“Justice, Justice You Will Pursue?”
Orthodox Jewry and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1970

A Thesis Presented

By

Lora Rabin Dagi

To

The Committee on the Study of Religion

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Harvard University

March 2006
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .................................................................................................................. iii

Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 1

Participation in the Movement: Nationwide Activity and Religious Motivations ............ 9


Yeshiva University Students: The Civil Rights Movement and Other Priorities .......... 49

Conclusion ................................................................................................................................. 72

Bibliography .............................................................................................................................. 76
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Tamsin Farmer, Professor Marla Frederick, Rachel Gordan, and Professor Kevin Madigan, all of whom inspired me to develop my thesis through independent research, challenging comments, and encouraging words. I have truly enjoyed working with such great mentors.

My parents were wonderfully receptive to my brainstorming sessions, and my grandparents were fantastic hosts during my New York research excursions. Aaron, Ari, Ellie, Jess, Miki, Shai, and Sunny have proven themselves to be wonderful thesis friends. The Radcliffe Fellowships committee generously supported my research over the summer, while Yeshiva University kindly gave me access to its various archives, libraries, and alumni offices. Finally, I cannot fully express my gratitude towards all those who gave of their time to answer my e-mails, fill out my questionnaires, and speak with me in person.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my Saba, an incredible and unique grandfather whom I think of often. Like a father who, spreading honey on wooden letters, sweetens his child’s first taste of Hebrew, Saba’s joyful love of knowledge surely sweetened its essence for me.
Introduction

The history of the 20th century black American Civil Rights Movement is fairly well documented. Southern Jim Crow laws limited blacks by restricting and segregating everything from bus seating to hospital services. In Northern industrial cities such as New York and Detroit, blacks were legally liberated, but they still lived in ghetto communities with little racial integration, low professional attainment, and unsuitable housing.\(^1\) While the older and well-known National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) attempted to integrate American society through the courtroom,\(^2\) other organizations arose that were dissatisfied with the results of the NAACP’s strategy and style. For example, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), founded in 1957 by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., promoted non-violent protest.\(^3\) It was joined in the 1960s by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a “student-run organization” dedicated to community organizing in the South and surfacing from the 1960 sit-in movement.\(^4\) Meanwhile, by 1960, fifty percent of the black population lived in “urban centers” outside of the South.\(^5\) More militant messages of black freedom and nationalism began to find an audience within black communities; this

---


\(^2\) ibid, 163.


\(^4\) Dierenfield, *The Civil Rights Movement* 164.

call for Black Power took on different meanings for different groups, and its effects ranged from cultural pride to anti-white racism.  

Before being shut out by the Black Power Movement, Jewish Civil Rights Movement volunteers – especially Northerners – figured largely among white participants. Jewish students “comprised roughly two-thirds of all white freedom riders,” courageous bus-riders who specifically rode across Southern state lines in integrated buses in 1961. In addition, more than “a third of the volunteers” who registered black voters in Mississippi in 1964 were Jewish. Yet of these Jewish volunteers, Orthodox Jews are rarely mentioned. Though one author writes that Orthodox rabbis supported the 1963 March on Washington, more often than not, Orthodox is left entirely by the wayside. Debra Schultz’s Going South: Jewish Women in the Civil Rights Movement explores the motivations and experiences of Northerners, women, Jews, and whites who went down South to help the Movement, using the testaments of 15 Northern Jewish white women. Though several of these women point to Jewish influences, none is Orthodox; in addition, while particular rabbis are mentioned, not a single one is described as having an Orthodox affiliation. If one looks in The Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights, 1880’s to 1990’s, one finds a multitude of essays on Jewish involvement, with a focus on rabbinical participation, but only two discussions of Orthodox Jews. The first

---

7 Dollinger, ”'Hamans' and 'Torquemadas','” 77. Also, Dierenfield, The Civil Rights Movement 162.
8 Dollinger, ”'Hamans' and 'Torquemadas','” 77.
9 Norman H. Finkelstein, Heeding the Call: Jewish Voices in America's Civil Rights Struggle (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1997) 152. This March is famed for Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s ”I Have a Dream“ speech. Dierenfield, The Civil Rights Movement 157.
briefly notes the small number of Orthodox rabbis in the South, and attributes their lack of involvement to their limited presence. The second spans a total of two pages (out of the book’s 337), and discusses the pro-integrationist stance of one Orthodox rabbi in Durham, North Carolina. One reads that Orthodox Jews “in particular had refrained from any public association with the Civil Rights Movement” in a book on Southern Jewry, and nothing is mentioned about the Miami Orthodox community whose synagogue was bombed in *South of the South: Jewish Activists and the Civil Rights Movement in Miami, 1945-1960*. Rabbi Marc Schneier’s *Shared Dreams: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Jewish Community* references specifically Orthodox Jews in passing, highlighting their “limited interest” in participating in the Movement. The author prefaces this cursory glance at the Orthodox response by claiming that:

> The majority of those Jews who went South to help blacks or who demonstrated in their own communities or gave money to the movement were neither rabbis nor adherents of Orthodoxy. It was just the opposite. In fact: most Jews who participated in the movement were the least religious of Jews [emphasis in the original].

Perhaps because Orthodox Jewry played a smaller role in the Civil Rights Movement, its actions have not been independently considered.

Who exactly is an Orthodox Jew, in any case? The question is deceiving in its simplicity. Professor Jack Wertheimer defines Orthodoxy as “a movement that views

---

16 *ibid*, 15.
itself as the only authentic continuation of traditional Judaism;” in other words, it regards itself as the sole bearer of un tarnished tradition.\textsuperscript{17} In contrast, Conservative Judaism accepts greater modification of Jewish law in light of contemporary times, while Reform Judaism does not view this law as binding.\textsuperscript{18} One could categorize Orthodox Jews as those who believe “in the historical event of the revelation at Sinai, as described in the Torah [Jewish Bible],” accept “divine law, in its written and oral forms,” and recognize “the authority of duly qualified rabbis.”\textsuperscript{19} However, this categorization is problematic in that individual Orthodox Jews may or may not fully believe in or practice each of the dogmas listed. In addition, Orthodoxy has confronted modernity with varying degrees of assimilation and rejection.\textsuperscript{20} In the mid-1960s, some “remnants of East European” Jewish immigrants were culturally and socially Orthodox simply because it was familiar, rather than for religious reasons.\textsuperscript{21} Others affiliated with Orthodox institutions but had no commitment to Orthodox ritual practice according to \textit{halakhah}, or Jewish law. Religiously committed Orthodox individuals were difficult to separate numerically, though about four percent of American Jews kept the laws of Sabbath.\textsuperscript{22} Of the committed Orthodox, sectarian Orthodox Jews, largely recent immigrants from Europe, centered their lives on the exceedingly strict practice of religious dictates and the insulated worlds of charismatic leaders and \textit{yeshivot}, or institutions of Jewish learning.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{20} Solomon, \textit{Judaism: A Very 105-107}.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{22} ibid, 31, 34, 36.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{23} ibid, 67.
\end{flushleft}
In other words, these ultra-Orthodox Jews attempted to “recreate an idealized version of what had been destroyed” during World War II. In contrast, Modern Orthodox Jews hoped to combine religious practice with a more contemporary way of life; given their comparatively open lifestyle, it is these centrist Orthodox practitioners whom I would expect to be involved in the Civil Rights Movement.

As a self-identified Modern Orthodox Jew studying the Movement, I could not help but question the dearth of information regarding Orthodox participation in the struggle for black equality. Is it true that Orthodox individuals – particularly non-sectarian affiliates – did not volunteer in the Civil Rights Movement? Why is it that Orthodoxy did not make a lasting impression in the Movement? Was it because other priorities consumed Orthodox leadership’s energy during the time period? And exactly what time period was I examining? These questions developed into my prospectus, and their answers, culled from interviews, newspapers, archive records, and a number of books, matured into my thesis.

The Brown v. Board of Education case, resolved by the Supreme Court in 1954, seemed to be an appropriate place to begin my research. Hailed as the “pivotal civil rights case of the twentieth century,” Brown v. Board of Education destroyed the legal basis of segregated public schools, claiming that forced racial separation led to inherently disparate education. Though Southern states greeted this ruling with fury and did their best to forestall its real-life consequences, Brown v. Board of Education implied the

---

26 Finkelstein, Heeding the Call 125. Also, Dierenfield, The Civil Rights Movement 21-24, 156.
beginning of the end for Southern Jim Crow laws.\textsuperscript{27} Since one could claim that “the modern civil rights movement emerged” from the Supreme Court’s verdict,\textsuperscript{28} 1954 marks the beginning of my time period of interest. The concluding year proves difficult to define, as no one court case denotes the end of the modern Movement. Indeed, its ideology still resides in American society today. However, the rise of the Black Power Movement, its attraction to various segments of the Civil Rights Movement, and its subsequently drastic effects on black-Jewish relations prove quite interesting and illuminating. The Black Power Movement certainly changed the nature of Jewish activism,\textsuperscript{29} and thus marks a new phase of the Civil Rights Movement. Therefore, I will bring my research to a close in 1970, a year chosen because it is then that we see the full-blown consequences of the Black Power Movement.

In my thesis, I will focus as much as possible on religious Orthodox Jews who were willing to step outside the confines of their community; in other words, from this point forward, unless otherwise noted, the term “Orthodox” will refer to centrist or Modern Orthodox Jews. Because I cannot scrutinize the religious beliefs of those I interviewed, any possible incongruity between denominational label and individual must be accepted as an inevitable research condition; I accept as Orthodox those who define themselves as such and are not specifically deemed otherwise by rabbinic figures. In addition, due to the ambiguity of Orthodoxy’s definition, there will be cases in which I have relied upon published material referring to only one segment of the Orthodox Jewish population, without my knowing so. Such uncertainty, though regrettable, is another unavoidable research caveat. As is the case within Judaism in general, to be Orthodox is not to define

\textsuperscript{27} Dierenfield, *The Civil Rights Movement* 21-25.
\textsuperscript{28} Le Blanc, ed., *Black Liberation* 62.
\textsuperscript{29} Finkelstein, *Heeding the Call* 168.
oneself solely according to theology, but also in terms of culture, lifestyle, and even ethnicity; therefore, one must recognize that while Judaism provided the sources for theologically-based activism, these sources did not bind all Orthodox individuals to take part in the Movement, and could not have been the only factor behind Orthodox Civil Rights Movement activity. Although there is no such thing as one single Orthodox community, the very existence of individuals who define themselves as Orthodox, especially with regard to institutional affiliation, points to a larger whole. Thus, though its borders remain hazy, this phrase serves as a helpful tool with which to refer to the aforementioned group.

In the first chapter of my thesis, I will break down the notion of Orthodoxy’s indifference to the Civil Rights Movement through two exercises. I will begin with an examination of a number of different cases of Orthodox participation in the Civil Rights Movement. Then, in an attempt to understand the religious nature of Orthodox involvement, I will analyze some of the theological motivations which spurred these individuals to volunteer in the first place.

If one were to read the first chapter on its own, one might forget that despite Orthodoxy’s committed activists, the denomination had limited to no recognition of its accomplishments. The second chapter, then, addresses the fact that Orthodox leadership did not make a lasting impression upon historians of the Civil Rights Movement. In this chapter, I will explore a variety of other issues which may very well have necessitated the input of a massive amount of Orthodox leadership’s time and energy, to the detriment of the Civil Rights Movement. Many of these concerns, including the survival of the Orthodox denomination, the effects of massive Eastern European Orthodox immigration
to the United States, and the existence of anti-Semitism at home and abroad, promoted a
trend of introspection and inward-focused activity.

In the third chapter, I will focus upon Yeshiva University, a microcosm of the
Orthodox scene. Yeshiva University presents a wonderful combination of a college locale
and a religious environment, which allows for the juncture of Orthodoxy and a plainly
fertile volunteer setting. Through interviews and primary source materials, I have found
that the Civil Rights Movement was a topic of discussion for many, and that there were
some diligent participants. However, most Yeshiva University students focused their little
spare time on a variety of other priorities and ideologies, such as religious practice,
schoolwork and administrative changes, Israel, the Vietnam War, and anti-Semitism.

In the course of researching, I have found that most studies of the Civil Rights
Movement are motivated by the author’s interest in a particular aspect of the struggle.
Perhaps one could say the same of most academic scholarship, despite scholars’ desire to
write objectively. This thesis is no different. My motivating interest, as discussed in
greater detail in the concluding chapter, is to investigate the historical precedent left to
the Orthodox young adults of today – my generation. While we are more privileged and
more established than our parents and grandparents, some suggest that we are less active
outside of the Jewish community than they were. Thus, the legacy of participation in the
Civil Rights Movement offers a powerful paradigm of the intersection of religious values,
leadership, and, ultimately, making the world a better place. The candid and sympathetic
examination of the historical forces leading to contemporary Orthodoxy can serve not
only to augment the academic notions of Orthodoxy in the 1950s and the 1960s, but also
to enhance the Orthodox conception of its past and its future.
Participation in the Movement: Nationwide Activity and Religious Motivations

On March 21, 1965, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. led thousands of marchers from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama in a political move that would ultimately lead to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. 30 Though Rabbi Dr. Abraham Joshua Heschel’s presence at the front of the crowd has graced photographs of the event ever since, the story of Rabbi Saul Berman’s imprisonment in a Selma jailhouse just days before seems to have drawn a smaller audience. Rabbi Berman was arrested on the Jewish fast day of Ta’anit Esther, which fell that year on March 17. 31 At nightfall, when the fast ended, Rabbi Berman was not able to break his fast on prison food, for it did not meet traditional Jewish dietary restrictions; a friend rummaged through Rabbi Berman’s suitcase and brought back the salami upon which Rabbi Berman was hoping to break fast. This friend also found another cylindrical item in the suitcase – a scroll containing the text of Megillat Esther, the tale of a Jewish girl who became queen of a massive kingdom and saved her people from certain destruction. Both the salami and the Megillat Esther proved to be of great use to Rabbi Berman: having broken the fast, Rabbi Berman celebrated Purim, a holiday commemorating the story of Megillat Esther, by reading the scroll out loud to “about 250 people” crowded into the jail. 32 One can imagine the power reverberating throughout the room as a young Orthodox rabbi, far from his congregation, read an ancient narrative recounting the deeds of a Jewish queen who saved her people

32 Rabbi Saul Berman. Personal interview with the author. 7 June 2005.
from an enemy within the government – a story that could easily resonate with a group of people hoping to save blacks from their own government’s voter registration prejudices.  

