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Part One

Cultural Pluralism: Its Origin and Significance for Jewish Survival
"A frontiersman of intellectual life," wrote one man. "A spiritual and philosophical pioneer helping to better American life," declared a second. He "has studied and labored to find solutions of all the major problems of Jewish survival both here and abroad," stated a third. "But no field of endeavor is as highly indebted to him as is that of Jewish education," noted a fourth. And in a letter to him, Mordecai M. Kaplan penned these words: "I have always regarded you as the foremost creative American-Jewish thinker who demonstrates by actual example that it is possible to live with distinction synchronously in two civilizations."


5 Mordecai M. Kaplan to Kallen, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2501, Aug. 7, 1952.
It is Horace M. Kallen, "originator and leading philosophical exponent of the cultural pluralism idea," to whom these five men referred.

Who is Horace Kallen? What is "cultural pluralism"? What are the implications of cultural pluralism for Judaism and Jewish education? It is to such questions that this dissertation is addressed.

Horace Meyer Kallen, oldest child in a family that was to include six girls and two boys, was born on August 11, 1882, in Berenstadt, Silesia, Germany. His father was Jacob David Kallen. His mother's name was Esther Rebecca (Glazier) Kallen. The family migrated to the United States in 1887.

In Boston, Kallen attended the Eliot Grammar School and the English High School. His education continued at Harvard University, from which he graduated magna cum laude in 1903.

Planning a literary career, he proceeded to Princeton University. He taught English literature and took courses, at the post-graduate level, in English literature and philosophy. In 1905, despite the recommendation of Princeton's


8 Much of the information in this biographical outline may be found in Twentieth Century Authors: First Supplement, ed. Stanley I. Kunitz (New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1955), pp. 507-508. Certain biographical details relevant to the development of Kallen's thought and actions will be discussed in the chapters dealing with those ideas and deeds.
English department, his appointment was not renewed. Although Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) was then president of Princeton University, other school authorities could no longer tolerate Kallen's so-called "Jewish heresies, which they said were debauching the youth." Kallen learned that "the merest commonplaces of Massachusetts Harvard could be the violent heresies of New Jersey Princeton." Having also discovered at Princeton that the study of philosophy excited him more than English, and having been offered a fellowship from Harvard's Philosophy department and not from its English department, Kallen returned to Harvard to study for his doctorate in philosophy.

Back at Harvard, Kallen became a student and friendly associate of some of the great men in American philosophy in the early years of the twentieth century: Josiah Royce (1855-1916), William James (1842-1910), and George Santayana (1863-1952). In addition to his course work, he served as Santayana's assistant.


11 Ibid.


13 Horace M. Kallen, Corliss Lamont, John H. Randall, Jr., Herbert W. Schneider, James Gutman, Ernest Nagel, and Milton Munitz, "Conversation on Santayana," Antioch Review, XIX, 2 (Summer 1959), 240. The point was made by Kallen.
The bulk of Kallen's academic life has been spent teaching thousands of students at The New School for Social Research. He served as professor of social philosophy and psychology (1919-1952), emeritus professor (1952-present), and as Dean of the Faculty of Political and Social Science (1944-1946). Kallen has also been a visiting professor or lecturer at many other institutions, including Columbia University, University of Buffalo, Long Island University, and PMC Colleges (Chester, Pa.). He currently (1970-1971) teaches a course at the Jewish Teachers Seminary and Peoples University in New York City.

In 1926, Kallen married Rachel Oatman Van Arsdale. They have two children, Harriet and David. His hobbies are reading detective stories, painting surrealist pictures, watching television (especially athletics and boxing), and walking.\(^{16}\)

Confessing his unwillingness "to separate my profession from my life,"\(^{17}\) Kallen has written articles and books—as well as become involved in organizations—dealing with may problems of contemporary society. Even a partial listing of his affiliations over the years gives as indication of the wide range of his interests.


Among his general affiliations are: Committee for Recommending Books to the U.S.S.R. (executive board, 1922); Committee of Sponsors of "Free Germany"—German-American Council for the Liberation of Germany from Nazism (1942); Masaryk Institute (director); The Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations (1959); American Labor Conference on International Relations (chairman of the commission on education); American Civil Liberties Union; Rochdale Institute of New York (trustee, 1941); Consumers' Cooperative Services of New York City (board of directors); Mayor's Commission on City Planning of the City of New York; New York Commission on Intergroup Relations (consultant, 1961); Presidential Commission on Higher Education (1946); Navy League of U.S.A. (consultant on education); International League for Academic Freedom (secretary); Institute of Church and State (trustee, 1948); Conference on Methods in Philosophy and the Sciences (honorary president); Society for Scientific Study of Religion (president); Society for Psychical Research. 18

Among his Jewish affiliations are: American Jewish Congress (administrative committee - 1934, chairman of the commission on education - 1935, honorary vice president - 1960); World Jewish Congress (honorary member of the executive committee); American Association for Jewish Education (vice president); The Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences (president); Academic Advisory Council of the Jewish Teachers Seminary and Peoples University; Yiddish Scientific Council - YIVO (chairman, academic council); New York Committee of the American Fund for Palestinian Institutions (1944); League for Religious Freedom in Israel (board of directors, 1964); American Friends of Religious Freedom in Israel (president, 1967); Judaism (contributing editor).

As is evident from the preceding lists, Kallen's concerns and contributions have embraced such fields as international relations, labor, civil liberties, consumers' cooperatives, religion, philosophy, education, Zionism, and Israel. Basic to Kallen's work in every field has been his philosophy and program for action termed "cultural pluralism." Let us proceed to consider cultural pluralism, described by Sidney Hook (b. 1902), an American philosopher and educator, as Horace Kallen's "most influential doctrine."19

CHAPTER II: WHAT IS CULTURAL PLURALISM?

Introduction

To understand what cultural pluralism is let us examine it against the backdrop of the two other theories of Americanization which existed before cultural pluralism came on the American scene.

Immigration to the United States

It is perhaps not as well known as it should be that "the United States has received a larger number of immigrants than any country in history."\(^1\) However, the pace of that immigration and the sources of it have varied over the years. In 1780, more than 75% of all Americans were born in the British Isles or were descended from persons who were.\(^2\) Whereas not quite 1,000,000 persons came to the United States between 1790 and 1840, the country admitted more than 4,300,000 between 1841 and 1860; most of these later immigrants, too, came from the British Isles, with Germany and France being two of the other countries from which many immigrants sailed for America.\(^3\)

2 Ibid., 72.
3 Ibid.
A huge wave of immigrants washed onto America's shores in the late 1880's and early 1900's. From 1890 to 1910, more than 13,000,000 entered; from 1910 to 1920, another 16,000,000 arrived. More than half of the "new" immigration movement was from southern and eastern Europe. The "old" immigrants, being mostly from northern and western Europe, were hostile to being inundated by "foreigners" from parts of Europe with which the "old" immigrants had no familial ties. This resentment, coupled with such other reasons as the fear that new immigrants would flood the labor market, resulted in Congress passing various laws against immigration. The first such restrictive enactment was passed in 1882; it excluded diseased persons, paupers, and Chinese.

The culmination of this anti-immigrant legislation was the Immigration Act of 1924 which provided that 2% of the foreign-born persons of each nationality living in the United States in 1890 could be admitted annually.


5 Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919), who later became the twenty-sixth President of the United States of America, was among those who expressed such concern: "It is urgently necessary to check and regulate our immigration, by much more drastic laws than now exist; and this should be done both to keep out laborers who tend to depress the labor market, and to keep out races which do not assimilate readily with our own, and unworthy individuals of all races..." Theodore Roosevelt, American Ideals; And Other Essays Social and Political (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899), 3rd ed., p. 29.

6 Rienow, "Immigration and Emigration," 72.

7 Ibid.
The "old" immigrants expected the "new" immigrants to come to terms with America. Before the formulation of the theory and way of cultural pluralism, there were two main theories of adjustment for immigrants. We shall call these two theories "Anglicization" and the "melting pot." Let us note briefly what these theories were and why Horace Kallen objected to them.

"Anglicization"

"Anglicization" refers to the immigrant's renouncing of his native culture and interests and adopting instead the language, social behavior, dress, values, institutions, etc. of the American Anglo-Saxon. This position had many

followers during the nativist American movement of the 1830's and 1840's, in the "Know-Nothing" Party of the 1850's, and in the end-of-the-century doctrine of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. 9

With the coming of World War I the demand increased that immigrants be quickly Americanized. National unity was the desideratum; national uniformity seemed the prerequisite. 10 Immigrants were urged to become fully American, outwardly as well as in their political loyalties and values. 11 Especially suspect were German-Americans. The suspicion with which they were eyed was extended to all "hyphenated" Americans—any person living in the United States who retained some connection with the country from which he had emigrated or with his Old World group. 12 The patriotic demand was loud and clear.

9 Madison Grant's The Passing of the Great Race is the classic American exposition of the racist doctrine extolling the superior qualities of the "Aryans" or "Nordics" and denigrating as inferior peoples those from southern and eastern Europe. Denying that environment, education, and more opportunity can alter what limits heredity sets, he wrote that even as an Egyptian or Syrian freedman cannot be transformed into a Roman merely by clothing him in a toga and having him attend gladiator combats, so "Americans will have a similar experience with the Polish Jew, whose dwarf stature, peculiar mentality and ruthless concentration on self-interest are being engrafted upon the stock of the nation." Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race: or, The Racial Basis of European History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 4th rev. ed., p. 16.


12 "We welcome the German or the Irishman who becomes an American. We have no use for the German or Irishman who remains such. We do not wish German-Americans and Irish-Americans who figure as such in our social and political life; we want only Americans...We have no room for any people who do not act and vote simply as Americans, and as nothing else." Ibid.
for "100% Americanism,"13 which was identified with the behavior and ideas of the Anglo-Saxon American.14 The immigrants were badgered to shed their Old World cultures and become "an American along Anglo-Saxon lines."15

"Melting Pot"

The "melting pot" theory wanted America's residents to be "cooked" together, "melted" in the "pot," and participate thereby in the making of a new "dish." That is, the diverse peoples in the United States would mix with one another, "cross-fertilize" so ethnic differences would dissolve, and a new type--an American--would emerge.16 A truly new "dish" would eventuate, one different from the "ingredients" of all the Old World peoples and cultures that went into its making.17

13 "Cease to be European, and become Americans like the rest of us," Roosevelt advised the immigrants. Ibid., p. 28.

14 "No cry of un-American was ever levelled seriously at Calhoun or Webster. Americanization came to mean, as we all know, Anglicizing ourselves." Payne, "Cultural Pluralism in American Universities," 10.


Especially in the isolation of the frontier, declared the American historian Frederick J. Turner (1861-1932), did this "melting" actually take place: "In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated, and fused into a mixed race, English in neither nationality nor characteristics." 18

The British-Jewish writer Israel Zangwill (1864-1926), in his popular play, The Melting Pot, exultingly proclaimed: "America is God's crucible, the great Melting Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and re-forming." 19 His published play was dedicated to Theodore Roosevelt, who had written: "In our veins runs the blood of many an Old World nation. We are kin to each of these nations and yet identical to none." 20

The "dish" that would emerge from the "melting pot" was of great concern to persons like Madison Grant (1865-1937), lawyer and author. Grant was worried that "if the Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control and we continue to follow our national motto and deliberately blind ourselves to all "distinctions of race, creed or color," the type of native American of Colonial descent will become as extinct as the Athenian of the age of Pericles, and the Viking of the days of Rollo." 21


21 Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, p. 263.
Others, who were not espousing theories of racial superiority, nevertheless hoped that while non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants would contribute to the "melting" process, the end result would have a very discernible Anglo-Saxon flavor.\textsuperscript{22}

Kallen, who also perceived that both the "Anglicization" and "melting pot" theories aimed to produce "a new "American race"--a blend of at least all the European stocks...into a newer and better being whose qualities and ideals shall be the qualities and ideals of the contemporary American of British ancestry,"\textsuperscript{23} objected to both theories. Let us consider his objections by discussing them from three perspectives: the immigrants, the Anglo-Saxons, and America.

**Objections Concerning the Immigrants**

First, argued Kallen, the "Anglicization" and "melting pot" theories paint an unrealistic picture of what actually happens to the American immigrant. When the immigrant comes to America he cannot be asked to divest himself at once of his Old World nationality and culture (including his native language). If he does, to whom will he be able to go with his problems? Who will understand

\textsuperscript{22} Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, p. 125

his ways of valuation, his customs and language, except one who was like-molded in the same Old World culture? Who will understand his conflicts between the Old and New Worlds, and who will advise him what to do in a language he comprehends? Only those from his ethnic group who preceded him to America and already know English as well as their Old World tongue can speak with the new immigrant in this way. But they can serve as intermediaries for the "greenhorn" only if the Old is not immediately discarded. 23a

If the ethnic boarding-house, the ethnic bank, employment agency, mutual aid society, and other ethnic institutions to which the immigrant turns in order to ease his adjustment in America were to be discouraged and eliminated, the immigrant would be lost in America. 24 These places are the main instruments for salving his natural feelings of being an outsider; they bring him gradually into the American ways of doing things.

Second, noted Kallen, the immigrant has often found himself thrown back into his ethnic-cultural group because of the economic exploitation and social discrimination he experienced. 25 To whom should he go for understanding and help if he is cheated or discriminated against by his English-speaking boss or fellow workers? To whom should he

23a Ibid., p. 161.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., p. 102.
turn if he, a laboring man, is denounced by the business interests as "socialistic," "radical," "un-American," a "hyphenated" American? To whom should he run for comfort when the "100% Americanism" groups begin to badger him because of his differences in speech, dress, manners, religious practices, etc. and press him to submit to Americanization?

For consolation the immigrant naturally turns to his Old World inheritance, especially to his native tongue and religion. Particularly to his religion does he turn, "for it conserves the inward aspect of nationality rather than mere religion." His religious institution becomes the focus of his Old World ties and gives the immigrant a feeling of comfort and at-homeness. The religious institution, therefore, whose function is primarily to deal with God and what He wants of man, also comes to serve the immigrant as a vehicle for preserving his ethnic group and culture.

26 Letter from Kallen to the editor of The Socialist Review, Jan. 12, 1920; Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2517.

27 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 102, 216-217.

28 Ibid., p. 103.

A third factor, says Kallen, pushes the immigrant back to his ethnic group: financial success in the New World. Initially, since he is desirous of economic employment, the immigrant endeavors to remove those external differences of language, dress, and other habits which might be frowned upon by a prospective employer. He tries to lose his Old World ways, becoming as the in-group wants him to be. However, as the immigrant becomes financially more prosperous and more Americanized externally, he is less likely to be labelled a "foreigner." It is now "safe" for him to seek ways of expressing his "traditional social inheritance or nationality" from the Old World, which he has not really lost. He is likely to "develop group self-respect; the wop changes into a proud Italian, the hunky into an intensely nationalist Slav." He seeks to learn or recall his nationality's cultural heritage which he had little time for in the adjustment-Americanizing days. He seeks ways of expressing his "nationality" in America. What has happened is that "the institutions of the Republic have become the liberating cause and the background for the rise of the cultural consciousness and social autonomy of the immigrant...On the whole, the automatic processes of Americanization have not repressed nationality. These processes have liberated nationality, or more or less gratified it."  

30 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 103.
31 Ibid., p. 106.
32 Ibid., p. 115.
So much for reasons why, from the immigrant's viewpoint, the demands of enthusiasts for the "Anglicization" and "melting pot" theories were not realistic. But Kallen also brings objections from the standpoint of the Anglo-Saxons themselves.

Objections Concerning the Anglo-Saxons

Where is the model American Anglo-Saxon, Kallen asks, whom the immigrant is to imitate if he wishes to heed the call to assimilate?\(^{33}\) An immigrant can change his clothing, food habits, and language; these are only externals. Those who clamor for the Americanization of the immigrant also want him to be converted to an "inward Americanization,\(^{34}\) a sameness in outlook and manner.\(^{35}\) But this inwardness that is supposedly so typically American is nowhere discernible. There are many differences in outlook and manner among Americans. Some of those differences erupted during the Civil War, but many of them continue. Should it be argued that a President is a fitting model of the "true" American, even such Presidents as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt differed decidedly


\(^{35}\) Note Theodore Roosevelt's words: "That man is the best American who has in him the American spirit, the American soul." Theodore Roosevelt: Addresses and Papers, ed. Johnson, p. 247. In speaking of the immigrants Roosevelt also said: "We must Americanize them in every way, in speech, in political ideas and principles, and in their way of looking at the relations between Church and State." Theodore Roosevelt, *American Ideals*, p. 26.
in aspiration and temperament. Which of them is the "true" American and why? If none, who is the model American Anglo-Saxon after whom the immigrant is to model himself? There is none, answers Kallen.

Furthermore, Kallen inquires, if the call is to do away with ethnic nationality and become "American," why the formation of such "patriotic" groups as the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, and family societies which trace their ancestry to England? Why the emphasis on the commonality of concerns and civilization between England and America? This emphasis on the Anglo-Saxon tradition deliberately perpetuates differences between the oldcomers and the newcomers and is a manifestation of an Anglo-Saxon "ethnic nationality."

Indeed, the Anglo-Saxons have urged the newcomers to assimilate but, added Kallen, the Anglo-Saxons have not helped them assimilate. They have hindered the immigrants' assimilation by refusing to have contacts with them. The immigrants are not accepted by the in-group Anglo-Saxons into their social or business worlds. This stratification makes for less intermarriage between Anglo-Saxons and non-Anglo-Saxons than would otherwise occur and makes less likely the immigrants' inward assimilation of American life.

36 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 264.

37 Ibid., pp. 264-265.

38 Ibid., p. 99.

39 Ibid.


41 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 98.

42 Ibid., pp. 96-97.
In avoiding contacts with individuals from the "new" immigration, the Anglo-Saxons are turning their backs on reality. They are trying to live in a country whose ethnic composition, they foolishly dream, is what it always was. But the national composition of the country has changed since the American Revolution. In 1776 the country was not composed of many ethnic variants. It was overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon in its forefathers and heritage. Now, however, ethnic dissimilarity exists. People from many lands have come to America. Not only has each people brought to the United States its own ideas, faiths, cooking, language, literature, skills, etc., but the various ethnic groups are concentrating in certain cities and sections of the country. Many French are living in Louisiana, Dutch in Pennsylvania, Negroes in the South, Germans in Wisconsin and

43 Ibid., p. 71. A different position was taken by Woodrow Wilson who, in speaking of America, stated that except for New England and the South "here from the first were mixture of population, variety of element, combination of type, as if of the nation itself in small." Selected Literary and Political Papers and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson, no editor noted (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1926), 3 vols., III, p. 223. But Madison Grant's opinion is similar to Kallen's: "One often hears the statement made that native Americans of Colonial ancestry are of mixed ethnic origin. This is not true. At the time of the Revolutionary War, the settlers in the thirteen colonies were overwhelmingly Nordic, a very large majority being Anglo-Saxon in the most limited meaning of that term." Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, p. 83.

elsewhere inland, Scandinavians in villages and farms of
the Dakotas and Minnesota, Slavs farther west in the mining
areas, Spanish and Mexicans in the Southwest, Irish in New
York and Boston, Jews and other immigrant groups from east-
er and southern Europe in New York and Philadelphia. The
country is dotted and striped with diverse ethnic group-
ings. 45

Displeased at the large numbers of diverse "foreign-
ers" keeping too many of their old ways in America, the
long-settled Americans could try to impose their cultural
outlook on the country by establishing English as the only
permitted language of education and social discourse, and
by concentrating in the schools on the teaching of English
literature, history, and customs. 46 This is undemocratic,

45 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States,
p. 77; The Education of Free Men, p. 118. This fact of
ethnic concentration in certain localities was very much
evident when Kallen wrote his articles, in 1915, on "De-
mocracy Versus the Melting Pot," which appeared in The
Nation on Feb. 18 and 25, 1915. The situation had hardly
changed when the articles were reprinted in his book,
Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 67-125, in
1924. Although ethnic concentration is not as pronounced
now as it was in the first two decades of this century, it
is still evident. Gordon--Assimilation in American Life,
p. 151--errs in stating that "the emphasis on ethnic
groups occupying their own locality, which is particularly
apparent in The Nation essays on cultural pluralism...is
not discernible in his later discussions." Kallen does
mention it as late as his 1949 volume, The Education of
Free Men, p. 118.

46 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States,
pp. 118-119. While Kallen is here opposing the use of public
schools as the Americanizer's tool, he does approve utili-
zizing the public school as a place where children "discover
America as an ideal and standard." See Horace M. Kallen,
Indecency and the Seven Arts: And Other Adventures of a
Pragmatist in Aesthetics (New York: Horace Liveright, 1930),
p. 91. In Kallen's opinion the public school should be the
locale for "the support and strengthening of the common
faith in the democratic way of life and thought by the de-
velopment of habits of thinking and doing." See Kallen, "Of
however, as well as destructive of the individual immigrant's self-respect. In addition, even these extreme measures could not insure the continuation of the Anglo-Saxon Americanism which the "old" immigration wants. 47

The truth is, distasteful though it be to the fervent Americanizers, that ethnic diversity has taken root in America and the clock cannot be turned back. Moreover, the sustaining heterogeneity of the Old World cultures of America's immigrants makes it clear that our many ethnic cultures won't be "Anglicized" or "melted" away. 48 The immigrants show no inclination to commit "collective cultural suicide." 49

What is at the heart of the demand that immigrants "Americanize" is a fear of difference. 50 Members of the "old" immigration are unwilling to live with those individuals whose ideas and ways are different from their own. In exploring persisting ethnic differences the Anglo-Saxons are

47 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 118-119.


49 "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," Farbund News, Feb. 1963, p. 1. This article consists of excerpts from a talk Kallen delivered at Unser Camp in Highland Mills, N.Y., when being honored on his 80th birthday by the Farbund-Labor Zionist Order. The excerpts were apparently not edited by Kallen for publication. The editor of Farbund News is not mentioned.

50 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 115; Americanism and Its Makers, p. 12.
really extolling uniformity to the Anglo-Saxon American culture. But their intent is contrary to the position of the men whom they admire so much, the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Objections Concerning America

The second paragraph of America's Declaration of Independence begins: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

What does it mean, Kallen asks, to say that all men are "equal"? "Equal" cannot mean "alike," "similar," or the "same," as one penny is to another penny in shape, weight, value, and design—for people vary in sex, skin-color, language, culture, rank, job, etc. At the root, "differences are ultimate" and cannot be wiped away. It

51 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 79, 145.


is difference which identifies an individual as that person, a group as that group. Indeed, "to be" and "to be different" are synonyms. Each person is different/all other persons. And each person, in struggling to continue living, is striving to live on in his or her difference.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence, says Kallen, understood this. By declaring that "all men are created equal" they were not stating that all persons are the same. Rather, they were giving a "revolutionary meaning" to the word "equal"—namely, "equal as different."


1. "Equal"--For Individuals

In the idea of "equal as different," which is what the Democratic Revolution vindicated, the Declaration of Independence was saying that each person is free to pursue his difference where he will. There are at least four implications of the individual's right to his life-long struggle to realize his difference: (1) that each person is different, a different, "an end in himself," and is entitled to his difference evidence of the realization of "the essential pluralism and variety of human nature" by the men who signed the Declaration; (2) that there is a "parity of the different," for each person is intrinsically "equal"--not superior--to anyone and everyone else in worth, meaning, and dignity; (3) that there is to be no


61 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 20, 60.


63 Kallen, Individualism, p. 93.


penalty for anyone being himself (i.e., different), and no attempt is to be made to impose one's own ideas or ways on others, for it is wrong to arrest the different's desire for self-expression; (4) that each individual is "equal" (i.e., no individual is more privileged than anyone else) in his right to pursue freely life, liberty, and happiness.

In a sentence, by "equal" the Declaration of Independence means that each individual is entitled to the same opportunity to realize his differentness as best he can. In calling the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness one of man's "unalienable rights" the assertion was being made that the individual's struggle to continue living, which is a struggle to realize himself in his difference, is intrinsic to man.


2. "Equal"--For Groups

Kallen states that when the Declaration of Independence asserted that "all men are created equal" the meaning of equal-as-different and the implications thereof were intended to refer to groups as well as individuals. 71

As Kallen has written in The Education of Free Men:
"Equal" in the intent of the Declaration, is an affirmation of the right to be different, of the parity of every human being and every association of human beings according to their kinds in the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." 72


72 The Education of Free Men, p. 110. Also see Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 81; The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 32; Americanism and Its Makers, p. 8; "Humanism and Anti-Semitism," p. 15. Leo Pfeffer—in Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 160—challenges Kallen's assertion that the Founding Fathers intended to sanction the diversity of groups. In speaking of the group of men who produced the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, Pfeffer declares: "If it thought of diversity at all, it thought of diversity of individuals, not of groups or cultures." Kallen replies—on p. 180 of the same volume—that the Declaration's emphasis on equal liberty for each individual is not meant to deny the diversity of groups but "to alter their associate structure" from "isolationist, authoritarian, hierarchical configurations to intercommunicative, democratic and congregational ones." After all, Kallen adds on p. 181, no individual constructs his personal history without groups to feed him ideas and practices; therefore, the Founding Fathers must have meant for diverse groups to exist.
That pluralism, including ethnic-cultural pluralism, was intended by the Founding Fathers may also be seen, in Kallen's opinion, in two other matters: the first proposal for the Great Seal of the United States, and the first American flag. 73

The initial suggestion for the Great Seal of the United States was an engraved shield divided into six sections, each part representing one of the six major European lands from which America's immigrants had come: England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, and Holland. The suggested motto was "E Pluribus Unum." If the Founding Fathers wanted to discourage or eliminate ethnic diversity, as well as differences in religion, politics, etc., why bother to remind Americans of their lands of origin?

As for the American flag, it contained thirteen stars and stripes—indicative of the thirteen different states with their many diversities/peoples and cultures.

The Great Seal proposal and the flag's design, Kallen holds, show the Founding Fathers' "awareness of the fact of difference, of the parity of differences, not political merely, but also ethno-cultural and religious." 74

73 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, pp. 68-69.

74 Ibid., p. 68.
But not only does each group have a right to live, it has the equal right to do so in safety. As for differences among groups or individuals being the occasion for aggression by other associations or persons, "to all this the Declaration said, No. Female and male, Indian, Negro and white, Irishman, Scotchman and Englishman, German and Spaniard and Frenchman, Italian and Swede and Pole, Hindu and Chinaman, butcher, baker and candlestick maker, workingman and gentleman, rich man and poor man, Jew and Quaker and Unitarian and Congregationalist and Presbyterian and Catholic—they are all different from each other, and different as they are, all equal to each other." 75

Each individual and each group is different and equal. Each group that an individual chooses to help form or belong to--be it ethnic, religious, scientific, political, or whatever--has an equal right to exist safely and freely in its difference. This includes each nationality and each culture in the land. 76 Each nationality is not asked by

75 Kallen, Americanism and Its Makers, p. 8.

76 In a letter to the writer of this thesis, dated Nov. 30, 1970, Kallen wrote: "To me nationality has always been interchangeable with culture." Nevertheless, in the bulk of his writing Kallen usually does distinguish between the two: a nationality or ethnic group fashions for itself a culture. See Horace M. Kallen, Judaism At Bay: Essays Toward the Adjustment of Judaism to Modernity (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1932), p. 38; Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 46. Also note Kallen's words on p. 31 below, from Ira Eisenstein, "Dialogue With Dr. Horace M. Kallen," Reconstructionist, XXXVI, 5 (May 8, 1970), 17.
America to "Anglicize" or "melt" but is given an equal opportunity to develop its differentness, to pursue its own brand of happiness. Just as the Irish are a part of the British Commonwealth with the opportunity to develop as the Irish wish, so should each nationality everywhere have an equal right to develop its particular genius as it wants. What each nationality develops is its culture. That different ethnic cultures can live together peacefully and fruitfully in one land "is possible only in a democratic society whose institutions encourage individuality in groups, in persons..." The equal right of/ethnic culture in a country to exist and develop its equal difference as it will in equal safety and liberty is what Kallen called "cultural pluralism."


78 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 118.

79 For more on the relationship between nationality and culture see notes 76 and 173 in this chapter as well as pp. 59-60.

80 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 43.

Horace Kallen was not only the first person to use the term "cultural pluralism," he was also the first to point out that the sanction for pluralism, including cultural pluralism, goes back to the basic ideas of the Founding Fathers. Kallen himself is well aware of this distinction. He has said that "you can't think of our Declaration of Independence...except as intending a society of equally free peoples. The plural peoples is my contribution. Cultural pluralism signifies acknowledging the diversity and equality of peoples and their cultures."

Thus, Kallen, in advocating "cultural pluralism" rather than "Anglicization" or the "melting pot," was very likely the first to champion the legitimacy of perpetuating different ethnic cultures in America.

3. Government As A Tool

Since, according to Kallen, those who signed the Declaration of Independence wanted to enable each individual and each group to have an equal opportunity to develop his

---

82 Kallen, in a letter to Milton M. Gordon (b. 1918), professor of sociology at the Univ. of Mass.--Mar. 17, 1959, p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives--wrote: "Yes, I am the originator of the term, at least I don't know of anybody else. I had begun to use it in the course of discussions with the late Alain Locke, who was a pupil of mine at Harvard around 1906 or '07. I had no occasion to use it in print until much later (namely, in 1924, in Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp.11, 43.)."

or its difference, an instrument had to be devised to ensure that each could do so without fearing aggression from another person or group. That instrument is the government.

It is from the statement that "all men are created equal" that the proposition follows, in the Declaration of Independence, concerning governments: "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

This means that government is a tool, not a master. A government is an institution. All institutions are "like the Sabbath, made for men and not men for institutions." A government does not dictate to the people what their purposes and rights are; the government gets its purposes and rights from the people. Government originates and continues by the consent of free men.

84 Horace M. Kallen, "Philosophical and Ethical Aspects of Consumer Cooperation," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 191 (May 1937), 3. For the Jewish classical source of the reference concerning the Sabbath being made for man, see Babylonian Talmud, Yoma 85b.


86 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 204.
is "a mode of association," a voluntary coming together of individuals in order to enable all the people and each person to continue struggling freely in his difference to attain life, liberty, and happiness.

The government's function is not to force or "melt" differences out of anyone. It should strive to let the differences exist and grow in equal safety and liberty.

The government's function is similar to that of a traffic policeman. A traffic officer tries to enable each person in his automobile to travel where he wishes, safely, for his own safety and that of others. The government does likewise. It tries to keep life's ways open by providing conditions whereby an equal opportunity is extended to each person and to each group to realize his or its proper excellence in equal liberty and safety regardless of the power, wealth, or station of any person(s) or group(s).

87 Kallen, Individualism, p. 159.

88 Horace M. Kallen, ""Black Power" and Education," The Hourglass, I, 2 (Fall 1969), 19.


90 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 76.

91 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 121; "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 82.

What if an individual or group wants more for itself than for others? Consider, again, the traffic policeman. He gives a traffic ticket to a motorist who violates the rules designed to enable many automobiles to be on the same road. As with automobiles, so with individuals and groups. They are all on the same "road" of life and their being different is not to be penalized unless one of them seeks to violate the rules of the "road" by trying to impose its will on others. Since democracy is concerned not with what a person's religion, culture, or other association or belief is, but with how he lives with those different from his own, there should be no penalty for being different but only for being intolerant to the different. Penalties must be given to such individuals and groups in order to allow democracy to achieve its goal of "so to perfect the organization of society that every man and every group may have the freest possible opportunity to realize and perfect their natures."

93 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 192.

94 Kallen, "Humanism and Anti-Semitism," 15; "Whither Israel?" 102; letter to Mrs. Hera Morgan of Washington, D.C., Jan. 6, 1956, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2503.


96 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 61.
But the United States was intended to be more than a country in which each person and group, in isolation, went about its way of struggling on as best it could with the government there to insure all the equal opportunity to do so in freedom and safety. Beginning with the right to be different, democracy suggests how to make best use of the fact of difference. That how Kallen also finds in the Declaration of Independence. The words "all men are created equal," he claims, were also "implying, if not saying that a free society is a voluntary union of the different." Just as individuals come together in a union to form a government so should differents associate in union, in equal liberty and safety, for the purpose of living better than any could alone.

4. Orchestration

What is the "union" way of coming together so a free society will result? The way or how of each different group (cultural, religious, occupational, etc.) living together, as well as what results therefrom, is described.


99 Since we are dealing primarily with cultural pluralism we shall henceforth refer mostly to "cultural," "nationality," or "ethnic" groups, not to others (such as occupational).
in Kallen's famous analogy of the orchestra. Just as in an orchestra each instrument has its particular tonality, timbre, and theme, so each cultural group has its distinctiveness. That distinctiveness or differentness is in its value systems, literature, cooking, ways of work and play, languages, art, etc. No instrument is outlawed: no culture is suppressed. Even as each instrument plays its part in the making of the melody, so each cultural community contributes to the fashioning of the larger national culture. The cultural composition that results is the American civilization—which could include Negro spirituals and jazz, the Jew's gefilte fish, etc.

However, even as the instruments continue playing during the making of the melody so do the cultural groups in America carry on even while joining in unison to form the national culture. Indeed, the playing never stops; the

100 Among the many places where Kallen uses this analogy are: Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 124-125; Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 198; The Liberal Spirit, p. 37; The Education of Free Men, p. 117; Americanism and Its Makers, pp. 13-14; "Prejudice—The American Way," Jewish Education, XVII, 1 (Nov. 1945), 24; "Whither Israel?" 102; "How I Bet My Life," 1.


103 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 118.
instruments (cultures) remain active and the melody (national culture) is continually being constructed by them. To use a different analogy, each cultural community is an individual stream of cultural difference which combines with other such streams and "makes the great river of the nation's cultural life"; but each stream remains a stream even after the river comes into being.

