC embraces the whole horizon of Jewish education, the flowering of the Jewish spirit; yeshivoth in Europe and Israel, schools for infants, children, adolescents, and adults, the promotion of Jewish literature, the encouragement of spiritual life in all the countries of our people's migration. The whole panorama of a life enriching, life endorsing program has been a task, both taxing and inspiring, which has challenged my heart and mind, my energies and steadfastness for over forty years. For twenty-six years it has been my privilege to head the cultural-religious committee and to see the moral and spiritual rehabilitations of our people...³¹

Jung's efforts to save European Jewry as well as its yeshivas began in the thirties. He traveled the world on behalf of JDC and acquired an understanding of the situation of

world Jewry. In the thirties, Jung went to Poland under the auspices of the JDC.³² The Union of Orthodox Rabbis and many other Jewish organizations sent appeals to President Hoover to help Jews in Poland.³³ However, it was the JDC rather than the UOJCA that was most effective in this area.³⁴

After Kristallnacht, on 11 November 1938, when the intentions of Hitler and German anti-semitism became clearer, many European Jews sought avenues of rescue for their children. The German Jewish Children's Aid Group would only place the children in the type of religious homes that they came from, so Orthodox children encountered particular problems because there were inadequate number of observant homes available and it became an unwritten policy to avoid bringing over Orthodox children.³⁵ This lack of Orthodox homes was another sign of American Orthodoxy's weakness. Rabbi Jung was instrumental in getting at least a few Orthodox children to America during the thirties. He felt that non-Orthodox children were already being taken care of. According to Judith Tydor Baumel, who researched the rescue of children at this time, "he was a one man dynamo, the only Orthodox rabbi on record to attempt to locate observant homes."³⁶ Close to 1,200,000 of America's 4,500,000 Jews were members of Orthodox synagogues by 1940, yet few were Orthodox.³⁷ Homes for some of these children were found in Rochester, Chicago, and a few in Boston, but not in New York. One major problem was that the government did not allow homes to have more than two children to a bedroom and Orthodox homes tended to have many children.³⁸ Though there was lack of money, the main issue was lack of space. Perhaps it also indicates that American Jewry did not consider the situation serious enough and did not offer their homes. Few Orthodox children were rescued and some were placed in non-Orthodox homes. Some of these

children became assimilated; parents reclaimed others after the war. Rabbi Jung found no homes in his own congregation. This is significant; perhaps his congregants did not meet the standards for Orthodox homes, though it is not clear who set the standards. Jung did not write about this disappointing situation.

Rabbi Jung in his role with the JDC, received varied requests, each again demonstrating a new leadership role for American Orthodoxy. A letter from the first Chief Rabbi Of Spain explained the plight of Jews there. In 1934, after 442 years, Spain opened its doors to Jews forced from their homes in Germany and Central Europe who sought refuge there. These refugees had no established community to assist them and they looked to American Jews.³⁹

Letters also arrived from Germany. According to Marc B. Shapiro, in 1933, when Hermann Goering demanded of Jewish leaders in Berlin that they contact newspapers outside Germany to deny that there were anti-semitic German assaults on the Jews, Rabbi Ezra Munk, an important Orthodox Rabbi in Berlin, chose to write to Rabbi Jung requesting that he contact all newspapers declaring that atrocities against the Jews were false.⁴⁰ This letter, we can assume, was written under duress; it was felt that external pressure was damaging. Rabbi Jung was involved in rescuing Jews so had to know this letter brought false information and did not follow up on the request. Another letter, on behalf of German Jewry to the American JDC, explained that since 1935 the supply of kosher food had been cut so again American Jewish assistance was requested.⁴¹ Rabbi Jung and Cyrus Adler, as JDC members, tried to respond to the German Jewish community's request to provide kosher food which was unavailable because of Nazi decrees against ritual slaughter. They tried to see if frozen food could be sent but that was

found to be unacceptable, as it would not be edible upon arrival. They looked into the option of sending salted or pickled meat. However, they were not successful because according to Rabbi Jung wholesale butchers, “are unwilling to give something for nothing,” and there were, “no funds available for the purpose of supplying kosher meat for Jewish institutions in Germany.”⁴²

Rabbi Jung corresponded with Rabbi Dr. Isak Unna about a project for saving Jewish refugees. Rabbi Unna had been rabbi of Mannheim, Germany, but at the time of the correspondence lived in Jerusalem. Rabbi Isak Unna wrote that on the peninsula of “Alasca,” conditions could be created for settling millions of refugees, for replacing Jewish centres that were being destroyed in Russia, Germany and Poland. Rabbi Unna wrote to Jung as he knew that he was already involved in saving refugees. Rabbi Unna had hoped that President Roosevelt would submit this suggestion to the congress. Rabbi Jung wrote back that, “unfortunately Alasca is a dream... circumstances do not justify such optimism...” Jung assured Rabbi Unna that he would have helped if he felt that anything could have been done.⁴³ Very sadly this project never went beyond the discussion stages.⁴⁴

Rabbi Jung was constantly in touch with American government officials urging that consideration be given to individual applications for immigration visas.⁴⁵ Some German-Jewish refugees escaped from Germany and did come to America where Jung urged his synagogue to welcome them.⁴⁶ That he had to urge the congregation, which was made up mostly of East European Jews, to welcome these refugees suggests that the pattern with the orphans was being repeated. Strained relationship between German Jews and East European Jews had a history going back to Europe and as Marc Shapiro wrote,

the relationship was never marked with mutual respect or understanding.⁴⁷ However, Jung had studied in Germany and was part of the German Orthodox world so could understand them and it also demonstrates his sincere desire to reach out to all Jews. The German-Jewish refugees who came to America created an Orthodox sub-community in Washington Heights, snidely called “the Fourth Reich,” by other Jews.⁴⁸ Their cool welcome might be one factor that kept the Orthodox German refugee community autonomous and separate from other Jewish and Orthodox groups.

2.iv. New Influences

It was difficult to get into America in the thirties but with the help of Jewish agencies and individual Jews, immigrants did come and these new immigrants would influence Modern Orthodoxy in the future. Included in their number were a significant percentage of Traditional Orthodox and Hasidic groups, a spiritual, intellectual elite. Earlier immigrants had come seeking a better financial future often with the desire to throw off the yoke of their earlier religious life; but this time, efforts to build a Torah life were more successful than before.

Yeshiva College and Rabbi Jung were involved in a frantic race to bring students, rabbis and professionals to the United States in the face of threats to the lives and welfare of European Jews.⁴⁹ At Jung’s request Revel prepared the necessary non-quota admissions papers for various rabbis.⁵⁰ Refugees augmented the Yeshiva student body and recent arrivals joined the staff.⁵¹ Though Yeshiva College was under tremendous financial strain, it provided shelter and instruction, refuge and scholarships. Yeshiva also established refugee grants.⁵²

A new influence was Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik. Reb Moshe, as he was known, became an integral part of the Yeshiva scene. After the death of Rabbi Solomon Polatchik, RIETS offered his position as Rosh Yeshiva (head of the Yeshiva), to Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, who came to America in 1929.⁵³ The new Rosh Yeshiva brought prestige to American Orthodoxy and to the Yeshiva; his family for centuries had been leading Talmudic scholars.⁵⁴ His background was not Modern Orthodox but his daughter Shulamit Meiselman confirmed that he had adopted a new approach to secular education; “he now maintained a new philosophy that in this changing world both religious and general education were necessary if one was to have an effective influence on Jewish young people”—provided that it did not conflict with tradition.⁵⁵ His son Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik had gone to the University of Berlin where he received a Ph.D, so his view of education had probably changed even while in Europe. Rabbi Soloveitchik joined Dr. Revel and Benjamin Aranowitz to form the Yeshiva ordination board during the thirties.⁵⁶ In 1932 Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik was brought to the United States by Hebrew Theological College.⁵⁷ He later became the mentor, par excellence, for Modern Orthodox rabbis and lay people.

In his travels for the cultural committee of JDC, Jung encountered the good work of Lubavitch Hasidim and he admired them. Lubavitch Hasidim had originally come from the town of Lubavitch in Russia, which is in Mogilev province, Belarus, but by the twentieth century had spread far beyond its place of origin. It may not be a coincidence that Lubavitch refugees first settled near Jung’s Jewish Center Synagogue and the Upper West Side of Manhattan became an area of Hasidic settlement. Rabbi Joseph Isaac Schneerson, head of the Lubavitch movement, and descendent of the founder of the

movement, delivered his first American address at the Jewish Center Synagogue. Every year after that, the Jewish Center raised money for Habad. Jung reminisced in his autobiography:

Thereafter every year a Malavah Malkah (after Sabbath night dinner) helped to ease financial problems of his [Rabbi Joseph Schneerson] organization. Its Yeshiva received part of my annual Hannukah Appeal funds.⁵⁸

It is unlikely that Rabbi Jung saw Hasidim as partners in making a new kind of Orthodoxy, as Jung tried to modernize Orthodoxy, yet he gave them a platform where their message could be heard and a message heard could in some way influence. As Jung had taken out of Reform and Reconstructionist Judaism what he liked, he could appreciate the enthusiasm and devotion of Lubavitch. Even if unintentional, this was an important influence on the congregation.

Many new yeshivas began in the thirties. Mesivta Torah Vodaas opened in 1929. Rabbi Jacob Ruderman founded Ner Israel in Baltimore in 1933, Rabbi Shraga Feivel Mendlowitz began Mesivta Tifereth Jerusalem in 1938 and Rabbi Isaac Hutner was the founder of Yeshiva Chaim Berlin in 1939. They did not wish to Americanize as did the Modern Orthodox, whom they opposed.⁵⁹ These yeshivas' graduates would in decades come to influence Modern Orthodoxy as they would teach in Modern Orthodox institutions, be hired as professionals in Modern Orthodox synagogues and be an example to Orthodox Jews of an appealing devotion and fervour.⁶⁰

2.v. New Look At Modernity

Jung cited the examples of the spiritual failures of modernity as confirmation that Orthodoxy had been correct in its uncompromising stand for the observance of Torah

Laws. In an age of irreligion Modern Orthodox thinkers were attempting to prove the virtues of religion and expose some of the weaknesses of modernity. Rabbi Jung believed modernity had not brought about a life of justice, righteousness, equality, or happiness.⁶¹ The Orthodox message was that people had been woefully deceived by the Enlightenment and that the compromises of Reform and Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, as well as Conservative Judaism, had accomplished nothing.⁶² People had assimilated at the expense of religious observance, believing that it would bring about equality, but the thirties brought social discrimination and political calamity.

In the eyes of the Orthodox, other Jewish groups had made concessions to the society at large with the idea that this would erase anti-Semitism. The Reform movement, a product of modernity, in Jung's opinion, had encouraged assimilation and Jung lamented the result:

None have tried harder than a certain section of German Jewry to escape Jewishness. They eliminated every reference to Zion from their prayer book. Hebrew became almost forbidden to them... In no country did Jewry contribute to the glory of the fatherland as fully, successfully and abidingly as in Germany... They denied their names, their parents, their grandparents... There were no assimilationists like the German Jewish self-haters.⁶³

None had been assimilated more than German Jews, yet Jung pointed out that they could not escape the consequences of being Jewish.⁶⁴ Jung claimed that, "unjewish Jews denying Judaism" still existed everywhere; yet they were not being admitted into Gentile society.⁶⁵ The rise of Hitler prompted new anti-Semitism in the United States which caused Jews to feel not quite so at home in America.

Jung wrote that the world was in moral turmoil; Russia's godless society, the rise of Hitler, and gangsterism in America pointed to the fallibility of modernity.⁶⁶ Jung said

that the youth had drifted away from the synagogue, “not because the synagogue had been too Jewish, but because it had not been Jewish enough.”⁶⁷

In the twenties it was popular to evaluate all phenomena through the lens of science; it was difficult for a religious individual to justify his position. It was especially difficult for Modern Orthodoxy, which was perceived incorrectly by the Reform and Conservative movements as being in opposition to the world of science, though the consistent goal of Yeshiva College and Modern Orthodoxy had been to promote harmony between Judaism and science.⁶⁸ For Jews science had not furnished answers to the question of the true meaning of progress and values. Earlier claims that religion had retarded the influence of science were challenged. There was some reaction against the total virtues of modernity. Jung included in his Jewish Library Series, Moses Isaacs’ article that recognized the limitations of science.⁶⁹ Jung said, “science has become aware of its limitations”⁷⁰ In May 1938, the RIETS newspaper wrote, “the most eminent scientists of today have learned not to scoff at religion.”⁷¹

The concept that science had its limitations was echoed by Conservative and Reform rabbis as religion gained more respect.⁷² Orthodox Rabbi Mendel Lewittes lauded the 1937 conference of JTS held to celebrate its 50th anniversary, because it emphasized the, “inadequacies of science without faith.”⁷³ Lewittes like Jung echoed the Modern Orthodox sentiment.

For Rabbi Jung the more comfortable people were with science, the more confident they could be that science and religion did not threaten each other. In fact, archaeology was, “proving that Biblical tradition is right” and renewing interest in

Biblical studies and religion.⁷⁴ For the first time science, instead of weakening religion, was furnishing it with new strength.

2.vi. Modern Orthodox Image

Decorum in the synagogue continued to be an important issue for Modern Orthodoxy; it was associated with Americanism and a positive image. The seeds of decorous synagogue behaviour that had been planted in the twenties were cultivated throughout the 1930s. The main area of achievement in this area was improvement in the conduct of the services. The Jewish Center had, “blazed a new trail combining conformity to the Din Torah [laws of Torah] with modernity of method,” and the Jewish Center Synagogue continued to be a model because of its emphasis on congregational singing and on the beauty of its service.⁷⁵ Modern Orthodoxy’s most representative organization, the UOJCA continued to emphasize decorum and dignity and associated Judaism, “with high aesthetic values.”⁷⁶

Yet, at the end of the thirties a student wrote in the Hazedek, one of RIETS’ newspapers, “others have introduced so much decorum that its atmosphere is like a fascist military review.”⁷⁷ There was a call for a “synagogue laboratory” to determine proper length of service, of sermon, type of decorum, and duration of singing. We thus see a hint of discontent with decorum from a rabbinical student. This discontent would be shared by others in the Modern Orthodox movement in decades to come. However, as long as Americanism and “good image” were American Jewish concerns, this type of decorum would be an important issue.

In terms of self-image, it was important to appear to be Americanized and the American Modern Orthodox Jew presented himself in the American fashion of the era.

Most of the rabbis of the RCA and the UOJCA representing Modern Orthodoxy were clean shaven.⁷⁸ When Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, who became the mentor of Modern Orthodoxy, came to Boston he did not have a beard. Rabbi Norman Lamm, president of Yeshiva University from 1976 to 2003, said that when he met Rabbi Soloveitchik in 1945 he did not have a beard.⁷⁹ This was even more true of Orthodox laymen. Traditional Orthodox and Hasidic rabbis all had beards, symbolizing that for them, Americanization was undesirable. Rabbi Jung came to America in 1920 with a beard and always had one; his beard, however, was neatly and stylishly trimmed. He described himself as “...bearded and Ph.D.” He was a man with his foot in both worlds, religious and modern.⁸⁰

2.vii. Changes In Synagogue Outlook And Activities

During the depression synagogues became even more concerned with practical, secular issues although this trend began in the twenties. Synagogues, like all other institutions, were preoccupied with financial difficulties while their *raison d’etre* of furthering religion was neglected. Integrating the secular and the sacred kept the synagogues afloat during periods of economic hardship and religious apathy.⁸¹ Lectures were given at Jung’s synagogue on “Basic Concepts of the Jewish Religion”; there were classes on ‘Maimonides’ Philosophy’ as well as advertisements saying, “keep trim at the Center gym.”⁸² As with Modern Orthodoxy itself this pull for synagogue involvement in both the sacred and secular caused tension. The Upper West Side, the “gilded ghetto” where Jung’s synagogue was located, lost approximately 10,000 residents early in the depression, but its population did increase late in the decade.⁸³ The ten synagogues in the

area, many of them large and ornate, which were supported largely by East European garment manufacturers suffered somewhat during the depression, but not as much as synagogues in other areas.⁸⁴ Jung's Jewish Center synagogue, like all institutions at that time, struggled to survive the financial crisis.

Financial support decreased to the point where merger discussions were again held between the Jewish Center Synagogue and the Society For The Advancement of Judaism, Mordecai Kaplan's shul. Additional families and combined resources would alleviate the financial problems. This proposed merger was an interesting phenomenon, given the anger and bitterness on the part of both rabbis.⁸⁵ The merger proposal was not unique to Jung and Kaplan's synagogues; smaller institutions were even more affected. Rabbi Nachum H. Ebin, president of the Rabbinical Association of RIETS, pointed out the need for centralization and advocated merging small yeshivas and synagogues.⁸⁶ The depression also reduced the need for new rabbis and in order to reduce the number of rabbis in need of a position by keeping them in school, plans to increase the rabbinical course of study at RIETS by one year were discussed, but never implemented.⁸⁷

3. AMERICAN ZIONISM

Zionism gained importance in the thirties but it was still not a key issue for the American Jewish community.⁸⁸ The Orthodox movements, Mizrachi and Agudat Israel, became more involved with Palestine. Certain issues made it more of a concern to all Jews, although Modern Orthodoxy had its own additional concerns. There was rising anti-semitism in America and this made it easier to spread the Zionist doctrine. European Jews were being forced out of their countries and had no place to go as they were refused

entry to other countries. Palestine was seen as a haven for oppressed Jews in Europe and the problem was relocation, not temporary relief. England did not stand behind the Balfour declaration, which gave recognition to Palestine as a Jewish homeland, and legal immigration to Palestine was restricted in 1939 with “The White Paper.”⁸⁹ However, the American Jewish community’s position remained generally non-Zionist during the thirties and only after 1940, when it became clear that no other solution to Hitler’s persecution was possible, did it favour a Jewish homeland for oppressed Jews.⁹⁰

Jung’s efforts to see the Jewish homeland restored became more urgent. He visited Palestine in 1933 to raise the American Jewish consciousness and support for some of its institutions.

Jung and other Orthodox leaders continued to confront the dilemma of their dual attachment to Agudat Israel and Mizrachi because, as discussed in the previous chapters, each organization had a different philosophy regarding Zionism. Rabbi Jung continued his involvement with Agudat Israel and befriended Jacob Rosenheim, head of Agudat Israel.⁹¹ He also aligned himself with Mizrachi. In 1940 Rabbi Eliezer Silver and Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik became co-presidents of Agudat Israel. They worked to raise money for settlements in Eretz Israel for refugees from Nazi persecution. Both were also allied with Mizrachi. Rabbi Herbert Goldstein president of the UOJCA, which endorsed Mizrachi, was also identified with the Agudat Israel movement.⁹² Jung felt that supporting both was supporting Orthodox unity:

Let Agudat and Mizrachi adhere, as loyally as they can, to their separate ideologies. But they must learn to agree to disagree on platforms and to join forces in work. For while we rejoice each in fidelity to one’s principle, those in our camp opposing the Jewish religion are forging on with amazing success.⁹³

Jung tried to convince the Agudat Israel Torah sages that Orthodoxy could survive and flourish in the context of Jewish sovereignty. Jung's call for unity was for the most part unheeded, though some prominent Orthodox rabbis tried to remain in both camps.

Jung continued to maintain that the Agudists differed from other Zionists especially when they stressed the religious character of Jewish history. He emphasized that in all matters touching on the abolition of the White Paper and of the laws restricting land purchase, as well as unlimited immigration, Agudah stood with the others.⁹⁴ Though Jung could oppose Agudat Israel's view of Zionism, he could support their educational projects as well as their Jewish rescue programs. He had seen some of their projects first hand and was also involved with some of their colonization projects.⁹⁵

Both Mizrahi and Agudath Israel's projects won favour in Orthodox circles. Agudah Israel worked to save yeshivas in Europe. Mizrahi established The Mizrahi Land Development Corporation for colonization by American religious Jews in Palestine and in 1936 founded a colony in Palestine for Orthodox laborers and middle class Jews.⁹⁶ Young Israel supported and organized programs to explain Mizrahi Zionism.⁹⁷ Seeds were being planted by Orthodox organizations; not only was Eretz Israel a refuge, but also a place for enriching religious life.

Rabbi Jung supported yeshivas in Palestine that were non-Zionist, though he did not share their ideology. Rabbi Jung tended to blur the differences between Agudat Israel and Mizrahi in the twenties and thirties. His dilemma would continue to plague many Modern Orthodox Jews caught between emotionalism and dedication to the religious aspect, and to the practicality and necessity of a Jewish homeland.

From 1933 on, every Bar Mitzvah boy at Rabbi Jung's synagogue had his name inscribed in the Golden Book of the Jewish National Fund that raised money for Eretz Israel and represented all Jews, but was controlled by Zionists. According to Jung, the Jewish Center was the only synagogue to do this. He felt that this made the boy and the Modern Orthodox Jew in general identify with the building of the Homeland. This identification was something that in the thirties was not taken for granted.⁹⁸ Another positive sign was that Jewish educators seized on Zionism as a tool for Jewish renewal, Zionist themes pervaded rabbinic sermons, activities and school curriculum and it became a morale booster.⁹⁹

4. EDUCATION

The problems that Jewish education faced included lack of funding, lack of capable teachers, lack of interest, lack of status, lack of suitable curriculum and lack of a universally accepted philosophy about aim and content.¹⁰⁰ Orthodox institutions had to, in Jung's words, work with "imperfect tools and half hearted support."¹⁰¹ The majority of homes did not reinforce what was taught in the schools.¹⁰² This lack of enthusiastic commitment to Jewish education, coupled with dwindling financial resources, obliged Modern Orthodoxy to broaden its base and develop an effective outreach program. Orthodox leaders, including Rabbi Jung, had to focus efforts into fundraising and building public awareness of the need for Jewish education. He also had to work to keep Yeshiva College viable through the depression.¹⁰³

Jewish education and the Rabbinical Organizations continued to have secondary status. Jewish Federations which allocated funds, deemed that Jewish education was non-

essential.¹⁰⁴ This was contrary to the stance of the UOJCA which was willing to assume an active role in education.¹⁰⁵ Editorials and articles in the Jewish Forum emphasized the necessity for continued support of Jewish education to prevent spiritual bankruptcy.¹⁰⁶

The Modern Orthodox apologia for Jewish education in the twenties was that Jewish education facilitated true Americanization, adjustment and “harmonization.” During the thirties, Rabbi Jung and others, presented it also as a weapon against anti-semitism.¹⁰⁷ There would be stronger Jewish commitment and also a more self assured and self-confident defence against anti-semitism with a better understanding of Judaism. Jung wrote that, “for our self defense, our children must receive a Jewish education, academic, social, and crowned by the pattern of Jewish communal enterprise that will give them self knowledge and a sense of historic importance.”¹⁰⁸ In 1938 Governor Herbert Lehman of New York stated at the annual Jewish Education Society dinner that the best way to combat anti-Semitism was to know and to show that Jewish education and Jewish ethical principles led to good citizenship.¹⁰⁹ Rabbi David deSola Pool wrote that anti-Semitism shocked, “even indifferent Jews into realization of their need for Jewish knowledge if only in defense of their own respect and raison d’etre.”¹¹⁰

There were hopeful signs as the decade progressed, though the picture was very gloomy early in the thirties. Rabbi Jung worked tirelessly to improve the quality of the education in the Orthodox parochial school. His publications and work to establish uniform textbooks for parochial schools helped to educate and Americanize the standards of Jewish education. Adult education increased as well as the realization that education was a community responsibility.¹¹¹

4.i. Yeshiva College

Modern Orthodoxy still had to defend and define itself. During the thirties the Agudat Harrabonim, still well represented at Yeshiva, had conflicts with Bernard Revel.¹¹² Revel tried to show respect while maintaining his assertive Modern Orthodox position. The antagonism of the Agudat Harrabonim was contained until Revel's death because they respected him, his Yeshiva training and Talmudic expertise as well as the fact that he tried to deal with them fairly and with consideration. He had to explain, defend and justify his position when confronted by the Agudat Harrabonim and this dialogue and debate may have helped lead to a clearer definition of what Modern Orthodoxy stood for.¹¹³

Yeshiva College expansion halted during the depression. Students were "starving in their unkempt, deteriorating dormitories."¹¹⁴ Staff members were not receiving salaries; Jung, in July 1932, had not been paid since December 1931.¹¹⁵ The faculty remained because of loyalty and probably because jobs elsewhere were difficult to find. During the summer of 1930, Revel and Dr. Shelly Safer, the first dean of Yeshiva College considered withdrawing the junior year courses of study but the idea was not implemented because they feared that demoralization would result. During the summer of 1931 the financial situation was so bad it was unclear whether Yeshiva College would reopen.¹¹⁶ By 1934, Yeshiva reported an increased enrolment, the depression had eased, but things remained difficult. However, only in 1937 could "The Alumni Quarterly" report that teachers were being paid on time.¹¹⁷

The Yeshiva had to make a major effort to reach the masses as leaders looked beyond Orthodox circles to sustain their institutions. Jung, considered one of the

spokesmen for American Modern Orthodoxy and for the Yeshiva, was appointed in 1931 to the faculty as professor of Ethics for both the Yeshiva proper and Yeshiva College.¹¹⁸ Jung was good at public relations and that was what Yeshiva needed. He instilled in his synagogue members, “the Center family,” as he referred to them, the need to support and work for Yeshiva and many of the members did join Jung in this effort.¹¹⁹ When Dr. Revel was unable to attend functions (and his health was an issue from the mid-thirties on) Rabbi Jung was often asked to replace him.¹²⁰ Revel said of Jung that he exemplified the harmonious development of spirituality and culture, which was the chief aim of Yeshiva College and that he could ably expound upon its philosophy.¹²¹

In 1936 Professor Albert Einstein agreed to lend the persuasive power of his name to the college and work on its behalf in conjunction with Rabbi Jung.¹²² The Orthodox institutions needed to seek help beyond their own community and they would always continue to do so. That they needed plugs from the non-Orthodox shows that they felt the Orthodox appeal was limited. It also shows that they were true to their philosophy of being “non insular.” Professor Einstein who was not Orthodox appreciated the uniqueness of the institution and was one of its ardent champions. Einstein said that, “Yeshiva College was vital for the survival of American Israel.”¹²³ Revel wrote a letter of introduction to prospective donors along with a personally addressed letter from Professor Einstein; then Rabbi Jung and Samuel Sar, registrar of the Yeshiva, were sent to speak. Trips to Tulsa and Houston were not “without material success.”¹²⁴ It was reported, “He [Jung] made us feel the responsibility of the college and... implanted his vital Jewishness on us.”¹²⁵ The by-products of these trips were far-reaching; they paved

the way for better understanding of the ideals and needs of Yeshiva College and therefore, of Modern Orthodoxy.

In 1934, Dr. Einstein received a Doctor of Humane Letters from Yeshiva. Bernard Revel admired the great Torah scholars of the time and succeeded in having some teach at his Yeshiva, but he equally appreciated modern scientists attached to the Yeshiva. Torah scholars and scientists harmonized the value of religion and science. Jung remarked that though Einstein had little theology and less Torah-true Judaism, Revel could, “square it with his weltanschauung to offer him an honorary degree.”¹²⁶

4.ii. Parochial Schools

In the thirties most Orthodox synagogues maintained their interest and commitment to their schools though the schools were not always successful. Almost every synagogue had afternoon schools or Sunday schools and a handful had launched Jewish day schools.¹²⁷ Jung spoke about the necessity to conduct a synagogue school and the values of a Jewish day school education.¹²⁸ What was going on at Jung’s synagogue reflected his commitment. The Jewish Center Day School was unsuccessful however, and its curriculum did not meet with Jung’s approval. Jung wrote:

There was a day school at the Center, in control of a lay pedagogue, to whom its leadership was entrusted and with whom I could not agree on either curriculum or division of authority. Established before its time and looked upon as fanciful luxury by many important Centerites, it was an expensive and inherently unsuccessful enterprise.¹²⁹

In 1932 the Jewish Center Synagogue plans for a Hebrew afternoon school were rejected because the board feared it would undermine support for the existing day school, The Jewish Center Talmud Torah.¹³⁰ Afternoon schools were more prevalent than day

schools so it was unusual for a congregation to make this decision .¹³¹ Therefore we can assume that Jung's influence was felt. The Jewish Center had a Sunday school for members' children that was abolished in 1935.¹³² The synagogue did go on to have an afternoon school. The principal of the afternoon school was Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, who became executive director of Manhattan Day School, which evolved from The Jewish Center Day School, and then director of the Torah Umesorah parochial schools.¹³³

In light of the fact that Rabbi Jung did not build a successful day school, we can really appreciate the accomplishment of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein at the neighbouring synagogue, Kehillath Jeshuran, who was able to establish a day school, called Ramaz, in 1937. Like the congregants of the Jewish Center Synagogue, Lookstein's congregants supported Jewish education and the idea of the school, but few sent their children there. The school attracted , to a large extent, children from the Americanized affluent class, who were not observant.¹³⁴ It was the most Americanized of the Yeshivas. Mixed dances were held, there was vacation at Christmas time and the precedent continued in Modern Orthodox day schools. This was Rabbi Lookstein's project, but Rosalie Rosenfeld said that her father, Rabbi Jung, was very proud of the Ramaz school established by his friend.¹³⁵

Ramaz is an example that Jewish education was being taken out of the cheder and the social atmosphere of Eastern European ghettos. This was a significant change from the twenties. Ramaz was a great accomplishment in a decade where some synagogues, because of lack of money, had hired untrained volunteers to teach in their schools and in a decade where there was significant anti-semitism.¹³⁶ The supply of modern teachers increased; the old type of melamed was rapidly disappearing. Men and women born and

educated in America started supervising the Jewish educational systems and textbooks became more interesting to the students.

The Modern Orthodox organizations worked to establish effective Jewish day schools. At the 40th annual convention of the UOJCA in New York in 1938, President William Weiss asserted that the future of Judaism rested with the Jews of America, and that they must strengthen Jewish life in America through the influence of the synagogue and education. The UOJCA had developed a million dollar Jewish education program to be coordinated by the National Orthodox Board of Education. The fund supported Yeshiva College, The Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, and other Modern Orthodox schools of higher learning, which were not specifically mentioned, and included as well, subsidies for schools that were not in big cities.¹³⁷ Among those recruited to raise funds and spread the message were Rabbi Moses Zebulun Margolies (RAMAZ) Dr Henry Periera Mendes, Rabbi Bernard Drachman, Rabbi Herbert Goldstein, Rabbi Joseph Lookstein, William Weiss and Rabbi Leo Jung. The effort was not successful.¹³⁸ Parochial schools continued to attract only a small fraction of the Jewish population.

The publication, "A Model Program for the Talmud Torah," by Rabbi Jung and Dr. Joseph Kaminetzky, which was used by many of the schools was an outcome of the million dollar campaign.¹³⁹ Talmud Torahs had come into being at the turn of the century with the great wave of East European Jewish immigration. The Talmud Torahs began as an after school program with a curriculum based on teaching the Hebrew language, the Pentateuch, Prophets, Jewish history, Jewish prayer and religious practice. In the mid-1920s congregational schools multiplied and the Depression strengthened the trend. The

growth of the congregational schools and the growth of the all-day school though small, did not bode well for the Talmud Torah.¹⁴⁰ The curriculum, classroom procedures, texts and grading of pupils needed revitalization, and the curriculum had to try to expand its influence on character growth, values and attitudes.¹⁴¹ Jung believed that without a uniform model curriculum, the schools would flounder.¹⁴² As chairman of the publications committee of the UOJCA, Jung spent seven years surveying and analyzing methods of Jewish education that would be appropriate for the hundreds of Orthodox Talmud Torahs across the United States and prepared uniform textbooks for them.¹⁴³ The final manuscript was completed in 1941.

The aim of his curriculum was, “to build... bonds... between the child and the Jewish past, present... particularly the American scene... and future.” Jung’s curriculum was designed to, “condition the child favorably to Judaism as a living experience by the vivid, aesthetic presentation of the ceremonials, customs and folkways of our people...”¹⁴⁴ The committee objected to Jung’s use of the word “folkways” as the word had previously been used by Mordechai Kaplan. The word was therefore changed as it was felt to have a misleading connotation. The influence of Kaplan on Jung in this area appears to be present or this is an area on which they both shared a similar view. The committee obviously felt that Kaplan retained influence and wished to blot out all that might keep alive this influence.

The child was to study Jewish texts, and be taught to relate to the local, national, Palestinian and Galut Jewish community. Hebrew was to be taught as a living language and English was to be the language of instruction with deliberate attempt at every possible occasion to use Hebrew. Jung’s curriculum for Talmud Torahs included “ivrit

bivrit,” which meant that the Hebrew language was used to teach Hebrew and Jewish subjects. The aim was to equip the child with the means of contributing as a Jew and as an American to the welfare of all humanity. All the earmarks of Modern Orthodoxy were included in the curriculum: positive exposure to the religious and secular world, aesthetic presentation, Zionism, reaching out to all Jews and even non-Jews, and the use of Hebrew as a living language.

By the end of the thirties Talmud Torah buildings increased and registration in Jewish religious schools grew but at the beginning of the thirties they were, “gasping for breath.”¹⁴⁵

4.iii. Hebrew in The Curriculum

The rebirth of Hebrew in Palestine had repercussions in America. There were new opportunities to learn Hebrew. This was important for the Orthodox movement because the Orthodox services were conducted in Hebrew. Some non-Orthodox services were also partially conducted in Hebrew. This revival of Hebrew had a positive effect on Judaism and Orthodoxy in particular though the forces behind Hebrew classes were not always Orthodox.

Young Israel advanced the cause of Hebrew.¹⁴⁶ Modern Orthodoxy embraced this program as it was eager to adopt Hebrew as a living language, and this differentiated it from the Traditional Orthodox groups that regarded Hebrew exclusively as a holy language. The Traditional Orthodox groups continued to use Yiddish in their educational institutions and to use Hebrew only as a language of prayer as they felt it demeaned the holy language to use it in conversation. This is another identifying issue for Modern

Orthodoxy. Hebrew was presented by Jung as a unifying force and is additional evidence of his cooperation with the non-Orthodox. For Jung, Hebrew was a protection against assimilation and a means of Jewish identity and authenticity. For Jung it inculcated religious-national values. Knowledge of modern Hebrew facilitated knowledge of the ancient texts and prayer books; it was a link to the past and the future. Jung stated:

The disappearance of the Hebrew prayer from our life would mean the breaking down of one more barrier between assimilation and us. Hence Hebrew is not alone the only means of genuine expression but because it is in Hebrew that our historical and religious associations are presented... that the unity of Jewry everywhere is maintained, that the fervor of earlier worship and that the strength of our hereditary trust in God is continued.¹⁴⁷

The context of this quotation showed how important Hebrew in prayer was for Rabbi Jung. However, from the curriculum he prepared for the Talmud Torah schools in the late thirties, it is evident that Hebrew as a living language was also very important to him and that knowledge of Hebrew in prayer facilitated the knowledge of Hebrew as a living language and vice-versa.

Requests for Hebrew instruction in the College of the City of New York were rejected in the twenties.¹⁴⁸ In the thirties those who petitioned were able to convince the educators of the cultural values of Hebrew. Some universities (New York University, City College of New York, Hunter, Queens, Fordham, St. John's), public high schools, and night high schools began to give credits for Hebrew course, teaching Hebrew as a modern language spoken in Palestine, not an ancient one. Hebrew clubs, promoted by the Bureau of Jewish Education, sprung up.¹⁴⁹

4.iv. Educational Outreach Publications and Radio

Throughout the thirties Jewish leaders and other religious leaders relied on radio as one avenue to sell religion and the synagogue as they realized that vast audiences could be reached and ideas disseminated. This was the use of modern techniques in the modern age and Modern Orthodoxy was involved in this endeavour. The radio was used to inform the unaffiliated Jews and non-Jews. The UOJCA broadcasted its message.¹⁵⁰ The JTS also produced a number of radio broadcasts in conjunction with local stations or national networks.¹⁵¹ In the forties JTS sponsored a weekly series called The Eternal Light, a program of dramas in conjunction with NBC, aimed at a Conservative interpretation of Judaism.¹⁵² Jung, the Modern Orthodox representative on the radio in the thirties and forties, spoke on radio for Orthodoxy and for the JDC. He taught about Judaism, the Jewish people, and informed people about the current plight of the Jewish people. This high profile position brought positive exposure and prestige to Modern Orthodoxy.

Jung's radio broadcasts were also one aspect of his interfaith activities; he felt that better understanding would bring about better relations, and that it would lessen anti-semitism.

The Depression had coalesced extremists and reactionary movements; Father Coughlin and Father Divine were Catholic priests who used the radio to express their anti-semitic propaganda. Father Coughlin in particular had a large audience, and having someone like Rabbi Jung on the radio to counter the racism by presenting the proper facts was very important for the Jewish population.¹⁵³

Rabbi Jung spoke on the radio for both Orthodoxy and for the JDC. On behalf of the Cultural Committee of the JDC, Jung requested donations from his audience and

explained the work of the JDC, constantly reminding his listeners that the needs for physical and spiritual relief were urgent.¹⁵⁴ The situation for the Jewish people was “bleak and getting bleaker.”¹⁵⁵ At the Jewish New Year of 1937, Rabbi Jung made a radio plea to help JDC in a time of cruelty.¹⁵⁶

The more traditional outreach tool was publications. Modern Orthodox involvement in publications became greater in the thirties. Jung continued his efforts at writing articles and editing books. Publishing Jewish material in English was essential to the growth of Orthodoxy in America and several organizations published textbooks and educational material. The UOJCA introduced a bi-monthly periodical the Orthodox Union in 1933 which published organizational news and informative articles. It was a means for the UOJCA to spread better understanding of the problems affecting the Orthodox community, which would hopefully lead to a united effort by Orthodox Jewry, which was felt to be missing. Jung contributed articles to this journal.¹⁵⁷ The National Council of Torah Education of the Mizrahi was established in 1939 for the purpose of publishing Jewish material.¹⁵⁸

Jewish literature had to reach the American Jewish public and to do so it had to be translated into English. Jung wrote:

A Jewish community comes of age when an attempt has been made to make available for the average Jew the classics of Jewish literature, not only the Bible, but, especially Rabbinics.¹⁵⁹

This began to happen in the thirties. Jung hailed the Soncino Press of London which he felt was destined to play an important role in the history of English speaking Jewry. A major achievement of The Soncino Press was the publication of the English translation of an annotated text of the Babylonian Talmud with all the volumes completed

by the early forties. The editions provided introductions, appendices and indexes. Jung stated: “no more will the Talmud be a closed book to Jew or non-Jew.” Rabbi Jung was a participant in the Soncino English translation of the Talmud translating Tractate Arakhin and Tractate Yoma with introduction and notes.¹⁶⁰ The Soncino Press also published an English translation of the Zohar. Jung wrote that the, “Talmud and Zohar together reveal more of the Jew and Judaism than anything else from the pen of any commentator however learned and persuasive”.¹⁶¹ In addition the Soncino Press published a collection of studies by Jewish scholars in Moses Maimonides VII Centenary Volume (1936).¹⁶²

Jung’s praise of Soncino Press, which was, and still is an Orthodox publication, can also be construed as criticism of the American Jewish Publication Society which in 1917 began to publish the Hebrew classics.¹⁶³ In 1920, the series was renamed the Schiff Library of Jewish Classics when, Jacob Schiff, its main supporter, died.¹⁶⁴ The Jewish Publication Society was involved with things that Rabbi Jung was philosophically opposed to, so he could appreciate all the more the need for the Soncino Press. No Orthodox Jews were active either in JPS projects or on the JPS board. Rabbi Jung critically pointed out that JPS policy was to stay clear of controversial issues that they felt would offend the Christian or the modern mind.¹⁶⁵ Defending the Jewish image was their basic issue. If it was felt that a classic did not place the Jew in a good light or that it could possibly be a cause of anti-semitism, it was rejected. It is likely that they did not publish the Zohar, a medieval book of mysticism, for the above reasons and because of their rationalist bent. This was a characteristic of the day, and not unique to JPS. Jung pointed out that the Soncino Press had published a thesis on the history of anti-semitism; this type of literature had been rejected by the JPS.¹⁶⁶ Though JPS did publish a translation of a

portion of the Talmud, it was edited by the Reform scholar Henry Malter who employed a scientific approach.¹⁶⁷ They also published volumes of The Book of Principles, by Joseph Albo.¹⁶⁸ The final volume, Moses Hayyim Luzzato's ethical treatise, Mesillat Yesharim, was translated by Mordecai Kaplan. The introduction reflected Kaplan's philosophy that was that the classics should be studied since they were a mirror to a given time and period.¹⁶⁹ Rabbi Jung's dislike of this philosophy, which contravened Orthodox principles, was well known.

Yet, Jung appreciated that the JPS did try to awaken interest in the Jewish Classics which had been previously unknown to English readers; they wanted to teach about the Jewish heritage and they published works of general literary interest such as poetry and ethics. Jung also praised the JPS for publishing the translation of the Hebrew Bible, the belles-lettres volumes and through the Schiff classics, Hebrew texts of importance.¹⁷⁰ In 1941 the JPS appointed Samuel Belkin, Oscar Fasman, Joseph Lookstein and David deSola Pool to its board in response to Orthodox criticism and demand to be represented.¹⁷¹ This was an example of Modern Orthodoxy's expanding influence. Perhaps it is because Jung's criticism was heard.

Since Orthodoxy was not well represented in the Jewish-American publication world, Jung's Jewish Library Series and his other works played an important role. Among some of Rabbi Jung's own publications in the thirties were, Judaism in a Changing World and Woman.¹⁷² The essays in Judaism in a Changing World dealt with the outlook and the significance of traditional Judaism, as did all the volumes of The Jewish Library up to this date. This volume explored the challenges Judaism faced during the thirties in a world that was becoming imbued with the spirit of science,

industrialization and democratic unrest. Some of the challenges were for Judaism to survive in a foreign environment, to erase evil, be saved from a world lacking moral and spiritual values, resolve the conflict between religion and science, and provide a proper Jewish education in a non-Jewish environment. Modern dilemmas faced in the home, economic and social difficulties resulting from migration, mixed marriages, urbanization, and birth control were other issues discussed. The solutions proposed all derived from “Torah-true” living.

Judaism was explained using the categories of modern thought. This approach had appeal to the modern Jewish American. Jewish theology, Jewish sociology and psychological analysis of Judaism were presented.¹⁷³ Emphasis was placed on the fact that Judaism taught brotherhood of mankind, equality of all, and even-handed justice. The perception that Judaism was particularistic, separatist or clannish had to be dispelled.¹⁷⁴ Judaism was not static and unresponsive to changing conditions and the advancement of knowledge. It was a religion of full life integrating the intellectual and emotional, which was one reason it survived.¹⁷⁵ Jews had to be uncompromising in observance of the laws while appreciating that the laws were adaptable and elastic; this was a key issue in Modern Orthodoxy. A contributor, Maurice Farbridge, said, “we are preservers and interpreters of tradition rather than hide-bound traditionalists.”¹⁷⁶

The third volume of Jung’s Jewish Library was devoted to women. Jung edited the book Woman which highlighted the noble work of Jewish women in various endeavours through time. Woman contains articles about powerful, active, contributing women in various fields. This panorama of activities by Jewish women deals with women’s participation in the religious life of Israel, in economic life, in community and

organizational work, and in political life. Rabbi Jung demonstrated a respect for the role and significance of the Jewish woman throughout history. In Jung's introduction he wrote that:

The Jewish woman looms large in the heart of family and nation. The noblest term in the Hebrew vocabulary is rachmanut, usually translated as mercy but meaning literally, other love, the only genuinely unselfish devotion.

The book dispels the misapprehension that women had limited knowledge, or that they always held inferior positions in traditional Jewish life. Nina H. Adlerblum, Jung's good friend and biographer wrote:

This volume has no doubt been projected by the editor less as an account of the achievements of Jewish woman than as a stimulus to further development on their part.¹⁷⁷

This type of book inspired and raised woman to a position of influence and authority in the community and extended her influence into social, economic and other areas of life. It was a stimulus to women's further development and shows Jung's refusal to accept an inferior status for women. This attitude also is a mark of Modern Orthodoxy. He seemed to be aware of contemporary issues in his articles on women's issues, and sexuality, but in his writings at this time, there is no evidence that he dealt with inequities in synagogue rituals.

5. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITY -ISSUES OF CONCERN

5.i. Disorganization

Lack of organizational skills and unity were still important issues. The Jewish Forum discussed the, "chaotic conditions of religious life," as branches of Modern

Orthodoxy still acted independently.¹⁷⁸ Rabbi Herbert Goldstein, a colleague of Rabbi

Jung, wrote in The Jewish Tribune:

These organizations (referring to Orthodox Organizations) at best have only nibbled at the various problems confronting them. The reason... is largely due to the fact that not one of these organizations really represents the whole Orthodox Jewry. Either they represent only the Yiddish or the English speaking element or the older or the younger alone.¹⁷⁹

At the UOJCA convention of January 29, 1933, chairman Isaac Rosengarten criticized the organization for not representing Orthodoxy across America and for not including representatives from Mizrachi, Young Israel and others.¹⁸⁰ Though the UOJCA conducted educational activities through its central organization, prepared text books and stimulated synagogue brotherhoods and sisterhoods, it was criticized for not embracing enough of America's 3000 to 5000 Orthodox congregations, which had little connection with each other. Rabbi Jung felt that the more representative an organization became, the more the organization could develop public opinion, "which alone in this country takes the place of the well knit kehilla in European countries."¹⁸¹

5.ii. Sabbath Observance

There was still no systematic way of dealing with the Sabbath problem, but there was resolve on the part of Orthodox organizations to make it a major project. Jewish groups continued to invoke their rights as American citizens to ensure rights for Sabbath observers. Jung was active in UOJCA and The Sabbath Alliance, of which Rabbi Bernard Drachman was still president.¹⁸² Isaac Rosengarten wrote that the *raison d'être* of the Union was, "its work on behalf of Judaism proper," and that the UOJCA's principle goal

should be a systematic effort to ensure Sabbath observance to enable stores to close on the Sabbath, and to ensure that Sabbath observers were hired and not penalized.¹⁸³

There was some praiseworthy activity in this area. The Jewish Sabbath Alliance made strenuous efforts to obtain for the Sabbath observer an equal chance to earn a living and obtain opportunity for the free development of religion. This they claimed was what America stood for and what was rightfully theirs. A larger number of organizations were involved in this area than ever before; among them were the American Jewish Congress, Young Israel, UOJCA, other rabbinical bodies, the newly formed District Sabbath Councils from several sections of the city (under the auspices of UOJCA). They all gave support and cooperation to the Jewish Sabbath Alliance.

These organizations supported the Hofstadter-Moffat Sabbath Bill, which was presented in 1931 to the New York legislature. Besides including rights for Sabbath observers to earn a living, this bill also included a prohibition against holding examinations on the Jewish Sabbath or Holy days.¹⁸⁴ The bill was not passed, but it fostered more awareness, involvement and cooperation in this direction. Since the Dickstein Sabbath Bill in the twenties, some progress had been made.

In 1933 a large symposium, "Sabbath Recovery in Jewish Life" took place to organize for Sabbath preservation, to enable people to earn a living without penalty.¹⁸⁵ Rabbi Jung, as president of the Rabbinical council of the UOJCA, was a presenter. He urged the organizations and synagogues, "to absorb the great masses of Jewish working men and women now, for the first time, able to observe the Sabbath without economic loss and in full accord with Jewish law and custom."¹⁸⁶ Jung had always encouraged the Jew to act as a true American and to demand his rights and he hoped with the given rights

they would use the Sabbath for “legitimate Sabbath enjoyment.”¹⁸⁷ Rabbi Jung urged Jews to use the Sabbath since the United States had given, “our working people the Sabbath.” When the New York-Brooklyn Jewish Federation insisted that an employee come to work on the Sabbath before their major fundraising event, Rabbi Jung fought for the Sabbath observing employee.¹⁸⁸ It was abhorrent to him that a Jewish organization would do such a thing.

Because of the Orthodox concern to maintain and encourage Sabbath observance, the Young Israel Employment Bureau, organized in 1925, expanded its activities during the Depression as Orthodox synagogues initiated successful efforts to help Jews find jobs that would not require Sabbath work.¹⁸⁹ The Board of Education in New York City sanctioned a Bureau of Vocational Guidance for Sabbath observers.

5.iii. Advent of The Rabbinical Council of America

The advent of the Rabbinical Council of America in 1935 brought a sense of unity and prestige to Modern Orthodoxy and garnered additional respect for its rabbinate from the public and other religious leaders. The role of the rabbi became more visible as the affiliated rabbis took an active role in the Jewish community at large through the RCA. The RCA was truly representative of Modern Orthodoxy because it recognized both American differences and that accommodation and adjustment to American culture was necessary. Rabbis J.M. Charlap, J. Damesek, and Rabbi Herbert Goldstein were elected co-presidents, Bernard Drachman, S. Reichman, Bernard Rosenbloom became vice-presidents. Rabbi Jung became treasurer, and Rabbi Joseph Lookstein was financial secretary. This organization of Orthodox rabbis evolved out of what had been the

Rabbinical Council of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, of which Leo Jung had been president from 1926 to 1934.¹⁹⁰ Though the RCA was allied to the UOJCA, it operated independently.¹⁹¹

The conflict between the RCA and the older European rabbis of the Agudat Harabbonim continued and helped define the RCA. Their philosophies differed on the issues that clearly defined Modern Orthodoxy, such as attitude to secular education, co-operation with other Jewish and non-Jewish groups, and the use of Hebrew. The Agudat Harabbonim perceived the RCA to be a competitor when the RCA involved itself in the area of kashrut, but this was not a new issue.¹⁹² It is in the area of kashrut that there was endless controversy that detracted from the Agudat Harabbonim's reputation.¹⁹³

RCA became a member of the Synagogue Council of America, an amalgamation of Conservative, and Reform Rabbinical organizations which dealt with matters of concern to all Jews. This was not acceptable to Agudat Harabbonim. Agudat Harabbonim also felt that rabbis should not serve in congregations with mixed seating while the RCA felt that rabbis had a job to convince the congregation that a mechitza was needed. While the decision to accept a job in synagogues without a mechitza was tactical and problematic, their co-operation with other Jewish groups was part of the philosophy.

In 1939-40 Rabbi Jacob Agus, then still affiliated with Orthodox Judaism, took a pulpit at a synagogue in Chicago without a mechitza that allowed mixed seating on certain occasions. According to Rabbi Agus's son, Robert E. Agus, Rabbi Revel recommended that Rabbi Agus accept the position in order to try to change the situation. Rabbi Lookstein visited the synagogue and preached there in 1940 or 1941 and this the RCA allowed.¹⁹⁴ Rabbi Jung asked Rabbi Jacob Agus, then helping Jung with the

teaching of Talmud and lectures, to research the question of mechitza so that a definite position could be taken. The intent was to send a sheilah, which is an Halakhic question, to the roshei yeshivos in Europe about the mechitza itself. Due to the unsettled environment of the mid thirties, it was not sent.¹⁹⁵ The issue of mechitza was not only a dividing line between Modern Orthodoxy and Agudat Harrabonim, it became a dividing line between the Orthodox and the Conservative in the late forties and early fifties and was only clarified in the early fifties. The Conservative movement maintained that the mechitza was not an essential requirement.

Differences also existed in the area of ordination. Agudat Harrabonim recognized only their members as qualified rabbis, recognizing only those granted Yadin Yadin and not the Yoreh Yoreh type semicha which RIETS granted to its rabbis.¹⁹⁶ Agudat Harrabonim resented that RIETS ordained its own rabbis and that individual rabbis did not give semicha, as was the European custom.¹⁹⁷ The problem remained of rabbis not being properly accredited and Jung was vigilant in scrutinizing the ethical behaviour of rabbis, some of whom took money and improperly facilitated divorces or who gave hechshers to unqualified recipients.¹⁹⁸

In 1939 Agudat Harabbonim tried to persuade the RCA to disband and become an alumni association of RIETS. This incident provoked the merger of the two groups, the RCA and the Alumni Association of RIETS.¹⁹⁹ Jung was on the committee to effect this merger which he always wanted because it contributed to a united front for the Modern Orthodox rabbinate in America.²⁰⁰

5.iv. Involvement In Kashrut

The kashrut situation was still chaotic. Rabbi Jung was very active in the organizing of properly supervised kosher facilities, which expanded in the thirties. An increased independent and qualified number of inspectors were needed for proper coverage throughout the state.²⁰¹ Proper enforcement remained the main issue because of lack of a proper inspection system.²⁰² The editor of the Jewish Forum wrote that unity in the kashrut endeavour was possible, and that, “credit... [would be] due to the determined stand of Rabbi Leo Jung and -----”²⁰³

In 1935, when the RCA was established, the concept of communal supervision of kashrut rather than individual endorsement continued. Leo Jung had been in the forefront of fighting individual interests. The OU symbol represented the UOJCA kashrut standards, which were managed by the UOJCA. In the early years of the RCA, kashrut was a major item on the agenda of every executive meeting.²⁰⁴ There existed many Kashrut Boards, one of which was the well-respected West Side Board of Kashrut of which Rabbi Leo Jung was chairman.²⁰⁵ The Boards tried to monitor what butchers sold, examining chickens to assure that they met the standards of kashrut and protecting consumers against any improper purchases.

In the thirties much effort went into making an Advisory Board to the Kosher Laws of the State of New York a reality. The goal of this board was to give guidance and assistance to the implementers of The New York State Kosher Law and to see that the Kosher Law was enforced like any other law on the statute books. A Kashrut association of rabbis and laymen would have jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to proper supervision. The state allowed for an Orthodox interpretation of the law and kashrut

supervision was to be taken out of the hands of those who had personally benefited. Jung credited the eventual improvement in the kashrut industry to the Advisory Board.²⁰⁶

A bill to enforce The Kosher Law and establish a permanent Advisory Board on Kosher law enforcement in the New York Department of Agriculture was introduced by Senator Mahoney but was not passed in the state legislature of New York in the thirties. Jung headed the advisory board for this endeavour.²⁰⁷ In the thirties the board worked in an unofficial capacity but in 1940 it became a Statutory Official Board in the Department of Agriculture and Markets, on which Jung served as chairman for thirty years.²⁰⁸ Jung pointed out that the New York State and the Jewish community working together in this endeavour represented, “an utterly unique, truly American achievement.”²⁰⁹

Rabbi Jung talked about kashrut, the same way he talked about Sabbath employment, in universal terms, that it was a democratic right in a country based on religious freedom and equality of all citizens. In a letter to Senator Mahoney, Jung thanked him for his help in connection with the bills affecting kashrut enforcement and praised him for his service not only to the Jewish community but to all who believe in respecting their neighbour’s convictions.

...whereas kashrut enforcement may appear a purely Jewish consideration, the principle behind the various bills touches upon righteousness and the promotion of justice which are treasures of interdenominational thought.²¹⁰

An example of the expanded role of kashrut supervision is Jung’s involvement with kosher facilities aboard ships. Two steamships, called the “Palazzo D’Italia,” and the “U.S. Lines Company,” on the suggestion of Rabbi Jung, provided kosher facilities on some of their ships. He provided detailed instructions about how to set up their pantry and kitchens and saw to it that Rabbinic Council supervision was in place.²¹¹ Louis

Bernstein wrote that when the Italian line, a major trans Atlantic steamship company asked the Union to assume the responsibility for kashrut on its ships, it was a major breakthrough. The arrangement continued until Mussolini joined the Axis.²¹² Rabbi Jung also investigated the possibility of having kosher kitchens aboard the Holland America Line.²¹³

National Jewish organizations ignored kashrut observance and as the lack of kosher facilities was a deterrent to Orthodox involvement, it was an important issue.²¹⁴

Jung wrote to the president of the Federation of Jewish Charities:

For principles which I know you understand, I steadfastly refuse to attend any dinner to which Orthodox Jews are invited unless it is prepared and served in accord with the Jewish dietary laws. I should be very glad to place at your disposal free of charge a mashgiach or supervisor and I hope you will see your way to remove this stumbling block to Jewish unity from the only sectarian non-kosher dinner of Federation.²¹⁵

As RCA 's self-confidence increased this trend continued to be challenged.²¹⁶ In December 1939 the RCA wrote to Hadassah and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies protesting their non-kosher dinners.²¹⁷ Rabbi Jung was uncompromising on this issue. Providing special meals or special tables was unacceptable because Jews must respect the, "religious scruples of his neighbor," and the "Torah-true Jew" must not be excluded or isolated from any of the community's activities.

6. WOMEN

Women's roles outside the home continued to evolve in this decade. Social and economic needs were so great that women were needed in the work force and in the volunteer force so their role began to expand. Rabbi Jung's attitude to women

corresponded with his philosophy of harmonizing Judaism with the ongoing changes of the times.²¹⁸ The American woman had a role to play in a Jewish revival. There was a new respect for women's role beyond the biological.²¹⁹ Jung believed that women had the same need and right to fulfillment as men, though he never addressed feminism as a movement. His four daughters, with his encouragement, went to college and worked after marriage.²²⁰ This attitude separated Modern Orthodoxy from Traditional Orthodoxy and defined Jung's type of Orthodoxy.

Rabbi Jung was chairman of the American Beth Jacob Committee, founded to support schools for European Orthodox Jewish girls formed in 1927. It was one of Jung's favourite projects, fostered and nurtured by Agudat Israel.²²¹ The movement was founded by Sara Schenirer, with the help of some leading Western European Jews to provide an education for girls. People who recognized the imperative need for a Jewish education for Jewish girls supported the school. Traditionally more emphasis was placed on Jewish education for boys because it was understood that they needed to receive a grounding in Jewish sources. Many Traditional Orthodox Jews thought that it was unnecessary, and even wrong in some cases, for girls to receive an education. To have a women's school of learning was revolutionary; it needed the support of Orthodox trailblazers such as Rabbi Jung. Jung followed in the German Orthodox tradition and recognized the legitimacy of women's religious development. Mid-century German Orthodoxy had recognized the changing status and role of women and began to stress women's education. Samson Raphael Hirsch and Ezriel Hildscheimer both were concerned with women's education.²²²

For Jung the Beth Jacob School was the “feminine counterpart of Yeshiva” and a much needed institution that “provided a curriculum for her education and a challenge for her moral and mental energies.”²²³ Rabbi Jung brought the message to America.²²⁴ It was a women’s movement with only a few men on the committee, including Dr. Cyrus Adler, Judge Otto A. Rosalsky and Rabbi Leo Jung.²²⁵ Girls in America were increasingly entering Jewish schools, but there were no Beth Jacob schools in the United States during the thirties.²²⁶

Women were making significant contributions and receiving some recognition .In April, 1934 the Jewish Forum, dedicated an issue to the Jewish woman and her, “proper place in the life of the coming generation.” The articles demonstrated the expanded and important work in which the women were involved, which at this point was largely organizational.²²⁷ Mizrahi Women’s organizational work was new; the organization grew rapidly because of awakening interest in Palestine. It sponsored a technical school and cultural centre for girls in Jerusalem.²²⁸ The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America Women’s Organization in 1930 established a Hebrew Teacher Training School for girls.²²⁹ The Ladies Auxiliary of Yeshiva College played an important role in supporting the refugees program.²³⁰

The problem of the agunah, the deserted wife, or wife not given a divorce, remained on the agenda. What was new was a proposal from the Conservative movement. In December 1937, Dr. Louis Epstein, reporting for the Committee on Jewish Law, part of the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative) recommended the adoption of a resolution to solve the problem of the agunah, by permitting a dissolution of the marriage.²³¹ This attempt to modify divorce laws was declared illegal by the UOJCA

convention that followed the Conservative Rabbinic Assembly convention.²³² The Orthodox rabbis felt that the Conservative solution did not follow the Halakhah. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Jung felt uncomfortable with the issue of the agunah, but as an executive member of the UOJCA and part of the leadership, there is no evidence to show that he did not concur with the convention's decision. Orthodox women in future decades would confront this unsolved problem that remains a dilemma for Orthodoxy.

7. CONCLUSION

Modern Orthodox leaders were busy laying the groundwork in education and in organizational activity that would lead to successes in the decades to follow. The advent of the RCA was very important as it helped define what Modern Orthodoxy stood for, helped unify Modern Orthodoxy to some extent, and added prestige to the Modern Orthodox rabbinate. The RCA put Modern Orthodoxy in a position to make clearer policies and decisions. The trend to social activism meant that Modern Orthodox leaders, with their expanded role, were reaching a wider audience as they functioned in both the modern and religious world. Concepts of Torah were applied to everyday life. Rabbi Jung, the social activist, began his efforts to save Jews and he continued to teach about Judaism and to work to make Orthodoxy viable and attractive in America.

- ¹ Leo Jung. "Jacob Rosenheim The Man and His Work." Jewish Forum 14.3(March 1931) 82.
- ² "Timely Topics." 1. Hazedek, (School newspaper) 15 Nov.1939. Y.U. Archives.
- ³ Oscar Fasman. "After Fifty Years An Optimist." American Jewish History. Vol. 69. (Dec. 1979)159.
- ⁴ Jenna Joselit. "Modern Orthodox and the Ordeal of Civility." American Jewish History. Vol. 74, (1984) 133.
- ⁵ Leo Jung . "Jewry Today." Jewish Forum 19.7 (Sept. 1936) 202.
- ⁶ Beth Wenger. New York Jews And The Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 184.
- ⁷ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Union Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, N.J.; Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 109.
- ⁸ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Orthodox Synagogue." Jeffrey Gurock , ed., American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House, 1996, 96.
- ⁹ Ibid . 245 . Beth Wenger. New York Jews and The Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 178.
- ¹⁰ Letter to Jung from William Weiss, President of UOJCA, 27 Dec. 1936. Yeshiva University Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 10.
- ¹¹ Letter to Jung from Stephen Wise, 3 December 1936; Letter to Jung from Cyrus Adler, 4 Dec.1936. Y.U Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 20, File 10.
- ¹² Letter to Mr. Reubin Guskin from Jung , 30 July 1937. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 20, File 10.

- ¹³ Edwin Scott Gaustad. A Religious History of America. N.Y.: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966, 334-340. (also discussed in -Martin Marty. "The Church Against The World The Recovery of Protest and Realism." Martin Marty, ed. Righteous Empire; The Protestant Experience in America. New York:Dial Press, 1970.)
- ¹⁴ Leo Jung. "Judaism and Economic Freedom." Jewish Forum (June 1935)119.
- ¹⁵ Leo Jung. "Some Aspects of Judaism." 4. Y.U. Archives, Sapphire Papers, Box 14, Folder 30/2-55.
- ¹⁶ Leo Jung. Between Man and Man. Jewish Educational Press, New York, N.Y., 1976, 6. (first published under title Human Relations in Jewish Law 1967)
- ¹⁷ Leo Jung. "Judaism and Economic Freedom." Jewish Forum (June 1935) 119.
- ¹⁸ Leo Jung. "Things Without Measure and Other Editorials." The Jewish Center Bulletin.1937, 12. (available at the Jewish Center Synagogue ,131 West 86th Street, N.Y.)
- ¹⁹ Leo Jung. "Orthodox Judaism." 2. Y.U Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 48, File 4. (published articles)
- ²⁰ Rabbi Moses Hyamson. Sabbath and Festival Addresses. N.Y.: Block Publishing Co., 1936, 129.
- ²¹ Mendel Lewittes. "The Semi- Centennial of the Jewish Theological Seminary." Jewish Forum 20. 8 (August 1937) 135.
- ²² Beth Wenger. New York Jews And The Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 195.
- ²³ Leo Jung . The Path of a Pioneer The Autobiography of Leo Jung. Jewish Library , vol.

8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 138.

²⁴ Maurice Karpf. "Community Organization in the United States." American Jewish Year Book . vol. 39. (1937-1938): 120.

²⁵ Joseph Hyman. " 25 Years of American Aid To Jews Overseas, A Record of the JDC." American Jewish Year Book.Vol. 41. (1939-40) 177.

²⁶ "Requirements for Cultural Religious Institutes." 19 Aug. 1940; JDC Archives, File 92, 33/44. "Rabbi Leo Jung Demands Support For The Security of the Spiritual and Cultural Institutions." JDC Archives, File 89, 33/44.

²⁷ Minutes of meeting, 8 May 1935. JDC Archives, File 89, 33/44.

²⁸ "Rabbi Leo Jung Demands Support For The Security Of The Spiritual and Cultural Institutions." 6 Feb.1935. JDC Archives, File 89, 33/44.

²⁹ "Requirements for Cultural-Religious Institutions." 19 August 1940. JDC Archives, File 92, 33/44.

³⁰ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Union Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, N.J; Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 119.

³¹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 81.

³² Ibid. 150.

³³ Harry Schneiderman. " Review of the Year 5692." American Jewish Year Book Vol. 34.(1932-3) 26.

³⁴ Judith Baumel. Unfulfilled Promise Rescue and Resettlement of Jewish Refugee Children in the United States 1934-1945. Juneau, Alaska, USA: Denali Press, 1990, 147.

³⁵ Ibid. 105.

³⁶ Ibid. 147. E-mail, 24 September 1997 from Judith Baumel to Maxine Jacobson

³⁷ Ibid. 146.

³⁸ E-mail from Judith Baumel to Maxine Jacobson, 8 September 1997.

³⁹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 226.

⁴⁰ Marc B. Shapiro. Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy The Life and Works of Rabbi Jehiel Jacob Weinberg, 1884-1966. London, Portland, Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 209.

⁴¹ Ibid. 227. To American Joint Distribution Committee from Reichszentrale für Schachtangelegenheiten, (Jewish organization representing all the Jewish organizations) 30 Sept. 1936. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 9, Folder 3.

⁴² Letter to Dr. Munk from Jung , 27 Jan. 1937. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 9, Folder 3. (see all correspondence between Dr. E. Munk and Rabbi Jung in Box 9, Folder 3.)

⁴³ Letter to Dr. Unna , 25 November 1939. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, File 3.

⁴⁴ Letter to Jung from Rabbi Dr. Isak Unna 27 September 1939, 23 November 1939. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, File 3.

⁴⁵ Letter from Robert F. Wagner, Chairman of U.S. Committee on Banking and Currency, 20 September 1939. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, File 3.

⁴⁶ Minutes Board of Trustees, Jewish Center Synagogue, 12 November 1936. Jewish

Center Synagogue Archives.

⁴⁷ Marc B. Shapiro. Between The Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy The Life and Works of Jehiel Jacob Weinberg 1884-1966. London, Portland, Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 54.

⁴⁸ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 94.

⁴⁹ Aaron Rothcoff. Bernard Revel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972, 200.

⁵⁰ Letter to Jung From Revel, 28 Feb. 1930; Letter to Revel from Jung, 25 Oct. 1932. (Rabbi Jung arranged for two men, from Bombay to receive free board and lodging from Yeshiva and this is but one example.) Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

⁵¹ "Yeshiva Establishes Refugee Grants." Y.U. Archives, The Synthesis (RIETS and Yeshiva College newspaper) (April 1939): 1.

⁵² "Yeshiva Establishes Refugee Grants." The Synthesis (April 1939): 1. Y.U. Archives.

⁵³ Aaron Rackeffet- Rothcoff. "The Semi-Centennial of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College." Jeffrey Gurock ed. Ramaz School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1989, 6.

⁵⁴ "Our Rosh Yeshiva Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik." Hazedek, 8.4 (Y.U. Newspaper) (31 March 1940): 2, Y.U. Archives.

⁵⁵ Shulamit Meiselman. The Soloveitchik Heritage A Daughter's Memoirs. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1995, 214.

⁵⁶ Aaron Rackeffet- Rothcoff. "The Semi-Centennial of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College." Jeffrey Gurock, ed. Ramaz School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 1989, 7.

⁵⁷ Oscar Fasman. "After Fifty Years An Optimist." American Jewish History. Vol. 69 (Dec. 1979): 160.

⁵⁸ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 125.

⁵⁹ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Orthodox Synagogue." Jack Wertheimer ed. The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 64.

⁶⁰ William Helmreich. "Old Wine in New Bottles: Advanced Yeshivot in the United States." American Jewish History .vol. 69, (Dec. 1979): 251, 243.

⁶¹ Leo Jung. "The Way Up." Jewish Forum 16.3 (Oct. 1933): 103.

⁶² Leo Jung. "Modern Trends in American Judaism." New York: Mizrachi Jubilee Publication ,1936, 8. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

⁶³ Leo Jung. "The Way Up." Jewish Forum 16.3 (Oct .1933): 103-104.

⁶⁴ Ibid. Letter from Revel to Mr. Salasky in Dallas, 27 Oct.1936. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21. (and Professor Einstein's acceptance speech on receiving an honorary degree read, "if German Jewry had institutions like Yeshiva College, their fate would not have been so tragic as they would have been fortified and sustained spiritually.")

⁶⁵ Leo Jung. "The Way Up." Jewish Forum 16.3 (Oct. 1933): 104.

⁶⁶ Leo Jung. "Sovietism, Gangsterism, Cynicism The Challenges of Today."

Jewish Forum 14.9 (Sept. 1931): 303-307.

⁶⁷ Leo Jung. "Some Aspects of Judaism." 10. Y.U. Archives, Sapphire Papers, Box 14, Folder 30/2-55 . (Also in Leo Jung ed. Judaism in A Changing World. The Jewish Library, vol. 4, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1939)

⁶⁸ Dr. David Macht. "Torah and Science Twenty Five Years Ago and Now." Jewish Forum 14. 9 (Sept. 1931):322.

⁶⁹ Moses Isaacs. "The Challenge of Science." Leo Jung , ed. Judaism in A Changing World . The Jewish Library, vol. 4, London, N.Y.: The Soncino Press, 1971,

⁷⁰ Leo Jung . introduction, Leo Jung , ed., Judaism in a Changing World . The Jewish Library, vol. 4 , London, N.Y.:The Soncino Press , 1971. x.

⁷¹ "Macht Treats Medical Aspect of Purity Laws." 1. . Hazedek 6.1(11 May 1938): Y.U. Archives.

⁷² Israel H. Weisfeld. introduction. Louis Finkelstein, forward. Israel H. Weisfeld,ed., The Message of Israel: Twenty-four Religious Essays and Sermons by Outstanding Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Rabbis. N.Y.: Block, 1936; Isaac Klien. "The Ten Commandments in a Changing World," , Israel H, Weisfeld, ed., The Message of Israel: Twenty –four Religious Essays and Sermons by Outstanding Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Rabbis. N.Y.: Block, 1936, XII- XIII; Louis I. Newman. "Profit Motive and Phophet Motif," Israel H. Weisfeld, ed., The Message Of Israel: Twenty-four Religious essays and Sermons by Outstanding Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Rabbis. 88 ,98.

⁷³ Mendel Lewittes. "The Semi Centennial of the Jewish Theological Seminary."

Jewish Forum 20.8 (Aug. 1937): 137.

⁷⁴ Dr. David Macht. "Torah and Science Twenty-Five Years Ago and Now." Jewish Forum 14.9 (Sept. 1931) (Quoting N.Y. Times of Feb 15, 1931) 327.

⁷⁵ Leo Jung. "Things Without Measure and Other Essentials. " Jewish Center Bulletin (1937) 15. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ B. Finkelstein. "Let's Try It---." 2. Hazedek. (2 Nov.1938): Y.U. Archives.

⁷⁸ Oscar Fasman. "After Fifty Years an Optimist." American Jewish History. vol. 69. (Dec. 1979) 161.

⁷⁹ Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

⁸⁰ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 47.

⁸¹ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 205.

⁸² The Jewish Center Bulletin. 22 Dec. 1939. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

⁸³ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 94.

⁸⁴ Ibid . 94.

⁸⁵ Rabbi Jacob Schacter. personal interview. 11 November 1996. The minutes of the discussion of this merger was missing from the Jewish Center Synagogue records , a physical reminder of how anything to do with Kaplan was ripped out of the records. Clearly the later board of The Jewish Center did not want this fact known. Rabbi Jacob

Schacter claimed to have found the record in the SAJ minutes. He feels it is deliberately buried somewhere. Also, letter from Rosalie Rosenfeld (Jung's daughter) to Maxine Jacobson, Oct. 29, 1997. Rabbi Jung's daughter said that "nothing was ever mentioned about a proposed merger of The Jewish Center and Kaplan's "shul".

⁸⁶ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of The Year." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 34 . (1932-33) 33.

⁸⁷ Ibid

⁸⁸ Melvin I. Urofsky. American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1975, 422.

⁸⁹ Tamar De Sola Pool. "Palestine in the Post War World." Leo Jung ed. , Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 329.

⁹⁰ Hyman Grinstein. A Short History of the Jews in the United States. Leo Jung ,ed., The Jewish Library , vol. 7 , London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 175.

⁹¹ Leo Jung. "Jacob Rosenheim and The Man and His Work." Jewish Forum 14. 3 (March 1931) 81.

⁹² Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, New Jersey, Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc.,1997, 99.

⁹³ Leo Jung. "Jewry Today." Jewish Forum 29. 7 (Sept. 1936) 200.

⁹⁴ Leo Jung. "Palestine Today." Jewish Forum (Sept. 1947) first page of article. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5.(published Articles)

⁹⁵ Letter from Dr. Breuer to Jung, 30 June 1937. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1, Folder 2.

- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ Harry Bluestone. "Program of Young Israel." Jewish Forum 14. 6 (June 1931) 207.
- ⁹⁸ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung .The Jewish Library,vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 124.
- ⁹⁹ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 193.
- ¹⁰⁰ Maurice Karpf. "Community Organizations in the United States." American Year Book. vol. 39, (1937-38) 75-76.
- ¹⁰¹ Leo Jung. "Bernard Revel." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 43. (1941-2) 424.
- ¹⁰² Isaac Breur. "Judaism and the World Order." Leo Jung, Ed., Judaism in a Changing World. Jewish Library, Vol. 4., N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1939, 57.
- ¹⁰³ Joseph Shipley. "Ten Years A College." Jewish Forum 21.11(Dec. 1938): 205.
- ¹⁰⁴ Maurice Karpf. "Community Organization in the United States." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 39. (1937-8) 76.
- ¹⁰⁵ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, New Jersey, Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 109.
- ¹⁰⁶ Isaac Rosengarten. "The Source of Israel's Strength." (editorial) Jewish Forum 14. 6 (June 1931): 195.
- ¹⁰⁷ Leo Jung. "The Soncino Press of London," Jewish Forum 19.9 (Nov. 1936): 261.
- ¹⁰⁸ Leo Jung. "News Years Program." Leo Jung. Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses, and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 155.
- ¹⁰⁹ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year 5698- United States." American Jewish

Year Book, vol. 40. (1938-39)147.

¹¹⁰ David deSola Pool. "The Challenge To Jewish Education." Leo Jung, ed. Judaism in a Changing World . The Jewish Library , vol. 4, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1939, 64.

¹¹¹ Ibid. 61.

¹¹² Jeffrey Gurock.Men and Women of Yeshiva : Higher Education, Orthodoxy and American Judaism. N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1988, 122.

¹¹³ Ibid. 127.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 124.

¹¹⁵ Letter to Revel from Jung , 29 July 1932. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹¹⁶ Aaron Rakefet Rothcoff. "The Semi Centennial Celebrations of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College." Jeffrey Gurock, ed., Ramaz School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing House Inc.,1989, 9.

¹¹⁷ "Here and There."(by E.L.), 2. The Alumni Quarterly. (21 Mar.1937): 2. Y.U. Archives.

¹¹⁸ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 106. Letter to Jung from President of the Faculty, 4 January 1931. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹¹⁹ The Jewish Center Bulletin. Vol. 1X. No. 8 , 22 Dec.1939. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

¹²⁰ Letters to Jung from Revel, 24 Mar. 1937 and 13 Jan.1935. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹²¹ Letter from Revel to Jung , 4 Jan. 1931. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹²² Letter to Jung from Revel, 21 April ,1937. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹²³ Letter to Oscar Fasman from Revel, 30 Oct. 1936. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 5, Folder 5/1-27. Leo Jung. "Bernard Revel," American Jewish Year Book. vol. 43. (1941-42) 424. (also in Leo Jung, Crumbs and Character Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.:The Night and Day Press, 1942.)

¹²⁴ Letter to M.M. Travis, (Revel's brother-in-law) 3 Dec. 1936. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 5, Folder 5/1-27.

¹²⁵ To Jung from Revel,(quoting from a letter from his brother-in-law George Travis of Tulsa) 30 Nov . 1936. Y.U. Archives, Revel Papers, Box 3, Folder 5/3-21.

¹²⁶ Leo Jung. "Bernard Revel. " Crumbs and Character Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.: The Night and Day Press, 1942, 313. (Or "Bernard Revel", American Jewish Year Book. vol. 43 (1941-42) 424.)

¹²⁷ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of The Year." American Jewish Year Book . vol. 40. (1938-39) 72-73.

¹²⁸ Minutes Board of Trustees of Jewish Center Synagogue. 15 March 1934. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

¹²⁹ Leo Jung. The Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8., London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 72.

¹³⁰ Minutes of Meeting of Board of Trustees, 19 October 1932. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

¹³¹ Maurice Karpf. "Community Organization in the United States." American Jewish Year Book, vol. 39. (1937-38) 72-74.

¹³² Minutes Board of Trustees, Jewish Center Synagogue, 12 June 1935. Jewish Synagogue Center Synagogue Archives.

¹³³ Dei'ah ve Dibur, Information and Insight , Mar. 24,1999, Biography of Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, taken from internet-
www.Shemayisrael.com/chareidi/archives5759/tzav/kamintzk.htm

Martin Schwarzenchild. personal interview. 11 November 1996.

¹³⁴ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Ramaz Version of American Orthodoxy." Jeffrey Gurock , ed.. Ramaz: School Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy . Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1989, 49 ; Mrs. Sadie Silverstein. personal interview. 19 November 1997. (A long time member of the Jewish Center Synagogue, Mrs. Silverstein said that she and only a few other members sent their children to Ramaz.)

¹³⁵ Letter from Rosalie Rosenfeld to Maxine Jacobson answering questions that were sent to her. 29 Oct. 1997.

¹³⁶ Jeffrey Gurock. "The Ramaz Version of American Orthodoxy." Jeffrey Gurock, ed.. Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Pub. House, Inc., 1989, 41.

¹³⁷ Harry Schneiderman . " Review of the Year 5698- United States." American Jewish Year Book ,vol. 40. (1938-39) 140-141.

¹³⁸ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, N.J., Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 110.

¹³⁹ Ibid. 95.

¹⁴⁰ Morris B. Benathen. "The Role of Talmud Torah in Jewish Education in America." Leo Jung , ed., Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library, vol. 5. N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 483-4.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. 488.

¹⁴² Letter from Leo Jung to William Weiss ,19 Dec. 1940, Announcing the conference to be held in Jung's study for the purpose of getting reaction regarding a proposed uniform model curriculum. Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 9, Folder 2.

¹⁴³ Meeting notices from William Weiss ,President of UOJCA, 2 Oct. 1939, 19 Dec.1940, 20 Nov. 1940. Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 9, Folder 2. Draft of the Curriculum is available in Koenigberg Collection, Box 9, Folder 2.

¹⁴⁴ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of The Year 5701- United States." American Jewish Year Book .vol. 43. (Sept. 22, 1941 - Sept 22, 1942) 33. (The draft was completed) "Draft of a Curriculum for Orthodox Talmud Torahs." (Prepared under the auspices of: The Educational Committee of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America. Rabbi Leo Jung Chairman. Y.U. Archives, Koenigberg Collection, Box 9, Folder 2.

¹⁴⁵ Isaac Rosengarten. "Organizing Orthodox Jewry in America." Jewish Forum 16. 1 (March 1933): 8. Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year 5698- United States." American Jewish Year Book .vol. 40. (1938-39) 147.

¹⁴⁶ Harry Bluestone. "Program of Young Israel." Jewish Forum 14. 6 (June 1931): 206.

¹⁴⁷ Leo Jung . "Yissgadal Veyisskadash." 2; Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 44

,Folder 3.

¹⁴⁸ Mordecai H. Lewittes. "Hebrew Enters New York High Schools." The Menorah Journal. (Spring 1938)

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. 235.

¹⁵⁰ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Story A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale. N.J.: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 109.

¹⁵¹ Jeffrey Shandler, Elihu Katz. "Broadcasting American Judaism." Jack Wertheimer ed. Tradition Renewed A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. vol. 2. 366.

¹⁵² Ibid. 152. Louis Finkelstein. foreward. Morton Wishengrad. The Eternal Light .

¹⁵³ Albert Slomovitz. The Fighting Rabbis:A History of Jewish Military Chaplains . Ann Arbor, Michigan : UMI Dissertion Services, 1996, 198.

¹⁵⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 175.

¹⁵⁵ Leo Jung . "Jewry Today." Jewish Forum 19.7 (Sept. 1936): 200.

¹⁵⁶ Script from Jung's Address on Colombia Network Station WABC. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1.

¹⁵⁷ Editorial. Jewish Forum 16. 2 (Sept. 1933): 43.

¹⁵⁸ Hyman Grinstein. A Short History Of The Jews Of The United States. Leo Jung, ed., The Jewish Library vol. 7, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980,113.

¹⁵⁹ Leo Jung. "The Soncino Press of London." Jewish Forum 19.9 (Nov. 1936): 161.

¹⁶⁰ Citation by Samuel Belkin in conferring degree upon Dr. Leo Jung. Y.U. Archives,

Public Relations Files, Honorary Degrees, 1947-1968.

¹⁶¹ Leo Jung. "The Soncino Press Of London." Jewish Forum 19.9 (Nov. 1936): 261.

¹⁶² Ibid. 262.

¹⁶³ Email, 17 June 2002 from Nachum Shapiro to Maxine Jacobson, Customer Service Soncino Press,(" Soncino Press always was and is an Orthodox publication.")

¹⁶⁴ Jonathan D. Sarna. JPS The Americanization Of Jewish Culture 1888-1988.

Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989 , 122.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. . 143.

¹⁶⁶ Leo Jung. "The Soncino Press of London." Jewish Forum 19.9 (Nov.1936): 263.

¹⁶⁷ Jonathan D.Sarna. JPS The Americanization of Jewish Culture 1888-1988.

Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989, 154.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 156.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. 158.

¹⁷⁰ Leo Jung. "The Soncino Press of London." Jewish Forum 19.9(Nov. 1936) 261.

¹⁷¹ Jonathan D. Sarna. JPS The Americanization of Jewish Culture 1888-1988.

Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989,139.

¹⁷² Leo Jung , ed. Judaism in a Changing World . The Jewish Library. vol. 4, N.Y.:

Oxford University Press, 1939 ;Leo Jung, The JewishWoman . The Jewish Library,vol. 3, N.Y.: 1934.

¹⁷³ Leo Jung. ed. Judaism in a Changing World . The Jewish Library, vol. 4 , N.Y.:

Oxford University Press, 1939.(see articles by H. Raphael Gold and Maurice Farbridge)

¹⁷⁴ H. Raphael Gold. "A Psychological Approach To The Torah." Leo Jung, ed. Judaism

in a Changing World. The Jewish Library, vol. 4, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1939, 106.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. 141.

¹⁷⁶ Maurice Farbridge. "Judaism-A Sociological Approach." Leo Jung ,ed., Judaism in a Changing World. The Jewish Library, vol. 4, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1939, 259.

¹⁷⁷ Nima H. Adlerblum, "The Elan Vital of the Jewish Woman." Leo Jung , ed., Woman. The Jewish Library, vol. 3, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1970, 143. (First publication 1934)

¹⁷⁸ Editorial. Jewish Forum 14.9 (Sept. 1931): 291, 302.

¹⁷⁹ Herbert S. Goldstein. "A Clarion Call for Harmony." The Jewish Tribune, August 1930, 4.

¹⁸⁰ Isaac Rosengarten . "Organizing Orthodox Jewry in America." Jewish Forum 16.1 (March 1933): 8. (Rosengarten was editor of Jewish Forum, and chairman of UOJCA conference. This is his speech delivered before the convention of the UOJCA, Jan. 29, 1933.)

¹⁸¹ Ibid. 8.

¹⁸² Editorial . Jewish Forum 14.3 (March 1931): 67.

¹⁸³ Isaac Rosengarten. "Organizing Orthodox Jewry in America." Jewish Forum 16 .1 (March 1933): 9-10.

¹⁸⁴ Editorial .Jewish Forum 14. 3 (March 1931) 67.

¹⁸⁵ "Sabbath Recovery in Jewish Life." Symposium. Jewish Forum 16.6 (December 1933): 129.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Leo Jung .“The Way Up.” Jewish Forum16.3 (Oct. 1933):105.

¹⁸⁸ Letter to Jung from an observant employee, 10 October 1934. (There are many letters to and from Judge Joseph Proskauer and Leo Jung on issues of Federation respecting observant Jews.) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 2.

¹⁸⁹ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and The Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 188; Harry Blumstone. “Program of Young Israel,” Jewish Forum 14. 6 (June 1931): 205.

¹⁹⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. New York: Shengold Publishers, 1982, 92.

¹⁹¹ Saul Bernstein. The Orthodox Story A Centenary Portrayal . Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997, 112.

¹⁹² Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y., 1982, 96.

¹⁹³ Ibid. Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff . The Silver Era. Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, Jerusalem, N.Y.: 1981, 99, 133.

¹⁹⁴ Email from Robert Agus to Maxine Jacobson, 3 April 1998.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Jeffrey Gurock. Men and Women of Yeshiva: Higher Education, Orthodoxy, and American Judaism. N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1988, 13.

¹⁹⁷ Louis Bernstein, “Generational Conflict in American Orthodoxy.” American Jewish History . vol. 69, Dec.1979, 228.

¹⁹⁸ Letter to Jung from Rabbi S. Gerstenfeld, denying charges that he received \$100 to facilitate a divorce; Letter from Rabbi S.A Pardes denying that he gave a hechsher to a non Jew. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1.

Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, 51-52.

¹⁹⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. New York: Shengold Publishers, 1982, 13-14.

²⁰⁰ Ibid. 11 – 12.

²⁰¹ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of The Year 5695." American Jewish Year Book ,vol. 37. (1935-1936) 164. Letter 1 August 1933, from Koegnisberg to unknown. (headed, My Dear-----) Y.U. Archives, Koegnisberg Files, Box 11, Folder 1. Samuel Rottenberg . "Kosher Food and the Struggle For Community Supervision." Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Files, Box 11, Folder 2.

²⁰² Harold P.Gastwirt. Fraud , Corruption and Holiness: The Controversy Over the Supervision of Jewish Dietary Practices in New York City. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press ,1974, 188.

²⁰³ Editorial. Jewish Forum 7.5. (May 1934):159.

²⁰⁴ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. New York:, Shengold Publishers, 1982, 93.

²⁰⁵ "A Message From The West Side Board of Kashruth." New York Times , Monday, 14 December 1931. Y.U. Archives, Konigsberg Papers, Box 11, Folder 1.

²⁰⁶ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung.The Jewish Library, vol 8,

London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 249.

²⁰⁷ Letter to Jung from Max Yellen, 19 May 1939, and letter to Governor Lehman from Jung, 29 May 1938; Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 1. Harold Gastwirt. Fraud, Corruption and Holiness: The Controversy over the supervision of Jewish Dietary Practices in New York City. Port Washinton, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1974, 133.

²⁰⁸ Ibid. 249.

²⁰⁹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 248.

²¹⁰ Letter to Senator Mahoney from Jung, 1 May 1941. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 1.

²¹¹ Letter to Mr. Occhipinti from Jung, Nov. 1936, Letter to Jung from J.F. Brennan, Passenger Traffic Manager of Holland Lines. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1.(Correspondence 1930-1939)

²¹² Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission; The Emergence of the English speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 93.

²¹³ Letter to Passenger Traffic Manager of Holland American Line, from Jung, 15 June 1938. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 10, Folder 3.

²¹⁴ Correspondence Rabbi Jung and Judge Joseph Proskauer, president Federation of Jewish Charities; 20 September 1934, 23 September 1934, 26 October 1936. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1.

²¹⁵ Letter to Judge Joseph Proskauer, 20 September 1934. Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer

Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 254. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41. Folder 1. (Autobiography- Photocopied Letters)

²¹⁶ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y. Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 93.

²¹⁷ Ibid. 94.

²¹⁸ Leo Jung. Introduction. XI . Leo Jung, ed. Woman. The Jewish Library , vol. 3, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1970. (first edition 1934)

²¹⁹ Beth Wenger. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 78.

²²⁰ Letter from Rosalie Rosenfeld to Maxine Jacobson. 29 October 1997.

²²¹ Marty Noam Penkower. The Holocaust and Israel Reborn: From Catastrophe to Sovereignty. Urbana University of Illinois Press, 1994, 239.

²²² Marc Shapiro. Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy, The Life and Works of Jehiel Jacob Weinberg. London, Portland ,Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization,1999, 210.

²²³ Leo Jung. The Path of A Pathfinder The Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 149.

²²⁴ Leo Jung. "Jewry Today." Jewish Forum 9.7 (Sept. 1936): 200. Leo Jung. Introduction. Leo Jung , ed., Woman. The Jewish Library , vol. 3, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1970, X1; Leo Jung. "The Renaissance of East European Womanhood." whole article.(Article appeared in first edition of The Jewish Library , vol. 3.) Y.U.

Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 3 .(Published Articles)

²²⁵ Leo Jung. "The Renaissance of East European Womanhood." last page of article.

Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 3. (Published Articles)

²²⁶ "Beth Jacob Schools," Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter Publishing House Jerusalem Ltd., Jerusalem, Israel, 1974 , Vol. 16, 1260. Mrs. Herbert Goldstein. "Orthodox Women's Organization of America." Jewish Forum 8. 4 (April 1934): 111.

²²⁷ Editorial, Jewish Forum 9. 4 (April 1934): 97.

²²⁸ Miriam Ginsberg. "The Mozart's Women's Organization of America." Jewish Forum 8.4 (April 1934) 110.

²²⁹ Mrs. Herbert Goldstein. "Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America." Jewish Forum 8.4 (April 1934): 111.

²³⁰ "Women Grant 136 Aid Scholarships." 1. Hazedek (RIETS Newspaper) 15 November 1939, Y.U. Archives.

²³¹ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year 5698-United States." American Jewish Year Book, vol. 40, (1938-39) 143.

²³² Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year 5695." American Jewish Year Book, vol. 37. (1935-36) 164.

MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE FORTIES

“Watchman what of the night—I see the dawn, but it is still night.”
(Isaiah 21,11-12)

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will show that Modern Orthodoxy became more important in the forties; it became more active, better known and more influential. In that decade Modern Orthodoxy took on a more expanded, visible and leading role; its image improved. There was an interest and demand for more Jewish knowledge on the part of the layman, and the clergy began to demand more observance from their congregants. Clearer policies served to broaden the gap between the Orthodox and Conservative movements.¹

Orthodox leaders took an active role in the war effort and that gave them experience in various roles and provided another avenue to get their message across. There was a realization that it was important to have an Orthodox presence in relief agencies and political affairs. World War Two resulted in a call for societal changes leading to a more important role for religion. Modern Orthodoxy presented “Torah” itself as an answer to the dilemmas and problems of the time. Modern Orthodoxy took a leading role in the search for deeper values and the call for justice and rights of minority groups.

Modern Orthodoxy began to be associated with active participation in its own organizations, as well as organizations and community activities that involved the welfare of all Jews, although they began this participation in the thirties. But, in the forties, this was exemplified by their war effort and their attitude to Zionism. Zionism took on new importance and was supported by Modern Orthodoxy without reservations. Eretz Israel

was looked upon as a source of Hebrew culture, Jewish tradition and a sign that Jews were equals in the world. Eretz Israel, like Modern Orthodoxy itself, represented Jewish tradition and modernity.

Yeshiva had to take more of a leading role, as there was turmoil in Europe. There were new leaders at Yeshiva; the Modern Orthodox faction was in charge and they had to take up the new responsibility and try to fill the gap of the loss of Talmudic leadership in Europe. They took the lead in presenting Modern Orthodoxy with a more defined ideology and in working to provide better Jewish education. The Yeshiva expanded into a full university in 1945. The reputation of Modern Orthodoxy and its rabbis was greatly enhanced for all Jewish people and in the community at large.

Resistance to Americanization by Jews broadened after the war. By the mid forties, the Jewish people were ready to analyze and to critique when necessary; they became less fearful of diversity. The general Jewish community matured; many Jews of America were no longer immigrants and therefore Americanization was no longer so prominent a theme. They were now interested in who the early Jews to America were, their trials and tribulations. The Yeshiva newspaper, The Commentator noted that there had been no attempt to analyze the changes that had occurred in the life of the Jews and the causes that brought about the changes since their arrival in America. The Commentator observed that first generation American Jews could not write their own history, the second generation was not interested, as they wanted to forget and escape from their Jewish past, which included a foreign language spoken in the home, their religion and childhood struggles; “the principle of the third generation,” is that, “what the son wishes to forget, the grandson wishes to remember.”² In the forties the third

generation was more interested in its history and religion. This was good for Orthodoxy. Jung's books and writings reflected the new interest in Jewish roots and religion and he exuded confidence in his critique of society and in his suggestions for a greater future. He edited his fifth volume for The Jewish Library series, Israel of Tomorrow, which deals with many of the problems, achievements, and dilemmas which confronted Jews in the past and which they had to face in the present. It served as a guide towards a deeper understanding of the Jewish background in Europe and America.³ Another example of the new interest in Jewish roots and history is the book The Rise of The Jewish Community in New York, 1654-1860, written by the newly appointed Yeshiva staff member, Dr. Hyman Grinstein, historian and professor, who received his Ph.D under Dr. Salo W. Baron, eminent historian of Jewish History and professor at Columbia University.⁴ This interest in history continued, and in the seventies Grinstein wrote A Short History Of The Jews in The United States for Rabbi Jung's The Jewish Library series.

Rabbi Jung's literary career progressed. Jung's influential articles in the forties espoused the benefits of religion and advocated a major role for religion. The articles all articulated the same thing, the Modern Orthodox philosophy and that religion was a rational phenomenon and humans had a great role to play. One of his articles of note was "God in Crisis," which was distributed to members of the Jewish faith in the armed forces of the United States by the Jewish Welfare Board. This article also appeared in his book Crumbs and Character published in 1942. "Religion in the American Dream," and "American Religion: Its Opportunity and Responsibility," are two articles that originally were talks on the radio programs "Mutual's Radio Chapel" and "Message of Israel," aired

in May and June of 1945. "Judaism and The New World Order: The Problems of Sovereignty and Minorities," appeared in The American Journal of Economics and Sociology in July 1945 and in his book Israel of Tomorrow. "Social Engineering" appeared in The Jewish Forum in October 1946.⁵

Rabbi Jung continued with his varied and extensive work for Judaism and the Jewish community. His educational endeavours continued. He helped Yeshiva through trying times, was on various boards and continued to raise funds on their behalf. He was chairman of the Mordechai Ben David Foundation Awards Committee, which Jung established to recognize Jews who distinguished themselves in the secular world of modern culture, and who promoted self-respect, independent self defence, loyalty, devotion and patriotism.⁶ This is part of what Yeshiva and Modern Orthodoxy stood for. It was well recognized that Jewish self-respect and dignity were important issues for Jung and as chair of the awards committee he was able to steer the prize to people who represented his values.⁷ Rabbi Jung was also an Officer of Endowment for Yeshiva University. Rabbi Jung received an honorary Doctor of Divinity Degree at The Yeshiva University graduation, June 17, 1949.⁸

Leo Jung continued to be an executive member of the UOJCA and chairman of the Educational Committee of the UOJCA. He therefore was in a position of leadership and influence. As addressed in the last chapter, under its commission he completed the manuscript for a uniform curriculum for Orthodox Talmud Torahs, which began in the thirties, and which was published under the auspices of the Orthodox Union.⁹ He was on the publications committee of UOJCA.

Rabbi Jung became very involved in the war effort in his role as Jewish chaplain. Jung received The Selective Service Medal in 1949 for his devoted voluntary work and also in 1949 received an invitation from the Pentagon to tour areas of the Far eastern command.¹⁰

He continued his work with the JDC. When Cyrus Adler died in 1940 Jung took over his duties as chair, but only became the official chair of the Cultural Committee in 1943. He remained chair of the JDC cultural committee until 1978; this being the longest chairmanship in JDC history.¹¹ He also continued with American Beth Jacob as chair. After the war he traveled extensively in Palestine for various organizations.¹² He began his work with the American Fund For Palestine in the forties.¹³

He also continued his efforts in the area of kashrut. He was chairman of the Advisory Board Kosher Law Enforcement Bureau of New York. He was also chairman of the Committee of Rabbis to supervise kashrut at Beth Israel Hospital.¹⁴

2. WAR EFFORT

2.i. Role of The Modern Orthodox Chaplain and Its Significance

The Orthodox chaplain played a great role in World War Two and this role was very significant for the development of Modern Orthodoxy. Louis Bernstein in Challenge and Mission points out that Orthodoxy took more of a leading role during the period of the war and since World War Two has become an important component of American life.¹⁵ Bernstein wrote that the role of Orthodoxy had been enhanced on the American scene by the contributions that the RCA made in the area of military chaplaincy.¹⁶ The participation on the part of the Orthodox meant that there were, when possible, Jewish

programs and provisions of the Orthodox standard. They were there to solve military-religious problems, to guide and to influence.¹⁷ The role of the rabbi enhanced Orthodoxy's image and in a world of anti-Semitism, image building was important. According to Bernstein they took Torah out to those serving in the armed forces, an example of a successful outreach program.

Most of the Orthodox clergy were from RIETS and so were Modern Orthodox; therefore the perspectives of Yeshiva College were presented. Rabbi Sidney Hoenig, a graduate of RIETS and chaplain in the armed forces, explained the reason for this. It was required by the armed forces that chaplains have a secular education, as well as a religious education. The rabbis from RIETS had both a secular and religious education and this allowed them to become military chaplains.¹⁸ Also, having to work with other denominations was a prerequisite and this was a problem for many Traditional Orthodox rabbis who would not work with Conservative or Reform rabbis. These Traditional Orthodox groups resented and criticized the perspectives of the Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), which had brought together the three official rabbinic groups and Yeshiva for their philosophy of education and outreach to other Jewish groups.¹⁹ Orthodox, Conservative and Reform worked together on issues of mutual concern. Because of what Modern Orthodoxy stood for, they were able to participate.

The chaplains impacted directly on the lives of service men and so an Orthodox presence was very important; according to Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, Halakhah permitted this. Rabbi Samuel Belkin, President of Yeshiva College, asked Rabbi Soloveitchik, head of the Halakhic Committee of the RCA, if he would write a responsum on the role, if any, of an Orthodox military chaplain. By the forties,

Soloveitchik was recognized as a Rabbinic genius and master of Jewish law. Rabbi Soloveitchik's responses influenced the religious practices of Modern Orthodox Jews. Rabbi Soloveitchik felt that it was not only permissible but a duty of every Orthodox rabbi to enlist in the armed forces for the purpose of rendering spiritual guidance.²⁰ When the Jewish Welfare Board requested that more clergy enlist, among those who signed the request of December 16, 1941, were Rabbis Joseph Lookstein, President of the RCA, Saul Silber, President of Hebrew Theological College, William Weiss, President of UOJCA, David deSola Pool, Chaiman CANRA.²¹ It is interesting to note that The Assembly of Hebrew Orthodox Rabbis of America (Keneseth Harabanim), which was more right wing than the Agudat Harrabonim, more anti-modernization and not Modern Orthodox, in September 1940 also urged the Orthodox Rabbinate to defend American democracy and enrol in chaplaincy duty.²² This demonstrates that advocating chaplaincy was wartime patriotism and not just a Modern Orthodox phenomenon, but that Modern Orthodoxy had a prominent voice.

There were twenty-six Jewish chaplains in World War One in the American forces; none were Orthodox.²³ More Orthodox applications than Reform were received for World War Two.²⁴ This certainly is one example of Rabbi Soloveitchik's influence and the unifying of Modern Orthodoxy. There were concerns expressed by military personnel, as it was most difficult for the Orthodox to adjust to army situations because of the clash between religious and army programs. However, Hoenig points out that the complaints were of little consequence.²⁵ In 1942 the three official rabbinic bodies, the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly (RA), and RCA were brought together by Frank Weil, president of the Jewish

Welfare Board (JWB) to form the Committee on Army and Navy Religious Activities (CANRA) of the JWB. It should be noted that in 1942 the RCA merged with the alumni of Hebrew Theological College of Chicago but the RCA name was retained.²⁶ Rabbi Jung was an executive member of the JWB. Jung toured army camps representing the JWB.²⁷ Cyrus Adler, head of JTS, had been the Chairman of the JWB from 1917 until 1940, the year that he died. He was succeeded by Orthodox Rabbi David de Sola Pool, who took over the chair of the military committee of JWB.²⁸

The Chaplain's Committee, as stated, was named, Committee for Army and Navy Religious Activities (CANRA).²⁹ Chaplains were chosen by their respective organizations and Rabbi Jung was chosen to be a chaplain by the RCA. Within CANRA, representatives from the RCA decided all Orthodox matters.³⁰ Other Orthodox rabbis active in CANRA were Herbert S. Goldstein, Joseph Lookstein and David de Sola Pool. The Committee on Religious Activities impacted greatly on the lives of service personnel.

One of the most active of the subcommittees of CANRA in the forties was the Responsa Committee; Dr. Leo Jung acted as the Orthodox representative, and Reform Rabbi, Dr. Solomon B. Freehof, served as the chairman.³¹ Jung served on its Responsa Committee with Reform and Conservative rabbis to answer Jewish legal questions from Jewish chaplains and service men and the government.³² Their task was not easy; they had to deal with war emergency conditions and had to operate on a tri-rabbinic level, which was why the Orthodox representation was Modern Orthodox. However, there was harmony and they were successful in publishing "War Responsa," which attested to this successful cooperation.³³ The presence of an Orthodox rabbi, in this case Rabbi Jung, insured that the Orthodox view was heard and respected.

Orthodox rabbis such as Rabbi Jung, Rabbi Herbert Goldstein and Rabbi Joseph Lookstein played an important role in CANRA seminar programs that took place in the Chaplain school at Harvard University.³⁴ Modern Orthodox rabbis lecturing at Harvard, even if it was the chaplain school, was an example of successful outreach, of getting their message out to a broader audience and of image building.

CANRA devoted much attention to publications.³⁵ Material on Jewish rites, holidays, kashrut, sermons, and guides to Biblical readings were made available. These publications were an important source of information for the Jewish soldier, as well as giving the soldier a sense of Jewish history, as well as a sense of belonging. Rabbi David de Sola Pool revised an edition of the JWB prayer book in 1941 containing also a separate Reform service, unlike the previously accepted 1917 edition that was for all Jewish denominations.³⁶ This prayer book catered more to the Orthodox than the one before, which is evidence of Orthodox successful participation. Also the chaplaincy committee later produced an abridged mahzor, the prayer book used for Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur for the Traditional and the Reform Jew.³⁷ Rabbi Jung represented the Orthodox rabbinate on the chaplaincy committee working with Reform and Conservative rabbis to prepare this prayer book to be used by all service men. According to Sydney Hoenig there were still complaints by some Orthodox chaplains about pages missing in this edition and these chaplains continued to use the previous editions.³⁸

The duties of the Jewish chaplain were many. The Rabbi was educator, recreational organizer, and source of kosher food, personal counsellor and spokesman for the Jewish soldier. He arranged that furloughs be granted to Jewish soldiers for high holidays and Passover. CANRA distributed Passover packages. Chaplains conducted

Seders and other holiday services, provided Jewish texts and kosher food.³⁹ Jung lectured to soldiers and his mail with requests for summaries of his lectures and questions show appreciation on the part of the soldiers.⁴⁰

In addition the chaplains had to deal with anti-semitic incidents. There was concern that Jews would be accused of disloyalty to America. In 1944 Rabbi Jung received a letter from Rabbi David de Sola Pool dealing with the fact that there was embarrassment on the part of Jewish servicemen with a line in the Haggadah, the text read at the seder; the line cited was: “this year we are here, next year may we be in the land of Israel.” Rabbi de Sola Pool wrote, “the point is important enough to justify making a new plate of page nineteen for any reprint of the Haggadah that the JWB may make...” and he requested that the “embarrassing words” be deleted.⁴¹

I suggest that the embarrassing words be paraphrased in a little doggerel, since no literal or even free translation can avoid the possibility of misinterpretation, and an explanatory footnote would be out of place and unsatisfactory. A note would call attention to the difficulty and qui s'excuse s'accuse.⁴²

There was still fear of showing dual loyalties to America and the Jewish homeland; the approach was still somewhat timid and the feeling was still one of vulnerability. That attitude would change in the post war years.

There was prejudice regarding the untrue stereotype of Jewish non-participation in the army that had anti-semitic overtones. Rabbis dealt with these issues too.⁴³ The JWB published detailed information about Jewish participation and the percentages of Jewish servicemen. Rabbi Jung sent out many copies of this news release to those needing clarification.⁴⁴

The stereotype of Jewish non-participation continued and to combat this and other forms of anti-semitism and to promote and present the Orthodox point of view of

Judaism, the Yeshiva College alumni went on radio every Sunday at 6:00 P.M. with their program called “The Jewish Tradition.”⁴⁵ The program that began in January 1945 and was on station WLIB, had been initiated by Rabbi Leo Jung.⁴⁶ In its first program Rabbi Jung gave a discourse on the teaching of Judaism in the world of tomorrow and the part it could play in the “humanitization of humanity.”⁴⁷ The program dealt with the role of the clergy in the war effort, raising the image of the rabbi in the eyes of those who disparaged the role of the Jewish chaplain service and in the eyes of other Jews.

2.ii. Orthodox Organizational Involvement

The great concern for saving Jews in a war- torn world became more intense in the forties and most organizations became involved in the war effort. Rabbi Jung continued his efforts for the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), and, in 1943, became the chairman of its Cultural Religious Committee. As chair, Rabbi Jung traveled to many parts of the world to check on how funds were distributed and used by religious and cultural institutions that JDC supported. Through JDC, in addition to his cultural activities, Jung also saw to it that basic need for such things as kosher food, blankets, beds and books were met as material aid continued to take on great importance.⁴⁸ Rabbi Jung collected more than 1200 affidavits that led to the rescue of over 9000 Jews.⁴⁹ He wrote in his autobiography, “to answer the cry for deliverance from Hitler’s hell, I determined on a campaign of obtaining affidavits.”⁵⁰ His correspondence at this time attests to this; there are many heart wrenching, frantic requests from individuals writing to him to help in saving individual lives.⁵¹

Jung begged his congressman, who was attending the Bermuda Conference in April 1943, to plead the case of the Jewish people who were, “walking through the valley of the shadow of death”.⁵² This Anglo-American Conference was held April 19 to 30, to discuss helping refugees. It was called because of Jewish and general public interest. Official delegates of the American and British governments were there. However, the Bermuda Conference dealt exclusively with those who had already reached neutral territory and totally failed to address the plight of Jews under Nazi occupation.⁵³ Jews demanded that Allied governments rescue the victims of Nazi persecution. However, the delegates were unwilling to refer to Jews as the Nazis’ main victims and Britain refused to abandon its white paper policy and instead proposed the impractical idea of opening camps in North America as haven for these refugees. The conference did not save a single Jew from the Holocaust.⁵⁴

Jung’s participation in JDC was another example of how the Modern Orthodox leadership functioned as was demonstrated in the last chapter. JDC was considered one of the Jewish community’s major agencies and the Orthodox participated with non-Orthodox Jews.⁵⁵ Jung commented in his autobiography that he found, “...the leadership, both lay and professional, uniformly fair and co-operative...”⁵⁶

However, the Agudat Harabbonim, The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, found it difficult to accept the leadership of the JDC, which included non-Orthodox Jews, who they felt could not appreciate their world view and in 1939 it founded the Vaad Hahatzala to preserve Torah scholarship and the sages who represented it.⁵⁷ The Agudat Harabbonim excluded themselves from working with the mainstream Jewish organizations. They would not join the UJA.⁵⁸ The relationship of the Vaad

Hahatzala with JDC and Modern Orthodoxy was problematic and exemplified the conflict of Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy. The establishment of the Vaad Hahatzala was symbolic of the disunity in the Orthodox Community. The leadership of the Modern Orthodox was once again at odds with the leadership of the Agudat Harabbonim and their norms.

The JDC, as well as several Orthodox organizations, were sceptical about a separate relief and rescue organization for refugee rabbis and their Yeshivot, feeling that the establishment of a new fundraising agency was not justified as it overlapped with the work of the JDC, which bore the major burden of overseas Jewish relief and rescue work and fundraising efforts and it drained needed resources from the UJA, which funded the JDC.⁵⁹ The Vaad Ha-hatzala worked in the same countries as the JDC, in Asiatic Russia and Shanghai, to name two.⁶⁰ Both organizations sent funds for maintenance of Orthodox refugees in Japan. JDC had allocated funds for the transportation of Polish refugees via the Far East, half of which were earmarked for rabbis and yeshivas.⁶¹

Until late in the war the Vaad Ha-hatzala had focused exclusively on rescuing rabbis and Yeshiva students. That led to bitter, on-going debates with the rest of the Jewish community as the Vaad work gave preferential treatment to one group at the expense of other Jews.⁶² However, JDC could accept Vaad Ha-hatzala if they limited themselves to just that, even if in that field the JDC had also contributed greatly to religious institutions, rabbis and Yeshiva students and even if they felt that they themselves had more experience and were better equipped to spend intelligently and effectively for rescue relief and rehabilitation. The executive vice chair of JDC, Joseph Hyman wrote:

If the Vaad Hahatzala were to limit itself to that type of aid [for yeshivas and rabbinical groups], it would be more understandable... Nevertheless what has happened is that the Vaad Hahatzala has announced that it has become a general

rescue and relief organization not merely for Yeshivot and rabbinical groups but for others as well. It has claimed to be the primary organization in the field of rescue.⁶³

The JDC felt that the Vaad Ha-hatzala had embarrassed and prejudiced the interests of JDC. Friction and accusations were not new; the JDC had accused the Vaad Ha-hazala of making statements unfavourable to JDC before.⁶⁴ JDC found itself in a position where it had to answer to UJA that disliked the competitive campaign.⁶⁵ The Vaad Ha-hatzala had to face The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds which put out a bulletin, dated June 1944, questioning the relationship between the two organizations and calling upon the Vaad Ha-hatzala to coordinate its efforts with the JDC.⁶⁶ The two groups did come to some arrangement to coordinate efforts in order to prevent the spectacle of competitive fund-raising and divisiveness. The Vaad Ha-hatzala claimed that it preferred its original task to work only for Yeshivot and Torah institutions and that it would leave the work of relief and reconstruction to other groups. It made requests of the JDC, one of which was that some Orthodox Europeans be hired by the JDC.⁶⁷ Rabbi Jung shared the Vaad's goal of supporting Yeshivot and Torah scholars; but he worked to convince local agencies to transfer funds to Yeshivot and the Torah scholars through JDC.⁶⁸ Also Jung had assured Rabbi Isaac Herzog, chief Rabbi of Palestine, that the JDC would always be mindful of religious requirements as irreligious influences were making their mark in European communities.⁶⁹

Vaad Ha-hatzala did have Modern Orthodox supporters, such as Herbert Goldstein and Joseph Konvitz and Jacob Levinson of the RCA.⁷⁰ In 1945 some Yeshiva students and faculty participated in a campaign to raise money for the Vaad Ha-hatzala. Though Jung was an outstanding fundraiser, his name obviously was not on the list for

this endeavour as JDC was seen as a competitor and he was involved with JDC.⁷¹

However, it should be noted that Rabbi Jung had a very good relationship with Rabbi Aaron Kotler, who came to America in 1941 and became an active leader in Vaad Ha-hatzala.⁷² The fact that Modern Orthodox leaders gave their support to Vaad Ha-hatzala and therefore to more right-wing factions of Orthodoxy, is an example of Modern Orthodoxy being influenced by this group.

It should be noted that by 1942, when the Final Solution became public knowledge, the attention of all Orthodox organizations went to rescuing the Jewish people.⁷³ Young Israel, UOJCA, and RCA supported the Vaad Ha-hatzala's efforts in this direction. Yeshiva College was also involved in many ways from rescue to rehabilitation.⁷⁴ The Agudat Harabbonim and the Modern Orthodox groups worked together for the purpose of rescue though they still differed ideologically.

The Rabbinical Council was involved in saving Jewish lives, and was also involved in world politics.⁷⁵ It also became active in the Joint Distribution Committee in projects overseas in an effort to solve the problem of refugee rabbis. Israel Klaven of the RCA met with Rabbi Jung to see if the organization that Rabbi and Mrs. Jung had begun in the twenties to deal with rabbis in need of aid, The Rabbonim Aid Society, could help. The Rabbonim Aid Society, run independently by women of Jung's synagogue, The Jewish Center, was only too willing. The synagogue held dinners in the forties to raise money and certain donors gave to this cause on a regular basis.⁷⁶ They raised money and helped rabbis in need, physical or financial, right up until the nineties.⁷⁷

3. JUNG'S RESPONSE TO WORLD WAR TWO

Through his refugee work Rabbi Jung became intimately acquainted with the social ills of the time. For Jung, World War Two was an example of rampant “social infection,” meaning lack of moral values. Rabbi Jung discussed the dangers of indifference and intolerance and the meaning or significance of World War Two in his articles, “God in Crisis,” “Social Engineering,” “Judaism and The New World Order: The Problems of Sovereignty and of Minorities,” “Religion in the American Dream,” and “American Religion-Its Opportunity and Responsibility.” It is clear from reading Jung’s articles that he gave a candid, assertive, and fearless critique of the social problems of the time, along with his remedy to meet the challenges ahead. Most of Jung’s writings and radio addresses were peppered with the same message in the forties. Jung’s thoughts were heard and appreciated by Jews and non-Jews and so he was influential in the Jewish and non-Jewish community.⁷⁸ In his files there are several letters from Catholic and Protestant laymen, theological students and clergy complimenting him and requesting copies of the radio addresses, so that they could send the message to others.

The problems were the failure of modernity, the existence of national sovereignty, the failure of organized religion to create liberty and equality for individuals. There had been no cooperation between social groups, nations and religious groups. Rabbi Jung repeatedly presented this critique as he felt that it was important to restore the importance of religion in society; values had to be explored, the political and spiritual systems had to be re-examined. Jung wrote, “. . .ruthless self criticism for a useful blueprint of the future must be a sine qua non for achievement.”⁷⁹

Modernity had not seen a role for religion and took over and ignored religious principles and this is what happened in a world where religion was seen as outdated.⁸⁰ Modernity could not infuse in society, ethical, moral ways and had failed to work out a system of social justice.⁸¹ Jung felt that the main value in society was materialism and that the tragedy of society was that it lacked spiritual values.⁸² Though there was talk of this in the thirties, there was no question of its truth in the forties. Though Modern Orthodoxy did not hold this view alone, Jung's position represented Modern Orthodoxy.

In Jung's view national sovereignty had been a major handicap in progress toward universal peace, security and happiness, as nationalism negated the aim of religion. The laws of the nation reigned supreme, laws that did not protect individual rights and freedoms, laws that mistreated minorities. National interests prevented nations from looking out for other nations.⁸³ Organized religion had failed in its role to prevent evil, and to give moral guidance and it had been intolerant.⁸⁴ Therefore the world had been plunged into misery.⁸⁵ Rabbi Jung specifically targeted Christianity and expressed his disappointment with the failure of Christendom to rise for the saving of Israel: "Hitler couldn't have accomplished what he did if there wasn't a wrong attitude towards fellow humans."⁸⁶ It was a time when people had forgotten to be "their brother's keeper." Anti-semitism was undemocratic and un-American and lacked religious values. Intolerance undermined the spiritual foundations and moral basis of all religions. Whenever persecution and poverty were permitted, everyone eventually suffered. Jung wrote:

Organized religion has often been undermined by its own inconsistent attitude, by frequent disregard of its own standards in its approach to other creeds, to treat one's neighbor with respect is not only in accordance with the principles of every religion, but it is essential for one's own survival.⁸⁷

Jung called for a more important, expanded and influential role for religion in society. Religions should work together to ensure equal rights of the individual, and the group, as well as to secure peace, social justice, social interdependence. Rabbi Jung pointed out that churches should lead people away from prejudices.⁸⁸ He stressed social interdependence, or “social engineering,” which meant cooperation, mutuality and concern with everyone’s welfare on the part of social groups, nations and religious groups. Divergences were important, but Jung felt that humans were all fundamentally alike. Each group should come to accept each other on democratic terms. In fact, for Jung, democracy implied the right to be different.⁸⁹ The majority must look out for the minorities.⁹⁰ Jung pleaded for the under-privileged:

The whole texture of our divine book expresses the conviction that the culture of a nation must be gauged not by its attitude towards majorities, but precisely by its attitude towards minorities, towards those who politically, socially, financially are without adequate support.”⁹¹

Before publishing his manuscript, “Jewish Foundations of the New World Order,” Rabbi Jung had asked Salo W. Baron, world-renowned historian and professor at Columbia University, to read it and to make suggestions. Baron considered it a valuable contribution to the contemporary discussion on what religion might contribute to post-war reconstruction. Baron, however noted that Jung had failed to address one important issue: how to, “wrestle with one major difficulty; what sanctions can religion put behind its demands today”. The secular society, and modern state had to stay clear of religious influences.⁹² Salo Baron, of course, had touched on the key dilemma of what religions faced in America. However, Baron felt that the article was appropriate and useful propaganda and apologetics. Even though religion lacked power of enforcement, it was

important to express this dilemma and important to bring to the public what religion had to say.

The article that Salo Baron critiqued, appeared in The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, and its editor, Mr. Will Lissner, wanted the part of Jung's disappointment at the failure of Christendom to rise to save Israel, deleted. Rabbi Jung requested that it be put in a note rather than completely omitted.⁹³ The reference was ultimately omitted, but the article does talk of the duties of the religious majorities. This incident is an example of the limits of freedom of expression on this subject, even in "friendly" places.

Jung tried to put his suggestions into concrete action. During the war, Jung hoped that each denomination could rally the faithful around its own flag to work with other groups for the promotion of universal peace and happiness.⁹⁴ He planned this project with Pearl Buck, a well-known author; the suggestion had come through a pamphlet that Pearl Buck had written, called, "Can the Church Lead?" Rabbi Jung wanted a statement of "common conviction" made by representative, clerical and lay leaders of all religions emphasizing in the name of God, "an unlimited and dynamic insistence on the dignity of the individual, on interdependence of ideals of religion and human security."⁹⁵ He tried to engage world religious leaders of different faiths to work together in a leadership role to champion the cause of universal justice. He pleaded:

God must be re-introduced to the common people not as a special possession of separate classes of groups, not with His holy name made almost shabby with overmuch indiscriminate use at mass meetings, but as the Supreme Court before whom no specious argument, however learned or brilliant, has any chance.⁹⁶

Jung recognized that no one religion alone possessed God's spirit, but that a religious person, no matter the faith was good for society and the emphasis was on working together to better that society.⁹⁷

Rabbi Jung wrote to Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick to involve him in his plan. Rev. Fosdick was a Baptist minister and one of the leaders of religion in the English-speaking world, whose books were best sellers. Rev. Dr. Fosdick was a good choice as both he and Rabbi Jung shared certain modern approaches to religion. Fosdick, like Jung, had felt that social reform and social service was the best expression of Christian principles and that liberty taken from one group would result in lack of liberty for all. Fosdick had written a petition that was printed in the New York Times, 26 May, 1933, protesting the plight of Jews in Germany. In this petition he also took a stand against religious and racial prejudice in America. Fosdick, like Jung felt that the struggle for human rights in America and the Nazis' treatment of Jews threatened the whole civilized world.

However, Rev. Dr. Fosdick was unenthusiastic about the project, as he felt that to include all religions, the statement would have to be too general and that the generalities that you would get would hardly be worth signing.⁹⁸ Fosdick's years as an activist fighting Fundamentalists had given him good insight.⁹⁹

Rabbi Jung tried to enlist the co-operation of Mrs. Chiang Kai-Shek, when she was on her trip to the United States in 1943, the Rector of the Moslem University in Cairo, the Dalai Lama in Tibet, as well as every prominent leader of the various faiths.¹⁰⁰ It ended in failure; Rev. Fosdick had been correct; a universal statement could not be agreed upon.¹⁰¹

Other Modern Orthodox rabbis made the plea that democracy meant the right to be different. This was representative of a new assertive attitude of Modern Orthodoxy. In Isaac Breuer's article "Judaism and The World of Tomorrow," which appears in Jung's "Israel of Tomorrow," his message was similar to Jung's. Breuer wrote that World War Two represented aggression, the attempt of the strong to exploit the weak and he called for self-determination of all people and respect for minority rights.¹⁰² The chosen nation had an historic destiny to bring justice. William Weiss, national president of UOJCA, wrote that democracy and the people of America were on trial, that the Bill of Rights guaranteed freedom of religion, worship, speech and assembly and that these were the symbols that have kept American democracy alive. He felt that following anti-Semitism would be anti-Catholicism and anti-Protestantism. He wrote that, "manifestation of anti-Semitism in this country is un-American conduct."¹⁰³ Weiss, too, pointed out that in preaching bigotry and hatred the church had failed the people. Weiss, like Rabbi Jung, gave the church the responsibility to preserve the American democratic way of life.

4. EFFECTS OF MODERN ORTHODOX PRESENCE IN THE WAR EFFORT AND TRENDS COMING OUT OF WORLD WAR TWO

4.i. Upsurge of Jewish Religious Life During and After the War Years: Upsurge in Status of Religion and its Institutions

Jung's efforts as well as the efforts of the other Modern Orthodox leaders contributed to the more prominent role that religion would play. In the forties the course of secularism did begin to change and the role of religion began to be elevated. This of course, affected all movements in Judaism, but this dissertation deals only with Modern Orthodoxy. In 1949 Carlos Romulo, President of the United Nations General Assembly,

was guest speaker at a Yeshiva University dinner; the topic discussed was the interrelationship between faith and freedom in general and Jewish tradition and American freedom.¹⁰⁴ Romulo echoed Jung's message, that it was necessary for the various religious faiths to unite and cooperate if democracy was to survive. The vital task of religion, Romulo said, was the promotion of health and welfare and peace and this was Jung's theme in the forties.

While all agreed that there was a return to religion, different explanations by Modern Orthodox thinkers were given for the return and perhaps all the reasons were correct. Rabbi Norman Lamm agreed that there was a return to religion but felt that it was due to the post war fear of communism.¹⁰⁵ Rabbi Jung felt that the new influx of observant Orthodox Jews from Eastern Europe was responsible for the return to religion:

We have learned to value their positive contributions to Jewish life in our country. The unquestioning loyalty to Torah-true Judaism of a great number, their eager sacrifice to the promotion of its cause, have proved a considerable stimulus to religious life in America and have added to the fighting strength of the Lord's Army in our state.¹⁰⁶

In 1944, Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva College, reported that new Orthodox congregations were springing up all over America and that there had been a reawakening of a long dormant interest in Judaism, not only in civilian life but in the armed forces. Belkin felt that the war experience had led to more interest in Jewish life, more group consciousness and more awareness and care for the past.¹⁰⁷ The challenge was to bring Judaism to the thousands of soldiers returning home who were more favourably disposed to Judaism than ever.

As demonstrated, Orthodox Jews took on a greater leading role during the period of the war. There was more Orthodox presence. Many servicemen rediscovered Judaism

through the chaplains they had met and given that many were Orthodox, Orthodoxy had an influence. The chaplain became representative of the Jewish community and was involved in rescue efforts, which marked the end of the war. Orthodox clergy were there to see that religious conditions had been met and that servicemen received educational material satisfactory to the Orthodox view. The Orthodox presence maintained and in some cases awakened the servicemen to religious experience and knowledge. It also gave the soldiers a feeling of identity, belonging, and equality. The rabbi became a positive model.

Also, the soldiers had met Jews in other lands, some saw Palestine, or concentration camps or both, and their experience made them rethink their Jewish commitment. Religious, moral, and psychological needs of the servicemen had been met at a very vulnerable time in their lives. Clergy had to be alert to having proper literature and answers and this kept them alert and more knowledgeable regarding both religious and secular issues. Hence the clergy and laypeople became better educated. The challenge was to maintain and keep up this learning and to sustain the “manifestation of foxhole religion.”¹⁰⁸

A contrary view was that of Rabbi Emmanuel Rackman, chaplain in the American Army Air force, a graduate of RIETS and rabbi of Manhattan’s Fifth Avenue Synagogue, who talked of the religious attitudes of the Jewish men in the service.¹⁰⁹ He reported that he saw no religious revival among the soldiers and that the soldiers were not aware of profound spiritual issues of the war. Rabbi Rackman, who later became a well-known Jewish philosopher, felt that foxhole religion was a superstitious faith. What he did see was the, “resurgence of a strong feeling of kinship with one’s Jewish co-religionists,” a

desire to be restored to a certain pride in their spiritual heritage and more interest in Jewish history books, as well as more interest in learning Hebrew so as to more fully participate in religious services.¹¹⁰ However, he suggested that Jewish identity, pride and appetite for Jewish education was a prelude to religious observance and that the war left people with nostalgia for deeper values.¹¹¹ It is unlikely that Jung or other Modern Orthodox thinkers would have disagreed with that statement.

4.ii. Image Change

A story about image building is the story of the Beth Jacob girls. As chairman of the American Beth Jacob Committee, Rabbi Leo Jung was involved with the promulgating in America of the tragic but heroic story of the Beth Jacob “Martyrs” in America. It was the story of 93 Beth Jacob girls, 14 to 22 years old, and their teacher, in Poland, who preferred death to being forced into prostitution at the hands of the enemy and so committed suicide. This represents an image change for Jewish people in modern times, a change away from being passive and inactive, though Zionists had also projected this image. It is the first occasion in modern times that the Orthodox group is depicted in this role. The eyes of Americans were on the plight and virtue of the Orthodox in Europe. While the story was eloquent testimony to Jews, and women in particular, in a heroic role, it also brought attention to the Beth Jacob schools and their goals.

Jacob Rosenheim, president of the Agudat Israel World Organization, sent a document to Rabbi Jung detailing the event. Rosenheim felt that it was the education in the Beth Jacob schools, which had granted the girls the courage of preferring death to disgrace. In Rosenheim’s own words, he was sending Jung a, “literal copy of a scarcely

precedented human document of Jewish heroism...” Rosenheim requested that Rabbi Jung, who was chair of the American Beth Jacob Committee, arrange a permanent Kaddish at the Jewish Center for the “martyrs.”¹¹²

Due to Rabbi Jung’s efforts the story appeared in the New York Times, 8 January 1943, under the title, “The Martyrs of Warsaw.” It should be noted that Jacob Rosenheim felt that the New York Times would not publish such a Jewish document, probably because he felt that it would not lend its sympathies in that direction.¹¹³ That the New York Times did publish it, perhaps demonstrated a changing attitude or perhaps it was felt that the heroic story would be interesting and appealing. Rabbi Jung showed great respect for this type of martyrdom. Jung wrote that:

This document tells a story true to the noblest pattern of Jewish martyrdom. It is unmatched in simplicity and sublimity, a living testimony of Beth Jacob’s service to Israel, indeed to all believers in the Universal Father of man.¹¹⁴

The story received an interdenominational sympathetic reaction. Judith Baumel, historian, writer and child of the Holocaust, said that everyone believed the story to be true: “I mean everyone—the Orthodox, the Zionists, the Reform, even the Reconstructionists—everyone venerated the girls.”¹¹⁵ But, as early as the forties, Baumel found evidence that some people were questioning the story. At a JDC Cultural Committee meeting in March 1950, it was suggested that the Beth Jacob story of the 93 girls be included in the history of the JDC that was being written for its 300-page brochure. A guest attendee suggested that he felt it was “good symbolism.” However, Pinchus Churgin, another committee member and also president of Mizrachi, pointed out that the story had never been documented. Rosenheim had sent a document of the story to

Jung, but that was not mentioned. Rabbi Jung's reply shows that he indeed believed the story to be true:

I do not think that any doubt has ever arisen about the authenticity of the document. I had the document in my own hands. I can give you a talk about the authenticity... It was not addressed to me but I believe it is genuine. I have never heard any doubt about its authenticity.¹¹⁶

However, the fact that its authenticity was discussed at the meeting showed that the authenticity needed defence. The first written evidence that Baumel found labelling it a forgery was in 1960 in a book of Holocaust martyrdom anecdotes published by Mossad Harav Kook and edited by Mordecai Eliav, called Ani Ma'amin.¹¹⁷ Judith Baumel considers this story a, "possible outline for traditional martyrdom"; she referred to the story as a new type of genre, the heroic Orthodox story, which lent prestige and good image at a time when it was needed and very important. However, Judy Baumel pointed out that it was not seen that way at the time.¹¹⁸ It is a story of heroines showing initiative, commitment to Jewish obligations, group aggressiveness, and courage, ready to make the ultimate sacrifice of death. In other words, the girls are the symbols of heroic action. There is still no consensus as to the truth of the story. In the article, "The Ninety-Three Bais Yaakov Girls of Cracow: History or Typology?" Judith Baumel and Jacob J. Schacter describe the story as, possible reality, possible symbolism, possible myth. They feel that the incident could have occurred, but it is unlikely that it did occur.¹¹⁹

4.iii. Co-operation with other Jewish Groups

Relationship between Orthodoxy and other Jewish groups was an important issue. Modern Orthodox clergy seemed to work well with Reform and Conservative clergy and

with non-Jewish chaplains; it was an experience with, to use Rabbi Jung's expression, "cooperation without compromise."¹²⁰ Rabbi Soloveitchik acknowledged the importance of unity and peace in joint social and political matters.¹²¹ When Jung joined the JDC in 1926, he was a pioneer in Orthodox circles, as he worked with all denominations. He proved to be a good model. He wrote:

We must resign ourselves to the fact of three American Jewish denominations. This is one more handicap, but it need not negate our efforts to prevent us from working for the common weal."¹²²

The chaplaincy role also provided a model for American Jewish religious life in the post war. As discussed, during the war the RCA representatives joined non-Orthodox rabbis in issuing religious edicts and this met with disapproval by Traditional Orthodox. The wartime role created a sense of interfaith rabbinic fellowship, which spilled over into other areas of communal life such as the New York Board of Rabbis and the Synagogue Council of America.¹²³ In contrast to other Orthodox groups Modern Orthodox rabbis maintained an ongoing relationship with their Conservative and Reform colleagues and their rabbinic groups.¹²⁴ This cooperation carried on into the fifties and sixties.¹²⁵ It meant that Modern Orthodoxy was present in all aspects of Jewish communal life.

4.iv. Accent on Renaissance and The Future-New Role For American Jewry

The onslaught overseas left American Jewry as the sustaining force for Jews throughout the world.¹²⁶ America had to take on a new responsibility. The centre of Judaism was transferred to America because of the tragedy. Rabbi Jung remarked:

...the Jewish community is adolescent in this young country, and as the result of the world's chaos, has obligations of maturity suddenly thrust upon it, both as a

section of the great American community and as a group with its own cultural and spiritual heritage”¹²⁷

In Orthodox circles an event of some importance was the transfer in April 1941, of the world executive centre of Agudat Israel from London to New York. This transfer reflected the increased importance of the American community in Jewish affairs. At the Agudat Israel convention that year, Rabbi Eliezer Silver was re-elected President. Silver called for the transfer of a number of famous Jewish religious academies from Germany and Soviet occupied territories to the United States. He called for a chain of Orthodox schools in America and for a wider campaign for education.¹²⁸

Dr. Leo Jung wrote in the preface of Israel of Tomorrow, “Poland was chosen as the most significant Jewish community of yesterday. America and Palestine as all important for Israel of Tomorrow.” Before the war Poland was the centre of scribes who wrote Torahs and of Jewish education. Before the war there were twenty-seven Jewish dailies in Poland, over 100 weeklies and dozens of periodicals. There were Jewish museums and archives.¹²⁹ Rabbi Jung wrote:

We American Jews, the remnants sent to our shores... must rise above our present level of moral consciousness if we are to prove of real assistance to the scattered remnant of our people.¹³⁰

Jung felt that to live up to the task American Israel, which included Orthodox, Reform and Conservative organizations, had to cooperate and work together.¹³¹

Thousands of books that had been saved from destruction during the war were brought to America. The cultural committee of JDC, of which Jung had served as chairman, had saved many of these books. The Yeshiva library received the Morris Friedman collection of rare books dating back to the 16th and 17th century, which had been obtained through Leo Jung.¹³² More educational material of high quality would

become available in America and America would not be the Jewish “wasteland” it once was.

Rabbi Jung, through the JDC, continued to be attentive to the needs of the refugees. Religious books and articles, kosher food and bedding were needed; Jung did his part.¹³³ This help was often a prelude to the refugees coming over to North America. One group with which Rabbi Jung was familiar, included the 15,000 refugees in Shanghai, which included Rabbi Meir Ashkenazi, chief Rabbi of Shanghai, and the Mir Yeshiva of Poland. Jung did his best to attend to their needs, such as supplying them with a special knife for slaughtering and with religious literature.¹³⁴

Yeshiva University also continued its efforts. Dean Samuel Sar of Yeshiva College was appointed to head JDC’s “Continent Drive” to improve religious conditions. Sar was also charged with the organization of schools, synagogues, kosher slaughtering and other religious functions basic to the continuance of Orthodox Judaism on the continent of Europe.¹³⁵

5. EDUCATION

If America and Israel had to share the mission of preserving Jewish cultural and spiritual life then certainly after the War there was a new role for Jewish educational institutions. Jewish education would be the greatest influence shaping the future. For Jung, Jewish education was the key to pride, to Jewish consciousness; the Jewish people would be equipped with an effective way to defend themselves, to promote their causes, and to contribute to the Jewish and to the American way of life. They would be bolder in

their demands and more able to work for democratic rights and a better life through the communal, political, and social structures of America. Jung continued to feel that

...for our self defense, our children must receive a Jewish education, academic, social and crowned by the pattern of Jewish communal enterprises that will give them self knowledge and a sense of historic importance.¹³⁶

A critique of Jung's view of parochial schools by the Reform Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger, and Jung's rebuttal in March 1945 gave a clear picture of the Modern Orthodox view of Jewish education and of the state of its Jewish institutions. Rabbi Jung promoted parochial schools as he felt that parochial schools were the main hope for producing knowledgeable, enthusiastic Jews and Americans.¹³⁷ He wrote: "...it has been my conviction for a long time that unless we obtain a well informed laity, American Israel will be doomed."¹³⁸ For Jung parochial schools were part of the American way of life.¹³⁹ Rabbi Jung's theme in the forties was that parochial school attendance was a symbol that the American Jew had come of age. Cultural pluralism was the American way of life; therefore Jews who adhered to Judaism were practicing the American way. The Reform Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger's views were opposite to Jung's; he felt that parochial schools and the American way of life were a contradiction, that parochial school was divisive and contrary to an opposite trend of inclusiveness in American life. Modern Orthodox leaders felt that Hebrew day schools were seen as a great potential for Orthodoxy.¹⁴⁰ In his response to Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger, Jung lamented that the average Talmud Torah, which was attended by only a small fraction of the Jewish population did not seem capable of supplying either sufficient knowledge or staunch allegiance to Torah-true Judaism. At the same time, Jung's work as chair of the education committee of UOJCA showed his devotion, desire and effort to improve the parochial

school system. However by the end of the forties, it was reported that there was an increase of 3000 children attending the Jewish day schools and an increase of 60-day schools. This still however, represented only a small percent of the total population eligible to attend.¹⁴¹

Rabbi Jung was not alone in his effort at better organization. Orthodox Jewish educational organizations established authoritative bodies to represent the traditional viewpoint in Jewish education and to strengthen the cause of Torah through study. The Long Island Board of Orthodox Jewish Education is an example. The Board agreed to seek the counsel and cooperation of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College in formulating educational policies and projects.¹⁴² Hence, Yeshiva was represented; Yeshiva called for the rallying of Orthodox forces, and was involved in formulating educational policies and projects. Yeshiva, the voice of Modern Orthodoxy became more directly linked with Jewish education and more influential.

