The origins of academic Judaica collections in the United States may be traced to the earliest days of the American academic establishment. Included among the books bequeathed to Harvard College by John Harvard were several items of Judaica. Hebrew Bibles, grammars, and rabbinic works were found in increasing numbers in the Harvard College library throughout the 17th century, and in the Yale University library from the early 18th century on—reminders of early New England’s interest in matters Hebraic.

The development of collections of Judaica as major research and bibliographic resources is, however, a phenomenon chiefly of the 19th and early 20th centuries. In this period were established the major collections of Judaica that were to serve as the foundation of a vast bibliographic network which developed after World War II. They were located at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Columbia University, the American Jewish Historical Society, and the New York Public Library in New York City; at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati; at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and at Harvard University in Cambridge.

In the quarter-century since World War II, these collections have all undergone considerable expansion, and their ranks have been swelled by a number of other substantial research collections, like that of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research and the Leo Baeck Institute in New York City, as well as
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research collections of Judaica on American college and university campuses. As in the preceding period, the greatest single concentration of these library resources remains New York City, although today it is really the Eastern megalopolis—from Washington through New York to Boston—that is the keystone of the nation’s Judaic library resources, supplemented by major bibliographic centers in Cincinnati and Los Angeles. Except for the State of Israel, the greatest conglomerator of Jewish library resources ever assembled now exists in the United States.¹

Some 30 years ago, the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK published two articles on the state of Jewish studies in the United States. Ismar Elbogen’s survey² of American Jewish

¹For brief descriptions of some of the Judaica collections mentioned in this essay, e.g., the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, YIVO, New York Public Library, Columbia University, Yeshiva University, New York University, Jewish Institute of Religion, Hebrew Union College, Dropsie College, Harvard University, Yale University, and the Library of Congress—see Harry M. Rabinowicz. The Jewish Literary Treasures of England and America (New York, 1962); cf. review by C. Berlin in Conservative Judaism, Vol. XIX, No. 1, Fall 1964, pp. 81-82.

scholarship in the first half of the 20th century was primarily concerned with a handful of Jewish institutions, chiefly rabbinical seminaries, which laid the foundations for the development of scientific Jewish scholarship in America and for half a century were the chief centers of such scholarly activity. In a companion article, Adolph S. Oko dealt with the development of Jewish book collections in the United States, and here, too, the focus was on the same few rabbinical seminaries, whose libraries then constituted the chief bibliographic resource for research in Jewish studies. By 1943 Elbogen could cite only a dozen or so positions in Jewish studies on American university campuses. A definitive account of the subsequent tremendous expansion of Jewish studies at American colleges and universities in the two decades since the end of World War II was given by Arnold J. Band in the pages of the American Jewish Year Book.

Today, Jewish studies in America encompass over 250 positions at institutions other than rabbinical seminaries. Since the establishment in 1969 of the Association for Jewish Studies, the professional academic association of scholars for whom Jewish studies are the prime focus of their teaching and research, its membership has grown to nearly 600, with more than half engaged in Jewish studies on a full-time basis. A recent B'nai B'rith survey of college courses in Jewish studies revealed that these are taught at some 300 institutions. Since the availability of library resources in a given area of study obviously affects teaching and research in that field, it seems appropriate to provide an account of developments in library resources supporting Jewish studies, since Oko's pioneer essay on the topic.

Despite this growth of Jewish studies in America and the importance of adequate library resources for these programs, astonishingly little information is available on the present status of Judaica collections in the United States. Aside from brief descriptive accounts of some of the major research collections,
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there is virtually no literature on the post-World War II growth and development of academic Judaica collections, nor has there been any discussion in print of the problems facing this vast bibliographic apparatus. Therefore, in presenting this account, we have had to draw to a great extent upon information gathered in the course of more than a decade of professional activity in the field of academic Judaic librarianship.

In addition, questionnaires (Appendix II) were sent to libraries at institutions offering courses in Jewish studies and to scholars teaching such courses. Of the approximately 300 such institutions, some 40 per cent replied, representing nearly 70 per cent of those offering more than three courses in Jewish studies. Most of the institutions that failed to reply offer fewer than three such courses, for the most part in elementary Hebrew, and, in all probability, lack even nominal Judaica library resources. Of the approximately 50 institutions offering undergraduate majors or graduate degree programs, some 75 per cent replied. There were also responses from approximately one-third of the 300 or so scholars teaching Jewish studies courses. In a few cases, where no reply was received, an estimate has been made, based on information supplied to the author in an earlier survey (April 1967) of libraries participating in the Israel PL-480 Program.

We are aware of the methodological limitations of this approach, as opposed to systematic and detailed on-site inspection and evaluation of these collections and detailed personal interviews with faculty. Nevertheless, the account presented here is the fullest available to date. It attempts to describe the status, and explain the development, of library resources for Jewish studies (especially on the American university campus), in an effort to focus attention on the major problems of these collections and to suggest how this unique bibliographic network of vital significance to the future of Jewish scholarship in America may be strengthened.

Nature of Jewish Library Resources and Their Development

Together, the holdings of the major Judaica research collections alone total over one million books, pamphlets, and
printed ephemera, and well over five million manuscript pages. Printed materials cover the entire gamut of the printed Jewish word, and range from Hebrew incunabula to contemporary Israeli election pamphlets, from early printed books to the latest novels on Jewish themes. Much of this material is in Hebrew and Yiddish; but virtually every European and Oriental language is represented. While large quantities of materials are in English, German, Russian, Polish, French, Spanish, and Italian, there are also significant collections in Hungarian, Dutch, and the Scandinavian languages. The provenance of the books is equally diversified. As expected, Europe, the United States, and, more recently, Israel are the chief countries of origin. However, there is also Judaica from Australia, Africa (North and South), the Middle East, Latin America, and the countries of the Far East—India, China, and Japan. The collections deal with a wide variety of topics, covering every aspect of Jewish culture: biblical studies, rabbinic literature, liturgy, philosophy and theology, belles lettres, history, and the sciences. The Judaica collections are thus a microcosm of world literature, encompassing vast chronological, geographic, and intellectual boundaries.

While libraries have usually been thought of in terms of books, increasing attention is being given to non-book materials of various types, and the Judaica collections under discussion are rich in such materials. Especially well represented in most of the major collections are printed pamphlets, which include, inter alia, political tracts, poetry, scholarly monographs, and others. Large collections of printed ephemera—leaflets, broadsides, posters—are to be found especially at YIVO, Harvard, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Theological Seminary, and the American Jewish Historical Society. These deal with such topics as theatre, politics, and cultural affairs, primarily in the last three quarters of a century.

American Jewish research libraries constitute one of the world’s great repositories of Jewish manuscripts, from Geniza fragments to medieval illuminated manuscripts and archives of contemporary Jewish organizations. The most significant general collection of manuscripts is found at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, with additional substantial collections at Hebrew Union College, Columbia, YIVO,
Dropsie, Yeshiva; smaller collections at Yale, Harvard, UCLA and the New York Public Library; and large specialized collections at the American Jewish Historical Society, Leo Baeck Institute, and Zionist Archives. Substantial collections of photographs and pictures can be found at YIVO, the Zionist Archives, American Jewish Historical Society, and American Jewish Archives (Hebrew Union College), while the American Jewish Committee has recently established the William Wiener Library of Oral History containing tape-recorded interviews with American Jewish personalities.

The beginnings of Judaica collections in libraries affiliated with Jewish institutions of higher learning were virtually simultaneous with the establishment of those institutions. For non-Jewish institutions, it was, and is, inevitable for some books of Jewish interest to be acquired by a library collecting in the humanities or social sciences. Therefore, the presence of Jewish books in public and university libraries long before there was a deliberate policy to develop a collection of Judaica is not surprising. In the case of the university, a conscious effort to build one invariably, and understandably, follows a decision to establish some kind of program in Jewish studies. The key factor in the real development of these collections has been the acquisition of one or more substantive private libraries usually belonging to a scholar or bibliophile. For example, the Jewish Theological Seminary has its Elkan N. Adler collection, Harvard its Ephraim Deinard and Lee M. Friedman collections, and Yale its George A. Kohut and Scholem Asch collections. Their acquisition promptly elevated each of these libraries to a position of eminence and provided a solid base on which to build. This was true in more recent times as well; for example, the acquisition by UCLA of the Bamberger-Wahrmann collection, which included part of the Moses Gaster collection.

Many of the smaller Judaica collections also owe their corporate development to the acquisition of a certain collection: e.g., the University of Denver and its I. Edward Kiev collection; or, on a much smaller scale, Duquesne and its Herman Hailperin collection. Many libraries which acquired collections in the early stages of their development continue to do so to develop further their resources, although the larger the holdings, the more the
risk of duplication; the larger libraries are eventually forced to
depend on item by item acquisition, except for highly
specialized subject collections that become available. More-
over, with the passage of time, as more and more collections are
acquired by institutional libraries, there are fewer available on
the market. Indeed, aside from collections such as the Sassoon
(Hebrew manuscripts) and the Mishkin (modern Jewish history)
collections, there are few privately-held libraries whose ultimate
disposition is still undetermined and which could become the
cornerstone of a general research collection. Highly specialized
collections, as of the ever-popular Passover Haggadah, or
modest ones of manuscripts or incunabula can adorn a research
collection, but are no substitute for it. Newer collections are
thus increasingly dependent on development through acquisition
of individual items.

Such individual acquisition is dependent on a library’s ability
first to learn of the existence of material, and then to obtain it.
Judaica in English and the more common European languages,
produced by regular trade publishers, poses less of a problem.
These are widely advertised, reviewed, and listed in trade
publications and the various national bibliographies. But here,
too, Judaica libraries, especially the smaller university collec-
tions and those in non-university situations, may encounter
problems; for few such collections can afford to subscribe to the
various European and other national bibliographies—or, for that
matter, to invest the time to peruse them—for the relatively few
Judaica items in their total listings. There is as yet no
comprehensive bibliography of such new Judaica on a current
basis. The closest approximation is Kiryat Sefer, the quarterly
bibliographic journal of the Jewish National and University
Library in Jerusalem, but it often lists items long after their
publication and only if they are acquired by that library.
Nontrade items, e.g., reports of Jewish organizations, and
private press publications, especially rabbinica, usually do not
appear in the regular trade lists or in the national bibliographies;
some are listed in Kiryat Sefer, and in various specialized
bibliographies, such as ha-Sifrut ha-Tsiyonit for Zionist
publications and Jewish Book Annual for current Yiddish and
American Hebrew publications.
Public Law-480 Program

Acquisition of current Hebrew—chiefly Israeli—publications posed no problem for the period 1964 to 1973. During that decade, the Library of Congress maintained the American Libraries Book Procurement Center in Tel Aviv, a program unique in the annals of Judaic librarianship. Within the framework of what is commonly referred to as the Public Law-480 Program, the United States government supplied some 25 American research libraries with a copy of virtually every monograph, book, and periodical then published in Israel that was, or might eventually be, of research value. From 1964 to 1973, approximately 1,665,000 items were supplied, with an average of 65,000 items for each full participant. The government’s entry into the world of Hebrew books was the by-product of an earlier humanitarian gesture: the Food for Peace Program (Public Law-480) established in 1954, which enabled certain needy countries to purchase surplus American agricultural products in their own currency, instead of in dollars. Since the program further provided that such currency was to be spent only locally, large amounts accumulated to the credit of the United States in the countries involved. Some of this money was made available as grants and loans to promote economic development; some was used for various cultural projects. One of the projects was to help American libraries develop their resources in various areas.

The availability of Public Law-480 funds in Israel, the great interest of many American libraries in developing or strengthening Judaica collections, and the success of the book procurement programs in other countries resulted in the establishment,
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in 1964, of the American Libraries Book Procurement Center of
the Library of Congress at the American Embassy in Tel Aviv.
Some 25 American libraries were invited to participate in the
Israel program. Besides the understandable criterion of a
library's resources in the field of Jewish studies, interest in
developing a collection, especially where wider geographic
distribution of this material would be assured, was also used as a
basis for issuing invitations. The list of participants reflected
these considerations; it included libraries of Jewish institutions
with a strong interest in Judaica: Hebrew Union College, Jewish
Theological Seminary of America, Yeshiva University, Spertus
College of Judaica. Also included were university and public
research libraries having distinguished Judaica collections, e.g.,
Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Library of Congress and New York
Public Library. Libraries developing such collections and
assuring wider geographic distribution included: Brandeis,
University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los
Angeles, Cornell, Indiana, Joint University Libraries in Nash-
ville (includes Vanderbilt), University of Michigan, Portland
State College (Ore.), Princeton, University of Southern Cali-
forina, Syracuse, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wayne State in Detroit,
and Boston Public Library. (Some 270 additional libraries
received copies of English language materials published in Israel
from 1965 through 1968.)

While the quantity and variety of monograph acquisitions
were impressive—the number of monographs supplied annually
varied between 1,100 and 2,600—the more than 1,300 periodicals
supplied by the PL-480 Program were simply overwhelming. 8
They reflected virtually every facet of Israeli life: scholarly
journals in the different areas of Jewish studies; political and
literary journals; trade and professional publications; and
periodical publications issued by national and municipal
governmental bodies. Since these periodicals appeared on a
daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly basis, the total number of
pieces supplied to an individual library was staggering. In
1967-68, at the height of the periodical operation, over 10,000
pieces were sent to each participating library.

8Cf. C. Berlin, 'Israeli Periodicals: A Review of the Contemporary Scene,' Jewish
The benefits to libraries participating in the program are rather obvious. There was, of course, a considerable economic advantage, since participants received all books virtually free of charge. A conservative estimate of the annual value of materials supplied to an individual library was over $10,000, with at least an equal amount representing the saving in time and effort that would have been needed to acquire this material through other channels. And, of course, it assured more comprehensive coverage than an individual library distant from the scene could have attained. The field office—in effect the equivalent of a library's representative in Israel—was close to the source of supply. Since it purchased 25 copies of a book at a time, many publishers were eager to bring their publications to the program’s attention. On-the-spot representation was especially important with regard to books published outside the regular trade: small private presses and governmental and institutional publications.

An extremely useful by-product of the program’s activities was the publication of a monthly accessions list of all items shipped at the time. This was an invaluable bibliographic reference tool for Israeli publications in the period covered, and came closest to being an Israeli national bibliography. Moreover, items were recorded according to the standard cataloguing rules of the American Library Association and the Library of Congress, enabling libraries to catalogue much of this material with greater ease. Indeed, for several years centralized cataloguing of these publications by the Library of Congress and supplying participants with full sets of printed Library of Congress catalogue cards were an integral feature of the PL-480 Program.