Just two years before, rabbinical degree in hand, Rabbi Berman arrived in Berkeley, California ready to work at Congregation Beth Israel. For the five years he served there, Rabbi Berman worked to better the rights of blacks in Berkeley and beyond. He returned to Berkeley after the 1965 Selma-Montgomery March determined to become more engaged with local civil rights politics. Though Berkeley’s high school was integrated, its lower education public school district lines were drawn in a way that separated white and non-white students. According to Rabbi Berman, two opposing forces were at work at once: one group wished to redraw the school lines so as to integrate the lower schools, while another group hoped to create a second high school that would essentially keep students segregated. Rabbi Berman primarily toiled to integrate the schools, though the community agenda additionally dealt with issues of free speech and, ultimately, the Vietnam War.  

Rabbi Berman’s case, though not the norm for the majority of Orthodox Jews in America, is by no means unique. Rabbis and some Orthodox laymen throughout the United States of America not only endorsed the Civil Rights Movement, but also worked to end racism against blacks. This chapter will commence with an exploration of the activities of representative Orthodox participants, focusing on both the wide variety and the numerous regions of activity. Then, I will discuss the problem of Rabbi Dr. Abraham Joshua Heschel’s inclusion in the category of Orthodox participants, even though he is a paragon of religious involvement in the Civil Rights Movement. This section will lead

33 ibid.
34 Rabbi Berman worked there from 1963-1969, with one year of sabbatical. ibid.
35 ibid.
into a short examination of the disproportionate prevalence of rabbis among Orthodox volunteers. Finally, the chapter will end with an investigation of the mainly religious motives which spurred certain Orthodox activists to take part in the Civil Rights Movement.

Rabbi Berman’s colleague in New York, Rabbi Irving (Yitz) Greenberg, also contributed to the Civil Rights Movement. Along with his wife, Rabbi Greenberg first supported the Movement through donations to “various civil rights groups and voting for candidates that were sympathetic to the [Movement];” soon, the two were “attending rallies or special demonstrations” for the improvement of the status of blacks in American society.36 As a faculty member at Yeshiva University, a Modern Orthodox institution in New York City, Rabbi Greenberg took the opportunity to bring in speakers who discussed various aspects of the Civil Rights Movement. As a rabbi of the Riverdale Jewish Center, an Orthodox congregation, Rabbi Greenberg “spoke passionately” about the Movement’s necessity.37 Finally, Rabbi Greenberg involved himself in HaTza’ad HaRishon, a controversial and ultimately unsuccessful group founded for the benefit of so-called black Jews. Certain American communities of blacks were presenting themselves as Jews,38 though the Orthodox community did not accept them as such. For instance, the Commandment Keepers Congregation of the Living God, based in Harlem, NY, identified itself as a sect of Judaism, though petition for institutional acceptance.

37 ibid.
38 The term “black Jew” has its faults. There are many different types of blacks who are Jews; some are descendents of Jews or of Jewish converts, while others belong to communities that have taken Judaism in one form or another upon themselves without formal conversions. Here, I speak of the latter. Of these, many would identify themselves as Hebrews or as Israelites rather than as Jews. Thus, not all who identified as black Jews, Hebrews, or Israelites are actually Jewish according to traditional Jewish law. Jacob S. Dorman, "The Rainbow Covenant: Black Jews, Black Power, & Black-Jewish Relations," Stanford University, 1996, 1-34, 62.
failed.39 Established in 1964, HaTza’ad HaRishon, or “The First Step,” hoped “to serve the Jewish social, cultural, and educational needs of New York’s Israelites, to unify their communities, and to integrate Black Jews into…mainstream” Judaism.40 It funded and organized social gatherings, Israeli dancing, “activities with other [white] Jewish youth groups,” prayer events, financial aid and placement in Jewish schools, educational discussion-based seminars, and edifying liaisons to white Jews who would discuss the existence of black Jewish communities.41 In addition, the group provided access to Orthodox conversion resources, should its members desire to ensure their full acceptance by all parts of the Jewish community.42 Ultimately, between incredibly charged questions of Jewish legitimacy, authority, and conversion, this group collapsed.43 HaTza’ad HaRishon, though not the norm, represents both the race-blind aspect of Jewish conversion, and the fact that at least some Orthodox Jews did not view blacks through the lens of ‘absolute other.’

In New York, Rabbi Greenberg was joined by the young Tsvi Blanchard, not yet a rabbi. Rabbi Blanchard was heavily involved by the late 1950s, and continued to take part in the Movement until the year after the 1965 Selma-Montgomery March. Splitting his time between college and yeshiva (a traditional Jewish institution of learning) in St.

41 ibid, 61, 127.
43 A number of black rabbis felt that their turf had been invaded. Many black Jews did not see a need for conversion – after all, in their eyes, they were already Jewish. In addition, with the rise of Black Nationalism and Black Power, group members grew increasingly committed to remaining within and under the authority of their black communities. The difficult alignment of two loyalties – black and Jewish – ultimately ruined HaTza’ad HaRishon’s chances. Jacob Dorman’s thesis, which focuses on black Jews and HaTza’ad HaRishon, does a wonderful job of pulling the reader through the organization’s complex history, as well as the complicated and varying sources of black Judaism. I strongly encourage anyone interested in this topic to read Dorman’s work, as one paragraph cannot do it justice. Dorman, "The Rainbow Covenant," 72, 126-128.
Louis, Rabbi Blanchard worked hard in Missouri and around his home in Rochester, New York to further the Movement’s goals. In St. Louis, he “was involved in redeveloping areas of the black ghetto.” In addition, Rabbi Blanchard participated in the boycotting and picketing of Woolworth’s and Eastman Kodak. The Woolworth’s story is fairly well known: in 1960, four black students started a sit-in at a Greensboro Woolworth’s to protest segregated seating; within weeks, the “Greensboro four” had inspired sit-ins and picketings across the country. In contrast, the Eastman Kodak narrative dealt with employment issues: Rabbi Blanchard joined Saul Alinsky, community organizer extraordinaire, to challenge Rochester’s Eastman Kodak to hire more black workers. At the same time, Rabbi Blanchard involved himself in “a whole series of various and sundry picketings of racist speakers,” and supported “black self-organization efforts” such as those surrounding the Kodak protest. The Selma-Montgomery March both highlights and marks the final stage of Rabbi Blanchard’s activity in this paper’s time period: when he returned to Rochester from Selma, he spoke to the Kiwanis Club about the March and felt he helped the Club view the Civil Rights Movement in a significantly more positive light. Soon after, Rabbi Blanchard made his way to Israel in order to further his Judaic studies.

Even the South, homeland of the Jim Crow laws and their overt supporters, hosted at least two Orthodox rabbis who quietly worked to promote the message of the Civil Rights Movement. One rabbi from Atlanta chooses to remain anonymous, but writes that he

---

44 Rabbi Tsvi Blanchard. Personal interview with the author. 6 June 2005.
47 Blanchard.
48 ibid.
participated casually throughout the time period; for instance, he would occasionally deliver sermons supportive of the Movement. At times he would host observant Jewish activists who had recently been released from jails in Atlanta, Birmingham, Montgomery and elsewhere. Finally, this rabbi took part in “informal discussion groups” on the matter. Another Southern rabbi, Rabbi Louis Tuchman of Durham, North Carolina, followed a similar pattern. Though his congregation hired him specifically because he was not a Civil Rights activist, Rabbi Tuchman was preaching pro-integration by 1957. He specifically incorporated the themes of freedom during the Jewish Purim and Hannukah holidays, relating the holidays to the black quest for full integration. Unfortunately for Rabbi Tuchman, that same year his congregation moved to the suburbs and to Conservative Judaism.

Rabbi Tuchman and his anonymous colleague in Atlanta deserve special recognition for their work. According to Mark Bauman, fewer than forty Orthodox rabbis served congregations in the South in 1954. The states of “Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Mississippi…claimed a total of three Orthodox rabbis,” and no Orthodox rabbis served Florida communities apart from those in Miami and Miami Beach. Bauman posits that the “limited” involvement of Orthodox rabbis in the South corresponds to the small number of Orthodox rabbis actually present. This theory relies upon only one incidence of Orthodox involvement noted in his book’s collection; however, one cannot ignore the fact that some forms of informal involvement may prove quite difficult to trace. For instance, more than one or two Orthodox rabbis may have

---

50 ibid.
53 ibid.
presented this controversial topic to their congregants through holiday sermons. Since participation in the Civil Rights Movement can include actions outside of a certain model of 1960s volunteering, the judgment of ‘limited’ involvement may be based upon somewhat incomplete evidence.

Rabbis Berman, Greenberg, Blanchard, and Tuchman, in addition to the anonymous rabbi, were not alone in their attempts to promote or support the efforts of the Civil Rights Movement. Around the United States, formally and informally, rabbis, future rabbis, and laymen joined the cause. Some, such as Chicago’s Rabbi Ahron Soloveichik, were better known; this leading Orthodox scholar passionately discussed the basis for equality in halakhah in the keynote address at a national convention for Orthodox affiliate Young Israel. Others participated during their college years: Glenn Richter volunteered in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) office during the summer of 1963, and was a member of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in Queens College, New York. During his summer vacations in California in his pre-rabbinic years, Rabbi Charles Sheer joined SNCC “social service projects” such as clothing drives.

While the rabbis mentioned above certainly deserve recognition, if there were an Orthodox rabbi known to the public, it would have to be Rabbi Dr. Abraham Joshua

---

54 One’s participation is often framed by the undercurrent of the classic participant mold (Freedom Rider, Voter Registration Volunteer, and so forth); while this notion is helpful in identifying some participants, it also excludes others who helped in quieter ways through financial donations or directed conversations.
56 Glenn Richter. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Civil Rights Interview." Personal e-mail. 26 July 2005.
57 Rabbi Charles Sheer. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Thesis Research Questions." Personal e-mail. 21 August 2005.
Heschel. Heralded as “the best-known rabbi in the civil rights movement,” Rabbi Dr. Heschel felt personally responsible to the black quest for justice.\textsuperscript{58} His prophetic appearance mirrored his theologically driven motivation, which heavily relied upon a vision of the Biblical prophets as the voice of society’s marginalized. Close to Reverend Dr. King, Jr., clearly visible at many Civil Rights events, and inspiring to his like-minded colleagues, Rabbi Dr. Heschel determinedly devoted himself to the cause.\textsuperscript{59} Indeed, Rabbi Dr. Heschel is a prime example of a religious participant in the Civil Rights Movement; his status as an Orthodox participant, though, is more complex.

Although Rabbi Dr. Heschel practiced traditional Judaism, he was not necessarily accepted by Orthodox communities as one of their own. Many in the Orthodox community greatly admired Rabbi Dr. Heschel for “his contributions to Jewish thought, made both on the popular level . . . and on an intellectual level,” for “his personal spiritual charisma and commitment,” and for his Civil Rights work.\textsuperscript{60} In fact, Rabbi Meyer Strassfeld of Boston, an energetic participant in the Movement,\textsuperscript{61} “attended his

\textsuperscript{58} Finkelstein, Heeding the Call 150.
\textsuperscript{59} ibid, 147-150, 162, 166.
\textsuperscript{60} Rabbi Robert Klapper. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Civil Rights Movement." Personal e-mail. 21 December 2004.
\textsuperscript{61} In Massachusetts, Rabbi Meyer Strassfeld utilized his position to bring leaders of the Civil Rights Movement to his community. In this way, the rabbi of Agudas Israel fostered a strong relationship between himself and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Several days after having Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s advisor over for a Passover sedar (a festive meal), Rabbi Strassfeld had Reverend Dr. King deliver a Passover sermon to his Orthodox congregation. The sermons and classes that Rabbi Strassfeld gave "exposed" his congregation to the fight. Like Rabbis Berman, Greenberg, and Blanchard, Rabbi Strassfeld took part in the Selma-Montgomery March in order to lobby for equal voting rights for blacks. He traveled to Selma with a group of Boston rabbis of all denominations (including one other Orthodox rabbi), choosing to work together to attempt to end discrimination. Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Jews of Boston in Historical Perspective," The Jews of Boston: Essays on the Occasion of the Centenary (1895-1995) of the Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna and Ellen Smith (Boston: The Combined Jewish Philanthropies, Inc., 1995) 108. Also, Rabbi Meyer J. Strassfeld. Letter to the author. 14 December 2004. Finally, Rabbi Murray I. Rothman, "Montgomery March -- a New Exodus," The Jewish Advocate April 1 1965.
lectures in Boston” and the Jewish Theological Seminary, and calls Rabbi Dr. Heschel “a true representative of Torah and Judaism in the fullest.”

