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Jewish Studies in American Liberal-Arts Colleges and Universities

by Arnold J. Band

The spread of Jewish studies as an accepted academic discipline in the American liberal-arts colleges and universities since the Second World War is one of the least charted areas of Jewish experience of the past two decades. While there have been any number of brief notices, usually based on the statistics first gathered by Abraham I. Katsh and Judah Lapson, we have but little information on this complex phenomenon and have not yet begun to ask some of the fundamental questions of definition and purpose.

In the process of gathering and analyzing much of the new information presented here, we have been repeatedly impressed by the obdurate variety of programs throughout the country. And because no two schools are alike, constants were difficult to establish, particularly since the source of information was either a questionnaire or the college catalogues rather than detailed personal interviews and a study of the programs as they operate within a wider academic context. And yet, though aware of methodological limitations, we feel that the picture presented here is fuller than any made public to date. It attempts to touch upon the major questions which should concern those interested in this aspect of Jewish cultural life.

In the main, we sought to determine the status and development of Jewish studies in American colleges and universities, the extent to which Jewish students avail themselves of those programs, and the type of faculty they attract. We also had in mind the effect of the growth of Judaic studies on the emergence of Jewish scholarship as a profession, and their potential as an instrument for helping the Jewish community to mature and for helping its members understand themselves.

---

1 See Appendix for text.
2 In Oscar I. Janowsky, ed., The American Jew: A Reappraisal (Philadelphia, 1964), a work of 468 pages, the entire subject is disposed of in one short paragraph (p. 152).
Place of Hebrew in Curriculum

Articles on Jewish studies in the American colleges have tended to concentrate on the status of Hebrew in the curriculum. Our interest differs in scope and kind. While Hebrew is obviously one of the central components of Jewish studies, it is not their totality. Hebrew, moreover, is not identical with Jewish studies, since it may be studied by a Christian as background material for theological reasons of his own, or by an orientalist as a tool in the study of one of several closely related ancient Near Eastern cultures. These distinctions become relevant when we consider the structure of the standard article on Hebrew in American colleges. More often than not, the first section of such an article is devoted to the study of Hebrew in the 17th-century colonies. After the citation of the Mathers and the theologically-oriented curricula of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, which included Hebrew, we usually leap to the end of the 19th century, when oriental studies were introduced into several American universities and, with them, some postbiblical literature usually considered as a branch of Semitics. Then would follow the third period of interest in Hebrew or Judaic studies, which began with the development of programs in various New York colleges in the late 1930s or early 1940s.

The selection of these three periods as peaks—the Colonial, the late nineteenth century, the past generation—is based on certain assumptions which bear examination. It is accurate for the development of the American university. But as a basis for our investigation two questions are important: What did the study of Hebrew mean to the administrators and professors in this discipline? Is the history of the American university the proper context within which a study of this problem should be conducted? The Puritan scholars, for instance, were primarily studying the language of Scripture, which they claimed as their Christian heritage. They did not associate their enthusiasm for the biblical text or Hebrew with contemporary Jews in America or in Europe. Indeed, the Puritans would cer-

tainly not have agreed with rabbis of their age, if they had known any, as to who were the legitimate heirs of "Old Testament" inspiration. The Puritan attitude towards Hebrew will therefore serve as an example of what we do not mean by Judaic studies, or Hebrew as part of these studies.

**Judaic Studies: Definition**

We would rather consider Judaic studies as the discipline which deals with the historical experiences, in the intellectual, religious, and social spheres, of the Jewish people in all centuries and countries. While this definition may generate certain difficulties, particularly in the consideration of Bible studies (where it is difficult to identify a scholar's "Judaics coefficient" because of the subtle differences in emphasis and approach), it will save us from serious confusion. It is, after all, no less reasonable to posit that Judaic studies have to do with the experience of the Jews and its intrinsic shapes and attitudes, than to assume that Chinese studies, for instance, have to do with the historical experience of the Chinese. Every culture has its own structure and the accusation of parochialism leveled at the intrinsic approach is therefore unwarranted.

It is not unreasonable to consider Judaic studies in the university from a broader historic perspective than one limited to the American experience. Our point of departure will then be not Puritan America, but mid-19th-century Europe, and Germany in particular. For once Jewish scholarship had been developed as a recognizable discipline by such men as Leopold Zunz, Abraham Geiger, and Heinrich Graetz, who initiated the Wissenschaft des Judentums—the substitution of scientific study, based on the principle of historical evolution, for tradition as the foundation of Judaism—it became the fond dream of westernized Jewish scholars that their discipline would be dignified by the establishment of chairs of Judaic studies in the universities. The first published document on this tendency is Abraham Geiger's *Ueber die Errichtung einer jüdisch-theologischen Facultät* (Wiesbaden, 1838). These dreams were rarely realized, but the cultural situation which generated both these dreams and their frustration must be the frame of reference for understanding the place of Judaic studies in the university ever since.

Emancipation, we know, exacted a high price from those Jews who sought it, and often ended in loss of specific cultural identity; the tensions released by the integration of Jews in the gentile society are still unresolved. Some degree of pluralism, however, is necessary for the creation
of a cultural climate in which particularity is accepted both in society and in the academic institutions which that society creates and supports. A study of Colonial American scholarship reveals little, if any, tolerance of Judaic culture except in so far as it relates to Christianity.

Because the academy is a fair reflection of the society which creates it—the notion that the university is an "ivory tower" is a poorly attested cliché—Judaic studies were more often to be found in the university program in the past century than earlier, and in recent times more often in America than in any other country. Between 1886 and 1902, five scholars were appointed to American university posts in Judaic or closely related subjects: Richard Gottheil at Columbia (1886), Cyrus Adler at Johns Hopkins (1888), Morris Jastrow at the University of Pennsylvania (1892), Emil G. Hirsh at Chicago (1892), and William Rosenau at Johns Hopkins (1902). These men are often considered semitists, but they all did some work in rabbinic literature. It is significant that all were Jews, as are most of the professors of Judaic studies today. (A few, like George Foote Moore of Harvard or Herbert Danby in England, were not.) Personal commitment to some aspect of contemporary Jewish life is not a requisite for teaching Judaic studies, but since extensive familiarity with difficult sources is crucial for professional competence, it is only natural that the qualified candidates for posts would be men who had studied these sources before their graduate training, and these are likely to be Jews.

Criteria for Selection of Institutions

The selection of colleges and universities for our study was therefore contingent upon these factors. It would have been useless to poll the 2,000-odd colleges in the United States to determine whether they teach Hebrew, or accept Hebrew as a language for admission or a language requirement toward the BA degree. It would have been just as futile to select such institutions from the Modern Language List of schools. We have, instead, restricted our queries to accredited liberal-arts colleges and universities which include Judaic studies and Hebrew in their humanities curricula. Denominational schools, seminaries—both Jewish and Christian—Hebrew teachers' colleges, and Dropsie College were therefore immediately eliminated, leaving two borderline cases: Brandeis University and Yeshiva University. We included the former, and reluctantly excluded the latter. Since our criterion is the pattern of cultural vectors generated by emancipation, the tolerance of the majority group, and the
identity-status of the minority group, Brandeis, though Jewish-sponsored, complies to a greater degree with this criterion than Yeshiva, in spite of the latter's liberal-arts program.

The choice between Brandeis and Yeshiva leads us to a question that is basic to this study: What is the power-structure of the university? Who are its administrators, its overseers and trustees, and its alumni? Is it still predominantly "white Protestant" and, if so, how responsive is it to the pressures of other interested groups, i.e., the faculty, the student body (both normally having a sizable Jewish component), and the community at large? This is by no means a theoretical question. It involves the day-to-day life of the university and comprises the real substance of the long-range process we call emancipation. The powers that be have not always been cooperative or magnanimous.3a

Scope of Study

Though our approach to the study was historical, the scope was, of necessity, determined by the raw material we succeeded in gathering and by the realities of the American scene. In this respect, our study differs significantly from that of Ismar Elbogen a generation ago.4 Then Judaic studies in the universities and seminaries could best be surveyed by a study of Jewish scholars and their scholarship, and the study by Elbogen, which did not set out to review Judaic studies in the American university, reflected the academic realities of the time fairly accurately. In the meantime, however, the situation has altered considerably: as in so many other areas of public life, we must deal with institutions, programs, numbers, and only incidentally with imposing scholars. These are indeed very few and their impact is circumscribed by the organizational structures.

Individuality today is institutional, a fact brought out by the bewildering diversity of programs. Precisely because of this diversity, it is wiser to address ourselves to specific problems than to a profile of each school. We are primarily interested, furthermore, in the broad contours and general problems of our subject, and not in its details.

3a A study of Jews in College and University Administration (May 1966), conducted by the American Jewish Committee, found that fewer than one per cent of the presidents and 2.6 per cent of the deans of American nonsectarian colleges and universities were Jews, in contrast to an estimated 12 per cent ratio of Jews in the student bodies of these institutions.

Listings

The most comprehensive listings of American colleges and universities contain over 2,000, of which about 1,100 are accredited.

The selection of schools for our study was made after a careful consideration of the probability of receiving meaningful information. After collating and comparing lists of institutions offering Judaic studies, derived from several sources, we compiled a list of 54 professors and 34 Hillel directors teaching such courses at 92 American colleges and universities. To them our questionnaire was sent. Forty-eight responded. Wherever possible, information regarding the remaining institutions was gathered from their catalogues.

For a correct evaluation of the various courses in Judaics, it was important to indicate the obvious disparity in quality of instruction at the various institutions. It is true that the most intimate and lasting aspects of the academic educational process cannot be ranked objectively, but it is also universally conceded that there are essential differences, some of which can be measured. Yet the academic community has not really attempted to tabulate even those aspects which can be quantified and there is no one generally accepted list ranking the various schools. A recent attempt, a study by Albert H. Bowker, although far from satisfying, provided some basis for ranking. Using various criteria, including rank lists of graduate schools previously published by Howard Keniston and Bernard Berelson, Bowker arrives at a list of fifty universities with top graduate schools in the social sciences and humanities and 20 undergraduate colleges most of which belonged to these universities. His list of undergraduate colleges is unfortunately short and favors some of the larger institutions over high-quality small institutions.

For our purposes we have set up two lists of institutions with full-time faculty in Judaics. Table A lists those of Bowker's top graduate and undergraduate schools which offer Judaic studies, plus several small institutions usually regarded highly in academic circles; Table B contains all

---


other schools included in our study. Within list A there are obvious differences in academic standing, but we could establish no objective criteria for subdividing this category.\(^6\) (We would rather err by being too inclusive than too exclusive.) For each of these institutions we have listed the department in which the Judaic studies are offered and shown whether the school is supported and controlled privately or by the state.\(^7\)

**TABLE A. DEPARTMENTS OFFERING JUDAICS IN TOP-RANKING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Support and Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston U.</td>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis U.</td>
<td>Near Eastern &amp; Judaic studies</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown U.</td>
<td>Religious studies</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, U. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Near Eastern</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Oriental languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (UCLA)</td>
<td>Near Eastern languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, U. of</td>
<td>Oriental languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia U.</td>
<td>a Near and Middle East; history; linguistics; English and comparative</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell U.</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>b Private/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard U.</td>
<td>Near Eastern languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana, U. of</td>
<td>Near Eastern studies</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa, U. of</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Oriental seminary</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky, U. of</td>
<td>a Classics</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba, U. of</td>
<td>Judaic studies</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan, U. of</td>
<td>a Near Eastern languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota, U. of</td>
<td>Middle Eastern languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri, U. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York U.</td>
<td>a Hebrew and Near Eastern studies</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, City U. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College</td>
<td>a Classical Languages and Hebrew; German</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(6^a\) See Preface.

\(7^7\) In a depressing number of instances the questionnaire returned was hardly informative. The reader should, therefore, understand the limitations of this study. The information, though fragmentary and, in keeping with our objectives, rather broad in scope, is fairly accurate for winter 1965–66. (Some universities which do not have a Judaics scholar at present plan to have one soon.) For more specific information, university catalogues should be consulted.
Institution | Department | Support and Control (Private or State)
--- | --- | ---
Hunter Queens | German Classical and oriental languages; history; English | State State
Oberlin, U. | Religion | Private
Pennsylvania, U. of | Oriental studies | Private
Princeton U. | Religion | Private
Roosevelt U. | Jewish studies | Private
Rutgers U. | Hebrew studies | State
Smith | Religion and Biblical literature | Private
Southern California, U. of | Religion | Private
Temple U. | Foreign languages | b Private/State
Texas, U. of | Linguistics | State
Vanderbilt U. | Religion | Private
Washington U. | Philosophy and religious studies | Private
Wayne State | Near Eastern languages | State
Wisconsin, U. of Madison | Hebrew and Semitic studies | State
Yale | Religion | Private

*Because the questionnaire was not returned, or returned incomplete, information was taken from catalogues.

b Privately supported and controlled, but receiving state grants for general budget.

Several conclusions can be drawn from these listings:

1. Many of the institutions in which Judaic studies and/or Hebrew are taught are in the top fifty-odd institutions in the country.

2. As far as could be ascertained, no Judaics courses are offered in the following colleges and universities rated high by Bowker: Catholic U.; Connecticut, U. of; Emory U.; Georgetown U.; Illinois, U. of; Mass. Inst. of Tech.; Nebraska, U. of; North Carolina, U. of; Notre Dame U.; Northwestern U.; Ohio State U.; Oregon, U. of; Purdue U.; Reed; Rochester, U. of; Swarthmore; Tulane U.; Virginia, U. of; Washington, U. of; Williams. To these above should be added such smaller colleges as Bryn Mawr, Carleton, and Vassar.

3. In Duke, Stanford, Syracuse, Toronto, and Wellesley—excluded from our lists—Judaic studies are considered as a distinct cultural area and given little attention.

4. Manitoba is the only Canadian university which merits a place on the list.

5. Several of the institutions listed by one or two of our sources as offering Judaics courses had no such program at the time of polling or listed no Judaics courses in their catalogues.
TABLE B. DEPARTMENTS OFFERING JUDAICS IN OTHER COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Support and Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi U.</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama, U. of</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska, U. of</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona, U. of</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(denominational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>a Religion</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(denominational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverford College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra</td>
<td></td>
<td>(denominational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach City</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (California)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island U.</td>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, U. of</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State College</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, U. of</td>
<td>a Foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma, U. of</td>
<td>Classics, foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State U.</td>
<td>Classical languages</td>
<td>b Private/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State College</td>
<td>a Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oregon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, U. of</td>
<td>Philosophy, languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont, U. of</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia, U. of</td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, U. of, Milwaukee</td>
<td>Hebrew studies</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Because the questionnaire sent to the university was not returned, or returned incomplete, information was taken from catalogues.

b Privately supported and controlled, but receiving state grants for general budget.

Place of Judaic Studies in Humanities Curriculum

When postbiblical Jewish studies were first introduced into the curriculum of American universities at the end of the last century, they were usually placed in the department of Semitics (or oriental languages). This was the logical place for them then, Hebrew being a Semitic language and Semitic studies in those days being almost exclusively philological. Since then both the world and the academic disciplines have become more complex. The very term “Semitics department” is a rarity in the academic language of the mid-20th century.

The emergence of America as a world power has forced upon the universities the rather new concept of regional studies, which in turn enhances the academic importance of the modern world. The archaeologi-
cal and philological advances of the past generation have shown us that this concept is crucial also in the study of the ancient Near East. Near Eastern languages or studies then, is one of the broad disciplines within which one now expects to find much of Hebraic or Judaic studies, particularly since the rise of Israel when a Hebraic-Judaic political enclave became an entity in the real Near Eastern world. And yet, the categorization is not as appropriate as one might think, for so much of postbiblical Jewish creativity is European in provenance and tone, certainly since the 10th century.

The department of religion (or religious studies) is a second logical place in which to offer a program in Judaic studies, and we notice that thirteen of the listed universities do so. We have restricted ourselves, of course, to departments of religion which are included in the general liberal-arts program. (If the university has a divinity school which lists in its catalogue many courses given also in the university's department of religion, our criterion for inclusion has been the apparent independence of Judaic studies from the doctrinal aims of the divinity school.) While in some colleges courses in Jewish religion are primarily service courses offered by the Hillel rabbi on a part-time basis, in other schools we find serious scholars as full-time teachers—e.g., University of California (Santa Barbara), Brown University (often distinguished visitors), Dartmouth, Drew, Iowa, Princeton, Smith, Vanderbilt, Washington University, Yale. That many schools of high academic standing invite specialists to teach Judaic studies in their departments of religion is in itself a sign of our times: religion is studied as a historical phenomenon in these departments, and not as a truth to be propagated.