The eventuating American culture is e pluribus unum, a single culture that comes about because of the union of many different. Different cultural communities have voluntarily joined in a union for the common good; American culture has resulted. What American culture is, then, is a union of ethnic cultures, a "national fellowship of cultural diversities," a "federation or commonwealth of national cultures."


107 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 232.

Of course there is no pre-determined agreement as to which culture will make what contribution to the national culture. In the "cooperation of cultural diversities," the Anglo-Saxon culture, for example, will be one culture among others rather than the only one. If the literary, political, and social traditions of English civilization are to be dominant in America—and Kallen admits this possibility—let it be a dominance which wins out as a result of a competition which is friendly and fair. As each ethnic group "plays" its "instrument"—lives its cultural life—others will decide which, if any, "notes" (i.e., cultural items from a particular ethnic group) will be accepted by more than the one "musician" (i.e., members of that ethnic group). The "music," therefore, is not "written" before the "playing." Indeed, "in the symphony of civilization the playing is the writing." 111

The important thing is that all the players come together resolved to play in harmony for the purpose of achieving a common melody—that is, that each cultural community should endeavor to relate to the other cultures in many and varied ways but in a purposely

109 Ibid.
110 Ibid.
111 Ibid., p. 124.
live-and-help-live manner\textsuperscript{114} for the benefit of each and all. A "precarious harmony"\textsuperscript{115} results from the orchestration of these different cultures. Not unanimity, but a consensus evolves from the interplay of differents.\textsuperscript{116} Quarrels, "discords and dissonances,"\textsuperscript{117} are present among the cultures and may overwhelm and destroy their living together in peace. What is necessary is vigilance, an ongoing watchfulness and determined effort to see to it that the different cultures do live together peacefully in the American Way. This desire to make cultural pluralism work is instilled by education,\textsuperscript{118} an education that begins early in life and which persistently and continuously guides people to realize the importance of cultural pluralism and how to implement this faith in cultural pluralism into fact.\textsuperscript{119}


\textsuperscript{117} Kallen, "Higher Education," p. 171.


\textsuperscript{119} Kallen, \textit{The Education of Free Men}, p. xiv.
Why is it important for cultures to "play" together in a "teamplay of the different?" Because of benefits they bring others as well as themselves, progress results when cultures orchestrate. New ideas and ways are brought into the larger national culture, enriching it, strengthening it, and enabling it to grow rather than stagnate. One outcome of this country's creative interaction of so many diverse cultures has been a richness which is far superior to what has been attained by homogeneous nations like Spain. Voluntary orchestration of differences has helped democracy become creative.

But there are additional benefits to each ethnic group in orchestrating with other groups in addition to the satisfaction of contributing to the national culture. As the various cultures communicate freely and equally with one another, one group might see something in another group which it wants for itself: "Each group finds something of a Jones in every other." A free exchange

120 Horace M. Kallen, "American Jews, What Now?" The Jewish Social Service Quarterly, XXXII, 1 (Fall 1955), 16; Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 147.


122 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 117.


occurs. Each group takes the item it wants—be it a food, article of clothing, an attitude towards women, a way of behaving at prayer services, a language, literature, manner of walking, etc.—into its own group, and is thereby enriched. And others borrow from that cultural group. A mutual enrichment takes place. In other words, by living in contact with other groups each is diversified and lives more abundantly than it could alone.

Furthermore, because the cultures come together in friendly communication without attempting to intimidate, outlaw, or destroy others, they help insure to each an equal opportunity to live more safely and freely than any one could by itself. Their joining in this way makes for the least frustration of any culture and thereby promotes peace and justice.


127 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, pp. 100, 190.
5. Implications of "Union"

Note that a key word of Kallen's is "union." He has said that "a free society is a voluntary union of the different."128 The cultures "effect a cultural union - a union, not a unity, an orchestration, not a unison."129 His choice of words is deliberate---"union" and not "unity." "Unity" has the connotation of "uniformity," of losing one's difference in the process of being joined to something else. "Union" connotes the retention of difference while relating to other equals in equal liberty and safety.130 Democracy "aims, through Union, not at uniformity, but at variety, at a one out of many, as the dollars say in Latin, and a many in one."131

"Union" is both the way different relates as well as the result of their relationships. For, indeed, e pluribus unum: from the union of different comes a union which is not identical with any individual different.132 This is the sense of "unitedness" in the words "United States."133

131 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 61.
132 Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 82.
Each state in our country retains its individuality even while in union with the other states; but the end result, the United States, is a union which is different from any individual state.

What is true of the individual states also holds for each ethnic culture. In America, each culture retains its identity while joining in unison to form a union of cultures. This is cultural pluralism.

Kallen considers "union" to be such a characteristic description of the American Way that he says a non-citizen of this country can become culturally an American if he endeavors to foster a union of differences. His advice to an immigrant, therefore, is not to "Anglicize" or "melt" but to orchestrate, to effect a union, between his pre-American past and his new life so that a healthy wholeseness, an "unum," results. The ideal is not to be assimilated to America, in the sense of completely losing one's Old World ways; the goal is to assimilate from America, to take the best from America and orchestrate it, form a union, with his Old World beliefs and practices.


135 Letter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121).

This union of things and people is what it means to live, be one an immigrant or native. In the struggle to live on each of us forms a union of his up-to-now self, with the present, to form a tomorrow. The individual's personality is an ongoing unique formation of self-orchestrating habits of perceiving and venturing which his biography spans.\textsuperscript{137} We make a union of the new skills and knowledge we acquire/ we had so we may live on in the future. We learn how to obtain food and shelter, how to read, work, speak, etc. We do not repeat the doing of any action today in exactly the same way as yesterday. We drop or modify some old ideas and ways. Each second of life we are the same and yet different from what we were. We continue struggling to live in the future in the ideal way we would like.\textsuperscript{138} We want the liberty to continue that struggle.\textsuperscript{139} Because liberty is so basic to a person's struggle to live,\textsuperscript{140} says Kallen, "I think this is why our Declaration of Independence calls freedom an "unalienable right," the peer of life and happiness."\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{137} Kallen, \textit{A Study of Liberty}, p. 22; cf. \textit{The Liberal Spirit}, p. 45.


\textsuperscript{139} Kallen, \textit{A Study of Liberty}, p. 77.

\textsuperscript{140} Horace M. Kallen, \textit{Liberty, Laughter, and Tears} (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Ill. Univ. Press, 1955), pp. viii, 118.

\textsuperscript{141} Kallen, "Disenfralment or Extinction," 39.
6. "Hyphenation"

And is not "hyphenation" a synonym for "union" or "orchestration?" "Hyphenation" is not an undesirable relationship. Basically, "hyphenation" is a very desirable, and unavoidable, way of living for men.

Kallen agrees that the denunciation of the "hyphenated American" during the World War I period was then "fully justified," for security reasons. Because of possible harmful consequences to America, to be condemned then were the "hyphenated" German-Americans who, living in America, were disloyal to America and aided the German enemy. Their "hyphenation" was of a type where the hyphen uniting the two parts (i.e., the German and the American) was either bent (so an individual remained with one side, America, only so he would use it for the welfare of the other side, Germany) or broken (so he definitely cast his lot with one side or the other).  

Now, however, the demand of the Americanizers is not justified, says Kallen. Their demand, in the post-World War I years, was that all immigrants "should be required at once to forget their past and cut themselves off from their present connections, learn English and be naturalized or expelled from the country." But where disloyalty to


143 Letter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121), p. 3.

144 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 133.
America is not involved, Kallen declares, such action is wrong. The words "hyphenated American" are not, in and of themselves, a "term of reproach." The term can be honorable and desirable, describing a worthwhile and inevitable relationship.

"Hyphenation" is a fact of life. It pervades one's life. No person has an interest in, and loyalty towards, only one individual, institution or group. At the same time one human being can be: a child, brother or sister, parent; member of a social, recreational, occupational, literary, or civic organization; member of a certain church, political party, and ethnic group; resident of a community, state, country; etc. Each claims his loyalty and calls for certain ways of behaving. At times these varied loyalties and different interests will conflict, and he may have to choose one over the other. But "it is absurd to lose sight of the truth that the hyphen unites very much more than it separates..." The more one hyphenates—that is, makes a union of—these associations and allegiances, the more agreement among them results. And his attachment to each is strengthened and nourished by his attachment to the others.

145 Ibid., p. 62.
146 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," pp. 82-83.
148 Kallen, A Free Society, p. 78; The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 62.
149 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 63.
150 Kallen, Individualism, p. 181.
The more different groups or associations an individual is, or could be, part of, the more enriching, free, and civilized he is likely to be.\textsuperscript{151} The person who isolates himself from contacts with different is ill; "the natural man is a social man."\textsuperscript{152} With his own ethnic group as the center,\textsuperscript{153} to which he maintains a commitment,\textsuperscript{154} the cultured man ties to relate with people of many cultures, religions, communities, and interests\textsuperscript{155} in order to learn therefrom, to have his life enriched, and to enrich the lives of others.\textsuperscript{156} The civilized individual "orchestrates a growing pluralism of associations into the wholeness of his individuality."\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{151} Kallen, \textit{Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea}, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{152} Kallen, ""Black Power" and Education," 5.


\textsuperscript{154} Kallen, \textit{Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea}, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{155} Horace M. Kallen, "The Jew and His Community," letter to the editor, \textit{Jewish Newsletter}, VIII, 18 (Sept. 1, 1952), 1; \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{156} Kallen, \textit{The Decline and Rise of the Consumer}, p. 457.

\textsuperscript{157} Kallen, \textit{Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea}, p. 25; cf. \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, p. 64: "In the individual this union is what we designate by culture, and culture is nothing more than spiritual hyphe- nation - it is humanism in the best sense of the term."
There is also another reason why it is desirable to have many and diverse attachments. With many hyphenations one is not as likely to be fanatically bound to any one association.\textsuperscript{158} One becomes more cosmopolitan; "without losing his commitment to his home base, his citizenship, his original culture, he is now also no stranger in any different country and culture."\textsuperscript{159}

As for a group, its culture is, in part, the result of contacts with other groups and being influenced by those contacts in ideas and practices.\textsuperscript{160} What, Kallen asks, is the British-American syndrome of some Anglo-Saxon Americans if not a "hyphenation?"\textsuperscript{161} Far from being anti-American, "the hyphen can be...a token of successful Americanization."\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{158} Kallen, \textit{Individualism}, p. 181.
\textsuperscript{159} Kallen, \textit{Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{160} Kallen, \textit{The Structure of Lasting Peace}, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{161} Kallen, \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, p. 104.
How the hyphen can symbolize this is described by John Dewey, whose words Kallen approvingly quotes: "The genuine American, the typical American, is himself a hyphenated character. This does not mean that he is part American and that some foreign ingredient is then added. It means that... he is international and interracial in his make-up. He is not American plus Pole or German. But the American is himself Pole-German-English-French-Spanish-Italian-Greek-Irish-Scandinavian-Bohemian-Jew—and so on. The point is to see to it that the hyphen connects instead of separates." 163

Good "hyphenation," therefore, is an enriching bond of union, of communication. 164 It is to be encouraged, not condemned. Good "hyphenation" makes for a more abundant life for an individual, a group, and for civilization itself which is, after all, but the "hyphenated" union of all the world's cultures. 165


7. The American Idea

The hyphen, too, says Kallen, "can be a symbol of the American Idea." 166 What is the "American Idea?" Cultural pluralism is an application of it to cultures. The American Idea speaks of all individuals, groups (cultures, religions, clubs, etc.), or whatever—any different—whose difference one recognizes as equal and legitimate, and to whom one strives to relate deliberately and respectfully in order to understand, appreciate, learn, and cooperate for the individual and common good. 167 In short, the American Idea signifies "the democratic process." 168

166 Letter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121), p. 3.


168 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 103.
The American Idea, which gave rise to the "American Dream," is very much part of democratic America. In fact, the American Idea constitutes "the religion of democracy." It is a definite "faith," truly America's

The "American Dream" is that America is a land of opportunity where a man is judged only on the basis of what he does and that the government should give him an equal chance to make of himself what he can and will; see Kallen, "The Making of Americans," 37. The phrase, the "American Dream," was first used in 1931 by James T. Adams (1878-1949), the American historian; see Kallen, Philosophical Issues in Adult Education, p. 49.

The phrase, the "American Idea," was first used on May 29, 1850, by Theodore Parker (1810-1860), a Unitarian clergyman and abolitionist, when he addressed an anti-slavery convention in Boston; see Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 61. The American Idea, Kallen maintains, really originated with Roger Williams (1603?-1683), a minister and founder of the Rhode Island colony, and with the Society of Friends, both of whom, in the seventeenth century, were receptive to the idea of religious freedom as a basic human right; see Kallen's letter to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121), p. 3.

T. S. Eliot, in his letter to Kallen, dated Nov. 26, 1954--pp. 1-2, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497--refers to Kallen having used the phrase in an address he delivered at a meeting of the National Administrative Committee of the American Jewish Congress. Eliot objects to the phrase, as he makes clear on p. 2, because he believes that national religions tend to become intolerant and imperialistic. On the same page, Eliot pleads: "I beg you, Horace, not to put the phrase "the religion of America" into circulation!" Kallen replies to Eliot--op. cit. (above, note 121), p. 3--and argues that the American Idea is "not so much a religion, as religion...and the American religion insofar as Americans are Americans. For they are Americans, and not merely citizens of a particular sovereign state, in the measure of their commitment to the American Idea." That is, if they have faith in the American Idea and accept the content of that faith as a creed and program of action, for them it is a religion.

Horace M. Kallen, "Color-Blind," The Emory University Quarterly, XXII, 2 (Summer 1966), 115.
national religion, and it identifies people as Americans. This American Faith, therefore, is not a substitute for religion; rather, it is that specific perception and understanding of human beings and their relations which people must accept if they are to live together peacefully and freely as equals. The American Idea is the religion of how—how different are to relate to one another. This American Idea is "the religion of religions" because without acceptance of the American Idea's how no other religion that a person adheres to could be assured that it would be able to live in peace and freedom as an equal.


174 See Kallen's reply to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 171). On another occasion Kallen said: "If you are truly American then you have got to believe in the right to be different..."; see Kallen's speech in the Proceedings of the 40th Anniversary Celebration of the American Jewish Congress, Nov. 22-23, 1958, p. 162, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2493.


176 Ibid., p. 207.

177 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 101.
The classic creedal expression of the American Idea, Kallen holds, is the Declaration of Independence. Its classic code is the Constitution of the United States. Subsequent elaborations were in such documents as: George Washington's letter to the Jewish congregation at Newport, Rhode Island, and his Farewell Address; Thomas Jefferson's inaugural addresses; John Brown's speech to the court that sentenced him; Abraham Lincoln's two inaugural speeches, Emancipation Proclamation, and Gettysburg Address; Woodrow Wilson's Addresses to the Congress on War Aims and Peace Terms; Franklin D. Roosevelt's Four Freedoms' speech. These are some of the outstanding items in "the Bible of America."  

178 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 222; also see p. 4 of Kallen's unpublished address, c. May 1958, at the Theodor Herzl Institute, in connection with the publication of his book, Utopians At Bay--Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 983.  

179 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 222.  

180 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 80; Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 87; An extensive list of documents is given in the latter volume on pp. 87-88.  

181 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 80; Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 222; "Whither Israel?" 100.
Cultural Pluralism

Cultural pluralism is an application to the area of cultures of the religion that is the American Idea. Because cultural pluralism aims to effect "a union of the different on equal terms through intercommunication and cooperation," it urges each ethnic culture to express itself as it will and to orchestrate itself with other cultures for the benefit of its followers and other people. America's culture eventuates therefrom. In a real sense, therefore, cultural pluralism is "both the means and goal of a way of life for whose survival and growth American history has been an unceasing struggle." To a great extent, the history of America has been and is an endeavor to realize in the facts of a way of life the faith in the equality of different and how different should relate. In a sentence, this is the means, way, and goal of cultural pluralism: the recognition of the equal right of each ethnic culture to exist and develop.


its equal difference in equal safety and liberty; to inter-
relate deliberately, respectfully, and peaceably in their
differences for the benefit and safety of each and all; and
to participate in the peaceful orchestration of their dif-
ferences, which results in the culture of the land and
helps fashion world civilization. 185

Summary

In conclusion, it is clear that Kallen rejects the
Americanization theories of "Anglicization" and the "melting pot" not only because they do not truthfully tell what
does and should occur to the immigrant, and because they
are false to the actual ways of behavior of the Anglo-Saxon
Americans themselves. These theories must also be reject-
ed—indeed, should primarily be rejected—because they dis-
tort the realities of America and its democratic religion
of the American Idea. Neither demands for "Anglicization"
nor the "melting pot" should be the way of acting towards
diff erents, immigrants or not. The best way is that of cul-
tural pluralism, which applies the American Idea in that it
advocates the existence, growth, and orchestration of the
diverse cultures into a harmonic and creative union.

185 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea,
pp. 51, 100; The Education of Free Men, p. 118; "Of Then
Which Say They Are Jews," pp. 26, 48, 82-83, 143; "E
Pluribus Unum" and the Cultures of Democracy," 331;
"American Jews, What Now?" 22; "The Restoration of Hebrew,"
14; idem, "Alain Locke and Cultural Pluralism," The Journal
of Philosophy, LIV, 5 (Feb. 28, 1957), 119.
CHAPTER III: CULTURAL PLURALISM AS A RATIONALE FOR JEWISH SURVIVAL

Introduction

What is there about cultural pluralism which makes it not only an alternative to the difference-rejecting theories of "Anglicization" and the "melting pot" but also a rationale for, and a way of, Jewish survival for the individual Jew and the Jewish group in the United States? Let us approach an answer to this through Horace Kallen's own experiences.

Kallen and His Jewish Identity

Kallen was raised in a home that emphasized orthodox Jewish religious observance. ¹ He recalls, for example, that when he was three years old an aunt dropped a coin on his Hebrew-alphabet book whenever he read a letter correctly.²

When a child in Boston's streets and schoolyards, Kallen was subjected to tauntings from, and scuffles with, some Christian children.³ They were directed at him because he was a Jew, one whose ancestors, they said, were responsible for the death of Jesus. This anti-Semitism, coupled with the collapse of his Jewish religious faith when he

¹ Eisenstein, "Dialogue With Dr. Horace M. Kallen," 16; Kallen, Individualism, p. 5.
read Spinoza in his high school years, helped make Kallen vary reluctant to continue living under the penalty the Christian world imposed upon anyone bearing the label "Jew."  

When Kallen was about to enter college he considered concealing his Jewish identity. In summary, four questions bothered him. First, since he viewed the word "Jew" to be, in part, "a name for a fear-nurtured error called "religion"," why remain within the Jewish fold? Second, since the other part of the meaning of the word "Jew" he thought to be "a name for an invidious error called "race"," why remain a Jew when making distinctions among races was erroneous? Third, since Kallen believed that the Jewish tradition had little, if any, connection with America, why remain part of something which had little relation with the fashioning of America's past or the building of its future? Fourth, if, as Kallen believed, America was to be a land where all people are the same, where Old World differences are dropped and all citizens are the same as "Americans," why keep such a qualifying label as "Jewish" American?

4 Ibid.; Individualism, p. 8; American Philosophy, p. 251.


8 Ibid., 9-10.


He gave answers to these four questions, answers which enabled him to retain, and willingly seek to advance, his Jewish difference in America. Let us see how he answered these questions. In his answers we shall understand how he viewed cultural pluralism as a rationale for his own, and other Jews', Jewish survival in the United States.

Questions one and two, whether the Jews are a combination of a religion and a race, deal with who are the Jews. Let us find out what Kallen came to say about which designations should be given the Jewish group and the totality of Jewish culture.

What the Jewish Group Is

Kallen agreed that human beings who have common ancestors, a common history, a common culture, and who live a common life, constitute a nationality or people. He observed that Jewish human beings are aware of these common ties, respect their history and culture, sense themselves united by their history and culture, and hope to transmit them to their descendants. The Jews, therefore, form a nationality, or people, or ethnic group, said/11


13 Ibid., pp. 19, 31; idem, Judaism At Bay, pp. 39, 77; "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57.
Nationality, however, is not to be confused with nationalhood or citizenship. The latter terms, said Kallen, involve a political state, but "nationality" does not necessarily. The Welsh, for example, are a nationality scattered throughout England. The Jews are a nationality scattered throughout the world.

What the Jewish Group Transmits

Each ethnic group fashions for itself a culture. By "culture," Kallen means "the total complex of attitudes and judgments, beliefs and knowledge, morals and manners, folkways and mores resulting whenever human beings, living and working together, shape their experience of thoughts and things into arts and sciences." Culture is a people's

14 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, pp. 20-21, 73.
15 Ibid., p. 20.
16 See above, notes 95 and 102 in chapter 2.
17 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 304. Kallen's understanding of culture— as he acknowledged in Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 44—is similar to that of Edward B. Tylor's: "Culture or Civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." See Edward B. Tylor, Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920), vol. 1, p. 1.
"total way of life," which, being "total," includes its religion(s).  

The Jewish nationality, like every ethnic group, has a culture. What is unique in Jewish culture is rooted in the uniqueness of Jewish people, just as what is unique in Spanish culture, for example, is rooted in the distinctiveness of the Spanish ethnic group.

**How One Becomes A Jew**

An infant born of a Jewish mother and Jewish father is not automatically a Jew, says Kallen. At birth every baby is only an animal being with, hopefully, the capacity of learning how to become a human being. But the baby does


19 T. S. Eliot, believing, unlike Kallen, that culture is included in religion rather than religion in culture, wrote Kallen that "a culture is the outcome of, the living garment of a religion"; See T. S. Eliot's letter to Kallen, op. cit. (above, note 171, chapter 2), p. 2. Kallen replied that "when I say "culture" I do not exclude, but include religion"; see above, note 121, chapter 2, p. 4.


not mature into a human being. He or she becomes a specific kind of human being. Which kind of human being the child becomes is decided at birth because of the education and life experiences that person undergoes in the home. 23

The child begins learning in the home how to live (eat, sleep, dress, etc.), which attitudes and memories to hold dear, which beliefs and practices to cherish, and which goals to treasure. 24 But his parents do not invent those ways and ideals for him; nor are they innate. 25 The parents have learned them from the culture of the ethnic group of which they are members. 26 Parents make their "animal" child into a Jewish human being by exposing him to the Jewish cultural identity 27 in order to help shape his growth through one or more of the following: the Jewish kitchen with its special foods and the ways of preparing them, Jewish values, Jewish books, Jewish holidays, Jewish art,


24 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 60; "American Jews, What Now?" 27.


Jewish customs, Jewish social organization, Jewish religion, the ways Jews speak, the languages they talk, the ways Jews act, the attitudes Jews have, Jewish places, contacts with Jewish people, etc. In sum, one becomes a Jew by acculturation, Kallen maintains, by being raised in and accepting for one's own his Jewish culture.

With this framework of Kallen's thinking concerning the Jews, which he started to come to in his college years, we can now proceed to detail how Kallen answered his earlier question concerning the Jews being a religion.

I. Jews Are Not A Religion

Kallen declared: "I am myself an adherent of no religion, but I should resist harshly a statement that I am therefore no Jew." And he realized there were others like him, men like Louis Brandeis (1856-1941)—the famous lawyer and Zionist leader, later to become a Justice on the United States Supreme Court—and Albert Einstein (1879-1955), the outstanding physicist and Zionist, whom


30 See below, pp.

31 Kallen, speech at Second Menorah Convention, p. 84.
rejected the beliefs and rituals of any and all varieties of Jewish religion but who nevertheless accepted and maintained an interest in secular aspects of Jewish culture as well as in Jewish survival. As for the Jewish religion, such Jews (including Kallen) appreciated its role in the making of Jewish history and Jewish culture but advocated a "transvaluation" of all religious traditions by science, industry, and other aspects of modernity. Surely, Kallen said, those persons like himself who are not followers of the Jewish religion are nevertheless still within the Jewish fold.

They are indeed, he came to conclude, because the Jewish culture or heritage is not solely religious.

1. "Judaism" and "Judaist"

To Kallen, the name of the culture of the Jews is not "Judaism." For him, "Judaism" is only the name of the Jewish religion. It is a religion, like Roman Catholicism or Presbyterianism. A person who ignores the


33 Kallen, ""Jew" and "Judaist"," 7.

34 Ibid.; Judaism At Bay, pp. 239-240.


secular elements of Jewish culture, 37 who believes in a Jewish religious creed and code, 38 and who limits his Jewishness to the religion of "Judaism"—such as an adherent of the Netumi Karta, Lubavitcher Rebbe, or the American Council for Judaism— 39 is a "Judaist," according to Kallen. 40 A "Judaist" insists upon identifying a person's Jewishness only on the basis of that individual's commitment to the supernaturalist creed and code of Judaism.

2. "Hebraism" and "Jew"

But Jewish culture is more than its religious elements, says Kallen. Beyond the creed and code of "Judaism" are many other aspects of Jewishness: languages such as

39 Kallen, ""Jew" and "Judaist"," 7.
Hebrew, Yiddish, and English (when these languages are used for purposes other than prayer and other religious activities); the Jewish group's non-religious literature, art, music, customs, attitudes, the multitude of its secular interests. 

Although the totality of Jewish culture was once mostly "Judaism," especially since the Haskalah (Enlightenment) have these secular elements come to prominence.

To the totality of the Jewish people's religious and secular components— that is, to all the languages, literatures, cuisines, art, attitudes, memories, customs, values, rituals, etc. that make up the culture of the Jewish people— Kallen gives the name "Hebraism." It is "Hebraism" from which Jewish parents take items when they teach their


43 Kallen, "Cultural Pluralism and Jews," 32.

44 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 107. Bernard Heller (b.1900), a Reform rabbi— in "Dr. Kallen's Judaism," The Menorah Journal, XXII, 1 (Apr.-June 1934), 78-79— has written that Kallen's dividing of the Jewish people's life into religious and secular areas is erroneous and a break with normative Jewish tradition. Heller understands Judaism's teaching of K'dushat Hachayyim (life's sacredness) to mean that all aspects of living are included within the religious domain. Moreover, even if one were to grant the existence of separate sacred and secular areas, Heller argues, Kallen errors in not assigning the religious elements the centrality they traditionally enjoyed.

children Jewish attitudes, beliefs, cooking, prayers, etc. It is "Hebraism" the child is reared in, learns, and usually comes to accept as his own.\textsuperscript{46} It is basically "Hebraism" that people mean when they speak of "Jewishness," and they intend "Hebraic" when they say "Jewish."\textsuperscript{47} Most people today use the word "Judaism" to include the religious and secular elements of Jewish culture--i.e., "Hebraism."\textsuperscript{48}

While a "Judaist" is one who embraces only the religious components of Jewish culture, a person who was raised in the Hebraic culture and who advocates some of Hebraism's secular components--regardless of whether or not he adheres to "Judaism"--is a "Jew."\textsuperscript{49} If, therefore, "to be a Jew is to be committed to an ethos, a culture learned from infancy and lived in and cherished,"\textsuperscript{50} and if this culture has


\textsuperscript{48} Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 42. Elsewhere--in "Menorah Address," 130 and "The Promise of the Menorah Idea," 13--Kallen has told us that the wording of the Harvard Menorah Society's aim, in which he had a part, was deliberate. The Society was established "for the study and advancement of Hebraic culture and ideals." The word chosen was "Hebraic," not "Jewish," nor "Judaistic," nor "Zionist," "Hebraic" was chosen with the intention of designating the totality of the Jewish culture and of making the Society a gathering-place for Jews of every inclination and interest.


\textsuperscript{50} Kallen, "American Jews, What Now?" 19.
children Jewish attitudes, beliefs, cooking, prayers, etc. It is "Hebraism" the child is reared in, learns, and usually comes to accept as his own. It is basically "Hebraism" that people mean when they speak of "Jewishness," and they intend "Hebraic" when they say "Jewish." Most people today use the word "Judaism" to include the religious and secular elements of Jewish culture—i.e., "Hebraism." 

While a "Judaist" is one who embraces only the religious components of Jewish culture, a person who was raised in the Hebraic culture and who advocates some of Hebraism's secular components—regardless of whether or not he adheres to "Judaism"—is a "Jew." If, therefore, "to be a Jew is to be committed to an ethos, a culture learned from infancy and lived in and cherished," and if this culture has


48 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 42. Elsewhere—in "Menorah Address," 130 and "The Promise of the Menorah Idea," 13—Kallen has told us that the wording of the Harvard Menorah Society's aim, in which he had a part, was deliberate. The Society was established "for the study and advancement of Hebraic culture and ideals." The word chosen was "Hebraic," not "Jewish," nor "Judaiistic," nor "Zionist," "Hebraic" was chosen with the intention of designating the totality of the Jewish culture and of making the Society a gathering-place for Jews of every inclination and interest.


religious and secular elements, a non-"Judaistic" Jew of Jewish nationality like Kallen can have a relation to his Jewish culture and Jewish people. Such an individual can be enriched by, and advance, the secular aspects of Hebraism and he can struggle for the survival of the Jewish group.51

A non-religious Jew is still a Jew because he is a member of the Jewish nationality or people, and one's nationality is not a sometimes thing. A person can change such associations as his job, political party, or religious preference, but an individual cannot change his nationality. As Kallen phrased it: "Men may change their clothes, their politics, their wives, their religions, their philosophies, to a greater or lesser extent: they cannot change their grandfathers. Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, in order to cease to be Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, would have to cease to be, while they could cease to be citizens or church members or carpenters or lawyers without ceasing to be."52

51 See Kallen's statement concerning Louis Brandeis and Albert Einstein, above, pp. 62-63.

52 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 122-123.
Being a Jew is like being a Welshman or Slav. It's one's "natural social group," a person's nationality in whose culture one is reared. This kind of group can't be destroyed without annihilating the individuals who constitute it.

In a sense, therefore, the Jew is like a soldier. Just as "soldier" is really a collective term--for one cannot think of "soldier" except in terms of "army"--so does "Jew" designate "an associative relationship." "Jew" is a collective term because being a Jew involves being part of the Jewish nationality and having as one's own that people's culture.


54 Kallen, "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57; also see The Structure of Lasting Peace, pp. 31, 63, where the statement is made that one is born a Jew.

55 Therefore, there is no such thing as an "identity crisis" to Kallen. After all, each person begins life with the nationality and culture of his parents. (If the parents are of different nationalities, the child may be reared in at least two different cultures and have more of a hyphenated nationality.) Of course a person adds to that basis throughout his life. See Eisenstein, "Dialogue With Dr. Horace M. Kallen," 19.

56 Kallen, "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57; The Structure of Lasting Peace, pp. 31, 63; Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 132-133.

57 Horace M. Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress" (New York: American Jewish Congress, 1933), mimeograph, 14; cf. Judaism At Bay, p. 123.

In summary, to Kallen, "anybody is a Jew who of his own free will calls himself by that name or feels compelled to answer to it when others call him by it." As Joseph L. Blau has pointed out, in Kallen's definition no one can coerce another into being a Jew; only "an inner coercion can lead to his feeling himself to be a Jew." To Kallen, this self-definition of "Jew" is very much part of his American heritage of freedom. He asks, "Isn't it a part of the democratic faith to accept their right to call themselves Jews so long as they choose to do so?"

Why had Kallen ever thought that the Jewish group is a religious body? Because of what happened to the Jews in the Emancipation period. Until the Emancipation, Kallen says, the word "Jew" possessed a single, unambiguous meaning. The least that the word meant was "adherence


65 Letter from Kallen to Arthur H. Sulzberger, Jan. 29, 1945, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
to the Jewish rule of life and the Jewish way of thought."

The individual Jew was looked upon by the Gentiles, and thought of himself, as part of a nationality, a group, a corporate entity. But with the Emancipation of the Jews, beginning in the late eighteenth century in Europe, "Jew" was split in two. The individual Jew was given citizenship but the "army" to which he belonged—the Jewish nationality with its distinctive culture—remained disenfranchised. The difference between Jew and non-Jew was said to be religion only, not nationality and ethnic culture. In accepting this bifurcation between religion and nationality, religion and ethnic culture, the emancipated Jews were really de-Hebraizing themselves into a sect and permitting their selfhood to be stripped away. For they could not be "natural" men as the Emancipators wished; there are no "natural" men. Human beings "are never merely men"; they are particular men and women who belong to a certain nationality and are the inheritors of that nationality's culture.

66 Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 3.

67 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 35.

68 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 68.
Thus, as for Kallen's first objection to remaining a Jew—that this meant believing in a religion, which he could no longer accept—Kallen came to see that religion is only one component in Jewish culture. The totality of that culture, Hebraism, includes religious and secular elements. Since the Jews are a nationality, and a Jew always remains a Jew, a non-religious Jew could enrich his life with the secular areas of Jewish culture. The truth is, said Kallen, that "sects and dogmas pass, ethnic groups and cultures remain." 69

II. Jews Are Not A Race

A second reason why Kallen, when he entered college, was reluctant to identify himself as a Jew was because he thought the Jews were not only a religion but also a race, and to him "race" was an offensive, discriminatory term. 70 During his college years, he admits, he shared the common belief of that day that differences among individuals were due to the fact that peoples were divided into races. 71 Instead of seeing each "instrument" in the country's "orchestra" as a nationality with its particular culture, he thought differences among peoples were effected

69 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 38.
70 See above, p. 57.
by "race."\textsuperscript{72} He argued for the existence of certain hereditary racial characteristics, an "inherited organic set from a remoter common ancestry,"\textsuperscript{73} which each individual gets via heredity. These characteristics, which get expressed in the personalities and culture of each ethnic group,\textsuperscript{74} are never nullified: "Interracial marriage or no intermarriage, racial quality persists, and is identifiable... to the end of generations."\textsuperscript{75}

Later, however, Kallen dropped this racial note and ascribed the differences among nationalities not to race but to the culture each ethnic group fashions for itself.\textsuperscript{76} Each people's "group-personality"\textsuperscript{77} is due to its particular culture. No doubt scientific investigations concerning "race" convinced Kallen to change his mind.\textsuperscript{78} Actually, however, even in his early writings Kallen had said that race "is hardly distinguishable from nationality."\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{72} Kallen, \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, pp. 42, 130.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 94. Also see Kallen, "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57, where Kallen spoke of the "inherited mental set of the group."