Yet Rabbi Dr. Heschel cannot be included in this section on Orthodoxy without some qualification. At the time of the Civil Rights Movement, Rabbi Dr. Heschel was teaching in the Conservative Jewish Theological Seminary; thus, while he may have practiced Orthodoxy in his personal life, his “institutional loyalty” placed him in the Conservative camp. As Rabbi Blanchard recalls, Rabbi Dr. Heschel was “seen as a representative” of Conservative Judaism, for “he lived in the [Jewish Theological] Seminary, [and prayed] in the Seminary;” though people “saw him as observant,” his institutional affiliation separated him from “the Orthodox movement.” In a similar vein, Yeshiva University’s Rabbi Yosef Blau writes in an e-mail that his “impression was that the majority of rabbis who participated [in the Civil Rights Movement] were not Orthodox, with the late Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel from the Jewish Theological [Seminary] the most prominent.” Here, Rabbi Blau places Rabbi Dr. Heschel within a group of non-Orthodox rabbis. In a final example of the issue’s complexity, and, ultimately, its irresolvable contradictions, while one interviewee claims that “Orthodox Jews in Berkeley, California, certainly considered Rabbi A. J. Heschel to be Orthodox at the time of his death in 1972,” Rabbi Berman asserts that his Orthodox Berkeley community “unfortunately saw [Rabbi Dr.

62 Strassfeld.
63 Since the demarcation between liberal Orthodoxy and right-wing Conservative was "very thin," "institutional loyalty" proved important. Liebman, "Orthodoxy in American," 45.
64 Blanchard.
65 Rabbi Yosef Blau. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Orthodox Theology and the Civil Rights Movement." Personal e-mail. 8 November 2004.
66 Rabbi Klapper, former rabbinic advisor to Harvard Hillel’s Orthodox community, writes that although Rabbi Dr. Heschel clearly practiced in an Orthodox manner, "from a sociological perspective… [he] was not part of the Orthodox community;” again, Rabbi Dr. Heschel is caught between his observances and his professional community in a way that does not comfortably allow for his inclusion. Klapper. "Re: Civil Rights Movement."
67 Mike Gerver. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Civil Rights Movement." Personal e-mail. 25 January 2005.
Heschel] as a faculty member at the Jewish Theological Seminary and therefore as belonging to the Conservative movement.” Yet the first Berkeley interviewee acknowledges that he could “well imagine” Heschel was not as accepted among Orthodox Jews in New York, while Rabbi Berman points out that a number of rabbis “saw [Rabbi Dr. Heschel] very differently,” and found great meaning in his way of thinking as it applied to Orthodoxy. In conclusion, one might have to agree with Rabbi Berman that “labels don’t quite work for someone of [Rabbi Dr. Heschel’s] stature;” whether or not Heschel represented Orthodox or Conservative Jewry, his place in the religious Jewish world will forever be bound with his work in the Civil Rights Movement.

Like their super-denominational colleague Rabbi Dr. Heschel, rabbis seem to have comprised the majority of Orthodox individuals involved in the Civil Rights Movement. In some cases, such as those of Rabbi Blanchard and Rabbi Sheer, participants were too young to be rabbis at the time, but they eventually received their rabbinical certificates. This trend seems to contradict the viewpoint of the leadership of the Union of Orthodox Congregations, who refused to financially aid Rabbi Strassfeld in his travels to Selma; these Union representatives “reasoned that a rabbi’s place was with his congregation,”

---

68 Berman.
69 Gerver. "Re: Civil Rights Movement."
70 Berman.
71 ibid.
72 As will be discussed in the second chapter, Orthodoxy in this era was both defending itself from the popularity of the Conservative movement, and slowly turning to the right. It is possible that from the vantage point of someone in the Orthodox scene today, Rabbi Dr. Heschel would not fit any of the Orthodox molds, even if he may have fit into the Orthodox scene of his time. Perhaps the path of Orthodox American history has prevented the incorporation of Rabbi Dr. Heschel’s legacy, and thus his identity as an Orthodox participant in the Civil Rights Movement has been challenged more than it would have been at the time.
and did not comprehend the connection between Rabbi Strassfeld’s rabbinical position and his support of the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{73}

However, it appears that rabbinical leadership did not entirely reject a role within the Civil Rights debate. By 1964, supposedly motivated by competition for “allegiance of the young” liberals flocking to Conservative and Reform denominations, the Rabbinical Council of America publicly declared its support for the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{74} Young Israel, another Orthodox group, had already backed the Movement in a 1962 editorial.\textsuperscript{75} The Orthodox Union, in turn, preceded Young Israel by agreeing with a “strongly liberal” plan for “civil rights and civil liberties” in the 1950s, and it continued to support the “civil rights gains of blacks” throughout the 1960s.\textsuperscript{76}

Why is it, then, that a greater percentage of Orthodox rabbis seem to have participated in the Movement, when compared to the percentage of their laymen? Perhaps the role of the rabbi in his community (or of a leader in any religious community) can offer one incomplete solution to this query. A rabbi has a bully pulpit; thus, rabbis could participate through speechwriting and speech delivery. A rabbi has the context within which to reach out to other community leaders, for they are, in a sense, his colleagues; therefore, rabbis could have better access to other leaders already polarized for or against the Civil Rights Movement, and could base their actions upon those of their colleagues. Finally, a rabbi represents and serves his community; hence rabbis could act in the name of their congregants. If, as the anonymous Atlanta rabbi writes, Southern “Jewish involvement [in the Civil Rights Movement] was limited to rabbis and to certain communal Jewish
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organizations,” one can imagine that those laymen who were supportive of the Movement relied upon their representative rabbis and/or communal institutions to participate in their place. For example, one interviewee from the Northeast writes that many Orthodox rabbis involved themselves in the Civil Rights Movement, while most Orthodox laymen, though supportive of the cause, stood to the side and often contributed monetarily. Rabbi Berman recalls that his congregation was on the whole “oriented very positively toward Civil Rights issues,” and backed his decision to go Selma during Purim. In fact, Rabbi Berman asserts that the congregation felt it was supporting the March vicariously through his presence.

Yet one cannot claim that all Orthodox laymen were supportive of their rabbis’ efforts in the Civil Rights Movement. Though Rabbi Strassfeld maintains that his Boston congregation supported him with “understanding,” and was “proud that their Rabbi [had] devoted” himself to the cause, an academic study of the decline of Jewish communities in certain Boston areas notes that Rabbi Strassfeld was “ritually in sync with the synagogue’s families but politically at odds with them;” his involvement in the Civil Rights Movement instigated a great deal of tension between himself and his community. Meanwhile, Rabbi Yakov Pollak’s New York congregation criticized his work on the implementation of the Princeton Plan, a busing proposal for black children from ghetto areas. Though Rabbi Pollak’s laymen respected his ethically-driven work, they felt their rabbi should focus his energy on issues within the Jewish sphere. The
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competing needs of the Orthodox community will be fleshed out in great detail in the second chapter. His congregation was not alone in their hesitation; some of Rabbi Pollak’s colleagues also questioned his work.\textsuperscript{83} These colleagues and congregants serve as a reminder that, while this chapter presents a rather rosy view of Orthodox involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, the majority of Orthodoxy did not necessarily participate in the Movement.

In addition to refuting the idea that there was no Orthodox participation in the Civil Rights Movement, this chapter gives voice to those who did participate, and addresses some of the challenges they faced. Considering the role Judaism played in these Orthodox participants’ lives – especially among the rabbis, for whom Judaism formed the basis of their career – the fact that many of these volunteers seem to have been religiously motivated to take part in the Movement is not surprising. Their religious inspirations stemmed from many sources, but fall into roughly two major categories: the first emphasizes the equality of mankind, and the second stresses the need to create a just society.

In a speech to a Boston Rotary, Rabbi Strassfeld underscores the Rabbinic notion that the first man according to the Jewish Bible, Adam, was purposefully created utilizing “dust…from the 4 corners of the earth, so that no nation could claim superiority over the other;” in other words, God created Adam with materials from around the world, so that no nation or race could say that they better mirrored Adam and thus were a better race, or were more beloved by God.\textsuperscript{84} Rabbi Strassfeld expounds upon this theme in a different

\textsuperscript{83} Rabbi Yakov Pollak. Phone interview with the author. 1 December 2004.
speech, in which he writes that since man was created in God’s image, all men should be treated with equal “dignity” and “with the honor due to a likeness representing” God. As proof for the fact that the Torah, or Jewish Bible, does not distinguish between people of different colors, Rabbi Strassfeld recalls that the command to shed the blood of he who shed another man’s blood does not differentiate between different types of men. Nor is it established anywhere in the Torah “that G-d created different kinds of men,” though the Torah does point to diverse sorts of animals. If anything, not only is all of man traceable to Adam, but all the nations listed in the Torah also trace back to Noah and his family, the only people left on earth after God’s destructive flood.

In addition, Rabbi Strassfeld points to the Biblical injunction to love one’s neighbor as oneself: though the command suffers from “physiological relativity,” for one might not treat one’s own self well, if the verse motivates someone to better the life of one’s (black) neighbor, one ought to proceed and act according to the verse. Rabbi Strassfeld adds to this theology in his second manuscript by citing Rabbi Dr. Heschel’s concept of humiliation: since one cannot humiliate a person in public without suffering a terrible punishment (for example, denial of a place in the world to come), and since “by silence we [anyone who has not shown their support of the Civil Rights Movement] have become accessories to this humiliation of our brethren,” those who remain silent on the issue will theoretically be forced to suffer the consequences.
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Rabbi Ahron Soloveichik, among others, joins Rabbi Strassfeld in this argument for equality. Though the speech which Rabbi Soloveichik gave at the Young Israel conference is not available to the author, one of Rabbi Soloveichik’s articles entitled *Civil Rights and the Dignity of Man* deals specifically with the matter of race and color. It is possible to derive at least some of Rabbi Soloveichik’s religious motivations from this article. There, he fiercely writes that “from the standpoint of the Torah…any discrimination shown to a human being on account of the color of his or her skin constitutes loathsome barbarity;” the *Torah* itself does not differentiate between a black and a white person. Indeed, all people, “regardless of religion, race, origin or creed [are] endowed with Divine dignity,” for all are created in God’s image; thus, every person deserves “to be treated with equal respect.”

In addition to being motivated by the equality of man inherent throughout the *Torah*, many Orthodox participants were motivated by their sense of justice. Here, too, their motivation derived from Biblical injunctions. Both George Farkas and Rabbi Soloveichik point directly to Deuteronomy 16:20, which reads, “justice, justice you will pursue.” For Farkas, this command relates to the Biblical vision of the Jewish people as a “holy nation;” through his activity in the Civil Rights Movement, he could “bring people closer to Torah:” in other words, Farkas could demonstrate to others the Torah’s beauty and righteousness. Farkas also looked to both Jewish and non-Jewish role models of

---

95 Soloveichik, *Logic of the Heart* 62.
96 Please see Exodus 19:6
97 George Farkas. Please ask author for e-mail address. "Re: Fwd: [or-Minyan-Misc] Civil Rights Movement." Personal e-mail. 16 November 2004.
righteousness, with the Biblical story of Noah paving the way. Noah, a non-Jew, was the only person whose family was saved during God’s destruction of the world; thus, Farkas felt comfortable following in the footsteps of Mahatma Gandhi and the Reverend Dr. King, Jr. ⁹⁸

Like Farkas, Rabbi Soloveichik examines the phrase “justice, justice you will pursue.” However, in this case, Rabbi Soloveichik derives meaning from the doubling of “justice.” Referencing another commentary, he claims that by repeating “justice,” “the Torah intimates how the same standard of justice and righteousness that is applied toward our Jewish brothers is also to be applied toward all Gentiles.” ⁹⁹ The doubling reinforces the concept of justice as a value to be applied universally. Rabbi Soloveichik continues by exploring the various ways in which the Torah applies the same degree of finesse towards property laws concerning Jews and non-Jews. ¹⁰⁰ Finally, he concludes by demonstrating the ways in which Moses embodied the value of justice and employed it equally in cases involving two Jews, two non-Jews, and a Jew and a non-Jew. Clearly, justice is a principle which must be applied to the world outside of the Jewish community. ¹⁰¹

Others agreed with the religious value of justice, without necessarily defining the concept in such exact terms. For instance, Rabbi Blanchard feels he acted in accordance “with [his] religious values…centered around justice and certain notions of fairness and equality.” ¹⁰² Though he does not reference specific verses, Rabbi Blanchard maintains that he was motivated by a religious sense of the principle. He is joined by Richter, who,
in addition to pointing to his parents as a source of notions of “fairness,” stresses that he was motivated by “emerging religious beliefs of right and wrong and [the] need to take a stand” against injustice.\textsuperscript{103}

Although overwhelmingly religious notions of justice and equality seem to have driven the interviewees, individual motivations were of course highly personalized. Some, like Richter, feel that their parents’ values influenced their actions a great deal. Rabbi Sheer invokes his parents’ “strong social consciousness” while also claiming that while “religious ideas” did contribute to his decision to be active in the Civil Rights Movement, he “would have done what [he] did in any case, even if [he] had not been Orthodox at the time.”\textsuperscript{104} It seems, then, that his parents contributed much more to his involvement than his Orthodoxy did – though of course, religious ideas are not at all the exclusive domain of the Orthodox. For instance, Rabbi Greenberg and his wife “felt highly sympathetic to the demand for equality and justice” especially because “figures like Martin Luther King invoked…models such as Exodus” to frame their notion of the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{105} The Biblical Exodus story recalls the Israelites’ journey from slavery to freedom with Moses as their leader; similarly, religious blacks hoped to follow a journey from their slave past to complete freedom within the American system. In other words, the couple was drawn into the Movement in part because of the Movement’s profound religious underpinnings, particularly in the South.\textsuperscript{106}
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Still other motives, though linked to religion, were more political in nature. The anonymous Atlanta rabbi felt that Jews could not “expect to fight discrimination [against] themselves if they [were] silent about the discrimination” of other minorities.\textsuperscript{107} For him, participation in the Movement was crucial in the fight against Jewish discrimination. In the previously explored speech to a Boston Rotary in 1966, Rabbi Strassfeld declares that the Civil Rights “battle” deals with “the very soul of democracy, the very promise of our Founding Fathers” that “all men are created equal with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.”\textsuperscript{108} Rabbi Strassfeld’s insertion of these core democratic values into a principally theological speech suggests that he may have associated the political values of democracy with the religious values of equality and justice. It also points to Judaism’s triplet existence as a religion, a culture, and a nation. Since the theological aspects of Judaism are so completely intertwined with Orthodox family life, cultural life, and political life, the gap between theological and political motivations may serve better as a helpful analytical tool, rather than as a strict division between political and religious life.