A major problem of any government-subsidized program of this kind is vulnerability to the vicissitudes of governmental budgeting. With the decrease in the availability of counterpart funds in Israel and the lack of alternate sources of funding, the Library of Congress terminated the book procurement program in May 1973. After a veritable ten-year “bonanza,” libraries once again faced the problems of obtaining current Israeli publications on a regular basis. Libraries must now come up with thousands of dollars to offset the loss of the PL-480 subsidy, if they wish to maintain the level of acquisition enjoyed
during the decade of the program's existence. The termination of the program at that particular moment was especially unfortunate, since it coincided with a period of increasingly tight budgets in academic institutions and increasing difficulty in obtaining funds in both the general and Jewish communities. The Israel PL-480 Program made a tremendous contribution to the development of Jewish library resources in the United States; it was perhaps the single most important factor in their development over the past 30 years. Coming in the midst of the continuing expansion of Jewish studies on campuses, its termination is all the more regrettable and dealt a harsh blow to the continued development of Jewish library resources.

Sources of Supply

Another aspect of library acquisition is actually obtaining a publication once its existence and relevance to the library is established. For the most part, libraries are dependent on bookdealers for acquiring, on a regular basis, both current and antiquarian books. In the pre-World War II years, libraries could avail themselves of the services of such great antiquarian booksellers as E. Deinard, D. Fränkel, J. Kauffmann, M. Lipschutz, A. Rosenthal, and Bamberger & Wahrmann. Of these, only one firm—A. Rosenthal—remains, and no comparable new ones specializing in Judaica have come into existence. Of course, numerous small firms in Israel are in a position to supply some out-of-print Hebraica. There are also a number of European and American firms dealing to some extent in out-of-print Hebraica and Judaica, but this is usually incidental to their main business, which is new Judaica publications or non-Jewish antiquarian books. While the lack of such specialized dealers has been somewhat offset by a relative abundance of materials in the post-World War II years, libraries are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain out-of-print or antiquarian Judaica, and success is more often a matter of chance than the result of systematic ordering.

Nor is the situation with regard to current Judaica much better. Most Western-language Judaica publications can be obtained through a network of general booksellers in the United
States and Europe, specializing in supplying a given country's publications, e.g., Harrassowitz in Germany, Allen in England, Weil in France. There are also several American and European firms that combine a modest program of publishing Jewish books and the sale of textbooks and liturgical works to religious institutions with the sale of a varying range of current Judaica publications. While somewhat helpful to libraries, especially the newer smaller ones, such firms generally lack the specialized bibliographical expertise to render meaningful service to research libraries and understandably feel constrained to cater largely to the textbook, prayerbook, and popular book trade. Only one of these firms, Bloch, issued a regular announcement of new publications available: *Bloch's Book Bulletin*, which from 1927 to 1969 was the primary bibliographic listing for new Judaica in the English language. Since the demise of that bulletin there have been sporadic attempts by others to issue one like it (*Judaica Book Guide; Judaica Book News*) while a British firm, Menorah, published two issues of a cumulative listing of current English Judaica. The chief source of current Yiddish books remains CYCO (Central Yiddish Culture Organization), although its service has been impaired by numerous changes in administration in recent years. In addition, various European publishers now and then issue lists of Judaica publications.

None of these firms, however, are able to meet fully the needs of serious academic Judaica collections. Most of them are either unwilling or, more likely, unable to obtain nontrade publications. Libraries therefore try to obtain such items directly from the institutional publishers, with varying degrees of success: American institutions usually comply with such requests; European (with the exception of British) and, especially, Latin American institutions usually do not. Often, the only way to acquire them is through a personal contact in a particular country. Much of this material tends to be pamphlet or periodical, the latter being perhaps most difficult to obtain. Fraenkel’s *The Jewish Press of the World* lists almost 1,000 current Jewish periodicals.

Supplying periodicals—which involves the acquisition of thousands of individual issues of publications that often change format and frequency of publication—is a most difficult task at best, and an impossible one at worst. Unfortunately no firm in
the Diaspora specializes in Jewish periodicals, nor are the few Israeli firms that claim to do so able to supply more than a small number of the approximately 600 periodicals currently published in Israel. Recourse to publishers is in many cases of little help, since publishers of the smaller journals view them as intended for a specific local clientele and therefore tend to ignore requests for foreign subscriptions. It is precisely periodicals that are the raw materials of scholarship, yet research libraries find them to be the most difficult to acquire. This has been true of Israeli periodicals, especially since the demise of the PL-480 Program in Israel.

The development of collections is also affected by the availability of materials. In the past 30 years, there have been vast quantities of Judaica, especially antiquarian materials, chiefly as a result of the upheavals experienced by Diaspora Jewry—the Holocaust in Europe and, to a lesser degree, the resettlement in Israel of large segments of Jewish communities of the Middle East. The Nazi occupation of Europe brought not only the destruction of Jewish libraries; there was also plundering of such libraries and the preservation of their contents for Nazi “research.” Much of this cultural loot was brought to Israel after the war, but many thousands of volumes of Judaica were also distributed to research libraries in America. With the disappearance of both personal and corporate owners, Judaica collections, or simply large quantities of Jewish books, ended up in the hands of booksellers and provided a source of supply, which is only now beginning to run dry.

Of course, the destruction of Jewish books in Nazi Europe did much to reduce the overall number of such books, so that in objective and absolute terms the availability of pre-World War II Judaica after the war was greatly limited to begin with. But now, 30 years later, when most of the surviving collections are in institutional custody, such materials are even more scarce.

In addition, the half century before the war was an era of great activity and interest in Jewish scholarship in Europe, when
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scholars and knowledgeable laymen alike amassed collections of Judaica. The stock of available Judaica again grew upon the death of the owners, since there was a growing tendency for families to offer such collections for sale. Now that the collections of that generation have, for the most part, been disposed of, this source of supply is also running dry. It is, of course, true that not all such material purchased in the past 30 years has gone into institutional custody, from which its release to the book market is most unlikely. Much of it has been acquired by individuals and gone into the working collections of a generation of students and scholars who, however, are still far from retirement and the concomitant disposition of their books. Thus it will be many years before such Judaica again becomes available on the market in large quantity.

Reprinting

In this connection, mention should be made of the reprint phenomenon and its effect on the development of Jewish library resources. While reprints of Judaica were not unknown before World War II, it is in the past quarter century that Judaica reprinting has had a tremendous impact. Much Judaica was scarce even before World War II due to small editions, as well as the turbulent lot and precariousness of Jewish existence throughout modern times; the Holocaust made the scarcity acute. The increased interest in Jewish studies in Israel and the Diaspora in the post-war era thus created a ready market for Judaica reprints. It also coincided with technological developments that made reprinting by offset lithography in limited editions economically feasible. Classic Hebrew rabbinic works were reprinted by and for yeshivah students, and there soon developed a small network of private presses, chiefly in New York City and in Israel, catering to the needs of a traditional clientele and of libraries unable to obtain the original materials. The major works of 19th- and early 20th-century Jewish
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scholarship in Hebrew, German, and other languages were quickly reprinted as well, enabling libraries to develop facsimile collections of out-of-print material indispensable to research in Jewish studies.

Initially, such reprints were issued by small Jewish presses in New York and in Israel, often without publisher's imprint or other identifying mark. Gradually, there came into existence a number of firms specializing in Judaica reprints, which carried their own imprint, and these issued series of works in Jewish history, philosophy, and language (Menorah, Hermon, Zion, and Philo); some even reprinted whole runs of periodicals (Kedem). Others reprinted books and added introductions by contemporary scholars (Ktav). In recent years there have entered the Judaica reprint field large general publishing firms, such as Olms, Arno, Greenwood, Gregg, offering large lists of Judaica. While some of their reprints have tended to be of marginal interest and importance because the more important titles had been reprinted before, they have again made available a number of useful monographs and periodicals, especially in German. Also, a number of English language Judaica journals have solved the problem of requests for out-of-print issues by turning over reprint rights to some of the large reprint houses like Kraus. Finally, a number of publishers have taken to publishing facsimile editions of Hebrew manuscripts; several European firms have issued facsimiles of illuminated Haggadahs. All in all, reprinting has enabled libraries to acquire a large number of otherwise unobtainable Judaica items and has facilitated the development of such collections.

Preservation of Material

A major concern of all libraries is the preservation of resources so painstakingly assembled. This problem is particu-
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larly acute in the case of materials printed on paper derived from wood-pulp, which is not acid-free. A good part of the Judaica, particularly newspapers and periodicals, published in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was on such paper and is in a state of continual deterioration, often disintegrating after a single use. At present, the most practical way to preserve the contents of this vast literature is by microphotography, especially microfilming, and a number of Jewish research collections have been assiduously committing large segments of Judaica to microfilm. The New York Public Library has been microfilming files of Jewish newspapers from all over the world, while Hebrew Union College, through its American Jewish Periodicals Center, aspires to preserve in this way American Jewish newspapers and periodicals published before 1925. More recently, the Leo Baeck Institute has begun microfilming large segments of the German Jewish press. Files of the Israeli press had been microfilmed by the Library of Congress in the early years of the PL-480 Program; the project was subsequently taken over by the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. Recently, commercial firms have become involved in microfilming the Jewish press: the New York Yiddish daily newspaper *Jewish Daily Forward* is being processed on a current basis by Record Retention and Retrieval Corporation; current issues of the Israeli Hebrew dailies *Haaretz* and *Ma'ariv*, by Microfilm Corporation of America, a subsidiary of the *New York Times*, and the London weekly, *The Jewish Chronicle*, by Xerox University Microfilms. Complete files of these and other newspapers exist on microfilm, thus preserving and making available indispensable sources of information on Jewish life in modern times.

Numerous books have also been preserved in this manner, especially by the Library of Congress and New York Public Library; Xerox University Microfilms has microfilmed much of the rare book and manuscript collection of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and makes available on microfilm, or in electrostatically reproduced paper copy, dissertations in Jewish studies. Microfilm has also facilitated access to collections of Jewish, especially Hebrew, manuscripts hitherto available only by travel to the library owning them, or by equally time-consuming individual application for microfilm copies. While a central
repository for microfilm copies of Hebrew manuscripts located in libraries all over the world exists at the Institute for Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem, there are in the United States smaller collections of such microfilms, the most extensive at the Jewish Theological Seminary. A smaller collection consisting of copies of the Hebrew manuscripts in Milan’s Biblioteca Ambrosiana, is located at the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Thus, microphotography and related reproduction techniques have enabled libraries to preserve a literary heritage that would otherwise have crumbled to dust in the natural course of events. They further guarantee the security of Jewish library resources that must contend with man-made dangers. Given the precariousness of Jewish life in many countries, microphotography is a feasible method of preserving the unique literary records of these communities. The potential danger from increasingly sophisticated tools of destruction, in particular, would suggest the wisdom of duplicating photographically much of the unique and irreplaceable Jewish materials in libraries in Israel, and depositing these copies in a number of American research libraries.

The Judaica Librarian

The successful development of the great Judaica collections that became the foundations of a vast Judaica bibliographic network was due in no small measure to the efforts of such librarians as Alexander Marx at the Jewish Theological Seminary, Adolf Oko at Hebrew Union College, and Abraham S. Freidus and Joshua Bloch at the New York Public Library, all scholar-librarians par excellence. Today’s even more complex Judaica collections similarly require the services of highly skilled personnel possessing both the erudition of the scholar and the managerial talent of the administrator.

Because Judaica encompasses many disciplines, crosses many geographic and chronological lines, and exists in many languages, a Judaica librarian must be familiar with many areas and cannot afford the luxury of his teaching colleagues who can restrict their efforts to one or two more limited ones. Besides
having bibliographic knowledge, the librarian must be able to communicate intelligently with students and scholars in these various disciplines, as well as with university administrators. In terms of academic background, he should have advanced university graduate training in Jewish studies—preferably at the doctoral, but at least at the master's degree, level—with substantial and intensive prior training, such as that offered at some rabbinical seminaries or institutions of higher Jewish learning. Technical training at an accredited library school may also be helpful in certain areas. Individuals with such qualifications are understandably rare; in fact, only a few Judaica collections are administered by such skilled personnel, while the total number of qualified academic Judaica librarians in the country does not exceed two dozen. To attract and retain individuals of such qualifications, it is necessary to make these positions competitive in terms of compensation and status. Faculty status for many academic librarians is now commonplace. The recent and much publicized funding by the Mellon Foundation of a curatorial chair in general librarianship at the New York Public Library and the existence, since 1962, of the Lee M. Friedman curatorial chair in Judaic bibliography at Harvard will hopefully inspire the establishment of similar chairs in Jewish bibliography at other institutions. Such curatorial chairs will enhance academic librarianship much as professorial chairs have done in the case of university teaching staff, and will help attract a cadre of similarly qualified academicians to library positions.

Most Judaica collections do not have a full-time librarian, whose chief responsibility is the development of that collection in the library. Many such collections are served by librarians who may have some limited knowledge of the subject, by graduate students with a knowledge of Hebrew, or, in many cases, by librarians with no such knowledge. While the lack of trained personnel is most common in small and medium-size Judaica collections in universities, it is by no means limited to them. Many substantial Judaica collections in various other types of settings are operating either without qualified leadership or with obviously unqualified leadership, and a frequent complaint of scholars and students is that failure to have proper
management vitiates the benefits that would otherwise accrue from the known holdings of collections.

In some cases, institutions have had to rely largely on faculty to do much of the work a qualified librarian should do, especially in collection development. Unfortunately, the demands of teaching and research leave faculty little time for this, no matter how good the intentions; nor are all faculty able to do this. Another problem of some specialized research libraries is a tendency on the part of the lay leadership, or its executive arm, to usurp the authority of the institution's professional librarian and to subordinate the library to other aspects of the institution. Since, in many cases, the library is the institution's raison d'être, such a reversal of priorities does great harm, and the interference by unqualified executives or lay leaders usually has a deleterious effect on library development. Besides a qualified top person, there is a need for highly skilled support staff at various levels, including bilingual secretary-typists, bibliographic assistants, and cataloguers. Here, too, the shortage is great, and many of these positions tend to be filled by the wives of local Israeli graduate students, which makes for a relatively high turn-over.

The shortage of staff at all levels is due not only to the many skills needed, but also to the fact that there does not yet exist in the United States a program for training such staff. The graduate library school at the Hebrew University trains librarians primarily for public and school libraries in Israel. In fact, Israel has been availing itself of American-trained librarians for key positions in its academic libraries. To be sure, occasional courses in Jewish bibliography or in various aspects of Judaica librarianship have been, and are being, given at various universities and schools of library science. But there is no sustained program geared to the needs of academic Jewish librarianship.

For the top positions, career preparation in effect remains graduate (preferably doctoral) level training in Jewish studies and “on the job” training in established Judaica collections under the guidance of qualified librarians. Less intensive graduate training in Jewish studies combined with “on the job” training is suitable for beginning and middle-level positions,
although occasionally internships are available for beginners. This was the case with Harvard College Library’s internship program which, for a number of years, included an internship in Jewish librarianship. Recently, an internship was also set up as a cooperative venture between the Harvard College Library’s Hebrew Department and Brandeis University’s program in contemporary Jewish studies.

There has been much criticism of library school programs, especially of their ineffectiveness as preparation for careers in academic librarianship. Such criticism is even more valid with regard to academic Jewish librarianship. The curricula are concerned with phenomena and bibliographic techniques and knowledge that are, in most cases, only of marginal interest and usefulness for Judaic bibliography, and hardly warrant the investment of a year’s time and tuition. Nevertheless, the master’s degree in library science has virtually come to be the *sine qua non* of professionalism in librarianship, especially in municipal, college, and university libraries, and chiefly for that reason it has become a customary adjunct to preparation for a career in academic Judaic librarianship.