The benefits of learning the Hebrew language for Modern Orthodoxy were discussed in the last chapter. The emphasis on the Hebrew language, which began in the thirties, continued.

Yeshiva University, representative of Modern Orthodoxy, promoted Hebrew studies and was pleased when New York University created a new Professorship of Hebrew Culture and Education, the first of its kind in United States.¹⁴³ Rabbi Jung helped to establish this chair.¹⁴⁴ The New York Times, 9 November, 1947, reported that an important step in the promotion of interfaith understanding had been taken by New York University with the creation of a new professorship of Hebrew culture and education, the

first of its kind in United States.¹⁴⁵ By 1949 New York University gave twenty-five different Hebrew courses.¹⁴⁶

After World War Two there were several new Hebrew clubs at Yeshiva. The Hebrew prerequisites at Yeshiva were under discussion and increasing the level of Hebrew spoken by a rabbinical graduate, were on the agenda.¹⁴⁷ The “Ivrith b’ivrith” which was the technique of teaching Hebrew using the Hebrew language, increased in popularity.¹⁴⁸ Jung liked this technique and had put it in his curriculum proposal for the Talmud Torahs.

5.i. Yeshiva

Yeshiva took firm leadership of Modern Orthodoxy after the war.¹⁴⁹ Yeshiva’s role in matters pertinent to Jewish education grew and it became even more indispensable to Modern Orthodoxy. The concerns of Yeshiva included reorganization and expansion.

In 1940 the college admitted its largest class ever; 40% came from the public high schools.¹⁵⁰ This demonstrated that the college had appeal to those seeking a secular education and possibly, it showed an increased interest in a Jewish environment. In 1941 for the first time courses were offered to adults at Yeshiva.¹⁵¹ This was a sign that there was a feeling that the times necessitated deeper knowledge reinforced by a concern for a sense of values.¹⁵²

Yeshiva became more successful and competitive on two fronts, the religious and secular, living out the on-going theme of synthesis, which was key to Modern Orthodoxy.¹⁵³ In 1941, renowned scholars like Leo Jung, Samuel Belkin, Pincus Churgin, Joseph Lookstein and Bernard Zeitlin were lauded in one of Yeshiva’s newspapers for

their outstanding publications and invaluable contribution in Jewish and Semitic studies.¹⁵⁴ William Weiss, National president of UOJCA, announced that Jung's Essentials of Judaism one of the Jewish Library Series of the Orthodox Union had gone into its seventh edition with the printing of another 10,000 copies.¹⁵⁵ On the secular side, the Yeshiva's journal, Scripta Mathematica, had earned a national reputation.¹⁵⁶

However, Yeshiva at the start of the forties had been in trouble; it had been plagued with financial woes and two of Yeshiva's great leaders died, as well, leaving it in a precarious situation. However, ultimately this situation resulted in strengthening the Yeshiva and therefore in strengthening Modern Orthodoxy. President Bernard Revel died in 1940; two months later Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, the Rosh Yeshiva, died as well, leaving the Yeshiva weakened.¹⁵⁷ Until the death of Rabbi Revel in 1940, the Agudat Harrobonim had somewhat contained its antagonism toward the board of RIETS, an antagonism harboured since Yeshiva College opened its secular classes in 1928, as they respected Revel. Also, Rabbi Soloveitchik had a long established admirable reputation as a Talmudic scholar, among all the rabbis. However, with the death of Bernard Revel there was an attempted takeover. Rabbi Eliezer Silver of Cincinnati, president of Agudat Israel sent a telegram informing the board that he had appointed a committee of seven to assume leadership of the school. The Yeshiva's directors, which included Rabbi Bernard Levinthal and the Honorable Samuel Levy, rejected the Agudat Harabbonim.¹⁵⁸ An executive board of seven members, which had full authority over the administration of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College, was formed. The chairman was the Honorable Samuel Levy; executive vice chairman was Rabbi Joseph Lookstein; members were Rabbi Jung, and representing the academic department, Mr. Samuel Sar, Rabbi Samuel Belkin, Dr.

Moses Isaacs, and Dr Pinkos Churgin. The board had a long and active association with the institution; it knew Revel's wishes.¹⁵⁹ Each appointee represented a special interest group within the school; Leo Jung 's Jewish Center included some of the most important supporters of RIETS. The board was set up to prevent another attempted takeover by the Agudat Harrabonim.¹⁶⁰ The board was to guide the school and to recommend candidates for the Rosh Yeshiva and the Presidency.¹⁶¹

Leadership of the school was a most pressing problem and this they did solve. There was a reorganization of the leadership of the institution and selections of new heads of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College.¹⁶² To replace Rabbi Soloveitchik two names were offered early on; Rabbi Jung had suggested Rabbi Chaim Heller, an Orthodox Biblical scholar, whose name would bring stature and prestige to Yeshiva, and Rabbi Herbert Goldstein had suggested Rabbi Joseph Soloveichik, who had been Rabbi Heller's student and had been the unofficial chief rabbi of Boston since his arrival in 1932.

Jung had written about Chaim Heller in the Jewish Forum, years before, praising him as an iluy, a scholar of extraordinary gifts in both Torah and secular studies and an "intellectual David," who was a scholarly and dedicated defender of the integrity of the Bible against the school of Gentile academics, who had written copious commentaries critiquing the Bible. Heller employed the scientific method for his responses and his research was built upon Torah im derekh erez in that he combined, "the latest scholarly method with deep reverence of a present day savant for the great minds of the past."¹⁶³ Jung wrote that Heller also reintroduced a method of studying rabbinic literature, which but for few exceptions, had been dead since the demise of the great Gaon of Vilna.¹⁶⁴

However, Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, the son of Rabbi Moses, was appointed and

became Rosh Yeshiva from 1941 to 1984, succeeding his father. He was acceptable to all factions and he became the new Talmudist and became known as “The Rov” and ultimate spiritual guide for Modern Orthodoxy, the most influential Orthodox religious leader during the second half of the twentieth century.¹⁶⁵ Rabbi Soloveitchik held a doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Berlin; he stood for the integration of secular and religious studies. Under his leadership Modern Orthodoxy’s reputation was greatly enhanced.¹⁶⁶ Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik as senior Rosh Yeshiva became more and more visible and prominent on the Modern Orthodox scene. There is no written evidence to demonstrate that Rabbi Jung was disappointed that his favorite candidate was not chosen and none of his comments about this election can be found. A negative reaction would be disrespectful of democratic means, would be politically unsavvy, and would therefore be out of keeping with Rabbi Jung. There is also no evidence to show that Jung and Rabbi Soloveitchik had any relationship at all, not even a formal relationship.

Rabbi Jung was also on the committee to elect a new president. In fact, there were board members, who were Jung’s congregants and they wanted Leo Jung to be the new president, as they felt that he represented Modern Orthodoxy and that he was devoted to what Yeshiva stood for. Jeffrey Gurock suggested that Jung’s candidacy had flaws as Jung did not have ordination from a leading Yeshiva in Eastern Europe and was not known as a Talmudic scholar.¹⁶⁷ Four decades later when Jeffrey Gurock interviewed Rabbi Jung, he insisted that he was not at all disappointed not to have been chosen, but Gurock said that he sensed that he was.¹⁶⁸ In 1941 Rabbi Samuel Belkin was made head of the Yeshiva after the death of Rabbi Bernard Revel. Samuel Belkin, who held a Ph.D from Brown University, had been secretary of the graduate school since it opened in

1937. With Belkin's appointment, the Modern Orthodox leaders were firmly in charge.¹⁶⁹

The gap widened between Agudat Harrabonim and Modern Orthodoxy as Modern Orthodoxy became even more distinct an entity. However, the Modern Orthodox continued to look over their shoulders at the more right wing faction. The Commentator, a Yeshiva Newspaper reported, "it is no secret that there are forces in Orthodox Judaism which would be quite content to let the influence of the entire movement initiated by Dr. Revel be eradicated by time."¹⁷⁰

Added to the faculty were European rabbis who had been rescued. An example was Rabbi Isaac Rubinstein, former chief rabbi of Vilna and a member of the Polish senate representing the Jewish community; and Rabbi M. Shatzkaes, formerly the head of the Yeshiva at Grodno.¹⁷¹ These appointments added prestige to Yeshiva and added to its credibility as a major Orthodox centre.

It has been amply demonstrated that Rabbi Jung influenced the financial destiny of Yeshiva. In 1939-40, Yeshiva was in dire straits and in need of \$130,000, according to Rabbi Jung. Revel had come to Rabbi Jung in great need of his help. Jung was able to raise \$50,000, from one donor, a non-observant Jew, who was impressed with how Jung presented Judaism and how he had presented the Yeshiva's needs. This donor insisted on remaining anonymous and so Jung used his Hebrew name when naming an award after him, "The Mordecai Ben David Foundation Award." In 1946 Jung revealed that the donor was Mr. Enrico Garda, Ambassador of Italy to San Marino.¹⁷² Jeffrey Gurock referred to Garda as Mussolini's ambassador to the United States.¹⁷³ Previously revealing his name would have been dangerous for the dictator of Italy, Benito Mussolini and for Mr. Garda, himself, as the two men had been friends. Having a friend that made such a

large donation to a Jewish institution in a country that Italy was at war with and who was Jewish, would put have put Mussolini, as well as Mr. Garda in grave danger. The remainder of the funds, Jung raised with the help of Mendel Gottesman, Abraham Mazer and Joseph Golding.¹⁷⁴ All these men played an important part in saving the institution from financial ruin.

In 1946 at a meeting of the National Council of Organizations For Yeshiva University, Samuel Belkin read a message from long time friend and supporter of the Yeshiva, Albert Einstein, “I am convinced that Yeshiva is of great importance for the preservation of Jewish tradition and for the deeper spiritualization of youth in general...”¹⁷⁵ Einstein continued to be enlisted to attract new supporters to the cause of Yeshiva and he continued to work with Rabbi Jung. It is to be noted that even Einstein seemed to emphasize religious values, though he meant different things than Orthodox Jews meant with the same terms. Though Einstein’s definition of religion was not Modern Orthodox he did, like Modern Orthodox thinkers and like the philosophy of Yeshiva, see a positive relationship between religion and science and in this way Einstein could represent Yeshiva. Einstein is quoted as saying; “I think that science without religion is lame and conversely, that religion without science is blind. Both are important and should work hand in hand.”¹⁷⁶ Einstein said: “Science can only ascertain what is, but not what should be, and outside of its domain value judgments of all kinds remain necessary. Religion, on the other hand, deals only with evaluation of human thought and action: it cannot justifiably speak of facts and relationships between facts.”¹⁷⁷ In a letter to Einstein, Rabbi Jung demonstrated that he respected both the religious and the scientific approach.¹⁷⁸ Rabbi Samuel Belkin said in his inaugural address that, “we prefer to look

upon science and religion as separate domains which need not be in serious conflict and therefore need no reconciliation.” Belkin felt that only within the personality of the individual could synthesis be achieved.¹⁷⁹

The Yeshiva University Conference in 1946 emphasized that Yeshiva University was a dream come true but that a greater future lay ahead; tangible evidence was provided to show that this was so. Plans for the establishment of professional schools were revealed; a dental, medical, and law school were being planned.¹⁸⁰ After the war Yeshiva College began to expand in every way; the emphasis was on the future. It had an expansion plan for a fifteen-story building. Buildings were added and a blueprint for a non-sectarian medical school was developed. Yeshiva received university status in 1945, had enlarged enrolment and expanded courses of study.¹⁸¹ Twenty-five new courses were added.¹⁸² Yeshiva was competing ably with other American universities. It is yet another example of Yeshiva living up to what it stood for. Yeshiva was advancing the cause of Modern Orthodoxy; it was visible and attractive to the American public.

6. ZIONISM

Just as there was a new role for America, there was a new role for Eretz Israel; Jews were determined to be masters of their own fate and rebuild a homeland. The Jew had been seen as helpless and passive in the concentration camp experience; however, that experience produced a new type of Jew, one who was bold, proud and less fearful of public opinion. The advent of the State of Israel itself infused more energy and passion into Zionism. Palestine represented a better tomorrow; American Jews were looking for better days.

The forties saw an increasing aggressive and nationalistic policy on the part of American Zionism.¹⁸³ There was a greater acceptance of Jewish nationalism. The Zionist message spread to American Jews.¹⁸⁴ The catastrophe of World War Two had helped to overcome the factionalism that plagued Zionism in the thirties, though some factionalism remained.¹⁸⁵

At the famous Biltmore Hotel Conference in 1942, chaired by Reform Rabbi and Zionist leader, Stephen Wise, there was a call for a Jewish State. The Biltmore Conference resulted in a new and vigorous course of action for American Zionism. Before Biltmore, Palestine was seen primarily as a place of refuge by American Jews; after Biltmore, world Jewry saw Palestine as a future Jewish state, where Jewish nationhood and justice was to be restored.¹⁸⁶ After Biltmore, American Zionist organizations could claim that they spoke for the majority of American Jews. In 1942 after the Biltmore Conference, a number of dissident Reform rabbis founded, "The American Council For Judaism," an organization that rejected any effort to impose Jewish nationality upon all Jews, as it felt that it was un-American. It was the first and only Jewish organization created at that point to fight against Zionism and the establishment of the State of Israel. However, it did not represent mainstream Jews.

The National Orthodox Conference held in January 1944, which was attended by over 1,200 delegates representing every important Orthodox community in America, denounced the American Council for Judaism and others who equated loyalty to the Holy Land as disloyalty to America. The Conference demonstrated the rising strength of Orthodoxy and its unanimity of purpose in facing a vital issue confronting Jewry. The conference denounced the deJudaized and self appointed Council as high treason to all

Jewry and accepted unanimously as its official view a statement read by Dr. Samuel Belkin which referred to the Council as a “disoriented fringe divorced from their people’s past...”¹⁸⁷ Rabbi Jung referred to the Council as an organization which is, “...un-American, un-Jewish, and has no counsel of significance to offer.”¹⁸⁸ Contrary to the Council, Rabbi Jung felt that Zionism promoted the realization of the American dream as it represented democracy, justice and righteousness.¹⁸⁹

6.i. Modern Orthodoxy and Zionism

The RCA and the UOJCA recognized and welcomed the State of Israel without reservations and were committed to religious Zionism.¹⁹⁰ The majority identified with Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi; only a small number identified with the anti Zionist Agudath Israel. Yeshiva hailed the new state as opening a new chapter in Jewish history.¹⁹¹ Modern Orthodoxy wholeheartedly supported the State of Israel; it lost its ambiguity with respect to Israel.¹⁹² The Modern Orthodox leadership did feel that the birth of the State of Israel had to be interpreted in terms of Modern Orthodox religious philosophy of history and warned of any attempt of secularization of Jewish life in Israel.¹⁹³ Eretz Israel saved lives and saved Judaism; this was the message in the forties.¹⁹⁴ Eretz Israel was the epitome of Modern Orthodoxy as it combined tradition and modernity. Modern Orthodox sources emphasized that Palestine was not only a source of benefit to American Jewry but to the world also. Rabbi Jung echoed the sentiments of many when he saw Eretz Israel as compensation for the wrongs that had been done.¹⁹⁵

Rabbi Soloveitchik ridiculed as false the theory that the establishment of Israel was not in keeping with Jewish law and he felt that Torah would be fruitful in Palestine

even if a majority of secular Jews ran the state. Rabbi Soloveitchik said; “Orthodoxy may not have a big share in the new state yet Torah will be fruitful in Palestine. Religious Jews will be able to live better in a Palestine ruled by Hashomer Hatzair than in an American Jewish ghetto like Williamsberg.”¹⁹⁶ This is a wonderful example of the Modern Orthodox approach to Zionism. Rabbi Soloveitchik was careful to see that issues regarding Palestine would comply with Halakhah. When Mizrachi asked the RCA to distribute a service that Mizrachi had composed for Yom Ha’atzmaut, Rabbi Soloveitchik ruled against a service conducted in a non-Halakhic fashion. He also felt that the RCA, a rabbinic group, should not disseminate material of another group, particularly a lay group.¹⁹⁷ RCA unlike Mizrachi was not supposed to be a political organization.

Jung wrote that the Galuth (outside the holy land) had built up the Holy Land but Eretz Israel would pour new strength into the Galuth.¹⁹⁸ Jung felt that Eretz Israel would release great religious energies.¹⁹⁹ Rabbi Joseph Lookstein said that there would be a, “two-way pipeline connecting the Jews of America with the Yishuv of Palestine.” From American Jews they would get money, weapons, and manpower; and from Palestine they would get “pure Jewish tradition.”²⁰⁰ Dr. Belkin talked about the importance of Zionism for Jewish spiritual life. Zionism would provide Jewish awareness and Orthodox religious life, said Norman Lamm.²⁰¹ Rabbi Meyer Berlin, chair of world Mizrachi, said that only in Palestine could Judaism exist on a permanent basis and that Hebrew culture depended upon the influence and nourishment it derived from Palestine.²⁰²

Jung saw Jews in Palestine as “chosen” to set a good example; it would not be a nation like other nations; it would lead by the example of virtuous behaviour. This was a classic Orthodox view that derived from biblical sources:

In accordance with the religious teachings of the Holy Torah, continuing its exemplary pioneering in National righteousness and stimulated by the dynamic influence of the new awareness all over the world, the Jews will take up again the challenge of the social imperatives of the Torah and by applying precedent to the new conditions make contributions towards a better world of tomorrow.²⁰³

Though Jung held a traditional view of Israel, he at the same time felt that Orthodoxy could survive the challenge of modernity and flourish in the context of Jewish sovereignty. Palestine represented “full stature” for Jews. Jews had a country, like everybody else did. Now Jews were equals among equals.²⁰⁴ Israel was a sign that Jews fit into the modern world.²⁰⁵ Israel represented the harmonization of ancient Jewish tradition with the requirements of a modern industrialized state.

6.ii. Contrasting Orthodox Views

In the forties Mizrachi and Agudat Israel’s rivalry intensified. As late as 1942, Rabbi Jung was addressing audiences on the significance of Agudat Israel; however, he quit his membership, after there was a State of Israel when Agudat Israel would not cooperate with the Israeli government, even on non-religious affairs.²⁰⁶ Although Jung had understood the fear of Agudists about the modern godless world and a Palestine dominated by secular Zionism, he, too, lost his ambiguity regarding Zionism. Rabbi Jung moved closer to Rav Kook’s philosophy, which could accept man’s intervention in the creation of the State of Israel.²⁰⁷ Jung still felt that Israel was indeed a Jewish and not a secular state; he cited as proof that there were kosher kitchens in workingmen’s hospitals and health resorts, even those belonging to the leftist groups.²⁰⁸

Though Rabbi Silver the president of Agudat Israel of America favoured a Jewish State, the organization Agudat Israel did not.²⁰⁹ A symposium under the auspices of the

Jewish Affairs Committee of RIETS in 1946 exposed the politically discordant and divergent views. Agudat Israel, unlike Mizrachi, could not accept any politics infused into the Zionist idea though both groups agreed that Zionism began at Sinai and not in London, recognizing the religious component.²¹⁰ Mizrachi felt that Orthodox interests could best be served by remaining in the government.

Also Agudat Israel was fearful that Mizrachi was interfering with their schools in Eretz Israel. They set up the Vaad Ha Yeshivot to prevent Mizrachi from interfering and to see that no secular and alien trends entered their schools.²¹¹ After the war there was also friction between Mizrachi and Agudat Israel's Roshei Yeshivas, who were becoming a prime force in American Orthodoxy.²¹²

6.iii. Rabbi Jung's Efforts

Rabbi Jung's efforts represented some of Modern Orthodoxy's involvements. He accepted an invitation to be a member of the enlarged Jewish Agency. His congregation raised money for Jewish National Fund, which he described as a organization that united all shades of political and religious opinion.²¹³ Jung became affiliated with Poalei Agudah, which more readily supported the Jewish nationalist movement.²¹⁴ Poalei Agudah was a strongly social minded and kibbutz- oriented movement that made a significant mark on the Israeli scene. It had ties with Zionism through the Jewish agency, took an active role in building the land and this led to a breach with Agudat Israel.²¹⁵ It became distinct from its parent organization the Agudat Israel.²¹⁶ Unlike the Agudat Israel, the Poalei Aguda frequently supported the government. Rabbi Jung commented that the Orthodox working men, Poalei Hamizrachi and Poalei Agudah did not generally

ask questions about political affiliation, but they worked together to make Judaism safe in the Holy Land. The Poalei Hamizrachi (Mizrachi labour) in between the war years emerged as a group who, like Poalei Agudah, placed importance on Torah, based on social ideals. Poalei Hamizrachi gained members and was strengthened by settlers from Nazi-ravaged lands. Its accomplishments were great in pioneering the creation of religious collective and cooperative farming settlements. The organization developed a stronger following in America than Poalei Agudah and they, unlike Poale Agudah, did eventually reunite with their parent organization Mizrachi.

The American Fund for Palestine Institutions, which supported eighty-six institutions from opera to Beth Jacob, from Habimah (the theatre) to Yeshiva Institutions, sent Rabbi Jung to Palestine. It was established in 1942 to co-ordinate fund raising for Palestinian institutions. There were two special committees in charge of traditional institutions, one in New York and one in the Holy Land, both composed of prominent Mizrachists, Agudists and other Orthodox leaders, Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Jung was part of this committee. It examined applications and made recommendations to the American Fund and so Jung reported that the American Fund had become important in the life of religious institutions.²¹⁷ Jung remarked that the non-religious institutions connected with the Fund, as institutions, observed the Sabbath and Holy Days.²¹⁸

Jung also went as chair of the JDC Cultural Committee. The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee needed help in supporting Yeshivas. However, the Jewish Agency was overburdened and could not support Jewish culture so the American Fund for Palestine filled the gap and this was most welcomed. In addition, Jung represented the American Beth Jacob Committee, which was building a seminary in Jerusalem to honour

the ninety-three Beth Jacob girls who had committed suicide rather than submit to Nazi violation.

In 1947 on his second trip to Eretz Israel, Jung visited Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog to consult with him on Halakhic problems.²¹⁹ He met with leaders of both Mizrachi and Agudat Israel. He met with Rabbi Meyer Berlin, President of World Mizrachi, Rabbi I.M. Lewin of Agudah, Dr. Jacob Engel of Mizrachi, and he spoke at Beth Jacob Seminary for Girls. He also visited Rabbi Avraham Yeshayahu Karelitz, known as the Hazon Ish, one of the great sages of modern times, an authority on matters relating to Jewish law and a strong influence on religious life and institutions in B'nai Brak; they discussed Torah and Palestine. Jung said that the Hazon Ish encouraged him to come to live in Eretz Israel and to bring his congregation along with him. Jung did return to America where he encouraged Jews to visit and to send their children to Eretz Israel to at least visit.²²⁰

6.iv. New Approach After War: Age of the Pioneer

The Hazon Ish had requested that Jung encourage aliyah. Encouraging aliyah represented a new approach for what Jung referred to as the “age of the pioneer.” There were periods in history when philanthropists loomed very large, other times when the shtadlan, one who pleaded for his people, were important, but now, according to Jung, the pioneer was important.²²¹ Jung described two types of pioneers, one who worked the land and fought for the land and also the pioneers of the Torah who constituted the spiritual army.²²² The pioneers of the land fought to restore the land and the others fought to restore the soul. Both were important to Modern Orthodoxy. After the creation of the

state, there was an increase in tourism to the Holy Land; Modern Orthodox organizations, as well as many other Jewish organizations, organized more tours to visit Israel.²²³

Yeshiva established scholarships to send rabbis to Israel feeling that they would get inspirational training at the source of Torah.²²⁴ Yeshiva newspapers highlighted former Yeshiva University students who had gone to live there and work on kibbutzim.²²⁵ The message from Yeshiva was that Yeshiva students must form the backbone of religious pioneering; that is what Modern Orthodoxy was espousing.²²⁶ In 1949, Yeshiva University gave a platform to Rabbi Isaac Herzog, Chief Rabbi Of Israel, who said, “American students of Jewish law should spend five years of study in Israel.”²²⁷ Yeshiva urged its students to at least visit Israel even if they did not plan to remain.²²⁸

7. HALAKHIC ISSUES

7.i. Increased Attention

Toward the end of the war and in the post-war period there began a demand for total ideological consistency and a demand for unequivocal observance of Halakhah on the part of the Modern Orthodox movement. Pulpit rabbis were asked by their rabbinic organizations to carry the message to their congregants and to be knowledgeable about what they were talking about.²²⁹ Rabbi Soloveitchik said that in religious and Halakhic matters Orthodox leaders must be autonomous and militant.²³⁰ This contrasted with the fear of demanding too much that was prevalent in the twenties and thirties. There was increased interest in the area of Halakhah and this was good for the Orthodox movement and the Orthodox way of life as adherence to Halakhah is what Orthodoxy stood for.

With the State of Israel, Jewish law received new impetus.²³¹ In the area of Halakhic issues the decisions required by the modern rabbi pertaining to the war, the State of Israel and new technology necessitated the expansion of the rabbi's areas of expertise. At the end of the forties, the Jewish State and Jewish law became important and often-discussed topics of Halakhic discourse.²³²

During World War Two Orthodox chaplains got experience in handling religious problems. During the war the responsa committee of CANRA, of which Rabbi Jung was the Orthodox representative, faced questions on disinterment and reinterment, autopsies, questions regarding Kohens coming in contact with the dead on the field, dietary laws, conditional gets, (Jewish divorces) marriages, time of the Sabbath in the Arctic and new technology .The RCA in particular was concerned with the agunah problem and Rabbi Mordecai Stern prepared a document to be signed by a soldier before he left for war, which constituted a "conditional get."²³³ The topic of the agunah received increased attention; the RCA devoted an entire session to the problem of the post war agunah.²³⁴ Still many Orthodox leaders agree that the problem remained unsolved because the Orthodox did not make a definite stand on the issue.

The State of Israel brought to the fore many Halakhic complexities and the rediscovery of special injunctions. The discourse centered on the application of Traditional Jewish Law in the State. There was a need for a comprehensive analysis of Torah concepts and the establishment of legal precedents that would govern the Jewish state. There were active Halakhic discussions concerning issues such as the status of Jerusalem as an international city.²³⁵ The challenge was to harmonize the ancient Jewish tradition with the requirements of a modern industrialized state.²³⁶ This was like Modern

Orthodoxy itself, which had to adjust to the modern technological world while observing the life of Torah.

The forties saw expansion in technology and in medical and scientific knowledge. This led to new questions. These new situations needed careful Halakhic examination.²³⁷ Rabbis had to be prepared with answers; they had to learn the Halakhah well and consult with Halakhic authorities. The American rabbi, in short, had to become more learned.

7.ii. Synagogue Issues

7.ii.1. Mechitza

Mixed seating was still an issue but there was a call for a well-defined and definite policy regarding mixed pews. Mixed pews were denounced in 1947 by Rabbi Samuel Belkin who felt that a synagogue could not be considered a traditional synagogue if there were mixed pews. He was quoted as saying:

The Yeshiva cannot and will not sanction this abrogation of the most essential and most characteristic element in the synagogue.²³⁸

On the other hand, Conservative Rabbi Louis Ginsberg, in 1947, changed his mind and agreed that there could be mixed seating; that the resisting minority should yield to the majority, who wanted this. In the twenties and thirties he had been against mixed seating. The difference between Orthodox and Conservative would no longer be one of degree of actual observance but of ideology. An example of this is that Orthodoxy claimed that its decision regarding mechitza was based in Halakhah and the Conservative factions also claimed that their decision was based in Halakhah. The point is that the

Modern Orthodox movement and the Conservative movement were moving further apart; Modern Orthodoxy was defining its stance on issues in a clearer, more definite way.

7.ii.2. Microphone

The issue of the use of the microphone in an Orthodox synagogue on Shabbat and holidays was raised. Though Simcha Levy, chair of the Halakhic Committee of the Rabbinical Council, eventually gave his approval for using microphones, this issue remained controversial in the forties, partly because the majority of the Agudat Harrabonim was against its use, because the Chief Rabbinate in Palestine prohibited its use, because Joseph B. Soloveichik had not given his approval, and because not all the RCA Halakhic committee members had given approval.²³⁹ Levy's approval was given, citing the scientific knowledge that was available.²⁴⁰ As Louis Bernstein pointed out, the American rabbis were still too timid and unsure of themselves to make a definite decision on their own; this issue was an example of this.²⁴¹ Some rabbis stated that the roshei yeshiva should be consulted; others felt that they should rely on themselves. The growing power and influence of the roshei yeshiva would be felt even more in the following decades and that conflict would remain in Modern Orthodox circles. Rabbi Jung was consulted on this issue but his answer could not be found; however there was never a microphone used in his own synagogue.²⁴² The discussion and background work that was ongoing in the forties led to its resolution in the fifties.

7.ii.3. Decorum

Chaplain Norman Siegal, supervisor of Jewish chaplains of the Pacific Ocean Area, speaking at a gathering of friends of service men sponsored by the Yeshiva College Alumni Association, felt that the boys who had become more religious during the war needed to come back to a “clean orderly synagogue.”²⁴³ Decorum continued to be a Modern Orthodox issue, but it is as if the discussion needed reopening and a defence. This was a harbinger of things to come.

7.ii.4. Kashrut

In this area progress was made in the forties. Questions posed by the consumer in the area of kashrut lessened, as there was more packaged food, although packaged food meant more complicated supervision.²⁴⁴ Rabbi Jung continued his efforts to see that the kashrut industry was well supervised and enforced.²⁴⁵ Jung continued to fight those who issued individual hechshers by strengthening the efforts of the RCA and in the forties there were less private hechsherim.²⁴⁶ He stood for uniformity in kashrut supervision. All payments of Mashgichim, or supervisors, had to be paid through the office of the Union.²⁴⁷ This prevented corrupt practices, such as bribery and ensured uniformity and consistency in kashrut supervision. Jung wrote that hillul hashem (desecration of God’s name) had been caused by these corrupt methods; he was very vehement in his condemnation.

I had taken measures to assure the unanimous passing of a resolution that would prohibit any individual Rabbi from endorsing for gain any article advertised as kosher. I need not grow eloquent to you on the catastrophic consequences of this evil custom.²⁴⁸

Jung continued to criticize the members of the Agudat Harabbonim who he said had for the last twenty-five years received payment for individual hechshers. The OU symbol challenged the older rabbis' way of earning a living and Jung acknowledged that the members of the Agudat Harabbonim resented him personally for his efforts, which they saw as contrary to their interests.²⁴⁹ Leo Jung was chair of the Vaad HaKavod, the RCA'S court of honour, which was involved with the problem of withdrawing hechsherim from two Agudat Harabbonim rabbis.²⁵⁰ The case was fought in the courts; it was the kashrut commission of the RCA versus the two rabbis and the victory went to the RCA. The RCA's determination to maintain kashrut as a public trust on the American scene was strengthened.²⁵¹ This case led the RCA and the UOJCA to refine and make more definite policies regarding applications, endorsements and supervision in the forties.²⁵²

Jung continued to lobby with government officials to prevent fraud in the industry.²⁵³ He worked with state Senator Walter Mahoney of New York who helped to see that kosher laws were clarified and proper inspectors and supervisors were in place. The Advisory Board, which in 1940 became a statutory official board in the Department of Agriculture and Markets for New York, assisted in appointing qualified inspectors. Rabbi Jung was chair of this board for thirty years. From 1934 to 1964, close to 3000 cases were prosecuted by this board. This had a positive effect on the kashrut industry.²⁵⁴ Jung claimed that New York was the first state to punish fraud and protect consumers with fair pricing to improve kashrut facilities.²⁵⁵

Non-kosher affairs by Jewish organizations continued.²⁵⁶ Jung had joined the American Jewish Committee to promote unity among American Jews but with regard to

its dinner, he wrote: "I feel that no Orthodox Jew should ever accept any invitation to a Jewish affair that is not prepared and served in accordance with Jewish Law."²⁵⁷ Jung would not accept even if kosher food was provided for him.

Jung became chair of the Kashrut Committee, which he had initiated, in Beth Israel Hospital. Also on the committee were Rabbi Joseph Lookstein and Rabbi Herbert Goldstein.²⁵⁸ This facility was important; an added help or incentive for those who kept kosher.

7.ii.5. Sabbath

The effort continued without ultimate success, to see to it that those who followed the Halakhah of Sabbath observance were able to do so, without too many difficulties. On 14 January, 1945, under the auspices of the Council of Religious Observance of Washington Heights, the first rally was held to urge Jewish shops to close and to encourage Sabbath observance.²⁵⁹ In 1947, UOJCA called together several representatives of Jewish organizations to enact legislation to enable Sabbath observers to remain open on Sundays, as they were unable to keep open on Saturdays. All organizations were urged to contact their legislators.²⁶⁰ This represented another effort in a long history of efforts to amend the ongoing penal law and to obtain suitable legislation to permit Sabbath observing merchants to operate on Sunday. Efforts were made, but results were still slow in coming.

8. CONCLUSION

The decade of the forties was marked with despair, discontent with the status quo and hope with the end of the war and the advent of the State of Israel. The Holocaust had given the American Modern Orthodox movement, as well as all Jewish movements a new role. The Holocaust was the ultimate example that modernity had failed and for many it meant that they were open to a new more positive look at religion. The cry of Rabbi Jung to give religion a more important role was heard and appreciated by groups and individuals. There was a new, improved image of the rabbi and of religion itself and of the Jewish people. The American Modern Orthodox movement showed that it was up to the task and that it had matured. It showed the ability to adapt, to lead, to inspire and to compete. Its many varied outreach programs showed some success.

The forties saw new and very capable leadership for Modern Orthodoxy. Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik emerged as leader, which was a sign that there would be some unity and direction in the movement. In the land of Israel, the chief rabbinate served to centralize, unify and provide leadership for Orthodoxy in Israel as well as in America. There was also new leadership at Yeshiva University, which was earning a fine reputation as a religious and secular institute. Because of the new leadership, issues and what Modern Orthodoxy stood for became better defined and would continue to be better defined in the fifties.

There was expansion and further development in the areas of education, kashrut facilities, and participation in social, political and cultural endeavours. Orthodox newcomers to America after the war, made Orthodoxy more visible; they provided examples of dedicated religious living.

All these happenings bode well for Modern Orthodoxy; the groundwork for greater achievements was being laid as Modern Orthodox faced the decade of the fifties.

- ¹ Jonathan Sarna . “Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue.” The American Synagogue Transformed. Ed. Jack Wertheimer. Cambridge; [Cambridgeshire] N.Y.: Brandeis University Press, University Press of New England, Hanover by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987, 380.
- ² “Grinstein Authors Volume On Early Jewish Community.” The Commentator 22.3 (a Yeshiva newspaper) 29 November , 1945, 2. Yeshiva University Archives. Alexander Brody, “American Jewish History Viewed From New Outlook.” The Commentator 24.3, 21 November 1946, 4. . Yeshiva University Archives.
- ³ “Professor L. Jung Edits New Publication On Jewish Problems.” The Commentator 23.6, 9 May , 1946 , 1. Yeshiva University Archives.
- ⁴ “Grinstein Authors Volume On Early Jewish Community.” 29 November, 1946, The Commentator 22.3, 2. Y.U. Archives.
- ⁵ Leo Jung. “Religion in the American Dream.” Mutual’s Radio Chapel, Station WOR, 6 May, 1945 .Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5. (published articles) Leo Jung .“American Religion –Its Opportunity and Responsibility,” Message of Israel, station WJZ, 17 June, 1945. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 46, Folder 4. Leo Jung. “Judaism and The New World Order, 11 The Problems of Sovereignty and Minorities. ” Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5. (published articles) (also in The American Journal Of Economics and Sociology 4.4, July 1945, 515-528 and in Leo Jung. Israel of Tomorrow . N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946.) Leo Jung. “Social Engineering.” Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 44, Folder 1. (also in Jewish Forum ,October 1946.)

⁶ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 111. "Garda Revealed As Anonymous Donor of Ben David Prize." Commentator 24. 1 (19 September 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.

⁷ "Garda Revealed As Anonymous Donor of ben David Prize." The Commentator 24.1 (19 Sept., 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.

⁸ "Graduation Set June 17." The Commentator 29.5 (12 May 1949): 1 .Y.U. Archives. Y.U. Records Public Relations, Folder For Honorary Degrees 1947-1968.

⁹ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year-5701 United States." The American Jewish Year Book vol. 43, (22 Sept. 1941 to 11 Sept. 1942): 32-35.

¹⁰ Letter from Jung to Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, 9 February, 1956. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Folder 42, Box 1. (Autobiographical letters) Photocopy of The Congress of the United States, The Selective Service Medal. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Folder 40, Box 7.

¹¹ Letter to Leo Jung from Paul Baerwald, 10 March 1943. JDC Archives. File 93, 1933-44.

¹² " Dr. Jung Says Gentile World Needs Judaism." The Commentator 26.5 (1 January 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹³ Leo Jung. "Palestine Today." third page of article. (no page numbers) Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 44, Folder 3. (article also in Jewish Forum Sept. and Oct. 1947) Address delivered at a reception to Rabbi Jung by the American Fund for the Palestine Institute, Essex House, N.Y., June 4,1947.

¹⁴ Letter from Nathan Ratcoff, M.D. to Rabbi Jung, 30 November 1942. Letter to

Senator Walter Mahoney from Rabbi Jung, 1 May 1941. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 44, Folder 2.

¹⁵ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. New York: Shengold Publishers, Inc., 1982, 9.

¹⁶ Ibid. 256.

¹⁷ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall, 1976): 39.

¹⁸ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16. 2 (Fall, 1976): 39.

¹⁹ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall 1976): 39- 40 ,43.

²⁰ Albert Isaac Slomovitz. The Fighting Rabbis:A History of Jewish Military Chaplains 1860-1945. Ann Arbor ,Michigan: UMI dissertation Services,1996, 169. Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall, 1976) : 45; 55. (Re the Korean War-Rabbi Soloveitchik wrote to Rabbi Klavan saying that it was permitted to volunteer with sanctions to be imposed for refusal to participate.)

²¹ Phillip S. Bernstein. Rabbis At War: The CANRA Story. Waltham, Mass.: American Jewish historical Society,1971, 55-56.

²² Harry Schneiderman. "Review of The Year 5701 United States." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 43. (Sept. 22, 1941-Sept. 11, 1942), 32-35. Jeffrey Gurock. "Resistors and Accommodators", Jeffrey Gurock, American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing Hopuse Inc., 1996, 57-59 (for an explanation of who

the Keneseth Harabanim were)

²³ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall, 1976): 38. Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 239.

²⁴ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16. 2 (Fall 1976): 40.

²⁵ Ibid . 40-41.

²⁶ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 14-15.

²⁷ Letter from Congregation Ramath Orah , 28 January 1945. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Folder 1, Box 5.

²⁸ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall 1976): 38-39.

²⁹ Gilbert Kollin. "The Impact of the Military Chaplaincy On American Rabbinate, 1861-1976." Gilbert Rosenthal , ed. The American Rabbinate. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1977, 30.

³⁰ Sidney B. Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi as Military Chaplain." Tradition 16.2 (Fall 1976): 41. Albert Isaac Slomovitz. The Fighting Rabbis; A History of Jewish Military Chaplains 1860-1945. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1996, 202-203.

³¹ Sidney Hoenig. "The Orthodox Rabbi as Military Chaplain." Tradition 16. 2 (Fall 1976): 42.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid

³⁴ Ibid. 43.

³⁵ Ibid. 44- 45.

³⁶ Ibid. 42-43

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid. 43.

³⁹ “Chaplain Siegal Speaks At Edison.” The Commentator 20.6 (18 Jan.1945) 1. Y.U.

Archives.

⁴⁰ Letter from Aryeh Lev of The National Welfare Board requesting summary of “Divrai Torah,” 8 Dec. 1949. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 7.

⁴¹ Letter from De Sola Pool to Jung, 7 Sept. 1944. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 4.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Albert Isaac Slomovitz. The Fighting Rabbis: A History of Jewish Military Chaplains, 1860-1945. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1996, 180,196.

⁴⁴ Letter to Rev. Father J. Elliot Ross, 16 March 1944. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 7.

⁴⁵ “Y.C. Alumni Takes To Air.” The Commentator 20.6 (18 Jan.,1945): 1. Y.U.

Archives.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Letter from Jung to Haym Gitler (Poele Agudat Israel) Aug.1946. Y.U. Archives, Jung

Collection, Box 1, Folder 6.

⁴⁹ Milton Konvitz . "Leo Jung Rabbi For All Jews." 39. (also in Midstream Aug/Sept. 1993) Y.U. Archives, P.R. Files- Leo Jung.

⁵⁰ Leo Jung. The Path of a Pioneer. The Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 140.

⁵¹ Many letters requesting help. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 1.

⁵² Letter to Honorable Sol Bloom from Jung, 14 April 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection. Box 1, Folder 4.

⁵³ Efraim Zuroff. The Response Of Orthodox Jewry In The United States To The Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of Yeshiva University Press; Hoboken , New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 2000, 245.

⁵⁴ Aaron Rakeffet Rothkoff. The Silver Era . Jerusalem, N.Y.: Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 218.

⁵⁵ Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jewry in The United States To The Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of Yeshiva University Press; Hoboken ,New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 2000, 34.

⁵⁶ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980 , 173.

⁵⁷ Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jewry in the United States to The Holocaust. N.Y.; The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of Yeshiva University Press: Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 2000, 33, 38 and forward.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 33.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 65, 131, 255. Minutes of JDC Meeting, 16 February 1944. JDC Archives. File 93 (1933/44).

⁶⁰ Letter to Harry Dickstein from Joseph Hyman, Executive Vice Chair of JDC, 31 August 1944. JDC Archives. File 362.

⁶¹ Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jewry in the United States to the Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of Yeshiva University Press; Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 2000, 132, 252. Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff . Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 201.

⁶² Efraim Zuroff. introduction. Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jewry in The United States To The Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of The Yeshiva University Press; Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Pub. House Inc., 2000)

⁶³ Letter to Harry Dickstein from Joseph Hyman, Executive Vice President JDC, 31 August 1944. JDC Archives. File 362 (1933-44).

⁶⁴ Letter to Rabbi Wohlelernter , chair Vaad Hahatzala Committee of RCA ,from Joseph Hyman, 16 November 1943, 2. JDC Archives. File 361 (1933/44).

⁶⁵ Letter to Joseph Hyman from Henry Montor, Exec Vice –Chair of UJA, 14 May 1943. JDC Archives. File 361 (1933/44).

⁶⁶ Letter to Harry Dickstein from Joseph Hyman, 31 August 1944. JDC Archives. File 362.

⁶⁷ Letter to Jung from Jacob Rosenheim, head of Agudat Israel, 26 December 1944. JDC Archives. File 93 (1933/44).

⁶⁸ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8,

London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 172.

⁶⁹ Cable to Rabbi Herzog from Jung, 9 December 1944. JDC Archives . File 93.

⁷⁰ Rakeffet-Rothkoff. The Silver Era . Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 189, 200-201. Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jewry to the Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of The yeshiva University Press; Hoboken, N.J., 2000, 119,126.

⁷¹ “Vaad Hatzala Achieves Goal of Raising \$25,000.” The Commentator 20.6 (18 January 1945): 1. Y.U. Archives.

⁷² Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview . 16 January 2003 . Rabbi Lamm commented on the good relationship with Rabbi Kotler. Also found in the Jung files was friendly correspondence between Rabbi Kotler and Jung.

⁷³ Efraim Zuroff. The Response of Orthodox Jews to the Holocaust. N.Y.: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of the Yeshiva University Press; Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 2000, 126.

⁷⁴ “Vaad Hatazlah Achieves Record Goal of \$25,000.” The Commentator 20.6 (18 January 1945): 1. Y.U. Archives .

⁷⁵ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishing Inc., 1982, 162.

⁷⁶ Mrs. Sadie Silverstein. (President of The Rabbonim Aid Society for many years, old member of the Jewish Center Synagogue since the early forties) personal interview. 19 November 1997.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1, Folder 7. Letter from Aryeh Lev, National Welfare Board, 8 December 1949.

⁷⁹ Leo Jung. "Program for 5701." B'nai Brith Messenger combined with The Jewish Community Press Friday , 27 September 1940, 24.

⁸⁰ Leo Jung, "American Religion- Its Opportunity and Responsibility." from "Message of Israel", Radio Station WJZ, June 17, 1945, second page. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 44, Folder 1.

⁸¹ Leo Jung. "Jewish Foundations of the New World Order." Leo Jung , ed. Israel of Tomorrow . The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 4.

⁸² "American Religion- Its Opportunities and Responsibilities." on "Message Of Israel" radio 17 June 1945 .Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 5. "Religion in the American Dream." on Mutual's Radio Chapel Station WOR, Sunday, 6 May 1945. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 46, Folder 4.

⁸³ Leo Jung. "Jewish Foundations of the New World Order." Leo Jung , ed. Israel of Tomorrow . The Jewish Library, Vol. 5 N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 12.

⁸⁴ Ibid . 8.

⁸⁵ Leo Jung. "The Challenges of Today." Leo Jung ,ed. Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses, and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 259.

⁸⁶ Leo Jung. "Rome and Jerusalem." Leo Jung, ed. Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 219.

⁸⁷ Leo Jung. " The Challenges of Today." Leo Jung, ed. Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 259.