To comprehend better the ways in which each of these motives intersect, one can examine Rabbi Berman’s reasons for participating in the Civil Rights Movement. Rabbi Berman subscribes to a philosophy of mitzvot, or religious injunctions, in which each mitzvah (singular) “has one of three purposes;” they “instruct us in truth, or…perfect some inner human quality, or…produce justice in society.”\textsuperscript{109} In other words, every mitzvah serves as a lesson, as a measure to perfect the individual, or as a way to better society as a whole. For Rabbi Berman, the Movement “fulfilled all three of those
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purposes:” it taught that every human is inherently equal, it helped develop the qualities of compassion and thankfulness, and it served as a chance to perfect “the character of justice” in society as a whole.\textsuperscript{110} Thus, Rabbi Berman applied principles of religious commandments to the Civil Rights Movement, and in doing so specifically stepped outside of his own Jewish community and into the realm of politics in the Berkeley area.

This chapter commenced with Rabbi Berman’s lesser-known story of reading \textit{Megillat Esther} in a Selma jailhouse, and ends with the theology underlying his religious excursion into the world of the Civil Rights Movement. In-between the two points, I explored the varied forms of Orthodox participation throughout the United States, the difficult question of Rabbi Dr. Heschel’s position within this thesis, the role of Orthodox rabbis as representatives of their congregations within the Movement or as maverick actors, and finally, the deeply religious theology motivating certain Orthodox participants. Though Orthodoxy clearly did not play as large a role in the Civil Rights Movement as did other denominations, one would be hard pressed to claim that Orthodox individuals – whether picketing, marching, or donating funds – played no role at all.
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Orthodox Leadership (1954-1970): A Trend towards Introspection

Having responded in the first chapter to the dearth of information regarding Orthodox participation in the Civil Rights Movement, I could continue with an exploration of student responses to the Movement at Yeshiva University, a microcosm of the Orthodox scene. However, to do so would be to ignore questions as pressing and as pertinent as that of whether Orthodox individuals volunteered in the first place: why is it that Orthodoxy as a denomination did not respond to the call for black equality with as much force as did other Jewish denominations? What other priorities captured the energies of Orthodox leadership? Before describing the involvement of a student subset of Orthodox Jewry, I will investigate Orthodoxy’s main concerns between 1954 and 1970. Indeed, while marginalized blacks were struggling to overcome a prejudicial American society, Orthodoxy was fighting its own battle against marginalization within American Judaism. In this chapter, I will discuss Orthodoxy’s fight for life, as well as its parallel turn to protective insularity and trend towards the religious right. In addition, I will delineate some of Orthodoxy’s other concerns, such as Israel and her survival, anti-Semitism in the United States and the Soviet Union, the aftermath of the Second World War, the Vietnam War, and the violence of some elements of the Black Power Movement. While none of these may have fully prevented Orthodox leadership or individuals from participating in the Civil Rights Movement, one or any combination of the above may have turned attention away from blacks and towards the survival and protection of Orthodoxy and its needs.
In the 1950s, Orthodox rabbis were quite concerned with the continuation of the Orthodox community at large: how could they protect their movement from falling prey to the rising popularity of other denominations and secularism?\textsuperscript{111} Though concrete boundaries between Orthodox and Conservative Judaism did not necessarily finalize until the 1960s,\textsuperscript{112} Orthodox rabbis expended a great deal of energy attempting to stem the tide of Orthodox lay members switching to Conservative synagogues. A study published in 1952 finds that the vast majority of Orthodox young adults were moving away from Orthodoxy, with half of them set on ‘transferring’ to the Conservative denomination; “within two decades,” the study’s predictions were fulfilled, and Orthodoxy lost the popularity contest.\textsuperscript{113} For the rabbinical graduates of the 1950s, the “battle to save Orthodoxy in America”\textsuperscript{114} lumbered on with a war over synagogues: could they prove victorious over Conservative rabbis in the job market? Often, these young hopefuls were relegated to “smaller [synagogues] of humbler pasts and doubtful futures.”\textsuperscript{115} Orthodoxy would have to rely upon quality of practice, rather than quantity of supposed practitioners, to save itself from what appeared to be a near disaster.\textsuperscript{116}

Orthodoxy’s battle seems to have influenced the actions of at least some rabbis vis-à-vis the Civil Rights Movement. For instance, one rabbi writes that he could “not afford the luxury of expending” energy on the black plight when his “own Jews were going
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down” yet again.117 Harking back to the first chapter, one wonders whether this issue may have motivated Rabbi Pollak’s somewhat-resentful congregants to ask him to focus on their progeny’s spiritual endurance rather than on black children’s educational vigor. Even Rabbi Sheer, who was active in the Civil Rights Movement as a college student in the 1960s, sympathizes with the rabbinic “need to endure as” an Orthodox community rather than take the “ethically on target” route and participate in the Movement.118 If rabbis and other community leaders were to focus on Orthodox fortitude, they may not have been able to afford to reach out to a community other than their own. In fact, to do so could have been constructed as an undue and unfair snubbing of the Orthodox plight.

Orthodox leadership expended a significant amount of energy strengthening its denomination in a variety of ways. For example, in order to increase lay commitment to tradition, Orthodox rabbis focused on developing communal education. An anonymous Southern rabbi prioritized work which helped “make Jews more Jewish:” in his fight against “assimilation and intermarriage and Jewish ignorance,” this rabbi did the best he could to create a knowledgeable group of laypeople through the study of Jewish texts and history.119 He poignantly compares the Orthodoxy of the 1950s to “a sinking ship:” “I saw my task as rescuer, pulling bodies out of the water to keep them from drowning as Jews, reviving them, and helping them back to a healthful Jewish life.”120 Another rabbi in the South, Rabbi Aaron Borow, spent his time on similar pursuits throughout the 1950s and 1960s; he particularly worked with youth – the next generation – and hoped to instill the significance of traditions such as keeping the Sabbath, practicing dietary restrictions,
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and learning Jewish texts.\textsuperscript{121} Indeed, the mid-1950s saw a heavy investment in religious day schools and seminaries.\textsuperscript{122} Between 1944 and 1963, over 200 new day schools were founded across America (compared to around 50 previously existent Orthodox schools); about half of these were non-sectarian.\textsuperscript{123} Additionally, some rabbis supported Orthodox university students as they confronted religiously challenging curriculums. Rabbi Greenberg proves an excellent example of this aid: he involved himself with Yavneh,\textsuperscript{124} an organization founded in the 1960s\textsuperscript{125} that was committed to helping Orthodox students align their religious beliefs with their secular education.\textsuperscript{126} Yavneh offered both “an outlet and support” for these university students, who found themselves confronted by ideas “radical in comparison” to their day school education.\textsuperscript{127}

With the initiation of the journal \textit{Tradition} in the late 1950s, the publishing house also required Orthodox leadership’s attention. Comprised of articles written by Modern Orthodox rabbis, this journal contested the viewpoints of their non-Orthodox colleagues, and presented Modern Orthodox opinions on a variety of subjects.\textsuperscript{128} Thus, paper titles in the first edition range from “Halakhic [meaning: of halakhah] Implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls”\textsuperscript{129} and “Review of Recent Halakhic Periodical Literature,”\textsuperscript{130} to “The Need
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for Tradition: The Editor’s Introduction to a New Journal,”\textsuperscript{131} in which the editor summarizes his view of Tradition’s purpose:

This is the function of [Tradition] – to interpret the Tradition, the Word of God, the heritage of Torah and mitzvot in a manner and form that the modern, educated, thinking Jew can understand...[Tradition] is a “Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought.” In these pages responsible thinkers will explicate our faith, teach its principles, and demonstrate its relevance to the concerns of contemporary men.\textsuperscript{132}

In other words, Tradition was created in order to promote the continued exposition of traditional Judaism within a “responsible” framework, so as to educate modern Jewish readers and validate the applicability and significance of “the heritage of Torah and mitzvot” in current times.\textsuperscript{133} This journal served as yet another tool in the fight for Orthodox survival.

The mid-1960s showed signs of relief in the struggle against the popularity of other Jewish denominations. A vibrantly optimistic American Jewish Yearbook article claims that due to increased numerical and financial force, Orthodoxy in 1965 was “on the upsurge.”\textsuperscript{134} Owing in part to the more comprehensive Jewish education found in the day-school system, the Orthodox community had a higher baseline of traditional knowledge; Orthodox individuals naturally “gravitated toward compact enclaves of like-minded people” with similar educational backgrounds.\textsuperscript{135} In addition, the Orthodox synagogue was now comprised of a generally more committed Orthodox group, which attended services, learned Jewish texts, and kept the commandments of the Sabbath, among other injunctions. The education and drawing in of those who were less observant or knowledgeable were not necessarily the rabbi’s priority; rather, he focused on his more
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committed members, who, in turn, expected their rabbi to practice his faith meticulously and have a mastery of Jewish texts.\(^\text{136}\) Though Orthodoxy was still losing members to the Reform and Conservative denominations, some individuals were switching to Orthodoxy in search of a more spiritual “personal religious experience,” smaller congregations, and the intimacy that smaller communities could offer.\(^\text{137}\)

Yet just as Orthodoxy gained confidence in its own viability, young Orthodox rabbis began to veer towards the right in religious practice, which hampered Orthodox participation in the Movement by enhancing and cementing Orthodoxy’s inward focus. The growing population base, with its mounting income, gave rabbis the freedom to be more stringent with their congregations.\(^\text{138}\) In addition, the most religiously conservative forces within Orthodoxy (sectarian and not) had “become more acculturated,” and therefore had gained better tools with which to effectively influence the Orthodox left-wing and pull it to the right.\(^\text{139}\) So while an Orthodox rabbi serving a suburban congregation in the 1950s simply “accepted the fact that many of [his] members would” not practice their faith scrupulously,\(^\text{140}\) a rabbi in the 1960s might feel he had more of a right to chastise and instruct his congregants on the proper Orthodox lifestyle.

Meanwhile, the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA), the one Orthodox organization particularly recognized as containing “American, English-speaking” rabbis,\(^\text{141}\) also began to move right-ward. In the mid-1960s, a key debate unfolded within the RCA over “its relationship with non-Orthodox rabbinical groups” such as the New York Board of
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Rabbis. At the same time, the RCA defended itself from “the Conservative movement’s new aggressiveness” in certain, typically Orthodox-controlled domains, such as the management and direction of kosher food, or food prepared under Jewish dietary restrictions. The combination of these two factors – the theological debate over pluralistic organizations and the defense against Conservative assertiveness – combined to ensure a greater tendency towards self-segregation. And while Orthodox leadership turned to the right, it also confronted a smattering of anti-Orthodox sentiment in the Jewish world. Many Orthodox Jews were “denied employment” in “national Jewish organizations” or their smaller, Jewish Federation institutional affiliates, simply because they would not work on the Sabbath or on Jewish holidays. Some prominent Jews, many of whom had divorced themselves from their Orthodox backgrounds, resented and were bewildered by the seemingly sudden Orthodox stability of the 1960s, and thus discriminated against Orthodox Jews through unfair stereotyping and personal prejudice. Due to the “alienation” felt by those Orthodox Jews who suffered from fellow-Jew discrimination, the “relative prosperity” of the Orthodox world, and the amplification of strict Jewish religious practice, Orthodoxy banded together more than before, and drifted away from the other Jewish denominations. One wonders whether this situation may have influenced some rabbinic leaders: rather than turning outwards towards the black Civil Rights Movement along with their rabbinic peers from other denominations, they focused inwards and assuaged their religious wounds. In other words, their need to defend Orthodoxy from external forces, as well as their distrust of
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occasionally anti-Orthodox sister denominations, may have discouraged these rabbis from joining a non-Orthodox, non-Jewish movement.