Foreign-languages departments, both modern and ancient, would be the third logical place for courses in Judaics, and Hebrew in particular. Here, too, the study of Hebrew has been encouraged by a more general trend in American higher education—the interest in all foreign languages (stimulated, to be sure, by the government for very practical considerations) and in linguistics *per se*. Hebrew is a "neglected language" (though not on the "critical" list) and funds can be solicited from the government for the study of Hebrew. It is not always easy to deduce why some institutions have put Hebrew with the other languages (and why, among these, some have preferred modern to classical), why for some it is a discipline within regional studies, and why for others it is the language of one of the major western religions. Sometimes the choice is meaningful, but sometimes it is purely accidental, the decision of a
The position of Judaic studies in the humanities curriculum is determined by their complexity. One might rightly expect to find different aspects of Judaic studies in related departments: Jewish history in the history department, Hebrew language in linguistics. At Columbia, for example, Hebrew is in Near and Middle East studies, Jewish history in history, and Yiddish in linguistics; and if we were to include incidental Judaics courses and scholars, they would fall into the departments of religion and classics. This fragmentation is understandable from the point of view of university administration. One could argue the obvious merits and disadvantages of this fragmentation, e.g., the escape from parochialism versus dissipation. One could also argue the merits and disadvantages of concentration, as at Brandeis, a fine example of the concentration of many disciplines in one department.

The fact is that it is often difficult to explain why university $x$ puts Judaic studies in one category, while university $y$ places them elsewhere. The "logical" answer—that is where they belong—proves little, since policy on their position is usually determined on a local and ad hoc basis: who sat on what committee when the subject was introduced and what was the forte of the first man to teach Judaics. In universities offering full programs in Judaic studies, the problem of academic disciplines is easily solved by the administrative expedient of crosslisting—a historian may be a member of a department of Near Eastern languages, but his courses are also listed under history.

**Evaluation of Judaics Programs**

Any consideration of the scope of an academic program must inevitably involve the quality of the students and the professional competence of the instructors. It is simply not enough to list the schools offering a Judaics or Hebrew major on the undergraduate level, or where a doctorate can be earned on the graduate level. We must keep in mind both the stature of the university under discussion (whether they belong in Table A or B) and the caliber of the faculty (listed in Table C below). And while a full program demands the presence of several competent specialists, talented, solitary individuals have done remarkable work in several institutions. However, most of the schools on our B list offer no Judaics or Hebrew major, while only few on the A list do not offer such a major (and these, often, because for them the program is quite new),
and most plan to have it in the near future or include it in a religion major. A student can gain a fairly adequate undergraduate training in Judaic studies at about 40 accredited colleges in this country, and can acquire substantial information on the subject in at least 25 other institutions offering a variety of courses but no undergraduate major.

On the graduate level the qualitative calculus becomes more crucial. We notice that the list of universities offering graduate programs in some phase of Judaic studies, leading to the Ph.D., is quite long. They are: Brandeis, Berkeley, UCLA, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, Iowa, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, New York University, Hunter, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Rutgers, Smith, Texas, Vanderbilt, Wayne, Wisconsin (Madison), Yale. (Hunter, Indiana, Rutgers, and Smith have programs leading to the M.A. only.)

While, on the whole, these rank high among the nation's universities, not all the instructors and directors of these programs have achieved scholarly eminence. The reader can arrive at his own conclusions by considering the quality of the institution, the composition of the department, and the eminence of the scholars in it. It should be pointed out, however, that in many cases the strength of the departments lies in the ancient period, specifically in Semitic philology (and the closeness of the relationship between this discipline and Judaic studies is, as we have noted, open to question). Further, the professor's specialization should be taken into account, particularly in those universities where there is but one instructor at the graduate level who cannot possibly direct doctoral theses in all subjects of Judaic studies.

In general it should be noted that the existence of a graduate program in universities will ultimately raise the level of their undergraduate studies. These schools naturally have goals which are somewhat different from those ordinarily associated with an undergraduate liberal-arts program. The training of professional scholars and the promotion of research become their professed primary purposes, and their faculties are usually highly qualified to teach on this level.

Faculty

Since manpower is the major factor in all academic programs, particularly on the graduate level, a listing of full-time, permanent faculty, by universities, together with their field of specialization and the institution where they received their doctorate (see Table C), will yield much information on the state of Judaic studies in the universities. Our emphasis
upon "full-time, permanent" is crucial, for it implies a certain commitment on the part of the university. (Permanent faculty members usually have the rank of assistant professor or higher; there are few instructors, now, and teaching assistants are far from permanent.) Part-time lecturers were not recorded since it was impossible to determine exactly what their duties are; part-time faculty above the level of teaching assistant would amount to at least twenty scholars of some importance. Because the material elicited by our questionnaires was incomplete, we have supplemented it where necessary and possible from the directories. In certain cases the designation of specialization is based on publications listed in these directories. The list has been restricted as much as possible to Judaics specialists: in the case of men competent in Ancient Near East or Old Testament, the inclination to viewing their discipline as part of a historical continuum extending past antiquity, however diffuse and changing, had to be attested in some way; training and competency in postbiblical Jewish texts was requisite for a man to be listed as a "history of religion" specialist.

Even from this incomplete table several important conclusions can be drawn:

1. Over 80 per cent of the professors listed have received their graduate training in the United States. An examination of their biographies reveals that over half were either born here or came here as children. In this crucial area of Jewish life, therefore, the community is well on the way to providing most of its own university Judaics scholars.

2. The men who are teaching in the better universities were also trained in fine graduate schools. The contribution of Columbia, often that of Salo W. Baron, is overwhelming. Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Chicago also stand high on this list, as they do on any list of graduate schools in the humanities. Dropsie, of course, has done its share in training professional scholars.

3. It is almost impossible to tell what a man's specialty is unless one reads his publications or his doctoral thesis. The various areas of Jewish scholarship are so often undefined and interrelated that the terms used in academic titles or catalogue descriptions do not convey an exact meaning.

8 More detailed information than we can present here may be obtained in one of the three standard directories: Directory of American Scholars; Who's Who In World Jewry; Who's Who. (Note that entries are usually based on material presented by the person listed.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Institutional Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston U.</td>
<td>Joseph Schultz</td>
<td>Postbiblical literature</td>
<td>Brandeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Altmann</td>
<td>Medieval philosophy</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheldon R. Brunswick</td>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>Columbia (M.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nahum N. Glatzer</td>
<td>Jewish history</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Halpern</td>
<td>Modern Near East</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baruch A. Levine</td>
<td>Semitic languages</td>
<td>Brandeis (M.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avigdor Levy</td>
<td>Hebrew language</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Neiman</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nahum M. Sarna</td>
<td>Postbiblical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Walter J. Fischel</td>
<td>Semitic languages</td>
<td>Giessen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Berkeley</td>
<td>Jonas C. Greenfield</td>
<td>Semitic languages</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Milgrom</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>JTS (D. Heb. Lit.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bezalel Porten</td>
<td>Ancient Near East</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Arnold J. Band</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Ruth Blum</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew literature</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. A. Davidson</td>
<td>Medieval philosophy</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf Leslau</td>
<td>Semitic philology</td>
<td>Paris (Docteur-ès-Lettres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Michael E. Stone</td>
<td>Apocryphal literature</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Stanley Gevirtz</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Golb</td>
<td>Medieval Hebrew</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Isaac Barzilay</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gershon Cohen</td>
<td>Jewish history</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uriel Weinreich</td>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Isaac Rabinowitz</td>
<td>Semitic philology</td>
<td>Ph.D.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Jacob Neusner</td>
<td>Jewish history</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Isadore Twersky</td>
<td>Jewish history</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Barzel</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Henry A. Fischel</td>
<td>Hellenistic Judaism</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td>Institutional Degree (Ph.D. unless indicated otherwise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Frederick P. Bargebuhr</td>
<td>Medieval Spain</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Samuel Rosenblatt</td>
<td>Bible, Semitic languages</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Zalman M. Schachter</td>
<td>Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College (DHL) in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Abraham Paretzky</td>
<td>Hebrew language</td>
<td>Hebrew U. (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York U.</td>
<td>G. Schramm</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, City U. of City College</td>
<td>Abraham I. Katsh</td>
<td>Medieval literature</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>David Rudavsky</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>PhD *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Milton Arfa</td>
<td>Bible, Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry Blumberg</td>
<td>Bible, Semitic philology</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Acker</td>
<td>Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximilian Ellenbogen</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania, U. of</td>
<td>Moshe Greenberg</td>
<td>Jewish philosophy</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>Dan S. Rin</td>
<td>Medieval Hebrew</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>Malcolm L. Diamond</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman N. Bronznick</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leon Feldman</td>
<td>History, religion</td>
<td>Brandeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curt Leviant</td>
<td>Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luba Uveeler</td>
<td>Medieval literature</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yosef H. Yerushalmi</td>
<td>Hebrew language, literature</td>
<td>Yeshiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew language</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Jochanan Wijnhoven</td>
<td>Jewish history</td>
<td>Liége (Dr. d’univ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Cutler</td>
<td>Jewish philosophy</td>
<td>Columbia (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Esra Shereshevsky</td>
<td>Religion, history</td>
<td>Brandeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Bar-Adon</td>
<td>Hebrew literature</td>
<td>Ph.D.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Dropsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew U.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C. JUDAIC STUDIES FACULTIES AND THEIR FIELDS (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>Lou H. Silberman</td>
<td>Rabbinics, philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington U.</td>
<td>Steven S. Schwarzschild</td>
<td>Jewish philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>A. Spiro</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Madison</td>
<td>Menahem Mansoor</td>
<td>Semitic philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Talmadge</td>
<td>Medieval studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan D. Corré</td>
<td>Hebrew linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judah Goldin</td>
<td>Rabbinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table B, special mention should be made of the following:

- **Drew**
  - Will Herberg
  - Jewish philosophy
- **Missouri**
  - Isadore Keyfitz
  - Semitics
  - Columbia

* Full information on specialization, institution, or degree not available.
4. An encouraging number of the scholars listed are under 45—a definite indication that younger men consider this academic discipline as one offering a promising future.

5. The general level of professional training is quite high, and interested students in the major colleges and universities, both undergraduate and graduate, can avail themselves of its benefits. For graduate work in a specific area, of course, the student must seek out the man under whom he wants to study, and for this he may have to go to another city or to Israel.

**Growth Trend**

In 1945 Judaic studies were to be found in but few universities and colleges in this country. Institutions offering these studies on either the graduate or undergraduate level were the major universities which had had Semitic-languages programs in the previous century and some of the New York City schools, namely Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Iowa (an exceptional case), Johns Hopkins, New York University, Brooklyn College, Hunter, Pennsylvania. The list has grown sevenfold since then and now includes almost every region of the country. The most striking growth in full-time faculty and actual course offerings has taken place in Brandeis, Columbia, California (Berkeley, Los Angeles), Wisconsin (Madison), and Rutgers (see map preceding article).

Doctoral programs in Judaic studies or some aspect of Semitic philology tangential to Judaic studies were offered in Columbia, Harvard, Hopkins, Berkeley, Chicago, and Pennsylvania in 1945. In the past twenty years doctoral programs have been developed at Brandeis, New York University, University of California (Los Angeles), Wisconsin (Madison), Iowa, and Vanderbilt.

The increase in positions and programs is out of proportion to the increase in college population since 1945–46. As to the causes of this growth, most men polled mentioned the inspiration of the State of Israel, the impact of the holocaust, the awakening of religious yearnings since World War II, the greater acceptance of Jews and Judaism by the Gentile community, and the response of the Jews to this acceptance. All these factors are operative and no observer of the Jewish scene in America would seriously discount their validity. To these we would add four other explanations for the growth, also reflecting current American realities. 1. The academic intellectual in America is eminently respecta-

---

ble today—not only the scientist whose discoveries have a direct impact on our lives but even the philologist or literary historian. Judaism is becoming intellectually respectable, a phenomenon which is both a cause and effect of the growth of Judaic studies in the university. 2. Since the war Jews have been invited in unprecedented numbers to occupy university posts in all fields. While in the 1930s and well into the 1940s most departments in major universities were "judenrein" (staffed mainly by old-stock Protestants), few are today. 3. Developments in regional studies, in religious studies, and in dissemination of "the neglected languages" have strengthened and legitimized the development of Judaic studies. 4. Fortunately, the needs and desires of the Jewish community run parallel to the educational trends prevalent in the country.

**Financing**

This concurrence of interest becomes most apparent when we study financing. Though our information here is far from full, it is clear that in both private and public colleges at least two-thirds of the funds needed to support Judaic studies come from the general university budget (including grants for language study from the federal government). There can be no more than ten endowed chairs in these studies in the entire country, while there are over 60 men occupying what may be called full-time positions.\(^{10}\) Over the years much has been done in this respect by the Hillel Foundation, which supports three professorial chairs (State University of Iowa, University of Missouri, and Vanderbilt University), not to mention the many Hillel rabbis who give accredited courses; by the Hebrew Culture Foundation, which has initiated many programs and expanded existing ones; by the American Jewish Committee, and by many local groups. Quite often the university has taken over the financing of the program after an initial period, if there is student interest. This does not mean that the days of the endowed chair are over, but rather that more often than not the financing comes from general university funds. If Judaic studies are considered as an integral part of a well-rounded humanities curriculum, there is no reason why the program should not be part of the regular budget.

**Student Participation**

Aside from its obvious result, the transmission of knowledge to students, the Jewish-studies program has many interesting side-effects which

\(^{10}\) The term "endowed chair" is rather nebulous; some are fully endowed, some partly.
cannot be quantified, but which the respondents to our questionnaire assert are very real. Again and again one encounters in their responses such language as “added self-respect,” “intellectual respectability,” and “prestige both among Jews and Gentiles.” It appears that the very presence of a Judaics scholar on the faculty or a Jewish-literature course in the catalogue has a meaning for students, for faculty, and for the administration. This presence, a sign of emancipation and equality, has its subtle psychological effects, which deserve serious study. Certainly it represents far more than public-relations value.

If we were to talk only in terms of direct student participation in the programs now available, the impact of their spread throughout the country would be negligible. Of the very many thousands of Jewish students in the universities today—Alfred Jospe quotes an estimated 266,000 in 1963 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 133)—excluding 9,000 in denominational and theological institutions, it would seem that five per cent would be a generous estimate for those taking courses in Judaics. If we were to calculate the percentage on the basis of undergraduate majors, it would, of course, be much lower. The highest absolute figures for undergraduate majors are: Brandeis, 23; Brooklyn, 10; UCLA, 30; Indiana, 13; Hunter, 16; Rutgers, 12; Wisconsin (Madison), 10; and Manitoba, 19. A liberal extrapolation would yield a figure of 500 to 600 undergraduate majors.

The graduate figures are much lower, as one would expect. Aside from Brandeis and Columbia, we have no information of more than ten full-time Judaics graduate students in any one institution. (On the undergraduate level the number of women equals or exceeds that of men, while the graduate students are overwhelmingly male.)

The survey courses attract larger numbers, but it is impossible to determine how many correspondents arrived at the figures they submitted: is one student taking three courses counted as one student or as three? At any rate, granted that the larger schools are correct in their estimate of 200 to 300 non-majors taking courses at any one time, the national total would not exceed 10,000.11 Gentile participation is so small as to be negligible.

11 Janowsky (op. cit. p. 152) quotes Lapson for a recent figure of 14,000 studying Hebrew alone—which is a bit high: the 1964 report of the Modern Language Association of America records 5,021 for 1962 and 5,347 for 1963. Of these, about one-third are attributed to Yeshiva. Even if we assume that 50 per cent are studying modern Hebrew (most of the other 50 per cent are in Bible colleges), Lapson’s figure is still above the M.L.A figures.
Career Aims

The reported career aims of students in Judaics are fairly logical: the full-time graduate students aspire to college teaching and research in Judaics; the part-time graduate students—many of whom are practicing rabbis—mention college teaching and research, but add “to continue serving in the rabbinate.” Though it is difficult to distinguish between full- and part-time graduate students, particularly after the first two years of formal courses, many of the part-time students seem to be rabbis or Hebrew teachers. The career aims of the undergraduate students are usually vague: teaching on various levels, the rabbinate, social work. An undetermined but seemingly large percentage of graduate and undergraduate students are already teaching in afternoon Hebrew schools or are in the rabbinate during their student years.

Indeed, it is only during the past few years, with the availability of substantial financial aid (National Defense Act, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, Danforth fellowships, university grants) that a substantial number of graduate students have been able to pursue their studies without teaching on the side. In Judaic studies, as in other academic disciplines, the graduate student has never before found financial support so available nor the prospects for advancement so bright. In the 1930s responsible scholars often tended to dissuade their students from pursuing purely academic careers in Judaic studies, since they knew that positions were scarce; now, however, it is difficult to fill many of the available positions with competent staff. Anyone involved in the search for good faculty cannot escape the fact that we are now in a seller’s market for scholars.

Programs of Study

Hebrew, we have said, is not the totality of Judaic studies. On the other hand, no worthwhile Judaics program is conceivable without the student’s preparation in the language in which most of the basic texts were written. All undergraduate programs require Hebrew for a major in some area of Judaic studies. Hebrew may not be required if the Judaics program is a specialty within a religion major, or if it does not lead to a full undergraduate major but is part of a general humanities curriculum or a series of service courses. The approach to the language, however, may vary greatly from school to school.

There are still colleges and universities in which Hebrew is taught only as a classical language, as it has been in American universities since
colonial days, but these institutions constitute less than a third of those on our lists. In most cases the Hebrew taught is what one would describe as standard modern literary Hebrew (which is not the same as colloquial Israeli Hebrew). The inclusion of modern Hebrew in the curriculum is to be expected today and, if taught properly, embraces the basic grammar of classical Hebrew. In some schools, classical and modern Hebrew are taught separately, while in others one comprehensive course includes both. In several of the larger urban universities some of the more advanced courses, particularly in modern literature, are conducted in Hebrew, and special conversation courses are offered. At present, Yiddish is taught only at Brandeis, Columbia, City College (N.Y.), and Manitoba. Both Hebrew and Yiddish are often studied by linguists as interesting examples of language structure; hence the housing of Yiddish at Columbia and Hebrew at Texas in the linguistics departments of those universities.

