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Reinhold Niebuhr: In Memoriam

Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the most important Protestant thinkers of his time, played a unique role in American life. His influence and thought extended far beyond the confines of religion. He was a great teacher, a profound analyst of the political scene, and an effective worker for many causes. His works were read and discussed by theologians, as well as by historians, political theorists and politicians. Jews, Catholics and Protestants, were influenced by his ideas. It would be difficult to name another contemporary religious personality, whose impact on American life was as great as his. Niebuhr's death was mourned by the many and varied groups that make up American society.

Niebuhr was a true and tested friend of the Jewish community. All his life, he was a diligent student of Jewish spirituality and faith, for he saw as his purpose "to strengthen the Hebraic-prophetic content of Christian faith." Coming from a rural, pietistic background, the young Niebuhr had little contact with Jews. It was during his pastorate in Detroit, when he fought for the rights of auto workers, that he came to recognize the quality of the Jewish commitment to social justice. He saw that Christians failed to "give the Jew credit for his [the Jew's] undoubted capacity for civic virtue," a characteristic he came to value ever more in the course of his continued efforts to improve the condition of the industrial worker and of his battles for other important social causes. He frequently commented that, in those days, he found the biblical position on justice more faithfully represented by the descendants of the Jewish Prophets than by the pious members of the churches.

In 1928 Niebuhr accepted a teaching post at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Active in politics, a speaker in great demand on various platforms, Niebuhr came closer to Jews and Judaism. He appreciated the colorful Jewish community of New York; he discussed theological and scholarly matters with the scholars of the Jewish Theological Seminary, located across the street from his own institution; he incorporated into his important and influential works what he considered to be the Hebraic spirit. He identified himself with the Zionist movement, and was frequently invited to address meetings on behalf of the Jewish national cause. He was a key figure in the ecumenical movement from its very beginning.

Later in Niebuhr's life, a warm friendship developed between him and Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary. He was among the first American theologians to call Heschel's works to the attention of the general religious community. The two scholars would take long walks
on Morningside Heights, discussing the subtleties of prophetic religion and the future of Jewish-Christian relations. Even when Niebuhr suffered serious illness, he expended whatever efforts he could to promote greater understanding of Judaism among Christians. When a volume of appreciation of Niebuhr's thought was published, Heschel contributed an important essay, "A Hebrew Evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr." Wrote Heschel: "In boldness of penetration, depth of insight, fullness of vision and comprehensiveness, Reinhold Niebuhr's system excels anything which the whole of American theology has hitherto produced."

After a long and painful illness, Reinhold Niebuhr died on June 2, 1971, at the age of 78. As his friends gathered in the Congregational church in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, Rabbi Heschel was asked to deliver the only eulogy. In a moving tribute, he said:

How shall we thank you, Reinhold Niebuhr, for the light you have brought into our lives? For the strength you have given to our faith? For the wisdom you have imparted to our minds?

He began his teaching at a time when religious thinking in America was shallow, insipid, impotent—bringing life and power to theology, to the understanding of the human situation, changing the lives of many Christians and Jews.

**Fight Against Nazism**

Several important aspects of Niebuhr's life and thought directly affected the Jewish community. During the period of the Nazi terror, Niebuhr urgently impressed upon his Christian pacifist colleagues the need to fight it vigorously. He himself had joined the pacifist movement in revulsion against the futility and bloodshed of World War I, and had served as national chairman of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the leading pacifist group in the country. He broke with the pacifists in 1932 to become "widely known as the sharpest critic of pacifism in the American church." Pacifists argued that no tyranny was great enough to justify war, that the Allies, too, were tainted by immorality, and that therefore it was wrong to take up arms in their cause.

Niebuhr held, particularly in his book *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, that morality must be related to the real world: "Religious perfectionism which shuns the realities of politics" mistakenly believes that the simple maxims of religions, like "Love thy neighbor," can be instituted in the affairs of men. In real life, we must take into account the exploitative grasp for power which overtakes men, and protect the innocent. It was
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2 John Bennett, "Reinhold Niebuhr's Social Ethics," in Kegley and Bretall; *ibid*, p. 65.
sheer sentimentality, he argued, to believe that Hitler would be moved by “passive resistance,” or that the enormous evil of Hitlerism symbolized by the persecution of the Jews could be overcome by any other means except war. The rejection of ideological pacifism did not mean that sometimes the nonviolent way was not effective—such as the efforts of Ghandi against the British or Martin Luther King against the Southern whites. However, the fight against pacifism in the 1930s and 1940s exemplified Niebuhr's most profound insight: that ethical teachings unrelated to the realities of individual and collective life are futile and even harmful. Realism involves a candid evaluation of the possibilities of human nature, for both good and evil.

State of Israel

Niebuhr was one of the few important Christian leaders who enthusiastically espoused Zionism. He argued, in writing and on the lecture platform, that the Jewish people required a national home for their continued existence as Jews and for the flowering of the Jewish spirit. “I do not see,” he wrote, “how it is possible to develop the prophetic quality of high religion in the Jewish community fully, if the nation does not have a greater degree of socio-political security.” Therefore, he continued, . . . “The Jews . . . long for a place on the earth where they are not ‘tolerated’ where they are neither ‘understood’ nor condemned but where they can be what they are, preserving their own identity without asking a ‘by your leave.’”

In 1946, when an Anglo-American Commission was appointed to recommend a solution to the “Palestine problem,” Niebuhr, speaking as a member of the Executive Committee of the Christian Council on Palestine, testified in behalf of a Jewish state. He asserted that the Jews “have a right to a homeland”; that their minority status all over the world endangered the future of the Jewish People. A Jewish state, on the other hand, would give them one place in the world where they would be masters in their own house and have the possibility to develop their culture and religion. In his view, it was necessary and right to make possible a Jewish state, for the sake of justice and for the sake of the historical rights of the Jews.

Niebuhr admitted that this would inevitably involve what Arabs would see as an injustice. However, he maintained that “There is, in fact, no perfectly just solution to any political problem.” But he hoped that it would be possible to “achieve a solution of this problem which would appeal to the Arabs as just.” In a statement made during the six-day war, Niebuhr compared Israel to David and the Arabs to Goliath. “This Goliath never accepted Israel’s existence or granted it the right of survival.”
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Professor Niebuhr vigorously defended the rights of the Jews to their ancestral homeland against the obviously hostile views of several members of the Commission. He never ceased in his efforts in behalf of Israel.