While it was forced to address issues of Orthodox insecurity, American Orthodox leadership also confronted generally anti-Semitic conditions. Throughout World War II, about half of the American public was deemed to have some anti-Semitic opinions.\footnote{Seymour M. Lipset, "The Political Profile of American Jewry," Terms of Survival: The Jewish World since 1945, ed. Robert S. Wistrich (New York: Routledge, 1995) 150.} This trend declined after the Second World War due to a combination of factors, including the horrific nature of the Holocaust and the presence of mostly native-born American Jews.\footnote{Peter Novick, The Holocaust in American Life (USA: Houghtan Mifflin, 1999) 113.} In addition to this decline in anti-Semitic public opinion, post-World War II American Jewish veterans benefited immensely from their inclusion in the GI Bill, through which they could take advantage of higher education, cheaper mortgages, and the ease and other benefits of suburban living.\footnote{Karen Brodkin, How Jews Became White Folks: And What That Says About Race in America (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998) 36-42. After having experienced the pain of being barred from social and educational mobility, some Jews utilized the black cause as a way to further the Jewish one: by legally securing rights for blacks, Jewish mobility would be secured as well. However, many Northern Jews simply wanted to fit into the suburban mold. Dollinger, "Hamans' and 'Torquemadas'," 69, 81, 87-88.} Yet not all was well in the Jewish scene. Jews were prevented from purchasing homes in certain neighborhoods, such as Rochester, New York.\footnote{Blanchard.} As will be discussed in the next chapter, medical schools applied strict Jew quotas throughout the 1950s.\footnote{Gurock, The Men and Women 157-62.} While American Jews hoped to integrate into their surrounding society as equals,\footnote{Peter Y. Medding, "The New Jewish Politics in America," Terms of Survival: The Jewish World since 1945, ed. Robert S. Wistrich (New York: Routledge, 1995) 91.} they faced a number of synagogue bombings throughout the South in the 1950s and 1960s,\footnote{Bauman, "Introduction," 6-7. Also, Dollinger, "Hamans' and 'Torquemadas'," 70.} including one in “Miami’s Orthodox Temple Beth-El” in 1958.\footnote{Webb, Fight Against 55.}
Semitism, often promoted by the same groups who terrorized Southern blacks,\textsuperscript{155} inspired fear in Southern Jewish communities and certainly prevented some Orthodox rabbis from openly participating in the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{156} Indeed, the consequences of open action proved so vicious, that Southern Jews were often upset by the supposedly callous actions of their Northern brethren, who would rile up Southern anti-Civil Rights agitators and leave the Southern Jewish communities to suffer the physical, social, and financial consequences.\textsuperscript{157} In addition, corrupt real estate agents in the 1960s, supported by bank officials and politicians among others, practiced a technique called ‘blockbusting:’ they literally terrified Jewish homeowners into quickly selling their houses, so that certain Jewish neighborhoods in Boston, Houston, Philadelphia and elsewhere were unfair victims of white flight.\textsuperscript{158} Therefore, Orthodoxy, already forced to confront insecure conditions within the Jewish community, may also have been inspired to turn inward due to uncomfortable conditions in American society.

While focusing on the quality of Orthodox Judaism in imperfect conditions, rabbinic leadership was also forced to deal with thousands upon thousands of Orthodox refugees to America, beginning from the mid-1930s and continuing past the end of the Second World War.\textsuperscript{159} Refugees from Europe brought with them a form of Orthodox “self-[segregation]” as yet unpopular in the United States.\textsuperscript{160} A taboo on mentioning the
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Holocaust publicly during the 1950s\textsuperscript{161} did not prevent Orthodox immigrants from influencing their American Orthodox counterparts. The Orthodox Europeans were “the first group of Jews in all of American history to come not primarily in search of bread but to find refuge for its version of Jewishness;” in other words, these Orthodox Jews preferred nothing more than to recreate the independent communities in which they had lived prior to the War.\textsuperscript{162} Rather than rely upon the extra-curricular Judaism classes that Reform, Conservative, and American Orthodox Jews utilized to educate their public-school children, the European ultra-Orthodox founded their own, Yiddish-speaking schools. American Orthodoxy, though much less separatist, “had little choice but to follow the example of the newest arrivals;” it was clear that the commitment of their children to Orthodoxy depended upon a better education.\textsuperscript{163} Thus, as previously discussed, so many new Orthodox day schools were founded that “by the mid-1970s, almost all children of Orthodox families” – sectarian or not – were sent to Jewish schools.\textsuperscript{164} As right-wing Orthodoxy helped inspire educational separatism in its American counterpart, it also attempted to pull American Orthodoxy away from the formal recognition of rabbis from other denominations. Eastern European rabbis strongly urged “Orthodox self-segregation” within a decade after the end of the Second World War.\textsuperscript{165} When in 1956 “eleven…heads of rabbinic” seminaries joined with the “leader of the [sectarian] Hasidic Lubavitch movement” in circulating an edict against Orthodox involvement with rabbinic organizations incorporating non-Orthodox rabbinic leadership,
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the RCA and its contingent of American rabbis were thrust into a heated debate.\textsuperscript{166} Though the RCA president defended the edict, the widely-recognized Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik declined to add his signature; most of the RCA rabbis followed Rabbi Soloveitchik’s lead.\textsuperscript{167} Ultimately, however, the very presence of this heated debate points to both the concerns of Orthodox leadership and the affect of the Holocaust on American Orthodoxy.

In the 1960s, the taboo against speaking about the Holocaust relaxed due to a variety of factors, including the highly-publicized capture and trial of Nazi Adolf Eichmann.\textsuperscript{168} By the late 1960s, “the trauma of the Holocaust…erupted into public consciousness” as new fears arose for Jewish safety in Israel.\textsuperscript{169} Orthodox leadership had already proven itself quite interested in the status of the State of Israel during the 1950s. In 1957, “two Orthodox Zionist adult male groups” merged to form the Religious Zionists of America, though their parallel women’s and youth groups remained disconnected.\textsuperscript{170} In 1967, with the explosion of the Six Day War after increasing tensions between Israel and its Middle Eastern neighbors, Israel’s territorial victories molded her into a military powerhouse. Israel changed from the “David” of the Middle East – small, young, and insecure – into the new “Goliath” – strong, proud, and mighty.\textsuperscript{171} For American Jews, this incredible military feat aroused fervent sentiments of pride in the Jewish country;\textsuperscript{172} Orthodox Americans certainly augmented their investment in Israel. For example, in the weeks
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leading up to the Six Day War, Rabbi Berman joined other Berkley campus Israel aficionados and convinced political theorist Eric Hoffer to lead a pro-Israel rally on campus. After spending the entire night printing and plastering posters, they managed to attract 8,000 students and change the current of anti-Israel rhetoric on campus.173 Following the 1967 War, many Jewish students flocked to Israel to help in factories and on kibbutzim (agricultural communities).174 Jewish “immigration…[to] Israel rose more than 500 percent.”175 According to the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, a total of 17,900 Americans immigrated to Israel during the first three post-War years.176 The call for aliyah, or immigration to Israel, pulled Orthodox American Jews across the ocean. From 1969 to 1970, “over one-third of the American [immigrants] defined themselves as Orthodox,” which points to a clear trend of “over-concentration and selectivity” in Orthodox aliyah.177 Orthodox leadership must have been forced to confront the realities of a shifting population demographic, as well as the upsurge in interest and commitment to Israel and her success. The Civil Rights Movement may simply not have figured prominently into the equation.

This theory of Israel-centricity proves especially compelling when one notes the parallel reaction of American Jewry to the American left. After 1967, the left-wing rejected Israel as a Middle Eastern bully.178 Not only did this rejection clash with
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American Jewry’s strengthened pride in the Jewish state, but it also included instances of blatant anti-Semitism, particularly amongst “Black Power advocates” who identified with the Arab cause.\(^{179}\) For example, SNCC’s 1967 summer pamphlet utilizes obviously anti-Semitic symbols in its cartoons: the Israeli general Moshe Dayan is “portrayed with dollar signs on his epaulets,” while a hand displaying “a Shield of David and a dollar sign” holds nooses around the necks of then-Egyptian President Abdel Gamal “Nasser and the American boxer Muhammad Ali (Cassius Clay).”\(^{180}\) The dollar symbols point to the stereotypical portrayal of Jews as money-wielding misers and lenders, even if they are meant “to reflect American backing of Israel,” while the presence of the Star of David on the hand holding a noose around boxer Muhammad Ali’s neck seems extraneous in a cartoon supposedly commenting on the 1967 Six Day War.\(^{181}\) Though some Civil Rights leaders, including the Reverend Dr. King, Jr., decried anti-Israel and anti-Semitic tendencies,\(^{182}\) Orthodox leadership would not have necessarily hopped on a bandwagon that the majority of American Jewry had rejected. Considering the Zionist ideology and right-wing tendency of many non-sectarian Orthodox Jews in America, it seems unlikely that Orthodox rabbis would commence participating in the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1960s.

Indeed, SNCC’s incorporation of such anti-Semitic themes highlights another trend: Orthodox leadership’s clash with Black Power and its often militant overtones. Though the Black Power Movement was in essence a campaign utilizing black cultural “self-definition” in order to tap into the American power structure and directly influence daily

\(^{179}\) Finkelstein, *Heeding the Call* 171.
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\(^{182}\) Zeitz, “If I Am Not for Myself.” 263. Also, Schneier, *Shared Dreams* 165-66.
concerns, it was comprised of a number of ideologically distinct sub-movements, some of which proved quite violent.\textsuperscript{183} For example, Black Islam incorporated Black Nationalism by describing Allah as a black man. Along with a stringent lifestyle based upon classic Islamic ideals, Black Muslims called for political and social partitioning from white society.\textsuperscript{184} By 1966, SNCC had also taken upon itself a form of Black Power separatism. According to one account, it expelled its white members; according to another, it asked its white affiliates to attend to the white community rather than to the black one.\textsuperscript{185} In either case, SNCC clearly moved away from encouraging the aid of white students, many of whom were Jewish.\textsuperscript{186} From the mid-1960s onwards, as anti-white and at times anti-Semitic currents grew stronger in the Black Power Movement, general black-Jewish affairs “deteriorated significantly;”\textsuperscript{187} ultimately, the rising of Black Power resulted in less Jewish involvement in the Civil Rights Movement overall.\textsuperscript{188} 

The white association of Black Power with “violence and destruction, racism [against whites], and black domination”\textsuperscript{189} was not lost upon the Jewish community,\textsuperscript{190} Orthodox and other. During the more than 300 black riots which took place between 1964 and 1968, many Jewish-owned stores, left over from the Jewish move to the suburbs, were
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“burned and looted by rampaging mobs” of angry ghetto protesters.191 When Jews relocated to their suburban homes, they often left behind both their “immigrant parents” and their “Orthodox synagogues.”192 Due to the infrastructure required for Orthodox practice, Orthodox Jews were some of the last to exit the city ghettos.193 Thus, Orthodox leadership sometimes dealt with the most bitter of moves: those forced by violence. For example, a Boston synagogue was sold to a group of Hassidim (sectarian) when its original members left for the suburbs. These Hassidim unknowingly entered a complex conversation between Boston’s Combined Jewish Philanthropies (CJP) and Elma Lewis, a black patron of the arts who ardently hoped to turn the facilities into a black cultural center. Complicating matters further, the Hassidim did not keep up the grounds well, though they did use the facilities for schooling and services. Soon after Reverend Dr. King, Jr.’s untimely death, CJP officials were warned by anonymous radicals that unless blacks were given the building free of mortgage, it would be burnt to the ground. CJP quickly decided to sell the building to Lewis, who successfully demanded to be given the facilities free of charge.194 Though sectarian Orthodox Jews lost the building, the transfer itself is indicative of the tensions between blacks and Jews, blacks and specifically Orthodox Jews, and Orthodox Jews and their non-Orthodox peers. Meanwhile, in 1968, SNCC “leader James Forman and other radical black leaders” declared that synagogues and Jewish businesses in black areas should pay reparations to blacks, shocking Jews and synagogue communities.195 Not only did the concept seem unfair, but the term “reparation” was linked, in the Jewish mind at least, to World War II and German
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reparations for the Jews.\textsuperscript{196} In New York, the late 1960s brought, among other events, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville debate, in which new policies of “community control” clashed with the traditionally liberal United Federation of Teachers.\textsuperscript{197} Fired Jewish teachers presented cases of anti-Semitism, while the black and Puerto Rican parents and principal called for educators whose lives (often meaning skin color) better mirrored those of the public school’s students. In the end, community control was severely reduced and the ten fired teachers were reinstated.\textsuperscript{198} One interviewee notes that many Orthodox teachers worked in the New York school system; accordingly, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville clash contributed to a “general hostility” towards the Black Power movement.\textsuperscript{199} Rabbi Berman concurs, claiming that the debate signaled to the Orthodox community that blacks were anti-Semitic, and ultimately “cut off what could have been a fruitful” relationship between the two sides.\textsuperscript{200}

Although the vocal voice of black anti-Semitism alienated Orthodox Jews, at least one group of Orthodox rabbis decreed that it would not tolerate anything short of perfectly ethical behavior on the part of its laymen’s interactions with the black community. When unhappy tenants took their case against Orthodox slumlord Israel Mindick to the Boston \textit{Beit Din}, or Orthodox Court of Law, the \textit{Beit Din} came to the conclusion that Mindick must repair his property – and that his tenants had to treat the property respectfully. Because Mindick did not fulfill his side of the deal, the \textit{Beit Din} fined him nearly fifty
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thousand dollars. Mindick could not take the pressure, and moved to Florida.\textsuperscript{201} In this example, Orthodox leadership did not simply side with its own layman; rather, it worked within Jewish law in order to create a more ethically proper situation.