Training in library science, however, is no substitute for subject competence, especially in a field like Jewish studies, which demands the broadest possible knowledge of a vast subject. Indeed, individuals with a smattering of Hebrew and an elementary knowledge of Judaica frequently acquire a degree in library science and are thus certified as “professional” librarians. Such people pose a serious problem for the maintenance of personnel standards in the field, since they are frequently accepted by institutions attaching more significance to professional certification than to subject competence. The absence of any regular program of professional training has contributed to the shortage of Judaica librarians, and often to the appointment of unqualified candidates.

There has also been a tendency to equate “love of books” with bibliographic knowledge and administrative competence, which, on occasion, has resulted in the appointment as librarians of well-intentioned but incompetent individuals who have failed as teachers or rabbis. This is especially true of institutions in the Jewish community, where the image of the Jewish librarian suffers by association with the large number of nonprofessionals
functioning as librarians in synagogue and center libraries. This problem is reflected in the Association of Jewish Libraries (AJL), whose membership includes both synagogue and community center librarians, as well as academic librarians. Since a relatively high proportion of the former lack advanced training in Jewish studies or in librarianship, AJL has tended to cater to the needs of this type of subprofessional or volunteer worker. As a result, participation of academic librarians in the Association has declined from nominal activity to virtual inactivity. However, as the need for developing Judaica collections becomes more pressing and the number of teaching positions grows smaller in the shrinking academic marketplace, there will be available a larger pool of qualified talent from which future academic Jewish librarians can be selected to direct the development of these collections.

**Bibliographic Services**

The accumulation of large quantities of books and manuscripts is of limited value, unless these materials are made accessible. Judaica collections have become functional tools of scholarship through a variety of bibliographic services. Essential to access is accurate and prompt cataloguing. In Jewish studies, as in so many other fields, the single most important aid in this procedure is the Library of Congress catalogue card. Inasmuch as the Library of Congress Judaica collection acquires more Judaica than all but the handful of major collections of this kind, its catalogue cards, which are printed for distribution to other libraries, can provide the needed data for most Judaica acquired by all but the major collections and eliminate costly duplication of cataloguing effort. The wide use of this service is possible because the cataloguing of Judaica has been largely standardized by the adoption by almost all libraries of the Anglo-American cataloguing rules, as well as of the Judaica classification system employed by the Library of Congress.

Only a few years ago, a number of other classification schemes were in use, most of them based on the so-called Freidus system, originated by A.S. Freidus at the New York Public Library. While the New York Public Library still uses
Freidus, as do a number of Hebrew college libraries, others have switched to the Library of Congress system either entirely (Jewish Theological Seminary) or in part (Hebrew Union College). The only other system in use at a major collection is that of the Harvard Judaica collection, which was devised by Professor Harry A. Wolfson in 1930 and modified by the library in 1961. Certain local anomalies still exist at some institutions, among them preference for Hebrew headings in catalogues, in defiance of standard transliterated headings, perhaps a relic of the old Haskalah spirit, as well as manuals recording page after page of "local usage" differing from the Library of Congress classification scheme.

Nevertheless, a high degree of standardization has been achieved in the classification of printed Judaica. This is, of course, an absolute necessity if Judaica collections are to benefit from various centralized and automated cataloguing operations, such as the Ohio College Library Center, whose prime source of Judaica cataloguing data is Hebrew Union College, and the embryonic Research Libraries Group, whose four participating libraries—Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and New York Public—have major research collections of Judaica. The publication in book form of the card catalogues of the Harvard University Library Hebraica collection, and of the catalogues of the Hebrew Union College and New York Public libraries, has contributed to the standardization of cataloguing by providing in convenient form, as of the catalogues' dates of publication, such data for much of the Western-language Judaica and for most of the Hebraica in the majority of Judaica collections.

With the exception of certain types of materials, such as early rare books and periodicals, American library materials are available in the United States through interlibrary loan. Most transactions naturally involve smaller collections borrowing materials from the large research collections, although the larger collections also borrow from each other. Where the actual loan of materials is not feasible, there is frequent recourse to photocopying and microfilming. Interlibrary loans have been

facilitated by the existence, at the Library of Congress, of a National Union Catalogue, being issued also in book form, which records among its many millions of entries Judaica titles reported by participating libraries. In addition, the Hebraic section of the Library of Congress maintains a separate Union Catalogue of Hebraica containing Hebrew titles held by libraries all over the United States. The printed card catalogues of the Harvard University, Hebrew Union College, and New York Public Library Judaica collections have provided additional sources of information on the location of Judaica.

The publication of these catalogues in book form, and other bibliographic works, including the first volume of the catalogue of the Leo Baeck Institute, made for tremendous progress in the dissemination of bibliographic data in the United States. These catalogues, concerned primarily with printed materials, have been supplemented for manuscript and archival materials by the publication of a number of catalogues of manuscript collections; e.g., the catalogue of the American Jewish Archives; Yemenite manuscripts in the Spertus College of Judaica library; Hebrew manuscripts in the Sutro library. A union list of Hebrew manuscripts and their location, prepared by the late Aron Freimann with an index volume by Menahem Schmelzer, has recently appeared. All these provide scholars and students with information about the contents of the collections and the availability of materials.

In addition, there have appeared a number of publications indexing in detail the contents of portions of the various collections. The voluminous literature buried in the elusive scholarly Festschrift (jubilee volume) has been indexed in the Index to Jewish Festschriften, prepared by Albert Bilgray and Jacob R. Marcus (for those published before 1937), and in the Index to Festschriften in Jewish Studies, by Charles Berlin (for those published from 1937 to 1970). Much of the vast Jewish periodical literature from 1946 to 1956 was indexed in Palestine and Zionism, published by the Zionist Archives and Library,
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while, on a more modest scale, the *Index to Jewish Periodicals* now published by the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies, has been indexing a small number of English language Judaica journals since 1963. Several bibliographies of doctoral dissertations in Jewish and related studies have appeared, most recently a series published by YIVO and *American and British Doctoral Dissertations on Israel and Palestine*, by Frank J. Shulman (part of the author's forthcoming *Doctoral Dissertations in Judaica and Related Subjects, 1945-1972*), published by Xerox University Microfilms. There have also appeared in the United States numerous bibliographies of special topics: volumes, such as Ephim H. Jeshurin’s *Hundert yor moderne yidishe literatur* and Z. Szajkowski’s *Franco-Judaica*; articles in journals, such as *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* (published by Hebrew Union College) and *Jewish Book Annual* (published by the Jewish Book Council of America); and articles in collections, such as *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev* (edited by Charles Berlin)—all serving to organize available library resources into coherent and related bodies of information.

Libraries also publish accessions lists and newsletters—e.g., the American Jewish Committee, Hebrew Union College, and, more recently, YIVO and the Jewish Theological Seminary. Many others hold exhibitions and publish catalogues for the occasion, such as the Harvard College library’s catalogue of its Israel 25th anniversary exhibition, *The Jewish People and Palestine: A Bibliophilic Pilgrimage Through Five Centuries*. Such publications serve to publicize the holdings of collections to the scholarly community. Mention should also be made of a number of bibliographic publications produced in Israel, which are very useful in providing accessibility to similar materials held in American libraries. The annual *Index to Articles in*...
Jewish Studies, published by the Jewish National and University Library since 1969 (covering 1966), covers the voluminous scholarly writings in Jewish periodicals, as well as occasional relevant articles scattered throughout the vast general periodical literature.

While the definitive bibliography of printed Hebraica to be published by the Mif'al Bibliyografi in Jerusalem is still many years away, the first volume of a new catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts—those bearing dates before 1540—has been published by the joint Hebrew Palaeography Project of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes of the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; it includes such manuscripts found in American libraries. In addition, there have appeared in Israel numerous subject bibliographies which are also guides to American Jewish library resources to the extent that these libraries possess the materials listed, e.g., the joint bibliographic project of the Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and the YIVO Institute in New York, which has resulted in some dozen bibliographic indexes to the vast Holocaust literature. While today the center for Jewish bibliographic scholarship clearly is in Israel, the Judaica research collections in the United States have achieved primacy in providing technical bibliographic tools and services that have facilitated the work of Judaica librarians all over the world.

Varieties of Judaica Research Collections

Research collections of Judaica may be grouped into five categories: a) rabbinical seminary libraries; b) libraries of research institutions under Jewish auspices; c) libraries in

15 Caution must be exercised in comparing the statistical data supplied by the various libraries. Statistics of Judaica library resources reflect a variety of methods of record keeping. Whether volumes or titles are counted; whether issues or bound volumes of periodicals are counted as individual units or as a single title; whether duplicate volumes are included; these and other variables affect the total count. Also, statistics are often self-serving and are compiled with an eye to public relations. If taken at face value, they would, in some cases, yield a number in excess of the estimated total output of Judaica. Nevertheless, statistics cited are those supplied by the libraries themselves, except in a few cases, marked by an asterisk, where estimates have been made.
colleges of Jewish studies; d) public libraries; e) college and university libraries. There are also Judaica libraries that, while not research libraries, may have some materials that are useful to scholars because of a special interest in a topic (as the library of the Jewish Education Committee in New York) or historical circumstances (as the archives of the late Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver in the library of The Temple in Cleveland, his pulpit for many years). A few private collections of Judaica will also have materials of interest to scholars: e.g., Hebrew manuscripts in the collection of Manfred Lehmann or Festschriften in the collection of Leonard C. Mishkin; but few private collectors have published catalogues, an exception being the Ludwig Rosenberger collection. It should, of course, be noted that items of interest to scholars and students in Jewish studies will occasionally be found in libraries that do not have Judaica collections. Such materials are frequently listed in standard general bibliographies, e.g., Hebrew incunabula in the Stillwell census. An account of such collections more properly belongs in a detailed history of Judaica in the United States and is beyond the scope of this essay, which is concerned only with resources basic to teaching and research in Jewish studies.

RABBINICAL SEMINARIES

The establishment of rabbinical seminaries in the United States naturally brought into existence libraries catering to their needs. The libraries of the two oldest seminaries, Hebrew Union College (HUC) and Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTS), have developed into the leading collections of Judaica in the United States and are among the foremost Judaica collections in the world. The library of the Hebrew Union College consists of a large research collection located on its
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Cincinnati campus, a smaller research collection in New York City—the library of the Jewish Institute of Religion (1922-1950) until its merger with the Hebrew Union College, and smaller working collections at HUC's branch in Los Angeles and at its school in Jerusalem. Established in 1875, the HUC-JIR library, with well over 200,000* volumes, is a comprehensive collection covering all areas of Jewish history and culture. Among its special features are: manuscripts, early printed books, a Jewish music collection, Americana (American Jewish Archives and the American Jewish Periodicals Center).

The library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, established in 1887 (reorganized 1902), consists of a central research collection at its New York City campus, a smaller working collection at its West Coast branch (University of Judaism) and the Schocken Library in Jerusalem (acquired in 1961). The JTS library, with some 200,000* volumes, is a comprehensive collection representing all areas of Judaica, but with special emphasis on rabbinic literature. Special features include: manuscripts; early printed books; the Ginzberg Microfilm Memorial Library (containing microfilms of Hebrew manuscripts found elsewhere). Regrettably, a disastrous fire in 1966 destroyed much of the research collection; restoration is still in progress.

The development of these remarkable collections has been facilitated by a number of factors. To begin with, the HUC and JTS libraries came into existence at a time when books, indeed whole collections, could still be acquired. And since these seminaries for many years were virtually the sole citadels of scientific Jewish scholarship, materials gravitated towards their libraries. With the passage of time, the ranks of their alumni grew, with each alumnus a potential, often an active, ambassador of good-will for his institution and its library. Finally, the centrality of the seminary in the institutional hierarchy of Reform and Conservative Judaism facilitated, and continues to facilitate, recruitment of patrons and funds for library purposes. By the time scientific Jewish scholarship began to flourish elsewhere, the two libraries, after a century of limited competition for available materials and funds, had already attained a preeminent position on the American Jewish scene.
There are a number of other rabbinical seminary libraries, the largest of them the library of Yeshiva University's Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (established 1897), with over 100,000* volumes in many areas of Jewish studies and special strength in rabbinics. The smaller, chiefly Orthodox, rabbinical seminaries have collections of rabbinica, geared to specific institutional needs, rather than to scholarly research. Among these, the largest is that of the Hebrew Theological College in Skokie, Ill., while the newest is the small general collection of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College in Philadelphia (established 1968).

**JEWISH RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS**

Scholars working in certain areas of Jewish studies can supplement the resources available in the general collections by consulting various libraries specializing and collecting in much greater depth in a single area of Judaica—Americana, Zionism, Ashkenazi Jewry in Eastern as well as in Central Europe. The American Jewish Historical Society library, established in 1892 and located in its Lee M. Friedman Memorial Building on the campus of Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., specializes in the history and culture of the Jews of North and South America. Its collection includes some 50,000 books, as well as manuscripts and ephemera.

The American Jewish Committee's Blaustein Library, established in 1939 and located in the Committee's Institute of Human Relations Building in New York City, specializes in materials dealing with civil liberties, human rights, and intergroup understanding, as well as contemporary Jewish affairs. Its collection includes some 40,000 books and pamphlets. The Zionist Archives and Library, established in New York City in 1939 by the World Zionist Organization, specializes in the history of Zionism, the Jews of Palestine, and the State of Israel. Its collection consists of 50,000 books, as well as pamphlets, manuscripts, and photographs. The YIVO Institute for Jewish Research library, established in New York City in 1939 by the American branch of YIVO, specializes in the history and culture
of East European Jewry, the Holocaust, and Yiddish language and literature, but also has extensive holdings in many other areas of Jewish studies. Its collection includes some 200,000* volumes, as well as manuscripts, ephemera, and photographs. The Leo Baeck Institute library, established in New York City in 1954, specializes in the history and culture of the German-speaking Jewish communities of Central Europe from the 18th to the 20th centuries. Its collection consists of some 40,000 volumes and includes manuscripts. There are a number of smaller specialized collections dealing with very specific topics, such as the Bund archives (New York) of materials on the Jewish labor movement in Eastern Europe.

COLLEGES OF JEWISH STUDIES

In the three decades since Oko's report, there has developed a network of independent (i.e., non-seminary affiliated) colleges of Jewish studies. Those with substantial Judaica collections, ranging in size from 15,000 to 40,000 volumes, are Gratz College in Philadelphia (established 1895), Herzliah-Jewish Teachers Seminary in New York (established 1918), Baltimore Hebrew College (established 1919), Hebrew College in Brookline, Mass. (established 1921), and Spertus College of Judaica in Chicago (established 1925). Their holdings are primarily in the Jewish social sciences and literature. Mention should also be made of Dropsie University (formerly Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, established 1907), a post-graduate institution for Jewish and Oriental Studies in Philadelphia, with a general Judaica library of over 50,000* books and manuscripts.