Like her husband, Mrs. Ursula Niebuhr has been closely identified with this work. She has recently requested that her husband's name be removed from the masthead of Christianity and Crisis, a journal founded by Dr. Niebuhr, because it published articles critical of Israel's administration of Jerusalem.

### Christian-Jewish Dialogue

Niebuhr played a key role in the development of Jewish-Christian dialogue. He was a frequent lecturer at the Institute for Social and Religious Studies, the pioneer effort launched by the Jewish Theological Seminary to bring Jews and Christians together in an ecumenical enterprise.

Of special importance was Niebuhr's statement calling for an end to Christian missionizing of Jews. In an address to a joint meeting of the faculties of the Union Theological Seminary and the Jewish Theological Seminary on "The Relations of Christians and Jews in Western Civilization," Niebuhr hailed "the thrilling emergence of the state of Israel" and expressed his admiration for the Jewish contributions to Western civilization and culture. Though he acknowledged that there were differences between Judaism and Christianity, in both dogma and religious style, he asserted that "the long and tragic history of the relations of the Christian majority in Western Christian civilization should prompt more humility and self-examination among Christians."

Niebuhr called upon the Christian majority to see in "Judaism something other than an inferior form of religion such as must ultimately recognize the superiority of the Christian faith and end its long resistance by capitulation and conversion." He commended the approach of Franz Rosenzweig, who defined the relation of Christianity and Judaism as "two religions with one center, worshipping the same God, but with Christianity serving the purpose of carrying the prophetic message to the Gentile world." For this reason, the missionary activity by Christians toward Jews is "wrong." This kind of statement by a great leader of Protestantism had a profound impact on both Jews and Christians—especially on the Jews because Niebuhr's position reflected his respect for them and their faith, and helped remove the anxiety that Christian ecumenical endeavors toward Jews was a cover for missionary activities. Thus the ground rules for Jewish-Christian dialogue were established.
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7 This address was later incorporated in Pious and Secular American (New York: Scribner's, 1958).
"Religious Realism"

Niebuhr's greatness was his ability to translate religious categories into guides for action in the world of politics and economics. He was withering in his criticism of ideologues who thought that it was possible simply to translate moral maxims into political realities. He recognized that "there is a mystery of evil in human life to which modern culture has been completely oblivious." At every level of human achievement, there is a mixture of good and evil. The failure to see this "dimension of depth in life" leads to the utopian illusions of perfectionists, who overlook the evil inclination and the cynical attitude of Machiavellians who fail to see the potential for good in human beings:

The two dominant attitudes of prophetic faith are gratitude and contrition; gratitude for creation and contrition before judgment; or, in other words, confidence that life is good in spite of its evil and that it is evil in spite of good. In such faith both sentimentality and despair are avoided.\(^8\)

No political decision escapes the ambiguity which is part of all human actions. We must aim for relative justice, furthering the good as far as we can, without illusion or despair. There should be a suspicion of too much concentrated power; therefore democracy, which tends to distribute power in more than one center, is the kind of government that best reflects both the defects and the possibilities of human nature. In a famous aphorism, Niebuhr said: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."

Human life is a mixture of freedom and necessity, success and failure. We strive for the good, but we cannot fully attain it. However, we must never forget that it is possible for our spirits to overcome even their own limitations. These ideas bear close resemblance to the Rabbinic doctrine of the two yetzarim (inclinations): the yetzer ha-tov and the yetzer hora, the good and the evil inclinations.

In 1934 Niebuhr composed a prayer, which was being used by countless chaplains and sufferers and is now the official prayer of Alcoholics Anonymous: "O God, give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed, courage to change what should be changed, and wisdom to distinguish the one from the other."

There were some who felt that Niebuhr's theology was antithetical to Jewish insights. They believed that he was pessimistic, while Judaism was optimistic; that he was sin-obsessed and against reason. Such criticisms were effectively countered by the work of Emil Fackenheim,\(^9\) Will Herberg.\(^10\)
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and, most of all, by Heschel. These important Jewish thinkers, and others as well, cited as authentic expressions of the Hebraic spirit Niebuhr's profound sense of the ambiguities of human achievement; his urging of realism instead of sentimentality; and, above all, his fervent faith that, whatever the ironies and disappointments of history, there is only one source of ultimate trust—the God revealed in the Jewish Bible.

In the last essay Niebuhr published, he deals with the place of religion in a pluralistic culture and argues that a culture must make room for pluralism in order to be vibrant and creative.

Just as a dialogue between Christian faith can be fruitful, a valuable two-way relationship exists between the religious communities and the pluralistic society, which can be extremely productive. The disciplines of secular culture and the cross-teachings of various historic religions act upon faith, criticizing and refining it. In turn, religious belief and commitment contributes to man's sense of moral responsibility toward his fellow man, and his relationship to the transcendent realm of God's mystery, without which both man and human history lack meaning.\(^{11}\)

Niebuhr's great achievement was to relate the realm of the here and now to the realm of ultimate mystery. In measure unequaled by any other man of American religion, he succeeded. He will be sorely missed.

Seymour Siegel

Jacob Glatstein: Poetry and Peoplehood

Jacob Glatstein died on November 19, 1971, in the midst of celebrations of his seventy-fifth birthday throughout the Yiddish-speaking world. At long last his work was achieving recognition, even among Jews with little or no Yiddish, as one of the unique accomplishments of Jewish art in this century. The discovery of Glatstein by many young, American-born Jews was significant for them in the unfolding of the rich and varied tapestry of the East European Jewish heritage.

More than perhaps any of his literary colleagues, he combined a highly refined poetic instrument of great sophistication and modernity with a deep rootedness in Jewish life of all generations from Abraham to the present. In this he was a foremost exemplar of the most notable achievement of modern Yiddish literature: the bridging of the gap between contemporary European literature and the national consciousness of East European Jewry. The result of this union was continuity, without attenuation, of the Jewish imagination in a modern though still specifically Jewish form.