Requirements for Judaic Studies

The requirement for the undergraduate major vary greatly.

UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

We restrict ourselves to the programs of three of the largest undergraduate schools: Brandeis, Hunter, and University of California (Los Angeles).

Brandeis

Two years, Hebrew.
One year, basic literature.
Two semesters, Biblical studies.
One semester, Jewish history.
One semester, Jewish philosophy, mysticism, or ethics.
One semester, modern Hebrew literature.
Four semesters selected from program offered.

Hunter

24 units (8 semester courses) in the Hebrew major. A comprehensive oral examination in two major fields, e.g., Biblical literature, modern Hebrew literature.
University of California (Los Angeles)

Prerequisites: Four semesters, college Hebrew.  
Two semesters, survey of Hebrew literature in English translation.

Requisites: 27 units (approximately 9 or 10 semester courses) including:
Two semesters, Bible
One semester, medieval Hebrew texts.
One semester, modern Hebrew literature.
Two semesters, structural grammar (Hebrew).
Four semesters (1-unit courses), conversation and composition.

Though there is some similarity on paper between these programs, it would be impossible to compare them because too many unregistered factors are involved, e.g., the quality of students, the level of instruction, the pre-college preparation of students, or their experience in Israel. Most schools responding to this poll indicated that about half their majors had studied some Hebrew before entering college; in the urban centers, New York in particular, the percentage is higher. Furthermore, it is becoming more and more customary for students to spend a year in Israel before graduation, often in some program connected with the Hebrew University. These factors make it impossible to answer the obvious question, how much can a student learn in an undergraduate major?

Graduate Studies

If half the undergraduate students have had some Hebrew before entering college, all applicants for admission to graduate programs should theoretically have had an extensive Judaics background before matriculating. In most cases, the admission requirements are a B average in a good undergraduate college and the equivalent of the undergraduate major in Hebrew or Judaic studies. Departments specializing in the ancient Near East demand less knowledge of Hebrew than those offering programs in postbiblical literature. The requirements to be met within the graduate program depend upon the student's specialization and the general requirements of the respective graduate schools. We can detect no uniformity in requirements, and certainly none in the rigor with which these requirements must be fulfilled.
The graduate schools we have listed—Brandeis, California (Berkeley), California (Los Angeles), Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Hopkins, Iowa, New York University, Pennsylvania, Vanderbilt, and Wisconsin (Madison)—offer a variety of areas of specialization within what may be called Judaic studies, though the university may list it as history, Near Eastern studies, or Semitics. However, two crucial factors must be considered: the size and caliber of the faculty and library resources.

While a talented and resourceful graduate student can do excellent work without good direction and good local libraries, it obviously helps to have both. Fine scholars may not be proof of the eminence of their teachers, but serious young academicians usually select the best man they can afford to reach. Adequate library resources are not always available. For students who are near the Eastern-seaboard megalopolis (Boston to Washington), library problems are minor; aside from Harvard, Yale, New York Public Library, Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshiva, Yivo, Dropsie, and the Library of Congress, there are at least six or seven fine smaller libraries (of less than 50,000 volumes). But for those who cross the Alleghenies library problems become crucial. If they cannot avail themselves of the splendid resources of Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati and of good collections in Semitics at Chicago, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin (Madison), and Berkeley, they have to go to Los Angeles for Judaica—and Los Angeles is not New York City. No statistics on library holdings or course listings, however, will serve as reliable indicators of the quality of professional training offered by any graduate school. For that one has to study the careers of the products of the graduate school.

Community Context

Were we to study our topic in isolation from the general community of Jewish learning in this country or in the world, we would not be able to understand much of the material presented here. The Judaics courses or programs are but a secular, public sector of a broader educational effort supported primarily by private Jewish funds: the rabbinical seminaries, the Hebrew teachers' colleges, the day schools, the synagogue schools, and dozens of more modest organizational programs. We have noticed that about one-half of the undergraduates had studied Hebrew before entering college, mostly in Jewish schools; that most graduate students have had some training in Jewish institutions, and that some of the outstanding libraries are supported by rabbinical seminaries or He-
brew teachers' colleges. Many of the leading Judaics scholars in America are on the faculties of Jewish-sponsored institutions which were not included here because of the precisely defined scope of our study, and Judaics in the universities would indeed be orphaned without them. There is considerable faculty exchange, giving full-time professors at one institution the opportunity to offer a course or seminar at a second institution.

By the same token, Israel is an important presence in the intellectual world of the university Judaics professors. This is so not only because American students often study in Israel or an occasional course dealing with Israel is offered in American universities, but also because the greatest concentration of Judaics scholars and publication is in Israel. In the past ten years there has also been significant faculty exchange between American and Israeli institutions. Rare, indeed, is the professor of Judaics who does not have intimate ties with his Israeli colleagues.

From time to time one reads euphoric articles on the renaissance of Jewish learning in America which cite as a prime example the spread of Judaics studies in the liberal-arts colleges and universities. The material presented here should give us some idea of the extent and limits of this growth. We have seen that relatively few students avail themselves of these courses, and that for most they constitute a vague presence which can imply acceptance in the academic community, intellectual respectability, or a justification for self-acceptance—and the same is true for the thousands of Jewish professors of all subjects who populate American universities. However, since it has finally become abundantly clear that more than two-thirds of American Jews of college age attend some college or university—the estimate for 1963 was between 70 and 80 per cent (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 133)—the campus has become the arena for Jewish organizational activity. The presence of Judaics programs on the campus has therefore attracted the attention of organizations which once hardly noticed them.

The rapid increase in Judaics posts in the universities between 1945 and 1965—from about 12 to over 60 full-time positions—has had a profound effect upon the teaching profession. We have not yet seen a major upsurge of Jewish scholarship in this country, but the prospects are encouraging. With two or three new posts created every year, the availability of positions attracts young men and enhances the security of more mature scholars. This expansion has provided a broad base for further development. Indeed, the one clear conclusion we arrive at, after examining the fragmentary and complicated welter of facts that emerged from our study, is that we are on the threshold of a new and promising period
in Jewish scholarship in America which merits careful attention and cautious, continual reassessment.

As Weisberg has put it, "Jewish culture in the United States is predominantly what Jews do under the auspices of Jewish organizations," and these organizations are primarily welfare or service groups. Thus Jews live a surrogate existence, in that their main function is doing things for others. If this is so, then the Judaics studies in the universities and their implications present an added opportunity for an interested minority to learn that philanthropy has not always been the sole purpose of Jewish communal life. We should not exaggerate the potential effect of Judaics programs upon American Jews; nevertheless they are a significant though small force in the slow, silent struggle to give institutional embodiment and communal identification to the essentials of Judaism (a minority tradition) for a meaningful identity within a leveling, permissive society. They might even present a few of the alienated Jewish intellectuals with an alternative to the rejected temple men's club and sisterhood.

APPENDIX

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH STUDIES IN NORTH AMERICAN LIBERAL-ARTS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SINCE WORLD WAR II

If any of the following questions can be answered by reference to the school catalogue, please write "catalogue" and send us a copy of the catalogue or photocopies of the appropriate pages.

1. Name of institution _____________________________;
   Your name _____________________________

2. In what department(s) are courses offered in Jewish studies (Jewish history, Jewish philosophy, Hebrew, Hebrew literature, Yiddish, etc.)?

3. What is the maximum scope of your program? (Please check one.)
   □ "Service courses" which do not lead to a degree in this field.
   □ Undergraduate major.
   □ Graduate courses toward the M.A.
   □ Graduate courses toward the Ph.D.

4. What, in your opinion, are the primary purposes of your program? (Please check one or more.)
   □ Training of professional scholars.
   □ Undergraduate teaching.

.faculty research.
- Service to Jewish self-knowledge.

5. How many courses are offered?
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

6. In what year were courses first offered?
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

7. What was (were) the initial source(s) of financial support?

8. Please give the number of full-time faculty members and courses at 5-year intervals, 1945–1965.

9. Please list the names of full-time faculty with their titles, year of appointment, educational background, and field of specialization. If this information is to be found in Who's Who, Who's Who in World Jewry, or Directory of American Scholars, please indicate.

10. How many part-time faculty members have you on your staff? How many courses do they teach?
- Number of part-time faculty
- Number of courses they teach

11. In what areas of Jewish scholarship have you the faculty to direct doctoral candidates?

12. How large are your library holdings in Hebraica and Judaica? What other significant libraries are there near you?
- Library holdings:
- Other libraries:

13. Independently of courses of instruction, what special research or publication program(s) in Jewish studies on your campus should be noted?

14. In what scholarly fields do you find particular difficulty in finding faculty?

15. Current enrollment:
- Graduate students (full-time)
- Graduate students (part-time)
- Undergraduate majors
- Non-majors taking courses

16. What is the age distribution of your students, graduate (full-time), graduate (part-time), undergraduate.

17. What are the various career aims of your
- Full-time graduate students?
- Part-time graduate students?
- Undergraduate majors?
18. What kinds of positions do your students now hold? (This question probably applies mostly to part-time graduate students.)

19. How many of your students are Jews? How many are non-Jews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Non-Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How many of your students are men? How many women?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Hebrew

- [ ] is taught.
- [ ] is not taught.

If taught, it is treated as a(n)

- [ ] classical language.
- [ ] modern literary language.
- [ ] language of conversation.
- [ ] example of linguistic structure.

22. Do you teach Yiddish? (If yes, please describe briefly your aim and method.)

23. What requirements must the undergraduate major meet?

24. What percentage of your undergraduate majors have had some Hebrew before enrolling in your program?

25. What are the requirements for admission to your graduate program?

26. Where have your graduate students studied before enrolling, e.g., liberal-arts college, rabbinical seminary, Israel? (Please estimate percentages, if possible; per cent may total more than 100, because a student may be in more than one category.)

27. What requirements have to be met within the graduate program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of examination for generals</th>
<th>Foreign languages</th>
<th>Hebrew (how extensive?)</th>
<th>Other Semitic languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. How many graduate students have been awarded the Ph.D. degree and how many the M.A. degree in Jewish Studies in your institution since 1945?
29. Is a bibliography of dissertations available for consultation? If so, please send or advise where one can be consulted. If not, please list some of the more significant ones completed. Please include dissertations which will be completed by June 1965.

30. How many (or what proportion) of your undergraduate or graduate students have spent some time at an Israeli institution? How important is this experience? Are your faculty members in contact with Israeli scholars?

31. Do you offer courses on Israel? Are these courses part of a general program of Near Eastern regional studies?

32. Do you have any formal or informal relations with specifically Jewish institutions of higher learning? If so, please describe.

33. How are your program or courses related to the cultural activities offered by the Hillel Foundation?

34. What has been the relationship of your Jewish studies program to the local or national Jewish community?

☐ Community or particular agency as a source of funds.
☐ Extension courses available to and used by the community.
☐ Other kinds of relationship. Please describe.

35. What are your current sources of support? (If necessary, check more than one.)

☐ General university budget.
☐ Jewish community or agency.
☐ Endowed chair. (Endowed by whom?) ____________________________
☐ Private funds. (Please explain.) ____________________________

36. How have your students benefited from your program? (If necessary, check more than one.)

☐ It has prepared them for careers in Jewish community work.
☐ It has prepared them for academic careers in Jewish studies.
☐ It has broadened or deepened their Jewish knowledge.
☐ It has allowed them to meet language, literature, or history requirements.
☐ Other. (Please specify.) ____________________________

37. What are your plans for future development of your program?

38. What in your view has been the impact of your program upon Jewish students? ____________________________

student body as a whole? ____________________________

faculty? ____________________________

local Jewish community? ____________________________

39. To what do you attribute the striking growth of Jewish studies in North American liberal-arts colleges and universities since World War II?
FELIX FRANKFURTER (1882–1965)

BY PAUL A. FREUND

Felix Frankfurter retired from active service on the Supreme Court in August 1962 because of ill health, and died on Washington’s Birthday, 1965, in his eighty-third year. Thus ended a life of extraordinary richness and range, so perfect a version of the romantic American saga that it almost seems as if nature were imitating art.

The bare outlines of his biography have become familiar. Brought to this country from Vienna as a boy of twelve, knowing no word of English, he soon mastered the language and much else in the world of ideas; haunted the libraries, reading rooms, and cafés of New York City; graduated with highest honors from City College and then the Harvard Law School; served his country under both Republican and Democratic administrations; was a founding editor of The New Republic; taught for twenty-five years at the Harvard Law School, and in January 1939 succeeded Justice Benjamin Cardozo on the Supreme Court. Abundant as are the records of his life, they scarcely convey the full flavor of the man or measure his impact on his time. On the occasion of his retirement, his friend Dean Acheson wrote:

One could read everything that he has written—a formidable task from several points of view—and still have little more than an inkling, if that, of why this man has evoked in so many such passionate devotion and exercised for half a century so profound an influence. I can think of no one in our time remotely comparable to him.

His influence radiated in the highest circles of authority and intellect, but he revealed himself perhaps most fully in his friendships with the less exalted—his students, his law clerks, those who served him. Childless himself, he found great refreshment in the company of children. These, no less than the captains and kings, were warmed by his effervescence, listened to his ebullient talk, heard his explosive laughter, felt his steely grip on the elbow, savored what he called the “Blue Danube” side of his nature.

He loved to tell of a visit to the home of a friend, where he found a
young son practicing on the recorder. Listening for a time, he said, “I would rather be able to play the recorder like that than to be a Justice of the Supreme Court.” “So would I,” was the prompt reply. “Good, wasn’t it! Wasn’t that good!” the Justice would shout when he repeated the tale. He was the first Justice to select a Negro as a law clerk. When his colored messenger heard of this he said, “Mr. Justice, that was a mighty fine thing you did, hiring one of our people to be your clerk.” The Justice said, “Tom, I have heard that kind of remark from others, but I am surprised to hear it from you. Don’t you know that I selected William Coleman because, on the basis of character and ability, I felt he deserved the position?” The messenger looked at him with a pitying glance and said, “Mr. Justice, do you think in this world our people get what they deserve?” “Good, wasn’t it! Wasn’t that good!”

On my last visit to the Justice, toward the end of his illness, he asked me to read aloud the epigraph of a volume on his desk. It was a sentence from Melville: “For genius, all over the world, stands hand in hand, and one shock of recognition runs the whole circle round.” “Good, isn’t it!” he said in an echo, a feeble echo, of the old exuberance.

Afterwards I reflected on this episode and felt that for the Justice, Melville’s figure of the encompassing human circle signified the meaning of friendship. His friendships were what they were because he gave of himself without reserve or inhibition. Another might be hesitant to inquire deeply into the lives of his friends lest he seem to be prying, or reluctant to send a note of reproach lest it be misunderstood, or diffident about praise lest it seem fulsome or flattering. But the Justice cared too deeply to be put off by constraint. He fulfilled the teaching of Martin Buber that all real living is meeting, that every human being whom one addresses “is Thou, and fills the heavens.”

If friendship was at the center of his heart, his love of country and of law was not far removed. He was an unabashed patriot. A product of Public School 25 in New York City, he never lost the excitement of the metropolis and of the teeming life into which he had been plunged. On a holiday in Southern California, it is reported, he spent his time pacing the beach, waiting for the New York Times. He was not a great traveler; his visits abroad were chiefly to England where he spent an enthralling year as Eastman Professor at Oxford at the beginning of Franklin Roosevelt’s presidency. His affection for England was, above all, for its tradition of law, of tolerance, of the reasoned ordering of affairs.

Law was the absorbing concern of his life—law as the mode by which the affairs of men are ordered through truth and justice. For him injus-
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tice was not a misfortune that had to be borne but an impiety that must be exorcised. Injustice could challenge the “Blue Danube” in him and transform it into a churning current of indignation. No one would doubt this who recalls his dedication to the cause of Sacco and Vanzetti in the Twenties and, some years earlier, his investigation of the outrages against striking copper miners in Arizona and his inquiry into the conviction of Tom Mooney in California.

His special concern was procedure in the large sense—the processes by which mortal praise and blame are assessed, by which rewards and punishments are meted out. Those who saw in the Sacco-Vanzetti affair and his other investigations a sympathy with the radical movement missed the point: what was at stake for him was the integrity of the law’s procedures. His scholarly work as a teacher reflected the same interest. His principal writings at that stage centered on the business of the Federal courts, on the functions of the Supreme Court, and on the use and abuses of the injunction in labor disputes.

On the Court his preoccupation continued to be the processes of justice. Though the issues were now more complex—if only because the judge’s role is more complex than the professor’s or the social critic’s—respect for the individual remained his basic concern. No one was more insistent on the right of racial equality in the public sphere, whether, in his words, the discrimination complained of was “ingenious or ingenuous.” He was in the forefront of those who demanded that Federal criminal procedures conform to the highest standards of fairness and decency, in order to safeguard not only the right of the accused but the honor of government itself. Due process of law was meant to be a safeguard for ourselves as well as for defendants. It was the necessary measure of difference between personal and disinterested retribution, between private vengeance and public justice. Only thus could the awesome power over other men’s lives and fortunes be made bearable to the wielders of the power. In Frankfurter’s view, both the judge’s authority and the limits of that authority had to be respected if liberty was to be maintained under law. To the complexities of the judge’s enterprise were added the ambiguities of the liberal spirit. Even so noble a right as freedom of speech and press, for example, had to be reconciled with the guarantee of a fair trial; and the supervisory power of the Federal courts had to recognize a marginal area of discretion left to the states.