In recent years, these institutions of higher Jewish learning have been developing cooperative programs with local colleges and universities, which permit cross-registration and exchange of credits. In many cases, the Jewish studies institution functions as the de facto department of Jewish studies for the cooperating school. Such programs have existed for many years at the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary. Among more recently developed programs have been those at the Hebrew College in Brookline and Spertus College of Judaica
in Chicago, on the undergraduate level; and at the Baltimore Hebrew College, the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, and the Hebrew Union College's Los Angeles school, on the graduate level.

Cooperative programs of this kind will require more extensive library resources than presently available. In the past, Jewish institutions of this type catered almost exclusively to students for whom Jewish studies were a secondary course of study pursued in the afternoon or evening, clearly of lesser importance in relation to studies pursued earlier in the day at a general "secular" college. Now that such programs are earning academic credit at a general college, students will increasingly regard them as being on a par with non-Jewish courses; they will expect a similar level of instruction, which will not be possible without adequate library resources. Virtually none of the non-Jewish partners in these cooperative programs have either faculty or library resources in Jewish studies and, understandably, they may view these arrangements as eliminating the need for developing their own resources in a time of increasing austerity in university budgeting. This places added responsibility on the Jewish institutions to develop their library resources to the point where they can support university-level instruction.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Collections of Judaica can be found in many public libraries. While some Judaica is bound to be acquired in the course of the library's regular acquisitions program, in cities with large Jewish communities (such as Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia) there is often deliberate effort to develop some kind of Judaica collection.\(^{18}\) This is especially so in libraries that, at one time, catered to a large Yiddish-reading immigrant public. Over the years these libraries have built up collections of Yiddish and other Jewish books, often in their branches in Jewish

\(^{18}\) Such interest is often reflected in the publication of special Judaica booklists, e.g., *Jewish Heritage: A Reading List for Adults*, issued by the Boston Public Library in 1966; *The American Jew, 1654-1954, A Brief Reading List Concerned with People, Places and Events Bearing the Stamp of Judaism in American Democracy*, issued by the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County in 1954.
neighborhoods. When the character of a neighborhood changed, and with it the demand for Jewish books, they were often incorporated into the library’s central collection and became the nucleus of a larger Judaica collection. Thus, when the famed West End branch of the Boston Public Library ceased to exist, its Judaica holdings were transferred to the main library, which for a time even maintained a separate Judaica department. The collections of Judaica in public libraries are geared, for the most part, to the needs of the general reader rather than the scholar or serious student.

Two public libraries, however, have developed collections of Judaica that rank among the great research collections in the field of Jewish studies: the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress. Established in 1897, the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library has amassed a comprehensive Judaica collection of some 135,000 books, manuscripts, and ephemera. Situated in the midst of the world’s largest Jewish community, with perhaps the largest concentration of individuals engaged in Jewish studies outside of Israel, the library’s Jewish Division has been a prime bibliographic reference center for generations of Jewish scholars and students.

The Library of Congress, which is not a public library in the usual sense, but really the national library, has a Judaica collection (established in 1910) of some 150,000* books, pamphlets, and manuscripts. With its array of bibliographic services, discussed earlier, the Library of Congress has played, and continues to play, a major role in the development of Jewish library resources in the United States.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In 1943 the only universities with Judaica collections of any significance were Columbia, Harvard, and Yale. These have now become major research collections and have been joined by a number of others, large and small. The Judaica collection at Harvard, a general comprehensive collection, numbers some 150,000 volumes, and includes manuscripts and ephemera. The next largest, with some 90,000 books and manuscripts, is that of the University of California at Los Angeles, begun in 1956.
Substantial collections of over 50,000 volumes are to be found at Brandeis (established 1948), Columbia, and Yale. All of them include collections of manuscripts, of which Columbia's is of special significance.

There has also been a proliferation of smaller collections suited to the more modest needs of teaching and research at colleges and universities where Jewish studies programs have recently come into existence. These collections (10,000-40,000 volumes; see Appendix I, C) are located at Albany, Berkeley, Binghamton, Brooklyn, Brown, Chicago, Cornell, Denver, Duke, Indiana, New York University, Ohio State, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Rutgers, Temple, Texas (Austin), Utah, Vanderbilt, Virginia, Wayne State, and Wisconsin (Madison). Among colleges and universities with smaller collections (more than 5,000 but less than 10,000 volumes) are Boston University, Case-Western Reserve, City College of New York, Kansas, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), Michigan, Northwestern, Oberlin, Portland State (Oregon), Smith, Stanford, University of Washington, Washington University (St. Louis), and Wisconsin (Milwaukee). Another 50 or so institutions report collections ranging from a few thousand to a few hundred volumes. (N.B.: most undergraduate programs in Jewish studies require 10,000 volumes as a minimum working collection, while graduate programs require at least twice that number.)

The development of these Judaica library resources reflects the tremendous activity in Jewish studies on the American campus in the post-World War II period. The degree of their availability at a given institution is indicative of the strength of its Jewish studies program. While it is true that some 300 colleges and universities offer such courses—and several hundred do, in fact, offer more than just a single course—the overwhelming majority of these programs have virtually no Judaica library resources behind them, or, at best, have only nominal collections of a few hundred, or a few thousand, books. The limitations this places on such courses are obvious.

More alarming is the fact that a number of institutions offering undergraduate majors or graduate programs in some field of Jewish studies have only nominal collections that can serve neither as resources for the level of instruction offered, nor as
research tools for students or faculty. Indeed, when asked to evaluate their Judaica library resources, faculty representing some 40 per cent of the schools offering graduate programs in Jewish studies characterized them as "inadequate," "weak," or "fair." Library resources in some schools, which in recent years have instituted large-scale undergraduate programs in Jewish studies, also failed to develop along with the teaching program, and were described as "inadequate" by faculty. One respondent observed that his personal library contained more Judaica than the library of the university where he was teaching. This is especially true of colleges and universities offering only a few courses in Jewish studies.

The development of adequate Judaica library resources at all institutions offering courses in Jewish studies is a matter of urgency, if students are to go beyond the classroom lecture. A bibliographic guide to Judaica, which will facilitate the development of such collections, is being planned by the Association for Jewish Studies. The volume, to be titled *Judaica for College Libraries*, will be similar in concept to *Books for College Libraries* (Voight and Treyz).

Apart from their great import for the future development of Jewish studies, Judaica collections at American universities also perform a vital service of cultural transmission as integral parts of the academic world. Through them, Jewish books are brought into close contact with students and scholars working in all fields of scholarship, and thus become a research tool for them. Conversely, as integral parts of larger bibliographic resources, university Judaica collections benefit from access to numerous services available to the university library as a whole. Especially significant here is the introduction of mechanization, including automated circulation systems for accurate control of a book's whereabouts; computerized accounting systems for fiscal control, and computer-assisted information storage and retrieval systems to produce cataloging records and bibliographic publications. Judaica collections in institutions that have introduced such automation in many areas of library operations have ready access to the new techniques. University libraries, too, often have an array of human resources, experts in various subject areas and languages, who stand ready to assist the Judaica librarian, just as he frequently assists them.
Where they are part of a large university library, Judaica collections also benefit from various projects designed to pool library resources, such as the Center for Research Libraries. This will no doubt be true of others now in the planning stage, among them the proposed Research Libraries Group, which envisages cooperation among Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and New York Public Libraries.

**Financing Jewish Library Resources**

Crucial to the continued growth of existing Jewish library resources, as well as to the development of additional resources, is adequate funding. Library book budgets that seemed adequate in the past are now totally inadequate as a result of the increasing number of Judaica items published each year, their higher cost due to inflation and the devaluation of the dollar, and greater and more sophisticated needs of students and scholars. As out-of-print and antiquarian items have become more scarce, their costs, too, have risen accordingly. Aside from scarcity, however, rare books and manuscripts have been fetching astronomical prices at auctions and at booksellers primarily because of the willingness and ability of private collectors to pay such prices. As for the very scarce qualified personnel to operate and develop Judaica collections, their services require expenditures on a par with, and in many cases above, those for teaching faculty. Judaica librarians with only a few years experience command salaries at the assistant professor level.

For established collections seeking to acquire new books as published, and to fill in gaps in holdings of earlier publications, the costs are significant. There are over 2,000 items published each year in Israel alone that are potentially of interest to Judaica collections, and over 1,000 items published elsewhere. To acquire only 1,000 items per year would require some $15,000 annually, while salaries of Judaica librarians with only limited experience range between $12,000 and $15,000. If the time and skills of the librarian are not to be wasted on clerical tasks, support staff must be provided; where bilingual or multilingual skills are required, the costs are higher. Thus even for a very small established collection, the minimal annual cost for books
and staff alone would be nearly $50,000. Naturally, the cost of operating larger units, such as the medium size and larger research collections, is considerably higher and requires expenditures in excess of $100,000.

However, to establish new collections to meet the needs of new programs requires far greater expenditures. To set up a small collection of some 10,000 volumes, covering two or three areas of Jewish studies of primary concern to a program's needs, would require an initial investment of some $60,000 to $100,000 for books only, depending on the method of acquisition. Staff requirements to do this and to make the collection accessible in reasonable time would be equally substantial.

Financial support of this bibliographic network has come from a variety of sources: private Jewish philanthropy, public funds, and organized Jewish communal philanthropy. Least recognized, perhaps, is the contribution of public funds to the support of Jewish library resources, a prime example of which was the now defunct PL-480 Program in Israel. During the ten years of the program's existence, more than $1.8 million was spent on the acquisition of Israeli publications for American libraries. Support of the Judaica collection at the Library of Congress and of its multi-faceted bibliographic services represents a continuing contribution. In recent years, federal funds have also been awarded by the National Endowment for the Humanities for projects that would strengthen Jewish library resources (e.g., to Leo Baeck Institute for completing and microfilming files of German Jewish newspapers). Funds from state governments are being provided by way of support of collections at state universities, or through grants from such agencies as the New York State Council on the Arts (e.g., to YIVO for the preparation of a catalogue of Polish Jewish photographs).

Private Jewish philanthropy in various forms is probably the single most important source of funding. In the case of collections at institutions under Jewish auspices, the library's budget consists of allocations from the institutional budget (which in turn is derived primarily from private Jewish philanthropy) and supplementary allocations in the form of gifts of money or materials from friends of the library. The generosity of the private donor to such institutions is
exemplified by the association of Sulzberger with the Jewish Theological Seminary and of Klau with Hebrew Union College.

As for Judaica collections in non-Jewish institutions, private Jewish philanthropy has been instrumental in both their establishment and continued development. Jacob Schiff’s support was crucial to the establishment of the Judaica collections at the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress. At Yale, it was George A. Kohut; at Ohio State, Samuel Melton; at the University of California-Los Angeles, Theodore Cummings; their philanthropy was in large part responsible for the establishment of substantial Judaica collections. Perhaps the largest single benefactor of Jewish library resources in America was Lee M. Friedman. Besides contributing funds for a building to house the library of the American Jewish Historical Society, Friedman bequeathed to Harvard his priceless collection of Judaica. He also provided Harvard with an endowment fund for the continued acquisition of Judaica, as well as for the first and still the only curatorial chair in Jewish bibliography in America, perhaps in the world—that of the Lee M. Friedman Bibliographer in Judaica. Such privately endowed book funds and curatorial chairs are of utmost importance in assuring the development of collections. In the case of these collections in non-Jewish universities, it should be noted, private Jewish giving has been augmented by considerable support on the part of the universities themselves from their general operating budgets and unrestricted funds.

The tremendous progress recorded in the development of Jewish library resources is a tribute, first and foremost, to the generosity of private Jewish philanthropy, university administrations, and the federal and state governments. The contribution of the organized Jewish community regrettably has not been a major factor in this development. Support from the organized Jewish community has tended to concentrate on those institutions that are part of it: the colleges of Jewish studies, which receive the bulk of their funds from Jewish federations. A number of Jewish research institutions also receive money from federations through the Joint Cultural Appeal of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture, while many college and university libraries have been the recipients of gifts of books from the Jewish Chautauqua Society.
In 1972 federations allocated approximately $350,000 to colleges and universities for formal Jewish studies programs; the estimated total university funding for such programs during the year was more than $5,000,000. University funding of Jewish studies programs includes a very substantial Judaica library component; where federations have undertaken to subsidize a position in Jewish studies, there is usually no provision, or only token provision, for library resources to support the teaching program. Even in colleges of Jewish studies, where a substantial part of the budget is provided by federations, there is often very limited support of library development. Book budgets in some of these institutions do not exceed $5,000. In one instance outside contributions to the library’s book funds made during a given year were deducted by the federation from its annual allocation to the library. In some cases, federations approved substantial expenditures for the construction or renovation of library facilities, while they resisted increases in the operating budgets.

Agenda for the Future

The network of Judaica research collections that has come into existence in the United States as a result of the labors of the last three quarters of a century has certainly exceeded the greatest expectations of its founders. When, at the dedication of the new building of the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1903, Mayer Sulzberger quite properly conceded pride of place to the famed European collections, he could not have known that some 70 years later history would dictate otherwise. Some 30 years later Professor Harry A. Wolfson, who served as honorary curator of Hebraica and Judaica at Harvard, observed that the “function of a great university library is twofold, that of a museum and that of a laboratory. In its capacity of a museum, it should harbor every book that is rare and unique. In its capacity of a laboratory, it should acquire every book that may be helpful to the scholar in his researches or the presence of

---

19 See “Federation Involvement in Formal Jewish Studies Programs at Colleges and Universities” (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, May 4, 1973); memorandum.
which may be stimulative to new researches." The events of the 20th century have made the European collections into great museums, but it is the Jewish research collections of the United States that truly exemplify the twofold function of museum and laboratory. Indeed, much has been accomplished; but the accomplishments, in turn, serve to point to an even greater potential.

In March 1969 the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) announced the establishment of the Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center, the second "area center" to be established; the first, the Center for Chinese Research Materials, was set up by ARL in 1968. The program outlined in the announcement is equally applicable to the field of Jewish studies, as we can see if we substitute "Jewish" or "Judaic" for "Slavic" in the following quotation, which could then serve as a plan for a Bibliographic and Documentation Center for Judaica:

The Center will undertake a variety of activities in order to aid scholars in the field of Jewish studies and the libraries which serve them. It will make available bibliographic and other reference tools, provide indexing and abstracting services, and identify and promote republication of important titles. All of these activities will be focused on publications printed in Hebrew and other languages, wherever published and without chronological limitations.

The need of a continuing national center devoted to the information needs of Jewish studies has resulted from the much more sophisticated demands made today on libraries by Judaic specialists and from the proliferation of Jewish study programs among many new centers of instruction and research. As a consequence, libraries are faced with a whole range of new problems in acquisitions, cataloguing, reference, bibliography and photoreproduction. Solutions to these problems are beyond the means of individual institutions because of the shortage of retrospective Judaica publications, trained personnel and funds. Simultaneously, the volume of current Judaica publications has increased tremendously. The abundance of current materials raises as many problems for libraries and scholars as the shortage of retrospective materials.

Policy guidance for the activities of the Center will be provided by an advisory committee made up of professors and librarians.