\textsuperscript{74} Kallen, \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, pp. 42, 175-182, 190.

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 176-177.

\textsuperscript{76} Kallen, "The Promise of the Menorah Idea," 11.

\textsuperscript{77} Kallen, \textit{Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea}, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{78} For a discussion of the concept of race, see Arnold Rose and Caroline Rose, \textit{America Divided: Minority Group Relations in the United States} (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), pp. 22-28, 256-276.

\textsuperscript{79} Kallen, \textit{Culture and Democracy in the United States}, p. 190.
But it is interesting that Kallen continued to refer to "race." For example, in a 1935 letter to Stephen S. Wise (1874-1949), the distinguished Reform rabbi and Zionist, Kallen wrote that he favored rejecting the Nazi notion that the Jews are a race. The Jews, said Kallen, are "a historic people with the blood of many races, having a social personality characterized by a single historical culture." ²⁰

This emphasis on culture, not race, as the differing factor Kallen made clear in 1941, in a letter to Alvin Johnson (b. 1874), director of The New School for Social Research. In it Kallen explained that Jewish culture "has no "racial" ground. It is a complex of traditions, sentiments, ideas, attitudes, documents, ceremonials, dialects and diets, making a whole with a certain timbre, rhythm and pitch of its own." ²¹

And in 1955 he wrote: "It is by now a commonplace of observation and study that what is Jewish in the Jewish being is not biological but social. The fertile matrix of this heritage is a tradition: that live configuration of remembrances, attitudes, and value-systems composed into doctrines and disciplines and making up the singularity of a culture." ²²

²⁰ Letter from Kallen to Stephen S. Wise, Nov. 6, 1935, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.


In 1957, Kallen specifically stated that the word "Jew" should not be taken in a biological sense. "It signifies neither race nor heredity," he declared.\(^{83}\) That which is "Jewish" about the Jew is his culture, which is not innate in him but which he learns.\(^{84}\)

It is apparent, then, that Kallen came to see that the Jewish group is not a race but a nationality, or people, or ethnic group, with its distinctive culture called "Hebraism."

III. Hebraism Has A Connection With America

A third reason for Kallen's early disenchantment with being known as a Jew was that he felt the Jewish tradition had little connection with the new America that was being wrought.\(^{85}\) But he came to be freed from this illusion by Barrett Wendell (1855-1921). In Professor Wendell's Harvard class on "The Literary History of America," Kallen saw and heard a man of the type he at first thought America was supposed to be made into—the Anglo-Saxon, New England mold—praising the Jewish Bible's positive influence in the making of the pre-1776 American mind and the later American

\(^{83}\) Kallen, "Goals for Jewish Education," p. 175.

\(^{84}\) Ibid.

\(^{85}\) See above, p. 57.
Kallen was perplexed and disbelieving. He wrote a paper taking exception to the teacher's position. Professor Wendell patiently went over the paper with his pupil. Feeling ashamed, Kallen determined that he would study the Jewish heritage, which was his heritage. He would see which parts of it were meaningful for him and for the world.

It was under Professor Wendell's guidance that Kallen came to perceive "the pluralistic faith underlying American life and letters." He learned that the Pilgrims and Puritans had been students of the Jewish Bible. Inspired by the example of the ancient Hebrews, they had come to America not, primarily, to worship God in their own way but seeking the freedom to actualize


89 This has been succinctly summarized as follows: "If humanism was the rediscovery of a literature, Protestantism was the rediscovery of a book...Bibliolatry took shape as an attempt to legalizate in the wilderness the Mosaic code and to learn from the cloudy pages of the prophets the American signs of the times." See Literary History of the United States, ed. Robert E. Spiller, Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, Henry S. Canby (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), vol. 1, p. 13. Also see Kenneth N. Murdock, Literature and Theology in Colonial New England (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1949), p. 42.
their English nationality as they wanted. The speech, history, and manners of English culture they utilized as the basis of their group life. It was from the Hebrews that this vision came of their right to be different before God, of their right to realize their nationality as they wished! So, too, was it from the Hebrews that their Calvinistic interpretation of "chosenness" came as well as the theocratic model of their political institutions! The Jewish Bible had also influenced the liberal organizational structure of the Congregationalist churches, whose pattern was a step "to the notions of equal liberty of all religious societies." 

No Hebraic contributions to America? Why, Kallen now concluded, "Hebraism and English nationality - these are the spiritual background of the American commonwealth." 

IV. The Jewish Difference Should Be Retained In America

As for the fourth question in Kallen's mind--If America was to be a land without differences, why retain the Jewish difference?-- we have already suggested

92 Kallen, "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 82.
93 See above, p. 57.
Kallen's answer. He came to understand that "equal" meant not the "same" but "equal as different"; that the equal right to be different applied to individuals and groups, including nationalities; that since America was to be a confederation or union of nationalities and cultures, each of whom would help fashion America's national culture, America wanted each ethnic group—including the Jews, whom Kallen came to see as constituting an ethnic group—to retain its difference and do its best so it could not only enrich the lives of all who came into contact with it but also better assist in the making of the national culture.

Let us make a few additional observations to this overall answer to which Kallen arrived concerning the retention of the Jewish difference in the United States.

1. "Equal" and the Jews

Mention has been made of Spinoza's influence on the weakening of the traditional Jewish religious belief which Kallen absorbed in his parents' home. It was from

---

94 Ibid., pp. 24-26.
95 Ibid., pp. 25-31.
96 Ibid., pp. 58-59.
97 Ibid., pp. 35-41.
98 Ibid., pp. 56-57.
studying Spinoza, too, that Kallen thought "equal" meant "same" and that differences among people make no difference.99

When he realized later that "equal" in the Declaration of Independence affirmed man's right to be equal in his difference, he saw in this interpretation a liberating statement for the oft-persecuted Jew: in America the Jew was not to be penalized for being a Jew, as he was elsewhere in the Christian world.100 The American Idea of equality liberates the Jewish individual and Jewish group, permitting them to exist as equals in difference with their Gentile neighbors.101 Here, the Jew doesn't have to apologize or justify his right to his Jewish difference.102 As of right the Jew is entitled to his equal difference as Jew. He is encouraged to make that difference grow freely and to orchestrate it with the other differences of persons and groups.103


100 Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 218.


102 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 85; idem, "Address By Prof. Horace K. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," mimeograph, p. 11, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2515.

2. "Freedom" and the Jews

In addition to "equal," there was another word that Kallen admits he originally misunderstood: "freedom." Like many American Jews he thought that to be "free" meant to throw off differences, to flee one's Jewish identity. Some possible alternatives that other Jews took when they tried to shed their Jewish difference, included: becoming Christian, or a non-hyphenated American, or a Reform Jew (whereby one's Jewish differences are minimized), or a Zionist in Zion (where a person's Jewish differences wouldn't have to be lived in a primarily non-Jewish environment).

But Kallen learned that democracy meant not freedom from but freedom for, not a freedom from difference so that everyone could be pressed into the same mold but a freedom for difference so that each individual and group could live, choose, and grow in its equal difference so as to live the more abundant life. Such a freedom, Kallen concluded, is "the supreme excellence of life."


107 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, pp. 73, 182; The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, p. 384.

3. "United States of America" and the Jewish Nationality

Freedom for the Jewish group is inherent, too, in America's very name, says Kallen. Unlike the names of European countries no nationality is part of this country's name, "United States of America." This is deliberate since America is meant to be "a democracy of nationalities" where no one nationality is favored. The Jewish nationality is therefore an equal nationality with all the other nationalities in America. The Jewish ethnic group is one of the equally cooperating pieces in the "mosaic of peoples" that is the "United States of America."

4. "American" and "Jew"

The Jew, like other individuals in the United States of America, possesses an equal freedom and right to be an American and a member of his nationality. The Jew becomes an American by or reared in, or learning later, the outlook and actions characteristic of the American culture; he is a Jew by nationality since that people is his "natural social group."

109 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 51.
110 Kallen, "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 82.
111 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 58.
112 Kallen, "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57.
As for the words "American" and "Jew," which most Jews living in the United States would be, Kallen holds that "the more comprehensive term is American." This is so because "American" denotes the act of faith in the American Idea, which is a large, trans-nationality, and trans-national Idea, and includes the assumption that Jews will work with non-Jews in its realization. But "Jew," Kallen maintains, connotes a "narrower, more intimate circle of relationships." With such a viewpoint it would seem more accurate to speak of "Jewish Americans" rather than "American Jews."

5. The Jewish Function in America

The Jew's function in America, Kallen declares, is to live his Jewishness freely, openly, and fully in order that other cultures in America could be enriched thereby; the Jewish group could play its part "in the cultural division of labor" whose orchestration eventuates in American culture; world civilization might be made more abundant by the Jewish contributions.


114 Ibid.


116 Kallen, "The Tercentenary: Yomtov or Yahrzeit?" 10.


118 Kallen, speech (untitled), Proceedings of the 40th Anniversary Celebration of the American Jewish Congress, 14.
6. Advocates of Jewish Assimilation Are in Error

Having laid the groundwork for retaining the Jewish difference in America because of how he now understood "equal," "freedom," and the nature of the United States as a country whose culture emerges from the cooperation of all ethnic cultures (including the Jewish), Kallen proceeded to answer those who advocated Jewish disappearance in America via assimilation. They were in error, Kallen held, for several reasons.

a. Against America's Best Interests

First, those Jews and non-Jews who advocate that the Jews should lose their Jewish difference are taking a position against America's best interests. They would deprive the American "orchestra" (national culture) of the Jewish "instrument" (nationality), of the special contribution that only the Jewish ethnic culture can make to the American cultural "melody." 119

b. Shows Distrust of American Idea

Second, if a Jew assimilates in America he would be showing his distrust of the American Idea. It is the American Idea which encourages the Jew to retain and develop his Jewish difference. 120

120 Kallen, "The Tercentenary: Yomtov or Yahrzeit?" 10.
that differences—including the Jewish different—can peace-
fully coexist, appreciate, and learn from one another. 121
An assimilationist ignores the American Idea's emphasis on
liberating differences not suppressing them. 122 He expresses
his disbelief in the American faith, in a free union of
the different via orchestration. 123

c. Would Eliminate A Source of Individuality and Diversity

A third reason the proponents of Jewish assimilation
err, says Kallen, is because nationalities—including the
Jewish nationality—are desirable power-stations for indi-
124 viduality and variety on the national scene. 125 Our

121 Kallen, "What Actually Is "Jewish Welfare" in America?"
204.

122 Kallen, "The Bearing of Emancipation on Jewish Sur-

vival," 30.


124 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States,

125 Here are two statements by Kallen in praise of vari-
ety: "The conservation and prosperity of a mode of [ethnic-
cultural] variation is enough," and "Even without fruitful
consequences to the common life, the mere fact that it
(i.e., one's Jewish difference) is there, that it is one
more variety in the dynamic whole, is, like the addition
of another taste or sight or sound, an enrichment, a con-
tribution to abundance, spiritual and material." (The first
quotation is from Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 256; the second
is from his "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 85.) In
the light of these quotations and Kallen's emphasis on the
right to be different, one reads with great surprise—in
Judaism At Bay, pp. 35-36—that "The conservation of no
social object whatever is morally justified unless it is
an actual synthesis of instrument and end, unless by being
most itself, by making the most of its individuality, by
perfecting itself in its natural function, it most avails
the rest of mankind." From this last quotation one could
conclude that an individual or group must do more than just
be: he or it must satisfy human needs by striving to make
the most good of itself so that it renders the most possible
benefit to mankind. But if the individual or group doesn't
so strive? Would Kallen then maintain that the individual or
group should cease to exist—despite the variety its being
adds to the world?
society is becoming increasingly uniform in work and thought because of the spread of science and industry. The most precious of all values, human individuality, is in danger of being stereotyped and crushed. The different cultures of the various nationalities make for a diversity of ideas and practices in this too-often standardized world.

d. Curtails Experimentation

A fourth reason for not following the assimilators' advice, Kallen insists, is that many experiments which can lead to advances for great numbers of people are best begun and supervised in individual ethnic groups. Important both to the maintenance of individuality and to the growth of a vibrant American culture is the right and opportunity to experiment with new ideas and new ways of doing things. But the risks in experimentation are less when the experiments are done by one nationality, in its culture, than if

126 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 229.


128 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 79.
the experiments were undertaken nation-wide. Let each ethnic culture, therefore, including the Jewish one, conduct such experiments which may bring new benefits to others and be emulated by them.129

e. Prevents Individual Fulfillment

A fifth reason why the assimilators are mistaken, Kallen asserts, is that it is "in and through the community that the individual is liberated for his own optimal contribution to the wider society, to national life."130 The peoples of Europe discovered that the individual comes into his personal freedom best by means of his nationality rather than alone.131 The individual exists not in isolation but rather in relation to an ethnic group, and his human potential cannot be fully realized except through enabling his nationality to continue. Being the reservoir of a person's individuality,132 the ethnic group enables

129 Ibid. Kallen points out—"Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," pp. 85-86—that some experiments have been undertaken by the Jewish group in America and have affected the larger American community. He specifies efforts in such areas as fund-raising organization and techniques, relations between employer and employee, education, literature, and the theater.

130 Horace M. Kallen, (untitled) talk at YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, c. Mar. 1, 1956, p. 7; the talk was typewritten from records of the speech and was sent to Kallen on Mar. 30, 1956, together with a letter by Pinkhos Schwartz (b. 1902), asst. exec. secy of YIVO; YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.


132 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 114. Also see above, pp. 84-85.
an individual to be himself and to make his best contribution to society.\(^{133}\) Before an individual can become free, therefore, his group must have liberty\(^{134}\) so it can give its individual members the best it has to offer, be a group with whose members an individual can associate in order to add to the fullness of life, and be a vehicle through whose common life the individual expresses himself.\(^{135}\)

But it is not only one's particular group that should be insured the freedom to exist; all groups should. For although an individual's birth-group is most important for his development and happiness, an individual "constructs his personal history moving out of groups and into groups."\(^{136}\)

By the word "groups" Kallen means all different kinds of groups—ethnic, religious, economic, etc. The fact is that no person lives "solely by himself, from himself, on himself, feeding, so to speak, on nothing but

(untitled)

\(^{133}\) Kallen, Talk at YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, op. cit. (above, note 130), p. 7.

\(^{134}\) Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 118; idem, "Address of Professor Horace M. Kallen Before the Third World Jewish Congress" in Geneva, Switzerland (New York: American Jewish Congress, 1934), mimeograph, p. 6, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2512.


\(^{136}\) Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 55. Also see A Free Society, p. 87.
his own flesh and spirit and growing by what he feeds on." 137 Each group with which an individual comes into contact, or in which he actively participates, can release another facet of his being and helps enrich his self. 138 Thus, if democracy is to be consistent with its emphasis on the rights and value of the individual, 139 it must permit separate groups of all kinds, including the Jewish nationality, within the nation so the individual can better fulfill himself. 140

f. Psychic Danger

Related to this is a sixth reason for ignoring the call to assimilate: there is a "psychic danger" 141 in repressing one's Jewishness.

Not only is a person what he biologically is because of his ancestors, but his selfhood is largely determined by the culture in which he is reared. 142 Of course an individual


138 Ibid., p. 25.


140 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 198.


142 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 60, 122-123.
cannot go it alone in life and needs his particular culture so he can learn from his parents how to eat, speak, play, work, treasure values, etc.\textsuperscript{143} But also, the knowledge and experiences he gains from his ethnic culture at home channel his emotions and shape his ideas of himself into his very personhood.\textsuperscript{144} Should he later strive to alienate himself from his "mother" culture by escaping, he is really trying to flee from his true self, his inner being.\textsuperscript{145} He cannot fully succeed in accomplishing that. His act is "cowardly...it is pathological."\textsuperscript{146} The unfortunate results of trying to prevent the natural expression and development of one's Jewishness are often self-hate and excessive aggressiveness as well as feelings of guilt, insecurity, and anxiety.\textsuperscript{147} Running from what one is may also make it impossible for such a psychologically ill person to be a good parent or good neighbor.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., p. 60; "American Jews, What Now?" 27.

\textsuperscript{144} Kallen, ""Heritage," "Heredity" and "Jewish Living"; 8.

\textsuperscript{145} See Kallen's letter to Rubin Gotesky, prof. at the Univ. of Ga., Oct. 4, 1954, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2498.

\textsuperscript{146} Kallen, "Current Trends In America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 9.

\textsuperscript{147} Letter from Kallen to Miss Janet G. Weisman, op. cit. (above, note 141); letter from Kallen to Horace S. Fries of the Univ. of Wisconsin, July 11, 1944, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, "Fries" folder; "Address By Prof. Horace M. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," p. 6; "The Promise of the Menorah Idea," 11; "The Bearing of Emancipation on Jewish Survival," p. 22; "American Jews, What Now?" 23.

Those who try to repress or remove their Jewish individuality become neither "Gentiles" nor "Americans" but "amateur Gentiles,"\(^{149}\) split personalities who are neither Jew nor Gentile but who live in fear that non-Jews will discover they really are Jews.\(^{150}\)

Even an apostate is only an "amateur Gentile," not fully happy because he is inwardly divided in two.\(^{151}\) His Jewish cultural upbringing gives his apostasy a Jewish flavor.\(^{152}\) For one may try to hide his nationality but sooner or later an individual's cultural upbringing will come out.\(^{153}\) It will become apparent in one's values, or attitudes, or food preferences, or in some other way.

The only way a Jew can attain wholeness is by accepting himself as a Jew, acknowledging his being part of the Jewish group, and making the most of the relationship.\(^{154}\)


\(^{150}\) Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," pp. 4-5.


\(^{152}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{153}\) Kallen, "Some Preliminaries to the Definition of Americanism," 57; *Judaism At Bay*, p. 83.

\(^{154}\) Kallen, "Address Before the Third World Jewish Congress," p. 6.
g. Non-Jews Prevent Assimilation

From this sixth reason for not assimilating comes a seventh: even if a Jew wants to escape being a Jew he won’t be allowed by the non-Jews to become a Gentile. The runaway Jew will be made aware that much as he might want to do so the non-Jews will not look at him as other than a Jew. If that is to be the situation, one might as well keep one’s Jewishness willingly and try to make the most of it; for should a person keep trying to escape his Jewishness he will only be forced back into it, sooner or later, by the Gentiles.

h. Uncertainty of Cultural Enrichment Elsewhere

An eighth reason for ignoring the counsel to abandon one’s Jewishness is that the escaping Jew cannot be certain that the culture he wants to accept as his main culture instead of Jewish culture will be an improvement. Kallen himself, therefore, preferred to remain with his Jewish cultural difference which is "no less real, worthy, and honorable than any other." After all, each culture has the potentiality of enriching the lives of those who turn to it. Ignoring or forgetting Jewish culture might impoverish an individual more than trying to live in it, said Kallen.

155 Ibid.
157 Ibid.
i. Good Assimilation and Jewish Survival

Let there be Jewish assimilation, but not the kind of assimilation in which the Jew endeavors to lose his Jewish difference. Rather, let Jewish assimilation be characterized by the Jew taking what he wishes from the non-Jewish ethnic cultures and from other groups (discussion clubs, art classes, business and civic associations, etc.), absorbing and digesting the items he takes, and nourishing his Jewish sustenance and individuality thereby. Good assimilation is assimilation by the Jew, not of the Jew.158

The goal is to survive and grow by means of assimilation, not to disappear by being assimilated.159

A person should retain "his firm seat in his home,"160 his ethnic group. Remaining with such roots, and with a commitment in that group in which he received his earliest education,161 a Jew should make "the Jewish interest the center of a contextual network"162 that reaches out to many different groups (cultural, /political, social, etc.).163


159 Horace M. Kallen, "Remembrance for Survival," The Menorah Journal, XXXIX, 1 (Spring 1951), 89.

160 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 64.

161 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 53; "The Jew and His Community."


Actually, Jews have done just that for centuries—and not only to enrich themselves. As one of mankind's nationalities, "the Jewish has been outstanding" in that a disproportionately high percentage of Jewish individuals has enriched civilization.

How can the Jewish group, in today's science-oriented world, prepare itself to continue enriching the lives of Jews and non-Jews? Not, answers Kallen, by considering itself a religion, race, or nation, but as "one communion of culture among the multitudes of others which together orchestrate into the civilization of the nations."

Only if Jews will think of themselves as an ethnic culture in a world union of such cultures will the Jewish group survive at all, "not otherwise."

As a cultural group, maintaining and developing their "instrument" of Jewish culture, Kallen would have the Jews turn to Hebraism for their own enrichment, bring Hebraism into the open marketplace of cultures so others can also be enriched thereby, so Jews can learn from other cultures and orchestrate that new learning with their old, and so Jews

164 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 255.
165 Ibid.
166 Kallen, "'Heritage,' 'Heredity' and 'Jewish Living'," 11.
167 Kallen, The Decline and Rise Of the Consumer, p. 457.
168 Kallen, "'Heritage,' 'Heredity' and 'Jewish Living'," 11.
and Hebraism can participate in helping to make more worthwhile the "melody" of American culture as well as the "melody" of world cultures (civilization) which are continuously emerging from the playing of each ethnic-cultural "instrument."

It is such a cultural pluralism, says Kallen, that is the why and how of Jewish survival.
Part Two

Hebraism and Zionism
Formation of the Hebraic Spirit

What is the nature of the Hebraic culture which Jews "play" in the "orchestra" of diverse cultures? Kallen asserts that since the days of the prophets¹ there has been a continuity of spirit, not form, which has characterized Hebraism, the culture of the Jewish people.² However, the items constituting the Hebraic spirit are not solely Jewish. That is, these items were not created by Jews who were living in isolation from the non-Jewish world. Instead, the items are the results of Jewish thinking and experience when confronting the thought and ways of Egypt, Canaan, Assyria, Babylonia, Greece, Rome, etc.³

¹ According to Kallen--in Zionism and World Politics, p. 20, and "Menorah Address," 130--the Hebraic spirit began with the prophets, not the priests. The priests, he holds, were Judaists; the prophets were interested in Hebraism. That is why, for example, Kallen thinks the prophets must have had a part in authoring those sections of Lev. and Deut. which extol righteousness and justice; Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 282. Kallen may have in mind such sections as: Lev. 18:6-24, 19:2-36, Deut. 14:20, 15:7-18, 16:18-20, 22:1-10. Kallen--in Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 222-223--does write of the prophets as being "social reformers" who were more interested in human rights than in property rights. They were "the atheists of their day"; Eisenstein, "Dialogue With Dr. Horace M. Kallen," 17. They upheld ethics and opposed law--ibid. They valued righteousness more than ritual--Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 222. Concerning ritual, Kallen may have been thinking of such prophetic passages as: 1Sam. 15:22; Amos 5:21-24; Is. 1:11-17; Jer. 7:21-23.


³ Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 183; Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 180; "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, at 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," p. 1.
The Jews took whatever thoughts and ways they wanted from the non-Jews and hyphenated the borrowings with their Jewish being. The non-Jewish and Jewish elements were orchestrated. The ideas characteristic of Hebraism resulted. But whereas the Jews borrowed some non-Jewish forms (e.g., praying by using words, music, and animal sacrifices), and share some similar forms with Gentiles, the cluster of ideas that distinguishes Hebraism—that is, the Hebraic spirit—is not duplicated in the culture of any other people.

Ideas Comprising the Hebraic Spirit

What are the ideas comprising the Hebraic spirit that have left their imprint on the Jewish people and its accomplishments? We can discern seven main ideas.

An example of this form-spirit difference may be seen, according to Kallen, in the book of Job. The form has a Greek basis, but the spirit is Hebraic. As Kallen put it, the book is "an assimilation of Greek form to Hebraic insight." (See Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 187.) As Kallen explains—in The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy: Restored With An Introductory Essay on the Original Form and Philisophic Meanings of Job (New York: Moffat, Yard and Co., 1918), pp. 19–33—that the book of Job is a four-act play in the Euripidean pattern of Greek tragedy, complete with a chorus and deus ex machina. In a letter dated Jan. 21, 1944, and sent to Willard Reed—Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research—Kallen reaffirms his belief that the book of Job was modelled after the Euripidean standard. Nevertheless, despite the tenacity with which Kallen clings to his theory, it is not accepted by most modern Bible scholars. For example, Marvin H. Pope—in his Job, The Anchor Bible Series (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1965), p. xxix—mentions Kallen's argument but states that "the similarity is less in form than in an occasional ideological parallel." Also, Robert Gordis—in The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 4—dismisses Kallen's theory because of the absence of a plot and the lack of progression in the views of Job's friends.
1. Reality Is In Flux

First is the Hebraic understanding of reality as being in flux.  

Kallen maintains that God's essence, according to the Hebrews, is change. There is, he says, no Hebrew word for "eternal," for an eternal God would be an unchanging, uncreative Deity. He sees the author of the book of Job depicting "the inscrutable absoluteness of omnipotent God," and learns therefrom that God's nature is such that no one thing must necessarily follow from it. Since Kallen holds that the Jewish conception of God "makes no distinction between God and Nature," he declares that nature too the Hebrews saw as ultimately unpredictable but real and functional.

5 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 39.

6 Horace M. Kallen, "The Hebraic Spirit," abstract of an address delivered at the International Students' Reunion, at Stanford Univ., on Aug. 18, 1915, p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2519. However, Malachi 3:6--"I am the Lord, I change not"--is a Biblical text that surely challenges Kallen's assertion.


8 Kallen, "Hebraism and the Ethos of Modernity," op. cit. (above, p. 25, note 6h).

9 Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 188.


12 Ibid.
Kallen contrasts this Hebraic view of reality as constant change with the Greek view, which sees immutable order as the essence of reality.\(^1\) The Hebraic outlook emphasizes the world as it really is—a pluralistic world of variation and repetition, change and tentativeness, wherein many creatures and things struggle to survive by ongoing modifications in themselves and in their relationships; the Greek outlook emphasizes the world as it is not, but as the Greeks would like it—a monistic world where each creature or thing is what it must be.\(^2\)

Kallen reminds us that it is the Hebraic outlook that has been vindicated by Charles Darwin's discoveries: that each thing struggles to survive by adapting itself but spontaneous variations nevertheless occur. The very title of

\(^{1}\) Kallen, *Judaism At Bay*, p. 9.

\(^{2}\) Cf. Kallen, "Hebraism and the Ethos of Modernity."
Darwin's book, *On the Origin of Species...*, published in 1859, supports the Hebraic view of flux and freedom and negates the Hellenic notions of the permanence of forms and the universe's structural order.15

In the radical empiricism of William James and Henri Bergson, as well as in the findings of post-Einsteinian physics, Kallen also sees support for the Hebraic view of reality. To William James this is an open-ended universe where nothing is fixed but all is flux, where the unforeseen dwells within everything, and the dynamic variety of items cannot be systematized into an ordered cosmos.16

15 Kallen, *Judaism At Bay*, p. 11. Kallen's idea that the Hellenic view of the world was not one of freedom and flux but of the permanence of forms may be challenged. John H. Randall, Jr.—in *The Making of the Modern Mind: A Survey of the Intellectual Background of the Present Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1940), rev. ed., p. 99—states that what Aristotle intended by the "form" of a thing was what the raw "matter" of that thing was capable of doing, of becoming. To realize what a thing could do the thing must often change from what it is at any moment, and people must use it in certain ways. Therefore, change and freedom were part of at least one Greek philosopher's outlook. For additional information on the fact that the Greeks did not de-emphasize flux, see: John H. Randall, Jr., "Dewey's Interpretation of the History of Philosophy," *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schlipp (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern Univ., 1939), p. 85; John P. Anton, "Randall's Interpretation of Greek Philosophy," *Naturalism and Historical Understanding: Essays on the Philosophy of John Herman Randall, Jr.*, ed. John P. Anton (Albany: State Univ. of N.Y. Press, 1967), pp. 13, 29 ("It would be unfair to accuse the Greeks of ever having denied the reality of change or of refusing to give experience a respectable place in the philosophies of being"); Abraham Edel, *Aristotle* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1967), p. 62. Also see below, note 19.

Henri Bergson's ideas of the newness and unpredictability of durational, flowing time, that "the inner aspect of things is found in the process,"17 also backed Hebraic change over Hellenic immutability. Werner Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle (or Indeterminancy Principle), which holds that the velocity and position of an electron cannot both be measured accurately at the same time for electrons are capricious, seems to fix chance and change at the very heart of the universe.18

The Hebraic view of reality as flux, therefore, Kallen argues, has been independently seconded by modern scientists and philosophers.19

2. Do the Best Possible

Which brings us to a second point in the Hebraic outlook: in a universe clearly not tailored for man all a person can do is his best under the circumstances.

17 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 14.
Kallen finds this approach stated in two places in the book of Job, lines which Kallen holds are "the sum of wisdom to me, with respect to all things." The first quotation is from Job 13:15-16, which, following the K'tiv (written text), Kallen translates: "Behold, He will slay me; I have no hope. Nevertheless I will maintain my ways before him: Even this shall be my security; that a hypocrite would not come unto him." The second quotation is Job 27:5b-6, which Kallen translates: "Till I die I will not put away mine integrity from me; my righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go: my heart shall not reproach me, so long as I live."

In these lines Kallen sees Job--the Hebraist, man--not submitting to the power of God or the world, standing as best he can on his own two feet, and, as long as he lives,

20 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 251.

21 Kallen's translation may be found in his book, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 109. The spelling of "him" with a small "h" is Kallen's own in the text.

22 Ibid., p. 135.
making the most possible of himself and of this world which is indifferent to him. The important thing is not to give up the fight. Man must keep struggling.

Although he does not emphasize the line nearly as much as he does the verses in Job 13:15-16 and 27:5b-6, Kallen also sees a similar meaning in Job 28:28a. There, God is quoted as having said to man: "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom." This "fear of the Lord" Kallen takes to mean man's awareness that in this world, which cares not about human beings, all a person can do is struggle to


24 Kallen—in The Liberal Spirit, p. 187—also called the two quotations from Job "an ultimate statement of this meaning (i.e., the Protagonian, man-is-the-measure-of-all-things type) of humanism." In Judaism At Bay, pp. 12-13, Kallen termed William James's pragmatism "only the modern way of asserting in an unfortuitous environment" what is found in Job 13:15. Milton Konvitz seems to be correct in stating that the philosophy that Kallen terms "Hebraism" he refers to as "humanism" or "pragmatism" on other occasions. See Milton Konvitz, "Horace M. Kallen, Hebraist," Dr. Horace M. Kallen (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1952), a pamphlet published in honor of the 70th birthday of Dr. Horace M. Kallen, p. 5. Some verification of Konvitz's point may be seen in Kallen's Patterns of Progress, p. 77, where James's "humanism" is compared with Job's holding to his integrity, and in Kallen's "Judaism and Social Service," The Menorah Journal, I, 4 (Oct. 1915), 239, where the prophets are labeled "humanists" because they were concerned with the reorganization of all society.
maintain his integrity.\textsuperscript{25} This wisdom comes from observing nature, studying history, and seeking out wise people. The result, hopefully, will be that an individual will know what to do to make life liveable.\textsuperscript{26}

Kallen declares that the Hebraic outlook did not affirm that man's wrestling with the world would result in man's happiness. Job, Hebraic man, faces the world without illusion and does the best he can under the circumstances. His comfort is the partial— but only available— victory of maintaining his integrity.\textsuperscript{27}

Understandably, this was small comfort for many persons. In time, therefore, the Hellenic view of an "ultimate happy destiny for man in a world immortally in harmony with his nature and his needs"\textsuperscript{28} conquered the Jews.

It was only with the rise of modern science, Kallen says, that the Hebraic view has been reinvigorated— but with an important difference. Science reasserts the Hebraic disillusion by also denying a changeless, planned order throughout nature and a guaranteed happiness for man in this world or a possible other world. But science gives

\textsuperscript{25} Kallen, \textit{The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 75.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 78; cf. "How I Bet My Life," 80.
\textsuperscript{28} Kallen, \textit{The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy}, p. 78.
man, in addition to Job's partial consolation of clinging to his integrity, another somewhat compensating comfort that Job could not give: some significant power over nature if man will apply knowledge to ferret out some of nature's secrets. 29

2. Pursue Righteousness

Hebraic man, in Job, said that while a person lives he should maintain his integrity by cleaving to righteousness. This commitment to righteousness Kallen finds in Job 13:15-16; 27:5b-6, and 28:28b, where "depart from evil" Kallen understands as synonymous with righteousness. 30 It is this allegiance to pursuing righteousness, which we list as the third item in the Hebraic spirit, that Kallen sees as the chief motif of Hebraism. 31 Life involves righteous action, not escape from the world. 32

The beginning of this Hebraic allegiance to the pursuit of righteousness Kallen places with Amos: "But let justice well up as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." 33

29 Ibid., p. 78; "Some Reflections on Humanism," 20. What John H. Randall, Jr. considers the other aspect of instrumentalism or pragmatism—namely, that science is to wrest whatever possible power it can over nature for man's benefit—is traced to Francis Bacon (1561-1626) by both Randall and Kallen. See: Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind, p. 616; Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 296. See note 19 above.


31 Kallen, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 54; "Menorah Address," 131.

32 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 54.

33 Kallen, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, pp. 50-51. The verse in Amos is 5:24.
This Hebraic devotion to righteousness Kallen contrasts with the Hellenic aim of perfection.\textsuperscript{34} The Hebrews took the world as it is and struggled courageously and with a basic self-respect to do the best possible considering the limitations. The Greeks saw the world as they thought it should be: perfect, and strove for what the Hebrews would evaluate as an impossible perfection.