Early Life

Unlike many Yiddish writers, Glatstein did not have to grapple his way out of a restrictive traditional environment in order to identify with the growing Yiddish literary movement. He was born on August 20, 1896, into a home where traditional Judaism was in contact with the Haskala and where the new Yiddish literature of the period was cherished. The city of his birth, Lublin, was a major Jewish commercial and cultural center whose 23,586 Jews (in 1897) represented almost fifty-one per cent of the local population. Jews were important in the industrial life of the city, and the growing number of Jewish workers led to the establishment of various Jewish radical movements during this period. At the same time, Lublin, which in Glatstein's later poetry became the symbol for all East European Jewish communities destroyed by the Nazis, was rich in tradition and memories. It was known for its fairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and for its yeshivah. For approximately two hundred years, until the middle of the eighteenth century, it was the seat of the Council of Four Lands (Va'ad Arba Aratzot) which had considerable authority over all the Jewish communities of the four central areas of Poland and Lithuania.

Glatstein was thus not raised in a shtetl, or in a rural backwater. He grew up in an urban center and in an enlightened home. Yet his environment was
rooted strongly in the past. His uncle was the official cantor of Lublin, a fact which may have had a bearing on his love of music and his musicality, as well as on his attachment to Jewish liturgy.

He received a traditional *heder* education until age sixteen. At the same time he was given private instruction in secular subjects. His father introduced him to Yiddish literature at an early age and was delighted with the thought that his son might become a Yiddish writer. At age thirteen Glatstein had already accumulated a small bundle of manuscripts and traveled to Warsaw in order to present his efforts to Y.L. Peretz and the other literary lions of the day.

Because of anti-Jewish persecution he emigrated to America in 1914, at the age of eighteen. The same year, his first story was published in an American Yiddish weekly. During the period that followed, however, he concentrated on Americanization and seemingly lost his Yiddish literary ambitions. In 1918 he enrolled in the Law School of New York University. There he met the young Yiddish poet N.B. Minkoff and resumed his writing as a result of their literary discussions. This was the real beginning of his writing career.

**Towards a New Poetics**

The years during and immediately following the First World War witnessed a remarkable flowering of Yiddish literature on American soil. In poetry, particularly, the young practitioners in their teens and twenties broke new ground and became the models for their colleagues in Europe and in the new Jewish population centers. The group known as *Di yunge* (*The Young Ones*) broke away from the concept and practice of functional, hortatory poetry of social consciousness which dominated Yiddish poetic writing in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century and in the earliest years of the twentieth. As impressionists, they introduced a new musicality as well as new refinements of the themes and forms of the personal lyric. To Glatstein and a small group of emerging poets this *fin de siècle* mood seemed totally unsuited to the world of turmoil, war, and revolution around them. Along with the Imagists in America and England, and partly under their influence, they sought a less conventional and more flexible mode of expression, one which would help free them from sentimentality and aid them in achieving what T.E. Hulme called "the cold hard line."

In 1920 Glatstein and his friends published an anthology of their work and proclaimed the establishment of the *In zikh* (*introspective*) school of Yiddish poetry. The group's manifesto, published in that volume, declared their preference for free verse and their liberation from any sense of social or Jewish obligation:

The pointless and fruitless question as to whether a poet "should" write about national [i.e., Jewish] or social issues or exclusively about personal matters
cannot exist for us. For us everything is "personal." Wars and revolutions, pogroms on Jews and the labor movement, Protestantism and Buddha, the Jewish school and the cross, the mayoralty elections and restrictions on our language. All these can either affect us or not affect us just as a woman with blond hair or our own unrest can affect us or not affect us. *

This may seem like a strange beginning for a poet whose mature work is so transcendentally Jewish. But the manifesto illustrates the tensions and conflicts which beset Glatstein and his contemporaries. They wanted to be in the mainstream of world poetry, yet they were writing in a language which they themselves were first refining into a sophisticated literary instrument. They sought to be avant-garde, but they had no élite university-trained audience. They were creating their own audience as they were creating their poetic language. They desperately desired the freedom enjoyed by poets in other languages; but the very fact that they were writing in Yiddish for an exclusively Jewish audience stamped them with an inescapable Jewish identity. It was the crucible of these tensions and conflicts that gave rise to the remarkable achievements of Glatstein and the other major Yiddish poets.

From Individuality to Identification

Glatstein's first book of poems, published in 1921, bears the poet's name as its title. This studied egotism is indicative of the self-assertiveness and the urge for purely individualized expression of the early Glatstein. He and his poems are inseparable, he seems to tell us. If the inner vision of which they are the expression does not appeal to the reader or is incomprehensible to him, that is the reader's problem. It does not make the vision, or the poems, any less valid.

The book voices the disillusionment which engulfed intellectuals throughout the world in the years following World War I. Edmund Wilson has given a concise description of this frame of mind in his discussion of T.S. Eliot's "The Waste Land":

... In our post-war world of shattered institutions, strained nerves and bankrupt ideals, life no longer seems serious or coherent—we have no belief in the things we do and consequently we have no heart for them.

There are no specifically Jewish themes in Glatstein's volume, although there are brief echoes of his childhood and school days. It is his poetic personality which receives ostentatious expression. Above all, the book clearly establishes Glatstein as the most experimental and daring of Yiddish poets in form and style, and the most skillful in verbal manipulation. Free verse is most common, although an occasional rhyme is employed. Master-
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ful use is made of sound to produce desired effects, while the sense often remains deliberately obscure. The arrangement of words on the page receives considerable attention, as does the deliberate division of words:

You hear
clin-
clin-
Tomor.
Row.
Comes
Tomor.
Row,
Comes.

Glatstein's second book Fraye ferzn ("Free Verse"; 1926) demonstrates a sharply increased ability to cope with "external" themes. He embraces a much wider range of motifs, such as city life, love, and social satire. Yet frequently, as in a surrealist painting, the real world is depicted through the poet's nonrealistic eyes.

It is evident to him that his Jewishness is an organic part of him, but he sees it as a burden toward which he feels the ambivalence of both love and rejection:

... But I found the burden of my grandfathers heavy,
I am a silent slave of their joy and their suffering ...
I cannot free myself from my ordained grey burden,
So I bear the sweet bondage without a sound.