Other Orthodox Jews responded to the violence and anti-Semitism associated with the black ghetto communities more disrespectfully. For example, one charismatic New York Orthodox leader, Rabbi Meir Kahane, founded an organization entitled the Jewish Defense League (JDL) in 1968.\textsuperscript{202} JDL chapters formed community patrols in order to defend the Jewish “elderly and the [Jewish] poor” left behind in the ghetto by the waves of white flight.\textsuperscript{203} Ironically, even as Rabbi Kahane claimed his group (and Judaism) drew strength from the practice of Jewish law, or halakhah,\textsuperscript{204} the violent militancy with which the JDL accomplished its goals seems to have derived more from Black Power models than from Jewish history.\textsuperscript{205} Thus, when Jewish Bostonian youth asked Rabbi Berman for support as they formed a JDL community patrol, Rabbi Berman only agreed on the condition that the patrol groups carry no weapons, consist of volunteer black and white patrolmen, and have a system of immediate contact with area police. Though Rabbi Kahane was upset by Rabbi Berman’s intrusion, he let the patrols take place as stipulated.\textsuperscript{206}
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The JDL also grew quite active in the fight for the freedom of Soviet Jewry.\footnote{Breslauer, Meir Kahane 81-83.} Under Joseph Stalin’s dictatorship, the millions of Jews in Soviet Russia had suffered from the blocking of government positions, show trials, Yiddish-language censorship, and the imprisonment and execution of Jewish leaders perceived to be unreceptive to Stalin’s policies. After Stalin’s 1953 death, the USSR continued to practice anti-Semitic procedures.\footnote{Staub, ed., The Jewish 1960s 121-22.} The government carried on systematic destruction of Jewish communal, cultural, and personal life. It published anti-Semitic documents and put Jews on trial for endorsing Zionism, practicing Judaism, or committing false economic crimes.\footnote{Jacob Birnbaum, "Fortieth Anniversary of the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ): Seminal Role in the Rise of the Soviet Jewry Movement in the 1960s," (Center for Russian Jewry with Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, 2004), 1.} Rabbi Kahane broke off from non-violent Soviet Jewry movements in the twilight of the 1960s, convinced of the need for “civil disobedience and violence” in order to succeed in the campaign for Soviet Jewry.\footnote{Yossi Klein HaLevi, "Lessons of a Movement," Jerusalem Post 11 June 2004: 21.} JDL members fought for Soviet Jewry with the notion that they would not act as docilely as did the Holocaust generation before them.\footnote{Breslauer, Meir Kahane 83.} In 1969, the JDL “sponsored a ‘Hundred-Hour Vigil’” in front of the Soviet Mission; as hundreds of “protestors rioted,” other protestors “chained themselves to a Soviet airliner at Kennedy Airport.”\footnote{Yossi Klein HaLevi, "Jacob Birnbaum and the Struggle for Soviet Jewry,” Azure 17 (2004).} Clearly, Rabbi Kahane specifically utilized militant actions in order to take advantage of the publicity they inevitably amassed.

Orthodox leadership outside of the JDL was involved with the Soviet Jewry Movement as well. As will be discussed in greater detail in the third chapter, Jacob Birnbaum’s Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ), organized in the early 1960s, worked peacefully and continuously in order to change the anti-Semitic conditions under

Some rabbis involved with the Civil Rights Movement were also participants in the Soviet Jewry Movement.\footnote{Sheer. "Re: Thesis Research Questions." Also, Greenberg. "Re: Thesis Research." 19 September 2005.}

Returning to Rabbi Berman, one learns that he helped create the Northern California Council for Soviet Jewry; took part in demonstrations and community education programs in California, Boston, and New York; “served on the [SSSJ] board;” and participated in an international Soviet Jewry conference in Europe.\footnote{Berman.}

For some, the struggle for Soviet Jewry proved at least as important as that for American blacks, if not more so.

As the Black Power Movement discouraged white participation, and the Soviet Jewry Movement roped in strong Orthodox leaders, the Vietnam War also received a fair bit of attention. The majority of Orthodox leadership supported the War, or at least was not involved in anti-War efforts.\footnote{Michael E. Staub, \textit{Torn at the Roots: The Crisis of Jewish Liberalism in Postwar America} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002) 14.}

According to one popular opinion, one had to support the Vietnam War in order to ensure America’s protection of Israel and Israeli policy.\footnote{Hertzberg, \textit{The Jews in America} 370.}

Others felt that American Jews could not afford to work against the government;\footnote{Staub, \textit{Torn at the Roots} 14.} this idea was rooted in the insecurities of American Jewry, as discussed previously. However, a strong-voiced minority certainly expended much energy on the affair and worked to end
the United States presence in Vietnam. Rabbi Blanchard, a committed Civil Rights Movement volunteer, heightened his participation in anti-War efforts after being told that the efforts of white Civil Rights volunteers would soon prove unnecessary. Though he was exempt from the draft due to his rabbinical studies, Rabbi Blanchard operated “Vietnam Summer” in St. Louis, organizing various anti-War activities. Rabbi Ahron Soloveichik served as “a spiritual beacon for the awareness that one needed to look at the issues of involvement...through the prism of halakhah;” in other words, he gave a decidedly religious twist to the debate over Vietnam, by considering the ways in which Jewish law affected involvement. For example, Rabbi Soloveichik paskened, or made a ruling according to Jewish law, that a Jew could not pilot for the Air Force in Vietnam: the bombing of entire villages suspected of hosting Viet Cong activity entailed a degree of “direct [civilian] massacre” unacceptable in accordance with Jewish law. Clearly, Orthodox leaders took the time to express a variety of opinions regarding the Vietnam War.

For Rabbi Soloveichik, the Vietnam War required a decidedly Jewish examination. In this sense, it was no different than the theologically-driven motivations of Orthodox participants in the Civil Rights Movement, as shown in the first chapter. However, it seems that Orthodox leadership in the 1950s and the 1960s focused mostly on self-preservation rather than on issues pertaining to American society in general. It concentrated on the schooling and segregating effects of immigrant absorption after World War II, the fight against Conservative Judaism’s popularity, insecurity and anti-
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Semitism in the United States and abroad, Israel’s survival and her post-1967 setting, and finally, the often militant overtones of the Black Power Movement. Whether or not these issues hampered Orthodox participation in the Civil Rights Movement depended upon the individual; indeed, some readers of this chapter might find it to be an insufficient explanation of Orthodoxy’s lack of response. To these readers I would explain that Orthodoxy was not necessarily ignoring the oppression of American blacks; it was more often than not attempting to survive an uphill battle from which it could not escape. My hope is that this chapter will allow its readers to assess Orthodoxy’s response in light of its historical context.
Yeshiva University Students: The Civil Rights Movement and Other Priorities

In 1965, the same year in which Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. led the Selma-Montgomery March, the American Jewish Year Book published an article on Orthodoxy in which Yeshiva University (YU) is hailed as “the one institution most prominently identified with modern Orthodoxy;” indeed, the same author theorizes that YU served so many communities through its rabbinical graduates, its community programming, and its college education that “were Yeshiva University to impose a definite direction” on Orthodox practice in America, “it would have the most profound repercussions within the Orthodox world.”223 Clearly, YU played a valuable role in the Orthodox milieu. Because of this university’s importance within the non-sectarian Orthodox scene, YU provides relevant material on varying responses to the Civil Rights Movement within the Orthodox college world, as well as bountiful material on the other, more pressing priorities of its student body.

However, before discussing the ideals and actions of YU students, one must first understand the context in which these students lived. Based in New York City, YU strove to “[embrace] the heritage of the best of western civilization, along with the ancient traditions of Jewish law and life,”224 through a philosophy and educational system of Torah U’Madah,225 or the study of both religious and secular disciplines.226 YU contained both undergraduate and graduate schools, though not all the graduate schools were specifically religious or even Jewish. Of the religious schools, Yeshiva College
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(YC) taught young men, while Stern College for Women (SC) instructed their female counterparts; in addition, YU included the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS), a rabbinical school.\textsuperscript{227}

Though other divisions existed,\textsuperscript{228} the materials available from YC, SC, and RIETS will form the basis of this chapter’s primary research. This material includes newspaper articles, journals, yearbooks, archived documents, interviews, and several works on YU institutional history. Unfortunately, an imbalance exists between the available data on Yeshiva College and Stern College. Since the YU alumni offices could not give out personal contact information, I relied upon word of mouth and mass e-mail requests to find YU graduates willing to be interviewed; unlike the male alumni, no Stern graduate responded to my requests. In addition, YC’s official newspaper, \textit{The Commentator}, compiled a series of alumni recollections just last year; Stern’s newspaper, \textit{The Observer}, does not seem to have followed suit. Finally, \textit{The Commentator} records are complete for the period of interest, while \textit{The Observer}’s records are missing editions between 1954 and May 29, 1959. However, the extant Stern archival material suggests that Stern students often had lifestyles and ideals similar to those of their male counterparts.\textsuperscript{229} For instance, both YC and Stern students specifically chose to attend an Orthodox college, where they would learn secular and Judaic studies; in addition, these young men and
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\textsuperscript{229} Of course, a variety of individuals attended YC and Stern; these students hailed from different locals and Orthodox backgrounds. See, for example, Gurock, \textit{The Men and Women} 203-205, 209. However, with this caveat in place, it is still possible to recognize various projects and ideals which occupied the students’ time.
women were compatible enough to befriend and date each other. Thus, rather than exclude Stern from this chapter, I hope to present at least part of the female YU voice.

Without question, YU students actively discussed the Civil Rights Movement, though not necessarily right away. The record for the 1950s is largely silent on the matter, and aside from late-night dorm-room conversations and a short editorial despairing over the bigotry extant at the University of Alabama, there may not have been much debate over the plight of blacks in America. However, analysis of student publications shows that by the beginning of the 1960s, students often discussed and educated themselves about the Movement. For instance, in 1961, Stern students listened to a Nigerian leader maintain the need for blacks and whites to work together. They later had the opportunity to hear the administrative assistant of the NAACP’s Executive Secretary speak about the history, purpose, methods, and goals of that prominent organization. In 1964, the YC Yavneh, an “Orthodox Jewish students organization,” hosted a panel on the Civil Rights Movement. An entire supplementary edition of The Observer was dedicated to questions on the causes of black rioting, theoretical solutions to help alleviate racial tension, comparisons between blacks and Jews in the United States, and comparisons between blacks and Israeli-Arabs. In fact, from 1967 onwards, black rioting and episodes of black anti-Semitism clearly affected the rhetoric on campus. Musing over the previous summer’s black riots, one YC student wondered whether there
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was any possibility of calming the revolts.\textsuperscript{238} The editor of \textit{HaMevaser}, the “official student publication of the religious divisions” of YU, acknowledged that SNCC had rejected Jews,\textsuperscript{239} yet felt that “a true religious person” could not blame all blacks for the actions of SNCC and its partners.\textsuperscript{240} Another \textit{Observer} supplementary edition addressed issues of Black Power, Jewish racism, Jewish withdrawal from the black-Jewish dialogue, and black anti-Semitism.\textsuperscript{241} That same month, the grassroots campus publication \textit{Pulse} published an author who was discouraged with the fact that black rioting and anti-Semitism had led some Jews to equate the push for black equality with extreme violence and fear, and thus to unsettling memories of the Holocaust. Rather than step away from American black society, this author hoped to encourage interracial discourse and the dissolution of negative black stereotypes among Jews.\textsuperscript{242} Still another student, disgusted with the turn of events, claimed that the Civil Rights Movement had generated a “Frankenstein” of violent militants.\textsuperscript{243}

YU students did not simply discuss the Civil Rights Movement; they also actively pursued its goals. For example, in 1960, YU was a member of the Metropolitan Students for Non-Violent Civil Rights Action, and YU students protested Woolworth’s Southern lunch counter policies by picketing and distributing leaflets in front of a New York branch.\textsuperscript{244} The next year, YU students started a tutoring program in a local public school;
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this program served as a model for other colleges.\footnote{245} One wholeheartedly dedicated Stern student published her memoirs of the March on Washington, where Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. gave his famous “I Have a Dream” speech; she later reported on a Washington, D.C. conference on apartheid, Southern segregation, and Northern discrimination.\footnote{246} This student soon worked with other Yavneh leaders to organize a “mass boycott of New York City public schools,” in which Yavneh members taught freedom schools and picketed throughout Harlem and Washington Heights.\footnote{247} In fact, YU even donated the use of one of its buildings for the endeavor.\footnote{248} By the late 1960s, over 100 YC students were tutoring through the Yeshiva University Neighborhood Youth Corps (YUNYC),\footnote{249} and SC started its own version of the same.\footnote{250}

Other students may have participated through their learning of religious texts, though the effects of their involvement cannot be measured in any scientific manner. These students placed civil rights injustices within a category of general injustice, and claimed that by studying Biblical and rabbinic texts, they fought as much of a struggle against wrongdoing as those who physically participated in the Civil Rights Movement.\footnote{251} One can better comprehend this point of view by examining the philosophy of tikkun olam, “fixing of the world,” espoused by Rabbi Y. A. Korff, who claims that “observing [the Sabbath] and observing [dietary restrictions] is as much tikkun olam as fighting for
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anybody’s civil rights,” for the fulfillment of commandments helps “repair the world.”

In other words, by fulfilling religious injunctions, including that of text-study, one makes the world a better place. Thus, a YC senior argues in Pulse that students who constantly learn religious texts “are the pillars which support the world;” perhaps it is due to their merit, he continues, that justice and respite have been achieved in any issue. However, these dedicated scholars of Jewish texts did not escape scathing criticism from those involved in organizations like YUNYC, who felt that these intellectuals were simply apathetic and hypocritical. Hence the nature of their involvement, or lack thereof, depends upon the religious mindset of the person examining their activities.