Kallen also notes that the Hebraic ethical concern is at variance with those religions and philosophies which stress(ed) a passive waiting for salvation.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{34} Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 8. It could be argued that the command "you shall be holy for I the Lord your God am holy"—Lev. 19:2, cf. Ex. 22:30, Lev. 11:44—is also asking for an impossible perfection from man. However, the Bible acknowledges the universality of sin by human beings; see I Kings 8:46, Eccles. 7:20. That is, while striving to imitate God's moral ways man must inevitably fall short of His perfection; see Roland B. Gittelsohn, "Judaism and Mental Health," Judaism, VIII, 4 (Fall 1959), 325-326. For the rabbinic interpretation of imitating God as meaning attempts to follow His ethical actions, see Sota 14a and Shabbat 133b.

4. Value of Each Individual and His Difference

The striving for righteousness involves actions that affect other persons and therefore necessitates having regard for the welfare and rights of other human beings, not only of oneself. Thus, Hebraism includes the "acknowledgment of the value and integrity of other persons." It recognizes the intrinsic value of the individual human being and his right to live as he will in his difference.

This Hebraic teaching, which we may consider a fourth point in the Hebraic spirit, was not consistently emphasized or followed in Biblical times, says Kallen. The "democracy" that the Hebrews established in Bible times was not a genuine democracy for it penalized persons who were different from the majority. Nehemiah, for example, Kallen describes as guilty of having made "invidious distinctions" between those Jews who returned to Judea and


38 Kallen may be thinking of individuals like the prophets who, in going against the "establishment" of their day, were often castigated for demanding—as Kallen terms it in "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 223—"integrity of private conscience." For examples of prophets disagreeing with the powers that be, see: 1 Kings 19:10 (Elijah); Amos 7:10; Jer. 26:8-9 (Jeremiah), 18:19 (Micah, the Morashtite), 20:23 (Uriah the son of Shemaiah). An earlier example than the prophets would be Ex. 31:14, which ordains that a person who chooses to profane the Sabbath shall be put to death; in Num. 15:32-36, we have the story of a man who was gathering sticks on the Sabbath and who was subsequently punished by being stoned to death by the congregation.

those who did not. The Bible also tells of wars "against Jehovah's Unchosen." Nevertheless, the Bible does evi-
dence a "succession of progressive affirmations of the
equal right of the different by the line of the prophets
whose consummation is Isaiah."41

5. Value of Each Group and Its Difference

The individualistic prophets, culminating in Isaiah,
added a fifth point to the Hebraic spirit: the extension
of righteousness from a recognition of the integrity and
rights of each person to the integrity and rights of each
group.42

When Isaiah spoke of what would happen "at the end
of days,"43 he pictured nations living in peace with one
another.44 Isaiah did not describe the Hebrew nation, or
any other nation, as destined to conquer other peoples so
that only one great world power would exist. Rather, each

40 Kallen, "American Jews, What Now?" 15. Kallen may
have been thinking about the wars described in such verses
as: Deut. 20:13-18; Josh. 6:17,21; 8:8,22-29; 10:24-40;
11:11-14.

41 Kallen, "American Jews, What Now?" 15. In books other
than Isaiah one thinks of such sections as: 2 Sam. 12:1-15;
Isaiah, in addition to the well-known 2:4, Kallen him-
self—in "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 85--


43 Isaiah 2:2.

44 See the Isaiah references above, note 41.
nation is to retain its independence and distinctiveness.\(^{45}\)
In Kallen's opinion, the prophets wanted the nations of the world to dwell with one another in a "cooperative democracy of nationalities, under conditions of universal peace."\(^{46}\)

6. Jewish Nationality in Zion

A sixth feature of the Hebraic spirit is that, like other peoples in the time of international peace, the Jewish nationality will have its special territorial place—in Zion.\(^{47}\) The prophets said as much.\(^{48}\) The prophets, who were

\(^{45}\) Harry Orlinsky takes issue with those who see Isaiah teaching that other nations are equal with Israel in God's eyes. He writes: "This may be a very noble and worthy concept, one that would do credit even to the nations of our own twentieth century; but it is unfair and historically unjustifiable to read this concept back into Israelite thinking two and a half millennia ago." See Harry M. Orlinsky, The So-Called "Suffering Servant" in Isaiah 53 (Cincinnati: The Hebrew Union College Press, n.d.), The Samuel H. Goldenson Lecture of Apr. 22, 1964, p. 16; cf. pp. 36-38. Also see idem, Ancient Israel (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1954), pp. 139-144. Some Biblical passages cited by Orlinsky to show that Israel was thought to be superior to the other nations in God's eyes, are: Is. 1:1-2, 19:24-25, 56:2-7; Zech. 2:14-15. Elsewhere, Kallen himself has admitted that the end-time envisioned by the prophets was one in which the Hebrew people would be pre-eminent. See Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 245; Zionism and World Politics, p. 12.


\(^{47}\) Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 120.

\(^{48}\) Some passages in which the prophets expressed concern for a restored Zion, are: Amos 9:13-14; Hosea 2:2; Isaiah 11:12, 43:5-6, 52:9, 54:7, 56:8; Jeremiah 31:16, 32:37, 33:7; Ezekiel 11:17. Also see below,
champions of "universalism,"\(^{49}\) did not espouse a humanity bereft of particular nationalities and nations. They envisioned a culturally pluralistic society, for they saw a world society of individual nations—including the Hebrew nation—living harmoniously with one another. The main difference between the prophetic view and cultural pluralism is that the prophets, according to Kallen in *Zionism and World Politics*, assigned "to Zion the foremost place."\(^{50}\) in that peaceful future; cultural pluralism asks each nation and nationality to consider itself and others as equals in their respective difference.

7. **Live-and-help-live Pluralism**

Kallen says that the prophets, who were so imbued with a fervor for their own people's right to dwell in its land in peace, came to realize that their own people could do so with assurance only if all the nations of the world lived in peace and if a common law (live-and-let-live or, preferably, live-and-help-live) was accepted by each and all.\(^{51}\) This goal and way of living together, a live-and-help-live pluralism of groups, is Hebraism's seventh item.


\(^{50}\) Kallen, *Zionism and World Politics*, p. 12.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p. 11.
The Jewish people itself, Kallen suggests, has been a miniature model for how nations should live together. Since the Jewish people was dispersed from the Land of Israel, it has constituted a single people, composed of diverse groups living in many lands, yet in free communication with each for the common good.\textsuperscript{52} Let the individual peoples of the world similarly feel themselves a union of nations and nationalities and cooperatively act accordingly.

\textbf{Hebraism and Cultural Pluralism}

We have noted seven principles in the Hebraic spirit: reality in flux; men should do the best possible in a world not made for them; persons should pursue and practice righteousness; human beings should have regard for each individual and his difference; the equal difference of nations should be acknowledged; the Jewish nation is entitled, as are other nations, to its own land; peoples should cooperate in a live-and-help-live fashion for the betterment of each and all. It is obvious that Kallen's doctrine of cultural pluralism is a virtual restatement of what he finds in the Hebraic spirit.

The change intrinsic in the universe as creatures and things struggle to survive by changing reminds one of Kallen's insistence that every living being struggles to

\textsuperscript{52} Horace M. Kallen, "Jewish Education and Jewish Survival," \textit{Jewish Education}, XXXIV, 4 (Summer 1964), 228.
to survive and in its struggling inevitably changes. To simply exist is to change by growing older. To give up the struggle to change is to stop living, to become fossilized. The Jewish people kept living as a people by changing, by responding to new circumstances and absorbing the new, orchestrating this new with its past, and transforming and enriching itself thereby in the never-ending struggle to continue.

That each person and group should do his or its best rather than not care what occurs, is the very basis of cultural pluralism. How else can individuals and cultures realize their potential and live with each other in a mutually enriching peace unless they wrest with life? Passivity can hardly lead to personal or group satisfaction—at least not for most people. Nor can fleeing from individual effort and responsibility into the comforting arms of a supposedly all-knowing authority be


termed liberating one's powers for good.\textsuperscript{57} Whatever happiness is available to man in this world comes by the on-going, Job-like endeavor to try to live with integrity: to attempt to fully bring to fruition the potential for good within oneself, one's ethnic culture, and other groups.\textsuperscript{58}

The Hebraic recognition of the legitimacy of individual differences is also a key point in cultural pluralism. No attempt is made in cultural pluralism to force the individual into a mold determined by someone else. Each person is equal to every other person as a different. Each human being struggles to live on as he determines. Each individual has his own vision of what constitutes his integrity.\textsuperscript{59} Each creature manifests his selfhood by

\textsuperscript{57} Kallen, \textit{Individualism}, p. 133.

\textsuperscript{58} Cf. Kallen, \textit{Patterns of Progress}, p. 8; "American Jews, What Now?" \textsuperscript{27}; letter from Kallen to Sue Kallen, his daughter-in-law, Oct. 26, 1956, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 973.

\textsuperscript{59} Kallen, \textit{Individualism}, p. 234.
choosing his own way. As Sidney Ratner has pointed out, for Kallen cultural pluralism "becomes the philosophical basis that would preserve and strengthen human individuality." 

The Hebraic emphasis on the legitimacy of different groups to exist as equals is at the very core of cultural pluralism. Each nationality and nation has a right to live freely and safely in its equal difference. This crucial point, which Kallen saw in the words "all men are created equal," was—and is—Kallen's particular contribution to social organization. It is extremely interesting that Kallen learned this idea of the legitimate diversity and equality of ethnic cultures from his Hebraic heritage as well as from the Declaration of Independence.

60 Kallen, The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, p. 7:
Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 177.

61 Sidney Ratner, "Some Central Themes in Horace Kallen's Philosophy," Vision & Action: Essays in Honor of Horace M. Kallen On His 70th Birthday, ed. Sidney Ratner (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1953), p. 107; Samuel Dinin (p. 1902)—in his review of Kallen's Education Versus Indoctrination in the Schools (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1934), Jewish Education, VIII, 1 (Jan-Mar. 1936), 49—says that Kallen doesn't sufficiently stress that the individual's uniqueness is partially acquired by interacting with his environment, which includes other peoples and heritages. This is hardly a fair criticism. Kallen's cultural pluralism is meant, in part, to enrich the individual by contact with the diverse. Kallen has stated that such contacts help fashion a person's beliefs and practices; see Kallen, "On Being Jewish Today," p. 313. What Kallen is stating is that "the individual is the standard of value, the rest of the world is only its content"; see Kallen, "Art, Philosophy, and Life," 47. That is to say, again, that each person does choose his own way in the world.

62 See above, pp. 27-31, for Kallen's elaboration of this phrase from the Declaration of Independence and his application of it to the equality and legitimacy of groups.

63 See above, p. 31.
Among the groups entitled to exist in equal liberty and safety is the Jewish group. Be the Jews concentrated in the Land of Israel as a nation—which Hebraism asserts is their right as a people entitled to its own land—or scattered across the globe, the Jewish nation in Israel and the Jewish nationality throughout the lands are equally entitled to persevere in their differentness with the other nations, nationalities, and communities. 64

Hebraism's goal of having the different nations cooperate in a live-and-let-live or live-and-help-live manner is also cultural pluralism's aim. In America, the theory and way of cultural pluralism would have each group retain its distinctiveness but orchestrate itself with other groups for the welfare of each and all. On the international scene the United Nations is an attempt to have nations work together for the common good; it is a union of individual nations in, ideally, a live-and-help-live orchestration. 65 What is very informative in Kallen's idea of a mutually beneficial orchestration of differents is that he also traced this notion to his Hebraic heritage. That spirit which endeavors to liberate each group and to make for the group's peaceful

64 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 156.

65 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 232; Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 40-41. For Kallen's statement of this principle in the early days of the League of Nations, see The Structure of Lasting Peace, pp. 6-7.
cooperation with others, Kallen perceived, "is also a part of the Hebraic spirit...the spirit that literally inspired the democracy of America." 66

Not only is this vision of a "constructive internationalism" 67 original with the Hebrews, but the Jewish people has been its main protagonists everywhere through the centuries. 68 The Jewish people has not only argued for this larger vision; this people has died for it. In refusing to surrender the right to its Jewish difference in equal liberty and safety with all other peoples, 69 the Jewish people has frequently paid in blood. Like Job, the Jewish people chose not to yield its integrity. The Warsaw Ghetto martyrs and the Six Million are part of that price; so are the Jewish deaths at the hands of the British and Arabs in the rebuilding of the Land of Israel in the twentieth century. The Jewish people, "the eternal Protestant," 71


71 Ibid., p. 222.
affirming against all intolerances and totalitarianisms the unalienable freedom of man, has a right to be proud of such ancestors, of the Hebraic spirit they developed, and of the humane obligations that ancestry and spirit set on their living descendants. 72

72 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 132.
CHAPTER V: ZIONISM AND ISRAEL

Introduction

We have noted that Kallen sees Hebraism as including a cooperative internationalism whereby each nationality, including the Jewish, has its own territory and freely communicates with other peoples.¹ The movement whose purpose was to regain Palestine as the homeland for the Jewish people was the Zionist movement. Indeed, Kallen saw Zionism as "the practical and most expressive incarnation of the Hebraic spirit."² Let us therefore study Kallen's ideas on Zionism. We shall not endeavor to present a detailed account of Kallen's Zionist activities but shall limit ourself to those ideas of his concerning Zionism which have a bearing on cultural pluralism, Judaism, and Jewish education.

Hope for Return to the Land of Israel

Kallen realized that the hope for an eventual return to the Land of Israel had helped keep the Jewish people from sinking into despair, and had helped make for their survival, during centuries of discrimination and persecution. Christianity, he asserted, was also very much aware of how important the hope of return was to Jews and Judaism.³

¹ See above, pp. 108-109.
³ Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 115, 125.
Start of the Modern Zionist Movement

As for the modern Zionist movement, Kallen understood that to be one of the Emancipation's consequences. Disillusioned with Emancipation's results for the Jews—for anti-Semitism continued to rage in "liberal" western Europe as well as in the autocratic eastern Europe of the last half of the nineteenth century—men like Moses Hess,⁴ Leon Pinsker,⁵ Max Nordau,⁶ Ahad Haam,⁷ and Theodor Herzl,⁸ gave up on the possibility of democracy being applied by the Gentiles to their relations with Jews. These writers and Jewish leaders, and others like them, "secularized the Judaist doctrine of ingathering and redemption of the exiles into the theory and practice of Zionism."⁹ Their secular formulation of the religious doctrine concerning the Jewish people's eventual return to the Land of Israel, a return

⁴ Moses Hess (1812-1875), German-Jewish writer and Zionist forerunner.

⁵ Judah Loeb (Leon) Pinsker (1821-1891), forerunner of political Zionism and Odessa physician.

⁶ Max Nordau (1849-1923), Zionist leader and physician who lived most of his life in Paris.

⁷ Ahad Haam (1856-1927), pen-name of Asher Ginzberg, a Russian-born Hebrew essayist and Zionist ideologue.

⁸ Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), Budapest-born founder and first leader of the modern Zionist movement.

⁹ Kallen, "The Bearing of Emancipation on Jewish Survival," p. 27.
which the traditional Jew prayed and waited for, was eagerly embraced by many Jews in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. To them, a Jewish homeland in Palestine would be a worthy substitute for the traditional doctrine. Nevertheless, while seeing modern Zionism as "organized, secular Jewish nationalism," and being non-religious himself, Kallen does view modern Zionism as a contemporary expression of the Jewish people's age-old commitment "to make good the Promise of the Promised Land."

Zionism and Cultural Pluralism
Kallen came to support modern Zionism not from reading the writings of Chaim Zhitlowsky or such left-wing, Marxist gradualists as Otto Bauer, but from the consequences of his own doctrine of cultural pluralism. The Zionist argument was, in Kallen's opinion, that of the cultural pluralist. To both, each nationality should have the opportunity to live on its own land where its folk and culture

12 See above, note 31, p. 62.
13 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 6.
14 Chaim Zhitlowsky (1865-1943) supported Jewish national rebirth outside Palestine and Yiddish as the Jewish people's language.
14a Otto Bauer (1881-1938) pushed for gradual change in western Europe's economic and political life.
15 Letter from Kallen to Moses Rischin, op. cit. (above, note 88, p. 76).
would be an equal with other peoples and cultures of the world. To both, society is a collection of different national groups, "a giant family of nationalities, carrying on the enterprises of civilization cooperatively, each contributing to the others according to its nature and power."17

1. Jews Entitled to Develop Their Difference in Their Land

Kallen said that one reason for Zionism is that the Jewish nationality is entitled, as is each nationality, to develop its difference on its own land. Democracy encourages differences among groups as well as individuals.18 Groups are also entitled to equal rights and status.19 The Jewish nationality has the right to be an equal nationality, not in the meaning of "equal" as "same" but "equal" as "equal-in-difference." It has the right to develop its equal difference.20 Zionism, "the Jew's extension of the democratic principle from the individual to the group,"21 asserts the Jewish people's right to live in its own


17 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 129; cf. idem, "A Change in Direction," The Hebrew Union College Monthly, XXIII, 6 (May 23, 1936), 16.

18 See above, pp. 27-31.

19 Ibid. Also see Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 272; "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 11.

20 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 272.

territory as a peer with the other peoples and cultures of the world. Kallen called it "a curious kind of liberalism" which would agree that other nationalities had the right to live on their national soil and to enrich world civilization from there but that the Jewish nationality had no right to do so from its land, Palestine.

As C. Bezalel Sherman (b. 1896) has accurately observed, "Zionism to Dr. Kallen is not an escape but an affirmation." Jews are to live a full national life in their own land not, mainly, in order to escape anti-Semitism but so as to have the means to be an equal as a people in the community of peoples and to realize more fully the potentialities of their difference as Jews.

2. Hebraism Flowers Best in the Jewish Land

The Jewish difference is that it is a specific people and it has its own culture, Hebraism. Since each nationality or people has something to contribute to world civilization, Kallen argued that the Jewish group should also make its contribution by causing the Hebraic spirit to

---

22 Cf. ibid., p. 190; Judaism At Bay, p. 112; "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 11.

23 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 119.

24 Ibid.

flower. This contribution to the cultural and religious values of civilization can be accomplished best only if the Jewish people is "planted on our national soil," Kallen said as early as 1915.

Of course Jews can enhance the culture of any country in which they live. However, Kallen maintained, a people's contribution to world culture will primarily come from the land in which that people is a majority of the inhabitants—that is, from its own land. Just as the English contributions to civilization come mainly from England and not from other countries where English people live, so with the Jewish people. Each nationality is "more purely and essentially that and nothing else in the home country which is a living individuality of its particular kind." Kallen's point becomes clearer when seen against the picture he paints of American Jewry circa 1915. Jews, he says, tend either to make so many concessions to their non-Jewish surroundings that their Jewishness virtually evaporates or they stubbornly resist any accommodation to their Gentile environment and tend to die out. Increasingly they do the former. They spend little time on Jewish studies, observe few Jewish rituals, and Americanize their prayer services, organizations, and institutions.


27 Kallen, "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 86.

28 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 119.

29 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 132.
In view of the diminution of Jewish life and individuality in America and elsewhere, and the subsequent poverty of Jewish contributions to world civilization, said Kallen, there is need to reconcentrate a substantial number of Jews in their own land to foster "the free development there of Hebraic culture and ideals such that all European peoples carry out in their own homelands of their culture and ideals." 30

Should there not be, Kallen asks, one country in the world where the Hebraic spirit and culture do not have to worry about accommodating themselves to the non-Jewish environment but where, retaining their integrity, they adapt (or orchestrate) the minority non-Jewish environment to the majority Jewish one? 31

Of course the Jewish majority will absorb influences not only from the non-Jewish minority within the Jewish land but from the entire world, assimilating the ideas and practices by making them over into part of the Jewish being. 32 However, although constantly engaged in this process of absorbing and assimilating, the Jewish people and the Hebraic spirit are the absorbers and assimilators.

31 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 132.
32 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 119.
3. Helps Insure Survival of the Jewish People

A third reason for Zionism, in Kallen's eyes, is that Zionism is the best bulwark against the disappearance of the Jewish people. Every people, Kallen said, must have some ideal for which to live. In the past that ideal for the Jewish people was to do God's will. But supernaturalist religion has lost its hold on Jews in the modern world. 38

The Jewish people are assimilating, losing their identity as Jews. If nothing other than supernaturalist religion is available to give their lives a Jewish anchor and direction, the Jewish people will drift off into the Gentile world and, in time, be lost as Jews. To Kallen, only the dream of a rebuilt Zion could animate and sustain the Jewish people. 39

Should the Jewish people surrender that dream, they would be giving up their integrity and the possibility of their survival. 40 Only by realizing the Zionist goal of concentrating a sizable number of Jews in one land and thereby reinvigorating Jewish nationality would the Jewish people endure. 41

38 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 77.
39 Ibid., pp. 77, 251.
40 Ibid., p. 251.
41 Ibid., p. 32.
not those being absorbed and assimilated. The Jewish culture, Hebraism, can thus be truer to itself only where the Jews are a free people and rooted in their own land. Only in Palestine is the Hebraic spirit adequately expressed. Only if Hebraic culture is developed freely on friendly soil can its future contributions to world culture be most worthwhile.

Kallen had high hopes for the Hebraic culture that would flourish in a Jewish state in Palestine. He spoke of the day when "the law shall go forth from Zion because only it is an exemplification of justice and freedom." Again using Biblical terminology, he expressed the hope that the obvious excellence of what the Jews would achieve in Palestine—by wedding modernity to Hebraism in such areas as the arts and sciences, religion, and social organization—would make their achievement "a light to the nations" who would learn from, and emulate, the Jews.

33 Ibid., pp. 38, 41.
34 Kallen, "Speech at the Second Menorah Convention," 86.
35 Ibid. See Isaiah 2:3 and Micah 4:2 for this statement's Biblical bases.
37 Kallen, "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 86.
4. Will Infuse New Life Into Hebraic Culture in America

A fourth reason for welcoming Zionism, in Kallen's opinion, is that a Jewish national center in Palestine will infuse new life into Hebraic culture in America with the result that Jews in America will be better able to make Jewish contributions to American culture.

As a cultural pluralist, Kallen holds that each national group in America has a particular contribution to make to American culture. The French have their contribution to make, the Germans theirs, etc.—and the Jews theirs. The Jewish contribution is made by advancing Hebraic ideals and culture. However, whereas all the other national groups possess a national center or homeland (e.g., the French have France and the Germans have Germany), the Jewish nationality has no such center because, as Kallen wrote before World War I, Palestine is no longer a Jewish state. For Jews, therefore, their Hebraic culture is not a living force but a past which they learn. To make Hebraic culture dynamic once more, a Jewish national center is necessary. Just as the cultures of the French-Americans and German-Americans are enriched by the living expressions of their "homeland" cultures emanating from their respective national centers in Europe, so should the Hebraic culture of the Jewish-Americans be infused with new life by the Jewish national center in Palestine.42

By World War II, Kallen noted, the Zionist concern had indeed stimulated Jewish life in America. Zionism accounted for a significant literary output, research, educational endeavors, communal cooperation, and more. It had become obvious for years that Zionism had indeed succeeded in uniting the Jewish people.

5. Will Eliminate the Jewish Problem

A fifth reason for Zionism, said Kallen, is to eliminate the Jewish problem. Unlike the English, French, Italian, or any other people, the Jewish people is thought to constitute a problem. The Jews are a problem because they are a group whom people are aware of as being different from other nationalities. This difference has caused confusion with regard to the Jew's status.

The Jews are a problem for two reasons: first, only Jews are viewed as a cursed, condemned people by Christianity; second, only the Jews lack a specific homeland.

43 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 70.


territory in which they are the numerical majority. Kallen, who was of course writing before the rise of the State of Israel in 1948, said that if the Jewish position were normalized by Palestine again becoming the Jewish people's national center the Jewish problem would be virtually solved.

Not that the first reason for the Jewish problem—anti-Semitism—would be eliminated when Palestine became the Jewish people's land once more. However, anti-Semitism would be effected in a number of ways. Some Jews who are extremely bothered by anti-Semitism and feel their Jewishness to be a burden and a penalty, can assimilate into the non-Jewish environment with few (if any) mental reservations once there is again a Jewish state. They will not be plagued by guilt feelings that their assimilation will mean the end of Jewish nationality. A Jewish homeland guarantees the continuance of Jewish nationality, at least as long as that homeland endures. As for those Jews who are perturbed by anti-Semitism because the handicaps it imposes on them prevents them from realizing all their Jewish potentialities, the reconstituted Jewish homeland will provide them with a free Jewish society to which they can go and in which they can endeavor to bring those potentialities to fruition.

46 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 268.
48 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 268.
49 Ibid.
One more point in this connection. Kallen praises the Jewish people for possessing many fine virtues: intellectuality, kindness, patience, moral idealism, concern for humanity, and a deep rationalism. These assets, he asserts, were elicited because of the abnormalities of the Jewish position among the non-Jews; they were how Jews chose to react to being dispersed and discriminated against. But liabilities also resulted from living among anti-Semitic Gentiles. Some of these shortcomings found among many Jews, Kallen says, are: argumentativeness, shyness, pushiness, trickery, undernourishment, and smallness of stature.

Although it was Christian anti-Semitism which made for those liabilities in the first place, when these defects came to be found in Jews they provided Christians with additional reasons for their anti-Semitism. In Kallen's opinion the success of the Zionist enterprise would largely eliminate these liabilities in Jews: Jews living in Palestine would be "normal" in their mannerisms and health, while Jews living outside Palestine would not be considered "odd" since Jews would think of themselves (and be thought of by others) as just another nationality. With these deficiencies mostly gone from Jews, this rationale for Christian anti-Semitism—that Jews are to be despised because of their bad habits—would be undercut.

51 Ibid., pp. 104, 448.
52 Ibid. Also note Kallen's comment that "a great deal of anti-Semitism could be abolished if Jews themselves undertook the social control and elimination of the exploitation of workers by employees, and especially the Jews by Jews." See Kallen's letter to Jacob X. Cohen (1889-1946), then associate rabbi of the Free Synagogue in New York City, Oct. 1, 1936, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
It might be argued that Kallen seemed unduly optimistic when he argued this way in *Frontiers of Hope*, in 1929. Well before that year, as well as after, Kallen often wrote of the obdurate nature of anti-Semitism. Especially had he indicated that anti-Semitism was fundamentally based on the Jewish rejection of Jesus and that Jews had subsequently been placed into a rejected-people slot in Christian theology. 53 This theological condemnation of Jewry, which Kallen admits has made for anti-Semitism, would not be eliminated if undesirable traits were effaced by Jews. As Kallen himself wrote: "There is no general technique, so far as I know, by which Christian anti-Semitism can be ended." 54


Assuredly, however, the second reason Kallen gave for the Jewish problem—that only the Jewish nationality has no homeland—would be eliminated (and has been) with the success of Zionism. With a Jewish homeland the Jewish people's status as an equal people with other peoples—each of whom has a homeland—will be clarified to the non-Jews. No longer would the Jews be different, a problem, in this respect. Moreover, the individual Jew's status will also be clarified. Like the immigrants to America who are of English, Italian, Spanish, or another nationality, those of Jewish nationality who choose to live in America will be welcomed as loyal citizens of the United States. They will be able to adjust harmoniously to America. 55

Dual-Loyalty Charge

The American Jew, Kallen said, can still retain an interest in Zionism and work for that cause. To do so is not incompatible with being a good American. Jews who charge American Jewish Zionists with dual loyalty—that is, being loyal to the United States and to the Zionist goal of a Jewish state, two loyalties which they claim are incompatible—are guilty of a "self-aggression which they project toward other Jews." 56 The anti-Zionist who makes such a charge is "tenuously Jewish." 57 He hates the Jewish

55 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 118.
label he bears and which causes him suffering in the non-Jewish world. To eliminate that pain he thinks that what must be done is to minimize the significance of Jewish nationality and its attempt to live on. Since Zionism openly proclaims the significance of the Jewish people, and desires the Jewish people to continue, he becomes bitterly anti-Zionist, theorizes Kallen. 58

That some Jews should feel that being a Zionist and a good American are incompatible also indicates an unwarranted anxiety about the Jew's present acceptance and future security as an American. There is a fear that Jews won't be accepted as full Americans because they profess a tie to a cause and nationality beyond the borders of the United States. But, states Kallen, this fear is ridiculous. All associations which foster life, liberty, and happiness—even if trans-national ones like Zionism—are to be encouraged. Good Americans can readily be loyal citizens of their state and the United States; they can support the programs of the United Nations and not be considered traitors to America. 59 Kallen dismisses the dual allegiance bugaboo in these words: "The anxiety that American Jews would, out of loyalty to Israel, become disloyal to the United States seems to me a condition for the psychopathologist to deal with." 60

58 Letter from Kallen to Felix Frankfurter (1882-1965), then professor of law at Harvard Univ. and later a Supreme Court justice, Apr. 9, 1915, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497.


Not only do most American Jews, including the Zionists among them, consider only America to be the homeland to which they owe political loyalty, but one does not become less of an American by asserting his membership in the Jewish nationality of which Zionism speaks. America is a land composed of many nationalities. Individuals may retain their nationality identity along with their loyalty to America. They are not incompatible.

To do away with this unhealthy condition of the Jewish people whereby some of its members come to possess such an inferiority complex as to shrilly denounce Zionists for supposedly advocating, or being guilty of, dual loyalty, is reason enough for normalizing the Jewish people by having the Jewish nationality and the Hebraic spirit rooted and flourishing again in its own land, concludes Kallen. 62

That All Jews Should Live in Zion

It should be clear that along with Kallen's denunciation of the myth of dual loyalty was his disapproval of the stance of many Zionists that all Jews should take up residence in Palestine. 63 (For our purposes we shall label advocates of the latter position as "extreme Zionists.") Both arguments—that of dual loyalty and that of the extreme Zionists—deny the possibility of Jews keeping their

1 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, 'en, Judaism At Bay, pp. 127-128.

Jewish nationality as equals while living in lands where most persons profess a religion other than Judaism and are members of non-Jewish nationalities.

Kallen considered the stand of the extreme Zionists not as an expression of their desire to fulfill the will of a supernatural God Who commanded an ingathering of the exiles, but as a psychological call for help. In effect they were saying that they could not take the strain of continuing the struggle to live as Jews while dwelling among Gentiles. They were stating that Jews can't freely and fully be Jews outside their own land. How "appropriate" that one of the first Zionists in modern times should be Israel Zangwill, father of the "melting pot" image, who championed surrender of individual difference! But democracy proclaims the individual's--including the Jew's--equal right to live wherever he wants in his difference. Kallen declared that just as others live as Czechs, Creoles, Negroes, or Yankees, so the Jews have the right to struggle on as Jews, where they will, in equal liberty.

For Kallen, Jews who live in America are not dwelling in "exile." He believes that "being at home or being in exile is not a geographical location but a human relation." 67

64 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 97.
66 Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 3.
If a person is discriminated against and forcibly segregated, he is in exile. When a person is not a target of discrimination but voluntarily exiles himself, he also is in exile. The exiled person feels unhappy among people who are different from himself. He flees them either by remaining within the country but shunning contact with people different from himself—e.g., the Nataf Karta group in Israel, which shows that one can be in exile even while living in the Jewish homeland—or by fleeing to another land where he can be among people who are mostly like himself.

In a sense, Kallen points out, "democracy" and "diaspora" are opposites. The former means a welcoming of differences and a willingness to be oneself in the midst of persons who are different from oneself. But "diaspora" implies a dispersion which is a fact but not a desired condition; the fact is that most Jews live in the diaspora, however the desired condition is that eventually they should all reside in their own Jewish land. Kallen objects to this. He upholds the democratic position: the Jew's right—everyone's right—to live anywhere as an equal in his difference.

68 Horace M. Kallen, "Exile, Israel (cf. Ben Halpern, The American Jew)," p. 2, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives. The title is given exactly as Kallen wrote it.


70 Ibid.
Furthermore, if "diaspora" implies the centrality of the Jewish homeland to the Jewish people and the secondary importance to them of other lands, then Kallen says that the term "diaspora" could also be applied to today's State of Israel. What Kallen has in mind is the situation when Jewry residing in a land other than Israel is doing more for the Jewish people's creative survival than the Jewry of Israel. Then that land is central, of most importance, for Jews; the other countries, including Israel, are "diaspora." As Kallen wrote in a letter to Judah Pilch (b. 1903), then the executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education, Israel's primacy for the Jewish people must be based not on sentiment but on what it actually accomplishes.71

Kallen's Zionist Activities

Although it is not the purpose of this dissertation to document the work that Horace M. Kallen has done for the Zionist cause, it is pertinent to indicate that Kallen, considering himself neither in exile nor trapped by a dual loyalty dilemma, has actively engaged in Zionist work over the years. As early as 1915 he had stated that Palestine was no longer an other-worldly hope but a fact that must be made into a Jewish homeland by practical measures.72 He

71 Letter from Kallen to Judah Pilch, July 14, 1962, pp. 2-3, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 977.
72 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 133-134.
tried to aid the Zionist cause by practical application of his talents. He did so by personally laboring for specific projects,\(^{73}\) by speaking frequently on Zionism,\(^{(4)}\) and by writing on the subject. One reviewer hailed his book, *Zionism and World Politics*, saying it would "contribute more towards an understanding of the Jewish problem than any work since the publication of Zangwill's *ghetto novels.*"\(^{75}\) It would be unusual if the open advocacy of Zionism by an educator and philosopher of Kallen's stature did not impress a number of American Jews who had thought Zionism to be un-American and/or philosophically not acceptable.\(^{76}\)

\(^{73}\) Some early examples of his endeavors: asked Henri Bergson's help in promoting industry in Palestine—see letter from Kallen to Bergson, July 24, 1915, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494; helped make arrangements for orphans of World War I to go to Palestine—see letter from the Joint Distribution Committee, of N.Y., to Kallen, Feb. 3, 1920, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494; helped organize agricultural committees to go to Palestine—see letter from Kallen to Leo N. Brown (b. 1878), a lawyer, of Mobile, Ala., Nov. 15, 1920, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494; solicited money for The School of the Parents' Education Association, in Jerusalem, where his sister Deborah was principal—see letter from Kallen to Mrs. Harry A. Overstreet, of N.Y., Mar. 12, 1935, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research; sought scholarships for the education of Jewish children who had gone to Palestine in the early years of Hitler's regime—see Kallen's letter to the painter and sculptor Maurice Sterne (1878-1957), of Brooklyn, Nov. 20, 1934, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

\(^{74}\) The Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs praised Kallen for speaking in the western states; see letter from Louis D. Brandeis to Kallen, Sept. 30, 1915, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494. In his letter to Brandeis, dated Sept. 15, 1915, Kallen mentions his travels—see Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494.