This ambivalence was to remain with Glatstein for the rest of the 1920s and most of the 1930s. During this period he continued to enrich his poetic arsenal. Glatstein's verbal dexterity, his cleverness, and his sense of humor were beginning to find more effective expression, as was his skill in irony and sarcasm. He became the master in Yiddish of play on words. He developed an unusual facility for coining new words and for extracting new meanings from old words. The addition of prefixes and suffixes to simple, everyday words not only expanded their meaning and the lexical treasury of Yiddish, but it also endowed his poems with levels of meaning and subtlety totally untranslatable into any other tongue.

It was impossible, however, for American Yiddish writers to avoid all concern with their Jewish heritage and to disassociate themselves completely from their Jewish roots. The unique position of the Yiddish literary artist in America as a conscious creator of a minority culture against heavy odds made at least some degree of Jewish consciousness inevitable. No one thought that the preservation of Yiddish culture was a natural phenomenon. All Yiddish writers were aware of the deep inroads of assimilation on the Yiddish-reading public in the United States, and of the fact that the American-born Jewish generations were discarding the language, at least as a mode of everyday expression. Only a conscious and intensive effort could succeed
in maintaining at least some degree of interest in Yiddish literature. The very determination, therefore, of the Jewish writer to use Yiddish as his medium of expression was a form of identification with the Jewish community.

This became increasingly apparent in Glatstein's *Yidishtaytshn*, which appeared in 1937. Here Glatstein's desire to shock the reader—always a fundamental part of his art—is expressed in form rather than in content. Perhaps he sensed that the times would soon prevent him from giving free expression to his passion for innovation and experimentation. Throughout the book we find deliberate word distortions, half-completed thoughts, typographical variations, and experiments in pure sound. In technical virtuosity *Yidishtaytshn* reaches an extreme not approached before and never to be exceeded by Glatstein.

But this is only one aspect of the volume. It also reflects a clear realization that the time for poetic indifference to the outside world was passing. The imminence of war and Hitler's persecution of the Jews, already well known, moved him to leave his position on the sidelines and to prepare for battle. Neither his poetic theories nor his own inclinations could withstand the pressure of events.

A profound shift of emphasis was now discernible in Glatstein's poetic attitude. In most of his previous work, including the bulk of the poems in *Yidishtaytshn*, the poet's main concern had been the poem itself and the techniques to be employed to produce the desired effect. Now he began to occupy himself increasingly with meaning rather than with effects alone, and his technical skill and cleverness were harnessed to express that meaning. Whereas previously the subject-matter had been of secondary importance, subordinate to the establishment of a mood, the theme of the poem now became its very core.

Glatstein's new sense of purpose was intimately related to the nature of his Jewish identification. Side by side with the many poems in this volume that have no Jewish reference at all, there are several which by their return to Jewish themes hold the key to his subsequent development. Glatstein has not yet attained a unified point of view. There can be no question, however, that the emphasis has shifted. He could no longer submerge his Jewish roots, allowing them to pierce the surface only occasionally. The Jewish tragedy which Hitler was beginning to unleash had strengthened and deepened these roots. The poet might accept or reject the new claims on his pen, but he could not ignore them.

This was by no means an unconscious process. In a poem entitled *Oyfn vaser* ("On the Water"), he mercilessly examined the problem. Like a sailor at sea, he was isolated from his home and origin. He had left his home and gone to sea to gain freedom, to liberate himself from restraints and responsibilities. Now he was plagued by doubts: What was the meaning of freedom? Freedom from what was he seeking? And what was the nature of the restraints he was trying to escape? Could it be that he had cut himself
off from the only ties that could provide his life with warmth and meaning? In this poem Glatstein dons the garb of a penitent—but a penitent who has not yet achieved absolution and serenity. He knows that life has ordained a new path for him to travel, and he is prepared to embark on it with resignation. But he has not yet found the key that will unlock the barrier between him and his Jewish heritage; that will enable him to find the meaning in Jewish experience that can provide him with a source of strength. The process of fusion between the poet and his Jewish identity which was to characterize his later work was not yet completed.

In discussing Ezra Pound's relative lack of popularity as a poet, as compared to T.S. Eliot, Edmund Wilson remarks that Pound does not possess a "complete literary personality." Despite his achievements he "does not dominate us like a master imagination—he rather delights us like a miscellaneous collection of admirably chosen works of art." This observation is equally applicable to Glatstein up to, and including, the late 1930s.

The Holocaust and Beyond

With the publication of his Gedenklider ("Poems of Remembrance") in 1943 and in his subsequent books, a "complete literary personality" was very much in evidence. The gulf that had existed between the formal and the thematic aspects of his art had disappeared. There now was a complete fusion between the two. Glatstein did not submerge his technical dexterity, nor did he lose his control over the instruments of poetry. But now his wit and his skill and his imagination were harnessed in the service of a great purpose: to find modern relevance in traditional Jewish values and to seek both meaning and hope in the tragedy of European Jewry.

This new fusion gave Glatstein's work a breadth of scope it had never possessed before. It endowed his poetry with a new spirit which was a far cry indeed from the disillusionment and despair of his earlier collections. For the first time, he seems to have achieved a measure of inner peace. Perhaps it is strange to talk about the attainment of peace and serenity as a result of processes unleashed by the Hitler period. Still, it was not the peace of indifference or helpless resignation; it was the cessation of the inner struggle of hostile forces in a poet who, after years of wandering, had found his vocation.

The ability to convey traditional Jewish concepts, the very thought processes of East European Jewry, in contemporary garb is perhaps the most notable achievement of modern Yiddish poetry. There is no finer practitioner of this art than Jacob Glatstein.

The Jews of pre-twentieth-century Eastern Europe lived in a Jewish world. They lived, thought, and felt as Jews twenty-four hours a day. Their heroes and models were drawn from the Jewish tradition: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Rabbi Akiva and Bar Kokhba, Yehuda Halevy and the Maharal of
Prague, all were part of their folklore. And they were creating folklore every day of their existence. How different this is from our condition in which the young of even the most committed segments of the Jewish community identify with the same sports and television heroes as does the rest of American society. The primary source for the conceptualization of the world and its problems in Jewish terms and as seen through Jewish eyes remains the vast body of twentieth-century Yiddish poetry, which was created in many parts of the world and, to a large and notable extent, in the United States. In this chain of continuity of Jewish mental and sensory processes expressed in the most modern and technically advanced form, Glatstein's work remains unsurpassed.