- ⁸⁸ Leo Jung. "Jewish Foundations of the New World Order." Leo Jung. Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 4.
- Leo Jung. Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 45-46.
- ⁸⁹ "Religion In The American Dream." Mutual's Radio Chapel Station WOR , 6 May 1945. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 46, Folder 4.
- ⁹⁰ Leo Jung. "Judaism and The New World Order." The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 4. 4 (July 1945): 519.(Also at Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5-Published articles)
- ⁹¹ Leo Jung . "The Rights of Majorities." Crumbs and Character: Sermons, Addresses, and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 229.
- ⁹² Letter from Salo Baron to Jung, 29 October 1943. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 16, Folder 2.
- ⁹³ Letter to Editor, Mr. Will Lissner from Rabbi Jung, 11 October 1944. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 16, Folder 2.
- ⁹⁴ Letter to Dr Harry Emerson Fosdick, 12 February 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1 Folder 4. "American Religion-Its Opportunity and Responsibility." Message of Israel, Station WJZ , 17 June 1945, 2. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 46, Folder 4.
- ⁹⁵ Letter to Reverend Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, 12 February 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Files, Box 1, Folder 4.
- ⁹⁶ Leo Jung. "The Problems of Sovereignty and of Minorities." The American Journal of

Economics and Sociology 4.4 (July 1945): 516. (Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5-published articles)

⁹⁷ Leo Jung. “ Jewish Foundations of the New World Order.” Leo Jung ,ed. Israel of Tomorrow . The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.; Herald Square, Press, 1946, 10.

Letter to Honorable Secretary, Religion United, Calcutta, 21 July 1944; Letter Examination Yuan National Government, Chungking China ,23 August 1944. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 3.

⁹⁸ Letter to Jung From Harry Emerson Fosdick, 18 February 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 4.

⁹⁹ William Jennings Bryan had attacked Fosdick(Scopes Trial) and this controversy made him a world figure. He fought fundamentalism and was a liberal activist.

¹⁰⁰ Letter to Mrs. Chiang Kai- Shek, 17 February 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1. Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 210. (Moslem representative said that they were not children of God but slaves of God----to point to an example)

¹⁰¹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London. N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 210.

¹⁰² Isaac Breuer. “ Judaism and The World of Tomorrow.” Leo Jung, ed. Israel of Tomorrow.N.Y. Herald Square Press, 1946, 88.

¹⁰³ William Weiss. “Democracy on Trial.” Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 44, Folder 4.

¹⁰⁴“General Romulo Emphasizes Bond Between Faith and Freedom.” The Commentator

30.5 (19 Dec. 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁰⁵ “Symposium Studies Jewry In America.” The Commentator 29.5 (12 May 1949): 4.
Y.U. Archives.

¹⁰⁶ Letter to Siegmund Hanover from Jung. 2 November 1945. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung
Collection, Box 1 Folder 5.

¹⁰⁷ “Congregations on the Increase”, Yeshiva and Yeshiva College News 2.2 (Dec.
1944) 2. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Y.U. Archives. News and Views.1.6. (May 1944): Box 19, Folder 4. Chaplain
Emanuel Rackman. “A Chaplain Speaks.” 3.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Letter to Jung from Jacob Rosenheim, 5 January 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung
Collection, Box 40, Folder 7.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ “Forward” written by Jung attached to “The Martyrs of Warsaw” and sent to the New
York Times on American Beth Jacob Committee Inc. stationary. The story appeared in
the New York Times on 8 January 1943. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder
7.

¹¹⁵ Judy Baumel. e-mail to Maxine Jacobson. 9 October 1997.

¹¹⁶ Minutes of Meeting of Cultural Committee , 21 March 1950. JDC Archives. File
#3390.

¹¹⁷ Judith Tydor Baumel. e-mail to Maxine Jacobson. 9 October 1997. (Ani Ma’amin

means “ I believe” and refers to the coming of the Messiah.)

¹¹⁸ Judith Tydor Baumel email to Maxine Jacobson 9 October 1997. Judith Tydor Baumel and Jacob J. Schacter wrote “The Ninety-three Bais Yaacov Girls of Cracow: History or Typology? Internet <http://www.rav.org/library/listing.htm>

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Leo Jung. “Jewry Today.(An Interview)” Jewish Forum 19.7 (September 1936): 202.

¹²¹ “Rabbi Soloveitchik’s Address,” The Commentator 25.3 (20 March 1947): 4. Y.U. Archives.

¹²² Leo Jung, “Program for 5701,” (1940) The Modern View. 43. (also in B’nai Brith Messenger and The Jewish Community Press Friday ,27 Sept 1940, 25.) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 23, Folder 2.

¹²³ Gilbert Kollin.”The Impact of the Military Chaplancy on American Rabbinate.” Gilbert Rosenthal,ed. The American Rabbi: a Tribute on the Occasion of the Bicentennial of the U.S., and the Ninety-fifth Birthday of the N.Y. Board of Rabbis. N.Y.: Ktav Publication House, 1977, 24.

¹²⁴ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbi. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 135.

¹²⁵ Gilbert Kollin. “ The Impact of the Military Chapalincy on American Rabbinate.” Gilbert Rosenthal, ed. The American Rabbi: A Tribute on the Occasion of the Bicentennial of the U.S. and the Ninety-fifth Birthday of the N.Y. Board of Rabbis. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House, 1977, 34.

¹²⁶ “ Celebrities To Attend 13th Annual Affair at Hotel Astor, ” Yeshiva College

Quarterly 4.5 (December 1941): 2. Y.U. Archives.

¹²⁷ Leo Jung. "Program for 5701" (1940) The Modern View . 43 . (Article also in Bnai Brith Messenger and The Jewish Community Press, 27 September 1940, 25.) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 23, Folder 2.

¹²⁸ Harry Schneiderman. "Review of the Year 5701-United States." American Jewish Year Book . 43 (Sept 22, 1941 -Sept 22, 1942): 33.

¹²⁹ Wolf Baltberg. "Polish Jewry, Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow." Leo Jung, ed. Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library., vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 369.

¹³⁰ Excerpts from Rabbi Leo Jung's Sermon First Day Rosh Hashona. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 21, Folder 11.

¹³¹ Excerpts from Rabbi Leo Jung's Sermon, Second Day of Rosh Hashanah. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 21. Folder 11.

¹³² "Libraries Receive Rare Collections," The Commentator 30. 5 (19 December 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹³³ Telegram from Kalman Kahane, Jacob Landau, Benjamin Mintz. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 5.

¹³⁴ Correspondence with Bernard Turk, 28 October 1945; 21 November 1945. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 5.

¹³⁵ "Mr. Sar Journeys Abroad for JDC." The Commentator 27.1 (19 February 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹³⁶ Leo Jung. "New Years Program." Crumbs and Characters: Sermons, Addresses and Essays. N.Y.: Night and Day Press, 1942, 155-56.

- ¹³⁷ "Response To Critique," 15 March 1945. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1, Folder 5.
- ¹³⁸ Ibid. Response to Reform Rabbi's critique of his stance on Parochial schools
- ¹³⁹ "Jewish Ledger", New Orleans, LA and Orthodox Tribune, March 1945. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1, Folder 5.
- ¹⁴⁰ "Rabbinical Council Plans For Future," The Commentator 24.1 (19 September 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴¹ "NCY Academic Progress Hindered by Lack of Unity," The Commentator 29. 1 (24 February 1949): 2. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴² "Executive Board Formed," Yeshiva College Quarterly 4. 5 (December 1941): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴³ Dr. S. Margoshes. "Department of Hebrew Culture at N.Y. University, The Hebrew Contribution to Civilization, On Interracial Understanding," News and Views 38. (20 November 1947): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴⁴ Letter James M. Hester(President of New York University) from Jung , 12 May 1971. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 16, Folder 11.
- ¹⁴⁵ " Courses in Hebrew Culture at NYU." The New York Times, Sunday, 9 November 1947 . Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 16, Folder 11.
- ¹⁴⁶ "N.Y.U. Department Head Addresses Cercle," The Commentator 27. 6 (13 January 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴⁷ "Bible Courses Required For Future Rabbis," The Commentator 24.3 (21 November 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.

- ¹⁴⁸ “N.Y.C. Academic Program Hindered by Lack of Unity,” The Commentator (24 February 1949): 2. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴⁹ “Y.U.---A National Asset(Sec’y of Defence Johnson) Program of Americanism Praised By Barkley,” Yeshiva University News 7.1 (Sept. 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵⁰ “College Admits Largest Class,” News Bulletin Yeshiva College . (Dec. 1940): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵¹ “Extension Courses For Adults and Students Introduced At Yeshiva College,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5(Dec. 1941): 2. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵² Bernard Revel. “Our Hope and Thought,” News Bulletin Yeshiva College 2.5 (Dec. 1940): 5. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵³ “Discuss the Role of Synthesis At Third Session,” The Commentator 27.5 (30 December 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵⁴ “Yeshiva College Noted for Publications,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (December 1941): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵⁵ Harry Schneiderman. “Review of the Year 5701-United States.” American Jewish Year Book. Vol. 43. (Sept 1941-Sept 22 1942): 34.
- ¹⁵⁶ “Yeshiva College Noted for Publications,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (December 1941): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵⁷ Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. The Silver Years. Jerusalem , N.Y.:Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 264-267.
- ¹⁵⁸ Gilbert Klaperman. The Story of Yeshiva University. London: Macmillan Company, Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1969, 172.

Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 264-267.

¹⁵⁹ “Executive Board Formed,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (December 1941): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁶⁰ “A New Era,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (Dec. 41): 4. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁶¹ Gilbert Klaperman. The Story of Yeshiva University. London: Macmillan Company, Collier- Macmillan Ltd., 1969, 172.

¹⁶² “A New Era, ” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (Dec. 1941): 4. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁶³ Leo Jung. “Chaim Heller.” Jewish Forum 8.9 (October 1925): 506.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid. 505.

¹⁶⁵ Jeffrey Gurock. The Men and Women of Yeshiva; Higher Education, Orthodoxy and American Judaism . N.Y.: Colombia University Press, 1988, 130-131.

¹⁶⁶ William Helmreich. “Old Wine in New Bottles:Advanced Yeshivot in the United States.” American Jewish History 69. (Dec. 79): 249.

¹⁶⁷ Jeffrey S. Gurock. The Men and Women of Yeshiva; Higher Education,Orthodoxy and American Judaism. N.Y.: Colombia Press , 1988, 138-139. Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkopf, The Silver Era. N.Y., Jerusalem: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 271.

¹⁶⁸ Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.

¹⁶⁹ Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff. The Silver Era. N.Y., Jerusalem: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim publishers, 1981, 271.

¹⁷⁰ “Eidenu Appears In Tribute To Memory of Dr. Revel,” The Commentator 15.4 (26

March 1942): 2. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁷¹ “Faculty Promotions Honor Yeshiva College Scholars,” Yeshiva College Quarterly 4.5 (Dec 1941): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁷² Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 110-111.

¹⁷³ Jeffrey Gurock. The Men and Women of Yeshiva: Higher Education, Orthodoxy and American Judaism. N.Y.: Columbia Press, 1988, 139.

¹⁷⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 111.

¹⁷⁵ “Conference Held: Plans Y.U. Future,” The Commentator 23.6 (9 May 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁷⁶ Peter A. Buckley, Allen G. Weakland. The Private Albert Einstein. Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel, 1992, 85-87.

¹⁷⁷ Internet. Yahoo.Com. Einstein Albert Science and Religion. Article is from Science, Philosophy and Religion, A Symposium, published by Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in their Relationship to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., N.Y., 1941.

¹⁷⁸ Letter to Albert Einstein from Leo Jung, March 1943. Y.U. Archives, Box 1, Folder 4.

¹⁷⁹ “President Belkin:” Yeshiva College News 3.2 (January 1946): 7. Y.U. Archives, Yeshiva and Yeshiva College News, Box 19, Folder 4.

¹⁸⁰ “Conference Held Plans Y.U. Future,” Commentator 23.6 (9 May 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁸¹ “Ed. School Grows New Courses, Faculty,” Yeshiva University News 7.2 (Nov.-

Dec. 19, 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Melvin I. Urofsky. American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975, 421.

“Zionist Youth Take A Stand,” The Commentator 22. 3 (29 November 1945): 2. Y.U. Archives.

“Zionist Congress,” The Commentator 24.6 (16 January 1947): 2. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁸⁴ Melvin I. Urofsky. American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/ Doubleday, 1975, 422.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid. 424.

¹⁸⁶ “Dr. Samuel Belkin Reads Important Statement Before National Orthodox Conference,” Yeshiva and Yeshiva College News 1.6 (Mar. 1944): 2. Y.U. Archives. Melvin I. Urofsky. American Zionism From Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/ Doubleday, 1975, 429.

¹⁸⁷ “Dr. Samuel Belkin Reads Important Statement Before National Orthodox Conference,” Yeshiva and Yeshiva College News 1.6 (March 1944): 2, 4. Y.U. Archives.

¹⁸⁸ Leo Jung, ed. Leo Jung, Preface. Jewish Leaders, 1750-1940. The Jewish Library, vol. 6 , Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1953, 1964 .

¹⁸⁹ Meetings of the Board of Trustees of Jewish Center Synagogue, 17 October 1947. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

¹⁹⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers, Inc., 1982, 52, 211-212.

¹⁹¹ “Yeshiva Hails Birth of Jewish State; Assemblies, Celebration Mark Event, ” The Commentator 24.4 (11 December 1947): 1. Y.U. Archives.

- ¹⁹² “Dr. Soloveitchik Asks Palestine Aid; School of Education To Open In The Fall,” The Commentator 24.6 (15 January 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- “Synagogue Council Acclaims Truman,” The Commentator 29. 7 (June 9 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁹³ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mision The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 53.
- ¹⁹⁴ “Dr. Weiss Reports on Basle Congress,” The Commentator 24.6 (16 January 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁹⁵ Leo Jung. “Jewish Foundations of The New World Order.” Leo Jung Israel of Tomorrow . The Jewish Library. Vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 17.
- ¹⁹⁶ “ Dr. Soloveitchik Asks Palestine Aid: \$15.000 Goal For Campaign,” The Commentator 26.6 (15 January 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.(Hashomer Hatzair is a non-religious ,socialistic Zionist youth group which emphasizes Jewish identity and culture.)
- ¹⁹⁷ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 52.
- ¹⁹⁸ Leo Jung. “Palestine Today,” Jewish Forum (Sept ,Oct. 1947) second page. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5. (published articles)
- ¹⁹⁹ Leo Jung. “The Problem of Sovereignty and Minorities, Judaism and The New World Order,” The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 4.4 (July 1945): 521. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5. (published articles)
- ²⁰⁰ “Present Validity Seen in Ancient Galuth Judaism,” The Commentator 27.2 (11 March 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ²⁰¹ “Symposium Studies Jewry In America,” 4. The Commentator 29.5 (12 May 1949): Y.U. Archives.

- ²⁰² “ Mizrahi Head Speaks Before Gala Assembly,” The Commentator 26.6 (15 January 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ²⁰³ Leo Jung . “Jewish Foundations of the New World Order.” Leo Jung, Ed., Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library, vol. 5, N.Y.: Herald Square Press, 1946, 18.
- ²⁰⁴ Paper headed Kislev 1947. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 46, Folder 4.
- ²⁰⁵ Marty Noam Pencower . The Holocaust and Israel Reborn: From Catastrophe To Sovereignty. Urbana University of Illinois Press, 1994, 435.
- ²⁰⁶ “Dr. Jung Addresses Yeshiva Chapter On Agudah Significance,” The Commentator 15.4 (26 March 1942): 1, 4. Y.U. Archives.
- ²⁰⁷ Milton Konvitz. “Leo Jung Rabbi For All Jews.” Midstream 39.6 (Aug/Sept 1993) 40.
- ²⁰⁸ Leo Jung. “Palestine Today.” Jewish Forum (Sept. and Oct . 1947): third page. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5.
- ²⁰⁹ Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 262.
- ²¹⁰ Ibid. 171.
- “Opposing Factions Review Zionist Stand,” The Commentator 24.4(5 December 1946): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ²¹¹ Ibid.
- ²¹² Aaron Rakeffet Rothcoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Press, 1981, 247.
- ²¹³ Leo Jung,” Palestine Today”, Jewish Forum (Sept ,and Oct. 1947): second page. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5.
- ²¹⁴ Milton Konvitz. “Leo Jung Rabbi For All Jews.” Midstream 39.6(Aug/Sept 1990): 40.
- ²¹⁵ Saul Bernstein. The Renaissance of the Torah Jew. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House,

1985, 62-63.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Leo Jung. "Palestine Today." Jewish Forum (Sept. and Oct. 1947): third page, fourth page. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 5.

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Ibid. fourth page.

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Ibid. second page.

²²² Ibid.

Minutes Executive Meeting of JDC, 17 September 1947, "Report by Rabbi Leo Jung," 2-3. JDC Archives. File # 2409.

²²³ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emeergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 213.

²²⁴ "S.O.Y. To Award Free Israel Trips," The Commentator 29. 3 (24 March 1949): 1. Y.U. Archives.

²²⁵ " Former Yeshiva University Students now Chalutzim in Israel," Yeshiva University News 7.2 (Nov. Dec. 1949): 2. Y.U. Archives.

²²⁶ "Dr. Soloveitchik Asks Palestine Aid; \$15,000 Goal For Campaign," The Commentator 26.6 (15 January 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.

²²⁷ "Chief Rabbi Talks On Halachic Topic," Commentator 29.3 (12 May 1949): 4. Y.U. Archives.

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ "The Yeshiva Rabbi in the Province,". News and Views 1.5 (April, 1944): 1, 4. Y.U. Archives.

- ²³⁰ “ Rabbi Soloveitchik’s Address,” The Commentator 25.3 (20 March 1947): 4. Y.U. Archives.
- ²³¹ Basil F.Herring . Jewish Ethics and Halakhah For Our Time. N.Y.: Ktav Pub House, Inc Yeshiva University Press, 1984 , 19.
- ²³² “Rabbi Drazin’s Lecture on Jewish State, Law,” (One of many examples) The Commentator 27.6 (13_ January 1949): Y.U. Archives.
- ²³³ Sydney B. Hoenig. “The Orthodox Rabbi As A Military Chaplain.” Tradition 16.2 (Fall 1976): 42.
- ²³⁴ Louis Bernstein.Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 241.
- ²³⁵ “Torah’s Use Urged By Agency Expert,” The Commentator (11 March 1948): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ²³⁶ Ibid.
- ²³⁷ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 34
- ²³⁸ “Dr. Belkin Opens Synagogue Panel,” The Commentator 25.3 (20 March 1947): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ²³⁹ Louis Bernstein . Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 38.
- ²⁴⁰ Ibid. 37 –41.
- ²⁴¹ Ibid. 38.
- ²⁴² Letter to Dr. Jung, 4 Dec. 1945. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 5 .

(please note this question came two years before the official decision of the Halachik Committee to okay microphone use.)

²⁴³ “Chaplain Seigal Speaks at Edison,” The Commentator 20.6 (18 January 1945): 1. Y.U. Archives.

²⁴⁴ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 34.

²⁴⁵ Letter to Rabbi Gutterman, from Jung , 24 Feb.1943. Yeshiva University Archives. Jung Collection. Box 1 , Folder 4.

²⁴⁶ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 92-93, 100.

²⁴⁷ Minutes Kashrut Committee of Rabbinical Council 27 June 1940 and Minutes from RCA , 16 Sept. 1948. Y.U. Archives, Konigsberg Files, Box 9 ,Folder 2.

²⁴⁸ Letter to Rabbi Simcha Levy , member of Kashrut committee of Rabbinical Council and Union, 7 July 1941, from Jung. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1.

²⁴⁹ Minutes of the Kashrut Committee of the Rabbinical Council and Union, 27 June 1940 . Yeshiva University Archives, Konigsberg File, Box 41 ,Folder 1.

Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 99.

²⁵⁰ Ibid. 95.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 98.

²⁵² Ibid. . 99.

Minutes of Kashrut Committee of Rabbinical Council and Union , 27 June 1940.
Yeshiva University Archives, Koenigsberg Files, Box 9, Folder 2. (Benjamin Koenigberg was chair of Kashrut Comm of Union---many of the minutes of this committee are in this file and attest to the statement that establishment of definite policies re applications,endorsements and supervision made in 40s.)

²⁵³ Letter to Senator Walter J. Mahoney from Jung, 1 May 1941. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 41, Folder 1.

²⁵⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 249.

²⁵⁵ Ibid. 248.

²⁵⁶ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 120.

²⁵⁷ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y: Soncino Press, 1980, 259.

²⁵⁸ Letter from Nathan Ratcoff, Medical Director of Beth Israel Hospital, 30 November 1942. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1.

²⁵⁹ “Shomer Shabbos Rally Held; Urge Jewish Shops To Close,” The Commentator 20.6 (18 Jan. 1945): 1. Y.U. Archives.

²⁶⁰ Letter from Koenigberg, Chair of UOJCA Committee on Jewish Observance, to Mr. Pfeiffer, 22 Nov. 1948. Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Files, Box 11, Folder 6

MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE FIFTIES

“If I have seen further... it is by standing upon the shoulders of Giants”

(Sir Isaac Newton¹)

1. INTRODUCTION

There were many things that had gone on before the fifties that prepared the way for the movement to the right, to more observance, more identification with the tenets of Orthodox Judaism, and to the tightening of religious standards. This chapter will deal with the issues that led to the movement to the right. Some of these signs were not so evident at the time, but are more evident when looking back.

The increase in Orthodoxy's participation in the Jewish and non-Jewish community, which occurred in the forties, had important consequences, as it prepared its leaders for dealing with the government, for effective outreach and for better experience in attracting adherents. There were certain trends that were good for Modern Orthodoxy. The modern age was under critical scrutiny; the disappointment in the hope that science would produce a just society led to a new appreciation of religion, which opened the way to a religious revival. The advent of the State of Israel strengthened the position of Modern Orthodoxy. In America Modern Orthodoxy had to face the intensified Halakhic standards of newly arrived Holocaust survivors without abandoning its commitment to university education and general culture.

The Holocaust, however, had killed huge numbers of the carriers of tradition; there were fewer examples of knowledgeable and observant people in Eastern Europe, which had served as an important reservoir for Jewish learning. Adults and peer behavior could no longer be counted on to transmit the ways of religious life and this, according to

Haym Soloveitchik, led to an increased reliance on texts, beginning in the fifties.² This new reliance on learning from the inflexible words of the texts led to more stringency in observance of Jewish laws.³

Conservative leaders were still calling Orthodoxy uncreative, stagnant, and confused.⁴ They believed that Orthodoxy was fated to disappear.⁵ Marshall Sklare, well known sociologist and representative of the Conservative thinking, did not see correctly what was going on in Modern Orthodoxy in the fifties, or did not interpret correctly what he saw. He stated:

Orthodox adherents have succeeded in achieving the goal of institutional perpetuation to only a limited extent: the history of their movement in this country can be written in terms of a case study of institutional decay.”⁶

Almost two decades later, Sklare wrote about his misdiagnosis of the situation:

In recent years it has become clear that Conservatism is incorrect in its diagnosis and especially in its prognosis of Orthodoxy’s future. Unaccountably Orthodoxy has refused to assume the role of invalid. Rather, it has transformed itself into a growing force in American Jewish life. It has reasserted its claim of being the authentic interpretation of Judaism.⁷

This chapter will demonstrate the activity in the Orthodox movement that translated into reinvigoration, such as more attention to Jewish education, more affiliation with synagogues, Jewish organizations, Jewish causes, and more infusion of Jewish tradition into the home. There were new trends in the religious situation. Rabbi Jung and others leaders of the twenties, thirties, and forties had made Orthodoxy in America a viable and attractive option. In describing the progress of Orthodoxy in America. Jung wrote:

We have seen the rise of a revitalized Orthodoxy, with its institutions improved in manner and method, with its teaching better presented and gaining wider acceptance... American Israel has moved from uneasy adolescence towards a solid measure of maturity... From the founders of our institutions to their

grandchildren there has been preserved the purity of vision, the quality of service and the stubborn determination to make America safe for Judaism untrimmed, unbarbered and infinite in its potentialities.⁸

New leaders emerged in the fifties with different approaches and with different priorities. Jung and others had laid the groundwork from which the new leaders could build.

The Modern wing of Orthodoxy had ambitious plans and made headway. There was organizational progress.⁹ Learning and scholarship became more respected and this changed the character of Modern Orthodoxy. More learning led to better knowledge and adherence to Halakhah, or Jewish law.

2. RABBI JUNG'S ACTIVITIES

Rabbi Jung kept up his many involvements. He was active in religious, educational, political, cultural and social undertakings that truly exemplified Torah im derekh erez, the philosophy of Modern Orthodoxy. His activities harmonized his support of religious and secular knowledge and demonstrate that he was an able exponent of Traditional Judaism and of the American spirit. He worked diligently for Jews all over the world that were in need and continued raising funds for various projects.

As chair of the religious board of JDC, he saw to it that religious needs were met for Jews in other lands. He went to North Africa in February 1955 to inspect JDC's educational and religious institutions in Tangiers, Morocco, Algiers and Tunis.¹⁰ He also came to the aid of Jews in Iran.¹¹

His work for Israel continued. Jung worked for Kibbutz Chofetz Chaim and for its children's village.¹² Jung was instrumental in starting a vocational school in Israel, and in

1951 he was co-founder of Kfar Eliyahu, named after him, an educational institute for girls aged twelve to eighteen, mostly from poor neighbourhoods.¹³ His Israel affiliations, which began in the forties with Poale Agudat Israel, which was called “a fortress of religious Jewry,” continued.¹⁴ He worked to promote this organization, which as discussed in the previous chapter, supported the Jewish nationalist movement and had ties with Zionism through the Jewish Agency. Poale Agudat Israel was part of the United Religious Bloc of America and did not frown upon secular education.¹⁵

He continued to devote time and effort to the Chaplaincy Program of the Army. He was an active participant in the successful Jewish Torah Convocation held at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. The programs were designed to reach out to the Jewish military personnel in army installations and to give support to the chaplains in their work.¹⁶

Jung became President of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, an organization which began, in 1927, an honour society of American Jews who had attained distinction in the arts, sciences and professions and which included among its members Dr. Albert Einstein, Paul Muni, a well known actor, Professors Abraham Katsh and David Macht of Yeshiva University. Its goals were to encourage, support and promote among Jews the advancement of the arts, sciences and all departments of knowledge, and the interchange of views among its members.¹⁷

Jung’s role as political activist was important as he worked to have the McCarran Bill repealed. The intent of the Act was to track down “traitors” who had any communist sympathies, but, in so doing, it took away individual liberties, such as freedom of speech, press, assembly, and academic freedom and also there was mail censorship. He felt that

The McCarran Bill threatened the Bill of Rights and what America stood for. Jung saw himself as a worker for the American dream. He wrote:

As a believer in the American dream, I have endeavored for the last thirty years to advance a knowledge of its ideal and its practical significance among all the citizens of this country.¹⁸

For Jung the American dream meant religious freedom; America was a place where differences were respected and where one could practice religion proudly and fearlessly. He felt that to fight the McCarran Act was to fight for what America stood for and that would ensure that Judaism would thrive on its soil.

He continued his fund-raising for Yeshiva and was still involved with its decision-making.¹⁹ Jung also taught four courses a week at Yeshiva University; he was professor of Ethics and Philosophy of Judaism.

Jung continued his Jewish Library series that dealt with Jewish topics. Jung edited Guardians of Our Heritage that dealt with the most recent history of Torah Jewry from 1724 to 1953.

3. WHAT FACILITATED THE MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT

3.i. Religious Revival

Emanuel Rackman wrote in 1952 that, “a spiritual quest is now going on. Orthodox Judaism is only beginning to recover from the initially devastating effects of the Enlightenment...”²⁰ There was relatively more respect for religion and less respect for secularism and so Orthodoxy had a chance to be seen in a more positive light. Modern Orthodoxy embraced the values of the Enlightenment, as well as the values of Torah

Judaism; however, enlightenment values had made it difficult for Modern Orthodoxy to put forth its philosophy; this milieu made it easier.

Orthodoxy, like all other groups, was helped by a postwar revival in religion. As in the forties, Jung continued to advocate a more important role for religion. There was enough interest in religion that one of his sermons, delivered at his synagogue on the Sabbath of 3 January, 1953, was reviewed in the New York Times. In this review it was reported that many of his remarks were addressed to college students home on vacation, and that he had said that the character of its average citizen, which should be shaped by civil leaders, clergy and teachers, would determine the character and destiny of a nation.²¹ Though no evidence was found to suggest that Jung knew in advance that this sermon would be reviewed, it can be nonetheless said that newspaper coverage of such things is rarely accidental. The point is that it was felt that the sermon had appeal to a larger audience and that there was interest in a religious point of view.

Will Herberg in his important article, written in 1950, "Religious Trends in American Jewry", described a general Jewish revival. This revival trend bode very well for Orthodoxy.²² Herberg said that the revival had benefited the Conservative group the most, but noted that the Modern wing of Orthodoxy had made "impressive headway."²³ He wrote that the Orthodox who were attending synagogue were no longer primarily older and immigrants, but were American-born in their twenties and thirties.²⁴

The veterans of World War Two, in many instances were active in initiating and building synagogues, a result, Herberg felt, of the activity of the chaplains in the army.²⁵ The return to the synagogue meant more synagogue construction, more synagogue attendance, and an increase in synagogue membership.²⁶ Jewish practices in homes, such

as lighting Sabbath candles and reciting the Sabbath kiddush, increased.²⁷ Nathan Glazer, professor at Harvard University, prominent sociologist and an editor of the journal, Commentary, also noted in 1955, that there was more attendance in Jewish schools and that synagogue membership was up. He noted that, “even Orthodoxy shows a new vigour that is particularly evident in its all-day schools.”²⁸ This certainly is tangible evidence that there was greater interest in the Jewish religion and Jewish education. Jung had repeatedly expressed his disenchantment with modernity and Orthodoxy was in sync with this disenchantment. Modern Orthodox values had a chance to be taught and presented to an increased audience.

3.ii. Prosperous Times

Nathan Glazer stated that the temper of the times brought people back to religion; Jews were more prosperous, self-employed and living with and among non-Jews.²⁹ Many Orthodox people by the fifties had begun to establish themselves in upper-class and upper-middle class areas, leaving the areas of second settlement, such as the Bronx.³⁰ A socialist working-class community had become middle class. Will Herberg agreed and wrote that the militant secular, radical and anti-religious attitude of the East European Jewish socialist was almost gone and that the growing acceptance of religion as an integral part of Americanism made socialism irrelevant.³¹ Modern Orthodoxy would get its share of those returning to religion.

3.iii. Influx of Orthodox Immigrants

The Orthodox who came to settle in America after the war, as discussed in the previous chapters, did play a large role in the movement to the right and Jung did play an important role in getting these immigrants here. Rabbi Norman Lamm said, “to his [i.e. Jung’s] great credit, he brought over many refugees during and after the war; it was a major contribution. He performed historically and did whatever he could to get Jewry to come to America.”³² Working through the JDC, Jung’s mandate was to bring the immigrant to America at this time. These efforts did not mean that JDC, or Rabbi Jung, discouraged aliyah to Israel, as JDC and Jung were involved in other projects that brought Jews to Israel. However, there was tension in the post-war years between Israel and the diaspora as destinations for Holocaust survivors. For Traditional Orthodox groups, teaching by example still continued and they began to influence other Jewish groups. A large percent of children remained loyal to the Traditional and Hasidic Orthodoxy that was brought over from Europe; they did not, for the most part, assimilate, as did adherents in other Jewish groups.³³ The rank and file continued to follow the example of their leaders and to take their advice, which provided them with an exciting intellectual and emotional experience. They learned and knew the religious texts. They were visible, strongly committed, proud and self-confident. Not only did they practice the rules, they derived joy from practicing them. They taught in Modern Orthodox institutions and this gave exposure to their ideas and ways. Modern Orthodoxy was stimulated by the emotional and intellectual fervor of the Traditional and Hasidic Orthodox groups.³⁴ It took time for this influence to be noticed.

3.iv. Organizational Progress

In general, there was organizational expansion of Modern Orthodox organizations and institutions.³⁵ The activities of the organizations were an example of the religious reinvigoration.

3.iv.1.UOJCA

Jung continued to be active in the UOJCA.³⁶ By the end of the fifties, Moses Feurstein was its president and there were three thousand Orthodox synagogues under its auspices.³⁷ It was a time for decisive action and there was progress in achieving goals, which were measured by the observance of Jewish principles in community organizations, community events, and synagogue activities.

The UOJCA convention in nineteen hundred and fifty-one in New York dealt with the reinvigoration of Jewish personal and communal life. The members at the convention set the direction Modern Orthodoxy would take in the future. UOJCA became less tolerant and more demanding, also a sign of a movement to the right. Analyses of currents trends, goals, clearer demands, and definitions of Modern Orthodoxy were made. Modern Orthodox issues pertinent in the fifties were discussed. Synagogue standards, such as mechitza, adult education, youth activities and lack of education of women were areas of concern.³⁸

This convention assembled a most representative and authoritative assembly of Modern Orthodox Jewry. Among the outstanding Orthodox leaders who participated were: Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, professor of Talmud at Yeshiva University, Dr. Samuel Belkin, President of Yeshiva University, Rabbi Oscar Z. Fasman, president of Hebrew

Theological College in Chicago, Rabbi Joseph Lookstein, professor of sociology at Yeshiva University, Rabbi Herbert Goldstein, Max Etra, newly elected President of UOJCA, Rabbi Leo Jung, and Herman Wouk, noted author.³⁹

On the question of mechitza, Rabbi Lewittes, an attendee, said that it was an unquestionable necessity, but it did not “have to reach the ceiling.”⁴⁰ Two issues were present in that declaration. Though Orthodoxy had maintained throughout the Modern Period, that mechitza was a requirement, it was not until the fifties that the discussion became a central focus of the divisions between the Modern Orthodox and the Conservative movements. Only when the Reform Movement removed the mechitza in the Modern Period were there responsa written requiring a mechitza.⁴¹ Added to the discussion was the necessary height of the mechitza. In Norma Joseph’s article, “Mechitza: Halakchic Decisions and Political Consequences,” she noted that Rabbi Feinstein felt that a minimum standard regarding the height of mechitza was not adequate and that it was best to have a high mechitza.⁴² The height of the mechitza would also distinguish Modern Orthodoxy from Traditional or Hasidic Orthodoxy. One important resolution adopted at this convention was that Orthodox Jews were not to be allowed to worship in Conservative and Reform synagogues; lack of a mechitza was a major reason for this decision.⁴³

Another resolution adopted was that UOJCA wanted assurances that Jewish institutions that were supported by the Jewish community observed Jewish law, and UJA, and the Long Island Jewish hospital were criticized in this respect. Rabbi Jung had always been active in insisting that kashrut be carried out in all Jewish organizations.

The topic of education for women was discussed and more attention and support

were given for education for women. This issue also made Modern Orthodoxy a unique group within Orthodox Judaism. Though the Beth Jacob Schools in America grew in the fifties, the education given did not represent Modern Orthodoxy.

3.iv.2. RCA

In the forties the RCA became more independent from the Agudat Harabbonim; it was noted by Rabbi Louis Bernstein that it was in the fifties that the RCA finally cut the “umbilical cord” to the Agudat Harabbonim.⁴⁴ According to Bernstein the RCA became the most important Orthodox organization in the world by the end of that decade.⁴⁵ RCA became a powerful and authoritative force in expressing the views of American Orthodox Jewry.⁴⁶ Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik became chair of the Halakhic Committee of the RCA in 1954, replacing Rabbi Simcha Levy, and in this role he brought prestige and stature to RCA, even among other Orthodox groups.⁴⁷ The Halakhic Committee claimed final authority on religious matters for Modern Orthodoxy. Many Halakhic issues were resolved under Soloveitchik’s leadership. The Halakhic Committee of the RCA underwent its greatest period of growth in the fifties under Rabbi Soloveitchik. By the fifties RCA members, part of the UOJCA, occupied more and more pulpits and the European rabbis who had been active in Agudat Harabbonim, occupied fewer pulpits. The influence of these European rabbis decreased.

The microphone was another issue that was finally resolved in the fifties. Levy had ruled that it could be used and this tested the authority of the Halakhic Committee as many Agudat Harabbonim members and roshei yeshiva had banned the use of the microphone.⁴⁸ The RCA was being challenged. Then, as Louis Bernstein wrote, came the

anti-climax. Rabbi Soloveitchik at a Detroit convention in 1954, ruled against the use of a microphone on the Sabbath on Halakhic grounds.⁴⁹ It can be deduced that the Agudat Harabbonim and roshei yeshiva had some influence in this case. The fifties was a time of assertive stands. Modern Orthodoxy did not wish to be confused with the Conservative movement. The banning of the microphone was another issues that distinguished Modern Orthodoxy from the Conservative movement. Many of the RCA's accomplishments were factors enabling a movement to the right as it made it easier for its members to comply with a stricter standard of Jewish observance.

The RCA made advancements in the area of kashrut, and the OU became the symbol of authority in this area.⁵⁰ In 1954 the RCA officially prohibited individual rabbis from issuing hechsherim. The procedure of granting OU endorsement was formalized by the kashrut committee in 1953.⁵¹ RCA and UOJCA established a joint kashrut department administered by laymen to take fiscal responsibility and by the rabbinic administration to control Halakhic and religious aspects.⁵² By 1953 kashrut had moved into big business, as they had many endorsements and there was an increasing number of products available for the kosher market. This was extremely important, as the availability of kosher food was the greatest inducement to keeping kosher. The greatest inducement was thus neither aesthetic nor scientific, but practical.⁵³

There was a lot of activity to promote kashrut, fact finding of how many people bought given products, and how to better reach the consumer. Surveys were conducted to obtain such information.⁵⁴

The committee had a busy outreach program in which information on kashrut was given to non-kosher homes.⁵⁵ The committee worked through the synagogues, Jewish

organizations and Jewish newspapers.⁵⁶ Thus in the Jewish Center Bulletin there began a column under “educational notes,” called “Jewish Domestic Science” which tried to acquaint its readers with the kosher kitchen and give recipes.⁵⁷ Rabbi Jung’s wife, Mrs. Erma Jung, ran a class teaching women how to keep a kosher kitchen.⁵⁸

The first issue of the OU News Reporter was put out in May, 1956, with two purposes: as a newsletter designed for use as a poster for congregational bulletin boards, and as a mailing flyer to individuals. The publication let the public know about OU products and where they could be purchased. There were even proposals for material to be used in children’s education and adult programs and a conference was held with Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky of Torah Umesorah to develop a program for this purpose. They worked to interest editors and publishers of Anglo-Jewish weeklies, including Conservative and Reform journals, editors of food magazines, executives of food chains and the general media.

As the RCA’s presence at large fund raising affairs of the fifties and sixties increased, and as Orthodoxy’s participation in the wider Jewish community increased as well, national organizations became increasingly careful in the observance of kashrut.⁵⁹ It is evident that things that Rabbi Jung had worked so hard to achieve were coming to pass, such as banning individual endorsements for kashrut and seeing to it that Jewish organizations, with respect for all Jews, kept the dietary laws at public functions.

The RCA acted independently and had some new, successful projects. It brought students from religious schools to Jewish sites in New York. The RCA became active in the political and social scene nationally and internationally.⁶⁰ It had a leading role in aid for Russian Jewry as it lobbied the government on their behalf.⁶¹ It fought for social

issues such as labor rights.⁶² Headway was made in securing rights for Sabbath observers at University exams.⁶³

3.iv.3. JDC

A major contribution of the JDC was providing for the sustenance and the spiritual revival of Jewish communities in every part of the world along religious and cultural lines. This was done through its Cultural and Religious Committee, and the JDC executive agreed that Rabbi Jung was one of the, “mainstays of the religious and cultural committees.”⁶⁴ Jung’s involvement was instrumental in seeing to it that Orthodox needs were met. The work of JDC was an example of American help and leadership in Israel, South America, Africa, and other areas where there were Jews in need. Jung who spoke German, Yiddish, Hebrew and Spanish was sent by JDC to various areas of the world and in this way Jung helped to spread Orthodox influence. When visiting his daughter in Buenos Aires, Argentina, Jung spoke on behalf of JDC.⁶⁵ When Benjamin B. Goldman of the JDC sent Jung’s biography to the group in Buenos Aires, where Jung was to speak, he wrote, “it is all too infrequent that one of our top JDC personalities is able to visit your part of the world.”⁶⁶

As the fifties began, financial aid to Yeshivas and Yeshiva students was very necessary and yeshiva programs were in need of revision as they lacked updated educational programs and capable teachers. JDC’s role was investigation, planning, remedying, and encouragement. JDC supported a Jewish Teacher’s seminary in Iran. This was important, as these graduates in Teheran became the first group of locally trained teachers available for Jewish schools in Iran, alleviating an acute shortage of teachers.

JDC supplied Israel and various areas of the world with necessary items, such as Talmuds, tefillin (phylacteries), Torah scrolls, and books.⁶⁷

Hassidic yeshivas, such as Lubavitch and Vishnitz began to accept support from JDC after having been persuaded to do so by the JDC. This made the JDC more representative of all Jews, as it now included most Orthodox groups.⁶⁸ These groups had found it difficult to accept the leadership of JDC, which included non-Orthodox Jews, and preferred Orthodox organizations such as Vaad ha-Hatzala.

Jung also worked for improved conditions for Jews in North Africa in the fifties. Jung traveled to Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria on behalf of the JDC to survey the various yeshivoth there and to evaluate how the financial support for education, cultural, and religious programs were being used. Jung visited institutions in various cities of Morocco, such as Talmud Torahs, Ozar Hatorah Schools, Lubavitch Schools, and Alliance Israelite Universelle operated centres. Jung wrote in later years that Ozar Hatorah was, “of paramount significance for the survival of Oriental Jews from North Africa to Iran and France.”⁶⁹ JDC’s role was to provide funds, direction, and to make available professional skill and consultations. In doing this JDC helped the Jews of Morocco, isolated from other Jewish influences.⁷⁰ Jung’s reports provided graphic and moving descriptions of North African Jewish life; this made American Jews knowledgeable about the plight of these Jews, thus his reports helped to link one Jew with another.⁷¹ In Tunisia and Algeria, Rabbi Jung also visited schools, medical welfare centres, and cultural organizations. Jung wrote detailed reports of community life from all aspects, including reports on assimilation and intermarriage in Algeria.⁷² It was

important, from his perspective, that they be exposed to Jewish thought to prevent assimilation.

3.v. Fighting for The American Dream-The Social and Political Situation In The Fifties That Affected Modern Orthodoxy

Jung, as vice-president of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, worked to repeal the McCarran Acts of 1950 and 1952 to ensure that the American dream would exist so that religion and, in particular for Jung, Modern Orthodoxy could thrive. This activity exemplified Modern Orthodoxy's broader view of its role on the American scene. The McCarran Act took place in the midst of the cold war, when there was a tremendous fear of communism and the power of the USSR and when the United States was fighting communist aggression in Korea. Jung wrote, "mankind is threatened by a sinister force, world communism, which aims at the destruction of the values the Jewish-Christian philosophy of life has been building up."⁷³ In 1950, the Senate and the House of Representatives overrode President Truman's veto and enacted the McCarran Bill despite widespread opposition of religious, educational, professional, labour, Negro, Jewish, fraternal and veteran organizations. Under the McCarran Act the customs bureau banned the import of certain books and periodicals, which were neither obscene nor revolutionary; the United States Information Agency libraries abroad took hundreds of books and junked them because authors were associated with subversive groups or those considered subversive. People were deported for what they said or for the ideas expressed by the people in groups they had joined, and passports were denied American citizens under the theory that passports were not a right but a privilege. People were kept in

detention camps without just cause or proof of crime. Jews who had been associated with communism became targets and hence Jewish organizations became involved.⁷⁴

Rabbi Jung was active with, among others, Zecharia Chafee Jr., who wrote a book denouncing the Act, called The Blessing of Liberty, and with Professor Paul Tillich, well-known Protestant theologian.⁷⁵ Jung, as a member of the Planning Committee of The National Committee to Repeal The McCarran Act, wrote to the editor of the New York Times denouncing the Act on at least two occasions.⁷⁶ It was a long and hard fight to have the Acts repealed. Jung recalled in his autobiography that the outright repeal of the act was urged by 1200 prominent Americans, among whom were several rabbis.⁷⁷ On the stationary of the National Committee To Repeal The McCarran Act the only rabbi who appeared was Rabbi Leo Jung.⁷⁸ There is no evidence to show that the Jewish community disapproved of Jung's activity, although the majority of Jewish leaders kept their voices still as they were anxious to appear to be loyal Americans and anti-Communists.

The McCarran Act led to even worse: The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, chaired by Senator Joseph McCarthy and the era known as "McCarthyism." The RCA in 1954 joined the chorus of religious voices critical of Senator McCarthy and his proposal to investigate the churches. The RCA conference in 1954 led to anti-McCarthy resolutions; the theme of the conference was "Challenges to Religious Freedoms."⁷⁹ The resolutions showed RCA's disapproval of McCarthy's activities and its willingness to be involved. Louis Bernstein, in his book about the RCA mentioned Uri Miller, a past president of the Rabbinical Council as, "one of those rare voices," that openly criticized the Senator and commented, "there was a courageous voice of protest heard," which meant that the RCA protested as a group though not many

individual members took up the fight on their own.⁸⁰ However, Jung's involvement and that of the RCA is an example of Modern Orthodoxy's interest in the broader community and in the social issues of the day. Unlike the insular European rabbis, who had brought the concept of separateness with them from Europe. Rabbi Jung saw this involvement as a patriotic and religious duty.