\(^{76}\) Note, for example: "His early participation in the Menorah Association and the Menorah Journal really marked the beginning of the Jewish literary movement among students and intellectuals." "Professor Kallen at 70" (editorial), *Congress Weekly*, XIX, 24 (Oct. 13, 1952), pp. 4-5. As early as 1915 Kallen was a member of the governing council of the Intercollegiate Zionist Association.
Kallen joined the Zionist Organization of America. Among his efforts for it was the writing, in 1918, of principles which enumerated what he believed should be the direction of Jewish Palestine's future development. These seven principles, in whose final form Justice Louis D. Brandeis "had the decisive voice," were adopted by the Z.O.A. at its July 1918 convention in Pittsburgh. The resolutions became known as the "Pittsburgh Program."

When the Brandeis-Mack faction withdrew from active leadership of the Z.O.A. after the 1921 Cleveland convention over the issue of which methods were to be utilized in developing a Jewish national home, Kallen was of the 37

77 In Kallen's Zionism and World Politics, p. 300, one reads: "The formulation of these resolutions was the work of one member of the group." In a conversation which the writer of this thesis had with Horace Kallen on Oct. 6, 1970, Kallen confirmed that he had written the draft of these principles.


persons to resign from the Provisional Executive Committee
for General Zionist Affairs and from other committees. 80
Kallen never formally rejoined the Zionist movement, al-
though he continued being a Zionist. 81 He felt there was a
conflict between what he wanted to do--build a Jewish home-
land in Palestine--and what many other Zionist leaders
seemed to want: perpetuate the Zionist organization.
Kallen believed that, as was sometimes the case, the in-
strument (in this instance, the Zionist organization) had
displaced the end (a Jewish homeland in Palestine) and had
become an end in itself. 82

Kallen has remained true to the "hard-nosed" approach
of the Brandeis-Neck wing. He has consistently advocated
deemphasizing propaganda and the view that Zionism is a
"compensatory ideal" 83 and charity cause; he has stressed,
instead, the need for efficient, practical techniques and
securing and realistic planning for/maintaining a Jewish homeland. 84

80 De Haas, Louis D. Brandeis, p. 145.
81 Confirmed by Kallen in a talk with the writer of this
82 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 280.
83 Ibid., p. 277.
84 Ibid., pp. 274-275; Frontiers of Hope, p. 106; "Menorah
Address," pp. 133-134; "Hitlerism and the American Jewish
Congress," p. 11; letter from Kallen to Carl Alpert (b. 1913),
managing editor of The New Palestine--Dec. 11, 1942, Kallen
Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research--in which Kallen
says it is imperative to get as many Jews as possible into
Palestine quickly to build a Jewish life there; letter from
Kallen to President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882-1945)--Jan.
15, 1945, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research--in
which he suggests that when Roosevelt meets next with Stalin
and Churchill he should insist that international obligations
regarding the Jewish right to enter Palestine be kept and
that Jewish immigration to Palestine be permitted "as trea-
ties and human decency require." In 1951--see "Whither Isra-
el?" 80--he said that for many people "Israel" is still an
abstract, to-be-realized ideal.
The Liberals and Zionism

Kallen was a Zionist in the first place because he saw Zionism as a legitimate expression of democracy, of cultural pluralism. It was only fair that the Jewish people have an equal right to possess and dwell in its homeland as every other people does. Seeing Zionism as part of the democratic tradition he believed that liberals, being supporters of other democracy and good causes, would acknowledge and assist the Zionists in enabling Jews to strive after life, liberty, and happiness through their organized Jewish nationality on their own land. Kallen noted that after World War I a number of non-Jewish liberals, wanting to implement the democratic ideas for which they said World War I had been fought, were desirous of implementing the Balfour Declaration.

If some liberals have soured on Zionism, Kallen said several years before the State of Israel's rise in 1948, it is because they are frightened by the word "nationalism."

85 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 120.

86 Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 1. In this connection it is interesting that in 1918 Kallen held that if the principle of nationality were to be truly vindicated by World War I, one of the countries which should have the opportunity for self-determination was what he called "Judea." Like other small states, however, he saw Judea as having to rely on a powerful alliance like the League of Nations—in essence, the goodness of liberal states—to prevent Judea from being overcome by aggressors. See Horace M. Kallen, The League of Nations Today and Tomorrow: A Discussion of International Organization Present and to Come (Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1918), p. 4.
Anything can be over-emphasized, including nationalism, Kallen declared. Zionists have to persuade liberals, who are "the only type of people that we can rely on to help us with respect to Palestine," that Zionism advocates a healthy nationalism. Also, by living as Jews in a democratic way wherever they happen to reside Zionists will help convince liberals that Zionism is "not a method of psychological compensation" for the difficulties of struggling to live as a Jew among non-Jews.

Still stressing the appeal to liberals, after the State of Israel's establishment Kallen wrote, in 1951, that all Americans should have a basic interest in Israel's welfare not only because of American self-interest in having a pro-American country in the vital Middle East but also because of America's moral obligation to further liberty.

In a 1953 letter Kallen stated that the way to maintain Israel in a world hostile to its very existence is only by a struggling faith in the equal liberty of the different and in a reciprocal insurance of each nation's right to exist by all nations.

87 Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 3.
88 Ibid.
89 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 104.
90 Letter from Kallen to Carl Frankenstein of Jerusalem, Mar. 16, 1953, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497. This statement is a clear parallel to Kallen's idea of cultural pluralism whereby the union of all helps ensure the equal liberty and safety of each.
As late as 1970 Kallen again affirmed that the State of Israel's friends are not primarily the powerful nations but "the enlightened opinion of the free world." 91

Israel: State-of-Survival and/or Integrity

The very establishment of the State of Israel Kallen saw as a great liberal act of faith in democracy. It, and the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943, are the two instances in recent Jewish history in which Jews demonstrated their faith in the equal liberty of the different and staked their lives on the outcome. They affirmed values for which they were/to fight and, if need be, to die. 92 The devotion and valor of the Israelis impressed Kallen as striking examples of mankind's determination to struggle for the increasing realization of their humanity. 93

91 Eisenstein, "Dialogue With Dr. Horace M. Kallen," 23; cf. Kallen, "Israel, Religious Freedom and the Jewish Question," 8. Kallen, in a letter to his close friend, Milton Konvitz (b. 1908), professor of industrial and labor relations at Cornell Univ.--Feb. 6, 1948, p. 1, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research--was not as confident of liberal world opinion as the earlier statements he had made would lead one to think. In this 1948 letter Kallen declared that in the face of Arab attacks on the Jews in Palestine--done with British connivance--the Christian world will talk piously but do nothing to aid the Jews. In fact, adds Kallen, the Christians will be "taking Christian pleasure in the fate of the Christ-killers." As for the hope that non-Jewish liberals would not be anti-Semitic, Kallen said: "Although it (i.e., anti-Semitism) becomes unconscious, it shapes the responses of ex-Christian agnostics, humanists and infidels to the word Jew wherever they see or hear it." See Horace M. Kallen, "Non-Jewish Relations in America: A Symposium," Midstream, XII, 10 (Dec. 1966), 57.

92 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 221; "Whither Israel?" 90.

93 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 290.
Like Job, observes Kallen, Israel holds fast to its integrity despite the many obstacles confronting her. Its people refuse to elevate survival over doing righteously. If Israel were to sell its integrity for the sake of survival Israel would commit spiritual suicide, "a sort of treachery to the six million whose lives are, in a sense, the sacrificial price for the State of Israel." Affirming that Israel is too young to die, Kallen avers that is why Israel must face death boldly, determined to live.

**Israeli Society**

Of course the kind of society Kallen wanted in the Jewish homeland, as he stated in 1918, was one in which complete political and spiritual equality prevailed for all the land's inhabitants and in which freedom and social justice were promoted.

---


95 Kallen, unpublished address delivered in connection with the publication of Utopians At Bay, op. cit. (above, note 178, p. 53), p. 9.

96 Letter from Kallen to Carl Frankenstein, op. cit. (above, note 90).

97 Letter from Kallen to Carl Frankenstein, Jan. 5, 1956, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497. Kallen's insistence that Israel confront the possibility of its extinction, and do so with manifest fearlessness, should not be taken to mean that he disapproves of Israel's resort to force as a way of defending its integrity. See Kallen's letter to Carl Frankenstein, Nov. 2, 1956, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497.

98 Letter from Kallen to E. G. Cohen, Sept. 15, 1918, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2494.
In that same year of 1918, in Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion, Kallen had said that the Jewish people should fashion in Palestine a society based on the economic principles enunciated in Jewish tradition, such as the Torah's statements concerning the rights of the poor, of slaves, and the equitable distribution of land. 99 These statements, however, he went on to say, had to be adjusted to the realities of life today. 100

Kallen was favorably impressed with the cooperative aspects of Israeli society. Having visited Kibbutz Ein Harod in his 1926 trip to Palestine, he lauded it as an "embodied Utopia" 101 and, 25 years later, he commended the country's experimental credit cooperatives. 102 He saw the kibbutzim and moshavim as democratic arrangements whereby individuals voluntarily come together so as to live more freely, safely,


100 Ibid.

101 Kallen, Frontiers of Hope, p. 87.

and abundantly than any one could alone. Although he believed that it was the encouragement of cooperative principles in the fourth point of the Zionist Organization of America's Pittsburgh Platform of 1918—which was later implemented by the Palestine Development Corporation—that was the source and stimulant for the interest in cooperatives in Palestine, he was perceptive enough to realize that most Zionists, especially those in the Brandeis-Mack group, were interested in cooperation only as an efficiency device.

Looking at the cooperative and other features of Jewish life in Palestine in 1946, Kallen wrote that the Jews had indeed established a democratic society in Palestine.

Sixteen years later, in an article written in honor of David

103 "Dialogue With Horace M. Kallen: Philosopher of Minorities," op. cit. (above, note 105, p. 37), p. 103; cf. Kallen's Letter to the editor, Jewish Frontier, XXXVII, 3 (Mar. 1970), 30. Kallen is a strong advocate of cooperatives for he holds that they are based on the democratic philosophy of recognizing the individuality, diversity, and equal liberty of each human being and they see human associations as ways of helping persons live better so as to fulfill themselves; see Kallen, The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, pp. 386, 420, and "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, at 30, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," 2. A particular feature of cooperatives that appeals to Kallen is the cooperative method, which is the democratic (cultural pluralist) method of acting on the basis of a freely arrived at decision via peaceful consensus; this is the best method, he says, for combining diverse human beings and groups in a common endeavor for the enrichment and strengthening of all without sacrificing individuality. See Kallen, The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, p. 420.


105 Kallen, Frontiers of Hope, p. 113.

Ben-Gurion's 75th birthday, Kallen stated that of all the nations that had come into being since World War II, Israel is the most democratic in its principles and practices. Which is not to say, of course, that Kallen was unaware of Israel's shortcomings. He was aware of them. But he was cognizant of Israel's determined struggle to create the kind of democratic society of which he basically approved.

**Cultural Pluralism and Israel**

How is the democratic Israel to come into being? By applying the cultural pluralism of the American Idea to the Israeli scene, answers Kallen. Let there be a personal commitment by each resident to the free association and union of the different individuals and groups in Israel on equal terms so "Israelis" are created thereby and an Israeli culture is fashioned.

Applied to the various groups of Jewish immigrants to Israel this means not attempting to purge the newcomers of their former cultures. The fact is that they cannot throw off their past, for it is part of them. Their present must be built on that past, incorporating that digested and living past into their present and future ways. Israeliization involves encouraging the immigrants to keep

---

their former cultures, to bring their ideas and practices into the life of Israel, to learn the ideas and practices of Israel and to embody what they wish of them into their own lives, to orchestrate their old and the new in order to live peacefully, freely, securely, and abundantly with their fellow Israelis in a scientific-minded, industrial-oriented, and necessarily militarized country. 108

Kallen is especially concerned that Oriental and European Jews understand this way—the cultural pluralist way—of human relations. He knows that the Jews from Arab lands who migrated to Israel in large numbers after 1948 differ significantly in their thinking and way of life from the European Jews who preceded them. As newcomers there is a tendency for the Oriental Jews to see their cultural and religious particularities as inferior to those of the established Europeans. This is an error, says Kallen. Their Oriental differences are of equal merit with the Europeans (Ashkenazim). Some of their Oriental differences can be offered to the European Israelis and adopted by them as part of their cultural patterns. Some Ashkenazic items the Oriental Israelis can adapt. Some Oriental cultural forms the Orientals themselves can reshape not by Europeanizing themselves but by absorbing the ways and values of industry and science. 109 The old ways should not disappear but should be interfused with the new.

108 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, pp. 35-86; unpublished address in connection with the publication of Utopians At Bay, op. cit. (above, note 173, p. 53), p. 5.

109 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 105.
Israelization

Kallen sees the Israeli leaders as "Utopians" because they are striving to realize the prophecies of a supernaturalist Bible in terms of a humanist-scientific commitment. That is, they are endeavoring to gather the Jews together in Israel, as traditional Judaism calls for, but they also want to fashion a society based on satisfying human needs with the aid of modern technology and its scientific approach.

The Jews who are being in-gathered come from many different lands. They bring with them their particulars and peculiarities of beliefs and practices, even as the Jewish immigrants to the United States did. The cultures in which they were raised and lived before coming to Israel continue to affect such areas of life as the ways in which the newcomers speak Hebrew and pray, the legends they relate, the songs they sing, the friends they have, the types of work they engage in and how they labor, their preferences in food and dress. Kallen observes that when immigrants from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds are mixed trouble ensues because immigrants from each country have their own singularities of belief and behavior. Indeed, each immigrant is seen by himself and others as first a Yemenite, or Anglo-Saxon, or whatever, and only second as an Israeli.

110 Ibid., p. 10.
111 "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," p. 2.
112 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 85; "Whither Israel" 97.
How can these diverse individuals be made into Israelis, each of whom is a free, equal citizen of Israel and is living in friendly communication with others? This is the task called "Israelization" with which Israel's leaders are struggling.113

Kallen notes that the problem is not unique to Israel. Every free society wrestles with the problem and tries to solve it. In America the problem was called "Americanization."114 Even as the immigrants to America were very different from one another, bore the label of "Americans" yet had to be educated into an understanding of what it means to be an American, so with the immigrants to Israel.115

Although the Jewish immigrants to Israel bear the same "Jewish" label, the content of their Jewishness is not a sameness in heritage. Their Jewish ideas and practices vary widely; their Judaisms are variegated. They do not possess a common past for the past of each person and group of immigrants has been different. Nor do they possess a sense of unity as a Jewish people, in Kallen's opinion, because the people are so diverse in their religious and cultural patterns as well as lands of origin. Kallen summed up the situation in a humorous-truthful analysis: Israel is "a pluralistic society whose togetherness is postulated on a common past which isn't common, on a simple faith which conspicuously isn't simple, and on ethnic unity which is/multiple."116

114 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
115 Ibid., p. 4.
116 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, pp. 102-103.
There is, however, one sameness about all Jewish immigrants to Israel: they are all "Jews." The "Jew" identification is not one which the Jews themselves give each other. Jews differ in what "Jew" means and one "Jew" might not be willing to bestow the name "Jew" on everyone whom non-Jews call a "Jew." It is from the unity of all bearing the "Jew" label given them by non-Jews that the Jews of Israel must be fashioned into Israelis via Israelization. 117

Kallen is pleased that Israel's leaders want this Israelization to come about by orchestrating—not by "melting"—the diverse inhabitants of Israel into free Israelis. 118 He wishes, however, that they would express their aim in more precise language. Israeli leaders should not refer to the making of immigrants into authentic Israelis as a process of "integration" or "absorption." Such terms connote the elimination of cultural differences and the molding of the immigrants into an "acceptable" Israeli shape. Kallen prefers, of course, the term "orchestration," which means not an elimination of differences but a harmonious living with differences in equal liberty and safety for the welfare of each and all. 119

117 Ibid., pp. 102, 165-166; unpublished speech in connection with the publication of Utopians At Bay, op. cit. (above, note 178, p. 53), pp. 3-4.

118 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 246.

119 Ibid., p. 80.
In Kallen's opinion many Jews residing in Israel are unaware of what it means to be an Israeli in terms of the changes they must make in their commitments and way of life based on such a creed as the Israel Declaration of Independence. 120 Too many Israelis, he says, are not committed to a live-and-help-live, learn-from-others-and-offer-to-others approach with regard to the cultural and religious differences among them. In addition, Kallen wrote in 1951, the many peoples in Israel have just not yet orchestrated themselves into the nation of Israel. 121 Nevertheless, Kallen admits in his book, Utopians At Bay, published in 1958, the varieties of Israelis do seem to share a common faith in the desirability and potentiality of the Jewish people living in their Land of Israel, speaking Hebrew, and affirming the Jewish Bible as their "nuclear achievement." 122 Eventually, Kallen acknowledges, this faith will produce the new Israeli, the "adam hadash" (new man) 123 whom Israel's "Utopians" want to make of each person living in Israel.

120 Ibid., p. 236.
121 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 95.
122 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 15.
123 Ibid., p. 129.
Education

1. Importance of Education

The "Utopians" themselves see education as the means whereby all people residing in Israel will be transformed into genuine, loyal Israelis. Kallen agrees. It is education which "is bound to shape the future and Israelization of the generations of newcomers." Kallen is very cognizant of the role education plays in Israel today as well as what was the educational situation for Jews in Palestine in the earlier years of the twentieth century. Although Kallen has not written a detailed account of Jewish education in Palestine and Israel, some comments he has made on the subject over the years are of interest to us and help us understand his attitude to the Israelization aim of the present-day educators of Israel.

As early as 1918 Kallen had written: "The cornerstone of the excellence of the New Zion will be its school system; and if it fails of excellence, the source of its failure will be its school system." A state is only as good as its citizens, and it is education that guides citizens in how to think, what to feel, and how to do what needs to be done.

124 Ibid., p. 13.
125 Letter from Kallen to Itzhak Kanev (b. 1896), of Tel Aviv, a social security expert and professor, Dec. 16, 1962, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 974.
126 Kallen, Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion, p. 22.
127 Ibid.
2. Education in Palestine

In that same year of 1918, Kallen, who had a hand in writing the Pittsburgh Program adopted by the Zionist Organization of America at its convention in July 1918, wanted, as the sixth point of the Program states, free public education for all grades in Palestine.\(^{128}\)

In 1921, his sister Deborah became principal of Jerusalem's School of the Parents' Education Association. It was a progressive school which saw the school as a home and community and aimed to develop character as well as teach facts.\(^{129}\) Kallen wrote highly of it.\(^{130}\) When the school was in financial difficulty, Kallen sent letters asking to friends in the United States for contributions to the school.\(^{131}\)

In *Zionism and World Politics*, published in 1921, Kallen praised the teachers of Jewish Palestine for being a democratic, responsible group of professionals, eager to improve their competency and standards.\(^{132}\) He

\(^{128}\) Kallen, *Zionism and World Politics*, p. 302. For Kallen's part in the writing of the Pittsburgh Program see above, note 77, p. 138.

\(^{129}\) Kallen, *Utonians At Bay*, pp. 266-270.

\(^{130}\) Ibid., p. 270. Also see Horace M. Kallen, "Lidmutah Achetee" (Portrait of My Sister), Dvorah Kallen; Chayveha Umifalah (Deborah Kallen: Her Life and Work), ed. Elisha Efrat (Jerusalem: Brandeis Centre, 1952), pp. 9-12.

\(^{131}\) Letters to Maurice Sterne and Mrs. Harry A. Overstreet, op. cit. (above, note 73, p. 137). Also see letters to Kallen from his sister, Deborah Kallen—the letters of Apr. 15, May 4, and Aug. 12 (all 1935), Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

\(^{132}\) Kallen, *Zionism and World Politics*, p. 119.
was distressed, however, that most teachers were not trained in pedagogy and were teachers mainly because of their dedication to the Hebrew language. They were carrying into the Jewish schools of Palestine the "irrelevant, other-worldly, speculative, and verbal" ways of traditional Jewish education. Vocational education was non-existent. Education did not deal with the realities of life in Palestine but continued the text-centered approach of the Jewish communities outside Palestine.

Kallen wanted school subjects to be related to the local scene. Let the study of zoology, for example, be related to animals the students would see on a farm, botany to what they observed in nature or in a carpenter's shop. Kallen suggested that American teachers, who had been trained in learning-by-doing rather than learning-by-speaking, should be imported to teach in Palestine.

For the young, Kallen wanted schooling to provide opportunities for public service. Especially during vacation periods teenagers could assist in such work as digging irrigation ditches, building roads, and laboring in fields and orchards.

133 Ibid., pp. 326-327.
134 Ibid., p. 326.
135 Ibid., p. 327.
136 Ibid., p. 328.
137 Ibid., pp. 329-330.
For adults, he wanted the school to guide foremen and management to make school-like places of their farms and factories so that each job would be seen as linked with the past and necessary for man's present and future. 138

Education should be woven into every endeavor in Palestine. Moreover, in line with Kallen's democratic emphasis, he urged that in every educational enterprise the children and adults should be taught how to govern themselves. 139 Education must be for responsible freedom, a freedom which enables each to grow in freedom even while cooperating with others for the common good.

Writing in his Frontiers of Hope, published in 1929, Kallen noted the "verbalism and abstractness" 140 which still prevailed in Palestine's Jewish schools. He also mentioned their lack of discipline and consistency of purpose when compared with government educational institutions. Although Kallen judged the Jewish schools to be far from the sound progressive schools he hoped they would become, he acknowledged that the schools were experimental and dynamic. On the whole he appraised them affirmatively, as may be seen in these words: "Their best, public

138 Ibid., p. 328.

139 Ibid., p. 329.

140 Kallen, Frontiers of Hope, p. 112.
or private, is as good as anything the United States or Russia can boast of; their worst is worthy at least of a church school conducted by a British curate.¹⁴¹ He praised, too, the desire of Palestinian Jewry to make every effort to provide the best possible education for their young; he found this trait most noticeable in the collective colonies.¹⁴²

3. Education in the Collective Colonies

Kallen was impressed by many aspects of the educational programs of the collective colonies. He admired the early chalutzim for not viewing teaching's goal as only the transmission of the past so as to get students to repeat the past. Influenced "by a fighting faith in the holiness of work as sheer bodily exertion, in vocation as the flowering and fruit of culture,"¹⁴³ they strove to teach the past in such a way that it could play a role in fashioning a different world of tomorrow, a world that would be transformed by science and industry.¹⁴⁴ This education, like that of some other schools in the land, aimed at the self-liberation of the student

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 111.
¹⁴² Ibid., p. 112.
¹⁴³ Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 259.
¹⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 259-260. Also see Kallen's letter to Aaron Steinberg (b. 1891), director of the cultural department of the World Jewish Congress in London, Nov. 26, 1938, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 978.
so he could function intelligently and skillfully whatever the circumstances. The method employed in the schools of the kibbutzim and moshavim was "a kind of pedagogical pseudo-progressivism." It did result, however, in teenagers who were capable of self-help, working with a group, and, sometimes, of being dogmatic, undisciplined, arrogant, and rude. The ideal of the kibbutzim and moshavim themselves—to be an independent-thinking, free, responsible human being—Kallen urged all Israel's schools to communicate to their students.

4. Education in Israel

Kallen wanted all Israeli schools to educate their pupils to freedom and to guide them into being more knowledgeable and skilled, more self-reliant and courageous individuals. Kallen felt that this could be done even if the collectives, the religious groups, and the other associations sponsoring schools were unified into a single educational establishment. This single establishment could serve all the different religious

145 Kallen, *Utopians At Bay*, pp. 260, 263.
146 Ibid., p. 261.
147 Ibid.
149 Kallen, *Utopians At Bay*, p. 263.
and secular groups that sponsored schools. It would consider all to be equals and endeavor to orchestrate them with each other so as to mutually enrich them, to develop a feeling of union and an awareness of interdependence.\footnote{150} This, of course, is cultural pluralism's unity-with-diversity applied to the school system.

Although Kallen realized that the State of Israel did eventually pass laws effecting an educational union along the lines he recommended,\footnote{151} the goals envisioned for students in Israel's schools Kallen termed "utopian."\footnote{152} No school anywhere, he asserted, has successfully implemented and achieved such goals for its pupils as: the development of a way of life based on its people's cultural values and also on scientific achievements; love of country; loyalty to one's country and people; the desire to participate in the building of a society based on (and practicing) equality, freedom, mutual help, tolerance, and love of others.\footnote{153}

In 1958, Kallen was impressed with the dedication of some education officials in Israel who were involved in trying to achieve such goals.\footnote{154} He was well aware of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{150}{Ibid., p. 271.}
\item \footnote{151}{Ibid., pp. 271-272.}
\item \footnote{152}{Ibid., p. 272.}
\item \footnote{153}{Ibid.}
\item \footnote{154}{Ibid., pp. 274-275.}
\end{itemize}
difficulties they labored under in a nation whose schools were also charged with the task of fashioning, from a polygrot population, the new Israeli—a person speaking Hebrew, loyal to Israel as a nation among the world's nations, and at home with Jewish culture as well as the ways of modernity. 155

Kallen sees the school, even more than Israel's army, as "a strategic bastion of utopian Israel at bay." 156 All who are truly interested in Israel's future, therefore, can do nothing more important than help Israel's schools. The country's main educational need, he declared, is more and better trained teachers for "the common school at the broad base of the educational pyramid." 157 To help obtain and prepare such teachers, and to study education, Kallen advocated establishing an independent institution of higher learning where education would be the main concern. 158 This institution would not be an ivory-tower school but a place of teaching and learning whose people would be researching education's role in the problems of day-to-day (and ideal) life in Israel. Such an institution could affect Israel's entire school system and help create an Israeli society of free and informed human beings.

155 Ibid.
156 Ibid., p. 275.
157 Ibid., p. 276.
158 Ibid., p. 275.
5. Hebrew

Before leaving the topic of Israel's schools, let us note what Kallen has to say about the language of instruction used in most of its schools—Hebrew. Kallen recognizes that because of the large immigration to Israel, Hebrew is being used by the Israeli government as an instrument for Israeliizing newcomers.\(^{159}\) He acknowledges that for the immigrants' children, and surely for their grandchildren, Hebrew will come naturally as their native tongue.\(^{160}\)

Although Kallen admitted the success of the modern endeavor to make Hebrew a living language once more,\(^{161}\) he believes that whereas all languages must struggle to devise new words for the scientific, industrial culture of today, "it is peculiarly the challenge to the Hebrew of Medinat Israel."\(^{162}\) However, as Arnold J. Band has pointed out in commenting on this assertion by Kallen, Hebrew is being utilized in complex fields today.\(^{163}\) Hebrew seems to be coping successfully with this challenge.


\(^{160}\) \textit{Ibid.}


\(^{162}\) Kallen, \textit{Utopians At Bay}, p. 248.

Whatever be its struggles in fashioning new terminology, Kallen hoped that the Hebraic culture being created in Israel would not isolate itself from other cultures. The Hebraic culture, like all other cultures, can grow only as it establishes communication with other cultures, cooperates with them, and learns from them even as they learn from it. 164

If Hebrew is used to give "noble meanings and beautiful forms all its own to the Jewish singularity of struggle" 165 for the free, happy, and abundant life, then modern Hebrew will join other languages which do likewise for their peoples' singularities in the intercultural and international world of literature.

Religion in Israel

In addition to Israel's schools and the Hebrew language there are, of course, other vehicles for educating Israel's inhabitants and for serving as bridges to unite native-born and immigrants. These other means include the army, Histadrut (General Federation of Jewish Labor), state, culture, and synagogue.

165 Ibid.
While the synagogue does serve as a common meeting-place for prayer for many Israelis of diverse backgrounds, the synagogue—in the sense of religion—is also a harmfully divisive factor in modern Israel, according to Kallen. Freedom and diversity of associations—be they religious, political, economic, etc.—are characteristics of free, pluralistic societies, which Israel is. However, equal rights must be extended to individuals and their associations. Israelis of whatever religious belief and practice must possess equal rights to them and should respect individuals and groups who differ from themselves in religious matters. Unfortunately, Kallen observes, this is presently not the situation. He terms it a "blasphemy beyond pardon" that Orthodox Judaists in Israel should seek to penalize anyone for his religious beliefs when Jews themselves have suffered so much at the hands of non-Jews for centuries primarily because of the Jewish religious difference. Kallen is perceptive and fair-minded enough, however, to note with concern that many students in Israel's institutions of higher learning express contempt—instead of an understanding, live-and-let-live or live-and-help-live attitude—toward traditional Judaism.

166 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 107.
167 Ibid., p. 292.
168 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 104.
and foresee the inevitability of a violent Kulturkampf. Kallen also is aware of the Israeli government's dilemma: it seeks to appease some religiously intolerant Orthodox Judaists (e.g., by consenting to their exclusive control over Jewish marriage and divorce) but it also affirms that Israel, as a member of the United Nations, will uphold the U.N.'s principle of equal liberty for the different in religion.

Kallen believes that by not ensuring religious liberty to all groups in Israel, including all Jews, the State of Israel is "increasingly alienating friends and making enemies." Those being alienated are Jews and, more important for their good-will, non-Jewish liberals who affirm the equal rights of all men. In accordance with Kallen's idea of what the government should be and do, Kallen would have the Israeli government, as a union different from all the religious (and other) groups which comprise it, show favoritism to no religious (or other) group. The state must give each group the democratic opportunity to develop its equal differentness in equal liberty, safety, and without penalty.

169 Letter from Kallen to Itzhak Kanev, op. cit. (above, note 124, p. 152).
170 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 98.
172 Ibid.
173 See above, pp. 31-35.
174 Cf. Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 209.
Kallen holds that eventually freedom of religion will come to Israel. Several factors will make for it. First, the scientific approach will carve inroads into religious dogmatism. As Israel, largely because of its security needs, pursues science, the scientific way of thinking and acting—premise, experiment, observation, proof on the basis of premise fulfilled, openness to other ways and proofs, and the possibility of being shown to be wrong—will affect what some Israelis now believe religiously and how they relate to persons of differing religious positions.

In this connection it is of interest to point out that as early as 1924, in Culture and Democracy in the United States, Kallen wrote that the attempt by Orthodox Jews to impose the ritual laws of the Torah in the modern world will fail because the Torah comes from a different, pre-modern time.

A second cause for religious change in Israel will be the deliberate spread of non-Orthodox Judaism by interested individuals. Kallen advocated specific actions in this respect. For instance, at a 1967 meeting of the Special Committee on Israel of the World Union for Progressive Judaism, he urged that the legal-fiction method of interpreting


176 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 332.
Jewish law by the Orthodox in Israel should be openly challenged and that Reform Judaism should initiate programs in Israel to acquaint Israelis with Reform Judaism. He felt so deeply about Reform's right to exist as an equal in Israel that he even suggested that a delegation of Reform leaders should threaten the Israeli Prime Minister with the withdrawal of Reform support for Israel unless the Reform demands were met! This is a surprising extreme for a person of Kallen's philosophic temperament. However, if he saw the Reform action as a live-or-die moment to affirm its Job-like integrity, his strong position becomes more understandable.

A third item in making for change in Israel's religious situation will be the actions of the bulk of the Israelis themselves, in Kallen's opinion. Eventually the non-Judaist majority in Israel will stop giving in to the Judaist minority on religious matters. Moreover, the Orthodox Jews will come to realize that their religious approach will win adherents not by forcing people to act in certain ways but by showing people through personal example how Orthodoxy helps an individual live better and freer. Life itself—the influence of the educational establishment, army, culture, etc.—will diversify the meaning of the words "Jew"

177 Minutes of the meeting, on May 19, 1967, of the Special Committee on Israel of The World Union for Progressive Judaism, p. 3, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2830.

178 Ibid., p. 5.

and "Judaism."\(^{180}\) Hopefully, all the Judaist cults in Israel will become diversified and orchestrated within the Jewish culture there, and a separation of synagogue from state will take place.\(^{181}\)

Kallen believes that Israel will be as Judaist as other modern countries are Christian. After all, there is a core of Judaist creed and code at the heart of Israel's culture no matter how secularized that culture becomes.\(^{182}\)

In 1929, Kallen had already observed that the chalutzim avoid pork and working on the Sabbath not because these are religious actions in their eyes but because this is how they choose to express their Jewish national way of life.\(^{183}\) It is likely that these and/or other specifics of Jewish thought and deed will constitute a core of Jewish beliefs and practices which will come to characterize most Jewish Israelis.

**Non-Jews in Israel**

If Kallen is so concerned with insuring the right to their equal difference for immigrants and individuals of all Jewish religious inclinations, we would be safe to assume that he is also greatly interested in seeing that non-Jews

\(^{180}\) Kallen, *Utopians At Bay*, pp. 280-281.


\(^{183}\) Kallen, *Frontiers of Hope*, p. 94.
in Israel have their rights protected. And this is the case. Kallen is not pleased with the fact that Israel's Declaration of Independence of May 14, 1948, speaks primarily of and to Jews "and only thereafter to all mankind." This is in contrast to the more democratic American Declaration of Independence whose import applies to everyone.