Yiddish poets were confronted with an enormous problem when they wrote about and bewailed the Holocaust. The measure of artistic detachment necessary for a successful poem is most difficult to achieve in the face of personal tragedy. Some Yiddish poets were crushed by the burden of destruction and by their own sense of loss and involvement. Glatstein was one of those poets who successfully met the challenge. Indeed, his unique poetic equipment, his technical facility, his skillful use of irony and sarcasm, led him to new heights not only in expressing the tragedy of the Holocaust, but in the art of poetry itself.

Glatstein's new purpose made him a voice of his people, primarily of the six million who were murdered together with their way of life, their ethical and moral constructs, and their view of the world. The abyss between him and his Jewishness was bridged by Jewish suffering.

In his early years Glatstein's principal emphasis had been on personal and highly individualized expression. The dominant theme of his later poems was the quest for the significance to the Jews as a people of the tragedy of European Jewry. Those Jews who remain alive and all future generations of Jews must accept the concept of Jewish unity—a unity not only in space among the living, but also in time among generations “past or passing or to come.” The destruction of East European Jewry was for Glatstein no less a covenant for all Jews than the granting of the Torah at Mount Sinai. In a magnificently evocative poem entitled Nisht di meysim loybn got (“Not the Dead Praise God”), he links the tradition that all generations of Jews were present at Mount Sinai with the concept that, in the same way, all Jewish generations were present at the destruction of East European Jewry:

And just as, united, we stood together
At the granting of the Torah
So truly did we all perish in Lublin.

The Holocaust was Glatstein's trial by fire. He emerged as a poet of genuine greatness whose evocations of the Jewish experience will remain a living part of the Jewish heritage.

SHMUEL LAPIN
Joseph Meyer Proskauer (1877-1971)

To essay an appraisal of the life of Joseph Meyer Proskauer in conventional chronological form would be as anomalous as to begin an abstract expressionist painting by first reaching for a measuring rod. In any event, the first brush marks suggest Mobile, Alabama, where Joseph Proskauer entered the world on August 6, 1877, soon after Ulysses S. Grant, twentieth President of the United States, had completed his second term in office. It ends with Proskauer’s death in New York City on September 11, 1971, nineteen presidencies later.

Traits of many of the Presidents during his lifetime are reflected in the mosaic of the Proskauer personality: the doughty courage of Grover Cleveland, the “strenuous life” philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, the scholarly idealism of Woodrow Wilson, the lonely stubbornness of Herbert Hoover, the calculated boldness of Franklin Roosevelt, the abrasive independence of Harry Truman, the sophisticated taste of John F. Kennedy, and the capacity for pragmatic accommodation of Richard Nixon.

Only a few months before his death, at the overflow annual dinner of the American Jewish Committee in the huge Waldorf-Astoria ballroom, the ninety-five-year-old Judge delivered an eloquent and impassioned address at the end of a long program of speeches during which he occupied himself by smoking two formidable cigars. The evening before, he had offered the main toast at the eightieth birthday dinner of Dr. Maurice B. Hexter, a long-time friend and colleague in the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, of which Proskauer had been president during the bleak depression period forty years ago. He captivated the guests with his wit and charm, and astonished them with the factual fidelity with which he reminisced about events of more than half a century.

On the International Stage

At the creation of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 Proskauer, then in his sixty-ninth year, achieved his greatest personal triumph. In its attainment he brought to bear the totality of his rare talent and vast experience as powerful advocate, omnivorous reader, sagacious political craftsman, and brilliant tactician of human affairs.

Proskauer was appointed a consultant to the American delegation at the San Francisco conference for the preparation of the United Nations Charter. Under his leadership the American Jewish Committee had pioneered in the
struggle for the international protection of human rights. He immediately sought to bring to fruition the Committee's aspiration for the creation of a Commission on Human Rights in the United Nations. The prospects seemed encouraging until the latter part of April, when several obstacles appeared to threaten the adoption of the proposal. The British were apprehensive that such a body might be used to cause them embarrassment in India and other territories. The American delegation, "though supporting the proposal in principle," found that some of its members, as well as a few officials in the State Department, regarded the proposal as going beyond the stated objectives of the conference. However, the most stubborn obstacle was the Soviet Union's insistence that the creation of the Commission might lead to interference in its "internal affairs."

Proskauer and American Jewish Committee Chairman Jacob Blaustein, his colleague at the San Francisco conference, had become aware of these developing objections and, fearing their precious purpose in peril, decided to strike with the calculated boldness which was one of Proskauer's conspicuous characteristics. They issued a press release, on April 28, declaring that "the New World order must provide security and contentment for citizens of every nation, irrespective of race or creed," and emphasizing their "profound belief that while the peace conference will ultimately give attention to the wrongs which have been especially inflicted on the stricken Jews of Europe by the holocaust of war and the bestiality of Hitler, the ultimate safety of the Jewish populations of Europe will rest upon the international enforcement of justice and equality of treatment to all men of every race and creed."

The movement gained momentum. A press report of April 30 recorded that "behind this campaign is the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the American Jewish Committee, twelve Catholic bishops, and the powerful Baptist Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations which speaks for 11,000,000 Baptists." However, on May 2, the last day any of the sponsoring nations could present amendments to the preliminary provisions known as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, all hope seemed to vanish. Early that morning, Proskauer and the other consultants associated in behalf of the human rights provision met with Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College and a member of the American delegation. She informed them it was unlikely that the American delegation would present such a proposal.

Proskauer and his colleagues were dismayed but not defeated. They promptly prepared a petition to Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, chairman of the United States delegation. Professor James T. Shotwell, the noted historian of Columbia University, and Dr. O. Fred Nolde of the World Council of Churches joined Proskauer in composing the document.

The petition was written by noon, and by 4:30 p.m. the signatures of 21 out of the 42 consultants were obtained. These included the representatives of the American Association for the United Nations, Federal Council of
Churches, Railway Labor Executives Association, National Association of Manufacturers, United States Chamber of Commerce, National Catholic Welfare Conference, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. The respect which the leaders of these groups held for Proskauer, his ready access to them, and his unique power of persuasion bore fruit.