The fifties was a time of patriotism and Rabbi Jung was caught up in the tide of enthusiasm. He professed his patriotism, "I believe with all my heart in the American dream. I have been an untiring worker in the cause of America."⁸¹ Jung and the Modern Orthodox movement exemplified this patriotic behavior as they fought for the values that they felt represented America. His speeches in the fifties were inspirational and patriotic.⁸² He stated, "My pulpit has taught Washington on its highest level as an echo of Mount Sinai and as a partial fulfillment of the divine promise."⁸³ For Jung, America encouraged the development of group culture. He noted that America did not do this at first and that two generations previous to this time the American Jew was impelled to ignore his past and his religion. In the fifties, Jung hoped that the Jew recognized that his major contribution to America and the highest expression of his patriotism must come from searching for and living up to the Jewish tradition.

3.vi. Zionism

In the fifties there was a very positive identification with Zionism by American Jews. In the thirties and forties anti-semitism had been an important cause of the spread of Zionism. However, the Jewish people saw the advent of the State of Israel in 1948 as a return to self-affirmation as Jews. The State of Israel gave Jews collective pride, and

helped reverse the trend to assimilation.⁸⁴ Disenchantment with modernity led to more appreciation of history and tradition. According to Will Herberg, the anti-religious socialist Zionist or Yiddish cultural Jews lost heart as their cause no longer seemed relevant; though, there still remained some devoted to this cause.⁸⁵ There was dissatisfaction with naturalistic and humanistic philosophies from many so-called “modern” Jews and naturalistic and humanistic philosophies had previously been considered the mark of the modern mind.⁸⁶

In particular, the State of Israel had very positive ramifications for Modern Orthodoxy. Orthodox Jews saw Israel as a means of preserving Torah Judaism. There was a realization that it was easier in Israel than elsewhere, to incorporate Jewish laws and philosophy into one’s life. Eliezer Berkovits wrote, “...the State of Israel itself points to the adequate place for Jewish Living, the natural home of Judaism.”⁸⁷ The Chief Rabbinate in Israel enjoyed exclusive jurisdiction in religious matters, and that fanned the hope in Orthodox circles of overcoming the division in American synagogues by uniting it in obedience to the chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem. Orthodox Jews saw the Israeli chief rabbi as a unifier.⁸⁸ The analogy was made that the chief rabbi would be like the Pope for the Catholics. Rabbi Israel Tabak, head of the RCA, President Samuel Belkin, of Yeshiva University and others endorsed this idea but it naturally did not appeal to Conservative and Reform leaders, nor to non-modern Orthodox elements.⁸⁹ Though many Orthodox Jews saw the chief rabbi as a unifying force for Orthodox Jewry in America; this unity certainly did not eventuate, as different Orthodox factions remained with their different ideologies intact.⁹⁰

American Modern Orthodoxy became heavily involved in a new aspect of Israel

work; lobbying congressmen and senators to plead for Israel's rights.⁹¹ During the 1956 War known as the Suez War or Sinai Campaign, Egypt sealed off the Israeli port of Eilat, effectively stopping Israel's sea trade with much of Africa and the Far East. In response to this violation of international agreements, Israel launched a military operation in 1956. Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal threatened as well British and French interests in oil supplies and trade and so they launched their own campaign. The United States, caught by surprise, was upset that Britain, France and Israel had secretly planned the campaign and had not informed them. The United States campaigned to force Israel to withdraw from the areas it had conquered; the campaign included a threat to discontinue all United States assistance, impose United Nations sanctions, and expulsion from the UN. One reason Israel complied was that it received assurance from the United States that it would maintain the freedom of navigation in the waterway, and in addition, Washington sponsored a UN resolution creating the United Nations Emergency force to supervise the territories vacated by Israeli forces.⁹² Rabbi Jung, as one of the leaders of Orthodox Jewry, wrote to John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, to appeal for American assistance for Israel in the 1956 war. He wrote, "I know that the overwhelming majority of my co-religionists are profoundly disturbed as I am about the failure of our government to assist Israel in her hour of great danger."⁹³ The relationship of Israel's leaders with American leaders eventually became a closer one as they realized that both of their democratic countries needed each other and it was important to note that Modern Orthodox leaders played a key role in this process.

Rabbi Jung was intimately involved with the Israeli leaders and with what was going on in Israel. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of the Mapai party, later called the Labor

Party, was interested in Jung's article in Israel of Tomorrow that pointed out that Jewish law had always been labour-minded. Rabbi Jung showed in this article how religious and labor ideals went together and Ben-Gurion was particularly interested that Jewish Law stressed labor practices.⁹⁴ Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog enlisted Jung's help to secure Sabbath observance in Israel. Rabbi Jung was able to help Herzog restore Sabbath observance at the Hadera Paper Mills as the owner, Mr. Mazer, was a Jewish Center congregant. Rabbi Herzog had hoped that this example would prevent more Sabbath desecration.⁹⁵

At the request of President of The Jewish Agency for Israel, Nahum Goldmann, Jung was on the Advisory Committee on Cultural Applications; this committee arose from the conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany. It worked for the cultural rehabilitation of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution and the restoration of cultural treasures destroyed by the Nazis. The committee was made up of representatives of various cultural trends. Jung served on the committee with Professor Salo Baron who was chair, Rabbi Samuel Belkin, Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Dr Oscar Handlin, Dr Abraham Sachar, Rabbi Leo Baeck, Rabbi Israel Brodie, Chief Rabbi of England, and Rabbi Jacob Kaplan, Chief Rabbi of France.⁹⁶ Rabbi Jung's presence, as well as Rabbi Belkin's, once again assured that Modern Orthodox perspectives would be included and demonstrated that American Modern Orthodoxy was playing an important role.

4. EXAMPLES OF MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT

4.i. Return to Halakhah

The movement to the right was exemplified by a return to Halakhic creativity and

interest, which began in the forties. Orthodoxy was concerned in the fifties with the difficulty of resolving questions of Jewish law along traditional and authentic lines, while at the same time adapting Halakhah to new situations and conditions.⁹⁷ Though Jenna Joselit, in New York's Jewish Jews, said that the ideology of Halakhic Judaism was articulated only in the 1960s, its roots emerged in the forties and fifties, as Orthodoxy laid claim to its share of American Judaism and as Conservative Judaism developed more liberal observances.⁹⁸ However, it should be noted that Conservative Judaism was also calling for a return to Halakhah and the Conservatives did generally remain within Halakhah, as they defined it. Solomon Simon wrote in his article "A Renewed Halakhah," that, "there were times when it was necessary to stand up against an inflexible Halakhah, but at the present moment it is necessary to return to Halakhah."⁹⁹ Simon's article was published in the journal Judaism, edited by the prominent Conservative rabbi and scholar, Robert Gordis. Marshall Sklare in his book Conservative Judaism talked about working out a more consistent pattern of observance and a desire to raise standards.¹⁰⁰ In past decades the key challenges for Modern Orthodoxy had been to discuss and impress upon the Jewish population issues of Sabbath observance, adherence to family law and some basic knowledge of Judaism. This challenge remained, but added was discussion of the role of Torah and Halakhah and observing the other mitzvot.

Rabbi Soloveitchik, chair of the Halakhic Committee of the RCA, was by the fifties very influential as a spokesman for Modern Orthodoxy; his world view was based on Halakhah.¹⁰¹ The Halakhic Committee in the first twenty-five years of the RCA had two distinct periods, the Levy and Soloveitchik eras. The Soloveitchik period brought to the RCA and to Orthodoxy greater prestige and the greatest growth occurred in the

fifties.¹⁰² The increased interest in Halakhic discourse on the part of rabbinic students was demonstrated by the packed attendance at Rav Soloveitchik's Halakhic addresses. His words set precedents and this exchange provided inspiration for rabbis, who went out to disseminate his message throughout the United States. His message was that Halakhah offered an approach towards the social, economic, and political problems that confronted society; Halakhah was the principal of intellectual activity and was a guide in forming a well-regulated life. Joseph B. Soloveitchik volunteered to speak on the Halakhah before Rosh Hashana at Yeshiva University, and this became a very important annual event in New York's Torah life.¹⁰³

Rabbi Jung did attempt to become more involved in the area of Halakhah. Asking questions concerning Jewish law and answering those questions, called responsa, became more important in the fifties. Jung sponsored an annual Halakhic volume, Noam ("Grace"). Rabbi Jung assumed financial responsibility, with help from Samuel C. Feurstein and Max Stern. Jacob Yechiel Weinberg, the last rector of the Hildesheimer Rabbinical School, victim of Hitler, and a resident of Montreux, Switzerland, was his consultant on several issues. Rabbi Jung chose Rabbi Menachem Kasher and his son Rav Moshe Shlomo Kasher to do the major work but Jung was involved in both method and approach.¹⁰⁴ Noam dealt with modern questions such as artificial insemination, autopsy, transplants and the problem of the aguna, some of which were controversial issues. Jung commented on this major difficulty:

There was a double difficulty to overcome: one a certain unwillingness on the part of some Torah authorities to deal with these, to them, unusual and too delicate questions: and there was the additional primary need to get absolutely authoritative opinions and decisions.¹⁰⁵

The series included nineteen annual volumes. The first volume appeared in 1957, the tenth volume contained an index of hundreds of responsa which had brought the laws of Torah up to date. Noam included writings of Rabbis Eliyahu Henkin, Moses Feinstein, Jacob Yechiel Weinberg, Rav Kasher and the Chief Rabbis of Israel. Rabbi Norman Lamm commented:

Noam was very important and it dealt with very important issues, but for some reason it did not have the resonance of the Halakhic community that it deserved. Most people, if you refer to Noam, won't know what you are talking about. The idea was Jung's and he raised the money for it. It was a major contribution by Jung.¹⁰⁶

It is somewhat curious that Rabbi Jung did not go to Rav Soloveitchik, who already had a reputation as an Halakhic scholar and major philosopher, for Halakhic problems and still referred to Rabbi Yechiel Weinberg in Europe for his questions and aid in his Halakhic journal. Perhaps, this is one reason that Noam was not as popular as it could have been. However, according to Lamm, Rabbi Weinberg was very much a Torah personality and giant. Rabbi Jung knew Rabbi Weinberg from Switzerland, as Rabbi Jung's in-laws were from there and he visited regularly, so it was understandable that he referred to Rabbi Weinberg.¹⁰⁷

Jung got Rabbi Kasher, a great scholar of rabbinical thought and literature, editor of the Torah Shleima, and writer of responsa, and his son Rav Moshe Shlomo to collect and edit such responsa. Rabbi Jung had written about what a "master mind" Rabbi Kasher was and Jung praised his commentary on the Torah in the Jewish Forum in January 1927. Rabbi Lamm said, "Rabbi Kasher was on a very high Halakhic plain."

¹⁰⁸Jung appointed three committees, one composed of three physicists, one composed of three lawyers and one composed of three physicians which were to study the questions

addressed to the sages, before submitting them, to make sure that the scientific material was free from inaccuracies or other flaws.

Rabbi Jung wanted his mentor, Jacob Yehiel Weinberg, to write a volume on Aguna, an issue that had always caused him pain. He felt that he needed an authority who was courageous enough to undertake this. Jung wrote:

I begged Dr. Weinberg to write such a thesis, telling him that it would immortalize his name not only as a profound scholar, but as a benefactor of the most sorely afflicted human being in the camp of Israel, the aguna.¹⁰⁹

Rabbi Weinberg, because of his poor health, recommended Dr. Eliezer Berkovits, of the Chicago Hebrew Theological Seminary, and his best student, to do this.¹¹⁰ According to Jung, he himself encouraged and financed Eliezer Berkovits to write a volume on the history and elucidation of the Halakhic problems involved with the aguna.¹¹¹ In his writing, Berkovits argued in favor of a certain form of conditional marriage which would eliminate the possibility of women becoming agunot because of their husband's refusal to grant a divorce. Weinberg seemed to approve of Berkovits's suggestion, but in the end Weinberg refused to support Berkovits. Jung remarked:

It was at a time when Dr. Berkovits had finished his book which the Gaon had cordially endorsed that some unknown rabbi upset Rav Weinberg's peace of mind and made him retract his enthusiastic endorsement of Dr. Berkovits opus. It was originally supposed to have appeared in one of the volumes of Noam.¹¹²

Marc Shapiro suggested in his biography of Weinberg, that he never changed his mind, but was fearful to approve and did not want to get involved, as this issue of "conditional marriage" was a major point of dispute between the Conservative and Orthodox movements. Also, Shapiro wrote that Weinberg sent one letter of approval to Jung, as he felt Jung supported this type of Halakhic approach, and another to Menachem Kasher, who he felt might not approve. Rabbi Berkovits said that, according to Rabbi

Jung, Rabbi Kasher had written to him saying that he was very pleased with Berkovits' manuscript, but then, later on, he had second thoughts, saying that it was Rabbi Weinberg who had objections, but Rabbi Berkovits did not believe this to be true.¹¹³ Kasher did not want the article included in Noam. Berkovits's "Concerning Conditional Marriage" was supposed to appear in Noam, until Kasher, partially because of fear of the religious right, decided this could not be done.¹¹⁴ Berkovitz's work ultimately appeared in 1967 as a publication of Mossad Rav Kook.

This is an example that some Modern Orthodox leaders feared and gave into the more right-wing rabbinic authorities and, at the same time, were worried about the perception that they were in any way allied with the Conservative movement. The Modern Orthodox movement wanted to define itself definitely with respect to Conservatism. The leaders wanted no overlaps with the Conservative movement, yet at the same time they created blurred lines with the more right wing Traditional Orthodox movements and they also created factions in Modern Orthodoxy. Rabbi Jung stood firm in his judgment and opinion, and showed courage and willingness to tackle difficult issues and to try to implement what he felt "Torah Judaism" stood for. Oscar Fasman, president of the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, and pulpit rabbi for almost thirty-five years in Skokie, Illinois, supported Rabbi Jung. Jung felt that the problem of the aguna could not be evaded, and he hoped that "the suggestions of the brilliant scholar, Rabbi Eliezer Berkovits, would lead to an alleviation of the aguna all over the world".¹¹⁵ However, most Modern Orthodox leaders still showed timidity or caution when it came to Halakhic change or interpretation and were not ready to face what they considered uncomfortable problems. Rabbi Lamm agreed that the handling of the aguna issue, "is a

failing of Orthodoxy in general.”¹¹⁶

The project was in the hands of great people, but one cannot help noticing the absence of Rabbi Soloveitchik. The fact that Rav Soloveitchik, chair of the Halakhic Committee of the RCA, did not contribute to Noam is somewhat curious. Perhaps this is why, as Rabbi Lamm said, the series did not have as much success or recognition as it deserved. No records have been found to shed light on the reason, so one can only surmise why Noam did not include the new American Halakhic leadership, the new generation of rabbis. It could be said that Jung was not supportive of the new leadership of Modern Orthodoxy; he had voted for Rabbi Chaim Heller, not Soloveitchik, as chair of the Halakhic Committee, or perhaps the new leadership was not supportive of Rabbi Jung. Rosalie Rosenfeld, Rabbi Jung’s daughter wrote, “so far as I know, my father had no relationship with the Soloveitchiks.”¹¹⁷ The fact that Rabbi Soloveitchik did not publish in Noam speaks to that lack of relationship. It is an example that Rabbi Jung was not considered a prime Halakhic scholar. In light of the new and Modern Orthodox leadership in Halakhic endeavours, it had been argued that Rabbi Jung did not entirely make this transition or that his attempts at doing so were thought by his colleagues to be “popular” and not “scholarly.”

4.i.1. Jung’s Philosophy

Jung’s philosophy and theme in the fifties became less secular, more based in Jewish law than before, and he articulated his belief that the core of Jewish living was kedushah, which means “holiness” for Jung. kedushah came from following the

Halakhah. This reflected a new emphasis on Halakhah. In previous decades Jung had stressed ethics, morality and human decency; in the fifties he stressed that these came from following the Halakhah. In the fifties reverence, righteousness and rahamanut, which he referred to as the three “R’s” of kedushah applied to many things, including married love.¹¹⁸ Reverence for God and man was essential to ensure righteousness or justice, which includes the assurance of our personal worth and of human dignity. Jung wrote:

The key to Judaism is “keddushah”(holiness) the endeavor to plant heaven on earth through divine values. Religion as such is co-extensive with life, holding us close to God .It may be neither divorced from life, nor divorced from God. The Hebrew term keddushah appears in connection with every aspect of Jewishness, from marriage to business from dietary laws to the laws of mourning... I would fain say of holiness within the Jewish scheme of life that it is composed of three “R’s”: Reverence, Righteousness and for the moment unexplained rahamanut... The crowning quality is Rahamanut for which there is as yet no word in the English language. Rahamanut is usually translated as “mercy” or “compassion” but etymologically it means “mother’s love”—the unselfish dedicated love of a mother for her little one, her passionate desire to spend herself... for the purpose of raising her baby from helpless infancy towards self sufficient maturity.¹¹⁹

His concept of kedushah is that, “kedushah amounted to a total program for a noble, wise, and generous life.”¹²⁰ The sixth and seventh volumes of The Jewish Library, Jewish Leaders and Guardians of our Heritage are about the teachings and judgments of selected Jewish scholars. Jung felt that these teachings and judgments stemmed from kedushah:

...that the magnitude of these contributions can best be understood if we first examine the underlying and unique concept first developed by the ancient Jews—the concept of Kiddusha.¹²¹

4.ii. Education

There were signs of revival in Jewish education in America, where assumptions had been made that Torah learning and observances were relics of the past. There was a

greater demand for intensive religious education in the fifties as there was more interest in religion, and efforts to reach the youth were expanded.¹²² There was greater emphasis on all-day education programs as opposed to afternoon schools.¹²³ Identification with the Jewish religion led to Jewish education, and was seen as a good thing for Jewish survival.¹²⁴ The reverse was also true; the revival of Judaism was in part due to increased concern for Jewish education, which laid the groundwork for the movement to the right. Nathan Glazer wrote that Orthodoxy showed new vigor, particularly in its all-day schools; the number of Jewish children getting some kind of Jewish education increased.¹²⁵ Only one who appreciates Judaism can be led to practice it and so Jewish education played a big role in the movement to the right. More children were being sent to parochial schools and of the parochial schools, almost all were conducted under Orthodox auspices and imposed Orthodox religious observances.¹²⁶ Marshall Sklare noted that it was the Orthodox movement, not the Conservative movement that had promoted the all-day school.¹²⁷

The Torah Umesorah movement, a national agency for the founding of Day Schools, spearheaded building new schools and developed educational programs for children and parents.¹²⁸ Although begun in the forties, the movement made headway in the fifties. In several cities the day school began with groups of Yeshiva students canvassing from door to door to sign up new students. Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, who received a doctorate from Columbia Teacher's College, was educational director of The Jewish Center Synagogue from 1934 to 1946, and wrote "Model Program For the Talmud Torah" with Rabbi Jung. He helped develop the Torah Umesorah day school movement originally began by Rabbi Feivel Mendlowitz.¹²⁹ He headed the movement from 1945

until 1980. He went from community to community to sell the idea of the Jewish Day school, as still more parents needed to be encouraged to send their children to parochial schools. Kaminetsky tried to see that there would be a day school in every Jewish community.¹³⁰ Torah Umesorah established a board of license to standardize requirements for teaching certificates. Well-trained teachers were a prerequisite for good schools. New day schools opened under Torah Umesorah auspices, resulting in a shortage of teachers. Newly established networks of parochial day schools fed a steady stream of students into schools of higher learning and influenced the community in which the school existed.¹³¹ Rabbi Joseph Kaminetsky in the article “Spiritual Values For Our Children,” which appeared in The Jewish Center Synagogue Bulletin said, “the day school movement has made tremendous strides in the last decade.”¹³²

Parents sent their children to the day schools for various reasons. Public schools were overcrowded, the yeshiva education was now more modern and progressive, and the school buildings were more physically attractive than they has previously been. Parents were not particularly religious or observant in many cases, yet the children learned Judaism and had to wear tzitzit and kippahs to school. The children became more prideful in their Jewish roots, and more comfortable with Jewish life than the parents.¹³³ Children in parochial school affected the parents. Often they had to join the synagogue as a prerequisite. Parents incapable of answering children’s questions about being Jewish soon got drawn in.¹³⁴ Looking back, Haym Soloveitchik wrote, “the hour of education arrived.” Mimesis of the home was replaced by instructional and religious apprenticeship.¹³⁵

Will Herberg claimed that there was a religious revival on the university campuses; books on religion were read more than before, religious speakers were invited and listened to more. Herberg noted that there was more interest, concern and commitment, though kashrut and the Sabbath were observed little. The student who was looking for meaning and spiritual values could not find these examples in the previous generation.¹³⁶ This can be seen as an indictment of the rabbinical leadership of which Rabbi Jung was prominent, but, then again, that generation also paved the way for the present generation of rabbis to lead.

4.ii.1. Yeshiva University

Yeshiva University extended its scope and activities. Rabbi Jung still worked closely with the president of Yeshiva University, Samuel Belkin, making recommendations and raising funds.¹³⁷ Samuel Belkin continued to struggle with the Conservative movement. However, he was able to launch a program of academic and physical expansion in the fifties. There was an increased enrollment at Yeshiva University, expanded courses of study, and increased number of faculty.¹³⁸ In 1951 it was reported that the college enrollment set an all time record with a 17.5% increase over the previous year's student body, the largest registration since the inception of the Yeshiva.¹³⁹ Yeshiva from 1945 to 1955 attracted a more homogeneous group of Orthodox students who had a Jewish educational background.

A charter was granted for the creation of a medical and dental school. This was the first medical school to be established in New York in fifty-two years and the first

medical school in the world under Jewish auspices. The medical school opened 1953, five years and one month after Yeshiva was elevated to University status.¹⁴⁰

A definite example of the movement to the right was when RIETS instituted its own kollel in 1950, a place where advanced students could devote their life to Jewish learning. Jeffrey Gurock pointed out that this was in response to the Eastern European Yeshivas and rabbis who had come to America after the war. The Talmudic scholar had become more attractive to the Jewish layperson and respect for Jewish learning increased.¹⁴¹

Yeshiva University maintained its philosophy of Torah umadda; religious and secular studies would be studied under one roof. When a debate occurred as to whether Jewish courses at the university should be mandatory as it prevented the student from taking other secular courses, the policy was defended. Dr. Pinchus Churgin stated:

...the purpose of this institution, as an Orthodox Jewish College, is to produce laymen well versed in the treasure of Jewish knowledge. In order to insure this aim... Jewish studies are required in the college... If we remove these courses or lessen their importance... by removing the credits... we would... be removing the necessity and purpose of Yeshiva College.¹⁴²

Yeshiva would not accommodate any watering down of what it stood for.

The rabbinical seminary reorganized its semicha program to recruit and train rabbinical students along lines that were uniquely Modern Orthodox. Talmud and codes were to be studied and more attention was to be given to Biblical studies, homiletics and pastoral counselling. RIETS students were required to take ninety credits in the Bernard Revel Graduate School that led an MA in Hebrew Literature. They were to take courses in Jewish philosophy, the history of Halakhah and aggadah. Rabbinical students were also to serve as apprentices with rabbis.¹⁴³ The rabbis would be educated and

knowledgeable in religious as well as secular studies and would be equipped to be capable pulpit rabbis.

Yeshiva University was unique among talmudic seminaries because Stern College, a college for women, was founded as part of Yeshiva University, in 1954.¹⁴⁴ Women were to be secularly and religiously educated. This was a sign of Yeshiva's uniqueness and status and helped further define what Modern Orthodoxy stood for.

4.iii. Jewish Scholarship More Respected

4.iii.1. More Reliance on the Text

Haym Soloveitchik wrote an article on the movement to the right in Orthodoxy in the nineties in which he looked back and gave reasons why the text became more relied on, why there was a new respect for knowledge, and why this led to stricter observance. This process began in the fifties and gathered force in the sixties and seventies. Soloveitchik called this the shift from practice to text.¹⁴⁵ He talked of, “augmented tradition,” because of the loss of mimetic tradition, where one learned by copying a living example; this loss led to reliance on texts where, “religious observance is both amplified and raised to new, rigorous height.”¹⁴⁶

Soloveitchik wrote that traditional conduct yielded to the demands of theoretical knowledge. Established practice could no longer be held up against the written word. This outlook, Soloveitchik said, began in the fifties.¹⁴⁷ In a traditional society, tradition was relayed from person to person as a way of life. In America, alternatives existed, and knowledge of the Jewish way of life was far from a given; knowledge and authority had

to come from the text, not from observing religious behaviour.¹⁴⁸ Soloveitchik called this the shift of authority to texts which led to a desire for accuracy and stringency.¹⁴⁹

4.iii.2. Image and Role of Rabbi

As texts took on new importance, the desire to have them interpreted correctly also became important. The rabbi had to be a Jewish scholar, knowledgeable in Talmud.¹⁵⁰ It is the emphasis that the Modern Orthodox rabbi must be a scholar that is new, though there were always examples of “scholar rabbis.” Previous generations of American Modern Orthodox Jews, however, had valued preaching ability more than expertise in Halakhah.

The RCA rabbi represented a new type of Orthodox rabbi, dignified, English speaking and conversant with Torah, Talmud, the secular culture of the day, and believing in the divine origin of the law. The demand for rabbis in America in previous decades had been for good speakers, who demanded little, partook in community work, and were personally appealing. Jung fit the criteria of that rabbi, although he was always involved in scholarly endeavors. However, in the fifties a new image for the rabbi and new expectations emerged. Dr. Nahum Glatzer wrote in 1950 that scholar rabbis should be men of knowledge, in addition to being able to inspire and be warm, in order to dispel the long held notion that Jewish scholarship was cold-natured.¹⁵¹

When Rabbi Norman Lamm was a student in the forties, he said that there were three major Modern Orthodox rabbis, Leo Jung, Joseph Lookstein and Herbert Goldstein. “Joseph Lookstein was very powerful, Jung very dignified and Herbert Goldstein was very involved in Zionist causes.”¹⁵² Jeffrey Gurock said:

...you had Herbert Goldstein, Joseph Lookstein and Leo Jung, not many out there

that had that combination of academic training and articulate English; they were the speakers that Orthodoxy could have as poster boys. They were the spokesmen for American style Orthodoxy. Their lay leadership was proud of them in terms of putting them out to represent Orthodoxy.¹⁵³

The heroes of Yeshiva students had been Rabbis Leo Jung, Joseph Lookstein, Herbert S. Goldstein.

However, the heroes of the generations of the fifties and sixties changed; the students looked to Rabbi Soloveitchik and the Roshei Yeshiva, who were expected to be expert in the religious texts and be able to interpret them.¹⁵⁴ The modern Jew was turning to classical sources of Jewish life and his revived interest in classical sources demanded interpretation and explanations by scholarly rabbis.¹⁵⁵ The fact that Rav Soloveitchik had such a dedicated following was seen as a strength in Modern Orthodoxy. This phenomenon was wider than just the Modern Orthodox constituency. Those who followed the Roshei Yeshiva were in the more traditional Orthodox camp. The students of Agudat Harrabanim rabbis, who had followed them faithfully, by the fifties, also began to turn to the Roshei Yeshiva and this weakened the state of the Agudat Harrabanim.¹⁵⁶

Even if the heroes were changing, the heroes of the past had brought them to this point. They had opened channels of communication with the contemporary generation. Leo Jung had always tried to elevate the importance and widen the role of the rabbi, to make what the rabbi said important and authoritative. He had written that the citizen determined the character and destiny of a nation and that the ultimate chapters of American history would be based on the character of its clergy and political leaders. He gave equal status to clergy and politicians, who in the fifties still commanded great respect.¹⁵⁷

4.iv. Literature

The movement to the right was seen in literature; there was an increase in the sale of guide books on Judaism, Bible and Bible related books, commentaries and Bible books for children, indicating a desire to learn more about the Jewish religion and an example of a text based culture.¹⁵⁸ Not all the books in the market represented an Orthodox understanding of religion, but they did represent a religious point of view. There was an effort by the Orthodox leadership to see that there were guidebooks on Orthodox Judaism, two of them were, The Jewish Way of Life by Isidore Epstein, editor of the Soncino Talmud, and This Is My God by Herman Wouk, both published in the fifties.

Jung's edited book, Guardians of Our Heritage, depicted leaders who led traditional and observant lives, and served as examples of "ethical conduct" and Torah-true leadership. He felt that at this time Jews were ready and open to "a missionary movement of Judaism by Jews among Jews."¹⁵⁹ The book Guardians of Our Heritage is an argument for Orthodox Judaism and a critique of those who assimilated and veered from Orthodox precepts. Jung felt that Torah True Judaism had suffered from the Emancipation, with the result that he feared secularist Jewish culture, the loss of Torah, religious heritage and national destruction. He felt that Reform and Conservative Judaism had been harmful to the quality of Jewish life. He wrote:

What is now indicated is, indeed, not name calling but a clear appreciation of the solid facts and a determination of Torah-true Jewry to invest all its efforts in the upbuilding of Judaism, both in America and in Israel. No argument against rootless, bootless reform, no evidence as to their destruction of Jewish religious life, no matter how eloquent, will basically help the situation.¹⁶⁰

The field of Jewish study, he felt, had not received sufficient attention from researchers and historians as there had not been a lot of interest in Orthodoxy by Jewish

readers.¹⁶¹ Rabbi Solomon Sharfman, president of the RCA, suggested that teaching Torah to modern minds had been neglected as “we have been too occupied with other concerns to provide for that.”¹⁶² He probably referred to the fact that the main attention had been given to modernizing Orthodoxy and making it viable in America. This would also be a reason why the study of Torah scholars was neglected. Rabbi Jung agreed and wanted to recognize the achievements of Torah-true leaders. Jung did not feel they had received adequate recognition and he wanted them to be remembered.

Guardians of Our Heritage was one of three biographical books edited by Rabbi Jung; the others were Jewish Leaders, and Men of the Spirit.¹⁶³ All these books were similar in intent. Jung’s desire was to encourage a move towards a renaissance of Jewish learning and observance. He wrote, “to encourage the average Jew to assume or continue the burdens of Torah True life, a well thought out presentation of its survival and serenity values is vital.”¹⁶⁴ He did this by presenting those whose lives were examples of Torah True living. His desire was to investigate and appreciate Torah-true Jewry, those who had invested all their, “efforts in the up-building of [Orthodox] Judaism.”¹⁶⁵ Jung wrote:

...it has been my aim to include every vital variety of rabbinic leader from patient saint to impatient pioneer, from the Tzaddik in Eastern lands to the Gaon in central Europe, from the protagonist of Torah im derekh erez to the builder-up of spiritual waste places, the marks of thoughtless assimilation or ruthless persecution, or both.¹⁶⁶

For Jung, there was no typical rabbi, their approaches and achievements varied, but all the leaders chosen were loyal to Orthodox Judaism and had made noble contributions.

The book contains short biographies of some of the most outstanding guardians of the Jewish heritage, recorded and analyzed, in many cases, by disciples, relatives or by people personally acquainted with the subjects. The biographies include Lithuanian

roshei yeshiva (heads of yeshivas), scholars from modern Germany, early American rabbis, the founder of Mizrachi, an Agudah leader, and other champions of Jewish Torah tradition, reinforcing the fact that Orthodoxy was not monolithic, or limited to one rigid ideology. Many of the scholars profiled do not represent Torah im derekh erez, the inclination of Modern Orthodoxy, although those who do are well represented in this book. Jung reiterates his own Modern Orthodox philosophy, which is that the tradition allows freedom of interpretation, a freedom that makes possible the variety of the subjects of the book.¹⁶⁷ Jung wrote:

As long as one acknowledges the divine revelation, as long as one recognizes the timeless truth of its essential message, one has, within the traditions of Judaism, a very wide margin of freedom. Indeed interpretation of such texts is not merely lawful, not merely tolerated as undeniable privilege, but throughout two millennia we have seen it encouraged and hailed as indications of religious loyalty.¹⁶⁸

4.iv.1. Correspondence with Herman Wouk

As already mentioned, it was important to Modern Orthodoxy that guide books represented that philosophy and so Jung encouraged Herman Wouk, well-known American novelist, to use his talents to write about Judaism, as he would have a large, receptive audience. Wouk had heard Jung speak and was inspired. Wouk studied with Jung, who exposed him to the classics of Judaism.¹⁶⁹ According to Wouk, Jung helped him through “his intellectual doubt and moral position.”¹⁷⁰ Wouk thanked Jung for encouraging him to write This is My God, published in 1959, which Wouk claimed had began thirteen years previous when Jung had lent him The Nineteen Letters of Ben Uziel, Samson Raphael Hirsch’s book of Modern Orthodox philosophy.¹⁷¹

Jung helped Wouk with editing and correcting the manuscript for This Is My God.¹⁷² Jung went through his manuscript very carefully and sent detailed suggestions, and corrected information regarding Jewish holidays, Halakhic details, mistranslations, interpretations and discrepancies of fact and law. Jung also advised some changes in thought and style. Jung referred Wouk to his own book, The Rhythm of Life for a fuller view of mikveh, to Living Judaism for why we pray in Hebrew, to Essentials of Judaism for facts concerning Mishna and Gemarah, to David Hoffman's article in Guardians of Our Heritage for a response to Wellhausen and the challenge to divine revelation, and to Abraham Cohen's article in Judaism in a Changing World, on the challenge of Biblical criticism. It can thus be seen that Herman Wouk used Jung's books as good references for Judaism and Jewish issues. Jung also referred Wouk to other writings to clarify points.¹⁷³ Wouk complimented Jung on his editing and promised to revise what he could.¹⁷⁴ This Is My God was written for laymen, not for rabbis, yet it dealt with difficult themes: the quest for holiness, the problem of praying in English, separate seating in synagogue, family purity and mikveh and principles of Orthodox Judaism. Jung's ideas and influence are present in the book. The fact that Wouk dealt with family purity, a difficult and seldom dealt-with topic, is testimony to Jung's influence.

The book rose to be on the best seller list and became a standard book on the Jewish faith, of interest to both Jewish and Christian readers.¹⁷⁵ That this type of book was written by a Pulitzer Prize novelist whose works had been a top attraction on Broadway and in Hollywood was good for Modern Orthodoxy. Here was an author who lived as an Orthodox Jew in the modern world.¹⁷⁶ It showed that Modern Orthodoxy was part of the American scene. Wouk acknowledged that This Is My God was similar in

intent to Jung's book, Guardians of Our Heritage.¹⁷⁷ The intent of the book was to teach about Judaism and Jewish values and to excite the readers to want to inculcate in their life what was taught. The reviewer in the journal Tradition felt that it took courage for Wouk to have written this type of book, as presenting himself as an advocate for Orthodox Judaism could have jeopardized his popularity as a novelist.¹⁷⁸ Wouk set an example and provided the tools for observant living. There was a change going on; the audience was receptive and eager to learn; a necessary requirement for a movement to the right to occur.

4.iv.2. New Orthodox Journal

The RCA wanted a journal to represent Modern Orthodoxy.¹⁷⁹ Rabbi Solomon Sharfman, president of the RCA, asked Rabbi Norman Lamm, as head of the publications committee of the RCA, to begin a new journal. Rabbi Lamm asked Rabbi Jung if he would undertake this, but Jung was too busy at the time; Lamm turned to Rabbi Sydney Hoenig, but he too, did not have the time. Thus Rabbi Lamm, in 1958, took on the task himself and became editor of a new journal, called Tradition.¹⁸⁰ Rabbi Lamm commented that he was younger than any other editor that he knew at that time.¹⁸¹ Hence, the journal was in the hands of a new generation of rabbis. Rabbi Lamm's said that at the time he really did not know much about the Jewish Forum as he was a student and had just gotten his semicha in 1951.¹⁸² The goal of Tradition was to discuss, interpret and illustrate Orthodox issues in such a way as to meet the doubts of the modern mind and strengthen the faith of modern man.¹⁸³

Rabbi Jung, frequent contributor to Jewish Forum, never wrote an article for this journal. The articles were on a high scholarly level; the journal showed a confidence that the tradition fit into contemporary times and the journal represented contemporary times. Rabbi Lamm referred to Rabbi Jung's writings as "popular"; he looked for scholarly works for Tradition and though Lamm said that Jung was too busy to write for the journal, one could be left with the impression that Jung was not asked.¹⁸⁴ Jung's lack of participation seems to highlight a tension that existed between the different generations of rabbis. The "popular" versus the "scholarly" seems to be indicative of this generational gap in perceived needs of Orthodoxy at this time.

4.v. Modern Orthodoxy Became Better Defined

4.v.1. Synagogue Service In Hebrew

Rabbi Jung wrote to Rabbi Jacob Yechiel Weinberg of Montreaux in 1953, asking if the Psalms during the prayer service could be recited in English. Rabbi Weinberg's answer was that while prayer could be recited in any language, the Psalms should not be recited in English for the following reasons. The Haredi (right wing Orthodox Jews) would oppose it and see it as a move closer to the Reformers, and he feared that it could cause malicious gossip. Rabbi Weinberg referred to Chatam Sofer, Rabbi Moshe Sofer, known by the title of his responsa, who had adopted in the nineteenth century, during the enlightenment era, the view that all that was novel in religious practice, was forbidden by the Torah. Chatam Sofer said that praying in another language was prohibited in a congregational service.¹⁸⁵ Weinberg continued his reasoning by saying that the synagogue

was the place for complete and pure Judaism, therefore the holy tongue should be used in the synagogue service as using Hebrew strengthened the sense of holiness of synagogue prayer. Another reason given was that using English would deviate from the practice of our ancestors and one should follow in their footsteps. Also, this practice would lead to even more English in central prayers. The conclusion was that only the Holy language could be used in the synagogue service; this further defined Modern Orthodoxy, preventing its services from in any way looking like those of a Conservative service. Rabbi Jung had always been interested in Americanizing and making the service more decorous and we can assume this was a reason that he asked the question. Again, it seems that he was not in touch with the new thinkers who were moving away from this desire to Americanize and were taking a stand on traditional approaches. The right-wing Orthodox thought and example, in this case of Rabbi Moshe Sofer, was influential.¹⁸⁶

4.v.2. Gap Between Traditional Orthodoxy and Modern Orthodoxy

Modern Orthodox rabbis had maintained principles of inclusion and cooperation with other groups of Jews. These rabbis respected and supported non-Orthodox colleagues and worked with them in communal work. Mixing with Conservative and Reform colleagues remained unchanged, but by the fifties, this relationship was in more need of defence as Traditional Orthodox groups exerted an influence. Working with other Jewish groups differentiated Modern Orthodoxy from other Orthodox groups.

Roshei Yeshiva came to America after the war and espoused a policy of separation, opposing the participation by Orthodox on mixed boards, as they felt that this gave status and legitimacy to the non-Orthodox and withdrawal from mixed bodies would

result in closer cooperation within Orthodox circles.¹⁸⁷ The dilemma as to what extent Orthodoxy might collaborate with other rabbinic groups, was solved in the fifties, though the issue was certainly reopened later on.¹⁸⁸ Rabbi Soloveitchik had written in 1954 that for things pertaining to Jewish interests and all Jews, all groups should be united and fight together against the common enemy. However, for spiritual-ideological issues and for the unity of a Torah community, Orthodox rabbis must not join with the non-Orthodox, as any deviation or compromise in the area of Halakhah was impossible and intolerable.¹⁸⁹ Rabbi Soloveitchik thus prohibited RCA members from participating in the Jewish Publication Society's Torah translation project, fearing that Orthodox rabbis would not have a veto in the final version.¹⁹⁰

In 1950 the RCA became more active in the Synagogue Council Of America, which had been organized in 1926 to bring together Orthodox, Reform and Conservative Rabbis in matters of common interest, other than religious issues.¹⁹¹ At first the relationship of RCA with the Council was ambivalent. Then the RCA realized that the Synagogue Council was the only vehicle for RCA to voice its opinions on church and state matters.¹⁹² The RCA took a broader view of its role on the American scene. It saw the Council, as an avenue for the Orthodox to act in community situations.¹⁹³ UOJCA had been the Orthodox representative on the Synagogue Council from the Council's inception in 1926. It had been agreed that religious matters would not be discussed and only matters affecting the welfare of the whole community would be on the agenda. Other Orthodox groups had no common language or interests with the Synagogue Council members. RCA was asked to join shortly after it began in 1935. It did send delegates, but the Council remained a minor concern of the RCA.

Participation in the Council came to a head in the administration of David Hollander when the conflict was finally resolved.¹⁹⁴ Hollander, president of the RCA , favored withdrawal from the Synagogue Council of America.¹⁹⁵ He had opted for a more insular Orthodoxy and appealed to Orthodox Yeshiva directors who had signed a petition against interdenominational cooperation. In 1956 eleven leading Roshei Yeshiva, part of the Council of Torah Sages, of Agudat Israel, which included Rabbis Moshe Feinstein, Jacob Ruderman and Aaron Kotler, issued a public ruling which prohibited activities in mixed groups. Rabbis Moshe Feinstein and Aaron Kotler decided that according to the Torah, mixed boards were prohibited. David Hollander felt that the RCA should follow the Council Sages. Rav Soloveitchik refused to sign the petition.¹⁹⁶ Rav Soloveitchik commented that the Igud Harabbonim, of which Feinstein and Kotler were members, was not a member of the Synagogue Council and so the issue was not applicable to them.¹⁹⁷ Therefore the Halakhic Commission did not deal with the issue as it did not want to conflict with the Roshei Yeshiva.¹⁹⁸ This issue was never decided Halakhically.¹⁹⁹ Though Soloveitchik would not go against the Yeshiva leaders, he held that there could be cooperation in matters that were non-Halakhic.²⁰⁰

When David Hollander offered Rabbi Jung an appointment to the Division of Religious Affairs Commission (DRA) in 1955, if he would agree to fight mixed rabbinic boards, Jung refused the appointment.²⁰¹ Rabbi Jung would not accept a conditional appointment, especially as he totally disagreed with the conditions. Hollander's view was voted down making the RCA policy clear; they would continue to participate on mixed rabbinic boards.²⁰² David Hollander and his right wing ideas did not prevail in the RCA at this time.

Emanuel Rackman was the president of the RCA in 1956, and also president of the New York Board of Rabbis, which included Orthodox, Conservative and Reform members. His view was that cooperation did not mean agreement but respect, and that Modern Orthodoxy could make better gains from inside. Rackman cited gains in kashrut facilities and observances at banquets.²⁰³

In 1954, The Men's Club of The Jewish Center held a symposium, "Tomorrow's Judaism A Realistic Approach," with Max Einhorn, a Reform rabbi, Emmanuel Rackman, an Orthodox rabbi, and Edward T. Sanrow, a Conservative rabbi. Leo Jung was the moderator.²⁰⁴ This demonstrated Jung's cooperative position. Jung had always felt that working with all Jews ensured that the voice of Modern Orthodoxy would be heard and that therefore its position would be strengthened.

Jung joined other non-Orthodox and Orthodox rabbis to see what steps if any should be taken to expand the knowledge and influence of the Jewish religion in various areas of the world.²⁰⁵ It was felt that the historical situation was favourable, World War Two and the founding of the State of Israel had gained the Jewish people more sympathy and respect. Reform Rabbi David Max Eichhorn, a prolific writer, who had written a book on conversion, Robert Gordis, who was founder of the first Conservative day school, president of the Rabbinical Assembly and Synagogue Council of America, and professor at JTS, and Leo Jung called a meeting at the JTS of a carefully selected group of Orthodox, Conservative and Reform rabbis to discuss this. The attendees represented only themselves.²⁰⁶ Orthodox Rabbis, Leonard Rosenfeld, Emmanuel Rackman and Herschel Schacter were among the members of the committee. Jung's goal was, "to spread the truth about Judaism among non-Jews." Robert Gordis was against

missionizing, but wanted “Information Centers” though some non-Jews would be led to Judaism through these centres. Rabbi Leonard Rosenfeld was in favour of, “an all-out program designed to gain converts.” Rabbi Bernard Bamberger, a Reform movement leader in the Central Conference of American Rabbis and Biblical scholar, also wanted the goal to be more than spreading information; he hoped that this process would result in acquiring converts.²⁰⁷ Conversion was on their minds as there were non-Jews married to Jews in Israel, there were Jewish converts who had come to Israel, whose conversions were not recognized, and there were former Jews who had converted to Christianity during the war and wished to return to Judaism. The issue of conversion for the sake of marriage was not raised. Jung insisted that these people must be converted under Orthodox rules.²⁰⁸ Orthodox participation meant adherence to Halakhic principles in the important area of conversion and without Orthodox involvement this point of view would not be enforced.