The establishment of a Bibliographic and Documentation Center for Judaica may well be the key to the further

development of Jewish library resources. The limited experience with an embryonic Judaica center—the PL-480 Book Procurement Program—has given an inkling of the great benefits a larger center could yield. It could clearly play a vital role in facilitating the identification and acquisition of current Judaica published all over the world, not only in Israel. At the same time, it could provide new, or supplement existing, centralized cataloguing services. A national program to train academic Judaica librarians might be developed, combining advanced training in Jewish studies at certain institutions with a “traveling internship” that would give training in a variety of library situations here and abroad.

Through an arrangement similar to the United States Book Exchange, a center could assemble, store, and make available duplicate materials presently scattered in dozens of libraries which, for want of time and incentive, do little to convert such duplicate materials into productive resources. At present, there is enough duplicate Judaica in the basements of Jewish research libraries to outfit perhaps a dozen substantial new collections. Perhaps a center could perform a service similar to that of the Center for Research Libraries, housing little used and/or exceedingly costly materials other libraries could borrow, rather than purchase.

A center could exercise considerable influence on the reprinting of Judaica by guiding publishers in the selection of items of the greatest priority. It would further be able to coordinate microfilming of Judaica by maintaining an up-to-date centralized file of all such microfilms, as well as to advise on priorities. The commissioning or the preparation of a variety of desperately needed bibliographic tools including, but not limited to, bibliographies, catalogues, and indexes (especially to periodical literature) is another obvious area of its activity. Of great importance would be its role of gathering and centralizing information on Jewish library resources, for there is, at present, a dearth of even bare statistical data, and these are often unreliable and inconsistent.21

On the international level, the proposed center could promote and facilitate cooperation, hitherto markedly absent, between

libraries in Israel, as well as other foreign Judaica collections, and Judaica collections in the United States. All the suggested national activities in fact have international parallels, including exchange of duplicates, training of personnel, and cooperative bibliographic projects.

The policy of a center for Judaica would be guided by librarians and scholars representing a broad spectrum of Judaica research collections and programs in Jewish studies. This would guarantee the center’s autonomy and minimize the negative effects of institutional rivalry and self-interest that have frequently inhibited interinstitutional cooperation. Direction of a bibliographic enterprise by librarians and scholars working in the academic field of that enterprise’s concern would appear to be obvious. However, given the tendency of some segments of the Jewish community to view Jewish academic affairs as an extension of Jewish communal affairs, with resultant interference in academic matters properly the province of academicians, there should be emphasis on the need to safeguard the autonomy and academic integrity of a Bibliographic and Documentation Center for Judaica.

Obviously, the establishment and maintenance of such a center will require substantial sums of money. Understandably, it will be difficult to persuade government funding agencies or the larger general philanthropic foundations to finance such a center in the “national interest.” However, it should be self-evident to the Jewish people, particularly to the American Jewish community, that it most assuredly is in their “national interest” to secure the foundations of Jewish culture. Long after the dust will have settled on a myriad of “innovative,” “creative,” and “relevant” programs and when the fads of the present become the curiosities of the future, Jewish library resources in the United States will remain the cornerstone of Jewish scholarship, which is the foundation of Jewish culture. Therefore, it is appropriate that financial support of this center should come chiefly from the American Jewish community as a contribution to the preservation and enhancement of Jewish culture. Then would the designation “People of the Book” be truly deserved.

22 The recently established Committee for Archives and Research Libraries in Jewish Studies, headquartered at the National Foundation for Jewish Culture and consisting chiefly of Jewish institutions in New York City, has encountered problems of this nature.
### Appendix I

**Major Research Collections of Judaica**

#### A. General Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Judaica Librarian</th>
<th>Catalogues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of California at Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., 90024</td>
<td>Shimeon Brisman</td>
<td>Catalogue of Hebrew Books (6 v., 1968);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue of Hebrew Books; Supplement I (3 v., 1972);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judaica (Widener Library Shelflist, no. 39, 1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript Catalog of the American Jewish Archives (4 v., 1971);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish Newspapers and Periodicals on Microfilm Available at the American Jewish Periodical Center (1957; Supplement I, 1960);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish Americana (1954);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An American Jewish Bibliography (1959);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 3101 Clifton Avenue, Cincinnati, O., 45220</td>
<td>Herbert C. Zafren</td>
<td>Reel Guides to parts of the collection microfilmed by Xerox University Microfilms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judaica is listed in the library's various printed catalogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New York Public Library, Jewish Division, Fifth Ave. and 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10018</td>
<td>Leonard S. Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Specialized Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Judaica Librarian</th>
<th>Catalogues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Leo Baeck Institute, 129 E. 73rd St., New York, N.Y. 10021</td>
<td>Fred Grubel (Institute secretary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1048 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10028</td>
<td>Dina Abramowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zionist Archives and Library, 515 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022</td>
<td>Sylvia Landress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSince the latest available directory of Jewish libraries, Josef Fraenkel’s Guide to the Jewish Libraries of the World, appeared in 1959 and therefore does not reflect the current state of Jewish library resources in the United States, it seemed advisable to append here a brief list of the major Judaica research collections, as well as of the larger Judaica collections in American college and university libraries, which may serve as reference until the publication of a new edition of the Guide.*
### C. Judaica Collections in College and University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brandeis University</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brooklyn College (of the City University of New York)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brown University</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University of Chicago</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Columbia University</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cornell University</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University of Denver</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Duke University</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Harvard University</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Indiana University</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. New York University</td>
<td>NR (20,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. State University of New York at Albany</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. State University of New York at Binghampton</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ohio State University</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Princeton University</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rutgers University</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Temple University</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. University of Texas (Austin)</td>
<td>30,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. University of Utah</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Vanderbilt University (Joint University Libraries)</td>
<td>10,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. University of Virginia</td>
<td>10,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wayne State University</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. University of Wisconsin (Madison)</td>
<td>30,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Yale University</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only collections of over 10,000 volumes. Statistics are those furnished by the libraries, except that libraries reporting statistics as "not available" (NA) or libraries not reporting (NR) have been included if estimates (from other sources) of their holdings exceed 10,000 volumes.

*Minimum estimate supplied by library.
Appendix II

Survey of Library Resources in Jewish Studies in American Colleges, Universities, and Research Institutions

A. Librarian Questionnaire

Name of institution ________________________________

Address ________________________________________

Telephone ________________________________

Name of person filling in questionnaire ________________

Title _________________________________________

Telephone ________________________________________

I. Size of collection

1. Number of volumes in library related to Jewish studies ________________

2. Of these, how many are in Hebrew? ___________ English ___________
   Other languages ___________

II. Nature of the collection

Approximately what percentage of the collection is in each of the following five areas of Jewish studies:

Jewish social sciences (incl. history) ____________

Jewish literature (all languages) _____________

Rabbinics ____________

Biblical studies ____________

Jewish philosophy and theology ____________

III. Development of the collection

1. Origin of collection:
   a. ____________Judaica acquired incidental to and within regular acquisitions program of library; no special policy.
   b. ____________Deliberate policy to acquire Judaica; began in ____________
   c. ____________Collection began with acquisition of special collection (by purchase ____________or gift ____________) in year ____________.

   Name of collection acquired ________________________________
   ____________Number of volumes ________________________________

2. Collection started before (__________) or after (__________) introduction of courses in Jewish studies.
3. Funds used to establish collection:
   University ____________
   Private ____________

4. Rate of growth:
   a. Number of books added to the collection in 1971/72 ____________
   b. Total number of books added in preceding five years ____________
   c. Anticipated growth over next three years ____________

5. Funding:
      Total library book budget _______________________________
      If no Judaica book budget, explain: _______________________________
   b. Source of funds, 1971/72:
      General library funds ____________ %
      Special funds (from non-university sources) ____________ %
      Others ____________ % explain: _______________________________
   c. Source of funds, preceding five years:
      General library funds ____________ %
      Special funds ____________ %
      Others ____________ % explain: _______________________________
   d. Projected funding, next three years:
      General library funds ____________ %
      Special funds ____________ %
      Others ____________ % explain: _______________________________

IV. Staff

1. Does the library have a specialist on staff responsible specifically for
development of Judaica collection? yes ________ no ________ IF
   NO, skip to No. 6.
   If more than one, how many? _______________________________

2. If yes, is this a full-time (__________) or part-time (__________)
   responsibility?
   If more than one, how many full-time? ________ Part-time?
   ________
3. Responsibilities of specialist(s) (check as many as are applicable):
   ______ Book selection
   ______ Cataloguing
   ______ Classification
   ______ Reference service

4. Extent of faculty responsibility for book selection:
   ______ 75-100%
   ______ 50-75%
   ______ 25-50%
   ______ 0-25%

5. Specialist chiefly responsible for collection:
   a. Name __________________________ Title __________
   b. Indicate degrees
      ______ BA Institution __________
      ______ MS in LS Institution __________
      ______ MA Institution __________ Subject __________
      ______ PhD Institution __________ Subject __________
      ______ Other
   c. Number of years in present position ______________________
   d. Language competence (check as many as applicable):
      Hebrew _______ German _______ Russian _______
      Yiddish _______ French _______ Others _______
   e. Other responsibilities at institution:
      ______ Teaching. Courses:
      ______ Administrative. Explain: ______
      ______ Other. Explain: ______________________

6. If the library has no staff member specifically responsible for the Judaica collection, who oversees its development?
   a. Does he/she have fluent knowledge of Hebrew? yes ______ no ______
   b. What percentage of his/her time does he/she spend on Judaica? _______%
2. Cataloguing system used:
   ________Anglo-American cataloguing rules (ALA/LC)
   ________Other. Explain: ________________________________

3. Use of LC cards:
   a. Used for _________% of Judaica catalogued
   b. Used for _________% of Hebraica catalogued

4. Is most of Judaica collection catalogued? yes no

5. Is most of Hebraica catalogued? yes no

6. Judaica collection:
   ________Exists as a separately defined unit within library.
   ________No separate collection; Judaica shelved as part of general collection.

VI. Acquisition of Judaica

1. Major bibliographic sources of new acquisitions (check as many as applicable):
   ________Kirjath Sepher
   ________Israel PL-480 Accessions List
   ________Various national bibliographies
   ________Trade journals (PW, LJ, etc.)
   ________Blanket-order with dealer
   ________Reviews in journals
   ________Other. Explain: ________________________________

2. Current Judaica acquired from:
   USA _________%          Israel _________%
   Europe _________%        Other _________%

3. Does the library acquire out-of-print Judaica? yes no
   If yes, what percentage is this of total Judaica acquired? _________% If yes, indicate source area:
   USA _________%          Israel _________%
   Europe _________%        Other _________%

4. What percentage of acquisitions is by gift? _________%

5. What percentage by exchange? _________%

VII. Periodicals

1. How many periodicals in Jewish studies does the library currently subscribe to? ________________________________
2. How many in Hebrew? __________
3. How many titles in Judaica periodicals collection? __________
4. How many in Hebrew? __________
5. Does library have complete or almost complete sets of:
   ______ Jewish Quarterly Review
   ______ Proceedings of American Academy for Jewish Research
   ______ Revue des Études Juives
   ______ Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
   ______ Zion
   ______ Tarbiz
6. Budget (1971/72) for periodicals if not included in amount given in III, 5a above: ____________________________

VIII. Relations with other Judaica collections
1. Interlibrary loans:
   a. Number of requests to borrow Judaica__________
   b. From whom chiefly borrowed__________
2. Indicate which of the following the library has (if any):
   ______ New York Public Library, Dictionary Catalog of the Jewish Division (1960)
   ______ Hebrew Union College, Catalogue of the Klau Library (1964)
   ______ Harvard College Library, Catalogue of Hebrew Books (1968)
   and__________Supplement I (1972)

IX. Special collections
1. Does the library have collection of manuscripts related to Jewish studies? yes__________no__________
   If yes, how many?__________Describe briefly__________________________
   Hebrew manuscripts? Yes__________No__________ If yes, how many?__________________________
2. Does the library have any other special collections of Judaica?
   ______ Micro-publications
   ______ Audio-visual materials
   ______ Ephemera
   ______ Non-book materials
   Describe briefly any special collection(s) of significance:______________________________

X. Overall evaluation
Judaica collection generally adequate for (check as applicable):
Undergraduate program__________
M.A. program
Doctoral program
Faculty research

XI. Only for participants in the Israel Public Law-480 Program
1. Indicate nature of library's participation in Israel PL-480 Program:
   ________English-language publications only
   ________Full participation

2. When did the library join the PL-480 program?

3. Indicate size of Judaica collection prior to joining program:

4. Approximate annual rate of acquisition prior to joining program:

5. Approximately how many non-PL-480 titles of Judaica have been acquired on an annual average since you have been participating in the program?

6. Approximately what percentage of PL-480 monographs are retained by your library?

7. What type(s) of PL-480 monographs are not retained?

8. Approximately what percentage of the PL-480 serial titles have been retained?

9. What type(s) of PL-480 serials are not retained?

10. How are PL-480 Hebrew acquisitions processed?

   ________Catalogued with LC cards
   ________Stored by PL-480 number without further cataloguing
   ________Other. Explain:

11. What percentage of Israeli periodicals formerly but no longer supplied by the PL-480 Program does your library subscribe to?

12. In the case of periodicals no longer being acquired, what is the library doing with back-files?

   ________Reject
   ________Retain
   ________Other. Explain
13. Principal source of supply of Israeli periodicals that the library continues to acquire:

Publishers
Dealers. Indicate

14. Please indicate any plans the library may have for the acquisition of Israeli monograph and serial publications after the expected end of the Israel PL-480 Program in June 1973.
B. Faculty Questionnaire

Name ___________________________ Date __________

Title ____________________________

University _________________________

Address __________________________

1. The library’s collection is particularly strong in the following areas of Jewish studies: ____________________________

2. It is particularly weak in the following areas: ____________________________

3. It is supplemented to a significant extent by the following libraries in this vicinity: ____________________________

4. For undergraduate work in Jewish studies, the collection is ____________

5. For graduate study leading to the M.A., the collection is ____________

6. For graduate study from the M.A. to the Ph.D., it is ____________

7. For use in my own research, I have found the collection to be ____________

8. Elsewhere in the United States or abroad I have used the following libraries for research: ____________________________

9. The collection here might be compared with others I have used in the following terms: ____________________________

Several months before his death on February 16, 1974, at the age of 91, Horace Kallen saw the publication of his latest book, *Creativity, Imagination, Logic*, and had begun to write another. In the same few months, he conducted a seminar in consumerism and cooperatives at the New School for Social Research, where he had taught since 1919 and was the last surviving member of the original faculty, which had included Charles Beard, John Dewey, and Alvin Johnson. Also in those same few months, he wrote a pamphlet, *Consumerism, Cooperatism and the Idea of the Consumer*, that was published jointly by the Rochdale Institute, of which Kallen was a founder and a trustee, and the New School; and the University Press of Virginia published his pamphlet, *Toward a Philosophy of the Seas*, in which was included his essay, “The Humanities of the Sea and the Future of Mankind,” that he had delivered in 1972 as a lecture at the University of Virginia.