No one who was approached refused to sign; but it was impossible to reach more consultants in the time allowed. At 5:00 p.m. the consultants were received by Secretary Stettinius with whom Proskauer had arranged a meeting. Dr. Nolde presented the petition in what Proskauer described as "a forceful and eloquent" statement. When Nolde concluded, Proskauer rose. He first reviewed the substantive contents of the document. Then, unleashing the rare talent for advocacy which made him the idol of his clients and the terror of his adversaries, he addressed the Secretary of State of the United States:

I am bound to you by close ties of personal friendship and official loyalty, and that very circumstance demands that I exhibit complete candor. The voice of America is speaking in this room as it has never before spoken in any international gathering and it is saying to the American delegation: "If you make a fight for the human rights proposal and win, there will be glory for all. If you make a fight for it and lose, we will back you up to the limit. If you fail to make a fight for it, you will have lost the support of American opinion—and justly lost it. In that event you will never get the Charter ratified."

The atmosphere was tense. Proskauer let a moment of silence elapse for its dramatic effect. He then turned to the consultants and declared that he had undertaken to speak for them but that anyone disagreeing could now express his dissent. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, stood up. Proskauer felt his heart pound in terror lest Murray dissent. The pounding became unbearable as Murray snapped: "Mr. Secretary, I didn't sign that paper." Then pausing for a few seconds, which to Proskauer seemed forever, Murray resumed: "The only reason I didn't sign it is that they didn't get it to me. I am here to tell you that I believe I am speaking not only for the CIO but for all labor when I say that we are 100 per cent behind the argument which has just been made."

Stettinius rose and exclaimed with uncharacteristic spontaneity that he was astounded by the intensity of feeling for the human rights proposal and would immediately present the matter to the American delegation. That evening he did so, and the delegation responded by not only submitting the amendments but vigorously advocating their adoption. The four powers concurred, and the human rights provisions are today a part of the United Nations Charter.

The eminent historian, Professor James T. Shotwell of Columbia University, later wrote of this episode:

Judge Proskauer made the most eloquent and convincing argument that I have ever listened to in my life. It is destined to become one of the chapters of
American history. I am very happy to bear witness to his great success, for he completely won over the meeting and Secretary Stettinius instantly promised that he would do all he could to have the human rights clauses inserted in the Charter. As an historian, with all of the careful reserve by which an historian is bound, I pay this tribute to the leader of the American Jewish Committee. It was a magnificent victory for freedom and human rights.

Proskauer had won the most spectacular victory of his long and eventful career. He had fought many battles—in courtroom and in boardroom, in private conference and in public meeting, in judicial, financial, commercial and political arenas, for client, for community, and for country—but none provided him with a sense of deeper satisfaction or of loftier achievement.

In giving an account of most men it would be anticlimactic to continue beyond this singular episode. But in an appreciation of the Judge's life it would be incomplete. And since Proskauer never let the dramatic, despite his taste for it, crowd out the essential, it would also be infelicitous to stop at this point.

**Founding a Career**

Soon after graduating from Columbia Law School and joining a small law firm, Proskauer began to interest himself in Jewish community activities. He led a boys' club in the Educational Alliance, the colorful Lower East Side cultural center. Later he was to become president of the 92nd Street YMHA and to accelerate its rise to the most notable community center in the country. He was called to the presidency of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies during the depression when the Jewish community was faced with an plenitude of needs and a paucity of means. Its leaders despaired of its ability to maintain the institutions or provide the services which had been expanded steadily during the preceding years of economic ascent. But he rallied the leadership, infused it with his zeal, and steered it successfully through its most critical era.

In early life he also began to participate in public affairs on a limited scale. In 1920 he served on a small committee appointed by the Bar Association to oppose the expulsion from the New York State Legislature of five duly elected Socialists, simply because they were Socialists. The chairman of the committee was Charles Evans Hughes. Proskauer worked with Hughes on the brief attacking the expulsion as outrageously unconstitutional. Together they went to Albany to present their case to the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly. Hughes' request for an opportunity to be heard was met with a curt denial, despite the fact that he was a former governor of New York and a former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. (He subsequently became Chief Justice.)

Thirty years later, during the McCarthy recurrence, Proskauer used a dramatic opportunity to strike back. Sitting next to President Eisenhower at a Dartmouth College commencement, Eisenhower asked Proskauer for a
suggestion of something special to say when he would later be called upon. Proskauer instantly responded, “Condemn the book burners.” The next morning, the phrase was virtually in every newspaper in the United States: “Eisenhower denounces book burning.”

Even before the vain but valiant effort to protect the constitutional rights of the Socialist Assemblymen, Proskauer became a member of the Citizens Union, a small nonpartisan organization of independent individuals interested in government reform, which exerted an enormous influence in New York City. Indeed, it exemplifies a distinctive American phenomenon which has not been accorded adequate attention since de Tocqueville pointed it out a century ago. There are on the American scene today many relatively small groups of knowledgeable, thoughtful people which exert influence wholly disproportionate to their numbers. Significant examples are the American Civil Liberties Union, the Civil Service Reform Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, and, indeed, the American Jewish Committee.

Proskauer’s interest gravitated toward the legislative activities of the Citizens Union. Through his efforts in behalf of liberal legislation, he became acquainted with an Irish Catholic assemblyman from the Lower East Side of New York, named Alfred E. Smith. Proskauer quickly recognized in Smith an uncommon understanding and sympathy for proposals for social, economic, and political reform. Thus began a notable chapter in the life of Proskauer and of Smith and, indeed, in political history.

Confidant of Al Smith

In 1915 Smith received the Democratic nomination for New York County sheriff. With some difficulty, Proskauer persuaded the Citizens Union that support of Smith’s acknowledged ability and integrity was a test of its avowed independence, and he obtained for Smith the Union’s endorsement. This was the first time this fiercely anti-Tammany body endorsed a Democratic organization candidate. It greatly enhanced Smith’s status and self-esteem. It also increased Smith’s respect for Proskauer.

Relations between the two men continued to grow warmer. When Smith was nominated for governor in 1918, he asked Proskauer to join a small group he called his “war board” with Robert F. Wagner, who later became United States Senator; James A. Foley, who soon achieved prominence as a jurist; John Godfrey Saxe, who was on his way to becoming a formidable lawyer, and several others.