The agonies of judgment implicit in the role of a sensitive judge were given expression in a memorable opinion in the flag-salute case in 1946:
One who belongs to the most vilified and persecuted minority in history is not likely to be insensible to the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. Were my purely personal attitude relevant I should wholeheartedly associate myself with the general libertarian views in the Court's opinion, representing as they do the thought and action of a lifetime.

But as judges we are neither Jew nor Gentile, neither Catholic nor agnostic. We owe equal attachment to the Constitution and are equally bound by our judicial obligations whether we derive our citizenship from the earliest or the latest immigrants to these shores. As a member of this Court I am not justified in writing my private notions of policy into the Constitution, no matter how deeply I may cherish them or how mischievous I may deem their disregard. The duty of a judge who must decide which of two claims before the Court shall prevail, that of a State to enact and enforce laws within its general competence or that of an individual to refuse obedience because of the demands of his conscience, is not that of the ordinary person. It can never be emphasized too much that one's own opinion about the wisdom or evil of a law should be excluded altogether when one is doing one's duty on the bench. The only opinion of our own even looking in that direction that is material is our opinion whether legislators could in reason have enacted such a law.

For him there was no single supreme simplicity. Though his approach to problems of constitutional law is not calculated to satisfy more puristic minds, it has its own relevance to the broader problems of our time, when the clamor of clashing isms and warring absolutes threatens to drown out possibilities of accommodation and reconciliation.

If the judicial opinions of Justice Frankfurter are not easily accessible to the general reader, readily available collections of his other writings contain distillations of his thoughts on men and affairs and law. His Reminiscences, transcribed from recordings of interviews, is not a full-scale autobiography but a set of pungent recollections of the years to his appointment to the Court. The volumes Of Law and Men and Of Law and Life and Other Things That Matter collect his essays, addresses, and tributes to departed friends, and reflect the astonishing scope of his interests and sympathies. The tributes, pointing to the qualities that he discerned in persons of all estates and talents, suggest his rare capacity to call forth the best of each man's gifts.

Although Frankfurter was not an observant Jew, he was, as his friend Benjamin V. Cohen has said, "very proud of his Jewish heritage. He did not profess to be learned in the Torah or Talmud but he would frequently amaze his friends with the bits and pieces of Jewish wit and lore he had somehow managed to acquire."

He became active in the Zionist movement for a Jewish homeland in Palestine in the early days of the First World War, when his friends Louis D. Brandeis and Judge Julian W. Mack assumed positions of leadership in the movement. In 1919 he served on the Zionist delegation to the Paris
Peace Conference. There he met T. E. Lawrence and, through him, the Emir Feisal, head of the Arab delegation. As a result of their talks came the historic letter of February 3, 1919, from Feisal to Frankfurter, in which Feisal stated that his delegation regarded the Zionist proposals to the Peace Conference as “moderate and proper,” that they “will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home,” that the Arabs and Jews “are working together for a reformed and revived Near East, and our two movements complete one another,” and that “neither can be a real success without the other.”

Frankfurter withdrew from the Zionist organization in 1921 with the rest of the Mack-Brandeis group, after the rejection of their demands for fiscal autonomy for American Zionism. But Frankfurter’s active interest in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine never faltered. He observed with growing concern a tendency on the part of Britain, the mandatory power, to attenuate if not to nullify its responsibility under the mandate to promote the development of the Jewish homeland. In April 1931, in a noteworthy article in *Foreign Affairs* entitled “The Palestine Situation Restated,” he set forth his views critically but constructively and affirmatively.

After his appointment to the Supreme Court he refrained from making public statements, but closely followed developments in Palestine and later in Israel, and eagerly received reports from Chaim Weizmann, David Ben-Gurion, and other Israeli leaders when they visited Washington. His deep interest in Zionism and the Jewish problem in the world setting enabled him to sense the threat of Nazism not only to Jewish survival but to human freedom itself, when many Americans still sought security in isolationism and neutrality.

Dr. Weizmann wrote in his autobiography, *Trial and Error*:

Felix Frankfurter I first met during my mission to Gibraltar in 1917. I had known him by reputation, and certainly was not disappointed when I came face to face with him. He was quick, intelligent, scintillating, many-sided, in contrast to myself, who have little interest in affairs outside Zionism and chemistry. He was of great help to us, as we have already seen, in the negotiations with the Emir Feisal. He also helped me a great deal toward understanding the ways and ideas of the American political leaders of that time. During the controversy with Justice Brandeis, described in ensuing chapters, Frankfurter and I drifted apart for some years, but I believe that even during this period our relations did not deteriorate seriously, and I am happy to think that whatever breach there was has been healed, so that there are today stronger mutual bonds of affection and respect.

Estimates such as this cause one to speculate on how much was lost to diplomacy when Frankfurter took his place in the judiciary. Not all,
however, was lost. During the Second World War his counsel was sought to a degree not yet made known; former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, in his memoirs, hinted at these services and had to be content with saying that for them Justice Frankfurter deserved well of his country.

During his last illness he made plans for the approaching end: too often, he said, he had seen an insufferable burden placed on survivors for lack of forethought and directions. There was to be no formal service, only music played by friends, some brief words of farewell, and, finally, a recital of the Kaddish by a former law clerk whose fidelity to the observances of his fathers had for years drawn the Justice’s profound admiration. Since the band of mourners would include some who were unfamiliar with the Kaddish, its significance was to be briefly explained—he would be a teacher to the end, and beyond. His emotions were at the breaking point; his voice was choked. “I came into the world a Jew,” he said, “and I want to leave it as a Jew.” And so in truth he did.
“Next to being the children of God, our greatest privilege is being the brothers of each other.” These were Martin Buber’s words to American Jewry when he visited the United States for the first time in 1951. His love of every man and joy of living were the secrets of the amazing sense of presence—the feeling of grandeur and greatness—that Buber transmitted to all who came in contact with him. He was one of the truly universal men of our epoch. Like Ghandi and Schweitzer, he transcended the boundaries of any one country. His influence reached into the farthest corners, and this because it came from the core of his being. Only a man who was at one with God and with his fellowmen could speak in words that moved men everywhere.

Buber was revered as a Jewish philosopher, one who drew for inspiration and illustration from the sources of Judaism—the Bible, the Kabbala, and, especially, hasidic writings. Not since Maimonides had a Jewish thinker who fully identified himself with his people exerted so much influence on the Western world of thought and letters. Paul Tillich emphasized this universality when he eulogized Buber:

As long as I have known Martin Buber, I felt his reality as something which transcended bodily presence or intellectual influence. He was there in the midst of the Western world, a part of it, a power in it, through his person, but also independent of him as an individual being, as a spiritual reality impossible to be overlooked.

Thus we speak of Buber as a pillar of light illuminating both the Jewish and the non-Jewish world, much like the pillar of light the Seer of Lublin was said to have seen rising out of a synagogue where Hasidim were telling one another about their zaddikim.

Influence on Western Thought

It is impossible to think of modern Jewish thought without referring to Buber’s seminal writings on the nature of religious existence. Ignacio
Silone expressed the view of many when he wrote to the Nobel Prize Committee in 1962: "I know of no person at the present moment who is Buber's equal in profundity of spirit or in the power and quality of his expression." His influence went beyond the realm of religion and philosophy. His published works have been translated into many languages for a worldwide readership, and his name may be encountered in works on political science, sociology, education, psychotherapy, or art.

Buber's remarkable power of expression, however, was not limited to the written word. He was a great teacher, a powerful lecturer, and an eloquent orator. His addresses moved the hearts of men; he engaged in dialogue with his listeners, though they were silent. But he also loved to talk with people—to engage them in real conversation, and these chats never failed to leave a lasting mark on them. He was impatient with abstractions and theoretical questions, and when he first met a group of students at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York he refused to be drawn into theoretical discussions and asked for "real" questions about concrete situations. He frequently asserted that he was neither a theologian nor a philosopher, and could therefore deal only with the concrete.

Buber was uncannily successful in calling forth "real" questions from his partners in dialogue, and his responses, born out of profound scholarship and experience, illuminated difficult situations and pointed the way to solutions. He denied that he had special solutions for all problems; all he could do, as he so eloquently declared in his novel For the Sake of Heaven, was to guide his questioner and spur him to venture forth and find his own solution:

I myself have no "doctrine." My function is to point out realities of this order. He who expects of me a teaching other than a pointing out will always be disillusioned. And it would seem to me, indeed, that in this hour of history the crucial thing is not to possess a fixed doctrine, but rather to recognize eternal reality and out of its depth to be able to face the reality of the present. No way can be pointed out in this desert night. One's purpose must be to help men of today to stand fast, with their soul in readiness, until the dam breaks and a path becomes visible where none suspected it.

Buber was short of statute and round of figure, yet his eloquent eyes, his flowing beard, his amazing presence, lent him an almost awesome aura. On his visit to the United States he spoke to vast audiences about complex matters, in a heavily-accented English which at times was very difficult to understand. But his listeners—whether students or laymen, professors or theologians—sat entranced, sensing that they were in the presence of greatness.
The Israeli critic and writer Baruch Kurtzweill discussed Buber's charismatic effect upon those who knew him:

His love of life and his savoir-vivre, this quiet confidence aroused trust and longings in the hearts of his contemporaries. Without being conscious of it, they felt in Buber something unusual—here was a man of the spirit, a great scholar, yet filled with tranquillity, self-confidence, and love of life. . . . unfortunates, those eaten up by doubt, sought to be near Buber. They expected that one who loved life and loved himself would surely love them, too. With great compassion and with sympathy he received all those who came to him.

Buber's long life spanned the world-shaking events of contemporary history. He not only lived history, he also helped shape it, for his writings and teachings constituted the greatest single contribution to Jewish thought and letters in his time.

**Zionist Ideal**

When Buber was in his twenties he was attracted by Theodor Herzl's idea of Jewish national rebirth. Buber's interest in rebuilding the Jewish national home was as far as could be from chauvinism or a desire to retreat from the life of the nations. For him "Zionism meant . . . the restoration of the connection, the renewed taking root in the community. . . . And the most sparkling wealth of intellectuality, the most luxuriant seeming productivity (only he who is bound can be genuinely productive) cannot compensate the detached man for the holy insignia of humanity—rootedness, binding, wholeness." He saw in Zionism the vehicle for establishing a center where the Jewish spirit could flourish and the Jewish ideal of true community could be realized. He couched this idea in more concrete terms later, when Mahatma Ghandi questioned the validity of the Jewish claim to Palestine:

We need our own soil in order to fulfill our task; we need the freedom to order our own life; no attempt can be made on foreign soil and under foreign statute. We cannot fulfill if the soil and the freedom for fulfillment are denied us. We are not covetous, Mahatma, our one desire is that, at last, we may be able to obey.

**Addresses on Judaism**

Buber's preoccupation with Jewish national rebirth led him to the search for the soul of Judaism. He wished to revitalize it by bringing back to it the confused and alienated youth of his day. From 1909 to 1911 he delivered before the Bar Kochba Jewish Student Organization in Prague his famous *Drei Reden über das Judentum*, which were later widely published in expanded form.
"The question which I pose today before you and before me," he said, "is the question of the meaning of Judaism for the Jews." He saw the spiritual process of Judaism as a striving for the realization of three ideas: the unity of the powers inherent in man (for the Jew is concerned with the whole rather than with its parts); the deed as the decisive element in man's relation with God, and the future as the "deepest and most original concept of Judaism," an idea inherent in Jewish messianism (for the messianic ideal is to be realized in the world of men and not in some other world).

Buber pleaded with his young audience for a renewal of the spirit of Judaism as symbolized in a hasidic tale about a fallen spirit. The spirit, which is destined to wander eternally from door to door and from place to place, suddenly stops and cannot continue. An old man appears before the spirit and asks, "Why do you stand so?" "I can go no further" the spirit answers. To this the old man says: "If you remain here and do not continue, you will cease your existence as a spirit and turn into a mute stone." This, Buber emphasized, was the danger threatening the Jewish people—the loss of its spiritual existence.

The deep impression Buber made on the youths was later recorded by Hugo Bergmann, now professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University, who was among those who heard him:

All those who heard these addresses of Buber have never forgotten them, nor will they ever forget them. . . . the voice of Judaism spoke to us from the lips of the lecturer, and we were bidden to reply with our lives. Though we did not speak during the lectures, we participated in a profound dialogue.

Hasidism and Views on Religion

Buber's decisive influence on contemporary Judaism was achieved by opening up the treasures of hasidism. He had experienced hasidism as a way of life in his childhood, the greater part of which he spent with his grandfather, Salomon Buber, in Lemberg. A visit to the rebe of Sadagora with his father left a particularly strong impression, and, although rejecting some of the "carryings on," he tells of the "unarbitrary nobility" of the hasidic community:

The palace of the rebe, in its showy splendor, repelled me. The prayer house of the Hasidim with its enraptured worshippers seemed strange to me. But when I saw the rebe striding through the rows of the waiting, I felt "leader" and when I saw the Hasidim dance with the Torah, I felt "community." At that time there rose in me a presentiment of the fact that common reverence and common joy of soul are foundations of genuine human community.
In making the hasidic literature available to the Western Jew and non-Jew, Buber reclaimed for them the riches of the Hasidim’s life and made hasidism, which had been ridiculed and denigrated by some Jewish historians as rank superstition, part of their religious consciousness. Buber also brought to the world “the mysterious land after mysterious land” of hasidic piety and the spirit of hasidic teaching which he regarded as the central core of Judaism:

The hasidic teaching is the consummation of Judaism. And this is its message to all: you yourself must begin. Existence will remain meaningless for you if you yourself do not discover its meaning for yourself. Everything is waiting to be hallowed by you; it is you. For the sake of this your beginning, God created the world. He has drawn it out of Himself so that you may bring it closer to Him. Meet the world with the fullness of your being and you shall meet Him. That He Himself accepts from your hands what you have to give to the world, is His mercy. If you wish to believe, love!

Buber has been criticized for concentrating only on anecdotal material and neglecting the theoretical aspects of hasidic literature. But his choice was determined by his belief that religious teaching should concern itself with real life, with the existence of human beings and their mode of living. This is why he frequently denied being a theologian. The tales became the cornerstone of Buber’s interpretation of hasidic piety, for, as he noted, “Even where I had to let theory speak, I could relate it back to life.”

Hasidism was the inspiration for Buber’s dialogic philosophy, basic to his view of religion and life. Its emphasis on the holy in the commonplace, its call for true community, and its recognition of the individual’s importance were behind Buber’s famed call to modern man to live on the level of the I-Thou relationship—to recognize in the concrete moment the presence of the Divine.

Influence on German Jews

Though Buber called himself a Polish Jew, his work and writings were mainly addressed to the German Jewish community and it, in turn, recognized him as one of its great teachers. When the great moment of trial and testing came, Buber understood the need of the hour. He straightened the backs of those who were systematically being humiliated, and filled the persecuted with courage and faith. He reminded them that “in our history, hardship has always had a reviving power. . . . What we must do is make of it freedom and a blessing.” And this he tried to help them do by an imaginative and intensive program of Jewish education which
Ernst Simon called a form of "spiritual resistance." His call to such resistance in the early days of Hitler's Reich was a shining page in a dark history:

The children see what is happening and are silent, but at night they groan in their dreams, awake, stare into darkness. The world has become unsafe . . . the soul no longer finds its way in the world. It becomes hardened and callous and that is how men become bad. How can this be avoided, what is to be done against resentment? I know nothing else but this; to bring something unshakable into the world of the child—we are not one other example of the species nation, we are the only example of our species, we are the people of Israel.

Buber's great contribution to the Jewish-German symbiosis was the translation of the Bible into German, begun with Franz Rosenzweig and completed only shortly before his own death. Ernst Simon drew an interesting parallel in connection with the translation: Moses Mendelssohn, the first great German Jew, translated the Bible into German in order to bring modern culture to his fellow-Jews. Buber, the last great German Jew, also translated the Bible into German, but his aim was to bring the power of the original Hebrew text to those who knew only German.

The Bible translation was Buber's most impressive work in the scriptural field, but not his only one. His book on Moses; his discussion of prophetic faith; his interpretation of the Psalms, and his many essays on Biblical topics have won for him an important place among contemporary interpreters of the Bible.

The Yishuv

When the Gestapo put a stop to Buber's educational activities in Germany, he became professor of social philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He was then sixty years old. He lived through the struggle for the establishment of the State of Israel and the great return of the exiles. He was not in agreement with the dominant political views of the yishuv. He advocated a binational, Jewish-Arab state, and the failure of the new State of Israel to make friends of the Arabs pained him.

When Buber retired from his university post, he did not retire from teaching. His special concern for the new immigrants, who needed help to overcome the difficulties of living in a new land, led to the establishment of the Seminar for Adult Jewish Education in Jerusalem, which he directed until 1953. It was the purpose of this seminar to train full-time teachers for adults, mainly for the new arrivals. From his modest home in Jerusalem Buber's influence continued to radiate throughout the world. He was visited by many people who came from near and far to
speak to him. He took on a stature larger than life. He became a legend in his own lifetime.