These facts are cited to convey Kallen’s remarkable energy and stamina, his wide-ranging interests, his dedication to the life of the intellect and spirit, his eagerness to grapple with new problems and to test himself against new challenges. The value of a man’s life, Montaigne observed, lies not in the length of days, but in the use he makes of them. In the case of Horace Kallen, we see the fortunate conjuncture of a long and a useful life; for he lived his days with the desperate eagerness of a man destined to die young—as if he had been marked for death, like Pascal, at 39, or Spinoza, at 45. Although aware of some external marks of aging, he felt sound and youthful, and when the end came, he was in a restaurant with his wife and some friends: there was no struggle with the enemy, no pain, “no sadness of farewell,” no “lonely spasm of helpless agony”—it
was a death he passionately must have wished for, almost as if he had invited it, as Socrates had in his prison cell in Athens. A man needs to be fortunate in dying, as in living.

Horace Kallen was blessed with a strong physique, a vigor of body and mind, a presence that marked him to strangers and friends alike as a special person, as the embodiment of qualities that identified him as a man who surely was famous; as someone who must be a celebrity; as someone who had position, titles, and honors. He had what is best expressed by the Hebrew phrase, hadrat panim, the beauty of physical presence that expresses the qualities of greatness of mind and soul.

His Life

Horace Kallen was born on August 11, 1882, in Berenstadt, a town in the German province of Silesia (now Poland). His father, Jacob David, came to Germany from Latvia, had studied at a yeshivah, and could have been a hazzan, a shohet, and a mohel; he functioned as Berenstadt’s assistant rabbi. Horace Kallen remembered his father as he was years later, a man with a long white beard, glittering blue eyes, both friendly and intimidating. He was expelled from Germany as a foreigner and made his way to the United States. When Horace was about five years old, his father returned to Berenstadt to move his wife Esther Rebecca, Horace, who was the eldest child, and his two daughters to the United States, where he became rabbi of the German-speaking Orthodox congregation Hevra ha-Moriah in Boston.

Rabbi Jacob David Kallen (originally Kalonymus, the name of many medieval Jewish families, including one of the most distinguished in Germany from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries) was a scholarly man. At the time of his death in 1917, he left some manuscripts which remain unpublished. While Horace Kallen felt close to his mother (she died in 1928), he was alienated from his father, whom he remembered as a proud, demanding, domineering father and husband. For many years they were not on speaking terms (in such cases we usually have only the son’s version; it would be interesting and instructive to have also the father’s side of the story). When his father was on
his deathbed, Horace was summoned, and he remained with him for about two weeks, until he died. In that fortnight, father and son—Kallen said many years later—reached "a sort of reciprocal respect and, to some degree, understanding." In his study at home, Professor Kallen had on his wall framed photographs of both his father and his mother.

Kallen did not start to attend elementary school until he was eight or nine, when the truant officer threatened his father. The boy was taught at home by his father and also attended Hebrew schools; and to help maintain the growing family (eventually there were eight children), he sold newspapers—over the proud father's strong objections. Rabbi Kallen wanted his son to follow in his footsteps, but Horace rebelled and at times ran away from home. His memories of those dismal years—the period that saw him through heder and elementary and secondary schools—troubled him for the remainder of his life. The deathbed reconciliation with his father did not engage his heart; he did not sit shivah nor recite the kaddish for his father, and whenever he spoke of him, he found it hard not to interject a harsh word.

When he was 18, Kallen entered Harvard College and after three years, in 1903, received the B.A. degree magna cum laude. For his intellectual and spiritual development these were perhaps the most important years of his life. His interest in philosophy, however, began only shortly before he left for Harvard, when he was still living at home and discovered among his father's books a copy of Spinoza's Ethics and Tractatus Theologico-Politicus in German translations. These were quite enough to excite his youthful, eager mind. Then, as a freshman at Harvard, he took a philosophy course with Santayana and, in the following year, with William James, on whom he thereafter looked as his master.

At this time he knew, of course, that he was excluded from Christian society, and he intentionally separated himself from his Jewish background and heritage. But in his sophomore year, when he was being so strongly influenced and motivated by William James, he took a course in American literary history with Barrett Wendell, whose teaching attempted to articulate the Hebraic elements in American political and literary thought and institutions. Kallen tried to resist and reject Wendell's teaching
but, in private conferences with his argumentative student, Wendell won out, and Kallen then began consciously and conscientiously to reclaim, and to identify himself with, his Jewish inheritance, Jewish culture, and the Jewish community. It was not that he accepted from Professor Wendell what he had rejected from Rabbi Kallen. He maintained throughout his life a strong anticlerical suspicion and bias: he rejected Judaism insofar as it is a religion; his anticlericalism and agnosticism became transmuted into Jewish secularism, Jewish culture, Zionism, Hebraism, and cultural pluralism.

After graduating from Harvard, Kallen took a position at Princeton as an instructor in English. He remained there for two years (1903–1905); his contract was not renewed. It was intimated that had the administration known that he was a Jew, he would not have been appointed in the first place. It was also suggested that he was undesirable because he taught atheism. When he discussed this incident in his old age, Kallen rhetorically asked how one could teach Shelley without talking about atheism. (Later, Ludwig Lewisohn wrote in Upstream about the difficulties encountered by a Jew who wanted to teach English literature.)

Kallen returned to Harvard as a graduate student. While at Princeton, he had thought he would write his doctoral dissertation on John Marston, the 17th-century English satirist and dramatist; but when he came back to Harvard, he resumed his philosophical studies, wrote his dissertation under James’s direction on the nature of truth, and received his Ph.D. degree in 1908. For the next three years he was a lecturer at Harvard and assistant to James, Santayana, and Josiah Royce, the three philosophical giants who made Harvard preeminent and gave it a worldwide reputation. For one semester in this period Kallen was an instructor in logic at Clark. In 1907, before he completed his graduate studies, he received a Sheldon fellowship that made it possible for him to go to Europe to study with the noted pragmatist philosopher F.C.S. Schiller at Oxford, and to attend the lectures of Henri Bergson in Paris. James sent Kallen $250, insisting that these were royalties on one of his books, which he wanted Kallen to have; and Wendell wrote offering to lend him money. Before Kallen’s return, Wendell set up for him at
Harvard a course in aesthetics, which he could give that summer.

In 1911 Kallen became an instructor in philosophy and psychology at the University of Wisconsin, where he remained until 1918. He resigned from his position over issues of academic freedom: his English friend Norman Angell, author of *The Great Illusion* (1910), who later was knighted and received the Nobel Peace Prize, was denied the right to speak on the campus because of his seemingly pacifist views. The faculty also sought to win unanimous approval from its members for a statement condemning United States Senator Robert M. LaFollette for his anti-war position. Kallen felt that he differed with the faculty over fundamental questions of academic freedom; that the academic atmosphere of the campus had been seriously compromised by intolerance and politics.

But his years at Wisconsin were productive ones, for it was in those years that he published *William James and Henri Bergson: A Study in Contrasting Theories of Life* (1914), *The Structure of Lasting Peace* (1918), and *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* (1918). In that period, too, *The Nation* published his articles containing the first formulation of his philosophy of cultural pluralism (1915). And it was in those years that he became deeply involved in Zionist thought and action. Had he been judged by the test of "publish or perish!" he would have been given tenure and a professorship, and other inducements to remain. But Kallen was restless; he wanted very much to be in Boston or New York, where he could attend meetings—especially Zionist meetings—and influence men and action. Accordingly, when he received an invitation in 1919 to join Thorstein Veblen, James Harvey Robinson, and other famous scholars who comprised the original faculty of the New School for Social Research, he accepted and remained there to teach for over half a century.

But Kallen was never the typical professional or careerist philosopher. This is how he saw himself in 1935:

> Although I feel philosophy as a calling and enjoy teaching it, I have not been able to devote myself exclusively to what is euphemistically known as "scholarship" and the sheer academic life. My earliest interests were as literary as philosophical, and were soon crossed by direct participation in
political and economic movements of the land, especially those aiming at
the protection and growth of freedom, including the labor movement, the
civil liberties union and the consumers' cooperative movement. Hence I
have never attained that fullness of pedagogical withdrawal which custom
and prejudice ordain for the practice of philosophy in America. Unable to
separate my profession from my life, I have always found myself ill at ease
with the philosophy and the psychology of the schools. The first has seemed
to me for the most part a ceremonial liturgy of professionals as artificial and
detached from the realities of the daily life as bridge or chess or any other
safe but exciting game of chance, and much of the second has seemed to me
the sedulous elaboration of disregard for the living man of flesh and blood.

When he considered the philosophic disciplines in the
mid-1950s, he saw them "as heroic endeavors after a precision
denied by their own history and by the nature of things. They
are, like all their kind, sisyphean labors. . . What I deprecate
in them is a certain self-isolation, a cultivated tangency and
irrelevancy to the rest of the human enterprise."

Who were the men who influenced Kallen? In 1935 he wrote
that the "paramount influences" on the development of his
attitude, point of view, and method were William James, George
Santayana, Barrett Wendell, F.C.S. Schiller, Edwin B. Holt,
and Solomon Schechter. In later years he added John Dewey,
and at times mentioned also Justice Louis D. Brandeis and
Edward Everett Hale, famous Boston Unitarian minister,
reformer, and author. Among the pictures on the walls of his
study, first in New York and then in Oneonta, were portraits of
Jefferson, Goethe, James, Santayana, Hale, Dewey, Judge
Julian Mack, and Schechter—it was for them—and Wendell—
that he reserved a lasting pious and affectionate reverence. Only
his spirit and heart could have tied together their diverse natures
into a confraternity of intimate friends.

And only his spirit and mind could have tied together—or
orchestrated, as he liked to put it—such a multiplicity of diverse
interests as adult education, worker education, Jewish educa-
tion, general education, consumerism, the labor movement, the
cooperative movement, Zionism, art and aesthetics, censorship
and civil liberties, the philosophy of secular Judaism, the Book
of Job, the League of Nations and the United Nations, civil
rights, pragmatism, the philosophy of pluralism, the philosophy
of individualism, the nature of comedy, the State of Israel, and
the whole of Western, especially American, culture and
civilization. The institutions Kallen helped found or supported to his last day—the American Jewish Congress, the American Association for Jewish Education, the New School for Social Research, the Rochdale Institute, the Jewish Teachers Seminary-Herzliah, the Farband, and the Labor Zionist Alliance—were treasures for him, and this showed where his heart lay.

Individualism

Kallen at different times gave different names to that of which we now think as his intellectual and moral legacy. The name depended on what he wished to emphasize at the time. He called his philosophy scientific humanism, free humanism, aesthetic pragmatism, cultural pluralism, individualism, the American Idea, Hebraism; but I doubt if he was pleased with any label, for he had a deep dread of all isms, all ideologies—anything that suggested a closed body of thought, a system of neatly organized propositions. This is one reason why he could not think of himself as a professional philosopher, for, as we have seen, he could not separate his profession from his life, nor play with thought as something artificial and detached from the realities of daily life. His thoughts had to be part of an ongoing process, just as his life was. And his life had to be open to whatever it would bring from without or within, and had to be open to welcome the unforeseen and the unforeseeable. If, as the Talmud suggests, fifty gates of understanding had been created in the world, Kallen would have liked to believe that all of them were turned over to him. Given such total openness to life, experience, and truth; and given the belief that the intellect is not the only instrument of knowing, but that one can also know through joy, love, the physical senses, even through dancing and singing, how then can one have a clearly defined system of thought?

And yet Horace Kallen's work does show a configuration, a unity, that can be described and discussed. When Kallen finished his last book and came to writing its introduction, he said that, as he read the whole, he found to his surprise that the book had an "unexpected continuity." He wrote:
I do experience a unity, not the structured unity built by the logic of a systematic treatise but the unity of intermittent unification generated by the confluence, next to next, of waves of consciousness.

When one reads Kallen's major works, one finds, I would say, an even greater degree of unity. They show more than a succession of waves of consciousness. He had a certain way of looking at the world and at life. His mind kept returning to certain themes. He had his affirmations and his negations, his affinities and rejections, his loyalties and hatreds. He did not want to feel that his thought was arrested at any one point: he wanted to feel and believe that his mind was always at the frontier, at the edge of the great unknown; that strange adventures and encounters were just over the line he had reached and were there waiting for his pushing and probing, that his writing was as much exploration as it was recording. But no man can stand on tiptoe very long. Balboa discovered the Pacific only once. The greatest philosophers, e.g., Plato and Kant, had essentially one or two ideas which they spent their lifetime developing, testing, modifying, applying, explaining.

If, as Kallen has said, William James was the first democrat in metaphysics, then Horace Kallen, we may add, was the second. Both James and Kallen broke with a long philosophic tradition that can be traced back to the pre-Socratic Greeks and from them to Kant and Hegel, F.H. Bradley, and Josiah Royce. That tradition accepted as a fundamental premise a radical distinction between appearance and reality. Time, space, motion, and becoming, the world as experienced by the senses—to quote Bishop Berkeley, all the "furniture of earth—in a word, all those bodies which compose the mighty frame of the world"—were somehow not quite real and belonged to the world of appearance.

James and Kallen refused to accept the distinction between appearance and reality as aboriginal and final. To them, the distinction was secondary and functional. They looked for nature and reality, not in abstractions and logical processes but in the data of experience and the insights offered by the intelligence. They did not try to build systems, but looked for instruction in the piecemeal character of knowledge and the
plural character of reality that this knowledge disclosed and apprehended. In the place of a universe, they found a multiverse; in the place of one order, they found either no order at all or many orders, perhaps an infinity of orders, all of equal reality and value. In the place of a single whole, a single neatly organized system or Absolute, James and Kallen found variety and multitudinousness of experience. Instead of denying appearance as error or illusion, they affirmed the reality of identity and change, of continuation and mutation, of the confluence of past and future. They affirmed the reality of "real duration," of "process," of becoming, change, and novelty. They rejected rigid materialism and mechanistic explanations and accepted the possibility of chance and uniqueness, the reality of surprise and contingency.

In brief, in his metaphysics Kallen, like James, was a pluralist and a temporalist. He rejected as invidious any sharp distinction between appearance and reality. He was concerned with consequences and not with freezing essences or hypostatizing ideas or ideals. He held that percepts were basic and that concepts were secondary and derivative. There are unities as well as parts, but unities are important only as instrumental. There are relations but they are external and only associative. There are no finalities, no foregone conclusions, no certainties, no guarantees.

The metaphysical pluralism that was James's became the cultural pluralism of Kallen. Cotton Mather, Kallen wrote, came to fruition in Channing, and Jonathan Edwards came to fruition in Emerson. In the same spirit we can say that William James came to fruition in Horace Kallen. To see them in this relationship is not to detract value or dignity from either, but rather to add to the originality and worth of each.

Applying pluralism to the human scene, Kallen disavowed the state or society as the social absolute. If there are any absolutes, there are many—as many as there are individuals, for individuals are the human pluriverse. They are the primary data and the primary values, and all principalities and powers, all societies and states, all kingdoms and governments are derivative and secondary. Men stand in relation to one another, but the relations are external ones. Society or the state is not an
organic entity, but an association of men who are free to disassociate and to form new societies, new states, and new governments.