Smith won a startling upset victory regarded as a political miracle in view of the pervasive anti-Catholic prejudice, especially in upstate New York which then had about one-half of the state’s population. Smith won wide respect by conducting the most progressive as well as the most nonpartisan administration in the history of New York, and was renominated in 1920.
To Proskauer's amazement, Smith asked him to manage the gubernatorial campaign. Proskauer protested his total lack of political experience and cited his nonmembership in the party organization. However, Smith insisted and Proskauer accepted, not unwillingly.

The election was a disaster. Smith was overwhelmed by the Harding Republican landslide and the defection from the Democratic party of masses of Irish voters because of their resentment against President Woodrow Wilson for failing to champion Irish independence.

In 1922 Smith was nominated again and once more called upon Proskauer to manage the campaign. The admiration and affection of the two men for each other had continued to flourish—in Smith because of Proskauer's brilliance, devotion, and irrepressible candor; in Proskauer because of Smith's ability, mastery of complex issues, and incorruptible courage. The last was memorably displayed when Smith bluntly told the party leaders at the 1922 Democratic State Convention that he would refuse the gubernatorial nomination if William Randolph Hearst, "that evil character" whom he despised as a charlatan, were to be designated the Democratic nominee for Senator. Despite the enormous pressure exerted upon him by some of his closest friends (not including Proskauer) and in the face of Hearst's enormous power, wealth, and following, Smith stood his ground and Hearst failed to achieve his life-long ambition. Smith won the election and was reelected in 1924 and 1926, thus serving four two-year terms in all.

Throughout the period, Proskauer was Smith's intimate friend and adviser. Together they strove for legislative action in the field of workmen's compensation, old-age pensions, factory laws, improved care of the mentally ill, and myriad measures which made Smith the idol of liberals throughout the land.

Proskauer was especially close to Smith during his bitter struggle for the 1924 presidential nomination culminating in the marathon Madison Square Garden Democratic National Convention which remained in deadlock between Smith and William G. McAdoo for a record of 103 ballots. The Ku Klux Klan, in the full flush of resurgence during the hysteria following World War I, dominated the politics of many key states, especially in the South and Middle-West. It poured its venom on everything Catholic, Jewish, Negro, foreign, and eastern, and especially on New York. The Prohibition establishment, a bizarre blend of fanaticism and hypocrisy, fell in with the white hoods. It was also the era of Henry Ford's espousal of the ludicrous Protocols of the Elders of Zion and of the grotesque Scopes anti-evolution trial. Proskauer was sickened by the vicious bigotry which disgraced the McAdoo campaign and by the sordid character of the convention generally. He would have been alienated from politics forever but for his complete devotion to Smith and faith in him.

The convention concluded by nominating John W. Davis, one of the foremost members of the American Bar, who later became one of Proskauer's
closest friends and his associate in many celebrated cases. He was toastmaster at a brilliant dinner given Proskauer on his seventieth birthday.

In 1928 Proskauer again stood with Smith when he won the nomination for the presidency and lost the election in the most stunning defeat experienced by any American presidential candidate before him. The campaign again was debased by virulent anti-Catholic propaganda and vituperative personal assault on Smith. But this time it was conducted under "respectable" auspices. The crude, coarse, whispered underground slurs were now clothed in the polished phrases of social and pseudo-intellectual figures.

Among others, an article by Charles C. Marshall, a well-known New York lawyer and student of church history, appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*. It purported to prove by lavish documentation, including quotations from Papal bulls and encyclicals, that a Catholic owed an immutable "higher loyalty" to the Pope and was, therefore, disqualified from being President of the United States. Indeed, Marshall concluded, no Catholic could conscientiously take the oath of office.

Smith first scoffed at the article and refused to answer it. Proskauer insisted he must, for the challenge had been flung at Smith that his religion made it impossible for him to be sworn in as President of the United States. He owed it to himself, to his party, and to his religion to answer it. Smith finally agreed, but told Proskauer that, though he had been a devout Catholic all his life, he had "never heard of these damned bulls and encyclicals and I don't know how to answer such things. I just know it ain't so." Then Smith continued with a twinkle in his eye: "You answer it, Joe." Proskauer retorted: "That would make a great hit—a Protestant lawyer challenges a Catholic candidate on an issue like this and the challenge is answered by a Jewish Judge." Smith instantly conceded the point but told Proskauer he would have to help. Proskauer agreed but added, "You have to give me a priest." "You can have the whole Diocese," shot back the Brown Derby. Proskauer chose the renowned war chaplain Father Duffy who, though not a scholar, provided him with the necessary references.

Poring over the complicated material, Proskauer found the Marshall article grossly slanted, studded with quotations out of context, loaded with archaic, medieval utterances, and untouched by modern Catholic theological thought. Proskauer prepared the answer, Smith added some of his inimitable personal touches, and the *Atlantic Monthly* published it with a headnote by its famed editor, Ellery Sedgwick, calling it "one of the great, historical state papers" in America. "The candidate has answered (the charge of divided allegiance)", wrote Sedgwick, "not deviously and with indirection, but straightforwardly, bravely, with the clear ring of candor." Here, indeed, was a handsome encomium to the quality of Proskauer's advocacy. A companion encomium to the quality of Proskauer's loyalty was his disavowal of authorship until after Smith had disclosed it in an article in *The Saturday Evening Post*. 
The Judge

Smith had several times proposed to appoint Proskauer to the Bench, and each time Proskauer declined despite Smith’s earnest entreaties. In 1923 Smith pressed the appointment once again and this time Proskauer acceded. He had been practicing law for twenty-five years in the small firm of Elkus, Gleason and Proskauer, and he decided it was “time for a change.” He served as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, a trial tribunal, from 1923 to 1927, when he was elevated by Smith to associate justice of the Appellate Division, the second highest judicial body in the state.

Proskauer found his term as a trial judge at once frustrating and fulfilling. The frustration came from his appetite for the advocate’s role which, as a judge, he knew he should submerge. He managed to curb the expression of his nimble mind and quick wit, but his patience was not of gargantuan proportions. When a lawyer failed to get to the point, he often cut in with a penetrating question or perceptive comment that brought the issue into immediate focus. It was the quip of many lawyers that if you drew Proskauer as the trial judge in a case the lawyer on each side had two lawyers against him—his adversary and His Honor.