In 1921, Kallen had urged the Jews of Palestine to strive for good relations with the land's Arabs. He also suggested that the Hebrew University open a Department of Arabic, that Arabs be admitted to all Jewish schools, and that Arabs be asked to permit Jewish enrollment in Arab schools. This would foster mutual understanding and a more willing orchestration of Jewish and Arab elements into each other's culture and into the country's overall culture.

In 1951, Kallen called the Ihud movement, which worked for cooperation between Jews and Arabs, "rightly aspiring [but] impelled by sentiment rather than guided by insight." Despite this evaluation, and his 1957 comment

---

184 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 16.
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that Ihud's program was a Utopian hope limited to some Jews and likely to be misunderstood by other Jews, 189 he joined Ihud and served on its National Advisory Committee of the American Friends of Ihud. 190 He felt it would be "unJewish" 191 of him not to join when invited. Kallen maintained that Ihud's dissent from the Israeli government's position vis-a-vis the Arabs was important and would prove beneficial to Israel in the eyes of the world's nations. 192

Kallen's advocacy of cooperation between Jews and Arabs should not be considered a sign of blindness on his part in regard to the difficulties that Jews had (and have) to suffer at the hands of the Arabs. In 1943, for example, he denounced the British for their long-standing policy in Palestine of giving in to Arab "gangsterism" 193 and thereby encouraging the Arabs to use force to get their way. Also, as has already

189 See the handwritten comment by Kallen on top of the letter he received from Ernst Simon (b. 1899), professor of education at the Hebrew University, then residing temporarily in Los Angeles, asking Kallen to become a member of the Advisory Board of the monthly publication Mer, published by American Friends of Ihud. Simon's letter is dated May 14, 1957. The comment by Kallen is dated June 8, 1957. Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 978.

190 Ibid.; letter from Kallen to Trude Weiss-Rosmarin (b. 1908), editor of the Jewish Spectator, May 1, 1958, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 980. Also see Alan G. Field, "Ichud," Jewish Spectator, XXIII, 5 (May 1958), 26.

191 See the handwritten comment by Kallen on top of the letter he received from Ernst Simon, op. cit. (above, note 189); cf. letter from Kallen to Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, op. cit. (above, note 190).

192 See the letter from Kallen to Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, op. cit. (above, note 190).

been noted, Kallen was not adverse to Israel defending herself militarily against the Arabs. In his concern for the ideal of Jewish-Arab friendship Kallen is obviously calling for implementation of the democratic live-and-help-live position and for the cultural pluralist stance of the right of different cultures to exist in equal freedom and safety in the same land. Moreover, when Kallen suggests that the basic issue between Israel and the Arab lands is "a way of realizing human relations," we know what he has in mind: that the individuals and countries presently involved/the Middle East conflict should come to accept and live by the goal and way of democracy, of cultural pluralism.

As for the "utopian" Israelis, Kallen believes they share his cultural pluralist view of the self-orchestration of the world's peoples and cultures, including the Jewish think they do not and Arab. However, says Kallen, whereas these Israelis/err when they sometimes refer this way of relationship to the Hebrew prophets, they are in fact mistaken. The prophets were authoritarian in their outlook, for they predicted an end-time brought about by God and in which the other nations would acquiesce to the Jewish people's superiority. The

194 Letter from Kallen to Carl Frankenstein, op. cit. (above, note 97, p. 143).

195 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 96.

196 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 245. Also see above, note 45, p. 108.
faith of the Israeli "utopians" is based not on the prophets but on the modern position of the plurality of groups and cultures, of their right to their respective differences in freedom and safety, "and that human beings are freest and happiest and most originative when the cultures they live in freely orchestrate to one another in an ever-diversifying teamplay of their differences." 197

This is the cultural pluralist, Hebraic-based, Zionist, and Israeli position. It remains to be seen whether all Israel's peoples—as well as the other peoples of the Middle East and elsewhere—will become committed to it.

197 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 245; cf. idem, "Whither Israel?" 86.
Part Three

Judaism and Jewish Unity
CHAPTER VI: JUDAISM AND RELIGION

Introduction

Having noted that Kallen considers Zionism to be "the practical and most expressive incarnation of the Hebraic spirit,"¹ let us proceed to discuss the religion of Judaism, a second aspect of the total Jewish culture that Kallen calls Hebraism. To understand Kallen's ideas of Judaism, let us see them within the context of his views of religion as such.

Origin of Religion

To Kallen, religion, like science and art, is an instrument man utilizes in his struggle to live in safety, happiness, and freedom.² Living in a world not made for him,³ man faces crises in his struggle to survive. Among the crises associated with the life cycle are the agony of birth, the uncertainties of adolescence and marriage, the fears of sickness, sin, and old age, the death of a loved one, and the threat of one's own demise. Other crises concern the needs for food, shelter, clothing, safety in


³ Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 126.
times of plague and war, etc. Kallen states that when a man has made use of things that exist in this world in order to cope with danger, and he still feels endangered, he turns to religion. Religion comes about when a person, family, or group endeavors to avert or conquer crises by calling on the more-than-natural, the supernatural, for aid when the natural forces prove of little avail.

In words, songs, and dances, an individual expresses his wish that the supernatural drive away that which one fears and enable one to feel secure again. Eventually, the individual employs sticks, stones, plants, or animals to express his yearnings. When the action comes to be deemed effective only if performed in a certain way, what we call a ritual has developed.

These rituals come to be the special domain of priests. The priests are turned to for help in making available the supernatural help. With the coming of the priest, therefore, a new mode of association develops between man and the supernatural: the priest mediates between the two. Often the people will come to a special place or building where the priest keeps the tools necessary for invoking the supernatural. As more people in a certain


5 Kallen, Why Religion, pp. 41, 55, 179; Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 174.


7 Ibid., p. 229.
geographical area come to rely on the priest, a religious society is formed which will enable the priest to service more persons in striving to control the supernatural. The supernatural comes to be identified as a god; the god's exploits and will are explained in myths; the divine myths are studied and expounded in a specific theology. A religion has developed.

Applying this to the Jewish people, Kallen says that like individuals who belong to other peoples members of the Hebrew people were troubled by crises and were not able to conquer them by natural means. They turned for aid to the more-than-human, the supernatural. Through various rituals, including prayers, they petitioned the supernatural for assistance. The rituals became standardized. They became the province of priests who were thought to be more effective with the supernatural than ordinary men. The priests, later the rabbis, were the ones to whom the Jews came for winning the favor of the supernatural.

9 Ibid., p. 259.
10 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 35.
Two Elements Comprising A Religion

Kallen holds that two elements comprise a religion: the individual's act of believing and that in which he believes.\(^{11}\) The act of believing is his faith in something and what that something can do for him. When his belief or faith in that something is intense and complete it may be called "religious."\(^{12}\) "Religious," therefore, designates how one believes rather than what is the content of one's belief.\(^{13}\) The "religious" designation applies to how a human being feels, the attitude he takes, not to the inherent quality of the what he believes in. To Kallen, the real proof of a person's faith is what he will risk to keep his faith or to bring it to fruition.\(^{14}\)

This kind of attitude, Kallen maintains, is common to all religionists and is also found in many people who profess no religion.\(^{15}\) Those who whole-heartedly assert that a chair will support them possess a faith in an unprovable future; if sitting in a certain chair were looked upon as a must for the sake of what being in that chair could do for

\(^{11}\) Latter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 121, p. 40), p. 4.


\(^{14}\) Kallen, ""Black Power" and Education," 7.

\(^{15}\) Kallen, \textit{Democracy's True Religion}, p. 7.
an individual, then he has a religious faith towards that
chair. 16 Similarly, those who devotedly believe that De-
mocracy, Socialism, Communism, Buddhism, A Health Food,
Art, Atheism, of Whatever, will enhance their life, are
professing a religious faith. 17

To enhance one's life, however, need not mean having
a good result. The belief can also produce evil conse-
quences. But when a person believes regardless of the
results, like Job who knew he would die but who neverthe-
less held to the integrity of his ways, then his belief is
truly a religious one. Although people may change what
they believe in, the act of betting one's existence on
something does not change. 18 Each individual stakes his
life on something—even if it's no-thing!

Religion, says Kallen, consists not only of the one
element of how one believes—namely, with an intense, com-
plete profession of faith. There is also a second element
in religion: a specific what in which one believes. This
what is the supernatural. Belief in the supernatural char-
acterizes religious belief. 19

16 "Dialogue With Horace M. Kallen: Philosopher of Mi-

17 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 14, 211;
(above, note 121, p. 40), p. 5.

18 Ibid., letter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, pp. 4-5.

19 Kallen, Why Religion, p. 112.
Why Judaism Is A Religion

In regard to Judaism, therefore, it is not that Judaism calls for an act of faith that makes for its being designated a "religion"; it is the what that one must believe in, the supernatural, which gives Judaism that designation. 20

As among other peoples, so among the Hebrews: the supernatural came to be identified as God. 21 Judaism comprises those rituals which Jews perform to win the favor of God as well as those ideas of God and His relations to human beings which Jews hold. 22

Let us now consider these two aspects of Judaism, rituals and ideas of God, again within the larger context of religion.

Rituals

Rituals, says Kallen, are instruments for manipulating the supernatural to do man's will. 23 They attempt to control the unknown future as man wishes. Each people develops its own words, objects, individuals, and places which are thought to be efficacious in avoiding, mitigating, or overcoming

20 Kallen, "Whither Israel?" 82.
22 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 47-48.
evil and obtaining good. 24 The Jewish people, too, developed rituals. A priesthood was in charge of the most important rituals.

Among the Hebrews arose prophets. The true prophets, from the time of Amos through Isaiah, saw the folly of serving the supernatural (God) through performing rituals, in Kallen's opinion. They declared that God was interested in men living righteously rather than in offering Him sacrifices. 25

Kallen declares that although the prophetic emphasis on righteousness was not lost among the Jewish people, as Judaism came to be developed by Ezra and later leaders—especially the rabbis—the prophetic stress on righteousness was excluded as an active element. 26 Judaism became distinctive because of its particular observances, rituals, and the way of life they called for or necessitated. The observances were said to be authorized by God and therefore to be obeyed by men. 27 For the most part they were so obeyed, and therefore helped Judaism survive until the Reform movement began discarding observances and sought a new rationale and distinctiveness for Judaism in ethical monotheism. 28


26 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 130.

27 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 168.

28 Ibid.
Kallen knows that old rituals are often retained with new meanings being read into them. These new meanings may be concessions by the supernaturalist-oriented religious authorities so these men and their institutions can retain power, or they may be naturalist reinterpretations designed to voice gratitude with the 'good' things of this world. Kallen notes, for example, how some kibbutzim in Israel keep the ritual of reading the Haggadah but add new paragraphs to it, how some collective colonies observe the old ceremony of redeeming the vineyards but with new songs and dances in honor of the grape harvest, and how secular kibbutzim may now sometimes conduct Bar Mitzvah ceremonies. While not necessarily approving of the rituals, Kallen sees them as attempts to make the old rituals live on in the only possible way—by investing them with new meanings and making them part of the living present.

30 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, p. 186.
31 Some examples of such Haggadot are: Haggadah Shel Pesach (Tel Aviv: United Artists Ltd., 1955), Hakibutz Haartzi Hashomer Hatzair Israel: Haggadah Shel Pesach, ed. Arvei Ben-Gurion et al. (Tel Aviv: Haaretz Ltd., 1962), Cultural Committee of Hakkibbutz Hamin'uchad.
32 For some interesting examples of this and other ceremonies, see The Religious Kibbutz Movement: The Revival of the Jewish Religious Community, ed. Arvei Fishman (Jerusalem: The Religious Section of the Youth and Nahalut Department of the Zionist Org., 1957), pp. 98-136.
33 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, pp. 186-187.
34 Ibid.
Kallen speaks rather wryly of some other Jews—and in this instance he calls them "Jews" and not "Judaists"—who are meticulous in their fulfillment of ritual duties but who hold very liberal ideas concerning God. To Kallen, apparently, this is an inconsistency. If one thinks of God as a poetic symbol and not a Being in the supernatural domain Who makes His will known to men, why make use of ritual? Kallen evidently sees rituals only in terms of in-veigling the supernatural or God and, rejecting both, has no need for religious rituals. However, non-religious rituals he does not find necessarily offensive. For instance, the ritual of saluting the American flag—but without the words "under God"—Kallen does find meaningful. That ritual, he claims, signifies America's goals, sets standards for relations among individuals and groups, and broadly notes the government's responsibility. In other words, the flag is neither a symbol of the supernatural (or God) nor identical with it; therefore, flag-saluting is not idolatrous.


37 Kallen mentions the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation wherein the bread and wine are said to be changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. For non-believers the objects seem idols; for believers they are the Deity's living presence. See Kallen, *Secularism Is the Will of God*, p. 187.
God

What about this supernatural (God) which objects symbolize or are taken as the living manifestation of? Since Kallen holds that religions predicate a supernatural, what is the nature of this supernatural?

Interestingly enough, Kallen does not deny the possibility of a "mystic dimension" nor of undergoing a mystic experience. He himself, he says, has undergone such experiences as a result of the Yoga discipline and the taking of nitrous oxide. Fasting, prayer, drugs, or a crisis situation, Kallen maintains, may also trigger a mystic experience. For this experience to take place, "the normal modes of perception must have completely broken down and been abrogated." Intelligence ceases. Usually illusions, then hallucinations, appear. An ineffable experience occurs in the course of which the person discerns "a core of presence which comes close to being what we usually mean by the word supernatural."

38 Kallen, Why Religion, p. 112.
39 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 249.
41 Ibid., p. 54; idem, "Religious Experience and Metaphysical Speculation," The Journal of Philosophy, XXVII, 25 (Dec. 4, 1930), 693.
43 Kallen, Why Religion, p. 64.
When this experience takes place people sometimes say they have seen God. But this is not so, Kallen asserts. Some people are apt to call the experience one of God because society tends to associate God with such experiences and because the setting where the experience occurs is frequently in a religious building or in the presence of a religious teacher. Although "God" is the word some use in endeavoring to define the experience, other persons might call it "intuition," "love," or "pure reason." Kallen prefers the word "mana" for this vibrant, radiant energy one directly experiences in the mystic or religious experience but which is otherwise inaccessible and imperceptible. But call it what you will, it is an impersonal force and conveys no message to man in the manner in which one thinks of a God as doing.

To Kallen, "God" is the word religionists use to fill in the gaps in our knowledge of man and the world. Whenever religionists don't know something--e.g., why a tragedy struck or how the universe came into being--they ascribe

Kallen, "Religious Experience and Metaphysical Speculation," 693.


the cause to God. It is God to whom the religionist appeals for safety from insecurity, from the known and unknown dangers when the natural means of coping with them are deemed insufficient or fail. 47

Note that in all these descriptions it is not God's essence, His what, that is being discussed; it is God's doings, His how. 48 The what is unknown; 49 the how is only man's feeble attempt(s) to explain the perplexities of human existence and to attain human desires. By giving the unknown future a name--such as "the infinite," "the transcendent," "the beyond," or "God"--men erroneously think they have confined the unconfinable. 50 But they are only voicing a faith in what they believe in, God, rather than disclosing existing facts. 51

An interesting example of Kallen's attitude may be seen in his comment on an article by Milton Steinberg (1904-1950), a noted Conservative rabbi. Steinberg had written: "At all times then, God has been, among other


49 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 191.


51 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 189.
things, a principle of explanation, through which an obscure universe takes on lucidity." Next to Steinberg's words, "takes on lucidity," Kallen pencilled in the words "needed to be explained." In other words, for Kallen, the God-belief is an instrument men make use of in attempting to answer questions they have about life. Not, of course, that believing in God furnishes verifiable answers for the believer; but for the believer "God" is an explanation, satisfying or not.

In actuality, Kallen states, "God" is not only an unenlightened way of saying science hasn't yet discovered the cause of something or it has no cause, but "God" is often given as the reason when we do know the real causes of things. But if science figures out some of nature's laws, why is there a need to ascribe these laws to God's will? It is done, Kallen answers, in order to keep God on the scene by introducing purpose into existence. However, purpose is man's projection into nature rather than a scientific fact, avers Kallen. As for the weighty theological discussions concerning God and purpose: "the time is still future when theological mystery can make philosophical sense."

53 Kallen wrote his comments on the Steinberg article, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
57 Ibid., pp. 294-295.
58 Kallen, A Study of Liberty, p. 80.
Regardless of differences among theologians and non-theologians, religions have all given to God purpose, or will, or intellect, sometimes all three. 59 Consider some Jewish developments concerning God.

In Kallen's opinion, the God of the Hebrews began as a phallic stone in an ark. 60 This stone was the supernatural power responsible for the simoom (the hot, dry, sand-and-dust-laden wind of the Arabian desert) and for other threatening dangers in nature. 61 This fierce God Who dwelled on Mount Sinai became the Hebrew people's God in Canaan, where the fertility powers of the baalim came to be ascribed to His original powers. 62 Still later, Yahweh, whose name the Hebrews borrowed from the Kenites, became not only the God of the Israelites but a universal God. 63

61 Kallen, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 46.
Particularly because of science's inroads since Galileo's time, what many people mean by "God" has changed significantly among Jews and non-Jews. As science largely displaced religion as man's best instrument for realizing human satisfactions, the kind of God believed in has changed from theistic to deistic to pantheistic to transcendental idealistic to a symbol for society's highest values.  

Kallen is well aware of Jewish attempts to keep God despite science's advances. In a letter to Abraham Cronbach, for example, Kallen remarks that Cronbach feels obliged to deny the factuality of God's existence yet, inconsistently, Cronbach grants God "spiritual purpose," a power that can go only with something which exists. Kallen writes: "I do not think that this modernistic process of rationalization is necessary."  

Eugene Kohn (b. 1887), a Reconstructionist rabbi, in arguing that God can be personal for man without God being a Person, wrote: "Since a human being cannot know the nature of God, but can only, in some measure, grasp His purpose with regard to human life, it is legitimate to associate God with anthropomorphic symbols, provided we are well aware that the

64 Kallen, Why Religion, p. 231; The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 42.

65 Letter from Kallen to Abraham Cronbach (1882-1965), a professor of Jewish social studies at the Hebrew Union College, Apr. 25, 1932, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2495.

65a Ibid.
symbols are not descriptive of the reality." Kallen's pencilled comment on Kohn's assertion that men can fathom God's purpose, is: "But this is knowing."

Again, man cannot "know" God, be the man traditionalist or modernist. That is why Kallen approvingly mentions Mordecai M. Kaplan (b. 1881), the famous founder of the Reconstructionist movement in Judaism, and Martin Buber (1878-1965), an outstanding Jewish philosopher—although Kallen doesn't necessarily agree with their positions. To Kallen, Kaplan and Buber at least realize that men can only appreciate and address (if they wish) the saving, mysterious, ineffable power that some call "God" but that nothing certain can be said regarding God.

It is to the book of Job that Kallen turns for help in determining what God-attitude to take. He points to Job as evidence that God need not be thought of, in Mordecai M. Kaplan's phrase, as "the Source of salvation." For when Milton Steinberg, in explaining what God means to Mordecai  


67 Kallen's comments are handwritten by him on the Kohn article. See Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

68 See above, p. 182.

69 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 191-192.

N. Kaplan and Eugene Kohn, had written that He is "that Power on which we depend for self-realization," 71 Kallen penciled in the margin: "Job contra." 72

Kallen has acknowledged that Job's attitude towards God, as Kallen understands it, is Kallen's own. 73 In the book of Job, declares Kallen, God is beyond human knowledge and beyond man's definitions of morality or justice. 74

God need not conform to what man thinks He should be or do. Showing impartiality to human beings, by a "justice of indifference" 75 each person is on his own to live righteously because that is how he best fulfills himself, not because of a coming reward from God.


72 Kallen's comments are handwritten by him on the Steinberg article, op. cit. (above, note 53, p. 183). Since Job realizes that God will slay him and he is without hope—see Job 13:15—Job's God is not a source of "self-realization."

73 Letter from Kallen to Stephen S. Wise, Mar. 20, 1941, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

74 For some examples in Job where God is said to be beyond man's knowledge, see 36:26, 37:5,19, 43:3. For some verses in Job where God is said to be beyond what man thinks moral or just, see 9:32 and 43:3.

Kallen contends that God is depicted in the book of Job as He is in Psalms and by the Talmudic sages, "identical with his manifestations." God punishes, rewards, sends rain, rules nature, and more. (In good pragmatic fashion, He is what He does.) These many manifestations of Him are the individual ways in which men are aware of God. He is real to them in these ways. But He Himself is not a diffused many-ness. He is a One, but a "many-in-one." God's multiplicity, as it were, is harmonized in a Union of His manifestations. His Union or Oneness may be said, in the terminology of cultural pluralism, to be an orchestration of His manifestations.

76 Some examples: thunder is His voice (Ps. 18:14, 29:3); "God makes the solitary dwell in a house, brings out prisoners into prosperity" (Ps. 68:?) brings rain (Ps. 68:10); intervention in battle (Ps. 76:4); humbles the arrogant (Ps. 76:13); heals (Ps. 6:3, 103:3, 147:3); is merciful (Ps. 13:6, 145:8, 147:11); is a refuge (Ps. 2:12, 5:12, 17:7-8).

77 In Judaism At Bay, p. 52, Kallen's footnote refers to chapter two of Solomon Schechter's Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Behrman House, 1935). Kallen probably has in mind pp. 43-44 of that book where Schechter quotes a rabbinic midrash from Pesikta d'Rab Kahana 109:b and Midrash T'hilin 22:16 to the effect that God appeared as a warrior (Ex. 15:3), a scribe teaching Torah (Ex. 24:4, 34:27, Deut. 5:19), an elder teaching Torah (Dan. 7:9)--but God is nevertheless One. Another rabbinic homily, from Sh'mot Rabbah 3:2, is also quoted; it states that while God is revealing His Torah on Mount Sinai He is also coming down from heaven into the people's midst. In addition to these examples, one wonders why Kallen--interested, apparently, in instances of diversity-in-unity concerning God--does not refer to God's revelation of His 13 attributes, in Ex. 34:6-7.

78 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 52. The emphasis and the small "h" in "his" are Kallen's.

79 God punishes (e.g., Job 4:9, 8:4, 10:14, 15:24-35, 20:15, 23-29, 31:3, 34:11, 24-30), rewards (e.g., Job 8:5, 20 and 36:6-7), sends rain (e.g., Job 5:7, 28:25-26, 36:27-28, 37:6), rules nature (e.g., Job 9:5-10, 26:7-13).

80 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 52.
and to be different from them—as water differs from the hydrogen and oxygen that go into its making, as the union of America's states is something more than the individual states joined, as America's cultural life is different from the many particular cultures that go into its fashioning.  

It is this God Who is different from any of His manifestations which Kallen understands Job as referring to when Job exclaims: "Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; On the left hand, when he doth work, but I cannot behold him; He hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him." Kallen understands Job's cry, and those of other sufferers yearning for the Deus Ahaconditus, to be—unknown to them—for "the Secularist meaning of the word God." 

It is the Secularist meaning of "God" that Kallen accepts for himself and which he would have all religions, including Judaism, accept for themselves in addition to the God ideas suggested by their particular religions. The Secularist meaning of "God" Kallen arrives at by noting that people use the word "God" not to describe the what of the religious or mystical experience, nor the written or verbal


82 Job 23:8-9. The translation, capitalization, and punctuation are Kallen's; the passage is cited in his Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 16-17.

83 Ibid., p. 17.

84 Ibid., p. 16.
explanations of that what, but to describe how the what helps them. Because it saves and sustains an individual, it is God. God is the salvation in which the believer believes. But while Dialectical Materialism may "save" for one person—and is therefore his God—Democracy, Science, Judaism, Christianity, or Something Else may be another person's salvation and is therefore that person's God. When these "gods" are acknowledged as realities for their believers and "compete without violence and cooperate without compulsion in manifestly the divine function" of saving, then the union of all these gods eventuates in the One God of Secularism. This One God is not a substance but an associative unity, a dynamic way of relating peacefully and beneficially (including an openness to additions and departures), as well as the good which is the vision of continuous aspiration. This God is the path and the destination, the going and the goal.

86 Ibid., p. 211.
87 Cf. ibid. Although in theory Judaism, Christianity, or another "usual" religion may not be a "God," in practice (for Kallen) each one can become a God. When a believer fervently trusts in his religion to save him, the teachings and practices of that religion constitute for him the tangibles of the intangibles in which he says he believes. For him, they are God. To live those teachings and practices as his religion's leaders say one should is, for the believer, to be in God's service. Cf. Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 211-212.
88 Ibid., p. 15.
89 Ibid., p. 184.
90 Cf. ibid., pp. 16, 185.
What we obviously have here is cultural pluralism applied to what is meant by God. Even as the individual cultures exist freely and safely in their difference while cooperating with the other cultures for their mutual benefit, with the national culture emerging, so do the gods people believe in dwell with one another in a free, safe, and cooperative mutuality with the One God of Secularism emerging from their union. Kallen even uses his analogy of an orchestra to describe how the gods unite; the "music" the gods produce is the harmony prevailing among them and the good towards which they aspire.

A particularly interesting point is Kallen's development of the idea of the God of Secularism wherein he identifies the basic meaning of Godhood as "Love-without-Hate," which is manifested in the open, loving way in which the gods (actually the faiths men hold since these faiths "save" their believers) cooperate towards consensus for man's welfare. If the gods (faiths) do not relate in love, there will be no union of diverse gods; one god will seek to impose its will on the others. Because of love the gods surrender their old will to dominate, and diverse gods are able to join in union for the common good. What happens is an e pluribus unum, a different One (God-faith) emerges from the union of the many gods (faiths).

91 Ibid., p. 16.
92 Ibid., p. 185. Also see pp. 119 and 190.
This is indeed a God that emerges, for the God of Secularism is a God that saves: love enables the diverse to live together in peace and to work together for the betterment of each and all. This God is the God of gods and is to be a person's main God together with his other (or secondary) God of Judaism, Christianity, Science, Art, or Whatever. It must be an individual's main God, else how can the other (secondary) gods exist without fear of being eliminated by the more powerful? In reality, the main God of Secularism is to the American Idea as the secondary God is to one's ethnic culture; even as the God of Secularism is a prerequisite to the peaceful coexistence of the secondary gods so is the American Idea of the legitimacy and equality of differences a prerequisite to the peaceful existence of the individual ethnic cultures. Moreover, just as the American Idea treats all differences alike so Secularism's God plays no favorites among the diverse faiths.93

93 Kallen, ""Jew" and "Judaist"", 8.
"What "Secularism" Is

For Kallen, it seems, the words "American Idea," "God of Secularism," and "Secularism" are synonymous. By "Secularism" Kallen does not mean the agnostic, non-supernaturalistic, anti-clerical religion of that name. Nor should Humanism, which is a specific religion or intellectual bent, be equated with Secularism. Rather, Secularism is "a way of being together of the religiously different, such that equal rights and liberties are assured to all, special privileges to none." The point is that while cultural pluralism is the way different cultures live together in peace, Secularism is the way diverse religions do.

Kallen, a Hebraist, finds Secularism's root in the Jewish Bible: "You shall not hate your brother in your heart; you shall surely rebuke your comrade and not bear sin because of him. You shall not take vengeance nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but you shall love your fellowman as yourself: I am the Lord." As was

---

94 Kallen, "Secularism, God and Freedom," pp. 459-460; "Secularism As the Common Religion of a Free Society," 115. The same point is made by C. Bezalel Sherman (1896-1971), a Jewish sociologist. Sherman—in "Nationalism, Secularism and Religion in the Jewish Labor Movement," Judaism, III, 4 (Fall 1954), 355—writes: "A line should be drawn between secularism and secularist ideology. As defined here, secularism is merely an extension of the principle of the separation of Church and State, and hence not incompatible with the profoundest religious feeling...Secularist ideology, on the other hand, seeks to eliminate religion from a voice in social relationships."


96 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 57.

the case with the Godhood of Secularism's God so with Secularism itself: at the root is love, the way and goal for different religions to dwell together in a mutually safe, enriching way and to work harmoniously for the common ideal of freedom-peace-justice (love).

Is Secularism really unique? Have not most religions taught the need for loving one's fellowman? It is this argument that Leon J. Goldstein is actually building on when he dissents from Kallen's use of the word "Secularism." Goldstein argues that even the most ardent religionist can adopt Secularism for it only involves loving human beings so that you are willing and desirous of having persons who profess a religion different from your own live in peace and safety. Goldstein insists that the opposite of "Secularism" is not "Religion" but "the attempt to impose one's own faith - sacred or profane - upon one's fellow men." 99

From Kallen's perspective, however, religions either do attempt to impose their faith on others or live in the fear that they will be so imposed upon. Kallen asserts that it is impossible for all religions to live willingly together in peace since they all, including Judaism, think theirs alone is the one true faith and the others are in

99 Ibid.
error and will eventually be eliminated. Religious intolerance through the centuries clearly shows that religionists have not practiced love of fellowmen. Something more than good intentions is required. Religions must be prevented from imposing their doctrines, penalizing the different, and obtaining special privileges for their sect alone.

America's Founding Fathers realized this. In their wisdom, hoping to avoid battles among religions for dominance and trying to insure the freedom and safety of each religion, religionist, and non-religionist, they wrote in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

With the separation of church and state, religion was made a private—not a governmental—concern. The government's role is only to guarantee that each religious group has equal protection and liberty in its difference under...


the nation's laws. An important consequence of this doctrine of separation has been that no religious sect is able to push its viewpoint in the public schools. 102

Secularism is the application and implementation to religions of the doctrine of the separation of church and state. It provides a way for diverse religions to relate to each other as equals in peace and freedom. When a religion chooses to relate to other religions in such a way that it respects the others' right to exist as equals in their respective difference and joins them in working for the common welfare, then that religion is an adherent of—and is practicing—Secularism, the peaceful orchestration of equally different religions. 103

While the acceptance of Secularism means that religions will peacefully orchestrate differences and will not seek to force their views on others, it does not call for the end of peaceful competition among religions. Even as each ethnic group can strive to do better what other ethnic cultures are doing, so can each religion. Just as scientific procedures invite cooperation among scientists but also encourage competition among them so advances can occur in scientific

102 Horace M. Kallen, rev. of Verle Conti, The Growth of American Thought (New York: Harper, 1943), Contemporary Jewish Record, VIII, 2 (Apr. 1944), 196. One may question whether there is actually an absence of a specific religion from most public schools in America. As Milton Marmor (b. 1918), a writer on Jewish subjects for the American Jewish Committee, has written—in "Secular Society? A Jewish Perspective," Daedalus, XCIV, 1 (Winter 1967), 224: "In every Western nation, Christianity's inseparable from the national culture for religious neutrality to be truly possible."

knowledge, so would Secularism enable the diverse religions to compete peacefully with one another while also cooperating. Secularism is being assented to by the different religions when they recognize that only in a peaceful union will each religion be able to cooperate and compete in liberty and safety as equals.

A religion that adds Secularism to its outlook has culminated a four-step progression: (1) "I am right; you are wrong, and therefore I'll convert or destroy you; but if you won't let me do that, you must let me live and also protect me"—this is the battle of the faiths; (2) "I'd like to convert you (or kill you if I can't), and you'd like to do the same to me, but let's agree not to hurt one another"—this is toleration; (3) "I am probably right and you are probably wrong but let's not harm or hate the other, this rather let's understand each other"—this is the live-and-let-live position; (4) "I believe and practice a religion that


Sidney Hook (b. 1902), an American philosopher and educator, and a friend of Kallen's for decades, has written in this connection: "What can unite Christian and non-Christian alike in a common struggle for freedom is only the pluralistic philosophy of democracy. For whatever its program for a more human control of the material conditions of life, it permits each individual "to save" his soul in his own way." See the statement by Sidney Hook in Religion and the Intellectuals: A Symposium (New York: Partisan Review, 1950), p. 77.

is different from yours, but you're as much entitled to your religious views as I am to mine; let's ensure each other's right to exist in equal liberty and safety by cooperating, learning about, and appreciating each other and thereby enable each to be enriched by this communication and to reach the excellence each can"--this is the live-and-help-live approach of Secularism. 106

This live-and-help-live approach of Secularism is, when accepted by a person, a faith. It is "a common faith which holders of all different religions share" 107 if they subscribe to its tenets. Secularism is a faith or religion because an individual or group can bet his life, his survival and growth, on the Secularist way of association. 108 To Secularism, Kallen applies the same terminology

106 Cf. Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 91-92; Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 191; The Education of Free Men, p. 230; Americanism and Its Makers, p. 9; The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 70; "The Foundations of Human Value and Purpose," 9; "On the Role of Religion in Society," 13-14. In talking about religious groups that may want to sabotage democratic society, Kallen--in Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 139--wrote that they "receive the hospitality of the Open Society so long as the openness can safeguard itself against their subversion." To Philip H. Phenix, associate professor of education at Columbia Univ.--in his review of Kallen's Secularism Is the Will of God, in The Journal of Philosophy, LII, 19 (Sept. 15, 1955), pp. 524-525--this proves that Secularism doesn't show equality to all religions but favors the democratic way of association. Yes, Kallen does favor that way. Note his support of military training so a land's freedom may be defended if necessary. See Kallen, "Defend Democracy," Forum and Century, XXVII, 3 (Mar. 1937), 146; also, see Kallen's letter to the writer, Emily T. Douglas (b. 1899), Apr. 24, 1945, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2516.


108 Kallen, Secularism Is the Will of God, p. 11.
as he does to the American Idea and Democracy—which is indicative of their virtual identification in his eyes. Each of these three he calls the "religion of religions." 109

Methods of Religion and Science

At the heart of Secularism, the American Idea, and Democracy is a method, the scientific method, which Kallen calls upon religions to accept. 110 Only if this method is accepted by religions will Secularism's union of diverse and equal religions be a reality.