In his belief in the primacy of the individual Kallen went beyond James and John Dewey, and, in this respect, we can associate his radical thought only with Jefferson and Emerson.

No thinker since John Locke, in his Second Treatise of Civil Government, put the case of individualism in stronger terms. Kallen wrote in 1933:

As a matter of scientific fact, individuals and societies are incommensurable assemblies. Analogies from one to the other are drawn at the drawer’s own risk. No earthly society has ever been an organism. Many or few individuals have composed each, entering it, leaving it, working for it or against it, as the occasion indicated; and when need was, destroying it and organizing themselves into a new society.

States, churches, industries, families are organizations, not organisms. They are associations of men and women occurring not because they inwardly must, but because an outward condition calls for control or manipulation which individuals cannot accomplish alone. There are no social institutions which are primary, which are ends in themselves and to themselves, as individuals are ends to and in themselves.

Almost a quarter of a century later, Kallen wrote: “I believe in the primacy of the individual because I can find no other human seat than individuality for choice, for decision, for the initiation of action.” The elemental term in every union, every association is “the individual in his indefeasible singularity.” The American Idea starts with the individual; society and government, if they are to be justified, must be justified in his eyes and by his instincts; hence, all association is voluntary. Kallen stated:

Society is indeed only the name for the endlessly varying ways in which individuals associate with one another. Whatever a man’s faith and loyalty, however mean and slavish his life, narrow his aspirations and limited his choices, to himself he counts as uniquely one; to his companions, his friends, his enemies, his masters or his underlings, he may not count uniquely, but he counts still as one. In his very submissiveness and acquiescence there is a core of choice, a unique and personal rejection of the burdens of freedom, the dangers of defiance, of conflict and self-assertion, an exhibition, therefore, of individuality.

However the name and fame of Horace Kallen are identified with the idea of culture and with the philosophy of cultural pluralism, and these ideas imply the concept of group existence,
of identification of the individual with a group and its customs, laws, loyalties, and ideals. How, then, did Kallen come to connect the individual with group life and group functions?

*Cultural Pluralism*

Part of the answer to this question is to be found in Kallen's biography. As we have seen, by the time he reached Harvard at the age of eighteen, Horace Kallen's feelings towards Judaism were not only negative but hostile; he thought of Jewishness as an affliction that an enlightened person should seek to discard. But Barrett Wendell, a Christian, "converted" Kallen to Judaism. He did not return to his father or to his father's religion, but to the Jewish heritage of culture, thought, and values, to the feeling of membership in the Jewish people, to a lively sensitivity to the Jewish being and the Jewish experience. Like Heine, Kallen felt as if he had never really left Judaism and the Jewish community, and the "conversion" was only a restoration of his sight.

Before long, Kallen discovered Zionism and threw himself into Zionist work. In 1902 Solomon Schechter came to the United States to become head of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and soon thereafter young Horace Kallen came to think of him as his "revered friend and teacher." When Kallen received his B.A. degree, all the essential components of his philosophy of cultural pluralism were already parts of his intellectual, moral, and spiritual equipment. All that he needed was the formula that would instruct him on the mixing process, and this he discovered and made public in his historically important articles in *The Nation*. Years later, Kallen himself stated what had come to pass:

> the commingling of James's lectures and Wendell's [literary history] crystallized in my mind into a new outlook, the results of which were: first, discovery of the meaning of "equal" as used in the Declaration [of Independence]; second, recognition of the social role of freedom and of

---

1For a full, detailed study of Kallen as a Zionist thinker and activist, especially in the years 1914-21, see Sarah Schmidt's doctoral dissertation, *Horace M. Kallen and the Americanization of Zionism* (University of Maryland, 1973).
individual and group differences, later to be expounded at length in my own philosophy; and finally, such a reappraisal of my Jewish affiliations as required an acquiescence in my Jewish inheritance and heritage, an expanding exploration into the content and history of both, and a progressively greater participation in Jewish communal enterprises.

What was true of Jewish difference, he knew, was true as well of all other ethnic-cultural groupings, “each with its own singularity of form and utterance.”

In his first formulation of cultural pluralism, Kallen thought only of the ethnic groups to which Americans belonged, and he thought of membership in the group as something the individual could not easily shed. An association was either natural or voluntary, either a Gemeinschaft or a Gesellschaft; the ethnic group was the former, a natural community. “Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons,” wrote Kallen in 1915, “in order to cease being Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons would have to cease to be, while they could cease to be citizens or church members or carpenters or lawyers without ceasing to be.” A man, he said, cannot change his grandfather.

Later, while continuing to believe that participation in one’s ethnic group and its special, unique culture had great significance for a person’s self-identification, sense of dignity and worth, and for his full development, Kallen tended to think that, without exception, all associations were, or ought to be, voluntary; for a person has the liberty to reject the fact that he is a Jew or a Pole or an Anglo-Saxon; a man cannot change, but he can reject his grandfather, as indeed many men have done. In a free society, membership in a group is effected not by status but by contract.

From the very beginning, Kallen’s individualism was not solipsistic. No individual, he wrote, is merely an individual; the elemental term in every group or association or union of persons, he always urged, is “the individual in his indefeasible singularity.” But, he hastily added, “I know of no instance of an individual building his personal history solely by himself, from himself, on himself; feeding, so to speak, on nothing but his own flesh and spirit and growing by what he feeds on.” According to Kallen, “rugged individualism” can be viewed only as a case of extreme selfishness; when invoked as
an ideal, it is only used to defeat individuality. Inherent in individualism, as understood by Kallen, is the principle of cooperation, but cooperation that is voluntary, that does not replace the primacy of the individual with the primacy of a society based on the principle of the organic interdependence of men.

How Horace Kallen wove together the different strands of thought, with the skill and delicate hand of a master, cannot be explained; it can only be illustrated by his own writings. The following passage is typical:

Drag or push and pull, each society is, for the individuals in whose lives it lives, a patterned environment. Its formations so work as to strengthen and enlarge, or to weaken and contract, his personal singularity. . . The more of them [societies] he can join or leave, the more varied their forms and functions, the more abundant, the freer, the richer, the more civilized, is likely to be the personality which lives and moves and nourishes its being among the diverse communiions. It is the variety and range of his participation which does in fact distinguish a civilized man from an uncivilized, a man of faith and reason from an unreasoning fanatic, a democrat from a totalitarian, a man of culture from a barbarian. Such a man obviously orchestrates a growing pluralism of associations into the wholeness of his individuality.

Who among those who have known Horace Kallen can fail to see in these words a self-portrait, no less than a summary of his essential position as a temporalist, an instrumentalist, a pragmatist, a humanist, an American, a Jew, and a hundred and one other things that he was? “The hyphen,” he wrote, “unites very much more than it separates.” He was, without doubt, the most hyphenated American thinker, and so lived more abundantly, more freely, more richly, and to whomever and to whatever he was united, he gave more abundantly, more freely, more richly.

Education of Free Men

Horace Kallen shared with Locke and Jefferson the belief that all men have inherent and inalienable rights, and the right to, and capacity for, self-government. Kallen thought in terms of the primacy of the individual and his inherent and inalienable rights,
a primacy which must not be compromised by, or shared with, culture, society, state, or government. These rights, together with self-government, imply or define equality and freedom.

Kallen never tired of articulating these basic assumptions and their implications for social organization, for educational philosophy and practice, and for Jewish education and culture. He saw human rights as inherent in, or constitutive of, the nature of each human being. Therefore, they derive from his nature, and not from any document, constitution, or contract. For bills of rights are themselves derivative: they do not give, but only profess or proclaim rights inherent in individuals—rights from which no individual may be alienated without compromise of his human nature.

Given inherent and inalienable rights and the capacity for, and right to, self-government, equality and freedom are inevitable marks of man and the societies of men. The equal exercise of these rights leads to diversity among men and their societies; and what is equality, asks Kallen, if it is not the right to be different? In a democracy men are unavoidably different because each expresses his inherent nature and exercises his right to self-government according to his inherent nature. This is why mere toleration is repugnant to the democratic position. For democracy, "difference, otherness, is not the same as wrong and evil; the unlike is equally good and right as unlike and because unlike."

So, too, men are unavoidably free if each expresses his inherent nature and exercises his right to self-government. Freedom, in Kallen's philosophy, is inseparable from human nature; it is not a mere means, but an aim or end, and the uses of freedom are a means to freedom.

Is a society of self-governing, free and freedom-loving, equal and different individuals an anarchic one? Not at all. "In so far as it is a society of friends," says Kallen, "it is an orderly society." By the process of orchestration, "the unique and the diverse in being and spirit" are brought "to mutual appreciation and respect, to pleasure in one another, to cooperation with one
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2For a comprehensive treatment of Kallen's contributions to Jewish education, see the doctoral dissertation of Louis Kaplan, Judaism and Jewish Education in Horace M. Kallen's Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism (Dropsie University, 1971).
another, or at worst to agreeing to disagree.’’ The ‘‘union of the
different’’ constitutes the spirit of the society or nation, or
association of nations. ‘‘It is sustained, not by mutual
exclusions, nor by the rule of one over others, but by their
equality and by the free trade between these different equals in
every good thing the community’s life and culture produce.’’
The free exchange of thoughts and things among the different
who are equal leads to forging bonds, the hyphenation which is
‘‘a bridge from each to each and all to all.’’
The implications of this philosophy for democratic educa-
tion—education for free men—are clear enough; for, ‘‘Educa-
tion is civilization and civilization is hyphenation.’’
Not long ago, a leader of the Zionist movement spoke
disparagingly of ‘‘hyphenated Jews,’’ maintaining that in Israel
Jews can be Jews without hyphenation. The answer to him is to
be found in Kallen’s books. ‘‘A society’s existence is
strengthened,’’ says Kallen, ‘‘its life is enriched, in the degree
that its members may pass unhindered from it to any other,
making free exchange of the thoughts and things of each; in the
degree that the members are hyphenated, and the hyphen is a
bond of union, a bridge from each to each and all to all.’’
Hyphenation, or cultural pluralism, is made possible by
education; education makes possible ‘‘freedom and fellowship
of different people as different.’’ Education makes possible the
justification of self-government, ‘‘sustaining and enlarging the
equal rights of different human beings diversely to live and to
grow in liberty and happiness.’’ For the task of education is
‘‘overcoming the isolations of spirit and flesh which tradition
sustains; generating, by means of the arts and sciences of free
communication, mutuality of respect, understanding and sympa-
thy among the different cultures of our civilization; initiating
such a habit of team play with the different that every people,
every culture, every individual of every people and culture,
experiences a greater fulfillment in freedom than by struggling
on alone.’’ The education of free men makes possible ‘‘a union
of the different on equal terms,’’ which is identical with
hyphenation. Hyphenation and orchestration are thus two sides
of the same coin. Implied in these concepts are the basic
assumptions of democracy: equality and freedom, inherent and
inalienable rights of individuals, the right to and capacity for,
self-government. And the philosophy and program of liberal education imply the basic assumptions of democracy, and are implicit in these assumptions.

It is thus clear that education and democracy are interdependent. In a letter to Jarvis in 1820, Jefferson wrote: "I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform discretion by education. This is the true corrective of abuses of political power." In a letter to Yancey in 1816, Jefferson wrote: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never shall be." Freedom may be an individual's inalienable right, but the security of this right, says Kallen, lies in knowledge.

The education with which democracy is inextricably connected is obviously not to be identified with teaching that is the mere transmission of a permanent body of facts or beliefs. Its aim is rather to conserve and nourish the power to learn, "that is, to change and grow," to appraise and change the past "toward ever greater freedom and friendship of people, whatever their origins, status, faith, sex or occupation."

The belief in inherent and inalienable rights does not assume a human nature that is fixed, a mental or spiritual endowment that is beyond education. On the contrary, democracy implies that "human traits can be made." Democracy rejects "invariant" personality in favor of "changing" personality. But the individual plays a role "in his own making." The idea that one's heredity or environment is a factor external to the person leaves no room, says Kallen, "for the most intimate and the most lasting of Everyman's experiences—the experience that he is, even at his most passive, diversely up and doing, selecting, rejecting, excreting, assimilating, from among the multitudinous alternatives which present themselves for his response, those that then and there engage and enchannel his powers most livingly and variedly." Kallen agrees with Pascal that "there is nothing which he [man] may not make natural; there is nothing natural which he may not lose."

Thus even inherent and inalienable rights need protection against loss and alienation, and their protection is one of the
tasks of democratic education. It has always been to the merit of Jeffersonian believers in inherent and inalienable rights that they have not relied on the inherent and inalienable character of individual rights for their preservation. On the contrary, they have always been foremost proponents of universal and free education, of the system of checks and balances, and of written constitutions and bills of rights, and believers in the interdependence of force and freedom. Knowing that inherent rights can be lost and that inalienable rights can be alienated, Jeffersonian democrats have ever been ready to fight to win, maintain, or enlarge their liberties. Says Kallen:

Such is the free man, inwardly at least, the master of his fate, the captain of his soul, the man who has chosen his destiny, who has held fast to his difference, his individuality, and not yielded. His faith in his choice is the efficacious energy of his power not to yield. His choosing is a condition of active tension, of holding his own without any assurance that the rest of the world will cooperate, with the future open and unguaranteed.

Thus the free man takes his stand for hyphenation and seeks the orchestration of differences among equals. He will strive for orchestration even if his very life be at stake; and he will strive for the right to be different, to be hyphenated in his own fashion, and according to his own bent, even if his very life be at stake. The free man is a citizen of an open city. The defense of his city always depends on him. Every minute of his life he is existentially involved in his freedom and citizenship. Hyphenation equally guarantees war and peace; for orchestration, like freedom, is never given, but must be taken.

Inherent in hyphenation and orchestration is the commitment to seek peace, to live and let live. But the commitment to hyphenation and orchestration is challenged by the absolutist and totalitarian, all those who insist that one can live on their terms only. Anti-hyphenation is committed to aggression, to live but not to let live. Therefore, lasting peace requires education for peace: education of free men for a free world.

Professor Kallen's philosophy of education grows intimately out of his assumptions regarding the nature and political theory of man. His system of thought was carefully and adequately articulated as he struggled at various times with the central problems of psychology, aesthetics, science, religion, politics, Zionism, literature, education, and morals.
The Education of Free Jews

As far back as 1909, Kallen identified his thoughts and loyalty with Hebraism. He gave to the term "Hebraism" his own, radically different meaning, as indicated in an essay, "Hebraism and Current Tendencies in Philosophy," in which he took issue with Matthew Arnold's famous chapter on Hebraism and Hellenism in *Culture and Anarchy*. Arnold had stated that Hebraism, as he understood it, had been overemphasized, while Hellenism had been underemphasized, by the modern world. Kallen, on the other hand, maintained that Hebraism had never dominated European life to the same degree as Hellenism; that, if one reads rightly the signs of the times, the time for Hebraism had not yet come.

But what, according to Kallen, is Hebraism, and what is its antithesis, Hellenism? Hellenism is concerned not with things as they are—as Matthew Arnold claimed—but with things as they ought to be, while Hebraism is concerned with making the best of a bad job. Hellenism is concerned with perfection, and Hebraism with righteousness; and the two, again contrary to Arnold's assertion, can never be identical.