*   *   *

There has been criticism of Buber's philosophy of Judaism, especially of his belief that its ritual and legal aspects were not integral to Jewish living. These views and his political principles tended to create a gulf between him and many in the Jewish community. But Buber's work in the Zionist movement; his call for a Jewish renascence; his understanding of the treasures of the Jewish past, especially the Bible and hasidism; his understanding of the dialogic character of living and religious existence; his plea for a spiritualizing of Jewish national living, and his striking literary work earned Buber the place as contemporary Jewry's greatest son.

And over and above these achievements, stood Buber, the man of faith. What was perhaps most Jewish about Buber was his constant awareness of living the presence of the Almighty; he lived by the Biblical admonition, "In all your ways acknowledge Him."

When I first began to teach theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary, I went to see Buber to ask his advice on how to go about this task. He rose from his chair and, in his characteristic bounding gait, ran to the bookshelves, took down a copy of the Tales of the Hasidim, and asked me to read this story:

The rav asked a disciple who had just entered his room, "Moshe, what do we mean when we say God?" The disciple was silent. The rav asked him a second and a third time. Then he said, "Why are you silent?" "Because I do not know." "Do you think I know?" said the rav, "but I must say it, for it is so, and therefore, I must say it: He is definitely there and except for him nothing is definitely there . . . and this is He."

Here was the essence of Martin Buber's life and work: to make known in the concrete moment the presence of God. He considered it to be our task as human beings and our responsibility as Jews to recognize and accept this presence. Here, too, he gave substance to his thinking by the use of symbolism: "When I was a child," Buber concluded his first address on Judaism, "I read an old legend, which at the time I did not understand. The legend said, 'Before the gates of Rome sits a leprous beggar and he waits. This is the Messiah.' At that time I came to an old man and I asked him, 'For whom does he wait?' The old man answered me then, and it was only much, much later that I really understood his reply. He said, 'He waits for you.' "
THE YEAR 1965 saw the fourth and concluding session of Vatican Council II. Historically, theologically, even administratively the Ecumenical Council was an impressive event. Over a four-year period, some 2,400 bishops from every corner of the world—from traditionally "Catholic" countries where the church has enjoyed a virtual monopoly over religious and cultural life, from democratic, pluralist nations like the United States, from the emerging nation states of Africa and Asia, from behind the Iron Curtain—representing an enormous range of opinion on a great variety of questions, met 168 times, heard some 2,200 speeches, submitted over 4,000 written interventions, consulted with 460 officially designated experts, discussed and debated questions ranging from liturgy to nuclear warfare and, in the end, adopted 16 documents. Some of these, like the schema on communications, were deemed conservative in spirit; others, like the constitution on the church and the declaration on religious liberty, marked a radical departure from the juridical language and rigid thought patterns of past centuries.

Jews, who had had reason to be apprehensive of ecumenical councils in the past, followed this one with lively interest. Of the 16 documents which emerged from the Council, one had particular relevance for them: the declaration on the relation of the church to non-Christian religions, which included a passage dealing especially with the church's attitude towards Jews and Judaism. The declaration on religious liberty, while it drew less specific comment from Jewish sources, was also regarded as highly significant.

Like most legislative bodies, Vatican Council II reflected various divisions. The Council Fathers divided into conservative and liberal, or progressive, camps. (In the early days of the Council the prelates resisted the use of these designations, charging that such political terminology did not apply to their various positions, but by the second session they had given up the struggle, accepted the words, and used them them-
selves.) Again, as with most legislative bodies, most of the documents that emerged represented a compromise between liberal and conservative viewpoints. This was true of both the declaration on religious liberty and the statement on the Jews. As a result of objections from conservatives, the text of the declaration on religious liberty was revised in two major aspects before its promulgation on December 7: more stress was placed on man’s moral obligation to seek the truth and live according to it, and more emphasis was given to the obligation of Catholics to follow the mandates of the church. Both themes were carried out throughout the revised text, perhaps the most controversial of all the documents from a doctrinal point of view. The passage of the declaration on the Jews, despite a sustained and powerful campaign to defeat or emasculate it, may be considered as a victory for the liberal elements within the church. It is so considered by most Catholics. Nevertheless, the fact that it had been compromised at all, and that the pure and spontaneous spirit which had prompted the late Pope John XXIII to initiate such a statement had given way to the demands of caution and expediency, created dissatisfaction among many Jews. This was due both to the content of the final text and to the maneuvering around it. If there had been no earlier version, the final document probably would have been universally welcomed by Jews. Considered in the perspective of 2,000 years of Catholic-Jewish history, the declaration, as it stands, has profound implications. In years to come, it may well be seen as a definitive turning point in Jewish history and the beginning of a new era in relations between the Roman Catholic church and Jewry. (In the United States there is evidence that it is to be seriously and thoroughly implemented.)

But that is in years to come. In 1965 the intensity—and, at times, the ugliness—of the struggle to abort the document and the Council’s partial retreat before the combined onslaught of conservative theology and political pressure left a bitter aftertaste in sections of the Jewish community.

Declaration on Jews Revised

As 1964 drew to a close, and with it the third session of Vatican Council II, those who had hoped for and worked toward a strong, forthright Council statement on Christian-Jewish relations had reason to be reassured. On November 20 the Council Fathers had given their preliminary approval to an unambiguous declaration which condemned hatred and persecution of Jews, admonished Catholics not to “teach anything that could give rise to hatred or contempt of Jews in the hearts of Christians,”
and specifically repudiated the notion of Jewish people as “rejected, cursed, or guilty of deicide.” Although the draft had been subjected to many delays and considerable maneuvering, the text adopted on November 20 was stronger than any previous version. From the viewpoint of the Catholic liberals, it appeared the battle had been won.

Still, the text was not final. The 242 placet, juxta modum (in favor, with reservations) votes, each enabling the voter to submit textual amendments, left the way open for changes. Despite repeated reassurances from Catholic spokesmen that the basic spirit of the document could not be significantly altered, the final fate of the declaration was still uncertain.

At the beginning of 1965 scattered indications from Rome, bolstered by reports of intensified Arab pressure against the document and belligerent statements from religious leaders in Arab countries (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 134—36), raised doubts, first whether the text was final and then whether the declaration was even still on the agenda for the fourth session.

The counterattack on the document was rooted at least as much in conservative theology as in political considerations, and one of the bluntest statements of this theology was issued in March by Bishop Luigi Carli, of Segni, Italy, one of the most ultra-conservative voices in the Council. Writing in Palestra del Clero, a magazine written by and for the Italian Catholic clergy, Bishop Carli asserted that the Jews of Jesus’ day did, indeed, bear collective responsibility for his crucifixion. Carli went even further, charging that to the extent that Judaism today constitutes “the free and voluntary continuation” of the Judaism of Jesus’ time, Jews today continue to “participate objectively in the responsibility for deicide.” For these reasons, he said, Jews can be called “reprimanded” and “cursed by God” (Religious News Service, March 17, 1965).

The Pope’s Homily

Such animosity might have been dismissed, by reason of its very excessiveness, as the outer limit of a kind of lunatic fringe of Roman Catholic thought. But a few weeks later the specter of collective guilt, and indeed of deicide, rose again, and this time from a much more authoritative source—or rather from the most authoritative source. In the course of a Lenten homily on Passion Sunday in a Roman church, Santa Maria della Guadalupe, Pope Paul VI remarked that the day’s Gospel lesson was a “grave and sad page narrating the clash between
Jesus and the Jewish people—the people predestined to await the Messiah but who just at the right moment did not recognize him, fought him and slandered him, and finally killed him."

The reaction from the Jewish community in Italy, Israel, and the United States, was immediate and heated.

Sergio Piperno, president of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities, and Chief Rabbi Elio Toaff of Rome expressed their "painful astonishment" in a telegram to the Vatican Secretary of State. Israel's newspapers spoke out sharply. Ha-tzofeh, an Orthodox publication, charged that the Catholic church had not changed since Auschwitz despite the work of Pope John XXIII and that "missionary aims" were concealed in the declaration on Jewish-Christian relations. Pope Paul's sermon was also criticized by Ma'ariv and Ha-aretz published a cartoon which showed the Pope nailing the Jewish document to the cross.

In the United States the sermon evoked objections from Jews and both apologies and apologetics from Catholics—depending on the source. The American Jewish Committee said it was "astonished and concerned" that the homily appeared to deviate sharply from the declaration on the Jews which had received such an overwhelming affirmative vote in November 1964. Rabbi Balfour Brickner, director of interfaith activities of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said:

It is difficult to believe that the man who less than a week ago spoke of removing from the liturgy of the Catholic church words and phrases offensive to Jews and Judaism could be the same person now reported again to raise the issue of deicide.

Since reports of the sermon were still unclear, Rabbi Brickner said:

It is of critical importance that the Vatican immediately clarify both the statement and the meaning of what the Pope said.

Vatican sources, according to the National Catholic Reporter (April 14), "tried to tidy up the affair as best they could." Although both the Associated Press and the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service reported the Pope as having said that the Jews "finally killed him," Vatican Radio, as reported by the Religious News Service, quoted the Pope as saying "and finally repudiated him."

The NCWC News Service issued a second version of the Pope's words, with the insertion:

1 In March Pope Paul had changed the title of the Holy Week prayer "For the Conversions of the Jews" to, simply, "For the Jews." It was the fourth change in the church's prayer for the Jewish people in less than twenty years.
Vatican sources said the Pope was not referring to the discredited deicide issue in his talk, but that he used the historical fact of the killing of Christ by the Jews to illustrate a human phenomenon in today's world.

A Vatican source told the Religious News Service that the Pope may have caused a misinterpretation by referring only to the Jews when he meant mankind in general.

Other Catholic spokesmen offered reassurances that the Pope's remark had no antisemitic intent. Augustine Cardinal Bea, head of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Catholic Unity and primary architect of the Jewish declaration, when interviewed by the Turin La Stampa, said that there was "no reason to be worried" about the Pope's remarks, since they had been couched

in the terms used by the Gospels in the way it is customary to preach, not in the technical language of a decree . . . addressed to the entire world and to all kinds of people.

Cardinal Bea issued a similar disclaimer on his arrival in the United States on April 28. He said that the Pope's statement "must be seen as an address to the simple faithful, who would not have understood sophisticated explanations."

In the United States Msgr. John Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University, wrote that the expressions used by the Pope were "unfortunate" but that they had

no antisemitic connotation whatever. Those who know him well think it altogether impossible that he wished to hurt Jews or . . . anyone else. He is a man without guile. I am sure he used those phrases quite innocently, never suspecting how they sounded to the ears of Jews . . .

Msgr. Oesterreicher and several other Catholic commentators (e.g., in Catholic Star Herald, April 30, and St. Louis Review, April 16) pointed to the common literary practice of using expressions such as "the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor" and "the Germans sent Jews to Dachau," and said that the Pope had used "the Jews" in that sense, without indicating a collectivity of Jewish guilt.

The reassurances, however, failed to reassure, particularly as they were unaccompanied by any official Vatican statement of clarification or apology. Especially irksome was the explanation that the Pope's comments had been directed to the "simple faithful." "What can one expect from country priests if the 'Supreme Shepherd' still speaks in such terms?" asked Israel, the weekly publication of the Union of Italian Jewish communities.

The Lenten sermon, which obviously embarrassed some liberals, occa-
tioned much labored explanation, but little outright criticism from Catholics. Commonweal's approach (May 21) was perhaps most straightforward:

The lapse in referring to the Jews as the killers of Christ was a mistake, and one that coincides with news of a fresh attempt to water down the Council's statement on antisemitism. Though it was followed by many unsatisfactory explanations both in Rome and the United States, it brought no apology from the Pope himself. In view of the delicacy of relations between Catholics and Jews, one should have been forthcoming.

The Protestant Christian Century weekly (May 5), was also dissatisfied with the explanations:

Some versions of the Pope's homily used the word "repudiated" instead of "killed," but this does not alter the fact that he identified the whole Jewish people with the crucifixion . . . It is not the Jew who is now on trial for the crucifixion of Christ but Christians who in vicious bigotry slay the spirit of Christ in their cruel hounding of innocent Jews. Let the church begin its fourth assembly in contrition and repentance.

Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg, writing as a columnist for the National Catholic Reporter (May 5, 1965), suggested that the real issue was not past responsibility for the death of Jesus, but the continued refusal of Jews to accept him:

"Christ-killer" is a phrase that evokes much emotion, for it stirs among Jews their deepest fears and it reminds Christians of their most shameful guilt's. Even the Pope cannot, today, utter the phrase, regardless of what he may mean by it in context, without provoking open criticism even among his own flock. None the less, at their very root, Judaism and Christianity do not divide over the question of who killed Jesus. Not "and they killed Him" but the more ironic "and they rejected Him" is indeed the essence of the matter for Christians and Jews. . . . The ultimate issue is, therefore, not the past. It is the present. It is not who killed Jesus nineteen centuries ago but who accepted him, and who does not today.

But whereas Rabbi Hertzberg implied that Jewish efforts to achieve a Vatican Council statement were justified, other Jewish spokesmen saw the Pope's sermon as definitive proof that it was impossible to enter into religious dialogue with the church. Thus, Rabbi Harry Levitsky of South Orange, New Jersey asked:

How many more incidents of this kind does it require for us Jews to give up our newly acquired penchant for dialogues with cardinals, archbishops, and bishops on theology?

Disturbing as the Pope's Lenten homily was in itself, much of the Jewish reaction was based on the suspicion that it pointed obliquely to a change in position on the larger question of the Vatican Council decla-
ration. Indeed, this was not only a Jewish interpretation. Christian and Moslem Arabs, according to the London Jewish Chronicle (April 11), "warmly praised" the Pope's sermon as a "fundamental indication" that the declaration was "doomed to extinction."

Rumored Fate of Declaration on Jews

In fact, the ecumenical grapevine had it that the declaration was in serious trouble, but these rumors remained underground until April 25, when Robert Doty of the New York Times broke the story. He wrote that the draft declaration was again "under convergent attack by two powerful forces—reaching up to the highest levels of the church"—i.e., a powerful conservative attack on doctrinal grounds, and Arab diplomacy and the pressure of Catholic bishops in Arab lands.

Doty reported that the conditionally approved document had been submitted to an ad hoc, extra-conciliar commission of four, including the ultra-conservative Bishop Carli, for review and recommendations for revision in a conservative direction. Doty's assessment, based "on a series of occurrences, some public, some behind the scenes," was: "It now appears more than likely that this wording will be substantially altered. . . ." A denial of the gist of Doty's report followed in short order. Father Stephen Schmidt, speaking on behalf of Cardinal Bea upon the Cardinal's arrival at Kennedy International Airport in New York (he was en route to Philadelphia to receive an award from the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission), denied reports that the document had been revised or changed in any manner. He noted that the views of Bishop Carli had no bearing on the declaration's text and denied that there was such a thing as "an extra-conciliar commission composed of four persons including Bishop Carli." He added that the document remained in the hands of Cardinal Bea's secretariat, which would be meeting in the early part of May.

Bea's denial was cautiously welcomed, but the prevailing attitude appeared to be wait-and-see. The Christian Century editorialized (May 19):

Cardinal Bea's statements raise hopes that in its closing session next Fall the Vatican Council will deal meaningfully with the centuries-old defamation of Jews by Christians. But since Cardinal Bea made no predictions about the future of the Council's draft on the Jews, we'll postpone celebration.

Commonweal warned (May 14) that "there must be no compromise" on giving final approval to the Jewish declaration, and, taking notice of recent rumors, added, "The wisest thing is to assume the worst." The real danger, said Commonweal, was not that the 1964 vote would
be reversed, but that the declaration on the Jews would be compromised with ambiguous and murky language to appease the Arab states and the conservative Curia. The editor continued:

The final declaration must be direct and unequivocal. It is shameful enough that the Church has taken 2,000 years to come to grips with its guilt. This shame has been compounded by the long struggle within the Council to achieve a strong position. No wonder many Jews have been pessimistic; they have suffered too long to take an optimistic view. If the Council fails or if it equivocates, the Church will stand condemned. That judgment will be justly deserved.

Skepticism regarding the final disposition of the document on the Jews was furthered by a public statement made by Patriarch Kyrillos of the Coptic church, claiming the Pope’s backing for his own position. He told the Middle East News Agency in Cairo, that a verbal message from Pope Paul had informed him that the Ecumenical Council would resume its discussion of the declaration on the Jews in September in the light of the decision of the Coptic church proclaiming “the Jews’ responsibility throughout the ages for crucifying Christ.” Kyrillos pointed out that his church had “placed on record that no Christian authority, however exalted or powerful, could amend or interpret these facts [of Jewish responsibility for the death of Jesus] in the opposite sense.” He also said that he had told the papal legate that, in the view of the Coptic church, the attempt to amend this teaching had political aims. The patriarch apparently had some political aims of his own:

The Pope of Rome, in his solicitude for world peace, must sponsor the cause of the return of the displaced Palestinian people to their homes in order that world tranquillity be restored in the Middle East and the flag of peace be hoisted in the land of peace.