Modern Orthodox representatives continued to work in the Synagogue Council of America, the Division of Religious Activities of The National Jewish Welfare Board, the New York Board of Rabbis, and in the Jewish Military Chaplains Association. Though the Roshei Yeshiva grew in numbers, strength and influence, they could not dictate to the Modern Orthodox group and their positions even helped define Modern Orthodoxy. Modern Orthodoxy would not be isolationist. The Roshei Yeshiva promoted the causes of the Agudat Harabbonim as they had condemned working with Conservative and Reform Rabbis in the Synagogue Council of America and on local boards and they also championed the cause of using the Yiddish language. The Agudat Harrabonim found that its goals were being furthered by the wave of new immigrant rabbis to America., part of

the Council of Torah Sages which would eventually replace it. The new Yeshiva world was replacing the Agudat Harrabonim. This gave Modern Orthodoxy a new, very influential group to contend with.²⁰⁹

4.v.3. Denying Legitimacy To Non-Orthodox Denominations

However, the Roshei Yeshiva influenced the Modern Orthodox movement and this caused a tension and a pulling in two directions. In the fifties Modern Orthodoxy became more intolerant though it maintained that it was not isolationist. Rabbi Soloveitchik, who approved the existence of mixed boards, discouraged pupils and disciples from granting legitimacy to non-Orthodox denominations.²¹⁰ Also in 1950, Israel Tabak, president of the RCA, refused an invitation to the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative) dinner saying no unity was possible until all Jews returned to the principles of Torah Judaism and it became a precedent for RCA presidents to decline such invitations.²¹¹ One of the reasons given for the change of attitude was that Conservative Judaism had gained momentum after the war and became more lenient in legal traditional matters, and this led to the mid-century Orthodox attacks. Jeffrey Gurock said that when the Conservative movement grew more attractive, it led to the Orthodox becoming more demanding.²¹² However banning of mixed boards never became official Modern Orthodox policy, probably because the rabbis appreciated the value of the encounters.

4.v.4. Mixed Pews (Mechitza): Example of Wider Gap Between Orthodox and Conservative

Orthodoxy made efforts to defend traditional Judaism and made issues of such matters as the mechitza.²¹³ As already discussed, the mechitza became a definer of Orthodox communal norms by the second half of the fifties.²¹⁴ This divisive issue between the Conservative and Orthodox movements in the fifties became another defining moment for Modern Orthodox Judaism. Mechitza was not a new issue and the forties had pointed to the direction that Modern Orthodoxy would take. However, it was not until the fifties that the debate became a big issue as there was confrontation between Orthodox and Conservative over control of important Orthodox synagogues, some of which were defecting to Conservatism.²¹⁵ Marshal Sklare reported that an overwhelming majority of Conservative synagogues had mixed pews.²¹⁶ There were still some RCA members who officiated in synagogues with mixed pews but they were permitted only if they worked to have that situation changed; again this was not new.²¹⁷

Jeffrey Gurock pointed out that separation of the Conservative and Orthodox movements was a slow process that began in the twenties and that there was not one single moment along the way when the separation took place.²¹⁸ However, the mechitza became a symbol in the struggle between the Orthodox and Conservative ideologies as well as a focus of controversy and agitation. According to Norma Joseph, professor of Religion at Concordia University, the conflict, though couched in legal terms, was political; the issue was not only to keep men separate from women in the synagogue but, to keep Orthodox Jews separate from Conservative and Reform Jews.²¹⁹

As discussed, the OUJCA had adopted a resolution that a mechitza was a necessity. The RCA had played a leading role in cooperation with UOJCA in the fight against mixed pews.²²⁰

Rav Moshe Feinstein wrote fourteen respona in Igrot Moshe about mechitza and he argued that the mechitza was a biblical law rather than a rabbinic enactment.²²¹ As Biblical law or Torah law was most authoritative, this accentuated how important mechitza was considered. The Modern Orthodox rabbis, headed by Solomon Scharfman, president of the RCA, ruled against mixed pews.²²² Rabbi Norman Lamm declared that mechitza was not a custom but a Halakhah.²²³ Rabbi Lamm wrote that Rabbis of the last generation such as Rabbi Israel Meir Hakohen (A.K.A. Chafetz Chaim) and Chief Rabbi Kook had upheld this Halakhah and that contemporary rabbis, such as Rabbis Herzog of Israel, Rabbi Samuel Belkin, and Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, also affirmed the law. Rabbi Lamm felt that the debate reflected on the validity of the Jewish tradition and its survival intact in the modern world.²²⁴

The Conservative movement had maintained that mechitza was not an essential requirement. From the Orthodox point of view this stance was considered illegitimate and Rabbi Feinstein wrote that one must not pray in a non-Orthodox synagogue, or in a synagogue without a mechitza.²²⁵ As already discussed, Rabbi Soloveitchik was in agreement. The attention given to this Halakhic detail and imposed strictness was one example of a movement to the right. The mechitza was one barometer that the Modern Orthodox synagogue was moving to the right.

In the fifties the Orthodox had to address the women's issue; its opponents made an accusation that separation gave women inferior status and that husbands and wives worshipping next to each other make for better families.²²⁶ Rabbi Lamm, in 1959, said the opposite occurred; confusion in roles had led to divorce and juvenile delinquency. Therefore separation of roles reinforced the family and was good from a social and

psychological point of view. Lamm wrote that woman who wanted equality in seating should also have to take on all the men's duties prescribed by Jewish Law, all the synagogue duties as well as the spiritual duties. This was a weak argument because some women were indeed ready to do this. Lamm made another argument when he wrote that equality in value did not mean equality in function and that mixed seating represented a "pagan-Christianization of the synagogue."²²⁷ What was significant was that Modern Orthodoxy's new leadership was forced to defend their Halakhic Jewish attitude towards women and to think about the role of women in Judaism.

Definite decisions were made; the movement had come a long way since the thirties when Rabbi Jung had asked Rabbi Jacob Agus to research the question of mechitza. However, the Jewish Center Synagogue always had a mechitza even if it was not high enough for some Traditional Orthodox. Rabbi Lamm told of one rabbi who used to come to the synagogue on Friday nights to pray, but never on Saturday morning. Rabbi Lamm later found out that it was because the mechitza was not high enough for him and that, at that time, there were no women on Friday nights, so he felt able to come then.²²⁸ Separate seating had also been a contentious issue between the Modern Orthodox and Traditional Orthodox, as the latter had never compromised on this issue.²²⁹

4.v.5. Conservative Bet Din and Ketuba: Another Example of Widening Gap Between Conservative and Orthodox

The Conservative Ketuba (marriage agreement) is related to the aguna issue. It was set up to restrict the husband's absolute power to divorce or not divorce his wife. The Conservative movement established its own Bet Din (court) and introduced its own ketuba. In 1954 Professor Saul Lieberman of the Conservative JTS introduced a new

clause to The Conservative Ketuba, amending the traditional ketuba text. As part of the Conservative Ketuba couples agreed to turn to the Rabbinical Assembly Bet Din and accept its ruling in cases of divorce.²³⁰ Professor Lieberman maintained that the civil courts could uphold the Bet Din decision if the husband did not accept the Bet Din ruling. Lieberman's proposal was rejected by the Orthodox rabbinate for many reasons. The Orthodox said that it lacked Halakhic integrity, they discredited the competence of the religious Conservative court as they felt that Conservative rabbis were not qualified to make Halakhic decisions. A non-Orthodox Bet Din was not acceptable, and civil courts could not enforce the ketuba that was viewed as a religious document. Added to the critique was that the amendment had no bearing on the aguna whose husband had disappeared or was missing in military action, it did not discourage frivolous divorces, and it could force unwilling spouses to consent to divorce.²³¹ These issues united the Orthodox factions and served to accentuate and clarify the line of demarcation between Orthodox and Conservative.²³² Orthodox leaders agreed that the problem had to be solved by genuine Halakhic means. Rabbi Lamm commented that nothing concrete emerged on the part of Orthodoxy to solve this problem and felt that this was a failing of Orthodoxy in general.²³³

5. CONCLUSION: THE FIFTIES

There were changes going on in the fifties; after World War Two there was recovery and a sense of renewal and revival. American life was being reshaped as more traditional values were called for. The Holocaust had intensified distrust of the modern world and secularism and even though Modern Orthodoxy stood for interaction with this

world, its emphasis on the importance of religion found a greater audience. As the attitude to western secular culture changed and religion gained more prominence, the desire to be more knowledgeable of Jewish texts, and to adhere to Halakhah became more important. It was in this environment that the qualitative character of Modern Orthodoxy began to change and become more intense. Rejection of the status quo in Modern Orthodoxy began in this decade as the age and class structure of Modern Orthodox adherents changed. The Torah scholars and Halakhic authorities became the new respected leadership. These forces led to more observance of religion, to a movement to the right in Modern Orthodoxy, although the most intense movement to the right in Modern Orthodoxy would come in later decades. In the fifties the right wing movement was not that noticeable but was at its beginning.

Rabbi Jung had put a lot of energy into Americanizing Orthodoxy; this was necessary at the time; however, the focus changed. Modern Orthodoxy became less accommodating to American culture. Those born in America took it for granted and many of the new immigrants who came were more committed to practicing their religion and less focused on Americanization than the immigrants of previous generations. Rabbi Lamm commented that, by the fifties, Modern Orthodox Jews had become like other groups in that there was unconscious acculturation and instincts calling for differentiation.²³⁴

There was a change of focus from ethics and social justice to observance of the law, and going to the sources oneself. There was resistance to ambiguity and ambivalence. This in part led to changes in the leadership in Modern Orthodoxy. The new leaders introduced more accurate learning of the Jewish classical texts and they became

more demanding in terms of Halakhic standards and higher levels of commitment. Desire and ability to observe the laws often comes with knowledge of the law and respect for the interpreters of the law; hence, the groundwork for this observance was laid in the fifties.

Rabbi Norman Lamm represented the new approach to Modern Orthodoxy, and when he came to the Jewish Center Synagogue in 1958 he left a different stamp on the congregation as he created a more sophisticated, intellectual climate.²³⁵ He introduced an ideological motif, and a sense of educational excellence.²³⁶ His vision was more academically ideological.²³⁷ However, in the fifties Jung continued to stress morality and justice. He stressed repeatedly his popular theme, “reverence, righteousness and rachmanot.” For the most part, except with Noam, he did not discuss or analyze Halakhah; Rabbi Lamm did this.²³⁸

Modern Orthodoxy was no longer floundering; it had made definite decisions that separated it from the Conservative movement. In the seventies, Marshall Sklare said that, “having achieved a new sense of élan, Orthodoxy has proceeded to implement a policy of strict non-cooperation with Conservatism.”²³⁹ The previous generation was more concerned with the Conservative on their left than the Modern Orthodox generation of the fifties. However, the right wing Orthodox who came after the war, both in America and in Israel, began to be influential. Before the Modern Orthodox Movement was looking over its left shoulder at the Conservative Movement, it now began looking over its right. There was some desire not to offend more traditional Jews, in some cases a desire to emulate them, coupled with the desire to maintain its Modern Orthodox influence. They went from desiring acceptance from their Gentile neighbour to desiring approval from the Traditional Orthodox.

¹ John Bartlett, Ed. Familiar Quotations. 14th edition, Boston, Toronto : Lett, Brown and Company, 1968, 379B.(Letter from Sir Isaac Newton to Robert Hooke, Feb 5,1675.)

² Haym Soloveitchik. “ Rupture And Reconstruction; The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy.” Tradition 28:4 (1994) 65-66.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Simon Solomon. “A Renewed Halakhah.” Judaism 3.1 (1954): 48.

⁵ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.:Shoken Books,1972 edition, 262.

⁶ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.:Shoken Books, 1955 edition, 43.

⁷ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. 1972 edition, 264.

⁸ Leo Jung. “Greetings. 1957.”Y.U. Archives, Public Relations Files,1942-1980.

⁹ Will Herberg . “The Postwar Revival of The Synagogue Does It Represent A Religious Awakening?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 319.

¹⁰ “Rabbi Jung and Notes on the Tercentenary, “ 1, The Jewish Floridian. Friday 28 January 1955. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 2. (Newspaper Clippings, Magazine Articles)

¹¹ Letter dated 1 February 1958 from the Iran Medical Center in America. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 8, Folder 1.

¹² Letter to Benjamin Mintz (Vice Speaker of the Israeli Parliament-Knesset)from Leo Jung, 26 May 1952. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 2.

¹³ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol. 8, Soncino Press, London, N.Y.: 1980, 180-182.

Letter “To Whom It May Concern” Kfar Eliyahu, signed Eli Shashar, Director of Youth-

Aliyah's Religious Department. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 14, Folder 4 .

Letter to Mr. Zev Wolfson, 31 March 1970, from Rabbi Chaim Wasserman, Director Poale Agudath of America . Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 14, Folder 5. “ Resume of Talks with Dr. Eliajahu Jung at his 1972 Visit at Kfar Eliajahu.” Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 14, Folder 6.

¹⁴ Letter from Benjamin Mintz (vice Speaker of the Israeli Parliament-Knesset)to Jung, Feb. 29, 1952. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box16, Folder 16.

¹⁵ “Agudat Israel.” Encyclopededia Judaica. 1972, Keter Publishing House ,Jerusalem Ltd ,Jerusalem ,Volume 2, 422-423. There is a request from the United Religious Bloc of America to Jung, 27 February 1950 and their stationary shows that the Organization comprises of Agudath Israel, amongst others. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2.

¹⁶Letter from Major General Patrick Ryan, Chief of Chaplains, to Jung , 25 May 1954. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 3.

¹⁷ Mordecai Soltes. (Educational Committee) preface. Jews In The Arts and Sciences Jubilee Volume of Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences. 233 Spring Street, N.Y: Herald Square Press Inc., [1955]

¹⁸ Letter to Mr. Bernard Baruch from Jung, 12 January 1953. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 3.

¹⁹ Letter to Dr. Samuel Belkin ,President of Yeshiva University, from Jung ,11 May 1955. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 8.

²⁰ Emanuel Rackman. “Orthodox Judaism Moves With The Times The Creativity of

Tradition.” Commentary 13.6 (June 1952): 550.

²¹ Review of Jung’s sermon .The New York Times, Sunday 4 January 1953 . Y.U. Archives, Box 40, Folder 7. Letter to Jung from Bernard Baruch , 5 January 1953. Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 2.

²² Will Herberg . “Religious Trends in American Jewry.” Judaism 3.3. (1954): 229. Movement away from secularism and assimilation, movement of “return” leads to return to synagogue and observance.

²³ Will Herberg. “ The Post War Revival Of The Synagogue, Does It Reflect A Religious Reawakening?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 315.

²⁴ Will Herberg. “The Post War Revival Of the Synagogue Does It Reflect A Religious Reawakening ?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 315.

²⁵ Will Herberg. “The Post War Revival of the Synagogue Does It Reflect A Religious Awakening?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 315.

²⁶ Will Herberg. “Religious Trends in American Jewry.” Judaism 3.3 (1954): 32.

²⁷ Will Herberg. “The Post War Revival Of The Synagogue Does It Reflect A Religious Awakening ?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 315.

²⁸ Nathan Glazer. “The Jewish Revival in America:1,” Commentary 20.6 (Dec 1955): 495.

²⁹ Nathan Glazer. “The Jewish Revival in America: 1,” Commentary 20.6 (Dec. 1955): 495.

³⁰ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1972 edition, 267.

³¹ Will Herberg. “Religious Trends in American Jewry,” Judaism 3.3 (1954) 233.

³² Norman Lamm.(President of Yeshiva University) personal interview. 16 January 2003.

³³ Nathan Glazer. "The Jewish Revival in America ;11 Its Religious Side," Commentary 21. 1 (1956): 23.

³⁴ Nathan Glazer. "The Jewish Revival In America:11 Its Religious Side," Commentary 21.1 (1956): 23-24.

³⁵ Marc Tanenbaum. "Communal Affairs. Organizational Expansion ," American Jewish Year Book , vol. 60, (1959);," 53.

³⁶ "UOJCA Will Seek To Establish Discipline of Orthodox Jewish Life and Education," The Commentator 24.4 (December 10, 1951): 4. Yeshiva University Archives.

³⁷ Minutes of UOJCA meeting, 29 April 1958, 1. Yeshiva University Archives, Koenigberg Files, Box 11, Number 3.

³⁸ "UOJCA Will Seek To Establish Discipline of Orthodox Jewish Life and Education," Commentator 24.4 (December 10, 1951): 4. Y.U. Archives.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Norma Baumel Joseph. "Mechitzah: Halakhic Decisions and Political Consequences." Susan Grossman, Rivka Haut,, ed. Daughters of the King Woman and the Synagogue. Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerisalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1992, 118.

⁴² Ibid .125

⁴³ "UOJCA Will Seek To Establish Discipline of Orthodox Life and Education," Commentator 24.4(December 10, 1951): 4. Y.U. Archives.

⁴⁴ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission: Te Emergence of the English Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers, 1982, 157.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 180.

⁴⁶ Ibid 206.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 51, 71.

⁴⁸ Ibid 40.

⁴⁹ Ibid . 41.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 92, 99.

⁵¹ Ibid. 103.

⁵² Ibid. 103.

⁵³ Jenna Joselit Weisman. The Wonders of America. N.Y.: Hill and Wang, 1994, 187.

⁵⁴ Report to the Joint Kashrut Commission On the Public Relations Program, 22 May 1956. Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Files, Box 9, Folder 3.

⁵⁵ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Misison The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. Shengold Publishers, 1982, 104.

⁵⁶ UOJCA Report to the Joint Kashrut Commision on the Public Relations Program, 22 May 1956. Y.U. Archives, Koenigsberg Collection, Box 9, Folder 3.

⁵⁷ Jewish Center Bullitin. 2 February 1951."Jewish Domestic Science." Jewish Center Synagogue Archives.

⁵⁸ Martin Schwarzschild. personal interview. 11 November 1996.

⁵⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 120.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 184.

⁶¹ Ibid. 167.

⁶² Ibid. 188.

⁶³ Ibid. 185-6.

⁶⁴ Titled, "Rabbi Leo Jung." 17 May 1957. Joint Distribution Committee Archives, File # 2409.

⁶⁵ Letter #1459, 16 June 1950, To AJJDC Buenos Aires, Julius Lomnitz, Re: Rabbi Leo Jung. JDC Archives, File # 2409.

⁶⁶ Letter # 1459. 16 June 1950, To AJJDC Buenos Aires, Julius Lomnitz. JDC Archives, File # 2409.

⁶⁷ Minutes 21 November 1950. JDC Archives, File #3390.

⁶⁸ Letter to Solomon Tarshansky, Director American Friends Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 26 November 1952 .Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 19. Folder 1.

⁶⁹ Letter to Mortimer J. Propp From Leo Jung, 18 November 1970. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 16, Folder 9. (Oriental Jews known as *Sephardit* Jews.)

⁷⁰ Proposed travel plan for Leo Jung, March 9-24, 1955. JDC Archives, File #2409.

⁷¹ "Rabbi Leo Jung----Honouring Leo Jung." 17 May 1957. JDC Archives, File #2409.

⁷² Ibid. JDC Archives.

⁷³ Letter to Mr. Arthur LeVine, 12 February, 1951. Y.U. Archives, Leo Jung Collection, Box 2, Folder 41.

⁷⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 265. Letter to Editor of New York Times from Jung and Carey McWilliams, 14 December 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41,

Folder 2. Milton Konvitz. "The Swing if the Pendulum." Book Review.(review of book The Blessing of Liberty by Zecharia Chafee) Midstream 3.1(winter 1957): 96-98.

⁷⁵Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library. vol. 8, London, N.Y.: 1980, 265. Letter to Jung from Secretary of Committee, 7 May 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2. Letter to Editor of New York Times urging repeal of the McCarran Act. 5 June 1951. Jung Collection. Box 41, Folder 2. Letter from John Thompson Dean Rockefeller Memorial Chapel University of Chicago, 11 December 1950, requesting that Jung become a leader in the opposition to this bill. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1.

⁷⁶ Letter to Editor of New York Times for Jung, Carey Williams, Olive O. Van Horne 14 December 1951. copy of Letter in New York Times ,”Repeal of Subversives Bill Urged”, 6 June 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2. (Photocopied Letters)

⁷⁷Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. The Jewish Library, vol. 8, London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 265.

⁷⁸ Letter to Jung from Olive O. Van Horne, Secretary of National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, 7 May 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2.

⁷⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 188-9.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 186.

⁸¹ Letter to Mr. Arthur LeVine, 12 February 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2.

⁸² Copy of New York Times, Sunday 4 January 1953, “Destiny of Nation Put To

Individual.” Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 2.

⁸³ Letter to Mr. Arthur LeVine 12 February 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 2.

⁸⁴ Will Herberg. “The Postwar Revival of the Synagogue Does It Reflect a Religious Awakening?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 316.

⁸⁵ Will Herberg. “The Triple Melting Pot.” Commentary (August 1955) 498.

⁸⁶ Will Herberg. “Religious Trends in America.” Judaism 3.3 (1954); 233-235.

⁸⁷ Eliezer Berkovits. “Jewish Living in America.” Judaism 2.1 (January 1953): 73.

⁸⁸ Will Herberg. “The Postwar Revival of the Synagogue Does it Reflect a Religious Reawakening?” Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 320.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 130.

⁹¹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers inc., 1982, 225.

⁹² “United States of America- Relations With Israel.” Encyclopaedia Judaica. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Jerusalem Ltd., 1972, vol. 15, 1666.

⁹³ Letter to Honorable John Foster Dulles, from Jung, 9 February 1956. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1.

⁹⁴ Letter to Jung from Ben-Gurion 21 June 1951 thanking him for sending Israel of Tomorrow. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 1. Letter to Ben-Gurion, 21 March 1951. Box 40, Folder 3.

⁹⁵ Letter from Herzog to Jung, 22 September 1957. Letter to Jung , 24 October 1957, from Sarah Herzog, Letter to Rabbi Isaac Herzog ,3 October 1957.Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 10 ,Folder 1.

⁹⁶ Letters to Jung from Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of Israel, 11 December 1953. Letter to Goldmann from Jung 14 December 1953. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 40, Folder 3.

⁹⁷ Jacob Sloan. "Community Affairs Religious." American Jewish Year Book.Vol. 58, 154. Solomon J. Sharfman. Forward. Tradition1.1 (Fall 1958) 5-6.

⁹⁸ Jenna Joselit Weissman. New York's Jewish Jews The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years. Bloomingtondale: Indiana press, 1990, 1-120.

⁹⁹ Simon Solomon. "A Renewed Halakcha." Judaism 3.1 (1954) 52.

¹⁰⁰Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1955, 154, 215, 224.

¹⁰¹Seth Farber. "Reproach, Recognition and Respect; Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik and Orthodoxy's Mid-century Attitude Toward Non-Orthodox Denominations." American Jewish History. Vol. 89 i2(June 2001) 193.

¹⁰² Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.; Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 71.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 28.

¹⁰⁴ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung . London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 126-130.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. 127.

¹⁰⁶ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Leo Jung. Path of a Pathfinder Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 129.

¹¹⁰ Letter to Rabbi Norman Lamm from Rabbi Eliezer Berkovits, undated but in the box with mail from the seventies. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 13, Folder 8.

¹¹¹ Leo Jung . Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, 129.

¹¹² Ibid. 129-130.

¹¹³ Letter to Rabbi Norman Lamm from Rabbi Eliezer Berkovits.(Undated) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 13, Folder 8.

¹¹⁴ Marc Shapiro. *Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy the Life and Works of Rabbi Jehiel Jacob Weinberg*. London, Portland , Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999, 190-191.

¹¹⁵ Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Sonncinp Press, 1980, 129.

¹¹⁶ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

¹¹⁷ Rosalie Rosenfeld. (Jung's daughter) Letter dated 7 October 1997, answering questions sent to her by Maxine Jacobson . (In possession of Maxine Jacobson)

¹¹⁸ "The Three R's of Married Love," Jewish News 61.36, Denver, Colorado, 9 September 1954. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 3. (Published Articles)

¹¹⁹ Leo Jung. "Kiddushah," Thought of the Week. Torah Vodaath. 19 April 1957. Y.U.

Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 3.(published Articles)

¹²⁰ Leo Jung , ed. Jewish Leaders. The Jewish Library, vol 6. Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1953, 1964, 5.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Morris N. Kertzer. "Community Affairs Religion." American Jewish Year Book. vol 56(1955): 233.

¹²³ Ibid. 236.

¹²⁴ Will Herberg. " The Postwar Revival of the Synagogue Does it Reflect a Religious Awakening?" Commentary 9.4(April 1950): 317.

¹²⁵ Nathan Glazer. "The Jewish Revival in America." Commentary 20.6 (December 1955): 495.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Shoken Books, 1955, 156.

¹²⁸ Jewish Center Bulletin, 8 December 1950. Jewish Synagogue Archives.

¹²⁹ Alexander Gross, Joseph Kaminetsky. "Shraga Feival Mendlowitz." Leo Jung ,Ed. Men of The Spirit. N.Y.: Kyamson Publication Company, 1964, 571, 717.

¹³⁰ Jonathan Rosenblum. Rosenblum's Columns. " Dr. Joe We Owe You, Jewish Media Resources ," The Jerusalem Post Newspaper: Monday, 29 March 1999, 2 . Yahoo Search. www.jewishmediasources.org/article/198.

¹³¹ Morris Kertzer. "Community Affairs Religion." American Year Book . vol 56(1955): 237.

¹³² Jewish Center Bulletin. 8 December 1950. Jewish Center Archives.

- ¹³³Harold U. Ribalow. "My Child Goes to Parochial School." Commentary 17.1(January 1954): 64-65.
- ¹³⁴Nahum Glazer. "The Jewish Revival in America:1." Commentary 20.6 (December 1955): 497.
- ¹³⁵Haym Soloveitchik. "Rupture and Reconstruction The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy." Tradition 28.4 (1994): 91.
- ¹³⁶Will Herberg. "The Religious Stirring on The Campus." Commentary 13.3 (March 1952): 244.
- ¹³⁷Letter to Samuel Belkin, President of Y.U. , from Jung, 1 May 1955. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 8.
- ¹³⁸ "New School Year Sees Enrollment Up. Faculty Additions," Yeshiva University News 8.1 (November 1950): 6. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹³⁹"College Enrollment Sees All Time High," The Commentator 24.2 (November 1950): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴⁰ "Charter Granted for Medical and Dental School-\$25 Million to be Sought-Wide Acclaim Greets Plan," Yeshiva University News 8.1 (February 1951): 1. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁴¹ Jeffrey Gurock. "Resisiters and Accomodators: Varieties of Orthodox Rabbis in America 1886-1983." American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996, 66.
- ¹⁴²"Required Jewish Curriculum in College Discussed by Margolith, Churgin, Arfa,' 2. Y.U. Archives, The Commentator 24.3 (26 November 1951):
- ¹⁴³Marc H. Tannenbaum. "Community Affairs Religion." American Jewish History. Vol. 60(1959): 54.

- ¹⁴⁴ William B. Heimlich. The World of Yeshiva. N.Y., London: New York Free Press, Collier, Macmillan Press, 1982, 196.
- ¹⁴⁵ Haym Soloveitchik. ‘Rupture and Reconstruction: The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy.’ Tradition 28.4 (1994): 4.
- ¹⁴⁶ Ibid. 68.
- ¹⁴⁷ Ibid. 69.
- ¹⁴⁸ Ibid. 70-71.
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid. 72, 74.
- ¹⁵⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y., Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 138.
- ¹⁵¹ “Yeshiva Men Should Inspire Community Says Dr. Glatzer,” The Commentator 21.1 (27 February 1950): 4. Y.U. Archives.
- ¹⁵² Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.
- ¹⁵³ Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.
- ¹⁵⁴ Haym Soloveitchik. “Rupture and Reconstruction: The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy.” Tradition 28.4 (1994): 95-96. Aaron Rakeffet –Rothkoff. The Rav: The World of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik. Vol. 2, Hoboken, New Jersey: Kyav 1999, 239. Bernard Rosensweig. ‘The Rabbinical Council of America: Retrospect and Prospect.’ Tradition 22.2 (Summer 1986): 10.
- ¹⁵⁵ Haym Soloveitchik. “Rupture and Reconstruction; The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy.” Tradition 28.4 (1994): 94.
- ¹⁵⁶ Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 292.
- ¹⁵⁷ Review of Jung’s Sermon. The New York Times. (Sunday 4 January 1953): Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 2

- ¹⁵⁸Isidore Epstein. "Step by Step in the Jewish Religion." (Book Review) Tradition 1.2 (Spring 1959): 249. Jacon Sloan. "Community Affairs The American Jewish Community." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 58. (1957): N.Y., Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 152.
- ¹⁵⁹ Leo Jung, ed. Jewish Leaders 1750-1940. Preface. Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1953, x.
- ¹⁶⁰ Ibid. ix
- ¹⁶¹ "Book Review of Guardians of Our Heritage." Tradition 1.2(Spring 1959): 248. He also wrote Harvest, Sermons and Addresses. N.Y.: Phillip Feldheim Inc., 1956.
- ¹⁶²Rabbi Solomon J. Sharfman.(President of the RCA) Forward. Tradition 1.1 (Fall 1958):
- ¹⁶³ Review of Jewish Leaders. The Jewish News. 18 December 1951. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 49, Folder 2. (Newspaper Clippings)
- ¹⁶⁴Leo Jung. Preface. Jewish Leaders 1750-1940. The Jewish Library, vol. 6, Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1953, 1964, ix.
- ¹⁶⁵Ibid. vii.
- ¹⁶⁶ Leo Jung.Preface. Men of the Spirit. Jewish Library Series, vol. 8, Kymson Publishing Co., 1964.
- ¹⁶⁷ Leo Jung, Ed. "Introduction:The Rabbis and Freedom of Interpretation."Guardians of Our Heritage. The Jewish Library, vol. 7, N.Y.: Block Publishing Co., 1958, 5-9.
- ¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 6.
- ¹⁶⁹ Letter to Jung from Wouk, 12 January 1953. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.
- ¹⁷⁰Letters to Wouk from Jung, 4 November 1943, 22 December 1943. Y.U. Archives,

Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷¹Letter to Jung from Wouk , 5 June 1959 from St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.Letter to Wouk from Jung,in response, 9 June 1959. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷² Letter to Wouk from Jung, 31 March 1959; Letter to Jung from Wouk, 26 March 1959.(request that Jung read the manuscript) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷³ Letter to Wouk from Jung, 27 April 1959; Letter to Wouk from Jung 13 April 1959. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷⁴ Letter to Jung from Wouk, 4 May 1959. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection ,Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷⁵ Letter to Wouk from Jung 30 October 1959.(recognizing that ‘This is My God’ on the best seller list) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷⁶ “Book Review Section-This is My God.” Tradition 2.2 (Spring 1960): 333.

¹⁷⁷ Letter to Jung from Wouk, 26 March 1959. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 20, Folder 4.

¹⁷⁸ “Book Review Section-This is My God.” Tradition 2.2 (Spring1960): 333.

¹⁷⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. Shengold Publishers Inc.1982, 27.

¹⁸⁰ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003. Norman Lamm. “The Need For Tradition The Editor’s Introduction to a New Journal.” Tradition 1. (Fall 1958).

7.

¹⁸¹ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Norman Lamm. "The Need For Tradition Introduction to a New Journal."

Tradition 1.(Fall 1958): 11.

¹⁸⁴ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

¹⁸⁵ Noah H. Rosenbloom. Tradition in an Age of Reform The Religious Philosophy of Samson Raphael Hirsch. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976, 391.

¹⁸⁶ Jacob Sloan. "Community Affairs Religion." American Jewish Year Book. vol. 58 (1957): 153.

¹⁸⁷ Agudat Harrabonim and Lubavith Rebbe . editorial, Der Yid(Satmar Paper) 16 March 1956. They attacked Modern Orthodoxy as introduction to Conservative and Reform.

¹⁸⁸ Jacob Sloan. "Community Affairs Religion." American Jewish Year Book. Vol. 58 (1957): 153.

¹⁸⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 59. (Translation of Di Tog Morgen Journal. 19 November 1954.)

¹⁹⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 53-56. Bernard Rosenweig. "The Rav As Community Leader." Tradition 30.4 (1996): 210-218.

¹⁹¹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Tradition The Emergence of the Ennnlish Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 142.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 154.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. 154

¹⁹⁶ Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem. N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press,

Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 291-292.

¹⁹⁷ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 146-147.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid. No halachic issue is ever solved.

²⁰⁰ Seth Farber. "Reproach, Recognition and Respect: Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik and

Orthodoxy's Mid Century Attitude Toward Non-Orthodox Denominations." American

Jewish History. Vol. 89 i2, 193.

²⁰¹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 253.

²⁰² Jeffrey Gurock. 'Resisters and Accomodators: Varieties of Orthodox Rabbis in

America 1886-1983." American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav

Publishing House Inc., 1996, 65.

²⁰³ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking

Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 145.

- ²⁰⁴ Notice of Symposium, 11 March 1954. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 8.
- ²⁰⁵ Letter to Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, 3 June 1958, from conveners Jung, Robert Gordis, David Einhorn. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 21, Folder 9.
- ²⁰⁶ Minutes of Meeting Friday, 13 June 1958. Y.U. Archives. Jung Collection. Box 21, Folder 9.
- ²⁰⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁹ Jeffrey Gurock. 'Resisters and Accomodators: Varieties of Orthodox rabbis in America 1886-1983.' American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996, 64.
- ²¹⁰ Seth Farber. 'Reproach, Recognition and Respect, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik and Orthodoxy's Mid Century Attitude Toward Non-Orthodox Denominations.' American Jewish History.vol. 89i2 (June 2001): 123.
- ²¹¹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission the Emergence of the English Speaking Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 136.
- ²¹² Jeffrey Gurock. "The Winnowing of American Orthodoxy." American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996, 299-313.
- ²¹³ Nathan Glazer. "The Jewish Revival in America:11." Commentary 21.1 (1956): 19.
- ²¹⁴ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 138.
- ²¹⁵ Norma Baumel Joseph. "Mechitza, Halakchic Decisions and Political Consequences."

Susan Grossman, Rivka Haut, Ed. Daughters of the King Women in the Synagogue.

Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1992, 128.

²¹⁶ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1955, 88.

²¹⁷ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbis. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 140.

²¹⁸ Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.

²¹⁹ Norma Baumel Joseph. "Mechitzah: Halakchic Decisions and Political Consequences." Susan Grossman, Rivka Haut, ed. Daughters of the King Women in the Synagogue. Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1992, 131.

²²⁰ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 138.

²²¹ Norma Baumel Joseph. "Mechitzah: Halakchic Decisions and Political Consequences." Susan Grossman, Rivka Haut, ed. Daughters of the King Women in the Synagogue. Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1992, 120.

²²² Arthur Hertzberg. "Communal Affairs Religion." American Jewish Year Book. Vol. 59 (1958): 119.

²²³ Norman Lamm. "Separate Pews In The Synagogue A Social and Psychological Approach." Tradition 1.2 (Spring 1959): 141.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Norma Baumel Joseph. "Mechitzah : Halakchic Decisions and Political Consequences." Susan Grossman, Rivka Haut, ed. Daughters of the King Women in the Synagogue. Philadelphia, N.Y., Jerusalem: 1992, 126.

- ²²⁶ Norman Lamm. "Separate Pews in the Synagogue A Social and Psychological Approach." Tradition 1.2 (Spring 1959): 146-151.
- ²²⁷ Ibid. 163.
- ²²⁸ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.
- ²²⁹ Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 192.
- ²³⁰ Ibid. 136.
- ²³¹ Norman Lamm. "Religious Additions to the Ketuba A Halakchic Critique." Tradition 2.1 (Fall 1959):. Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff. The Silver Era. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Yeshiva University Press, Feldheim Publishers, 1981, 295.
- ²³² Louis Bernstein. Challenge and Mission the Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. N.Y.: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1982, 134, 138.
- ²³³ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.
- ²³⁴ Ibid.
- ²³⁵ Rabbi Jacob J. Schacter. personal interview. 11 November 1996. Martin Schwartzchild. personal interview. 11 November 1996.
- ²³⁶ Rabbi Jacob J. Schacter. personal interview. 11 November 1996.
- ²³⁷ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.
- ²³⁸ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003. Martin Schwartzchild. personal interview. 11 November 1996.
- ²³⁹ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1972, 264.

CONCLUSION OF THESIS

This is the story of the renaissance of American Modern Orthodoxy, from the disorganization of the older Orthodoxy to the new spirit of confidence that emerged after World War Two. America went from being a “Jewish wasteland” to being a reservoir of Jewish life. Many modern Americans had viewed the religious person as an anachronism and this person was rehabilitated partly due to the efforts of the clergy and partly due to the changing times and the realization that modernity itself had failings.

What remained of Orthodoxy in America in the twenties and thirties was poor quality Jewish education and the remnant of Shabbat, kashrut and Jewish marriage law observance. Modern Orthodoxy was not well organized, not well defined, not well represented in Jewish institutions, and not able to cope well with modernity. It lacked leadership and strong institutions. Its staying powers were questioned and it was, in fact, in grave danger. However, Rabbi Jung pointed out, in the twenties, that it was not Torah Judaism that needed renewal; it was the Torah Jew.¹ In the late forties Modern Orthodoxy began to flourish and America was no longer a cultural and religious wilderness for Orthodox Jewry. Modern Orthodoxy began to take on a leadership role in Jewish religious endeavors. By the end of the fifties there were adequate facilities and leadership. Modern Orthodox institutions were stronger and Modern Orthodoxy was more dynamic and intense.

The considerable advances were due in part to the work of the Modern Orthodox leadership. The leaders worked hard to avoid a chasm arising between Halakhah and life that encouraged the necessity for change. The leaders adopted the forms of the modern world, but remained within the boundaries of Halakhah. The presentation of Modern

Orthodoxy was changed but never the tenets. These leaders created facilities enabling Orthodox Jews to practice their religion and they created educational facilities and tools that enabled them to appreciate Modern Orthodox Judaism and to take pride in what it stood for.

As pulpit rabbi, organizational worker, teacher, writer and social activist, Rabbi Jung took up the cause of what he called Torah-true Judaism and what this thesis refers to as Modern Orthodoxy. He taught his co-religionists to love America, and to fight internal imperfections, inertia, and Reform Judaism. He helped raise a new class of students, who were both Yeshiva educated and professional, committed to Modern Orthodoxy, America and Israel. The Modern Orthodox cause was advanced due to its landmark institutions such as Yeshiva University, the UOJCA, and the RCA, organizations that Jung helped to set in place.

Rabbi Jung was truly the epitome of Modern Orthodoxy as he synthesized the laws and the secular world. For Jung the secular and the sacred intertwined and interacted; they did not merely exist side by side. Though many of Jung's activities were this-worldly rational, secular endeavours, he also considered them spiritual endeavours, in keeping with the life of Torah. Religion for Jung also meant the promotion of justice and security.² As well as being a religious leader, Jung was a religiopolitical activist. He used the media, sermons, schools, newspapers, journals and his Jewish Library series to teach about Judaism and to achieve goals of religious and social significance. Jung addressed issues pertinent to the Jewish community, to Jewish welfare and the community at large. He embraced issues such as store openings on Saturdays or Sundays, role of women, ethnic rights. He exemplified the universalistic spirit that is inherent in

Jewish particularism; his message was both particular to Modern Orthodox Judaism and of value to humanity.

Jung represented a turning point in American Modern Orthodoxy. He was a new phenomenon, a rabbi trained in Torah and modern thought. He taught, by example, that there was no conflict between Judaism and science. Not only was there no conflict, he felt that they enriched each other. There were Jews in the scientific age that completely chose the secular way and discarded Judaism; there were others who compromised and altered Halakhah or the doctrine of divine revelation; and there were those, who at the opposite end, turned their backs on secular thought and immersed themselves only in the religious milieu. For Rabbi Jung these extremes did not represent Torah-true Judaism.

The beginning of his career overlapped with those of Rabbis Philip Klein, Bernard Drachman and Moses Hyamson. They represented unusual deviations from the Eastern European rabbinical norm as they were secularly educated, in tune with American values, and they were models for many rabbis. One congregant wrote to Jung reminiscing, “I remember the awesome impression that you made on me when I first met you [you were] an Orthodox rabbi, who not only spoke English, [but had] a Ph.D from Cambridge... never before had I known an Orthodox rabbi of such background, such appearance...”³ Rabbi Jung was a pulpit rabbi par excellence. Rabbi Lamm commented, “I don’t know how many shomer shabbos Jews there were; there were more Jung worshippers than God worshippers... to his credit he kept his congregants.”⁴ All the congregants interviewed spoke of his interesting sermons and they all commented on his kindness, his interest, and his participation in their lives. He was respected for being a

wonderful speaker, having both a secular and religious education, and for being a good person.

1. THE NORMS OF MODERN ORTHODOXY IN THE DECADES UNDER DISCUSSION AND HOW JUNG'S ACTIVITIES AND PHILOSOPHY HELPED CLARIFY WHAT MODERN ORTHODOXY STOOD FOR

This dissertation dealt with the development of Modern Orthodoxy from 1920 until 1960. The norms of Modern Orthodoxy were examined in each decade. To begin with, Modern Orthodox adherents tended not to be Jewishly literate, sophisticated or observant. The trend was to assimilation and secularism. What put them under the rubric of Modern Orthodox in many cases was their desire to identify with a Modern Orthodox synagogue, or rabbi or organization.

There were many ambiguities or “grey areas” in Modern Orthodoxy, so much so that it was perceived to be similar to Conservative Judaism. The lines were so fluid that Jung could call Conservative Judaism, “the other kind of Orthodoxy” and the merger of the Orthodox and Conservative seminaries could be contemplated.⁵ Major issues, such as the necessity for a mechitza and the use of a microphone on the Sabbath and other holidays, had not been decided.

The Modern Orthodox attitude towards Zionism was also ambiguous. However Modern Orthodox, unlike other Orthodox groups, did for the most part maintain support for Zionism. There was no Orthodox unity in Zionist causes.

Jung's dilemma was representative of that of many Modern Orthodox thinkers; the dilemma was accepting a political State of Israel and integrating it with the traditional Jewish concept of return to the holy Land. He came to appreciate, though not without

difficulty, that Israel the political entity was important, but always attached to it a religious connotation. The dilemma of dedication to the religious aspect of Eretz Israel and the practicality and necessity of a Jewish homeland came more to the fore as the decades advanced. Attention to Zionist themes increased and there was general agreement in Modern Orthodoxy that Judaism could better thrive and flourish in the context of Jewish sovereignty.

Modern Orthodoxy made social, not religious changes. Jeffrey Gurock described Modern Orthodoxy as an Orthodoxy that strived to be socially appropriate and yet Halakhically correct.⁶ Orthodoxy was represented by decorous service and sermons in English, not Yiddish. Decorum meant that things were compatible with modernity and Americanism. Rabbi Jung recognized that Modern Orthodoxy had to appeal to the Jew who wished to be modern and American. He was faithful to the principles of divine revelation but introduced fresh methods and approaches. Rabbi Jung ably met the needs of those not fully observant making social accommodations, but he avoided any change to the mode of worship. He added decorum to the Modern Orthodox service bringing with it a sense of dignity and Americanism. He gave his sermon in English and made sure that the sermon was meaningful to the congregants who had little religious education. He tailored his message to be responsive to current needs.

Rabbi Jung tried to clean up the Orthodox image by seeing that there were attractive facilities and appealing Orthodox institutions. Rabbi Jung saw to it that there were clean and proper kashrut facilities. Jung fought a corrupt kashrut system and succeeded in replacing it with the reliable OU. He battled and campaigned to promote family purity and to replace the unsavory mikvehs with attractive buildings. He fought

for the rights of Sabbath observers, for schools with good Jewish education, good educational materials and literature that taught about Judaism, as all these things were basic to developing a Torah-true life.

Rabbi Norman Lamm feels that one of Jung's major achievements was that, "Jung brought to Orthodoxy a sense of dignity. He took it out of the kitchen into the dining room and gave it an aura."⁷ Rabbi Jacob Schacter said that Jung "left a dignified Orthodoxy, dignified, well-focused."⁸

Modern Orthodox leaders showed that Halakhah addressed everyday problems. Rabbi Jung presented Halakhah and religion as this worldly and rational in keeping with modernity and American values and he provided attainable goals. Jung, as well as other Modern Orthodox leaders, emphasized everyday ethical traits as they applied to everyday life, to real-life issues, rather than intricate, esoteric issues of law. Practical explanations for Halakhah were given that the people could understand and identify with. He felt that human relations such as those between worker and employer, and husband and wife, should replicate the relationship of man and God. Feeding the hungry, housing the homeless, building institutions was his Torah 'Im-Derech Eretz. Ethics for Jung was Judaism in the concrete.⁹ Ethics is part of Halakhah and this was the area that he emphasized. For Jung the study of Torah was the fusion of the ethical and the intellectual. Halakhah was the ritual way to the ethical.¹⁰

Rabbi Jung saw the problems of his time. He believed in freedom of interpretation of Torah, for every generation had new problems and questions, and the answers lay in Torah.¹¹ The laws were not rigid and were to be applied to new situations.

There were certain issues that developed in the twenties, but remained of importance in succeeding decades. Yeshiva College opened its doors, and its synthesized secular and religious education became one of the hallmarks of Modern Orthodoxy. This dual educational system demonstrated that Torah learning was not exclusive, that religious growth included openness and participation in the world, and that western thought was a positive challenge. From the Modern Orthodox perspective, this educational system helped in the struggle to confront Judaism and modern secular civilization. Modern Orthodox Jews were to live in two civilizations and be committed to both. Jung's support and involvement with Yeshiva, from its inception, exemplified his support for a secular and religious education that intertwined.

In the thirties Modern Orthodox educational institutes began to Americanize in order to attract the masses that lacked enthusiastic commitment to Jewish education. Mixed dancing and vacations at Christmas became the norm in Modern Orthodox educational institutes, exemplifying American ways. This phenomenon has changed demonstrating a change of focus away from the Americanization of Modern Orthodoxy and toward a movement to the right. Rabbi Jung, along with other leaders, promoted the Jewish day school as a defense against anti-semitism; and anti-semitism was presented as being un-American. It was felt that having Jewish knowledge would enable one to better defend the Jewish people and Jewish causes.