YU as an institution encouraged a positive perspective on the Civil Rights Movement. In 1961, it awarded an “honorary Doctor of Laws degree” to Chief Justice Earl Warren, who was quite influential in the 1954 vote to end segregation. Just four years later it bestowed another Doctor of Laws degree upon then Vice President Hubert Humphrey, who was “known for his strong civil rights stand.” In addition, its medical school application did not ask for a photograph, and thus had color-blind admissions. This fact is noteworthy in a country whose medical schools were not fully open to blacks until 1966. Starting in 1969, the medical school’s King-Kennedy Medical Program subsidized lower-income blacks as they prepared their pre-medical curriculum, so that
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they could later improve medical care in their ghetto communities.\textsuperscript{260} That same year, a black Jewish YC freshman discussed his identity in \textit{The Commentator}; clearly, a black Jewish student in the College was not only tolerated, but openly accepted.\textsuperscript{261}

Though the institution seems to have acknowledged certain values of the Civil Rights Movement, a vocal group also begged its contemporaries to work with caution. For instance, one student responding to the Woolworth’s protest unashamedly critiqued the Student Council for officially backing the picketing: because of this backing, the Student Council had turned YU students into unwilling representatives of all East-coast Jews.\textsuperscript{262} Rabbi Lichtenstein, a major figure in the school, felt that Orthodoxy’s slow response to issues such as the Civil Rights Movement was due to an appropriate sense of prudence;\textsuperscript{263} still others felt YU could not afford to critique society publicly when it was just proving the possibility of living religiously and functioning fully within America.\textsuperscript{264}

Yet another group of students may not have formulated extensive opinions on the Civil Rights Movement at all. Throughout the timeframe, \textit{The Commentator} and \textit{The Observer} published articles scorning the supposedly commonplace apathetic student lifestyle. Whether deriding the student body for voting half-heartedly, if at all, in the Student Council elections,\textsuperscript{265} or simply condemning students for displaying “indifference” towards non-academic activities,\textsuperscript{266} student leaders at SC and YC
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despaired over the seemingly “contagious” apathy displayed by their classmates.\textsuperscript{267} This laziness does not necessarily point to an entire generation of bookworms. As one 1963 graduate recalls, “while some of [his] classmates went south” in order to participate in the Civil Rights Movement, “a bunch of [his] friends” also considered spray-painting the tarnished YU domes gold.\textsuperscript{268} In other words, these students were often doing what so many past and present students have done: enjoying their time in college without necessarily contributing to national movements.

Indeed, while the “dominant picture” of the Civil Rights Movement generation is one in which the vast majority of college students actively participated in various movements pushing for social change, in truth, many teenagers simply went to college in order to learn and to have a good experience.\textsuperscript{269} For example, one YU graduate fondly reminisces over his four years on the varsity wrestling team, as well as his time on the intramural volleyball team;\textsuperscript{270} considering the one-to-two pages of space devoted to YU sports teams in almost every issue of \textit{The Commentator}, this former student had a good crowd of teammates and sports aficionados. According to Professor of Jewish History Jeffrey Gurock, author of \textit{Judaism's Encounter with American Sports} and assistant men’s basketball coach at Yeshiva University, sports helped these YU students prove that they were not dissimilar to other college students across America.\textsuperscript{271} For some, sports offered a way to fit into the network of regular college students, even if they were learning at a unique Jewish institution.
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At SC, part of the college experience included serious relationships and possibly marriage, especially to YC men. In May of 1961, *The Observer* reported that nearly half the graduating class was already married, and two women had already borne children. Interest in femininity encouraged the young women to bring a special instructor on “posture, hair care, make-up, and fashion” to the school three times during the 1963 to 1964 school year. Just a year later, Stern women asked for a class focusing upon the laws of *Taharat HaMishpacha*, or Family Purity; these laws define some of the religiously-dictated relations between a husband and wife upon marriage. The issue of feminism does not seem to come up until the very end of the 1960s, when at least one student took the matter quite seriously and asked her classmates to ponder their roles as females and/or as feminine beings.

For all of their apathy and college obsession over sports or dating, it seems that YU students also heavily invested themselves in a series of activities and ideologies other than the Civil Rights Movement. Religious issues affected their day-to-day lifestyle. They restricted their eating by following the laws of *kashrut* (religious dietary practices), and for a full day every week, they celebrated the Sabbath, a day in which they would not write or use electricity. Of course, whether or not an individual subscribed to each injunction cannot be ascertained; however, religious practice did seem to require time and energy. For example, SC women would have special *Shabbatons*, or Sabbath gatherings,
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for the out-of-towners. In addition, students would hold and attend group learning sessions on Jewish texts. Some students even felt that their religious lifestyle gave them immediate access to an “ultimate purpose” – a meaningful experience which nullified the need for rebelliousness, LSD-use, and free sex. The combination of difference in religious practice and religious values made student travel outside of the Orthodox community somewhat difficult. On the one hand, they faced an “unsympathetic world” with few of the institutions necessary to easily observe kashrut or the Sabbath, and with little tolerance for restrictive lifestyles. On the other hand, some worried that their actions would unfairly represent all of Orthodoxy for non-Orthodox Jews and non-Jews, so that every step outside of the Orthodox community required great consideration. This situation may have prevented some students from participating, or participating more actively, in the Civil Rights Movement.

In addition to keeping religious dictates, YU students concerned themselves with the survival of Orthodoxy and Judaism. For example, in 1958 the donations of a YU Charity Drive were to be divided amongst organizations dedicated to “the furtherance of Orthodox Judaism.” Certain students felt Jewish needs ought to come before non-Jewish needs, and would rather spend their free time working as teachers in Jewish education than volunteering in the Civil Rights Movement. As far as they were concerned, Judaism in the United States was still insecure and unstable, and the burden of
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supporting and strengthening Judaism fell upon observant Jews. Following this logic, the YU Youth Bureau agreed to send Stern and Yeshiva students to different Jewish communities in order “to spend a weekend there and help spread Torah spirit.” Finally, students struggled to synthesize the “Modern” and “Orthodox” within Modern Orthodoxy. Whether asking questions about this synthesis in a session with the YU President or attending a forum on the path of Torah U’Madah in the future, students seem to have approached one of 1964’s “most discussed subjects” quite often.

In addition to religious priorities of practice and support, schoolwork took a toll upon student time. YU college students had to survive a dual curriculum of secular and Judaic classes, some of which were held on Sundays. Often, classes were scheduled during the night hours. The cumulative workload was so intense that several students wondered whether the four-year program ought to be expanded to five years. At least on the men’s side, many students hoped to matriculate in medical school or law school after graduation. In the 1950s, those hoping to enter medical school faced a quota system so difficult that YU founded its own medical school; thus, they had to excel in order to have the chance to further their education. Though this quota system basically
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disappeared in the 1960s,\textsuperscript{295} many students planning to enter professional fields still worked diligently.\textsuperscript{296}

Issues with the institution of YU also called for substantial student efforts. Students jostled with the administration over guidance networks, freedom of speech and attendance, the curriculum, and school facilities. In 1954, YC men worked with the faculty to pair students off in a student-faculty mentorship program.\textsuperscript{297} In the late 1950s and early 1960s, \textit{The Commentator} launched a minor campaign against the direct “suppression” of student activities and newspaper articles by the YU administration.\textsuperscript{298} Soon, though, the discussion moved from censorship to attendance, and students in Stern and Yeshiva fought to abolish class attendance requirements. The first year of the new decade brought more stringent attendance standards upon vocally ambivalent Stern women.\textsuperscript{299} YC juniors, seniors, and underclassmen with certain grade point averages were first allowed to miss class only after a 1968 threat of student strike.\textsuperscript{300} Meanwhile, class-attending students put their extra-curricular hours to work evaluating their courseload. In the first half of the 1960s, YC and RIETS men labored over curricular reviews,\textsuperscript{301} and in the late second half, Stern women partnered with their professors to appraise classes and teachers.\textsuperscript{302} Finally, in the late 1960s, Stern women spent much energy on their fight for the erection of a new school building. Constantly facing
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unfulfilled pledges, these students protested in 1967,\textsuperscript{303} drafted their own plans for the empty lot in 1968,\textsuperscript{304} and put on a massive school strike for construction in 1969.\textsuperscript{305}

While administrative issues served as a source of frustration, Israel remained a top priority throughout the timeframe. Significant student efforts went towards meeting the needs of the recently-established Jewish state.\textsuperscript{306} Fundraising drives for Israeli establishments were commonplace. For example, a 1955 drive went towards the strengthening of Israel’s military,\textsuperscript{307} whereas a 1965 drive hoped to support four girls in an Israeli orphanage.\textsuperscript{308} In a strong show of encouragement and assistance, every YU student council joined to fundraise for the Gesher Foundation, established in Israel by YU alumni in order to draw non-religious Jews back to traditional Judaism.\textsuperscript{309} One graduate of the 1950s claims that “an overwhelming concern of Yeshiva students during this period was the fledgling State of Israel,”\textsuperscript{310} while a faculty member recalls the period around the 1967 War as one in which YC “in effect closed” because “Israel was under attack.”\textsuperscript{311} Stern students joined their male classmates around the radio, waiting for every snippet of news.\textsuperscript{312} These women succeeded in raising nearly $40,000 for Israel just before and during Israel’s Six Day War (1967), in addition to joining a March on Washington in support of the Jewish state.\textsuperscript{313}
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Within American Jewry as a whole, the 1967 Six Day War served as a turning point, for it catalyzed American Jewish support of, and pride in, Israel. Among YU students, however, it seems that the 1967 War simply drew upon emotions already present throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Even when not fundraising, rallying, or tensely listening to the news, YU students celebrated the country, educated themselves about it, and even moved there. In 1959, YC founded a religious Zionist club chartered on the advice of their rabbinic leader, Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik. Israeli Independence Days were annually celebrated with dancing and speakers. In 1962, The Observer published a list of different opportunities available to Stern students trying to visit or study in Israel. Four years later, a YU student outlined some of the opportunities for work and study in Israel and forcefully argued that there was no excuse for people to “[stay] behind” in the States. Perhaps the only major difference after the 1967 War was intensity of ideology: for example, in 1968, the editor of The Commentator felt that YU should promote aliya “even at [YU’s] expense;” this call appears more extreme in nature than previous calls to work, study, or live in Israel, for it claims that YU should promote these moves even if they cause financial harm to the academic establishment. In fact, it seems that many YU graduates did make aliya, though not necessarily before completing their education.
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Israel may also have influenced student opinions on another highly-discussed topic: the Vietnam War. Some students and faculty linked their support for Israel with their support for the Vietnam War, for, the reasoning followed, if the United States supported the Israeli army, any supporter of Israel ought to be loyal to the American army in return.\textsuperscript{321} In 1966, twenty-seven YC students collected 800 signatures backing American policy in Vietnam and presented them to key government officials;\textsuperscript{322} clearly, the pro-War voice had a place on campus, at least at first. However, the anti-War voice soon broke through, and loudly. Though the men on campus could easily (and often dishonestly) dodge the draft by filling out a deferment form in which they claimed they were studying to be rabbis and would eventually become military chaplains,\textsuperscript{323} many still took strong stances on the Vietnam War. A 1968 Stern survey shows that a full ninety-three percent of Stern women wanted the United States military to withdraw from Vietnam, either immediately or through different phases.\textsuperscript{324} In 1969, YU joined other universities in an Anti-War Moratorium, during which activities, speakers, and discussions on the Vietnam War culminated in a “city-wide rally” in Bryant Park.\textsuperscript{325} Some students protested the Moratorium, reminding the College that a pro-War voice still survived.\textsuperscript{326} However, few seemed to deny the validity of a YU student strike over the killing of four student protestors at Kent State and the United States Army’s forays into
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Cambodia. Yeshiva ultimately gave YC students the option to end the secular-studies part of the semester early, so long as they were involved in anti-War protest.