Almost two months after Cardinal Bea’s denial that the document had been altered or in any way taken from the hands of his commission, the London Observer (June 20) bluntly asserted that the declaration “has been dropped from the agenda for the final session of the Vatican Council.” The Observer repeated that a four-man commission had been set up by Pope Paul to revise the document on the Jews, that its chairman was Bishop Carli, and that it had been instructed to revise the adopted declaration to omit all mention of deicide.

The Observer also charged that the draft declaration on religious liberty was being limited by specific instructions from above:

It must be accompanied by a statement setting it within strict limits so that it will be clearly understood that nothing in its terms trespasses on the claim of the Roman Catholic church to be the one and only true religion. Further, in estab-
lishing freedom of conscience for all men, the impression was not to be created that this puts the different churches on the same spiritual level. On the contrary, the whole object of the declaration must be seen merely to give to non-Catholics a fuller opportunity to examine and so come to appreciate the Catholic faith.

A day later (June 21) the Allgemeine Zeitung of Frankfurt also reported that the Pope had sent a written notice to the Vatican Council's coordinating commission instructing it to remove the declaration on the Jews from the agenda. The New York Times, somewhat more circumspect, reported on June 20 that the ultimate fate of the draft document was "under study," according to high Church sources. These sources, according to Robert Doty, "declined to confirm or deny reports circulating in Rome and abroad that the declaration had been withdrawn, by order of Pope Paul VI, from consideration by the fourth and final session of the Council. . . ."

The report that the Jewish declaration had been eliminated from the agenda was promptly and categorically denied by Archbishop Pericle Felici, secretary general of the Council. Additional assurance came from a spokesman for Archbishop John J. Krol of Philadelphia, who said that the archbishop had received a copy of the agenda for the Council's 4th session, and that the declaration was on it (New York Post, June 21). But the press continued to respond to the rumors.

The Baltimore Catholic Review (June 25) referred to the London Observer report as "the worst Council rumor yet," but took comfort "in the certainty that any minority tampering with the document already so heavily backed by the majority would be vigorously resisted by that majority." The Christian Century (July 7) was less sanguine:

What Christendom and world Jewry need is Felici's prompt, plain, and unequivocal statement that the draft on the Jews as voted by the Bishops will be on the agenda for the Council's fourth session beginning September 14. Such reassurance from the Council's Secretariat General would end the tormenting, pernicious mystery surrounding this issue and would lay rumor to rest.

Despite the official denials from Rome that the declaration had been shelved, uncertainty continued throughout the summer months of 1965, sustained by contradictory rumors about the Jewish declaration and the declaration on religious liberty. Thus, the Rome correspondent of the London Jewish Chronicle, Tullia Zevi, reported (June 25) that the mood prevailing in liberal circles within the Catholic church was "pessimistic." She also stated:

Rumors are circulating both inside and outside the Vatican. One is that the Pope sent a letter ordering the dropping of the declaration, but withdrew it when the news leaked out. Another is that the declaration has been placed last on the
agenda. This would have the practical effect of ensuring that there would be no time to discuss it. It would then, according to this school of thought, be issued at a later date, but as a pastoral letter and not an Ecumenical Council document.

_America_ (July 3) welcomed the denial of the rumor that the declaration had been shelved, but admitted the picture was not too rosy:

But opposition is by no means dead, and the upcoming Council discussions may provide more than one dramatic moment. The hurdles yet to be surmounted are both political and theological. . . . Hope is dimming that the declaration will ever be understood [in the Middle East] as anything but a political document. . . . The theological hurdles are more subtle and may prove in the end more fateful. For one thing, the Christians in the Middle East (whether Orthodox or Catholic) do not see eye to eye with Western theologians. . . . It is possible that a real consensus on the declaration may not yet exist within the Council.

_America_ then went on to express an annoyance which, it became apparent, was also felt by many other Catholics:

It sometimes seems as if nothing short of the rewriting of the New Testament will satisfy the demands [of some Jewish spokesmen]. Some commentators argue that the Passion story, notably that portion concerning the part played by the Jewish leaders and the Jewish people, is a historical falsification and should be abandoned by the Council. . . . Jews are entitled, of course, to believe what they wish about the New Testament. But Christians should be able to stand by the Christian revelation as they received it—in its entirety—without being suspected of antisemitism. By the same token, the Vatican Council, in its declaration, cannot legitimately be asked to betray its own theology.

The magazine took some comfort from a statement by Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee that he had “never suggested the revision of scripture which Christians hold sacred—nor has any responsible Jewish leader to the best of my knowledge.”

Uncertainty persisted until after the opening of the fourth session of the Ecumenical Council on September 14. One reason was the relative silence of the American hierarchy—relative, that is, to the strong outpouring of opinion from American prelates between the second and third sessions, when almost every American cardinal had firmly predicted the passage of a declaration at the forthcoming session. The

---

2 Rabbi Tanenbaum’s statement was made in a letter to the editor of the _Camden Star Herald_, a New Jersey diocesan newspaper. Its editor, Msgr. Salvatore Adamo, a supporter of the Vatican declaration on the Jews, had expressed some resentment and bewilderment over Jewish reactions to Pope Paul’s Lenten sermon and, like _America_, had raised the question whether the Jews were asking that the New Testament be rewritten. Rabbi Tanenbaum wrote him (June 18): “What we have asked for, and what we consider necessary and justifiable in the light of centuries of persecution and vilification of Jews, is an appropriate interpretation of those passages of Christian scripture which are most easily open to distortion.”
paucity of firm predictions from the American episcopacy led some observers to speculate that silence on the subject had been imposed from above. The Observer (May 2) noted that “a pall of silence, more all-enveloping even than that which surrounds the Pill,” had descended on both the Jewish and the religious-liberty declarations.

Another reason was the continued appearance of extremist antisemitic viewpoints, which indicated a sustained campaign. For example, Msgr. George Higgins, a columnist for the National Catholic Welfare Conference’s press service reported angrily (St. Louis Review, July 30) that Gerald L. K. Smith had written to all American bishops offering to supply them, free of charge, with a copy of an English translation of a “sickening diatribe against the Jews.” This long “pathologically antisemitic book,” by a pseudonymous Maurice Pinay, entitled Il Complotto contro la Chiesa (“The Plot Against the Church”), had been distributed to all of the bishops during the second session of the Council (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 112). Smith’s four-page letter, Msgr. Higgins reported, suggested that the American bishops had been taken in by “a fraternity of deceivers too close to the centers of authority in the affairs of the church.” Higgins saw the letter as “just one more convincing proof that the Council’s proposed declaration on the relationship between Christians and Jews is desperately needed and long overdue.”

A pamphlet distributed at a Franciscan sanctuary near Rome, written by someone calling himself Fra Giorgio da Terni, charged:

All of the most famous popes, saints and fathers of the Church . . . have . . . warned against the epidemic Jewish disease, more contagious than the plague or venereal disease. . . . From the first Masonic lodges to the Bolshevik revolution, we find Jews everywhere; from . . . Rome to the ferocious and bloodthirsty Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev. . . . The six million Jews gassed in German concentration camps never existed, except in the distortions of the clever Children of Israel. . . . This truth is beginning to appear in the Egyptian, Syrian, and Jordan press. Go and ask the Arabs who the Jews are, and you will really learn how they hate Jesus.

After protests filed by the Italian Federation of Jewish Youth and the Union of Italian Jewish Communities, Bishop Giuseppe Gori revealed that Fra Giorgio was “neither a priest nor religious” but a layman, Giorgio Trillini, who had “no authorization whatsoever to speak or publish with ecclesiastical approval.” Gori added that he was “most sorry” for what had happened.
Protestant Opinion

As the fate of the declaration remained uncertain, Protestant voices were heard increasingly. The Evangelische Kirchentag in Cologne, from July 28 to August 1, adopted a statement urging “all Christians in Germany, regardless of the church to which they belong, to think, speak, and act in the spirit of Cardinal Bea’s proposed declaration.” Expressing “brotherly concern” over “reports about resistance” to the declaration, the Protestant leaders declared:

What will happen in this matter at the Council is something that concerns all of us; it will make a contribution either to the continuation or to the overcoming of an old, heavy guilt and shame of Christianity.

Recalling that in Germany many Christians participated in antisemitism with such “murderous result,” the statement asserted the Evangelical and Catholic churches’ responsibility for ending prejudice against Jews and “assertions of a collective guilt of the Jewish people in the crucifixion of Jesus by which, through centuries, the seed was planted for hatred of Jews.” The Evangelische Kirchentag was attended by more than 20,000 ministers and laymen, joined by prominent religious leaders from abroad. Among these were Wilhelm Visser ’t Hooft, secretary general of the World Council of Churches, and other WCC leaders who had become apprised of the concentrated effort developing within the Vatican against the Jewish declaration.

During the meetings in Cologne Joachim Beckman, president of the Evangelical church in the Rhineland, publicly asked the Roman Catholic archbishop of Paderborn, Lorenz Cardinal Jaeger, about the fate of the declaration on the Jews. He replied that he had worked on it and was satisfied by it, and predicted it would be adopted. “We must tell the truth regardless of possible losses and results,” he added cryptically. The remark, according to John Cogley (New York Times, August 8), was widely interpreted to mean that the Council Fathers, in the interest of truth, would have to put aside any concern that passage of the declaration would make life difficult for the Christian minority in Arab lands.

Another development within German religious circles was reported by Cogley in the same article. A letter had been sent to the entire Roman Catholic hierarchy of West Germany by the Coordinating Council of the Societies for Christian-Jewish Collaboration in Germany. The letter, signed by a Catholic priest, a rabbi, and a Protestant minister, called upon German bishops to exercise their influence at the forthcoming session in favor of the declaration on the Jews. It reminded the prelates
of a recent poll disclosing that antisemitic prejudice was still abroad in Germany and was furthered "not least by religious teaching and preaching even today." The letter, written late in June, at a time of widespread rumors that the declaration was being abandoned, added that "there is now prevailing a crisis of confidence vis-à-vis the Catholic church." Cogley reported that only five German bishops replied to the letter, and they were noncommittal. One complained that Jewish leaders had been trying to convert the declaration into political capital for Israel.

Arab Pressures

The Arabs kept up their pressure. The Moslem mayor of Jordanian Jerusalem announced that, as a result of a resolution of the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant communities, the bells of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—regarded by most Christians as the site of Jesus' tomb—would toll in protest against Vatican endorsement of the declaration. He also revealed that a cable was sent to Pope Paul, with copies to the seven Oriental Rite cardinals at the Ecumenical Council, reminding the pontiff of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land and "the results of Jewish crimes against Palestine's Arabs."

Revised Declaration on Jews

On September 11 the New York Times confirmed what had been one of the most persistent rumors regarding the declaration: that the draft text had been revised to omit the word "deicide." The revision was disclosed, Doty reported, by an authorized "leak" from the Vatican, which said the changes in the text were not a change in its essential meaning. The purpose of the changes, according to Vatican sources, was to eliminate "confusions and misunderstandings" that had grown up because of "counteropposed interpretations given to it by Arabs and Israelis." There was also a desire to avoid giving the impression that the declaration was

3 According to Look magazine ("How the Jews Changed Catholic Thinking," by Joseph Roddy, January 25, 1966), the changes in the text of the declaration had actually been made back in May, when some members of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity met to vote on the bishops' suggested emendations. Roddy strongly implied that both the elimination of "deicide" and the removal of "indeed condemns" from the earlier phrase "deplores, indeed condemns, hatred and persecution of Jews" came directly from the Pope. According to Roddy, the angry insistence from the Vatican in June that the Jewish declaration was still "under study" was "precisely true while completely misleading . . . the study was finished, the damage was done, and there existed what many regard as a substantially new declaration on the Jews."
a "negation of all that the Gospels said." Doty pointed out that the word "deicide" in the statement had taken on a "symbolic importance in three years of bitter behind-the-scenes dispute between conservative and pro-
gressive churchmen."

The revised text of the Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions was distributed to the Council Fathers on September 30, and an official summary made public. In a great many respects this version was close to the November 1964 text. The references to Hinduism, Buddhism, and the Moslems remained unchanged. So did the substance of the conclusion, which reproved, "as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion." Like the earlier ver-
sion, the later text implored the Christian faithful to "maintain good fellowship among the nations . . . so that they may truly be sons of the Father who is in Heaven."

Only the passage dealing with the church's relationship with the Jews had undergone change. To some, the differences in language between this and the 1964 version seemed minimal, more nuance than substance; to others the nuances added up to a significant difference in content: a generous statement curtailed here, a grudging or legalistic phrase inserted there, appeared to tip the scales of the entire document. A comparison of the text of a few critical passages (not necessarily in order) illustrates the major changes.4

1964 Text

With a grateful heart, the Church of Christ acknowledges that, ac-
cording to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her elec-
tion were already among the Patri-
archs, Moses and the prophets.

The Church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revela-
tion of the Old Testament from4a the [Jewish] people with whom God in His inexpressible mercy concluded the Ancient Covenant.

1965 Text

Thus the Church of Christ ac-
cknowledges that, according to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her election are found al-
ready among the Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets.

The Church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revela-
tion of the Old Testament through4a the [Jewish] people with whom God in His inexpressible mercy con-
cluded the Ancient Covenant.

4 Full text p. 75.
4a Author's emphasis.
Even though a large part of the Jews did not accept the Gospel, they remain most dear to God for the sake of the Patriarchs.

All that happened to Christ in His passion cannot be attributed to the whole people then alive, much less to those of today.

Moreover, this synod, in her rejection of injustice of whatever kind and wherever inflicted upon men, remains mindful of that common patrimony and so deplores, indeed condemns, hatred and persecution of Jews.

May, then, all see to it that in their catechetical work or in their preaching of the word of God they do not teach anything that could give rise to hatred or contempt of Jews in the hearts of Christians.

May they never present the Jewish people as one rejected, cursed, or guilty of deicide.

As Holy Scripture testifies, Jerusalem did not recognize the time of her visitation, nor did the Jews, in large number, accept the Gospel; indeed not a few opposed its spreading. Nevertheless God holds the Jews most dear for the sake of their Fathers.

True, the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ; still, what happened in His passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today.

Furthermore, in her rejection of every persecution against any man, the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but the Gospel’s spiritual love, decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.

All should see to it, then, that in catechetical work or in the preaching of the word of God they do not teach anything that does not conform to the truth of the Gospel and the spirit of Christ.

... Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures...
Explaining the Revisions

Discounting the subtler changes, most observers settled on two points as marking the most significant departures from the earlier text: the elimination of “deicide” and the change from “deplores, indeed condemns” to “decries.” At the United States bishops’ press panel after the distribution of the revised text, Father Robert Trisco, professor of church history at the Catholic University of America, said that some of the Council Fathers wanted the word “deicide” removed to avoid any notion of collective guilt on the part of the Jewish people, while others thought the word was ambiguous and that it might have implied that the church was abandoning the teaching that Christ was God. Father George Tavard, an Assumptionist from Pittsburgh, said that a large group of bishops opposed the use of the word “deicide” and that the loss of their votes “might have denied the Fathers the large plurality they desire.” He added: “The changes were made to satisfy one side without weakening the text. Actually, I thought they strengthened it.” Father Thomas Stransky of Milwaukee, of Cardinal Bea’s secretariat, said “deicide” had been removed after “serious questioning by the Secretariat itself whether it would substantially change the text.” His own opinion was that the text had been “strengthened and the loopholes eliminated” by the changes. It would be wrong to say, he cautioned, that all the objections coming from bishops from the Near East were politically motivated; “Many of their objections contained valid theological arguments.” Father John J. King, superior of the Oblates’ Rome House of Studies, pointed out that the phrase “moved not by political reasons,” had been added to the condemnation of antisemitism in a direct attempt to obviate Arab objections. According to Father John Donnelly, writing for the NCWC press service, the panelists “seemed unanimous in assessing the new text as stronger than the old one in condemning antisemitism.” (“Antisemitism” had not been used in the earlier document.)

Commenting on the change from “deplores, indeed condemns” to “decries,” Father Stransky said:

Previous Councils of the Church specialized in condemning things or forbidding them, but there has been a practiced effort at this one to be positive, to encourage Christians to do what is right, not condemn what is wrong.

He also pointed out that two-thirds of the people in the world are neither Christians nor Jews, and that hundreds of bishops from Asia and Africa have never met Jews and “thus don’t consider this a universal problem.” Future generations, he added, will not judge the declaration
on the basis "of these few sentences," but on what the rest of the document says on the need for universal love and respect for all men.

But, in the words of the Detroit News,

The ghost of one word, deicide, hovers over the most convincing explanations for its absence [October 1, 1965].

**Jewish Response**

American Jewish leaders expressed disappointment tempered by caution. Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, called the new version less "decisive and satisfactory" than the original draft, but acknowledged that it contained a sharp, explicit condemnation of antisemitism. "While reserving our dissent from some portions of the document, we regard it as a forward step in Jewish-Catholic relations," he concluded. Rabbi Israel Goldstein commented that it "would have been better" if the text had remained unchanged: "It was hoped that the ghost of this specific charge would be laid to rest once and forever."

Joseph Lichten of the Anti-Defamation League also commented that "it would have been better" if the word deicide had been retained. Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary was bitterly critical:

Not to condemn the demonic canard of deicide . . . would mean condoning Auschwitz, defiance of the God of Abraham, and an act of paying of homage to Satan.