The Greeks, said Kallen, sought structure, harmony, immutable and eternal order. The Jew, on the other hand, saw the world as in flux, and events occurring according to no predetermined plan. In the Hebraic view, he held,

Sin got its punishment, virtue its rewards. But no man was immutably sinful, no divine fiat eternal and unalterable. There is room for atonement, for a readjustment and a new life. The thing is exemplified best in the greater tragedies, which portray the inexorable working of ancestral curse. Destiny is necessary. For the Hebrew, an alteration of life means an alteration of destiny. A "repentant" man means a "forgiving" God. In a word, for the Greeks, change is unreal and evil; for the Hebrews the essence of reality is change. The Greek view of reality is static and structural; the Hebrew view is dynamic and functional.

Professor Kallen's statement is predicated on much in Jewish thought, biblical and post-biblical. Of course, the Book of Jonah most readily comes to mind, for it relates that God had commanded Jonah to go to Nineveh and to proclaim there God's
judgment on its people, for, said God, "their wickedness has come before me." When, after some misadventures, Jonah finally came to Nineveh and cried out that in forty days destruction would come to the city, its king and its inhabitants, believing God and Jonah’s prophecy, proclaimed a fast and at once turned from their evil ways and injustices. God, seeing this, renounced the punishment that he had planned.

When science is viewed from the Greek point of view, said Kallen, the subject of research had to be seen as "eternal and immutable substance, as forms, genera, species, varieties, existing eternally in their Aristotelian classifications." Darwin’s theory, however, with its principles of spontaneous generation and the survival of the fit, dealt a deathblow to scientific Hellenism. The Darwinian approach is "to espouse the flux, to allow for the reality of individuals as against classes, to allow for genuine freedom and chance in the world, to insist on the concrete instance rather than on the general law—in a word," Kallen concluded, "to give an overwhelming scientific background to the Hebraic as against the Hellenic visions of the nature of reality."

Kallen found the Hebraic view of reality and the Hebraic ways of thought in Darwin and in the epistemological and ethical aspects of William James’s philosophy; he found them, too, in the metaphysical views of Henri Bergson. For Bergson, wrote Kallen, the structure of things is only an incident, "a mere instant or position through which the life of the world passes. Change and not immutability is found real; the static and not the dynamic is found to be ‘mere appearance,’ unreal." And Kallen adds: "But such a finding is the essential finding of Hebraism. In philosophic thought, it is exceedingly recent, but promises to be philosophically dominant." He concluded that, through the work of James and Bergson, the metaphysic of Hebraism opened a new era in the history of philosophy, in which Hellenism will be subordinated to Hebraism.

Although Hebraic vision was truer than the Hellenic, the Hebraic mind allowed itself to become Hellenized. It gave up its innocent and unsophisticated closeness to the flux of life for an eternal order and a static universe. When the Jews first began to think metaphysics, Kallen stated, "they immediately began to Hellenize." He wrote:
The history of their philosophy, as that of the whole Christian world, is the history of an attempt to subordinate [the Hebrew] prophets to Plato, [biblical] revelation to Aristotle. From Philo to Mendelssohn, as from St. Augustine to Hegel, the attempt has been to make the dynamic and functional character of the universe an aspect, a mere appearance of the static and structural, to explain the part by the whole, mutation by identity. . . . In philosophy at least, the nations of our modern world have stood to Hebraism in a relation which dwarfs it and to Hellenism in a relation which magnifies it. It is easily demonstrable that the gigantic reconciliation which Christian institution and thought attempted between Hellenism and Hebraism never took place, that Hebraism has never dominated European life to the degree in which Hellenism has dominated it, that the “supremacy” of Hebraism is, if one reads the signs of the times right, yet to come.

Zionism

Believing that thought is a prelude to action, Horace Kallen translated his Hebraic thought into Zionist action. In an article published in 1910, Kallen proclaimed, “I am a Zionist,” and proceeded to explain: “I look toward the concentration and renationalization of the Jews. I am committed to the persistence of a ‘Jewish separation’ that shall be national, positive, dynamic and adequate.”

As noted before, Kallen found that in metaphysics the historic content of Hebraism was the vision of reality in flux. He discovered that, in morals, the Hebraic conception centered on the value of the individual; and in the Hebraic religion, the central stress was on God as the moral arbiter who commanded a life of righteousness. But throughout history Hebraism found its sustenance and security in the life of the group, the ethnic group known as the Hebraic or Jewish people. Jews never would have survived as individuals totally separated one from the other except for a common religion known as Judaism. They were Jews, not merely Judaists. “What really destroys the Jews,” wrote Kallen in 1910, “is what ‘universalizes’ them, what empties their life of distinctive particular content and substitutes void phrases to be filled with any meaning the social and religious fashion of the day casts up. Hebraism, what ‘Israel has stood for in history,’ is the life of the Jews, their unique
achievement,—not as isolated individuals, but as a well-defined ethnic group,—in government, in industry and commerce, in social economy, in the arts, in religion, in philosophy.’’ The historic personality of the Jewish people, he wrote in 1916, is ‘‘that social and spiritual complex of group qualities and customs which constitute nationality.’’ And he added, ‘‘Today in the modern, democratic world, the integrating force which articulates nationality is Zionism.’’

In 1919 Kallen argued that democracy is antiassimilationist. Democracy ‘‘stands for the acknowledgment, the harmony and organization of group diversities in cooperative expansion of the common life, not for the assimilation of diversities into sameness. Zionism is antiassimilationist because it is democratic, because it has enough faith . . . to apply its teachings to groups as well as to individuals.’’ With Mazzini, Kallen saw democracy and nationalism joined together in the struggle against oppression, and he offered as summary of Mazzini’s teaching an adaptation of the Declaration of Independence: that all nationalities are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And, Kallen added, ‘‘this is the whole Zionist ideology.’’

It was within the context of his concern with Hebraism and Zionism that Kallen argued that, from the 18th century on, liberalism overplayed the idea of the isolated individual. It failed to see that individuality does not come with birth but is achieved, and that all men depend in their beginning on a society which is a natio before it is anything else. Genuine liberalism, he continued, requires for the group, for races, or nationalities, ‘‘the same freedom of development and expression as for the individual.’’ Indeed, ‘‘in requiring it for the individual, it must necessarily require it for them. They [that is, nations and races] are the essential reservoirs of individuality.’’

Through national freedom, the Jewish people would be in a position to render service to mankind. And this service and freedom may best come out of Palestine. Its aim to achieve the liberation of the Jewish people and the reconstitution of Palestine as their national home, made Zionism a part of the tradition and aspiration of democracy. Zionism, Kallen wrote, ‘‘conceives human society as a democratic cooperative organi-
zation of nationalities, no less than of other forms of the
associations of men in the endeavor after life, liberty and
happiness, and it claims for the Jews opportunity and security in
this type of association." For the Jew will not win his
emancipation as a human being, as an individual, unless he first
wins it as a Jew, and "the prerequisite to the liberation of the
individual is the liberation of the group to which he by birth
belongs." Accordingly, "Nationalistic Zionism demands not
only group autonomy, but complete individual liberty for the
Jew as Jew." Enlightenment has failed for the Jew because it
offered him complete individual liberty on condition that he
cease being a Jew; but "Zionism extends the principle of
enlightenment by requiring for the Jew complete individual
liberty not as an abstract human being of ambiguous nationality,
but also as a Jew. Zionism asserts the principle of freedom of
association."

While in history Jews had been disfranchised and enslaved as
a corporate entity, as a nationality, the Enlightenment and
Napoleon offered them the franchise and liberty individually,
"Jew by Jew, each as a 'natural man,' the equal of all other
'natural men,' without heredity, history, language, culture, or
social memory."

The offer stripped the Jews of all that
made them concrete human beings, of all their reality. The
Enlightenment and emancipation would remove all inferiorities,
but also all differences. "The whole process," wrote Kallen in
1921, "rests on the illusion that equality is similarity."

As one can readily see, all the essential ingredients of what
has come to be known as cultural pluralism were articulated by
Horace Kallen in his attempt to define Hebraism and Zionism.
On the published record, it would seem that he arrived at
cultural pluralism by thinking about himself as a Jew and about
the meaning and significance his Jewishness should have had for
him. But as he thought about himself, he soon found himself
thinking about the Jewish people, their literature, their history,
their place in human history, and their future. In an essay on
"Judaism, Hebraism, Zionism" published in 1910, Kallen wrote
in general terms that "culture constitutes a harmony, of
which peoples and nations are the producing instrument, to
which each contributes its unique tone, in which the whole
human past is present as an enduring tension, as a background
from which the present comes to light and draws its character, color, vitality.” Here is the analogy with the orchestra, and the harmony which was to become orchestration of the differences. But when the college student Kallen, under the influence of Barrett Wendell, turned to his Hebraic heritage, he had already been exposed to the strong influence of William James and the American tradition. “Every idea,” Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, “is an incitement.” A wise man possesses ideas; but ideas have a way of possessing a man, of pushing his mind in this or that direction. In Horace Kallen’s case, the complex ideas that lodged in his mind fell into an order—intricate, dynamic, deep—in which ideas became strange bedfellows; in which the Hebrew Prophets, William James, Barrett Wendell, Louis D. Brandeis, Theodor Herzl, Moses Hess, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Thomas Paine, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, all were on friendly speaking terms and all seemed to have a part in Kallen’s philosophy, which he called the American Idea, or cultural pluralism, or Hebraism. The name does not really matter, for the life of Kallenism, like the life of the man himself, was a self-evolving circle. In the beginning was its end, and in the end its beginning.

In Kallen’s own order of priorities, Hebraism came first. Reflecting upon his own intellectual-moral development, Kallen wrote in 1933: “It is upon the foundation and against the background of my Jewish cultural milieu that my vision of America was grown.” It is not true, as has been asserted, that Kallen saw Zionism through his vision of America. The order, by his own published testimony, was just the reverse: he saw America through his vision of Zionism. He read the Declaration of Independence against his memory of the exile, as he and his people left Egypt for the Promised Land, slavery for freedom. “In our household,” he wrote, “the suffering and slavery of Israel were commonplaces of conversation; from Passover to Passover, freedom was an ideal ceremonially reverenced, religiously aspired to. The textbook story of the Declaration of Independence came upon me, nurtured upon the deliverance from Egypt and the bondage in exile, like the clangor of trumpets, like a sudden light. What a resounding battle cry of freedom!”

From his own experience Kallen evolved his views on
education of Jews as Jews. The key to his philosophy of Jewish education was his understanding of the past, of tradition, and of its function in the life of the individual and his group. The basic idea, Goethe said, is that a tradition is not inherited as if it were a piece of property; it needs to be achieved as something for and on which one works. In the process of achieving a tradition, or a past, the person or the group changes that past, that tradition. A person or a group makes his or their past; and so the past is something that is constantly remade. And only insofar as the process of remaking takes place is the past or the tradition a living, not a dead, past or tradition. As Emerson put it in his essay on "Self-Reliance," a man lives now, and thus he "new dates" and "new creates" the whole. Thus the Bible, or Plato, or Homer has no significance, no life to a primitive man who lives in an African or Amazonian forest. They are part of my past, my tradition, only because they are part of my present life.

Kallen never tired of teaching this lesson in countless ways and forms. Explaining the meaning of tradition in Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea (1956), he wrote:

That word means, literally, a carrying on, a continuous ongoing—but a carrying on, or ongoing, as any person's life goes on, not changelessly, but as a process of changing, where the old phases both continue in the new and are altered by the new. Self-preservation, whether of an individual or a group, is this process wherein the past endures only as it lives on in the present and future, and lives on only as it is changed by them.

People say that they cannot change the past. But Kallen asked; "What else is there to change? What else is the present but the past changing?" Only what is dead does not change. "Unhappily, in our experience," wrote Kallen, "whatever stays truly always and everywhere the same stays null and dead. What exists and lives, struggles to go on doing so, and its struggle is its change. A living culture is a changing culture; and it is a changing culture . because of the transactions wherewith living, altering individuals transform old thoughts and things while laboring to preserve them and to produce new."

Kallen saw in the application of this view to the Jewish tradition a self-transcending and self-transforming principle, without which that tradition would be dead. Without the built-in self-transforming principle, the Jewish people would, indeed, be what Arnold Toynbee falsely said they were, "a fossil of Syriac
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civilization.’” Through Jewish living and education Jewish culture has survived, “as the living past growing and changing in the present, making the newness of the future.” For American Jews Kallen saw the possibility of growth and change in the interplay between Jew and non-Jew, each bringing to the union the rich cultural inheritance that the words “Jewish” and “American” suggest. As he put it in an essay written in 1955:

Such consummations are beyond the reach of the individual isolate and alone. They require a home-centered community with its traditions of language, diet, worship, feasting and fasting, play and sport, expressive and representative arts, all carrying forward communal remembrance, beliefs, works and ways. Their communication by the generations is what sustains the communion which holds the altering community together. They are what Jewish in Jewish American signifies. They thrive best when supported by a free trade with their peers of different communal cultures, assimilating and hence transfiguring what they get in exchange, and again communicating the new life-form of their changing and growing old culture to their non-Jewish neighbors, and receiving theirs in return. The social orchestration which this intercultural exchange consummates actualizes the American Idea and gives the culture of the American people the qualities that Whitman and Emerson and William James and Louis Brandeis celebrated.

Kallen said in this passage what he said over and over again, in his inimitable style, which was as personal as that of Henry James. What was that message? That the Jew is different by reason, not of his birth, but of his culture, which is the product of thousands of years of growth and development; that the Jew is not a Jew in isolation, but as a member of a communion and a fellowship which preserves, transmits, and changes Jewish tradition and culture; that the Jewish tradition and culture thrive best when they are not isolated but live in symbiotic relation with other cultures, with other traditions, in an orchestration based on the principles of the right to be different, of live and let live, live and help live. In this way, the individual Jew achieves inner peace and enjoys outer freedom, and a Jewish community constituted of such individual Jews enjoys happiness. The Jew, said Kallen,

comes best to his personal health and wholeness amid a configuration of institutions which preserve, use, and transmit the knowledge, the ways and the works whereby a Jew is a Jew, and do so in the course of an open and free inter-communication of forms of faith, vision and works with the entire miscellany of communities and enterprises orchestrating into the
American people and the American way. The orchestration liberates the Jewish person for his optimal role in our national culture. By virtue of it, his Jewishness is help and not hindrance, and his commitment to the Idea which renders America American is unrestricted and creative.

Thus to be a creative American the Jew must be a Jew; and to be a Jew, he must be creative both as a Jew and as a human being, one who has inherent and inalienable rights, who has freedom and the right to be different, and therefore the right to be a Jew: to express his human essence as a Jew, to belong to the family of man as one who belongs to the family of Jews.

It was a grand and noble vision, seen by one who saw America as the Promised Land, but saw it with the eyes of one who had first seen the Promised Land of Israel. He was an American and a citizen of the world. But first and always he was a Jew—one who had left the slavery of Egypt and entered the freedom march to which there is no end.