In addition to Israel and the Vietnam War, students spent time dealing with the aftermath of the Second World War. From the 1950s to the mid-1960s, it seems that numerous students were either directly related to European immigrants or were in communities to which these immigrants had moved. One graduate recalls that many students, their families, and their communities were still quite involved with the inclusion of Holocaust survivors. Meanwhile, a YU professor of Political Science writes that students through the mid-1960s “were first generation Americans, at best:” they spoke with their families’ “mainly East European accents,” and incorporated “their families’ belief that the world at large worked against them as Jews.” These were truly children of the Holocaust generation. The “acceptance of foreign-born students, refugees, and survivors of Hitler’s persecutions” into the YU faculty and student body as a direct result of the War ensured that individuals of European heritage had a significant impact upon the school. By the early to mid-1960s, these immigrants may have followed the historical trend to more openly publicize their “memories [and]…collective sense of obligation to those who had not survived” the Holocaust. The legacy of the Second World War especially manifested itself in YC during the late 1950s and early 1960s,
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generally through articles discussing the role Germany and its language should play in the student community. In 1959, the Student Council denied a German club charter.333 A year later, in a three-article series, a YU reporter in Germany wrote that the European country was (in his view) dishonorably shifting the blame for the Holocaust over to other parties.334 In 1961, with the trial of infamous Nazi Adolf Eichmann, more articles concentrating on the legacy of the Holocaust appeared; among other topics, these articles dealt with the trial itself,335 discussed the horrific comparison of Israel to the Nazis,336 or reported on educational programs on the Nazi regime.337 Even as late as 1968, YU men and women volunteered to collect eyewitness testimony from Holocaust survivors throughout the New York area.338

The Holocaust influenced student reactions to the national and international environment. When Israel fought the 1967 War, student response incorporated the concept that the Holocaust’s threat had not disappeared; rather, the Nazi’s anti-Semitic allies were still robust and the possibility of Israel’s destruction signified just another “phase” of the war against Jews.339 A report of a 1967 synagogue bombing in Miami, Florida spurred one Stern journalist to lament that white racists had espoused “a Nazi-type anti-Jewish terrorism” in the South.340 The idea that the Holocaust could be extended through people besides the Nazis also seems to have shaped student reactions to the Black Power Movement in the late 1960s. With the commencement of black rioting in
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Northern cities, some students jumped to the conclusion that the parallels between rioting and “the Nazi reign of terror” were too compelling to continue to be associated with the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{341} The development of anti-Semitic rhetoric among a vocal black minority further scared students, for whom this rang of Nazi propaganda.\textsuperscript{342} For instance, SNCC’s 1967 summer pamphlet includes, among other tidbits meant to educate readers about the Arab-Israeli conflict, a one paragraph reference to the Rothschilds:

“the famous European Jews…who have long controlled the wealth of many European nations, were involved in the original conspiracy with the British to create the “State of Israel” and are still among Israel’s chief supporters. That The Rothschilds Also Control Much of Africa’s Mineral Wealth.”\textsuperscript{343}

The reference to Rothschild control of European wealth and African goods, “associated as they are with enduring myths about worldwide Jewish financial domination,” soundly resembles anti-Semitic rhetoric.\textsuperscript{344} Ironically, when speaking to one of YC’s honor societies, Black Power activist Phil Luciano fiercely asserted that blacks were being subjected to a form of American holocaust, and were the only obstacles in the way of greater anti-Semitism in the States.\textsuperscript{345} This speaker obviously hoped to gain his audiences’ attention by locking into the legacy of the Holocaust – a topic which was sure to win their consideration. What this speaker could not have known is that only months later, a string of knife attacks and other acts of violence against YU students and staff in the Washington Heights neighborhood would augment student fears, create small bands of student vigilantes, and form the impetus for founding a Jewish Defense League (JDL).
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chapter. The JDL attempted to protect Jews by teaching and practicing self-defense techniques. This League felt that guarding Jews and their material goods should be its members’ ultimate priority, and therefore had no interest in interracial dialogue.

The expenditure of energy on anti-Semitism and the general Jewish plight during the 1960s extended beyond the 1967 War and the Black Power Movement. Indeed, it ranged from a 1960 telegram from the Student Council to the Secretary of Defense over anti-Semitism in the Navy, to student attempts to stop the tide of Christian missionaries converting impoverished North African Jewish refugees, to a rally over the public hanging of nine Jewish Iraqi men for questionable charges of espionage. Many students may have subscribed to the opinion of The Commentator’s editor-in-chief when, while listing a series of contemporary national and international cases of anti-Semitism in a 1962 editorial, he drew the gloomy conclusion that anti-Semitism “[would] never be eradicated” through either judicial systems or rational thought.

The matter of Soviet anti-Semitism did not escape the notice of this editor-in-chief. Recall that beginning with Stalin, millions of Soviet Jews were prevented from taking certain government careers, were censored in their language and worship, and were unfairly tried and accused in show courts. In addition, the USSR government published
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anti-Semitic propaganda and harshly punished any Zionist tendencies. YU students approached the situation slowly. In the late 1950s, they contrasted the freely practicing Irish Jewish community with Soviet Jewry’s imperfect living conditions. In 1961, student leaders discussed Soviet Jewry’s predicament with the unsympathetic Soviet representative to the United Nations, and in 1963, a Stern activist invited her classmates to send messages to their congressmen “urging definite action.”

With the arrival of charismatic immigrant Jacob Birnbaum to the New York scene, many in the YU community rallied around the cause of Soviet Jewry. On April 27, 1964, Birnbaum founded the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ) during a city-wide meeting. Though not necessarily true outside of New York, this SSSJ chapter drew many Orthodox Jews to its ranks, in part due to Birnbaum’s policy of meeting with YU students and Modern Orthodox educators. Once established, SSSJ led the American fight for Soviet Jewry, and riled up YU campuses along the way. In June of the same year, a Stern student declared that SSSJ protests and publicity efforts would persist throughout the summer. Over the next two years, SSSJ sponsored around thirty events, and YU students were sure to take a part. For instance, they reported on an SSSJ trip to Washington, D.C. in which delegates met with a Soviet Embassy official and

scouted sites for a future “mass” march for Soviet Jewry. Stern and Yeshiva students joined a 1,000-strong rally in December of 1966, and helped with a massive Passover Youth Protest sponsored by the New York Youth Conference for Soviet Jewry. Over the next few years, SSSJ continued to run numerous events, activities, councils, and educational programs. Birnbaum particularly highlights the 1968 Liberty Boat Ride, in which Stern women decorated two rented ships and “transformed them into Exodus Freedom ships,” publicizing the predicament of censured and confined Jews in the USSR. Activity continued on through the end of the 1960s: almost one hundred YU students picketed Russian newspaper editors touring America in 1970, and students gathered again to demonstrate against the anti-Zionist imprisonment of Boris Kochubiyevsky just months later.

Not all students and faculty supported the non-violent SSSJ tactics. For some, protest lay in the realm of the irreligious, and was alien to Orthodoxy; rather than protest, one ought to rely upon the actions of the Gadolei HaDor, or Giants of the Generation, learned and respected men who would solve such problems for the masses quietly and cautiously. Birnbaum recalls his fight against this “entrenched traditional Orthodox concept of ‘Shtadlonus,’” for among those who were certain that rabbis were already engaged in secret diplomatic negotiations with Soviet Russia, any public displays of

protest not only seemed disrespectful, but also potentially dangerous for Soviet Jews.\footnote{70 Birnbaum, "U.S. Jewish Student Activism for Soviet Jewry in the 1960s," 2.} Other students listened to Rabbi Kahane, head of the JDL, as he pushed for disrespectful and violent means more suited to the decade’s zeitgeist. He and his followers felt that SSSJ’s tactics, though noble, were simply unable to garner the necessary amount of attention.\footnote{71 Ella K. Shapiro, "Rabbi Kahane Defends JDL Tactics; Believes Active Protests Essential in Battling Increasing Anti-Semitism," \textit{The Observer} 11 March 1970. For more information on JDL’s tactics, please refer to the second chapter.} Meanwhile, YU leadership did not at first appreciate the toll the Soviet Jewry Movement was taking upon the limited time and overloaded curriculum the students shouldered. However, once the administration understood that the matter of Soviet Jewry was in fact “a matter of survival,” it consented to the cause.\footnote{72 Sheer. "Re: Thesis Research Questions."}

SSSJ tactics were by no means without inspiration – in fact, they were based upon the non-violent protest espoused by certain factions of the Civil Rights Movement. SSSJ leaders also encouraged,\footnote{73 Richter. "Re: Civil Rights Interview."} and received, the public backing of major Civil Rights leaders, including the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.\footnote{74 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Speaks out on Behalf of Soviet Jewry. "SSSJ Collection: Programs -- Soviet Jewry Information," 1965-1968, Yeshiva University Archives.} One of the original founders of SSSJ, Glenn Richter, feels that a number of religious college students sympathetic to the Civil Rights Movement, but unable to become involved in it for one reason or another, “found an acceptable” Jewish “outlet” for their sympathy through SSSJ activities.\footnote{75 Richter. "Re: Civil Rights Interview."} Accordingly, SSSJ’s opening letter parallels the “wrongs suffered” by American blacks to the “silent, strangulated pain” of Soviet Jews.\footnote{76 Jacob Birnbaum, Bernard Caplan, Moses Stambler, and James Torczyner, \textit{College Students’ Struggle for Soviet Jewry}, "SSSJ Collection: Founding Meeting April 27 1964," Yeshiva University Archives.} The letter also calls upon the legacy of the Holocaust, reminding its readers of their condemnation of silent
bystanders during World War II, and asking its readers to follow their words with action in the war for Soviet Jewry’s freedom.\textsuperscript{377} In fact, one of the reasons that Birnbaum so emphasized the acquisition of support from Christian clergy and Civil Rights leaders was that through the joint efforts of the American community at large, he envisaged an almost redemptive “counterpoint to the radical aloneness” of the Jewish community during World War II.\textsuperscript{378} In the case of SSSJ, the Holocaust, the Civil Rights Movement, and the fight for Soviet Jewry were inextricably intertwined.

Though Birnbaum’s Soviet Jewry Movement incorporated some of the leaders and tactics of the Civil Rights Movement, one would not say the same for YU student investment in religious practice, schoolwork, administrative changes, Israel, the Vietnam War, or other cases of anti-Semitism. Thus, while classmates did discuss the Civil Rights Movement, and some were even quite active within it, many others seem to have spent their time on distinct priorities and ideologies.
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Conclusion

In the previous chapter, I analyzed the priorities of Yeshiva University’s religious student body. Within an environment where Orthodoxy, intellectual pursuits, and extracurricular life coexisted, it seems clear that the Civil Rights Movement – as well as its brother Black Power Movement – inspired a great deal of discussion, a thirst for education, and some action. However, this same environment engendered a number of other student priorities, and most YU students spent what little time they had on a variety of affairs ranging from school administration and religious practice to Israel’s survival and the Vietnam War.

Yeshiva University’s students did not act on any of these issues alone. Just as some students proved deeply committed to the causes of the Civil Rights Movement, other Orthodox individuals across the United States participated in an array of activities supportive of the Movement, from community organizing to picketing. In addition to revealing some of these narratives and exploring Rabbi Dr. Heschel’s position as an Orthodox participant, my first chapter exposed the religious motivations behind Orthodox Civil Rights activity. Yet just as YU students often concentrated on issues closer to the proverbial Jewish home, such as anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, Orthodox leadership seems to have addressed issues of greater Orthodox concern with more attention than it did the Civil Rights Movement. As discussed in the second chapter, Orthodoxy spent the 1950s and the 1960s fighting for survival, supporting Israel, assimilating some of the values of its newer European immigrant constituency, reacting negatively towards anti-Semitism, anti-Orthodoxy, and the Black Power Movement, and arguing for and against
the Vietnam War. These matters may have helped lead Orthodoxy away from the struggle for black equality.

As I bring this project to a close, the novelty of much of my material has left me with questions just beyond its scope. For example, I feel that my thesis is male-oriented; women rarely responded to requests for material, whether on YU or on the Civil Rights Movement. Does this fact point to a generation of Orthodox women who were less proactive than their male counterparts? Were Orthodox women living in a culture that discouraged involvement in such tumultuous affairs? Or is some fluke of communication at fault for this skewed result? In addition, my thesis focuses on Orthodoxy without differentiating between Sephardic and Ashkenazic religious brands; these labels signify ancestry from different areas of the world, and carry the connotations of differing customs and cultures.379 What were the competing priorities of the Sephardic minority?380 Were religious Sephardic Jews involved in the Civil Rights Movement to the same degree as Ashkenazic Jews?

Though my thesis cannot possibly examine all aspects of the Orthodox milieu in the 1950s and 1960s, one observation which struck me as a Modern Orthodox college student in 2006 was the seeming similarity between Orthodoxy’s priorities then and now. Obviously, the Vietnam War has long passed, and the immediate effects of the Black Power Movement are not as violent or as fresh. We are now two generations removed from the Holocaust. Yet the voices which speak through The Observer and The Commentator feel much more familiar than foreign, and I cannot help but re-examine my
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thesis as it pertains to a similarly Orthodox student who daily decides which of her campus opportunities she will prioritize.

Rabbi Tsvi Blanchard writes that the Orthodox community today is not as committed to issues outside of the Jewish community as it was during the Civil Rights era.\textsuperscript{381} Meanwhile, Rabbi Saul Berman notes that the contemporary Orthodox community differs significantly from that of the 1950s and the early 1960s, in that it is almost homogeneously committed to religious precepts and firmly based in its Jewish day school education. Orthodox Jews have made inroads in almost every profession possible, and at the same time, Orthodoxy is more alienated from general American values.\textsuperscript{382} Modern Orthodoxy has weakened since Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik’s withdrawal from “public engagements” in the 1980s, and Orthodoxy in general has continued its trend to the religious right.\textsuperscript{383} On the other hand, Orthodoxy is much more comfortable in the limelight – take, for example, the case of Joseph Lieberman’s vice presidential campaign in 2000; through his nomination, an Orthodox individual was elected to represent the Democratic Party in national elections.\textsuperscript{384}

I wonder whether the precedent of Orthodox involvement in the Civil Rights Movement has been passed down to the next generation. Most of the Orthodox individuals with whom I have discussed my thesis are intrigued by its topic simply because it astounds them. Looking back, I realize that although my Orthodox day school celebrated Martin Luther King Day with passion, it never presented examples of participation that we could relate to as Orthodox Jews. Rosa Parks, a historically
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significant and courageous figure, did not represent an attainable model any more than Napoleon Bonaparte. I hope that through the process of preparing and submitting this thesis, I have inspired my co-religionists to recognize new models of Orthodox activity. Ultimately, the legacy of Orthodox Civil Rights volunteers is a powerful example of the intersection of religious values, individual leadership, and tikkun olam.
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