**Catholic Response**

Catholic editorial comment on the revisions was somewhat reserved. *America* (October 16, 1965) said the revised version was "still a good text" which would "stand as an adequate rebuke to antisemitism," but hoped that the document might be strengthened:

Surely, if the Council can deplore hatred, it can condemn it. To do so would add a little to the force of what is already an excellent statement of the Church's attitude toward the Jews.

A public appeal for "a strong, unambiguous statement on the Jews" also came from the Catholic Interracial Council of Pittsburgh in a letter to Cardinal Bea. Declaring themselves "painfully aware of the powerful and bitter resistance" the statement had encountered, the signers emphasized that antisemitism is, to a large extent, the product of false Christian charges that the Jewish people are guilty of deicide.
Fourth Session

With the vote on the revised declaration set in the Council for October 14, there were some last-ditch efforts to strengthen the document. One of these was made by Abbé René Laurentin, a Council expert and a journalist for the Paris newspaper Figaro. On October 12 Doty of the New York Times reported that Abbé Laurentin had distributed to certain bishops a brief stating that the elimination of “deicide” could lead to grave misunderstandings and could sanction continuance of anti-Jewish teachings by bigots. A somewhat different effort was made by Auxiliary Bishop Stephen Leven of San Antonio, Texas, who circulated a suggestion that the Council Fathers vote against the revised draft, in the hope that its defeat would mean the restoration of the original version. Neither of these efforts was successful; the word was out that the revised draft would stand, and that Cardinal Bea himself was reconciled to it as the best possible compromise.

There were last-ditch attempts on the part of the conservatives also, this time to defeat the declaration, even in its somewhat weakened form. The conservatives circulated a petition to block the declaration, among whose signers were Bishop Carli, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, superior of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit, a Frenchman, and Archbishop Geraldo de Proença Sigaud of Diamantina, Brazil. Doty of the New York Times (October 14, 1965) felt that its sponsors had no hope of succeeding:

They merely want to muster enough negative votes to destroy any impression of unanimity in favor of the document. . . . One of the desired changes would be to restore the idea that, “in a Biblical sense,” there is collective Jewish guilt for the Crucifixion.

In the meantime, Pope Paul VI had made his whirlwind—and in the eyes of most Catholics, triumphal—visit to New York, including an address to the United Nations and a mass celebrated at Yankee Stadium. The Pope’s trip was in the interest of promoting peace, a goal which could only elicit high praise from every side. Still, not every aspect of the papal visit went uncriticized. Several Protestant spokesmen considered it amiss, for example, that the Pope used the international podium of the United Nations to combine his plea for world peace with a stricture against birth control.5 Others objected to the free coverage given to Pope

5 “You must strive to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind, and not rather favor an artificial control of birth which would be irrational, in order to diminish the number of guests at the banquet of life.”
Paul's Yankee Stadium mass, unlike the meetings of Protestants like Billy Graham.

During the course of the mass for peace at Yankee Stadium—which, as has been noted, received enormous radio and television coverage—a passage from John was read, including the verse:

Now when it was late that same day, the first day of the week, and the doors were shut, where the disciples were gathered together for fear of the Jews. . . .

While there were no official Jewish objections to the phrase “for fear of the Jews,” its inclusion was undoubtedly deeply disturbing to many. The New York chancery, which arranged the service, received a number of protests from individual Jews. One discomforted Catholic, the Rev. William Van Etten Casey, S. J., professor of theology at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Mass., commented:

I too winced when I heard those words, “for fear of the Jews,” ringing out over the airways into millions of homes that evening. . . . The unfortunate thing is that someone did not alert the Pope to the fact that that Gospel text in that Mass was inapropi rate for the occasion and irrelevant to the purpose of the Mass. . . . This episode demonstrates clearly the necessity for the Church to conduct a thorough review of all the scriptural texts used in the liturgy and to adopt an approach to the liturgy that is less rigid, less mechanical, more flexible, more reflective of our needs and more responsive to our occasions. If ever an occasion warranted a careful and special selection of biblical texts, it was this Papal Mass. It could easily have been done, but no one thought to do it [National Catholic Reporter, October 27, 1965].

The fate of the declaration was soon decided. On October 14 the Council Fathers began voting on the schema.

Before voting began, Cardinal Bea reported on the amended text and made a strong plea for its acceptance, asserting that all changes had been made to make the document “clearer and more accurate in such a way that the substance of the text which you approved last year by a large majority would be faithfully retained.” Concerning the omission of “deicide” Cardinal Bea made three points:

1. The schema completely preserves and presents the truth of the Gospel.

2. At the same time it excludes unjust affirmations and accusations made against all Jews then living, without distinction, and against the Jews of today: namely that all are guilty of the condemnation of the Lord and are therefore rejected by God and cursed.

3. The Council exhorts that in catechetical work or in preaching they conform to the truth of the Gospel and the spirit of Christ.
He added: "The substance that we wished to express in the prior text by this word is found exactly and completely expressed in the new text."

On October 15 at their 150th meeting, the Council Fathers voted final approval of the amended document on the Church's attitude toward non-Christians, including the Jews. The schema was approved as a whole by a vote of 1,763 to 250.6

At the United States bishops' press panel after the vote, Bishop Francis P. Leipzig of Baker, Oregon, chairman of the subcommission on Catholic-Jewish relations of the United States Bishops' Ecumenical Commission, said that the road of cooperation and mutual understanding which had been helped by passage of the declaration must be a two-way street to be a success. He declared himself "delighted at the approval of the declaration," and held it of great significance . . . I am sure it will usher in a new era of friendship and cooperation with our Jewish brethren for the benefit of all men.

He noted that there were "in my opinion, minor" implications in the document, but that these carried less weight than its overall spirit.

At the press meeting it was disclosed that the Council Fathers had received an antisemitic document signed by 31 organizations. This "crudely written pamphlet," which "appeared mysteriously in St. Peter's Basilica" on the day the final vote had been scheduled, called on the prelates not to vote for the declaration "because it would betray Christianity to the Jews." In an angry comment, America (November 6, 1965) denounced the pamphlet as "skullduggery" and a "fraud." According to the Jesuit

6 The votes, by section, were:
Vote 1—on the schema's introduction—yes, 2,071; no, 110; null, 4.
Vote 2—on non-Christian religions in general, with special mention of Hinduism and Buddhism—yes, 1,953; no, 184; null, 6.
Vote 3—on the Islamic religion—yes, 1,910; no, 189; null, 6.
Vote 4—on the first section dealing with the Jews, setting forth the spiritual relationship between the peoples of the Old and New Testaments—yes, 1,937; no, 153; null, 9.
Vote 5—rejecting the collective guilt of the Jewish people for the death of Christ—yes, 1,875; no, 188; null, 9.
Vote 6—declaring that the Jews must not be represented as "accursed" or "rejected" by God—yes, 1,821; no, 245; null, 14.
Vote 7—rejecting antisemitism, persecutions against the Jewish people, and the spreading of anti-Jewish sentiments through preaching or teaching—yes, 1,905; no, 199, null, 14.
Vote 8—a summary on universal brotherhood excluding all discrimination—yes, 2,064; no, 58; null, 6.
Vote 9—a general vote on a number of minor amendments throughout the text—yes, 1,856; no, 243; null, 9.
weekly, at least a half-dozen of the purported signatories to that appeal had not given permission for the use of their names, and three of the Italian organizations on the list “do not even exist.”

The last-minute efforts—on one side, to strengthen the document, on the other side, to quash it—failed in the end. On October 28, 1965, in an address referring to “the Israelites, objects certainly not of reproba
tion or distrust, but of respect, love and hope,” Pope Paul VI solemnly promulgated the historic Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions as one of five Ecumenical Council documents.\(^7\)

Given Cardinal Bea’s plea for a quick acceptance of the amended document, the lack of discussion on the Council floor, the vote and the pro-

**Appraisal**

What, finally, did the declaration represent? Was it a victory for the conservatives or a triumph for the liberals within the Church? How did Catholics interpret it? How did Jews respond?

According to an American Jewish Committee survey of press reac-
tions to the declaration in the United States and Europe, the general press, with the exception of extreme rightist and antisemitic papers, greeted the declaration with genuine enthusiasm, at times tempered with caution:

**London Times:**

In spite of all pressures the document remains in its essential part on the Jews a strongly worded condemnation of anti-Semitism, and a clear statement that the responsibility for the death of Christ should not be attributed indiscrimi-
nately to all Jews living in the time of the Passion or to the Jews of today.

**Guardian:**

The Jewish part of the declaration, which will tear at the roots of antisemitism which have been nourished by a kind of Sunday-school, cowboys-and-Indians level of Gospel interpretation, should have a healthy effect in the West, at least among those claiming to be Christians.

In Italy one paper after another voiced approval of the Council’s ac-
tion. **La Nazione:** “A historic vote.” **Il Mattino:**

The bishops’ long applause put the seal on a phase that one can define as historic for the Council: the phase of the definitive reconciliation among the people of the ancient alliance and those of the New Testament.

---

\(^7\) The other documents were 1) Decree Concerning the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church; 2) Decree on the Adoption and Renewal of the Religious Life; 3) Decree on Priestly Training, and 4) Declaration on Christian Education.
The influential Catholic *Avvenire d'Italia*:

This action must be considered as one of the most significant of Vatican II, opening the road to a new, more fraternal relationship between Christians and Jews and all other believers.

*La Stampa*: “After twenty centuries, the Council wipes out the absurd accusation against the Jews.” *Corriere della Sera*: “... an event of capital importance in the history of the Ecumenical Council and, more generally, in the history of the Catholic church.”

Positive, too, but more tempered in their judgments, were the leading French papers. Taking note of a sharp criticism of the new text by Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan of France (who declared on the radio that it “showed that those who amended last year’s text were determined not to clear the Jews of the accusation of deicide,”) *Le Monde* commented:

Most reactions express the idea that the text will be judged by its fruits, that is to say, the manner in which it will be translated into religious teaching and in the behaviour of Catholics vis-à-vis Jews.

Writing in *Figaro*, Abbé Laurentin remarked:

This dense, limpid text . . . is perhaps the most beautiful success of the Council. . . . The text remains beautiful, like those women at the beginning of their decline, still admired, but of whom those who knew her once say, in a low voice: "If you only knew how beautiful she was! . . ."

If antisemitism disappears, Abbé Laurentin continued, the omission of the word “deicide” will appear to be only a minor incident in the Council. But if the future holds in store new persecutions of the Jews, then the omission will be judged as a grave mistake. Thus, the church must speed up its efforts to expurgate books that implant the seeds of contempt and hatred for Jews in the hearts of children.

Of course there was no change in the viewpoint of right-wing and antisemitic papers. The neo-fascist *Secolo d'Italia* grumbled that it did “not understand” why this subject was included in the Council at all. *Rivarol*, one of the leading French antisemitic weeklies, berated the Council Fathers for not having had the courage to include in the declaration a call for the conversion of the Jews, as advocated by Bishop Carli.

In the United States the Catholic press was largely enthusiastic. Although a few commentators expressed their preference for the earlier version of the declaration, the great majority interpreted its affirmative statements as a mandate for the improvement of Catholic-Jewish relations.
America (October 30) felt that “the original text would have better achieved the goal intended” but that

Taken as a whole . . . the declaration stood out as one of the great and promising accomplishments of Vatican Council II. It marks a revolutionary departure in attitudes and practices that have deep and gnarled roots in world history.

Similarly, Commonweal (October 29) editorialized that the declaration was

neither the best nor the worst of the various drafts to come before the Vatican Council. Nevertheless, it is clear and emphatic and should be of immeasurable help in tearing the roots of antisemitism out of Christian tradition . . . . The Church is, at last, firmly on record in a statement that should have profound influence on the life of Catholics.

An article in the same issue by the Rev. Gregory Baum stated:

If the present text had not been preceded by a previous one, it would have been judged as a great act of friendship . . . . The dogmatic foundation has been laid for spiritual brotherhood between Christians and Jews.

Two of the more popular syndicated columnists of the National Catholic Welfare Conference’s press service Father John B. Sheerin and Msgr. George G. Higgins, stressed that the Jewish declaration was a beginning, rather than an end. Father Sheerin wrote that “we must get on with the dialogue.” In view of the “terrific pressures” which were exerted on the Council Fathers, “we should salute the tenacity of men like Cardinal Bea and Cardinal Lienart who have brought the document to final approval.” Msgr. Higgins commented that the very fact that the declaration had run into so many obstacles and delays “is one more proof that it was badly needed.” He called upon Catholics “to take the lead, humbly and penitently” in fostering mutual knowledge and respect in order

to transform the Council’s declaration . . . . from a lifeless piece of paper into a living document which, in God’s good time, can literally change the face of the earth.

With few exceptions, the Catholic diocesan press echoed the same sentiments. While a few expressed regrets that the text had been weakened, all viewed it as a decisive mandate to be taken seriously by Catholics. A typical formulation was that of the Providence Visitor (October 22):

Every Catholic should not only heed them [the teachings of the Council] but also try to implement them . . . . Until the Council teaching fully seeps down into the masses of Catholics, and then all mankind, the problems of Jewish-Christian relations will not have been solved.
A thoughtfully analytical article explaining the need for the Jewish declaration came from the Rev. Raymond Bosler (Criterion, Indianapolis, Oct. 22):

In the United States, antisemitism is mostly a cultural or sociological problem. ... In Europe, however, and in the Middle East, in particular, antisemitism is an intellectual and theological conviction. In its extreme form it claims that scripture shows that the Jewish people, as a people, rejected Christ and put him to death and are therefore cursed and punished even to this day for the crime of killing God. This kind of thinking was behind much of the antisemitism which Adolph Hitler used to rise to power.

Ironically, Father Bosler said, it was not so much the effort to placate the Arabs which led to the weakening of the Jewish declaration as "the desire to appease the Orthodox. . . . The Orthodox leaders had let Rome know that if the Council rejected the accusation of deicide all possibility of unity talks would be off indefinitely." And he concluded: "One thing that these four years of struggle over the document made painfully evident is the frightening amount of antisemitism in the Christian church. Here is proof enough for the need of a declaration on the Jews."

The Jewish Community Comments

Jewish reaction in the United States to the document ranged from qualified enthusiasm to bitter denunciation. As analyzed by Rabbi Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee in the New York Herald Tribune (October 17, and later picked up by various Catholic diocesan papers around the country), Jewish reactions to the document revealed three basic attitudes: Some Jews resented the declaration because "it appears not to have resolved conclusively the ancient ambivalence of love and contempt for Jews and Judaism which has dominated church literature and practice for almost two millennia" and because of "the incredible backing and filling over three to four years trying to carry out an act of elementary justice long overdue." Others, he wrote, were indifferent because "they rely more on the democratic ethos and the power of the secular state to enforce anti-discrimination programs than they do on Christian humanism or piety, whose record in combatting antisemitism in the past has not inspired great confidence." The third group, himself included, "welcome the document, even with some regrets . . ."

In fact, the responses of Jewish organizational spokesmen struck this middle note, welcoming the affirmative aspects of the declaration but expressing reservations regarding those sections which had been weakened. Almost all stressed that the ultimate significance of the declaration
depended upon the manner and vigor with which it would be carried out. Statements to this effect were made by Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee; Zachariah Shuster, the Committee's European director; Joseph Lichten of the Anti-Defamation League; Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; William Wexler, president of B'nai B'rith; Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, and the World Conference of Jewish Organizations.

While most Catholics tended to view the declaration as a blueprint for the future, it was apparent that various Jewish commentators would not allow the past to be lightly dismissed. The negative responses among Jews—some of them very forceful—centered around three themes: the elimination of "indeed, condemns" with regard to antisemitism; the removal of "deicide," and, perhaps most important, the absence from the Vatican document of any sense of contrition, any expression of regret, indeed, any acknowledgment of the church's role in creating the antisemitism it was now decrying.

"What sort of church is it," asked the Reconstructionist (October 29, 1965), "that equivocates in condemning an attitude and declaring as a heresy a doctrine that has been the source of persecution and bloodshed inflicted upon millions of innocent human beings for 2,000 years? The statement fails to recall the fact that . . . it is the church itself which is chiefly responsible for the spread of Jew-hatred down through the ages." The American Zionist (November 1965) asked "how many more Jewish lives have to be destroyed before the church will feel compelled to take a stronger attitude." The Voice (California, October 29, 1965) wrote: "The honest words have yet to come—they will equate in meaning to 'forgive us.' It is not the Jews that need exoneration. It is the church that needs forgiveness." The Detroit Jewish News (November 5, 1965) was sarcastic: "What a glorious day! We are no longer rejected by God nor accursed."

Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, writing in the November Jewish Spectator, criticized the declaration on somewhat different grounds. Until Rome acknowledged other religions, including the non-Catholic churches, as lawful paths to God and dispensers of salvation, she said, there is no hope for a basic change in the Catholic attitude to Jews. Papal references to Abraham and Joseph are "cut out of the same cloth as the usual type of missionary booklet," she remarked, and expressions stressing the "spiritual semitism" of Catholics "are as much a part of the conversionist strategy of Catholicism as were the harsh measures against Jews instituted by Ecumenical Councils of the Middle Ages."
Arthur Weyne (Buffalo Jewish Review, Oct. 29, and other papers) commented:

As it stands the declaration is an anti-climax. . . . John XXIII would not have settled for a document that rejected the chief stone of the arch that he had sought to build . . . the vigor, the urgency, the tonic of John's aggiornamento have been washed out; in place of the spirited and the unequivocal, there is now the discreet, the anemic; there was clarity and exaltation, there is now ambiguity and compromise.