The schools promoted Hebrew as a living language and supported new programs for the teaching of Hebrew. Rabbi Jung helped develop one of the new programs. This was also an identifying feature of Modern Orthodoxy as the Agudat Harabbonim argued that Yiddish was the most appropriate language for religious instruction.¹²

In the thirties social reform and social services became an expression of Modern Orthodoxy and the emphasis was on presenting Modern Orthodoxy as a social religion. Modern Orthodox leaders showed that ensuring social justice was a function of religion. Modern Orthodoxy emphasized that Halakhah sanctioned worldly activity and Modern Orthodox leaders showed that Jewish law responded to economic and social events; it was interested in the poor, the worker, and the alien. Hence, the role of the rabbi expanded as the rabbi had to function in the secular world; he saved lives as well as “souls.” Modern Orthodoxy was thus not just the observance of dietary laws, the Sabbath, Jewish education and family laws.

Organizational work was one avenue through which Rabbi Jung could fulfill his social responsibility and where he could promote a Torah-true life. As chair of the cultural committee of JDC for many decades, Jung pleaded the case of worldwide Jewry and Torah Institutes. His work with JDC took him around the world and demonstrated his global effort on behalf of Judaism and the Jewish people. He galvanized members of his synagogue to provide affidavits for scores of Jews who needed to come to America or Israel. He was one of the first to come to the aid of the Beth Jacob movement in Poland. It is well recognized that one of Jung’s greatest contributions was rescuing Jews from war-torn Europe.

In the thirties Modern Orthodoxy became even more this worldly and pragmatic. There was an increase in activity and participation in the secular world and with non-Orthodox Jews and non-Jews. Modern Orthodox Jews had to identify and cooperate with other Jews. There was a call for mutual respect and toleration, which was consistent with Torah tradition. Jung felt that a fundamental of Judaism meant not isolating oneself from

the rest of mankind as all people were God's creations and that all people had to work together for certain social ends. He was active, open-minded and willing to learn from other cultures and others. He faced challenges of competitors, taking what was positive and good in their programs and adapting it within the Halakhic scheme. Jung wrote, "we expect and respect our differences."¹³ His motto was "cooperation without compromise." That was his interpretation of Jewish law and it coincides with what Modern Orthodoxy stood for. At the same time he fought Reform and Conservative movements, always pointing out what he saw as their errant ways.

Rabbi Jung was a staunch defender of Modern Orthodox participation on Synagogue Councils or Boards of Rabbis, which included the non-Orthodox when common interests were at stake. He was even able to keep one foot in the Traditional Orthodox camp. He demanded that the Modern Orthodox view be represented and he raised awareness and the profile of Modern Orthodoxy. He went beyond his own community for support for Orthodox institutions and met with considerable success.

Modern Orthodoxy was "man-centered," not "theo-centered" as the Modern Orthodox person had freedom to improve, correct and be creative and had a major role to play in his own destiny. Modern Orthodoxy stressed human responsibility and activity rather than passive submission or fatalistic resignation to one's condition. It does not desire isolationism and blind obedience to rabbinic leaders. This became another defining point of Modern Orthodoxy. This worldly and practical approach became more essential as Jewish lives had to be saved from Hitler. For Rabbi Jung, trust in God and belief in divine revelation was no reason for inaction, as he felt that people were placed on earth to do work and help God in shaping their own destiny.¹⁴

The advent of the RCA in the thirties, served Modern Orthodoxy and the Modern Orthodox rabbi well as it championed their causes. RCA helped to define Modern Orthodoxy with its policies of accommodation and adjustment to American culture, cooperation with other Jewish groups and with non-Jewish groups, and was a sign that Modern Orthodoxy was getting stronger. The RCA rabbis were generally clean-shaven and Americanized in other ways as well, and thus able to well represent Modern Orthodoxy at that time.

Going into the forties, the earmarks of Modern Orthodoxy were positive exposure to the religious and secular world, aesthetic presentation, Zionist support, reaching out to all Jews and non-Jews, and the use of Hebrew as a living language. This religion was modern as it appreciated universalism, secularism, human autonomy and reason, yet it remained authentically Jewish, upholding the centrality of Halakhah.

By the forties, it was clear that the spell which science had once cast was over; people were no longer totally enamored by modernity. Life had been explained solely in scientific terms and it was felt that reliance on religious notions was for the uneducated and unsophisticated. However, the forties saw a more important role for religion and an upsurge in its status.¹⁵ There was a more important role for Modern Orthodoxy on the American scene as war had thrust America itself into a more responsible position. Under the new leadership of Rabbi Soloveitchik, Modern Orthodoxy had more unity and direction, and he enhanced its image and reputation.

The expanded influence of religion paralleled Yeshiva's physical expansion and increased influence. Modern Orthodox leadership was in place and in charge of Yeshiva University by the mid forties having eliminated the threat of takeover by the Agudat

Harabbonim. Yeshiva was able to compete with other universities in the secular area as well as in the religious area demonstrating that its dual educational system was successful. It was another example of Modern Orthodoxy being universalistic as well as particularistic.

Modern Orthodoxy became more influential through outreach in its war effort, through various media-radio, publications, and organizations. Though Modern Orthodox rabbis were not the only chaplains, they were well represented and this role left the Modern Orthodoxy's image enhanced. Jung's involvement in chaplaincy brought comfort and Jewish values to the Jewish servicemen in World War Two. These modern Orthodox chaplains set an example of commitment to Judaism and to America; they were dedicated to Halakhic observance and to working with other Jewish groups as well as with non-Jews. The chaplains, part of the American armed forces, were a blend of religious and political symbols, as they represented Modern Orthodox Jewish values and American values.

Rabbi Jung was the Modern Orthodox representative on the Responsa Committee of CANRA (Committee For Army And Navy Religious Activities). The new attention to Halakhah led to more knowledge and respect for observance. Working in the real world with real situations, and real restrictions made the Halakhah come alive and demonstrated that Halakhah was adaptable, relevant and not stagnant as it solved modern-day problems and dilemmas with the help of human intervention.

The Beth Jacob story of ninety martyred young women, which was told in America due to the efforts of Leo Jung, was an example that commitment to religious principles was admirable and heroic.

The birth of Israel also fueled interest in Halakhah as the state presented challenges to Halakhah. It was shown that Zionism was in keeping with Jewish law. Again it was shown that the law was not stagnant and that it ably addressed new possibilities. The State of Israel was another example that Halakhah was able to meet new challenges.

Modern Orthodoxy lost its ambiguity towards Israel and welcomed the state without reservations. Modern Orthodoxy was nourished by the birth of Israel and its enthusiasm for the state grew. Israel recognized only Orthodoxy and leaders in America hoped that this would bring unity to Judaism. Modern Orthodox leaders, like Rabbi Jung, encouraged aliyah and visits to Israel as well as studying in educational institutes in Israel.

For Jung, Eretz Israel was important to Jewish life as its people were to set an example to the rest of the nations of the world. Jung wrote that Israel's ideal of, "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation... is a goal, not a starting point."¹⁶ In keeping with the tenet of "chosenness," Israel would set an example; it was a Jewish country that was democratic and would respect the rights and differences of all people. This is yet another example of the relationship of universalism and particularism in Modern Orthodoxy.

The fifties was a time of maturation for Modern Orthodoxy; it became more defined, more decisive, more demanding and less tolerant while maintaining its policy of being non-isolationist. Modern Orthodoxy became more particularistic, yet maintained its universalistic approaches. It became more assertive and comfortable with its American norms and less in awe of Americanism. There were changes occurring as to what was important in Modern Orthodoxy.

Modern Orthodoxy continued to be involved with social, economic and political problems. In the fifties, Jung waged battles for human rights, to abolish the infamous McCarran Acts, which threatened religious freedom and the values of America, which he cherished. His efforts to abolish the McCarran Act demonstrated that he saw his role as more far reaching than just attending to his synagogue, the Modern Orthodox community or the Jewish community at large, and that he saw his role as a fighter for human rights. It is another example of his efforts as social activist, facilitator or enabler. Modern Orthodoxy could not thrive under the conditions of the McCarran Act. It is an example of aggressive activism rather than passivity and timidity and this represented a transformation of Modern Orthodoxy's approach and image.

Also, the pendulum was swinging and the American people also became more interested in religion and more religious. There was a religious revival. It began to be easier to be pious. Increased numbers of people went to the synagogue in the fifties, sent their children to Jewish day schools and there was a continued expansion of Yeshiva University. There were more educational institutes. The schools prepared children to take on more religious traditions than did their parents. Younger, more affluent American-born Jews were attracted to Modern Orthodoxy. The Jewish day schools became another mark of Modern Orthodoxy.

This return to religion bode well for Modern Orthodoxy. Reform and Conservative Judaism had thrived accommodating to the secular world and they had felt that Modern Orthodoxy had been out of tune with the times. This religious revival pointed to the fact that Modern Orthodoxy had been somewhat correct as it had welcomed modernity but had not made the accommodations that the Conservative and

Reform groups had made. This return to observing more of Jewish laws, referred to as the “movement to the right,” began in the fifties.

Modern Orthodoxy also became exposed to the life of the new, more right wing Orthodox immigrants and their rabbinic leaders who had come to America because of persecution in Europe. Modern Orthodoxy was still battling with Eastern European norms and organizations such as the Agudat Harabbonim and the Vaad Hahatzala, while the new immigrant rabbis were increasingly influential.

Learning and scholarship became more respected. The fifties saw the beginning of a renaissance of Torah learning on American soil. There was a new way of acquiring knowledge. There was a new reliance on the text as many of those who could transmit the knowledge experientially had been killed in the Holocaust. An example of this desire to learn and study the texts was the newly opened kollel at Yeshiva University. A new image of a desirable rabbi emerged. The rabbi was to continue to be a brilliant orator; however, now there was greater emphasis on the rabbi being a scholar of the Jewish texts and an excellent teacher.

The increased interest in Jewish texts was good for Modern Orthodoxy as it led to more adherences to the Halakhic way of life, something that Modern Orthodoxy had steadfastly emphasized. Interest extended beyond Sabbath, kashrut and family laws.

Yeshiva opened Stern College to educate women in religious and secular subjects. This was an example that Modern Orthodoxy was committed to education for women. This was another identifying feature of Modern Orthodoxy. Rabbi Jung who had taught at Stern College advocated a role for women out of the home in keeping with his sense of ethical justice, but he did not concretize a role for women. He found a sphere for

women in sisterhoods and involvement with charities. His books included female authors and biographies of female leaders, such as Sara Schenierer, whose cause he worked for. He had a sense that there should be a new role for women and he was not alone in failing to define this role. The status of the Jewish woman in Modern Orthodoxy has never been resolved and in this area there remains a lot of ambiguity.

Organizations became more efficient. The UOJCA adopted resolutions that made Modern Orthodoxy more decisive. The RCA became more independent from both the Agudat Harabbonim and the Conservative movement. The gap between Modern Orthodoxy grew as the Conservative movement officially adopted mixed pews, the use of the microphone on the Sabbath and Jewish festivals and as they adopted their own Beth Din and Ketuba. Modern Orthodoxy settled the mechitza and microphone issues; there was to be a mechitza in every synagogue defined as Orthodox and there was to be no use of a microphone on the Sabbath and on Jewish festivals. Kashrut supervision became reasonably reliable. The synagogue service was mainly in Hebrew, except for the English sermon, and though there was discussion about adding more English, the traditional stance seemed to be holding. A Modern Orthodox person was urged not to pray in a Conservative or a Reform synagogue, as Modern Orthodoxy would not grant legitimacy to non-Orthodox denominations. The tolerance of individual Orthodox rabbis toward Conservatism, which had been characteristic of the twenties and thirties became “only a dimming Conservative memory...”¹⁷

2. MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT

One of the things that this thesis did was to examine the religious status of

Modern Orthodoxy with reference to increased observance of Halakhah or Jewish law. The movement to the right only began in the fifties. This movement intensified later on. The Modern Orthodox person became by the sixties more educated in religious and secular matters, more observant, more self-confident and assertive; this person was not the old, uneducated, unacculturated, poor Eastern European Orthodox Jew. Rabbi Jung's congregants began to want sermons that dealt with more than ethics.

Even Jung's adoring congregants acknowledged that his successor, Rabbi Lamm's sermons dealt with more profound religious issues and they appreciated the educational excellence that Rabbi Lamm represented.¹⁸ Rabbi Lamm said that Jung's sermons repeatedly dealt with "reverence, righteousness and rahamanut" and with "modernity of method," which were some of Jung's favorite topics. The impression given by Rabbi Lamm was that the audience had tired of these topics and this approach.¹⁹

One of Jung's key issues, Americanization, was no longer of great interest to the younger generation. There was less of a quest for Americanization and less accommodation to Americanism and modernity.²⁰ Many Modern Orthodox Jews were, for the most part, born in America and they were already "Americanized." Rabbi Lamm said that he was born in America, and that he took the issue of Americanization for granted.²¹ Rabbi Lamm said that Jung had made Americanism into a quasi-religion, when he equated the American constitution with the Torah, wearing Tzitzit (fringes) with wearing the American flag, and when he compared Washington to Sinai.²² This was offensive to the younger generation, as they felt that the Torah, wearing Tzitzit and Sinai were too holy to compare with American symbols.

Decorum, another key issue for Jung, remained important in the synagogue but

the reason for it changed. No longer was decorum something done to appear more American or modern, since Americans prayed in a decorous manner. It was presented as a Halakhic demand; davening (praying) with kavannah (true commitment and devotion) in conducive surroundings was a requirement. In this way decorum was made legitimate as it was based in Halakhah. With this change Jenna Joselit referred to the Modern Orthodox group as the “post-decorous” generation.²³ Rabbis and officers in the Jewish Center continued to wear top hats, an anachronism in the late twentieth century. Whenever a proposal was raised to discontinue wearing the top hats, there was a clamor to keep the custom; however, the custom became harder to maintain as younger people became involved in the synagogue.²⁴ Rabbi Schacter himself came to appreciate what top hats symbolized, though at first the style made him uncomfortable.²⁵ Jung’s legacy of dignified Orthodoxy continued, but formal worship was not enough.

The Traditional Orthodox Jews who came to America after the war were an example of warmth and emotionalism that conflicted with the rationalistic approach of Rabbi Jung and his generation. The approach of the Traditional Orthodox newcomers to America and their influence was in place in the fifties. Rabbi Jung was out of sync with the new emotionalism. His rational, practical approach was out of date.

Modern Orthodoxy is itself a modern phenomenon; it is the reassertion of tradition in an innovative form. However, the movement to the right represents the sense that modernity has flaws and for Modern Orthodoxy presents a tension for living in this world. Keeping a balance between being part of the culture of the modern world and being different, participating in the world of science and the world of Torah, being tolerant yet demanding, is an on-going challenge for Modern Orthodoxy.

3. SOME ANECDOTES THAT GIVE A GLIMPSE OF WHAT BECAME OF THE MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT THAT HAD BEGUN IN THE FIFTIES

Toward the end of his career Jung came to resist what he saw as the excesses to the right. The resistance tells the story of the development of Modern Orthodoxy. Rabbi Norman Lamm and Rabbi Jacob Schacter, who had been connected with the Jewish Center Synagogue, are repeatedly cited, as they represent the new outlook of the following generations and also tell the story of what Modern Orthodoxy came to represent.

By the end of the fifties Sabbath attendance was beginning to increase; this attendance continued to increase in following decades to the point that those who came late found it hard to get an available seat on the Sabbath.²⁶ The empty pews were part of the historical past. Over the years, the daily minyanim (group of ten men or prayer group) tripled. Eventually a second, then a third and more minyanim were opened, which created sub-groups in a large synagogue. As a result of these smaller groups, there was more intimacy, warmth and emotionalism. Also, these smaller prayer groups replicated the old Eastern European style.

Jung's synagogue lost the image of the "shul with the pool and the school." Two floors were rented out to a health club, the sixth floor was rented out to the Drisha Institute for women and the ninth floor was rented out to an Advanced Torah Institute.²⁷ The synagogue was no longer the "rich man's club." According to Rabbi Lamm, the synagogue before he came was a "closed club" and new members were not welcomed, but this changed over time.²⁸ With Rabbi Lamm already part of the Jewish Center

Synagogue in the fifties, Talmud study and the study of Daf Yomi (referring to the daily study of a page of Talmud) intensified.²⁹

Rabbi Schacter told the story that when he davened the shmoneh esreh (the eighteen benedictions, a key prayer) with his tallis (prayer shawl) over his head, an example of being alone, though in a crowd, and undisturbed in one's devotion to God, Jung asked him if he would not do this. Rabbi Schacter replied that he felt more comfortable doing this if Jung did not mind.³⁰ This disturbed Jung's sense of dignity; the demeanor was east European in flavor and he could not appreciate Schacter's new passionate approach and emotional commitment.

Some younger rabbis continued to advocate a more important role for women in the synagogue. Rabbi Schacter gave Talmud classes for women and other rabbis such as Avi Weiss and Moses Rifkin advocated women's tefilla (prayer) groups.³¹ Women started to partake more actively in holiday rituals; on Simchat Torah they began to dance holding the Torah, a custom previously done only by men. Regarding this issue of dancing with the Torah on Simchat Torah, Lamm said, "Jung's reaction was not strong, but he did leave early—Jung was a law and order man—Simchat Torah and Purim were too disorderly with all the singing and dancing. Purim and Simchat Torah were dark days for Jung."³² It appeared that Jung was uncomfortable with women's new involvement and also with what he perceived as the lack of dignified, rational approach.

There is no institutional policy in Modern Orthodoxy on women covering their heads, however, Modern Orthodox women cover their hair much more than the last generation and there are more men wearing beards and kipas (skullcaps).³³ This is a sign that particularism is more emphasized, and that there is an increase in observant men and

women. Rabbi Jung's wife wore a sheitel (wig), but only as it was a custom from where she had come from in Europe and she never changed. Jeffrey Gurock said that Mrs. Jung had told him that if she had to start over, she would not do it again.³⁴

Clean-shaven was a sign of Americanization. Rabbi Lamm said that when he came to the Jewish Center he did not have a beard, but adopted one at a later time and that when he first met Rav Soloveitchik, the Rav did not have a beard.³⁵ Rabbi Jung always wore a well-trimmed beard. Perhaps this is an example of his independent thinking, his strong pride and conviction in his Judaism and most of all, his synthesis of modernism, Americanism and Judaism. It is no longer true that members of OUJCA and RCA are mostly clean-shaven. This is an example of lack of interest in visible Americanization, a desire to be more particularistic and of paying closer attention to Halakhic details and interpreting Halakhah in a more stringent way.³⁶

4. CONCLUSION

Jung's work was not ideological and he made no contribution to the ideological definition of Orthodoxy. Rabbi Lamm supported this contention and said that, "he [Rabbi Jung] represented sophisticated dignity and his activities in government and secular circles enhanced the reputation of Modern Orthodoxy, but he never took off his ideological gloves."³⁷ Jung showed no ideological consistency; if his ideology was clear in his own mind, he kept it hidden. He supported Yeshivas in Israel that were non-Zionist and his early affiliation with Agudat Israel was problematic in Modern Orthodox circles. Rabbi Lamm pointed out that Jung was very close with Rabbi Aaron Kotler, who headed Vaad Hatzala, a group that had been in conflict with the JDC and represented Traditional

Orthodoxy, and that Jung became interested in Lubavitch through one of his congregants, Sam Kramer, a distinguished lawyer.³⁸ Rabbi Schacter pointed out that Jung had come upon the works of Habad, which represent the Lubavitch movement, as chair of the cultural committee of JDC and that Jung had a soft spot for Rabbi Yosef Isaac Schneerson. Rabbi Jung was a very generous and outreaching man, even if not ideologically consistent and maybe this too represents Modern Orthodoxy. He lacked hard, clear lines in his approach; a phenomenon characteristic of Modern Orthodoxy itself in his day. This story is of Modern Orthodoxy looking for a precise definition, which continues to elude it.

Rabbi Jung presented Modern Orthodoxy as an alternative to a purely secular or fundamentalist stance. He instilled in those who heard his message, respect for the modern world, but also respect for religion. He was the epitome of Modern Orthodoxy combining tradition and modernity. He was tolerant, yet intensely observant and unyielding in his beliefs; he was part of the culture while maintaining his differences.

Jung revived and revised Orthodoxy; the revision is ongoing. The religious status of generations ago should be appreciated as but a step along the way toward full-bodied Torah Judaism. Jung's leadership was a key factor in the growth of Modern Orthodoxy between the wars. Jung had fought for a more important role for religion and that was good for Modern Orthodoxy. However, when this goal was reached, followers looked to those who epitomized Torah scholarship and devotion to Halakhic study. Rabbi Jung had been immersed in helping his fellow Jew and was no longer the hero of this generation, though without the foundation that he laid, they could not have gotten to this point. There was a change in the way one acquired knowledge and the new generation critiqued him

for not being profound in his approach to Talmud learning and they looked back on his view of decorum as trivial pursuits, sometimes not appreciating the dilemmas of his time.³⁹ Jung's literary works were no longer valued as much as the religious output of the younger rabbis. It was a sign of the times that his work was less appreciated because it was based in the secular world and this was a sign of the movement to the right.

He helped make the environment conducive to the development of Modern Orthodoxy ensuring that there were kashrut facilities, mikvehs, rights for Sabbath observers, schools with good Jewish education, and literature that taught about Judaism. Jung and colleagues waged battles on behalf of kosher law enforcement, for the closing of Yiddish theatres on Rosh Hashana, and other public violations of Jewish law, which were then in vogue. His production of literature in English presented the values and ideals of Torah-true Judaism and Jung was a forerunner of the ever-growing literary activity in the field of Torah study for those unable to study Hebrew originals. He battled on behalf of suffering Jews of Europe and all over the world, helping them remain loyal to Torah values. His practical organizational work laid a foundation upon which a more esoteric and spiritual life could be built. He worked to inculcate Jewish values, knowledge and a desire to observe the laws.

It must be noted that all Modern Orthodox rabbis are not scholars; all Modern Orthodox laymen are not involved in Talmud study, or committed to the observance of Halakhah, but there is an increase in these types of people. Trained laymen and scholarly rabbis have brought vitality to Modern Orthodoxy. The key terms in describing Modern Orthodoxy in America from 1920 to 1960 are change, acculturation, renewal and improvement.

5. THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS THESIS IN A WIDER CONTEXT

Interest in Modern Orthodoxy was sparse before the sixties and there was little written about it before the nineties. There is room for new investigation. Collecting information about a religious group is a worthy endeavour as understanding a group leads to more tolerance, respect and better accommodation on the part of society.

This thesis has relevance for further studies in various areas. It is part of the study of religious acculturation, of the interaction of religion with the different social systems, of the conflict between tradition and modernity and of religious reinvigoration in a secular society.

America prides itself on being a compilation of various immigrant groups. This is the story of adaptation of one particular group in America and of accommodation with contemporary society and changing times. Having lost their moorings, the Modern Orthodox group looked for a definition of who they were and what they stood for in the land of democracy and freedom of religion. Communal problems and happenings were looked at and it would be interesting to compare and contrast this group's experience with other groups. This is an immigrant story and is part of the history of United States.

A religious system does not exist in a vacuum; it interacts with other social systems. The time period covered depicts an era of change, of new vitality, of self-confidence and maturity in Modern Orthodoxy and this parallels the change, new vitality, and maturity in the political, social and economic history of United States itself. Modern Orthodoxy responded to the cultural, economic and political challenges presented in America.

The social values of the twenties affected the religious outlook. The twenties with its value of material things had led to a mounting permissiveness in society and had set the moral and social tone of the nation, which made for a poor religious milieu. Jung and other leaders stressed morality and ethics, instead of emphasizing the law, and tried with little success to present the spiritual benefits to existence. The economic depression of the thirties made Modern Orthodoxy focus on the social issues and social justice that were part of the religious tenets of Judaism and it increased its need for outreach. The economic recovery, after the war, accompanied a sense of renewal and revival, which affected the religious outlook.

This story can be part of a study of religious responses to the Holocaust. The Holocaust is an example of modernity at its worst. It is an example of an abusive political regime, outside of America, that led to a call for stronger religious leadership and involvement, a call that Modern Orthodoxy, amongst other movements, responded to. Modern Orthodoxy's response to what it saw as the flaws in modernity, one of many, influenced the emphasis on more religious values into American society.

Modern Orthodoxy can be included as part of the study of the rightward drift in religion and its implications. A movement to the right can be a sign of rejecting the establishment. When this group first came to America there was wholehearted acceptance of the status quo of America, making religious adherence a dilemma. By the late thirties and forties, Rabbi Jung, religiopolitical activist, as well as other Modern Orthodox leaders, drew attention to the flaws of modernity and enlightenment values and tried to improve society and reshape American life. He protested and critiqued society. The movement to the right is part of the quest for good values. The growth of the right reflects

developments in other faiths as well, like Christianity and Islam. Modern Orthodoxy can be included in the study of those who return to a religious life in the various faiths, called “born agains” or “returnees,” or in Hebrew, ba’alei teshuva.

The “right” has had political spin-offs. Political issues affect religious outlooks, but the reverse is also true. With the reassertion of religious values, there is a decline in the liberal establishment and a trend to more conservatism. The “right-wing” have concerned themselves with issues such as abortion, homosexuality, role of women and family. They embrace issues of religious significance like store openings on Saturday or Sundays. Religious variables are important in understanding political behaviour and this thesis could lend information to such a study.

The movement to the right, as mentioned, serves as a lens to focus on the conflict of modernity and tradition. While modernity is flawed, most groups are not reactionary and they do appreciate Enlightenment thinking. This study of Modern Orthodoxy presents the dilemmas, conflicts and choices that are made in the on-going quest to coordinate or synthesize modernity and tradition.

- ¹ Leo Jung. "Jews and Jewishness in America," Jewish Forum 9.5 (July 1926): 132-137.
- ² Leo Jung. "Religion in the Concrete," The Federation Chronicle (September 1969) 31. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 30.
- ³ Letter to Jung from David Miller, 28 November 1977. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 3, Folder 3.
- ⁴ Rabbi Norman Lamm. personal interview .16 January 2003.
- ⁵ Leo Jung. "Orthodoxy, Reform and Kaplanism," Jewish Forum 4.3 (April, 1921): 782.
- ⁶ Dr. Jeffrey Gurock .personal interview. 17 December 1996.
- ⁷ Rabbi Norman Lamm .personal interview. 16 January 2003.
- ⁸ Rabbi Jacob Schacter. personal interview. 11 November 1996.
- ⁹ Martin Schwarszchild . (former president of synagogue and life long member) personal interview .11 November 1996.
- ¹⁰ Letter to Albert Einstein , 15 April 1943. (in German) Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 4.
- ¹¹ Leo Jung. "The Rambam in True Perspective." Jewish Forum (April 1935): Leo Jung. Path of a Pioneer Autobiography of Leo Jung. London, N.Y.: Soncino Press, 1980, xvi-xvii.
- ¹² Jeffrey Gurock. American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective . N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996, 64.
- ¹³ Leo Jung. "Intermein," 5. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 45, Folder 4.
- ¹⁴ Leo Jung. Foundations of Judaism. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923, 40.
- ¹⁵ Will Herberg. "The Postwar Revival of the Synagogue Does It Reflect a Religious

Awakening?" Commentary 9.4 (April 1950): 317, 323.

¹⁶ Leo Jung. "Religion in the Concrete," The Federation Chronicle (September 1969):

12. Y.U. Archives, Jung Collection, Box 48, Folder 30.

¹⁷ Marshall Sklare. Conservative Judaism. N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1972, 264.

¹⁸ One can deduce this from interviews with Rabbis Norman Lamm, Jacob Schacter, and Jeffrey Gurock.

¹⁹ Rabbi Norman Lamm .personal interview. 16 January 2003. This is substantiated by various congregants . Interviews with various congregants.(see bibliography)

²⁰ Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Jenna Joselit. New York's Jewish Jews: The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999, 43.

²⁴ Jacob Schacter .personal interview .11 November 1996.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Norman Lamm. personal interview .16 January 2003.

²⁷ Jacob Schacter .personal interview. 11 November 1996.

²⁸ Norman Lamm. personal interview. 16 January 2003.

²⁹ Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.

³⁰ Jacob Schacter. personal interview .11 November 1996.

³¹ Jeffrey Gurock .personal interview. 17 December 1996.

³² Norman Lamm .personal interview .16 January 2003.

³³ Jeffrey Gurock .personal interview .17 December 1996.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Norman Lamm.personal interview .16 January 2003.

³⁶ Oscar Fasman. "After Fifty Years An Optimist," American Jewish History vol. 69, (Dec. 1979); 161.

³⁷ Norman Lamm.personal interview. 16 January 2003.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ One can deduce this from interviews with Rabbis Norman Lamm, Jacob Schacter, and Jeffrey Gurock.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. GENERAL WORKS CITED

- Almog, Shmuel, and Shapira Anita Reinhartz, eds. Zionism and Religion. New England: Hanover University Press, 1998.
- Baumel, Judith Tydor. Unfulfilled Promise Rescue and Resettlement of Jewish Refugee Children in the United States 1934-1945. Juneau, Alaska, USA: The Denali Press, 1990.
- Bauer, Yehuda. My Brother's Keeper, A History of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1929-39. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1974.
- Berkson, Isaac Baer. Theories of Americanization: A Critical Study. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Bernstein, Louis. Challenge and Mission: The Emergence of the English Speaking Orthodox Rabbinate. New York: Shengold Publishers, 1982.
- . "Generational Conflict in American Orthodoxy: The Early Years of Rabbinical Council of America." American Jewish History 69:2 (Dec. 1979): 226-33.
- Bernstein Philip S. Rabbis At War: The CANRA Story. Waltham, Mass.: American Historical Society, 1971.
- Bernstein, Saul. The Orthodox Story: A Centenary Portrayal. Northvale, New Jersey and Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc. 1997.
- . The Renaissance of the Torah Jew. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1985.
- Binyamin, Ish Shalom. Rav Avraham Itzak HaCohen Kook: Between Rationalism and Mysticism. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

- Breuer, Isaac. Concepts of Judaism. Jerusalem and New York: Israel University Press, 1974.
- Breuer, Jacob, ed. Fundamentals of Judaism: Selections from the Works of Rabbi Samuel Raphael Hirsch, and Outstanding Torah True Thinkers. New York: P. Feldheim Publishers, 1969.
- , ed. Samuel Raphael Hirsch: Timeless Torah, New York: P. Feldheim Publishers, 1957.
- Bulka, Reuven. The Coming Cataclysm: The Orthodox Reform Rift and the Future of the Jewish People. Oakville, Ontario; New York: Mosaic Press, 1984.
- . Dimensions of Orthodox Judaism. New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1983.
- Bunim, Amos. A Fire in His Soul. Jerusalem and New York: Feldheim, 1989.
- Cohen, Alfred S., ed. Halakhah and Contemporary Society. New York, N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House; Rabbi Jacob Joseph School Press 1983.
- Cohen, Naomi W. American Jews and the Zionist Idea, New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc. 1975.
- Danzger, M. Herbert. Returning to Tradition: The Contemporary Revival of Orthodox Judaism. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Davis, Moshe. The Emergence of Conservative Judaism. Philadelphia :Jewish Publication Society of America, 1963.
- Drachman, Bernard. The Unfailing Light Memoirs of an American Rabbi. New York: The Rabbinical Council of America, 1948.
- Eisen, Arnold M. The Chosen People in America: A Study in Religious Ideology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.

- Elazar, Danial. Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society, 1976.
- Ellenson, David Harry. Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and the Creation of a Modern Jewish Orthodoxy. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990.
- Ellenson, David Harry. Between Culture and Tradition: The Dialectics of Modern Jewish Religion and Identity. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Farbridge, Maurice. Judaism and the Modern Mind. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Finkelstein, Louis, ed. The Jews: Their Religion and Culture. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Gastwirt, Harold P. Fraud Corruption, and Holiness: The Controversy Over the Supervision of Jewish Dietary Practices in New York City. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1974.
- Geller Victor B. Orthodoxy Awakens the Belkin Era and Yeshiva University. Jerusalem, N.Y.: Urim Publications, 2003.
- Goldberg, H.E., ed. Judaism Viewed from Within and Without. Albany, New York: State University New York Press, 1987.
- Goldman, Karla. Beyond The Synagogue Gallery. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Gurock, Jeffrey, S. American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective. New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996. [-----
- . The American Rabbinate. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 1985.

Comments

- . Men and Women of Yeshiva: Higher Education, Orthodoxy and American Judaism.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- , ed. Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy. Hoboken, New Jersey:
Ktav Publishing House, 1989.
- Gurock Jeffrey, S. and Jacob J. Schacter. A Modern Heretic and a Traditional
Community. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Handlin, Oscar. Adventures in Freedom: Three Hundred Years of Jewish Life in
America. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Heilman, Samuel. Defenders of the Faith. New York: Schochen Books, 1992.
- . People of the Book. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- . Portrait of American Jews: The Last Half of the Twentieth Century. Seattle and
London: University of Washington Press, 1995.
- Heilman, Samuel and Steven Cohen. Cosmopolitans and Parochials. Chicago and
London: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Helmreich, William. The World of the Yeshivah: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox
Jewry. N.Y.: Free Press, 1982.
- Herring Basil, Ed., The Rabbinate as Calling and Vocation, Jason Aronson Inc., Northvale,
New Jersey, London, 1991
- Herzberg, Arthur. Being Jewish in America. New York: Schochen Books, 1979.
- , ed. The Zionist Idea. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970, c1959.
- Hirsch, Samson Raphael. Nineteen Letters. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969.
- Hyamson, Rabbi Dr. Moses. Sabbath and Festival Addresses. New York: Bloch
Publishing Co., 1936.

- Jackson, Bernard, ed. Modern Research in Jewish Law. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.
- Joselit, Jenna. New York's Jewish Jews: The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- . The Wonders of America. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.
- Kasher, Menachem Mendel, Norman Lamm, and Leonard Rosenfeld, eds. The Leo Jung Jubilee Volume Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday. New York: The Jewish Center, 1962 .
- Katz, Jacob. A House Divided: Orthodoxy and Schism in Nineteenth Century European Jewry, Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press; Publishers University Press of New England, 1998.
- Katz, Steven T. American Rabbi: The Life and Thought of Jacob B. Agus. New York and London: New York University Press, 1997.
- Kaufman, David. Shul With A Pool: The "Synagogue-Center" in American Jewish History. Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Klapperman, Gilbert. The Story of Yeshiva University. New York: MacMillan, 1969.
- Klien, Isaac. The Ten Commandments in a Changing World. New York: Bloch Publishing House, 1944.
- Kochan, Lionel. The Jewish Renaissance and Some of its Discontents. Manchester, U.K., New York: University Press; St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Kurzweel, Zvi. Modern Impulse of Traditional Judaism. New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, 1985.
- Lamm, Norman. Faith and Doubt: Studies in Traditional Judaism. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1971.

- Lamm, Norman, and Walter S. Wurtzburger , eds. A Treasury of Tradition. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1967.
- Landman, Leo, ed. Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein Memorial Volume, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1980.
- Leibman, Charles. Aspects of Religious Behaviour of American Jews . New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.
- Leibman, Charles S. and Eliezer Don-Yehija. Aspects of Religious Behavior of American Jews. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.
- Lookstein, Joseph. Faith and Destiny of Man. New York Bloch Publishing Co., 1967.
- Lowenstein, Steven, M. Frankfurt on the Hudson: the German Jewish Community of Washington Heights. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- Marcus ,Jacob Rader and Abraham J. Peck. The American Rabbinate: A Century of Continuity and Change, 1883-1983. Hoboken, New Jersey:Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1985.
- Meddling, Peter, ed. Studies in Contemporary Jewry. Vol 2. ,Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Meiselman, Shulamit. The Soloveitchik Heritage: A Daughter's Memoir. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1995.
- Mittleman, Alan L. The Politics of Torah: The Jewish Political Tradition and the Founding of Agudat Israel. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Moore, Deborah Dash. At Home in America: Second Generation New York Jews. New York: Colombia University Press, 1981.

- Neusner, Jacob. The Alteration of Orthodoxy. Vol. 8. New York: Garland Publishers, 1993.
- Neusner, Jacob, ed. Sectors of American Judaism. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1975.
- Newman, Louis I. , Biting on Granite, Selected Sermons and Addresses, N.Y. Bloch Publishing Co ,1946.
- Parzen, Herbert. Architect of Conservative Judaism. New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1964.
- Pelcovitz, Ralph. Danger and Opportunity. New York: Shengold Publishers, 1976.
- Penkower, Monty Noam. The Holocaust and Israel Reborn: From Catastrophe to Sovereignty. Urbana University of Illinois Press,1994.
- Posner, Zalman. Thinking Jewish: A Contemporary View of Judaism, A Jewish View of Today's World. Nashville: Keshet Press, 1978.
- Rakeffet-Rothkoff, Aaron. Bernard Revel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972.
- . The Silver Era In American Jewish Orthodoxy: Rabbi Eliezar Silver. New York, Yeshiva University Press; Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1981.
- Raphael, Marc, ed. Approaches to the Study of Modern Judaism. Vols. 1 & 2. California: Chico Scholars Press, 1983.
- . Profiles in American Judaism. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Reznikoff, Charles, ed. Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty. Selected Papers and Addresses. Vols. 1 & 2. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1957.

- Rosenbloom, Noah H. Tradition in an Age of Reform: The Religious Philosophy of Samson Raphael Hirsch. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976.
- Rosenthal, Gilbert. Contemporary Judaism: Patterns of Survival. New York, New York: Human Sciences Press, 1986.
- Rosenthal, Gilbert, ed. The American Rabbi: A Tribute on the occasion of the Bicennial of the United States and the Ninety-fifth Birthday of the New York Board of Rabbis of New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1977.
- Rotenberg, Mordechai. Dialogue With Deviance. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1983.
- Sacks, Jonathan. Arguments for the Sake of Heaven. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1991.
- . One People: Tradition, Modernity and Jewish Unity. London ,U.K., Littman Library of Jewish Civilization; Washington, D.C: ,Distributed in the U.S. by Bnai Brith Book Service, 1993.
- . Orthodoxy Confronts Modernity. Hoboken, New Jersey and London: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1991.
- . Tradition in an Untraditional Age. London; Totowa, New Jersey: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1990.
- Sarna, Jonathan. JPS: The Americanization of Jewish Culture, 1888-1988. Philadelphia : The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989.
- . People Walk On Their Heads: Moses Weinberger's Jews and Judaism in New York. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1982.

- Schacter, Jacob J., ed. Judaism's Encounter With Other Cultures. Northvale, New Jersey and Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997.
- Schacter, Jacob, ed. Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1992.
- Schacter, Jacob J., ed. Reverence Righteousness and Rachmanut: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung. Northdale, New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson Inc., 1992.
- Schweid, Eliezer. Democracy and Halakhah. Lanham, N.Y.: University Press of America; Jerusalem: The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1994.
- Scult, Mel, ed. Communings of the Spirit: The Journals of Mordecai M. Kaplan. Volume 1, 1913-1934. Detroit: Wayne State University Press; The Reconstructionist Press, 2001.
- . Judaism Faces the Twentieth Century. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993.
- Scult, Mel, Emmanuel Goldsmith, and Robert M. Seltzer, eds. The American Judaism of Mordechai M. Kaplan. New York: New York University Press, 1990.
- Sharfman, I. Harold. The First Rabbi: Origins of Conflict Between Orthodox and Reform. Malibu, California: Pangloss Press, 1988.
- Shapiro, Marc B. Between The Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy: The Life and Works of Jehiel Jacob Weinberg 1884-1966. Portland, Oregon :The Litmann Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999.
- Sklare, Marshall. Conservative Judaism: an American Religious Movement. New York: Schocken Books, 1st edition 1955; 2nd edition 1972.
- Slomovitz, Albert Isaac. The Fighting Rabbis: A History Of Jewish Military Chaplains. 1860-1945. Ann Arbor , Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1996.

- Sokol, Moshe, ed. (Orthodox Forum.)Rabbinic Authority and Personal Autonomy
Northvale, New Jersey: J. Aronson, 1992.
- Stevens, Richard P. American Zionism and U.S. Foreign Policy 1942-47. New York:
Pagent Press, 1962.
- Stitskin, Leon D., ed. Joshua Finkel Festschrift In Honor of Dr. Joshua Finkel. New
York:Yeshiva University Press, 1974.
- , ed. Studies in Torah Judaism. Yeshiva University Press, Ktav Publishing House,
1969.
- Urofsky, Melvin I. American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust. Garden City, New
York: Anchor Press; Doubleday, 1975.
- Warshaw, Mal. Traditional Orthodox Jewish Life in America. New York: Shochon
Books, 1976.
- Weisfeld, Israel H. The Message of Israel. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1936.
- Wenger, Beth. New York Jews and the Great Depression. New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1996.
- Wertheimer, Jack. A People Divided: Judaism in Contemporary America. New York:
Basic Books, 1993.
- , ed. The American Synagogue A Sanctuary Transformed. Cambridge;
[Cambridgeshire] N.Y.; Brandeis University Press; University Press of New
England, 1987.
- , ed. The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era. N.Y.: Jewish
Theological Seminary of America; Cambridge Mass.: Distributed by Harvard
University Press, 1992.

Zuroff, Efraim. The Response of Orthodox Jewry in the United States to the Holocaust.

New York; Hoboken, New Jersey: The Michael Sharf Publications Trust of The Yeshiva University Press; Ktav Publishing House Inc., 2000.

2. WRITINGS BY LEO JUNG

Jung, Leo. Business Ethics in Jewish Law. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company in conjunction with Board of Jewish Education of Greater New Yoirk, 1987.

---. Crumbs and Characters: Sermons, Addresses, and Essays. New York: Night and Day Press, 5202/1942.

---. Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan Literature. Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning; 1926. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.
Originally presented as the author's thesis, University of London.

---. Harvest, Sermons, Addresses, Studies. New York: P. Feldheim Inc., 1956.

---. Human Relations in Jewish Law, 1967. Rpt. as Between Man and Man. New York: Jewish Educational Press, 1976.

---. Knowledge and Love in Rabbinic Lore. New York: Yeshiva University Press; (Department of Special Publications) 1963.

---. Living Judaism. New York: Night and Day Press, 1927.

---. Love and Life. New York: Philosophical Library, 1979.

---. The Rhythm of Life: Sermons, Studies, Addresses. New York, New York: Pardes Publication House Inc., 5710/1950.

---. Sages and Saints. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Press, 1987.

---. Towards Sinai: Sermons and Addresses. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1929.

Jung Leo. The Jewish Library Series, First series of The Jewish Library Series 1928-1964, Second series began 1968 with revised and new volumes.

First Series

Foundations of Judaism. The Jewish Library Series. 1. N.Y.: Jewish Center, 1923.

Essentials of Judaism. The Jewish Library . 2. New York: Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, 1927, 1943, 1953c.

Woman .The Jewish Library Series.3. New York: N.Y.: Soncino Press , 1934.

Judaism in a Changing World, Ed. The Jewish Library Series. 4. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Israel of Tomorrow. The Jewish Library Series. 5. New York: Herald Square Press, 1946.

Jewish Leaders, 1750-1940. The Jewish Library Series. 6. New York: Bloch Publishing Co.,1953.

Guardians of Our Heritage, 1724-1953, The Jewish Library Series.7. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1958.

Men of The Spirit. The Jewish Library Series. 8. New York: Kymson Publishing Co., 1964.

Second Series

Faith . The Jewish Library Series. 1. London, New York: Soncino Press, 1968.

The Folk. The Jewish Library Series. 2. London, New York: Soncino Press, 1968.

Woman. The Jewish Library Series. 3. New York, London: Soncino Press, 1970.

Judaism in a Changing World. The Jewish Library Series. 4. London, New York:1971.

Panorama of Judaism. Part One, The Jewish Library Series. 5. London, New York:

Soncino Press,1974.

Volume 6- Panorama of Judaism. Part Two. The Jewish Library Series.6. London, New

York: Soncino Press, 1974.

Hyman B.Grinstein . A Short History Of The Jews In The United States. The Jewish

Library Series. 7. London, New York: Soncino Press,1980.

The Path of a Pioneer The Autobiography of Leo Jung, The Jewish Library Series. 8.

London, New York: Soncino Press, 1980.

3. ARCHIVAL MATERIAL

3.i. Leo Jung Collection,Mendel Gottesman Library of Yeshiva University- There are fifty boxes, which include correspondence, personal material, financial records and printed works.

3.ii. The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee Archives, 711 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017

3.iii. Jewish Center Synagogue Archives-Bulletins and Jewish Center Synagogue Annual Meeting Minutes were referred to.

4. INTERVIEWS

4.i. Congregants of Rabbi Jung

Dora Federbush. Telephone interview. 4 March 2002.

Shelley Helfand. Personal interview. 24 April 2002.

Martin Shwarzschild. Personal interview. 11 November 1996.

Sadie Silverstein. Personal interview. 19 November 1997.

4.ii Colleagues

Rabbi Dr. Jacob J. Schacter .Former Rabbi of Jewish Center Synagogue. Personal interview. 11 November 1996.

Rabbi Dr. Norman Lamm. Former Assistant Rabbi of Jewish Center Synagogue, President of Yeshiva University. Personal interview . 16 January 2003.

4.iii. Scholars

Jeffrey Gurock. personal interview. 17 December 1996.

Jenna Weisman Joselit. personal interview. 11 November 1996.

Robert Agus. Email interview.

Judith Baumel. Email interview.

4.iv. Family

Tirzah Houminer, granddaughter of Leo Jung. Email interview. and written interview

Rosalie Rosenfeld, daughter of Leo Jung, Letter interview.