109 Kallen applies the three words, "religion of religions," to Secularism—in ibid., p. 58, as well as in "Jew" and "Judaist," 8. He applies the three words to the American Idea—in "Whither Israel?" 101. The same three words are applied to Democracy—in Americanism and Its Makers, p. 12, and in "Human Rights and the Religion of John Dewey," 174. It will be recalled that T. S. Eliot—see above, note 171, p. 51—took sharp exception to Kallen's speaking of the religion of America. Of interest in this connection is the comment by Herman Finer (1893-1969), professor of political science at the Univ. of Chicago, that he would like to "put democracy as a faith over religious faiths" so diverse religious convictions can be peaceably reconciled. Finer's comment appears as part of his commentary to an article by Mordecai W. Kaplan, "The Need for Normative Unity in Higher Education," Goals for American Education, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert H. MacIver (New York: The Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, 1950), p. 299.

110 Kallen, "Remembrance for Survival," 83.
What has been religion's method? To Kallen, "religion takes its ground on revelation,"\textsuperscript{111} or, if the religious interpretation is of the non-orthodox variety, in mystic insight.\textsuperscript{112} (Kallen prefers "intuition" to describe how an individual arrives at a new teaching; he says that this is really what religionists have in mind when they use the word "revelation."
)\textsuperscript{113} But religion's method is the same no matter what name is given to the means by which it arrives at its doctrines. That method is to try to impose its beliefs and practices by ignoring or punishing alternatives, by appealing to tradition, by authority, and by force if possible.\textsuperscript{114} Beginning with priestly Judaism, Kallen maintains, Judaism—thinking like other religions that it alone possesses the one, true revelation—also favored religion's traditional method of imposition.\textsuperscript{115}

Kallen sympathizes with what calls forth religion's method even if he cannot agree with the method itself. In his desire to find something on which he can rely with perfect faith, the religionist dismisses doubts, shuts out alternatives.\textsuperscript{116} He is unaffected by results which


\textsuperscript{112} Kallen, \textit{The Liberal Spirit}, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., p. 215.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., pp. 120, 124; "Behind the Bertrand Russell Case," p. 75; also see note 100, p. 195.

\textsuperscript{115} Kallen, \textit{Zionism and World Politics}, p. 21.

\textsuperscript{116} Kallen, \textit{The Liberal Spirit}, p. 104.
demonstrate the falsity of his beliefs. He wants to make sense of a world not tailored to our specifications. And it is more comforting to believe in a world as we would like it to be than as it actually is.\textsuperscript{117} Thus, men seem to believe spontaneously but only doubt after being taught to do so.\textsuperscript{118} Even when we learn how to doubt it is difficult continuing to doubt for we seem to yearn for certainty rather than uncertainty, belief not doubt.\textsuperscript{119} But a truer picture of the world emerges from applying science's ways.

Science as well as religion tries to make man more at home in a world indifferent to him.\textsuperscript{120} While religion affirms a faith in the supernatural,\textsuperscript{121} science asserts a belief in a different unseen: the invisibles which are the basic subject matter in such disciplines as radiology, micro-biology, biophysics, astronomical physics, and chemistry.\textsuperscript{122}

However, science arrives at its teachings differently from religion. Science strives to understand how nature behaves by studying nature directly. It does not postulate a God Who must be appeased by men. Science bases its conclusions on what

\textsuperscript{117} Kallen, \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{118} Kallen, \textit{Why Religion}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{119} Kallen, \textit{The Liberal Spirit}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{120} Horace M. Kallen, "A Pragmatic Interpretation of the History of Philosophy," \textit{The Mid-West Quarterly}, IV, 1 (Oct. 1916), p. 76.
\textsuperscript{121} Kallen, \textit{Why Religion}, p. 305.
\textsuperscript{122} Kallen, \textit{The Liberal Spirit}, p. 98.
scientists discover.\textsuperscript{123} Scientists continually check their findings and theories via hypothesis, experimentation, and observation. Possessing an ongoing faith in what has been discovered as true, the scientist leaves himself open to change what is deemed truth. He can be convinced of his errors by further experimentation, observation, and the fulfillment of a new hypothesis.\textsuperscript{124} The scientist, in short, sees and describes the world as it is, not as he wants it to be. Preferable to the religionist who places the authority of dogma, a book, interpreter, or leader over what he thinks or is discovered, is the scientist whose approach gives authority to the free mind.\textsuperscript{125}

Science's method—its how of inquiry and evidence as opposed to religion's how of revelation and dogmas—is similar to that which prevails when diverse cultures come together. In cultural pluralism the right of each group to exist in its equal difference is recognized; each group peacefully pursues its own excellence, cooperates with other groups for the common welfare, makes its ideas and practices known to all for borrowing purposes, and contributes to the

\textsuperscript{123} Regarding science's conclusions too, however, Kallen has said: "The conclusions of science are no less articles of faith than the dogmas of religion." Kallen's letter to William McDougall (1871–1938), a professor at Duke Univ., Nov. 3, 1932, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2503.

\textsuperscript{124} Kallen, "Freedom and Authority," p. 441; "Behind the Bertrand Russell Case," p. 35.

\textsuperscript{125} Kallen, "Freedom and Authority," p. 441.
culture which emerges from the union of specific cultures. Similarly, in science, each scientist recognizes the equal right of other scientists to work in the field of science; viewing differences among men, other creatures, and things as natural (and not to be made to conform or unite), the scientist gives the differences an equal chance to prove themselves. The differences among scientists are given that opportunity by having each scientist experiment and publish the results so others may be convinced and share in that knowledge, or challenge the findings. Man's knowledge is advanced when a finding is verified and accepted by all—even as an item in one culture may be accepted by other cultures.

Using one of his favorite words, Kallen describes science's methods as that of "orchestration" since science's findings come about from the freedom given different men and theories, and the union of their results, in the consensus eventuating from the cooperation and competition among scientists.

Can religions adopt science's method? They should, answers Kallen. As many religionists themselves recognize, they must if they don't want to perish or be left behind in this science-oriented age. Let assent to religious

doctrines be freely given, not imposed. Let religions admit that people of other (or no) religious positions have an equal right to their different beliefs. Let there be free communication among the different within a religion and among religions. Instead of each religion proclaiming itself as the one infallible religion for all and not permitting dissent, let religion's claims—like science's—be tested by their consequences in fair competition with the claims of other doctrines, disciplines, religions, philosophies, etc. Religion's primary concern should be with how an open-ended truth is agreed upon rather than on what the truth is. Such a how will enable the diverse cults to communicate peacefully, enrichingly, and in freedom. Such a how is the secular, non-revelatory method of science.

Religion In A Scientific Age

As science came to explain more and more about how nature operates and what men could do to enjoy its benefits and try to avoid its liabilities, religion's influence has waned. The religious way of looking at the world as the domain of a supernatural who is to be appeased by rituals, has been largely abandoned. Food, shelter, health, and other

130 Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 52.
131 Kallen's letter to his daughter Harriet, Oct. 9, 1948, p. 2, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 923.
132 Kallen, "Human Rights and the Religion of John Dewey,
174
blessings became obtainable without religious intercession. The priest, manipulator of the supernatural for the benefit of the faithful, was supplanted by the scientist and industrial specialist.

One result of this displacement of religion has been, in Kallen's opinion, that instead of religious institutions being faithfully frequented by believers who see in them material shrines for their religious teachings and memories, the institutions are now mostly social centers for specific sects and places where clergy work. 134

To survive in modern times religions have adjusted their salvationist schemes to science's method and findings. These adjustments have included new ways of conceiving of God, 135 deemphasizing the next world and stressing instead salvation in this world and the necessity of social action in order to make this world into the Kingdom of God, and uniting with former religious rivals in a common attempt to deal with modernism's challenges. 136 Religions must make such changes in order not to lose most of their followers to the scientific, humanitarian, aesthetic, sport, and other leisure-time interests which have already won over the religious interest for many persons. 137

134 Kallen, Indecency and the Seven Arts, pp. 87-88.
135 See above, pp. 185-187.
137 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 70.
Judaism In A Scientific Age

The effects of science and democracy—what might be called "secularization" or "modernity"—have also become very apparent in Judaism. Kallen notes that belief in traditional Judaism, with its supernatural God and rituals, has waned. Jews observe few of the traditional Jewish religious practices, spend little time in the study of the Jewish tradition or in praying, and come to the synagogue building mostly for social and secular activities. The synagogue, in trying to retain members, has become a place for such groups as the congregation's Sisterhood, Men's Club, and youth group to conduct card parties, fashion shows, dances, sporting events, discussions on non-religious subjects, etc. How else, in addition to bringing one's children to the synagogue-school for a Jewish education of sorts, will most "recessive Judaists" (which constitute the bulk of American Judaists today) be brought into a synagogue building?

With the decline of traditional Judaism has come, from modernity's impetus, a number of non-Orthodox Jewish denominations as well as a host of secular organizations. As the wall separating Jew and non-Jew crumbled, Judaism's

unity burst its confinement and was diffused in such movements as assimilation, Haskalah, Reform, Modern Orthodox, and Zionism, Conservative Judaism, Reconstructionism, each with its own beliefs and practices. Secular Jewish groups like the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association, the Jewish Community Center movement, Hadassah, Jewish Labor Committee, B'nai B'rith, Jewish War Veterans, Jewish fraternities and sororities—such groups have claimed the interest of many Jews who formerly were Jewishly unaffiliated or only synagogue-bent. Since World War II, Jewish country clubs have made serious inroads in the living-time of Jews. The Jewish philanthropic organizations, especially fund-raising for the cause of the State of Israel, have also enticed many Jews. In summary, the secular components of Jewish life have increased while the traditional religious aspects have decreased. And there is no need to dwell on the enticements of non-Jewish organizations and activities for Jews both old and young.


144 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 189.
It is also true, however, Kallen states, that in addition to the rise of non-Orthodox Judaist groups there have been other religious results of modernity which, in part, offset the Jewish secular leap. Because of modernity (or democracy, or Secularism—call it what one will), Judaism is permitted to exist without penalty. After centuries of degradation because of their Jewish difference, the new world of modernity declares that the religiously different should not be penalized for their difference. Secularism has triumphed in America in this respect—at least much more so than in any other place and time in history—and its triumph has proven a great blessing for Judaists and Jews.

Secularism's live-and-help-live approach has also meant an increasing willingness among Judaists to know, understand, respect, learn from, and cooperate with those who are religiously different from oneself. Judaists of diverse denominations cooperate for the common good in such organizations as the national Synagogue Council of America and in local Board of Rabbis' groups. In Jewish community councils and such groups as the American Association for Jewish Education, Judaists work with non-Judaists for the common Jewish good. Modernity has manifested itself, too, in the interfaith


movement, in such organizations as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, wherein Judaists and Christians "dialogue" in order to learn from each other, cooperate with one another, and foster peace among men.147

While these positive results of modernity have not made for a resurgence of traditional Judaism to the level of the pre-secularization centuries, Judaism and Judaists have neither been eliminated nor without benefits from the age of democracy.

What role will Judaism play in the lives of Judaists in the years to come? Kallen is not optimistic about Judaism's prospects in the scientific world of the twentieth century and of future centuries. It is not because of Judaism per se that Kallen is pessimistic about its potential; it is because of his beliefs about all religions.

What Kallen wrote to the noted philanthropist and financier, Jacob S. Schiff (1847-1920), more than fifty years ago, still represents his fundamental attitude towards religion. He stated frankly: "I am not an admirer of the effect of the religious institution on the happiness of mankind. If it could be extirpated, I should on the whole approve of its extirpation. But as a student of psychology, I know that it cannot be extirpated. There is that in the human mind of which religion is a special and independent

147 Kallen, Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea, p. 205.
expression. And since religion must be, my problem, as a more or less political thinker, is primarily to mitigate whatever evil effects it may give rise to and to preserve whatever good it may create."\[148\]

From this letter Kallen's position concerning religion is clear: since religion, unfortunately, cannot be eliminated, some way must be found to soften or eliminate the evils it is capable of committing and to retain the good. Kallen did arrive at a way of eliminating some of religion's evils: Secularism. Let all religions recognize the equality and fundamental difference of each religion and religionist, and let the religions associate in a live-and-help-live love relationship for the good of each and all. But what of Kallen's desire to preserve religion's good? This could be accomplished, in part, by what religion could do for those who might wish to make use of it.

Kallen sees religion's modern role to be that of giving men the vision, and reinforcing their strength, to continue struggling zestfully for the life abundant in this world without illusions of another world.\[149\] Instead of being a vehicle for manipulating nature, religion can be a way of attaining inner peace, of facing life and death.

\[148\] Letter from Kallen to Jacob S. Schiff, Jan. 11, 1918, pp. 1-2, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2507.

If religion wishes a task in which all men can join, let it help factualize the faith implicit in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations on December 10, 1948.  

Judaism can do these things for Judaists. Judaism's leaders, the rabbis, can bring Judaism into the daily lives of Judaists to enhance their security, assuage their fears (especially of death), and give them the will to make the most of their potentialities for good in this world.

But for most Jews, it is not the Judaist part of the Jewish heritage that holds meaning for them, and that they will turn to, in a non-supernaturalist, science-oriented time. The religious form of Jewishness—that is, thinking of the Jews only as a religious body and of the Jewish religion as constituting the entire Jewish heritage—has no future in today's world, Kallen declares. Not religion but nationality—Jewish nationality, peoplehood—must be emphasized; not Judaism, but the secular aspects of Hebraism will be the best vehicle for Jewish life and continuity in modernity, Kallen insists.

150 Ibid. Kallen praises this Declaration and sees it as stating the equal liberty of the different to be, in effect, the common religion of all men. See Horace M. Kallen, "Are There Limitations to Toleration in a Free Society?" One Globe—Two Worlds, editor not listed (New York: New School of Social Research, 1950), p. 5; "Of Those Which Say They Are Jews," p. 114; Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 36-37.

151 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 198, 219.

152 Kallen, Frontiers of Hope, p. 440.

153 Ibid., p. 450.
Fortunately, he contends, the east European Haskalah (the literary-cultural, secular, this-worldly movement from approximately 1750 to 1885) showed Jews how to live in today's world. The Haskalah followers in eastern Europe, unlike the form Haskalah took for many Jews in western Europe, sought to have the Jews assimilate non-Jewish culture rather than to be assimilated by it. Seeing religion as only a part of Jewish life, the devotees of east European Haskalah emphasized the secular aspects of Jewish culture. They developed a non-religious Hebrew and Yiddish literature, fostered secular Jewish music, art, and drama, originated secular theories of Jewish history, provided a secular organizational basis for Jewish education, and reorganized the Jewish community by recognizing the legitimacy of the religious and secular approaches. East European Haskalah consciously began readjusting the Jewish people to the conditions of modernity.

The leaders and followers of east European Haskalah showed in the Jewish lives they led that no supernatural rationale is necessary for human beings to behave decently and for an ethnic group to retain its distinctive way of living. Kallen asserts: "All group life has its specific excellences, intrinsically justified, and the social customs which are the effective content of orthodoxy are not

154 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 107.
155 Ibid., p. 108.
the less desirable and Jewish when we learn that they are human and relative."\textsuperscript{156} Even without Judaist beliefs and practices there remained much in Hebraism for the Haskalah men and women to live by and utilize in enriching their lives.

From Kallen’s viewpoint, in seeing Jewish life as a totality of the religious and the secular the east European Haskalah was only being true to earlier Jewish history.\textsuperscript{157} Until the Reform Judaists compressed Jewish life into only Jewish religion, Jewishness consisted of the religious and the secular. In this totality of Jewish culture, Hebraism, Judaism is only one element— but by no means the central or exclusive one.\textsuperscript{158} If Judaism is to survive in modernity, Kallen submits, it can do so by being what it once was: an item in the warp and woof of the total Jewish culture called Hebraism.\textsuperscript{159} But since religion "has been over-emphasized in the life of our \textsuperscript{159}Jewish\textsuperscript{160} people," it and religion is out of step with the march of modernity, for the health and survival of the Jewish people let Judaism retreat backstage, making room for the secular elements of Hebraism to come to the fore. As Kallen phrased it, in 1964, when praising the fruits of east European Haskalah:

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., pp. 75-76.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., pp. 4, 38.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., p. 103; "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 42; also see pp. 64-67 of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{159} Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 4, 46, 109.
\textsuperscript{160} Letter from Kallen to the Editor of The Socialist Review, op. cit. (above, note 26, p. 16).
"The vital changes in the Jewish being which began as a shifting of its supernaturalist postulate from the centre to the periphery of Jewish culture, and of its secular beliefs and ways from the periphery to the centre, make more vital, more viable configurations with modernity than the much ballyhooed "return to religions". "161

The secular emphasis of such writers as Yahudah Leib Peretz (1851-1915), Eliezer Ben Yehudah (1857-1922), Sholom Aleichem (1859-1916), and Simon Dubnow (1860-1941), Kallen sees as closer to the life and hopes of the common Jew than the abstract doctrines and compulsive rituals of the Judaists. "162 Jewish secular organizations like the Farband-Labor Zionist Order, Arbeiter Ring, and Jewish Bund, impress Kallen as "together nearer to what we mean by modernity, and to possess a greater potentiality of survival as Jews within modernity." "163 Being more attuned


162 Ibid. Jacob Neusner (b. 1932), a professor of religion at Brown Univ. and a Conservative rabbi, has also written of the value of this secular Jewish literature for some Jews: "Modern Hebrew literature, and modern Hebrew thought particularly, but not only on Zionist and other sociological issues, will provide for the secular-intellectual a source of values, of self-awareness and self-identification no less fruitful than earlier Hebrew literature provides for those whose orientation remains religious." See Jacob Neusner, History and Torah: Essays On Jewish Learning (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), p. 60.

to modernity, these secular Jewish writers and organizations--rather than the Judaist ones--are more likely to offer Jews an ideal and way convincing enough to have them choose to be Jews.\textsuperscript{164}

To Kallen, what is necessary in this world of science and democracy, of the American Idea and Secularism, is for Jews to build on the east European Haskalah's "recovery of the idea of Jewish nationality on a secular and civil basis, as the peer of other European nationalities."\textsuperscript{165}

What is needed is an "American Haskalah"\textsuperscript{166} based on the American Idea. From contact with the forces of modernity and the many cultures composing America, the "antiquated religious nationality"\textsuperscript{167} that the American Jewish group largely was in the early 1900's should become more flexible, less religious-oriented, and more secularist-oriented. American Jews must be guided to consider themselves a people with a distinctive culture (Hebraism), entitled to live with other ethnic groups in an equality of the different, using Hebraism to enrich the lives of Jews, orchestrating Jewish culture with the cultures of other groups, and contributing to American culture and world civilization.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., p. 324.

\textsuperscript{165} Kallen, \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{166} Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 9.

\textsuperscript{167} Kallen, \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 102.
to modernity, these secular Jewish writers and organizations—rather than the Judaist ones—are more likely to offer Jews an ideal and way convincing enough to have them choose to be Jews. 164

To Kallen, what is necessary in this world of science and democracy, of the American Idea and Secularism, is for Jews to build on the east European Haskalah's "recovery of the idea of Jewish nationality on a secular and civil basis, as the peer of other European nationalities." 165

What is needed is an "American Haskalah" 166 based on the American Idea. From contact with the forces of modernity and the many cultures composing America, the "antiquated religious nationality" 167 that the American Jewish group largely was in the early 1900's should become more flexible, less religious-oriented, and more secularist-oriented. American Jews must be guided to consider themselves a people with a distinctive culture (Hebraism), entitled to live with other ethnic groups in an equality of the different, using Hebraism to enrich the lives of Jews, orchestrating Jewish culture with the cultures of other groups, and contributing to American culture and world civilization.

164 Ibid., p. 324.
165 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 107.
167 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 102.
CHAPTER VII: JEWISH RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Are Judaisms, Not 'A' Judaism

Having discussed Kallen's ideas on Judaism against the backdrop of religion, let us see what his views are concerning the different religious groupings within Judaism. In doing so we must be careful not to categorize these groups too rigidly into, for example, Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist, and Orthodox. For, observes Kallen, none of these groups is monolithic. Each has sub-groups because of slight, or perhaps even major, differences in ideas and practices. In endeavoring to determine what Judaism is or is not, therefore, one should try to make certain that he has knowledge of the many variations in code and conduct within Judaism. Although a person may be seeking knowledge of "Judaism," and he may apply the word "Judaism" to the totality of Judaist ideas, practices, and groups, let him know and remember that each variation of individual or group Judaist belief and behavior is a legitimate "Judaism" with a creed and code. Strictly speaking then, there are "Judaisms" rather than a "Judaism."

1 Kallen, "The Bearing of Emancipation on Jewish Survival," p. 32; idem, "The 70th Birthday Celebration of Albert P. Schoolman" (untitled in original), a talk (unpublished), c. May 1965, p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2830.

2 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews;" p. 104.

Kallen holds that it has been the American Idea that is mostly responsible for the many Judaisms existing in the United States. The American Idea of equal rights for each person and group led to Jews being unafraid to express their differences in personal beliefs and practices and in the groups they organized. Thus, in America, unlike elsewhere, many Judaisms have come into being. Each "Judaism" is how one Jewish individual or group thinks and acts because of his or its Jewish environment, experiences, and knowledge. Furthermore, even as each ethnic and religious group has a right to exist in its difference, so does each "Judaism." Following the e pluribus unum model, we might say that "Judaism" emerges from the union of "Judaisms."

What does Kallen have to say about the main groupings in this "Judaism?"

Reform Judaism

When Reform Judaism began in western Europe in the early nineteenth century, it endeavored, Kallen said, to do what it could to moderate—hopefully, eventually to eliminate—existing social and political disabilities against the

4 Kallen, "The Bearing of Emancipation on Jewish Survival," p. 32; speech at the 40th anniversary celebration of the American Jewish Congress, p. 164.
6 See above, pp. 42-43.
Jews. To attain this goal Reform tried to drop, or at least repress, all the cultural (including the national) differences between Jews and Gentiles. It asserted that Jews are members not of a people with its own distinctive culture, but of a religious body. Reformers argued that Jews could be loyal citizens of a country with all the rights and privileges appertaining thereunto because, being only members of a religious group, their sole loyalty was to their country of residence. They wanted Jews to continue in their religious difference while becoming similar to other citizens in everything else.

In Kallen's eyes, wherein did Reform err?

1. Patronizing Attitude Towards the Jewish Masses

Reform Judaism erred, Kallen stated, in several respects. First, too many Reformers in America—especially from c. 1880-1924, the years of massive Jewish immigration from eastern Europe—adopted a distant, patronizing attitude towards the Jewish masses. Writing in 1925, Kallen observed that "being a Reform Jew is being first of all a member of a social group among the Jews." The more money you have and the better English you speak, the more likely you are to be of Reform affiliation. These Judaists

7 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 80; "A Change in Direction," 16.


9 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 190.

10 Ibid.
seemed to belong to a separate class, not to the Jewish people. The rich Reform Judaists acted like wealthy, supercilious relatives toward their poor, east European kin. The "Americanized" Reformers "knew" what kind of Jewish life was good for their fellow Jews—one, hopefully, which would win the favor of the Gentiles. The trouble was, however, that the bulk of Reform Jews lacked understanding of the daily life, traditions, ideals, and hopes of the masses of east European Jewish immigrants. The Reformers also lacked a genuine feeling of kinship with them, a sense of common purpose. For the most part, the Reformers saw the Jewish masses as objects of the Reformers' charity. No wonder, noted Kallen in 1911, that the bulk of American Jewry is untouched and uninfluenced by Reform Judaism.

2. Thought Jews Are A Religious Sect

Second, said Kallen, Reform Judaism made a mistake in thinking the Jews are only a religious sect and, consequently, in separating the Jewish religion from the larger Jewish culture-complex. To contend that every Jew is only a Judaist—which is what the Reformers have done, explained Kallen, in their insistence that the Jewish group is only a religious society—is to deny the obvious peoplehood of the Jews as well as the secular, non-religious elements in the Jewish heritage.

12 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 53.
But, argued Kallen, the Jews are a people—"a social and cultural and religious community"—and not merely a religious congregation. This people (or nationality), like every other people, did create a religion. It is "Judaism." But Judaism is only part of what that people has created. Judaism does not comprise all the Jewish people's life or heritage. Secular elements such as non-religious Jewish art, music, philosophy, foods, languages, literature, and much more—in addition to Jewish religion—have been brought into being by Jews and are also part of the total Jewish culture. To detach Judaism from the total Jewish culture—complex of Hebraism is to ignore the other (secular) items in Jewish culture. It is to see the wide road of Hebraism as the narrow path of Judaism. To separate Judaism in this way from the larger Jewish life is to kill Judaism, even as a limb severed from the overall body quickly dies. If Reform wishes to make the Jewish religion healthy, the Jewish people's entire "body" (i.e., the religious and secular

13 Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 11. Concerning the Jews being a people see above, pp. 58-59. Concerning the Jews not constituting a religious group see above, pp. 62-72. Kallen also objects to the American Council for Judaism's limiting of the Jewish difference to the religious elements; see Kallen's letter to Arthur H. Sulzberger, op. cit. (above, note 40, p. 64).

14 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 82. Also see above, pp. 64-66.


16 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 109.
components of Hebraism) must be made sound, as must the Jewish people whose "body" is involved. In other words, Judaism must not be isolated from the living Jewish people which nourishes Judaism through Jewry's total cultural and communal life. Reform must return to a concern for the entire Jewish culture and for the welfare of the entire Jewish people, fashioners of that culture.

3. Jews Have No "Mission"

A third shortcoming of Reform Judaism, in Kallen's opinion, was its notion that Jews possess a sacred "mission" to bring all men to "ethical monotheism." Kallen attacked this notion on several grounds. To begin with, "ethical monotheism" is not Judaism's distinctiveness.

The first principle of Reform Judaism's famous 1885 Pittsburgh Platform had stated: "We hold that Judaism presents the highest conception of the God-idea as taught in our Holy Scriptures and developed and spiritualized by the Jewish teachers in accordance with the moral and philosophical progress of their respective ages. We maintain that Judaism

17 Kallen, rev. of Harry E. Lewis, Liberal Judaism and Social Service, 240.

18 Horace W. Kallen, "From A Menorah Address" (untitled in the original), speech at the fourth annual convention of the Menorah societies, The Menorah Journal, II, 1 (Feb. 1916), 63; Judaism At Bay, 84, 141. Kallen had in mind invigorating Judaism through such communal institutions as the Jewish bakery, dairy, and bath-house. Since Kallen wrote of such institutions in Judaism At Bay, their number has declined. But other secular concerns are still available, e.g., Jewish philanthropic groups and Jewish service organizations (B'nai B'rith, National Council of Jewish Women, etc.).
preserved and defended amid continual struggles and under enforced isolation this God-idea as the central religious truth for the human race."\(^{19}\)

Reform's 1937 statement of "Guiding Principles," adopted at the convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis in Columbus, Ohio, put it this way: "The heart of Judaism and its chief contribution to religion is the doctrine of the One, living God, who rules the world through law and love."\(^{20}\)

Judaism doesn't possess a specific idea of God, argued Kallen. Philosophers use their reason to discuss what they mean by God. Their ideas may be set in a theological system. But Judaism's sages, surely in its great Biblical and Talmudic periods, did not engage in the making of systematic theologies.\(^{21}\) Those Jewish greats who did, like Philo (c. 20 B.C.E.-50 C.E.) and Moses Maimonides (1135-1205), were, in that respect, closer to the Hellenic spirit than to the Hebraic.\(^{22}\) Judaism's distinctiveness is not in its idea of God.


\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 137.

\(^{21}\) Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 167.

Nor is Judaism distinctive for its ethical teachings. Many—if not all—peoples believe in justice, compassion, charity, etc. Reform's insistence, in the sixth principle of the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform, that the Jew has a special "moral truth" which he is to bring mankind, is an error. Historically, Jewish thinkers did not attempt to synthesize and systematize ethical precepts, like the Greeks did, so as to have Jews and non-Jews know what Judaism's ethics are.

Judaism's distinctiveness, Kallen holds, does not reside in its God-idea nor in any one—or combination of—its theological or ethical teachings. To try to abstract such items from their larger Jewish context is to substitute ideas for the living reality of a people which strives to behave in a certain way. For it is in the particulars of observance that Judaism's distinctiveness lies. Judaism is not a disembodied set of principles, but concrete ways of behaving.

Principles which don't specify a definite way of living can easily be dropped for other principles. Reform Jews, for example, can very quickly become Christian Scientists since only a change in what one says he believes would

23 Schwartzman, Reform Judaism in the Making, p. 120.
24 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 167.
25 Ibid., pp. 29, 168.
26 Ibid., p. 96.
be necessitated; there would be no serious difference in
the specific manner of conducting oneself since Reform
Judaism makes no distinctive demands concerning that. In
universalizing Jewish ideas and substituting words for
actions, therefore, Judaism might be threatened with a
loss of followers. And if all religions are ultimately
to be nothing more than similar ways of believing, why do
we need Judaism? Let there be one world religion! But no,
Judaism is Judaism because it is a particular religion,
different from other religions even as they differ from
it. 27 Judaism calls for distinctive, Jewish actions. As
Kallen wrote more than a half century ago: "I regard Ju-
daism as a life rather than a set of opinions." 28 Those
who were Reform Judaists had yet to learn the difference.

Reform Judaism knew, of course, that traditional Ju-
daism included an emphasis on law and that these laws
called on Jews to act in certain ways. But in stressing
"ethical monotheism" over law and observances Reform
thought itself true to the spirit of the Hebrew prophets. 29
The Reformers understood the prophets to have stressed
ethics over law. The Reformers preferred prophetic ethics
to the unpalatable laws, and sometimes the legalism, they
took much of the Talmud and Shulchan Aruch to be.

27 Ibid., p. 24.

28 Letter from Kallen to Martin A. Meyer, op. cit.
(above, note 59, p. 69), p. 2.

29 See: Jacob B. Agus, Guidestones in Modern Judaism: An
Analysis of Current Trends in Jewish Thought (New York:
Bloch Publishing Co., 1054), p. 295; Nathan Glazer,
American Judaism (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1957),
Kallen agrees with the Reform interpretation of the prophets as anti-legalists, but he condemned Reform for basing itself on "prophetic Judaism" rather than "Talmudical Judaism." Kallen's protest is two-fold: (1) Reform errs in stressing prophetic ideas while ignoring the specific ways of Jewish living that the prophets and later Jewish leaders stressed; (2) Reform errs in thinking the prophets were religion-oriented (Judaists), for although the priests were so oriented the prophets were not.

This second point is readily clarified by stating that Kallen believes the prophets lived before Judaism came into being. The religion of Judaism fundamentally began, as Kallen reads Jewish history, in the Babylonian Exile and continued under Ezra and Nehemiah. That is when ritual

31 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 130.
32 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 39.
33 See above, note 1, p. 95.
34 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 130.
35 Kallen, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 8.
came to be emphasized and Judaism was fashioned. The makers of Judaism did not include the prophetic contributions and spirit as dynamic elements in Judaism.  

Kallen insists that the prophets, to whom Reform Judaism looks so endearingly, did not urge the people to bring "ethical monotheism" to the rest of mankind. The prophets spoke of their people returning to Zion and living a just life there. Neither they nor later generations of Jews saw the Jew's primary goal to be the "mission" of spreading "ethical monotheism." Kallen asked if it was, perhaps, "to justify such minimal Jewish traits as the organizers of Reform could not bring themselves to abandon" that necessitated the concocting of the "mission" theory.

36 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 130. David Philipson (1862-1949), a Reform rabbi and one of that movement's leading historians, condemned Kallen for stating that the prophets were pre-Judaistic. He said--in David Philipson, "Response," The Menorah Journal, I, 2 (Apr., 1915), 133--that such an interpretation, as well as the notion that Judaism was formulated in the post-prophetic, post-Exilic years, is the usual Christian one. Philipson insists that, for Reform Judaism, "Judaism" very much includes the prophetic element. For a recent example of a pair of Christian scholars whose interpretations follow Kallen's, see C. Ernest Wright and Reginald N. Fuller, The Book of the Acts of God: Contemporary Scholarship Interprets the Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1960), pp. 144-145.

37 Kallen, The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 57; also see above, p. 103, especially note 48.

38 See Agus, Guidestones in Modern Judaism, p. 149.

39 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 36.
Another possibility, Kallen suggested, is that the "mission" notion was devised in order to furnish anti-Semites with a reason why the Jewish group should continue.\textsuperscript{40} The "mission" theory is a self-defense against inferiority feelings.\textsuperscript{41} But are the English, Russian, Japanese, or any other people asked to give reasons why they should continue existing? Of course not! No other people excuses its living on—with explanations of a "mission" that must be fulfilled, or with any other explanation. Kallen would have the Jews do likewise: continue living with no furnishing of reasons why. Jews, like other people, should be accepted for what they are: a nationality equally entitled with other peoples to live its difference.\textsuperscript{42}

This is really Kallen's equal-as-differents idea, which, it will be remembered, he saw in this country's Declaration of Independence,\textsuperscript{43} and which is at the heart of cultural pluralism. This concern with "equality" Kallen emphasizes in another argument against the "mission" theme. If Jews are to be the teachers of "ethical monotheism" for the indefinite future, then that implies that

\textsuperscript{40} Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 30-31.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., pp. 124, 134; Zionism and World Politics, p. viii.
\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 30-31.
\textsuperscript{43} See above, p. 25.
other people will be clinging to low morality and something other than monotheism. If the "mission" idea makes no such implication, whom are the Jews to teach? Is the "mission" purpose a decent one, Kallen asks, if the condition for exercising Jewish goodness is Gentile wickedness?\textsuperscript{44}

Surely to consider oneself or one's group "chosen" for teaching "ethical monotheism" to people is to violate America's fundamental principle of equality for all. Since each individual and group is equal in its inherent difference, no group can be thought of as destined or "chosen" to be a teacher while all others are students. The whole notion of chosenness—whether to teach "ethical monotheism" or something else—is repugnant because of the offensive distinction it makes and tries to support between one group and other groups.\textsuperscript{45} America's "equality" principle declares that we are not to penalize that person or group which is different from us. The American Idea displaces such notions of "chosenness" and "mission" with the belief that divinity favors no one over another.\textsuperscript{46} In sum, "either all mankind are missionaries to each other, or none are."\textsuperscript{47} That is, we

\textsuperscript{44} Kallen, "Speech at Second Menorah Convention," 83.