The most widely-read ironic Jewish response was that of Harry Golden, which appeared in his general-press column (October 24, 1965) and was reprinted in both Christian and Jewish periodicals. Golden announced a plan

to call a Jewish Ecumenical Council in Jerusalem . . . for the purpose of issuing a Jewish schema on the Christians. . . . I propose that we forgive the Christians for the Inquisition, the Crusades, the ghettos and the expulsions. I think we can also include the forgiveness for the usurpation of property which continued unabated for sixteen hundred years, the rape of Jewish girls, the world-wide discrimination, and we may also waive our annoyances at the barriers that guard country, city and fraternal clubs.

The Christians have been nice. Now we can be nice. There is no reason to hold bitterness in our hearts because Crusader Godfrey of Bouillon drove the Jews of Jerusalem into the synagogue and set it on fire.

There is no reason in the world why our Christian neighbors today should be held responsible for the wholesale slaughter of the Jews in the cities on the Rhine by the Christians of the Second Crusade. Nor should they be held responsible for the murders perpetrated by Peter the Hermit and Peter of Cluny. . . . For all this terrifying history, let us clear those Christians living today.

Other Jewish publications saw the declaration in a more positive light. Congress Bi-weekly editorialized (Nov. 15, 1965):

It would be unrealistic to expect the church to indulge in a flood of confessions about its past guilt to the Jews, but it is heartening to know that it is sensitive to the enormities of the historic persecutions heaped upon the Jews through the antisemitism fostered by Christian teachings.

Similarly, Professor Jacob Neusner of Dartmouth, in the Connecticut Jewish Leader (Nov. 4, 1965) said: "The statement as it stands, without regard to its history or to the debates that hovered over it, is . . . affirmative, constructive, and mostly to be welcomed, so far as it goes, by the Jews. Any statement which will lead to a social reconciliation and to harmony among differing groups is to be welcomed, and so is this."

This view was held also by Leo Mindlin, columnist for the Jewish Floridian (Oct. 15, 1965), and the Canadian Jewish Chronicle (Nov. 22, 1965).
Many Jewish reactions were not to the actual content of the declaration but to the misleading headlines in a great many newspapers: "Catholics Absolve Jews" or "Ecumenical Council Exonerates Jews."

**Christian Reaction**

Some Protestant tempers were kindled as well. The prominent American Protestant leader, Eugene Carson Blake, criticized not so much the declaration as the "assumption so widely held by Christians that it was in the power of the church to absolve Jews..." *Christian Century* (September 29, 1965) was sharper:

> What monstrous arrogance is this which assumes that Christians have the right and power to forgive Jews for a crime of which they are not guilty!... They should be on their knees in contrition begging forgiveness from the God of Christians and Jews.

Catholic sources responded irenically to these charges. The *Catholic Courier Journal* (Rochester, N.Y., November 19, 1965) chided Dr. Blake for relying on newspaper editorials, and *America* (November 27, 1965) responded to *Christian Century*:

> There is no question... of the church playing God by presuming to absolve the Jews. This is not at all what the Council statement is about. Rather, it is a document addressed to Catholics, exhorting them to root out misconceptions about Jewish guilt for Christ's death—false views that in the past caused Jews to undergo discrimination and suffering.

Msgr. Higgins, too, expressed discomfort at the popular misreading of the declaration's intentions, and pointed to a possible consequence of such misreadings:

> If Jews mistakenly think that the declaration was addressed to them and was meant—insultingly and condescendingly—to "absolve" them from responsibility for the Crucifixion, they will understandably be very reluctant to enter into dialogue with Christians. And, by the same token, if Christians fail to understand that the declaration was meant to be a sincere examination of the Christian conscience—which has so much to answer for in this area—they will be ill-prepared for the kind of dialogue which is so strongly recommended in the document [St. Louis Review, March 18, 1966].

**To Dialogue or not to Dialogue...**

Msgr. Higgins put his finger on a key issue. Dialogue, a word loosely applied to a range of interreligious activities and programs, had become an increasingly emotive term within the Jewish community—refracting different positions and attitudes on an acceptable agenda for Christian-Jewish relations.
Undoubtedly spurred by Ecumenical Council developments, interreligious activity accelerated and broadened during 1965. There was an increase in conferences, institutes, and colloquia between clergy and other religious professionals, and more and more participation on the part of the laity. "Living-room dialogues"—the continued meeting of individuals or married couples, designed to bring persons of different faiths together to discuss a gamut of matters—grew considerably. Much of this activity was confined to Protestant-Catholic dialogue, but Jewish participation was increasingly sought by one side or the other. A host of new educational materials was being created to assist these programs.

The increase in dialogue provoked discomfort and skepticism in some segments of the Jewish community. An Orthodox rabbi, Eliezer Berkovits, "Judaism in the Post-Christian Era" (Judaism, Winter 1966) wrote:

For Jewry as a whole an honest fraternal dialogue with Christianity is at this state emotionally impossible. . . . In a hundred years, perhaps, depending on Christian deeds toward Jews, we may be emotionally ready for the dialogue.

While interchange of ideas was desirable, Berkovits said, there was no need for a specific Jewish-Christian dialogue. As to a purely theological dialogue, "nothing could be more fruitless and pointless. Judaism is Judaism because it rejects Christianity, and Christianity is Christianity because it rejects Judaism." Rabbi Berkovits even cautioned against joint Jewish-Christian endeavor in ethics and social action, both because Christianity "has been compromised" by the close connection between colonial conquest and missionary activities and because, "it is not always easy to determine what is a humanitarian-ethical deed and what is Christian propaganda." The Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menahem M. Schneerson, opposed dialogue because he maintained it was prohibited by the Torah; contributed to the "alarming growing rate of intermarriage," and misdirected "energies and resources sorely needed elsewhere, namely . . . in the spreading among our youths a deeper knowledge of the Torah. . . ." Others were worried not so much by the pace of interreligious activity as

by its base, fearing that the Jews who were most enthusiastic about interreligious dialogue were often least grounded in their own tradition and theology. Generally, most of institutional Orthodoxy accepted the position of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik: interreligious cooperation on social problems such as peace and race relations is encouraged, but no dialogue about faith or theology. The underlying assumption often was that the hidden agenda for Christian theologizing with Jews was conversion. Others asserted that it was not possible, in practice, to draw distinctions between civic cooperation and theological dialogue, because the Catholic position on many issues of common concern were so largely predicated on theological considerations and that discussion of them outside a theological frame of reference was not feasible, even if theoretically preferable.

A spokesman for Conservative Judaism, Professor Seymour Siegel of JTS, took sharp issue with Orthodox leaders who opposed Jewish-Christian dialogue. He said the purpose of dialogue was not to destroy but "to understand, to learn, and to love," and charged Orthodox leaders with "unwarranted, ill-considered, and intemperate attacks" on efforts to increase interreligious understanding (New York Times, October 11).

The Rabbinical Assembly regarded the dialogue affirmatively, provided the Jewish participants were qualified. It expressed gratitude to the leaders of the Conservative movement for their pioneering efforts in this direction and rejected the criticism "of those who assert that open discussion in matters of faith is inimical to the best interests of Judaism." However, the Assembly maintained "... only scholars deeply steeped in the teachings of our tradition should be considered suitable representatives in any discussions which deal with the relations of the Jewish people with any other historic faith. . . ." 9

Similarly, the Reform movement's central congregational body, UAHC, urged an "expansion and deepening" of interfaith activities and called on its congregations "to enter more intensively into dialogue with our Christian compatriots, even into those areas which touch on matters of faith." 10

While the internal Jewish debate over the value of interreligious dialogue was largely substantive and seldom rancorous, a somewhat more heated debate went on within the Jewish community over a different but related subject: Jewish involvement on behalf of the Ecumenical Council statement.

The underlying positions on this matter have been more fully described

9 Resolution adopted in May 1965.
10 Resolution adopted in November 1965 by General Assembly.
elsewhere (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 129–33). For the most part, Orthodox Jewry and the rabbinical organizations of Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Judaism eschewed any official involvement in the Council’s proceedings, on the ground that the declaration—and the Catholic teaching about Jews and Judaism, generally—was a matter of internal Roman Catholic policy from which Jews should stand clear. Others, notably the community-relations agencies, considered the adoption of the declaration to be of direct and self-evident interest to Jews, and carried on an active program toward that end. They prepared special documents and sent representatives to Rome (although there were never official Jewish observers at the Ecumenical Council, there was frequent informal consultation between Jewish representatives and many Catholic bishops and periti). They also maintained contact with Catholic leaders in the United States, Europe, and South America. Despite the official silence of the rabbinic and synagogal organizations, many rabbis were similarly active in an individual capacity.

The Ecumenical Council has concluded and the declaration has been promulgated, but the internal Jewish debate continues. Its resolution will depend, to a large extent, on how effective an instrument for change the declaration proves to be. If the affirmations of the statement on relations with the Jews—the call to brotherhood, mutual esteem, and the inferences that certain Catholic teachings are to be revised—are largely ignored by Roman Catholic authorities, then those who have criticized Jewish “lobbying” in support of the declaration may feel their case has been proved: nothing will have been affected by these efforts but Jewish dignity, and that for the worse. If, however, the declaration becomes the platform for far-reaching changes in Catholic-Jewish relations, then those active in its behalf may be recognized as having performed a genuine service for Judaism and the Jews.

Only time will settle this question, and it is likely to be a matter of some generations before the effects of the declaration will be fully realized. For the immediate future it would appear that the document will be least implemented where it is most needed. In the words of Léon Poliakov, “Those areas where much or everything still remains to be done... prove to be precisely those countries whose bishops show themselves to be reserved and sometimes even hostile in the matter of this new reform.” (Midstream, Winter 1966.)

Still, there are indications that the declaration will be taken seriously in many parts of the world. One action, largely symbolic perhaps, but none the less dramatic, was the official exoneration of the Jews who had
been executed in 1475 for the supposed “ritual murder” of the two-year-old Simon of Trent. In a pastoral letter dated October 28 (to coincide with Pope Paul’s promulgation of the declaration the Archbishop Alessandro Gottardi of Trent acknowledged the innocence of the Jews who had been tortured and executed five centuries earlier. The Sacred Congregation of Rites withdrew the status of martyr from Simon and forbade any further veneration of his relics or masses in his name.

In the United States there were several encouraging developments. The United States Bishops Commission on Ecumenical Affairs has appointed a Subcommission on Catholic-Jewish Relations which, at its first meeting in Washington, D.C., on March 1, 1966, pledged itself to fulfill the spirit of the declaration and agreed to begin work on recommended guidelines for relations with Jews.

**Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions**

*This is an English translation of the text of the Second Vatican Council’s Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, proclaimed by Pope Paul VI on Oct. 28, 1965.*

1. In our time, when day by day mankind is being drawn closer together, and the ties between different peoples are becoming stronger, the Church examines more closely her relationship to non-Christian religions. In her task of promoting unity and love among men, indeed among nations, she considers above all in this declaration what men have in common and what draws them to fellowship.

One is the community of all peoples, one their origin, for God made the whole human race to live over the face of the earth. One also is their final goal, God. His providence, His manifestations of goodness, His saving design extend to all men, until that time when the elect will be united in the Holy City, the city ablaze with the glory of God, where the nations will walk in His light.

Men expect from the various religions answers to the unsolved riddles of the human condition, which today, even as in former times, deeply stir the hearts of men: What is man? What is the meaning, the aim of our life? What is moral good, what sin? Whence suffering and what purpose does it serve? Which is the road to true happiness? What are death, judgment and retribution after death? What, finally, is that ultimate inexpressible mystery which encompasses our existence: whence do we come, and where are we going?

2. From ancient times down to the present, there is found among various peoples a certain perception of that hidden power which hovers over the course of things and over the events of human history; at times some indeed have come to the recognition of a Supreme Being, or even of a Father. This perception and recognition penetrates their lives with a profound religious sense.

Religions, however, that are bound up with an advanced culture have struggled

---

11 The London *Jewish Chronicle*, however, reported as early as July 16 that the ritual murder libel had been retracted.
to answer the same questions by means of more refined concepts and a more developed language. Thus in Hinduism, men contemplate the divine mystery and express it through an inexhaustible abundance of myths and through searching philosophical inquiry. They seek freedom from the anguish of our human condition either through ascetical practices or profound meditation or a flight to God with love and trust. Again, Buddhism, in its various forms, realizes the radical insufficiency of this changeable world; it teaches a way by which men, in a devout and confident spirit, may be able either to acquire the state of perfect liberation, or attain, by their own efforts or through higher help, supreme illumination. Likewise, other religions found everywhere try to counter the restlessness of the human heart, each in its own manner, by proposing "ways," comprising teachings, rules of life, and sacred rites.

The Catholic Church rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions. She regards with sincere reverence those ways of conduct and of life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing in many aspects from the ones she holds and sets forth, nonetheless often reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all men. Indeed, she proclaims, and ever must proclaim Christ, "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14, 6), in whom men may find the fulness of religious life, in whom God has reconciled all things to Himself.

The Church, therefore, exhorts her sons, that through dialogue and collaboration with the followers of other religions, carried out with prudence and love and in witness to the Christian faith and life, they recognize, preserve and promote the good things, spiritual and moral, as well as the socio-cultural values found among these men.

3. The Church regards with esteem also the Moslems. They adore the one God, living and subsisting in Himself, merciful and all-powerful, the Creator of heaven and earth, who has spoken to men; they take pains to submit wholeheartedly to even His inscrutable decrees, just as Abraham, with whom the faith of Islam takes pleasure in linking itself, submitted to God. Though they do not acknowledge Jesus as God, they revere Him as a prophet. They also honor Mary, His virgin mother; at times they even call on her with devotion. In addition, they await the day of judgment when God will render their deserts to all those who have been raised up from the dead. Finally, they value the moral life and worship God especially through prayer, almsgiving and fasting.

Since in the course of centuries not a few quarrels and hostilities have arisen between Christians and Moslems, this sacred synod urges all to forget the past and to work sincerely for mutual understanding and to preserve as well as to promote together for the benefit of all mankind social justice and moral welfare, as well as peace and freedom.

4. As the sacred synod searches into the mystery of the Church, it remembers the bond that spiritually ties the people of the New Covenant to Abraham's stock. Thus the Church of Christ acknowledges that, according to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her election are found already among the Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets. She professes that all who believe in Christ—Abraham's sons according to faith—are included in the same Patriarch's call, and likewise that the salvation of the Church is mysteriously foreshadowed by the chosen people's exodus from the land of bondage. The Church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revelation of the Old Testament through the people with whom God in His inexpressible mercy concluded the Ancient Covenant. Nor can she forget that she draws sustenance from the root of that well-cultivated olive tree onto which have been grafted the wild shoots, the Gentiles. Indeed, the Church believes that by His cross Christ Our Peace reconciled Jews and Gentiles, making both one in Himself.
The Church keeps ever in mind the words of the Apostle about his kinsmen: "Their is the sonship and the glory and the covenants and the law and the worship and the promises; theirs are the fathers and from them is the Christ according to the flesh" (Rom. 9, 4-5), the Son of the Virgin Mary. She also recalls that the Apostles, the Church's mainstay and pillars, as well as most of the early disciples who proclaimed Christ's Gospel to the world, sprang from the Jewish people.

As Holy Scripture testifies, Jerusalem did not recognize the time of her visitation, nor did the Jews, in large number, accept the Gospel; indeed not a few opposed its spreading. Nevertheless, God holds the Jews most dear for the sake of their Fathers; He does not repent of the gifts He makes or of the calls He issues —such is the witness of the Apostle. In company with the Prophets and the same Apostle, the Church awaits that day, known to God alone, on which all peoples will address the Lord in a single voice and "serve him shoulder to shoulder" (Soph. 3, 9).

Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is thus so great, this sacred synod wants to foster and recommend that mutual understanding and respect which is the fruit, above all, of Biblical and theological studies as well as of fraternal dialogues.

True, the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ; still, what happened in His passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today. Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures. All should see to it, then, that in catechetical work or in the preaching of the word of God they do not teach anything that does not conform to the truth of the Gospel and the spirit of Christ.

Furthermore, in her rejection of every persecution against any man, the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel's spiritual love, decries hatred, persecution, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.

Besides, as the Church has always held and holds now, Christ underwent His passion and death freely, because of the sins of men and out of infinite love, in order that all may reach salvation. It is, therefore, the burden of the Church's preaching to proclaim the cross of Christ as the sign of God's all-embracing love and as the fountain from which every grace flows.

5. We cannot truly call on God, the Father of all, if we refuse to treat in a brotherly way any man, created as he is in the image of God. Man's relation to God the Father and his relation to men his brothers are so linked together that Scripture says: "He who does not love does not know God" (1 John 4, 8).

No foundation therefore remains for any theory or practice that leads to discrimination between man and man or people and people, so far as their human dignity and the rights flowing from it are concerned.

The Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion. On the contrary, following in the footsteps of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, this sacred synod ardently implores the Christian faithful to "maintain good fellowship among the nations" (1 Peter 2, 12), and, if possible, to live for their part in peace with all men, so that they may truly be sons of the Father who is in heaven.