But in view of Proskauer’s recognized ability and integrity, many lawyers nevertheless relished pleading their cases before him, even though it meant risking embarrassment from a client who might later say to his lawyer, “The Judge made a brilliant point for us,” in a tone which implied, “How come you didn’t think of it?” In any event, it was common knowledge that when lawyers learned Proskauer would be the trial judge, they prepared their cases with extra thought and thoroughness.

Satisfaction came to Proskauer from his sense of participation in a process that brought justice to the parties contending before him. But he derived even greater satisfaction from his success in bringing parties to amicable settlements of bitter and bruising disputes. He took particular pride and pleasure in resolving controversies between employers and employees, a phase of the law then still in its swaddling clothes.

Return to the Bar

Proskauer resigned from the Bench in 1930 to resume private law practice, joining the firm of Rose and Paskus, which then became Proskauer, Rose and Paskus and several years later Proskauer, Rose, Goetz and Mendelsohn, the name it continues to bear. It has long been recognized not only as one of New York’s prestigious law firms, but also for the key role played by many of its members in the civic and philanthropic life of the city.

Proskauer’s second career at the Bar was rewarding to both ego and
exchequer. He immediately attracted a clientele of prominent corporations and individuals with complicated and challenging cases involving enormous stakes. His clients included the National City Bank of New York, Niagara-Hudson Power Company, Consolidated Edison, Sinclair Oil, Warner Brothers, New York Giants Baseball Club, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Lee Higginson and Company in a crisis involving the Krueger & Toll bankruptcy which shook the financial world, Robert R. Young of railroad renown, and Mrs. Gertrude Whitney in the battle for custody of her niece Gloria Vanderbilt.

In the trial of cases, Proskauer’s calculated boldness in cross-examination often delivered decisive blows for his clients; at other times, his uncanny avoidance of asking the “fatal last question” sealed the quantum of proof he had safely established.

But his versatile interests and impish sense of humor never let him become obsessed with the cash register, nor with the office time-sheets. When he was asked to argue the appeal for Mrs. Whitney, he replied he would do it only if his “terms were met in full.” When told he could name his fee, he said he had not meant money but wanted only to be restored to the trout-fishing privileges he had once enjoyed in Mrs. Whitney’s Adirondack stream near his own summer camp, which had been revoked when he left the Bench. If that were done, he declared, she could fix the fee; if not, she would have to get other counsel because his heart would not be in it. His request granted, he argued the appeal and cast the stream with zeal and relish. He won the coveted case and many a prized trout.

Leader of Jewry

Proskauer’s principal nonprofessional interest during the last three decades of his life was the American Jewish Committee. President of the Committee from 1943—1949, he retained a lively interest in its affairs until the day he died. As his sharp eye and keen mind observed Committee activities, he commented freely and frequently—sometimes approvingly, sometimes disdainfully—but always, to borrow one of his favorite phrases, making himself “indubitably clear” and often spicing his remarks with relevant Rabelaisian expletives. But coursing through all was a fierce pride in the Committee, into which his exquisite talents and powerful personality had been so sumptuously poured.

He led the American Jewish Committee with a strong will and sureness of purpose. But he was not impervious to views differing from his and he often acknowledged their validity, although not always when they were first expressed. His resiliency provided him with a capacity for accommodation. In earlier life, he was an anti-Zionist who proclaimed his creed with characteristic gusto. But as world events unfolded, he tempered his views to a pragmatic non-Zionism; he became the American Jewish spokesman for a liberal immigration policy into British-mandated Palestine. His address before
the Anglo-American (McDonald) Commission on Palestine, composed of a half dozen prominent American citizens and an equal number of luminous British subjects, was of surpassing quality and persuasiveness. And then, because he saw it as serving humanitarian as well as practical political purposes—"grasping the nettle," as he would say—he led the American Jewish Committee, American Jewry, and American opinion generally in espousing the partition of Palestine and the concomitant creation of a Jewish state. He was ready to slough a label if it could save a life!

He has been called a Renaissance man. His versatility of tastes and interests entitle him to that tribute. He adored music, reveled in belles lettres, delighted in the paintings of the masters and in civilized food, sophisticated wines, and refined sports. But to him the finest of fine arts, the quintessence of them all, was the art of advocacy. Its form, its composition, its color, its style, its rhythm, its crescendo fascinated him, challenged him, and swept him to the zenith of his profession and earned him the highest respect of his fellow Americans.

One event in his life as an advocate and as a Jewish leader must have been unforgettable to him and to anyone who was then "in the sound of my voice," as he so often was heard to say. At the climactic final session of the American Jewish Conference, several thousand delegates gathered from all over the land to demand the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. It was in a critical period of World War II, and the Judge was convinced that such a demand at that time was unwise and unrealistic, especially with Palestine then two-thirds Arab and one-third Jewish. The huge auditorium was charged with emotion. The crowd, overwhelmingly Zionist, was fired by the oratory of of Abba Hillel Silver, Nahum Goldmann, and Stephen Wise, all at the pinnacle of their powers and their power. Each could manipulate a crowd as though it were a huge baby. The audience resembling a political convention was brought to its feet over and over again, chanting the cadences of Ha-tikvah.

Judge Proskauer sat on the platform with a dissenting statement in his pocket. A few of his colleagues from the American Jewish Committee, very few, sat huddled together dreading the moment when he would be asked to speak. To say even that his physical security seemed in jeopardy is not hyperbole. Then the presiding officer intoned, "The chair now recognizes the president of the American Jewish Committee, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer of New York." Proskauer rose, walked resolutely to the center of the platform and, looking out over the audience, purred, "I now know how Daniel felt when he entered the lion's den." The startled audience broke into uproarious laughter and then into hearty applause. The tension had been shattered and Proskauer delivered his statement to completely attentive and respectful listeners. He was again applauded at its conclusion, even though almost every person present passionately disagreed with him.

He was a gallant gladiator: the platform was his battlefield and words were his weapons in the causes he espoused.
The phrase “Happy Warrior,” with which he anointed Al Smith through Franklin D. Roosevelt, he drew from his beloved Wordsworth. But the image emerged from the depth of his own subconscious. He projected upon his hero, Al Smith, his dream of himself. One thinks of him as one reads the lines of Wordsworth:

Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?
It is the generous spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his childish thought:
Whose high endeavours are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright:
Who, with a natural instinct to discern
What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a lover.

DAVID SHER
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