\textsuperscript{45} Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 17; Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 284.

\textsuperscript{46} Kallen's letter to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121, p. 40), p. 4.

\textsuperscript{47} Kallen, "Speech at Second Menorah Convention," 83.
must adopt the democratic, union-type, associative, culturally pluralistic way of relating equal differents to one another for their mutual enrichment; to single out one as "chosen" or possessed of a "mission" is to regress to the undemocratic, authoritarian level where inequality and penalties for the different are the rule, a level that freedom-loving men reject.

But not only the American doctrine of "equality" teaches this. If the Reformers understood the book of Job better, Kallen submits, they would realize that the just God has no favorite but that He "must maintain all His creatures with an equal providence, thus vindicating the right of each to his different integrity." 48

4. Misunderstood the Meaning of "Equal"

Very much related to the preceding, with the rejection of "mission" by Kallen because it flies in the face of democracy's notion of "equality," is a fourth fault Kallen found with the Reform movement: it misunderstood what "equality" means.

When Jews were enfranchised the Reformers thought that to be equal to their fellow citizens meant that they had to become similar to them. They took the non-Jews as the people to be emulated. They consciously stripped the Jews of many of the differences separating them from the Gentiles. This was an error, said Kallen. "Equal" means not "similar," but the same in rights as a different. The basic thrust of America has been to respect and provide for each individual's and group's right to differ peacefully without penalty. Therefore, instead of looking at Jewish difference as unbecoming, and thereby help make the Jew lose his self-respect, consider the Jewish difference as equally worthy as any other people's or group's.

This acceptance of human beings and groups as they are, in their difference, is at the core of the American Idea. Democracy wants a pluralistic world of diverse individuals, groups, cultures, and peoples, where each retains its difference, realizes its good potentialities as much as possible, and peacefully cooperates with the others for the benefit of oneself and others." Let Reform Judaism urge Jews to pursue "equality" in this equal-as-different sense.


See above, pp. 23-24.


See above, pp. 50-53.

Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 61; also see above, pp. 25-55.
5. Rejected Zionism

Reform Judaism's false understanding of "equal" and its effort to profess only one national loyalty so Jews would not seem different from non-Jews in a country, led Reform to a fifth error, said Kallen: rejection of an eventual reconstitution of Jewish nationhood in the Land of Israel, Zionism.

Seeing the Jews as a religious body and not a nation in exile, Reform reinterpreted the dispersion from the traditional view of a punishment for Jewish transgressions (which would end one day in a return to Zion) to a blessed opportunity to perform the "mission" of bringing "ethical monotheism" to mankind. 55

The 1885 Pittsburgh Platform had asserted the incompatibility of political Zionism and Reform Judaism. The concluding sentence of the Platform's fifth principle read: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the administration of the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state." 56 As Gustavus Poznanski (1805-1879), religious leader of Beth Elohim congregation in Charleston, South Carolina, the first Reform temple in the

55 Kallen, *The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy*, p. 57.
United States, had declared in 1841: "This country is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem, this house of God, our Temple." 57

In 1907, pro-Zionist professors at Cincinnati's Hebrew Union College, the Reform rabbinical school in the United States, were dropped from the faculty. 58 The Reform rabbinical association, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, passed frequent anti-Zionist statements. 59

In 1915, Kallen himself attempted to organize and conduct a Zionist meeting in Reform Judaism's stronghold of Cincinnati. He encountered bitter anti-Zionist sentiment from the Reform leaders in that city. 60

Kallen was appalled at Reform's attitude towards Zionism. Apparently the Reformers did not understand that the same prophets whom they extolled for their "universalism" were also "particularists" in that the prophets wanted their people to be a free nation again in its own land. 61 Indeed, "when [prophetic universalism] was most "universal," it was


58 Ibid., p. 74.


60 Letter from S. Marcus Fechheimer of Cincinnati to Kallen, Mar. 9, 1915, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497.

61 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, pp. 11-12; The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy, p. 57. See above, note 48, p. 108, for some Biblical passages in which the prophets expressed their concern for a restored Zion.
most actively nationalistic for the rhythms of deuteroc-Isaiah, the utterances of Zachariah and of Haggai formed the conspiracy to restore the independence of the kingdom of Zerubbabel, servant of the Lord, scion of the House of David, for King."

Kallen believed that the Reformers failed to realize that Zionism is not inimical to democracy. Genuine democracy extends the right to live in one's difference not only to individuals but also to groups. There is no reason, therefore, why a Jew should not want to help the Jewish people return to Palestine, "our national soil," where the Jewish culture (including the Jewish religion) can develop organically, the Hebraic spirit grow best, and the Jewish people--through Hebraism--make its most productive contribution to world civilization.


63 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 112; Frontiers of Hope, p. 365; "Hiterism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 11; also see above, pp. 27-31.

64 Kallen, "Nationality and the Hyphenated American," 86.

65 See above, pp. 121-124.
If the leaders of Reform Judaism would understand and act on the fact that diverse cultures and peoples are encouraged to exist and grow by democracy so they can enrich their adherents and others, and that one of the ethnic cultures that has a right to be and bloom in its own land is the Jewish one, then the unhealthy fear of double-loyalty will be eliminated. 66

Reform Judaism and Zionism are not natural enemies and should not be made, by either side, to appear to be so. As straightforwardly Kallen wrote in 1911: "There is no intrinsic quarrel—in spite of hysterical Zionists and rabid reformers—between reformed Judaism and Zionism." 67 Three years later, in a letter to Stephen S. Wise, Kallen wrote that "the complete interdependence of Liberal Judaism and Zionism is fundamental." 68

The rising anti-Semitism in Germany in the 1930's, the anti-Semitic activities of some American Gentiles then, the gradual ascendance to prominence in the American Reform Judaism movement of east European-born Jews or their children—these were some of the factors that did help to make for a growing sympathy towards Zionism in Reform ranks beginning with the third decade of the twentieth century.

66 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 127-128.
67 Ibid., p. 41.
68 Letter from Kallen to Stephen S. Wise, Nov. 2, 1914, p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 967.
Kallen, in 1943, explained the rapprochement as sheer practicality by Reform which "had to go to Zionism in order to save Reform, which would otherwise have died of emptiness." Divorced from the lot of the masses, advocating a body-less set of principles and few practices, experiencing a slight loss in congregational membership while Conservative Judaism was booming, getting on the Zionist bandwagon—Kallen suggested—gave Reform at least the possibility of definite content and more followers.

Actually, as early as 1936, in an issue of The Hebrew Union College Monthly, Kallen had publicly heralded the change in Reform thinking. He wrote: "Today this conflict between Reform Judaism and Zionism is, I think, at an end." Zionism, he went on to say there, had helped Reform Judaism to redefine and redirect itself. One result has been an increasing attachment to the Zionist cause by Reform Jews. As for the Zionists, he added, most of them are more sympathetic to the modern-minded Reform than to an Orthodox group like the other-worldly Agudat Yisrael.

69 Letter from Kallen to Carl Alpert, Jan. 22, 1943, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

70 Halperin, The Political World of American Zionism, pp. 99-100. See, especially, the chart on p. 99 of "Reform Congregational and Family Affiliations."

71 Kallen, "A Change in Direction," 16.
The redefinition and redirection in Reform ranks became most apparent at the 1937 convention of the American Reform rabbinate, in Columbus, Ohio. At this convention the rabbis overwhelmingly adopted "The Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism." Concerning Palestine, in principle five, one reads: "We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life."\(^{72}\)

By the time the State of Israel was established most Reform rabbis had long been active supporters of Zionism. After attending a 1954 meeting concerning Israel at which Nelson Glueck (1901-1971), head of the Reform movement's Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, had spoken of his archeological research in Israel, Kallen said, in a pungent and good-humored communication to Moshe Davis of New York: "I appreciated the opportunity to see Nelson Glueck's pictures and to hear his eloquent and subtle propaganda for Israeli development. Both his mode of speech and his emphasis tickled my gizzard...Way back in 1915, Kaufman Kohler excommunicated me from the Hebrew Union College as a godless Zionist, and now look at the damn thing."\(^{73}\)

\(^{72}\) Schwartzman, Reform Judaism in the Making, p. 139.

\(^{73}\) Letter from Kallen to Moshe Davis (b. 1916), a Jewish historian and Conservative rabbi, Mar. 26, 1956, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 24/96. See above, note 60, p.232.
Explanations of Kallen's Anti-Reform Vehemence

The vehemence of Kallen's anti-Reform attack must be understood against the historical background of American Jewry in the first two decades of the twentieth century. The large wave of Jewish immigrants to the United States in the 30-year period beginning in 1881 numbered two million; approximately 90% of those Jews came from eastern Europe. These east Europeans Jews had emigrated from lands in which, unlike their west European fellow Jews, they often lived in a physical and cultural ghetto. Because American Reform, in the years of the arrival of this mass immigration, had largely abandoned some long-established Jewish ideas and practices—such as the use of a head-covering in the synagogue, Hebrew for most prayers, kashrut, and Zionism—both the religious and secular Jews from eastern Europe were not attracted to Reform Judaism.

For these east European Jews seeking to become acculturated to America, there was no place in the New World's Judaism which could provide them with the warmth of the Old World Judaism and/or its communal life, with some American "adjustments." Reform was an individual—and not particularly Jewish—way of believing. Reform was not what the religious

Judaists and secular Jews from eastern Europe had experienced overseas and also wanted on these shores: a communal and richly Jewish way of living.  

Kallen, seeing Reform Judaism dominating the American Jewish scene as the "approved" way of "Americanizing" by wealthy Jews, mostly of west European background, was distressed that the bulk of east European Jewry was being rebuffed or ignored by the anti-Zionist religious sect that was Reform Judaism. With his attachment to the totality of Jewish culture (Hebraism), he would naturally be sympathetic to the east European immigrants, most of whom were also committed to more than Judaism-as-a-religion. In his desire to foster cultural pluralism, with each ethnic group (including the Jewish) maintaining a way of life which enhanced the lives of its own members and others, and helped make the American cultural whole, Kallen was opposed to the Reformists who, by deliberately narrowing Hebraism into Judaism, would make for the cultural and spiritual impoverishment—and possible disappearance—of his Jewish ethnic group.

Many Reformers possessed good secular educations and had been in America longer than their east European fellow Jews. These qualifications, coupled with their positions of leadership in American Jewry's social and philanthropic activities, made them the most logical leaders for American Jews. However, to Kallen, their ideas and actions, particularly before their adoption of Zionism, showed their inability to fuse modernity with Jewish life so as to preserve and enhance the Jewish people and its Hebraic culture.

Reform Judaism and Chance

Although Kallen took definite exception to many of Reform's principles, he did not disapprove of their goal: helping Jews live in the modern world. Reform's intentions were commendable; their method was faulty. Not only should Reform have striven to express and develop the Jewish religious, cultural, and social inheritance openly, but those changes which it sought to make should have come by evolution not revolution. Putting it another way, Reform's changes have been forced on Hebraism and Judaism by a few "doctors" who want to operate by cutting out parts of these two Jewish "bodies" before the "patients" (Jewish masses) consent to the operations. The operations have been performed, but the patients have not been effected. Only the "doctors" and their followers applaud the operations.

76 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 37; "A Change in Direction," 16.

77 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 53.
Of course changes occur, whether we will them or not. Rather than reacting to change, people should endeavor to initiate the changes they want. But changes should come from within, not without. Kallen wants changes made the democratic way whereby majority rules. Not the few rabbinic "doctors" but the mass of Jewish "patients" should decide which changes should be made. Changes should be the result of the actions of the mass of Jewry rather than "the endeavor of the churchmen, of the "spiritual leadership" to hold their customers."

The kind of change Kallen would have Jews effect is one which sustains "the continuity of Jewish being." The analogy he offers is an apt one. You are and are not the same person you were when five years of age. You bear the same name; you are you, but your selfhood has not been static. Through an ongoing process of change you have endeavored to eliminate what might harm you and absorb and transform what might help you live on abundantly. If this process of elimination, absorption, and transformation is blocked, illness results.

78 Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 185.

79 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 220. In seeming contrast with this, Kallen, after noting that rabbis who rebel against the religious establishment are likely to have difficulty retaining a rabbinical position, states that nevertheless "only with such rabbis lies whatever may be hopeful in any future which Judaism may have." See Horace M. Kallen, "Is A Code for Rabbis Possible?" The Hebrew Union College Monthly, XXI, 3 (Feb. 1, 1934), 10. But suppose the masses outvote the "churchman's" suggested change?

80 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 245.

81 Ibid., pp. 245-246.
The Jewish "body" is ill. Reform Judaism is absorbing too much from the outside world, being influenced by its standards and ways so much that the Jewish "body" is hardly recognizable as Jewish, Kallen wrote in 1915. As for Orthodoxy, it is actively resisting any outside influences, Kallen observed in 1916. Both attitudes are in error. The Jewish "body," like an individual human or anything wishing to survive, will live on only as it grows different by continuously orchestrating (interrelating) the transformed "new" it absorbs with the "old" it was for the sake of the better "body" it hopes to become. Proceeding from the "old" (the familiar and traditional), and adding the "new" (the worthwhile in the contemporary scene), let the better Jewish person, Jewish culture, and Jewish group be fashioned.

Although Kallen condemned Reform's way of initiating change, the three items he singles out for praise in American Reform were the results of changes the Reformers—not the masses—initiated.

82 Kallen, rev. of Harry E. Lewis, Liberal Judaism and Social Service, 2nd ed.
83 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 82.
85 For the idea that innovation should proceed from the familiar and traditionally approved to the contemporary and radical, see Kallen's letter to Walter Cohn of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, Dec. 4, 1939, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
First, although there is "no infallible authority for the practice"\textsuperscript{86} of Confirmation at Shavuot, Kallen says that the ceremony is "a form of communal action which has grown up naturally and spontaneously... and therefore possesses the weight and sanction that should pertain to any group custom."\textsuperscript{87}

Second, Kallen praises the Reform movement for equalizing the religious rights of the Jewish woman. By counting her in a prayer quorum, abolishing the women's gallery in the synagogue, enabling her to serve on Jewish boards of trustees, expecting her to obtain as much of a formal education as a male, amending marriage and divorce procedures, and in other respects equalizing the Jewish woman's position, Reform Judaism liberated the Jewish woman. If Reform Judaism had done nothing more, this magnificent achievement alone justifies Reform's right to exist, Kallen contends.\textsuperscript{88}

Third, Reform Judaism has affected Orthodox Judaism, Kallen declares, by taking from Orthodoxy some of its past and potential adherents. To forestall such "raids" in the future, some Orthodox leaders have softened a little.\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{86} Kallen, \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid. How "natural" and "spontaneous" the initiation of the Confirmation ceremony was, however, is debatable. See: Schwartzman, \textit{Reform Judaism in the Making}, pp. 41,105; Hayyim Schauss, \textit{The Lifetime of A Jew: Throughout the Ages of Jewish History} (Cincinnati: U.A.'s.C., 1950), pp. 120-121.

\textsuperscript{88} Kallen, \textit{Zionism and World Politics}, p. 37; \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 103.

\textsuperscript{89} Kallen, \textit{Judaism At Bay}, p. 103.
Many other changes have come into Reform Judaism, as into every religious and secular Jewish group since Kallen, in his *Judaism At Bay* (published in 1932) attacked the extreme Reform of pre-Columbus Platform days. What with its current Zionist emphasis and its closeness to many concerns of American and world Jewry, Kallen has less reason today to censure Reform for the kinds of shortcomings he saw in it decades ago. Nevertheless, as a Judaist group, Reform Judaism may still earn Kallen's criticism—as would all Judaist associations—for concentrating on (Reform) religious matters to the detriment of what Kallen deems the more important non-religious Jewish cultural affairs.

Orthodox Judaism

Writing in *Judaism At Bay* concerning Orthodox Judaism in America during, approximately, the first third of this century, Kallen noted that Orthodoxy's way of dealing with modern conditions differed from Reform's. Whereas Reform surrendered to the environment, Orthodoxy combatted it by stiffening. Orthodox Judaism reacted to modern times by making drastic changes in Hebraism and Judaism, but Orthodoxy's reaction was basically to reemphasize traditional Jewish observance. Orthodox made no significant concessions or creative changes in patterns of Jewish living.


91 Kallen, *Judaism At Bay*, p. 82.
Kallen, whose cultural pluralism calls for the free exchange of ideas among groups and an openness to change so that one can live on in the best possible way, obviously found fault with Orthodoxy turning its back on what was happening in the scientific-industrial world of twentieth-century America. Whoever or whatever, like Orthodoxy, seeks to segregate itself and only repeat the past cannot live abundantly. To refuse to change is to fossilize oneself and die, for we survive only as we struggle to make ourselves different. Orthodoxy's fear of change, said Kallen, is part of that outlook many people have which postulates an unchanging One--a God, Nature, Tradition, Ideal, Law, or Something--which is a refuge against the changes and uncertainties in life. A living tradition, however, involves not avoiding change but carrying over the past into the today and tomorrow which alter it and thereby help create that living tradition.

An Orthodox Judaism which refuses to change is unfaithful to its own method, Kallen observed. The halachic method, which some call "legalism", recognizes the possibility of change and provides a technique for bringing about changes in Jewish religious matters. This method makes for change from within by utilizing tools already present within the Jewish tradition rather than by, as the Reformers do, operating on Judaism from without.

93 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 170.
94 Kallen, "The Tree of Life," 10.
95 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 55.
The halachic method, however, Kallen states, can sometimes be employed in ridiculous ways in attempts to deal with modern conditions. He gives the example of Orthodox Jewry in Israel who sell their land to a non-Jew before every Sabbatical and Jubilee year so their land will lie fallow then (thereby fulfilling the Biblical law), but who then work the soil because the land is now not "theirs." That the Torah's laws are being transgressed if one does not sell the land but works it, and are not being transgressed if one does sell the land but works it, seems to Kallen to be a judgment made by human beings rather than facts emerging from the study of the Torah's injunctions and the situations to which they have been applied. 96

The halachic method one can argue about, but it is an instrument for helping Orthodox Jews live in the world. 97 It was utilized, for instance, in the nineteenth century when, Kallen declares, Orthodoxy did not stand still. 98 If the legal method of halachah is the one that Orthodox Judaism wishes to employ, let the Orthodox do so in such a way that it assists human beings to live more fulfilling Jewish lives in this age of modernity.

96 Kallen, Utopians At Bay, pp. 182-183. That the land should not be tilled during the Sabbatical year is mentioned in Lev. 25:4. The regulation concerning the Jubilee year is found in Lev. 25:11.

97 Ibid., p. 184.

98 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 53.
When employing its halachic method, and at other times, Orthodox Judaism should beware of expecting all Judaists and Jews to believe and practice as Orthodoxy ordains. Kallen urges Orthodox Judaism to desist saying that no non-Orthodox Judaist can be a Jew. Orthodox should stop proclaiming that its view is the correct Jewish viewpoint.

On this last point, Kallen reminds us that Albert Einstein, for example, who was certainly not Orthodox but who was a Jew, selected what he wanted from the total Jewish heritage in order to add meaning to his life. He had every right to do so, even as every other Jew or Judaist makes his choice. However, "both he and they would be wrong if they treated their selections as accounts of the entire Jewish reality, as descriptions of the historic content of Judaism and Hebraism." Each individual's selection becomes a Jewish view of life but not the Jewish view of life. There is no one "true" Jewish viewpoint. There are only Jewish views of life.


100 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 106.

101 Ibid., Cf. Kallen's point that there are Judaisms rather than a Judaism; see above, p. 216.
Those who proclaim there is only one Judaist viewpoint fail to take cognizance of the diversity of Jews and Judaists which has existed for more than two thousand years. They also ignore the right to be different. The latter applies not only to the individual Jew's right to be a Jew and not a Christian but also to his right to differ from his fellow Jew's interpretation of what a Jew should believe and do. Men have suffered enough from those fervent believers of infallible faiths who saw (and see) the different as sinful and yearn to unite everyone in their image.

The fact is, Kallen asserts, that there is no one, "true" Jewish group—Orthodox or otherwise. There are only diverse Jewish groups which in their totality constitute the Jewish people.

While Kallen sees certain shortcomings in Orthodoxy, he judges the Orthodox Jew as a person who "retains his integrity with his darkness." Although the Orthodox cling to supernaturalist-based beliefs which, Kallen submits, cannot stand up to reason, they do not fawn before the Gentile world. That clinging to their Jewish integrity is admirable. The

103 Ibid., p. 172.
106 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 84.
108 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 76.
Orthodox keep up the Jewish communal institutions—the synagogue, Jewish school, slaughter-house, butcher-shop, dairy, bakery, mikvah, etc. Their Judaism is rooted in the Jewish people. Unlike the Reformers, their Judaism involves specific ways of living, not just talk. Even when some Orthodox Jews become intellectually convinced of the soundness of Reform doctrines, they often retain the Orthodox way of behavior.

Again, these remarks must be viewed in the perspective of the American Judaism of several decades ago that elicited them. Nevertheless, the isolationism and supernaturalism of Orthodoxy—more so of Orthodoxy than of the other Jewish denominations, but applicable in lesser degree also to them—would continue to be looked upon with disfavor by a man like Kallen since he espouses free communication among groups as a democratic ideal and he himself upholds a non-supernaturalist position.

Orthodoxy's fundamental problem is "how to harmonize the methods and findings of the sciences with the doctrines and discipline of orthodox Judaism." But Orthodox Judaism has no monopoly on that problem.

109 Ibid., pp. 96-97.
110 Ibid., pp. 70, 84.
111 Ibid., pp. 75, 77.
112 Letter to Benjamin Fine (D. 1905), an educator and author, Feb. 27, 1938, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 972.
Conservative Judaism

Kallen has something to say about Conservative Judaism's attempt to keep its Judaism in this world of the scientific method and achievements. He begins by quoting Conservative Judaism's aim: "The preservation in America of the knowledge and practice of historical Judaism, as ordained in the Law of Moses and expounded by the Prophets and Sages of Israel in Biblical and Talmudical writings." 115

Despite this goal, Conservative Judaism has failed to preserve American Judaism against modernity's effects, Kallen insists. 115 That should not be surprising. It is extremely difficult to "preserve" anything in the modern world of science, industry, and democracy. Things move too quickly today to permit any person or group the opportunity to remain isolated from the larger scene. The environment is so pervasive it even breaks through barriers erected to "preserve" unchanged whatever lodges within.

Moreover, Conservative Judaism's use of the word "preservation" implies keeping Judaism as it was. That too, Kallen maintains, is impossible. There is no such thing as a non-changing Judaism. Whichever adjective one prefaces

114 Kallen quotes this in Judaism At Bay, p. 208. The quotation itself is from the "Agreement of the B'rur" signed Apr. 14, 1902, between Adolphus S. Solomons, president of The Jewish Theological Seminary Association, and Cyrus Adler, president of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The entire document may be found in Moshe Davis, The Emergence of Conservative Judaism, pp. 393-395.

115 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 208.
"Judaism" with--"traditional," "historical," "prophetic," "Conservative," "Orthodox," or something else--Judaism has been continually changing. If Judaism, or anything else, stopped changing--stopped adapting itself to the world, taking from the world in order to survive--it would die. 116

Kallen explains what Conservative Judaism's method has been to "preserve" Judaism. It has chosen not to let the non-Jewish environment overwhelm one's Jewish stance and ways, which was Reform's error; nor did Conservative Judaism endeavor to retreat from the non-Jewish surroundings, which was Orthodoxy's way. Conservative Judaism's method has been to give "multiple meanings" 117 to Biblical and Talmudic statements. The resulting vagueness enables a person to choose the interpretation that pleases him. Rather sarcastically, Kallen expounds the Conservative method: "Seeming to say or to do one thing and intending something else has become the whole technique by which the practice at least of "historical Judaism" is preserved in America." 118

117 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 209.
118 Ibid.
Kallen apparently means that the leaders of Conservative Judaism seem to talk with the accents of modernity but they really intend a status quo Judaism. This criticism, too, seems less true today than when Kallen first made this critique of Conservative Judaism's method.

Reconstructionism

Of all the religious groupings in American Judaism it is Reconstructionism which Kallen praises most. He calls it "seminal." He praises the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, the Reconstructionist synagogue-school-center founded

Note, for example, in his book, A Partisan Guide To the Jewish Problem (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1943), p. 166, the words of Milton Steinberg, a prominent Conservative rabbi: "The leaders and official agencies of Conservatism have failed to live up to their preachments. Affirming tradition and progress, they have in half a century failed to commend a single departure, no matter how slight, from old patterns. For all practical purposes they might as well have been Orthodox." Cf. Nordecai M. Kaplan's statement: "It [Conservative Judaism] yields only to change which has come to stay, but it does not initiate change. This accounts for the curious fact that, although it professes the willingness to reckon with the needs of contemporary Jewish life, it has not, of its own accord, sanctioned a single one of its departures from traditional Judaism. Only after they were introduced by some more enterprising trend in Jewish life, or had managed to become irrevocable, did Conservatism finally accept them." See Nordecai M. Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953), pp. 25-26.

For some specific changes which have been voted affirmatively in recent years by the Rabbinical Assembly's Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, see Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, ed. Jules Harlow (Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs), XXV (1961), pp. 194-199 and XXXIII (1969), pp. 199-200.

in 1922 by Mordecai M. Kaplan and 22 families which seceded from New York's Jewish Center, \(^{121}\) as an "imaginative adventure in harmonization" \(^{122}\) for its attempt to harmonize Judaism and modernism. In 1925 Kallen applauded Mordecai M. Kaplan's re-interpretation of Judaism as "the most matured, the most articulately expressed and the most concretely embodied that American Jewry possesses." \(^{123}\) He went on to acclaim Kaplan as "the most imaginative and influential mind" \(^{124}\) in American Judaism.

Kallen describes Reconstructionists as believing in "Judaism without supernaturalism...\(\text{and practicing}\) Shulhan Arukh with secularist sanctions." \(^{125}\) It's a Judaism without doctrines but with plenty of disciplines. \(^{126}\)

Although Kallen seems somewhat critical of Reconstructionism in these last two statements, implying that the only rationale for religious ritual is belief in a supernatural God rather than a naturalistic One, he himself has said that Jewish customs and the Jewish way of life could readily continue to be practiced without believing in a Supernatural Who commanded those customs and way of life. Kallen had contended:


\(^{122}\) Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 188.

\(^{123}\) Ibid., p. 215.

\(^{124}\) Ibid., p. 216.


\(^{126}\) Kallen, "Of Those Which Say They Are Jews," p. 35.
"All group life has its specific excellences, intrinsically justified, and the social customs which are the effective content of orthodoxy are not the less desirable and Jewish when we learn that they are human and relative." 127

Surely "the social customs" of Jewish group life could include the customs found in the group's religion(s)!

Kallen—who is not a believer in the desirability of religion for mankind 128 and who would not, it is suggested here, really favor any religion which conceives of God as Something or Someone other than the Democratic Way—would be understandably critical of Reconstructionism because it is a religious species and an overly observant (Shulchan Aruch) type at that. His implied criticism of Reconstructionism could be answered, however, by pointing out that Reconstructionism is "guilty" of carrying out what Kallen had advocated: continuing Jewish group life without the supernaturalist rationale.

Kallen's reluctance to grant religion the right to do anything other than strive to manipulate a Supernatural in which it "must" believe, comes across in another of his comments concerning Reconstructionism. He sees Reconstructionism as "a reinterpretation of religion which identifies it with

127 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, pp. 75-76. See above, p. 219.
128 See above, pp. 209-210, especially note 148.
social consciousness." But since Kallen identifies intelligence and social consciousness as secular (not religious) modes, he views their use in religion as more evidence of religion's secularization.

However, Reconstructionism would be an excellent example of Kallen's observation that religions are wont to keep unaltered their symbols and rituals but to change the meanings ascribed to them. As Kallen understands Kaplan's method, Kaplan would have people use the traditional symbols and prayers, but—as in Kaplan's use of the word "God"—he would mean something else by them than the meanings associated with them by historical Judaism.

129 Kallen, Judaism At Eye, p. 68.
130 Ibid.
131 Kaplan maintains that religions differ most in their "sancta," a group's heroes, historic events, institutions, texts, places, and other objects to which are ascribed sanctity or great importance for deriving meaning in life. Kaplan writes that "the traditional sancta of a religion must be re-interpreted in each generation so that their meanings are kept relevant to the needs of that generation." See Nordecai M. Kaplan, The Greater Judaism in the Making: A Study of the Modern Evolution of Judaism (New York: The Reconstructionist Press, 1960), p. 158. Kaplan admits, however, that some sancta may have to be dropped if they become meaningless and that new sancta are produced by a living, creative people; Ibid. Kaplan also warned: "Some have attempted to obviate the need for change in the traditional prayers by reading into them meanings completely at variance with what they meant to those who framed them. This practice is fraught with danger...Unless we eliminate from the traditional text statements of belief which are untenable and of desires which we do not or should not cherish, we mislead the simple and alienate the sophistical." See Sabbath Prayer Book (New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 1925), p. xxiii.
In a letter to the editors of The Reconstructionist magazine in which he expressed gratitude for the kind remarks made about him in an editorial, Kallen added that he and the Reconstructionists "share the same view of Jewish relations and of the role of the Jewish community in our country." 133 It is to be expected that Horace Kallen and Mordecai Kaplan, being liberals, would agree on many points. One particular area of agreement is of special concern for our purposes: Kaplan's idea—like that of Kallen's—134 that democracy is a how for enabling differences to relate peacefully and enrichingly.

Commenting on Kaplan's paper, "The Need for Normative Higher Education," 135 Unity in / David Sidney (b. 1908), then research associate of The Viking Fund, asked Kaplan whether democracy should "be conceived as a sociocultural method of resolving the problems of human society, or does it entail a common philosophy of salvation as well?" 136 Kaplan replied that "democracy should be conceived as a sociocultural method as such which ... presupposes not a common philosophy but a common method of achieving salvation." 137 Kaplan, in an explanation


134 See above, p. 50. It is succinctly stated in "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 26: "What else can democracy he but the organization of liberty?"


136 Ibid., p. 330

137 Ibid.; emphasis in the original.
that could have come as readily from Kallen, went on to say that democracy is "a method whereby it is possible for people of diverse cultural background and belief to achieve their salvation, or to make the most of their own lives without hindering their neighbors from making the most of theirs as they conceive it." \[138\] Again paralleling Kallen, Kaplan concludes: "If we wish to see advantage accrue also to religion and social democracy (or genuine equality), we need, "a religion of democracy"." \[139\]

Although Kallen and Kaplan agree, therefore, on the importance of the democratic method—and this is a vital agreement—one should not conclude that they do not have their disagreements. They do. For example, according to Kaplan, the great contribution of Jewish civilization to world civilization consists in having alerted men to the realization that to achieve brotherhood "the one problem they must seek to

\[136\] Ibid., pp. 330-331; emphasis in the original.

\[139\] Ibid., p. 331. See above, note 109, p. 199, for instances when Kallen calls democracy a religion. That the religion that is the democratic way is at the heart of Reconstructionism, Kaplan has admitted: "The Reconstructionist movement is a method rather than a program. As a method, its validity should not be tested by its organizational success in forming an additional sect or denomination. What will prove whether Reconstructionism is valid is the extent to which it will succeed in preventing the existing sects or denominations from doing the harm they do at present to Jewish life and in eliciting and reinforcing the good they are capable of doing." Nordecai M. Kaplan, "Reconstructionism As A Method For Jewish Living," The Reconstructionist, XXIII, 20 (Feb. 7, 1958), 8.

This is what Kallen would have "the religion of democracy"—"Secularism" is what Kallen labels it when applied to religions—accomplish! See above, p. 193, especially notes 95 and 96.
solve is how to tame their will-to-power."\textsuperscript{140} Kallen dissents by saying that other peoples have also taught this. The Jewish contribution, in Kallen's opinion, is not the teaching itself but whatever specific Jewish comments there are on the teaching.\textsuperscript{141}

Another difference between Kallen and Kaplan concerns how many civilizations or cultures\textsuperscript{142} the American Jew lives in. For Kaplan, the number is two; they are, the American and the Jewish.\textsuperscript{143} For Kallen, the American Jew lives in many civilizations. While the American and Jewish cultures--to use the word Kallen prefers--are probably the cultures most familiar to him from his home, school, job, and other experiences, the American Jew also has contacts with other cultures. If he was born abroad or has traveled in another country, if he has visited the ethnic "pockets" in the United States (such as where Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Cubans, or Chinese are concentrated),


\textsuperscript{141} Kallen, "Remembrance for Survival," 88; cf. above, note 27, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{142} To Kaplan, the total heritage of a people--its language, literature, customs, art, memories, etc.--is its "civilization." To Kallen, this total heritage is a "culture." For Kaplan's view, see \textit{The Future of the American Jew}, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 119, p. 241), pp. 147, 67. For Kallen's view, see "What Actually Is "Jewish Welfare" in America?" 199, and above, pp. 59-60, 65-67.

if he has seen moving pictures, watched television, listened to the radio, read newspapers and books, spoken with people who were visiting the United States or who had settled here after emigrating from another land—if he has done one or more of these activities (and who has not?) he has learned something of cultures other than the American and the Jewish. Kallen would have the American Jew orchestrate all these cultures. The American Jew who wishes to enrich his being from contacts with diverse cultures "endeavors to absorb and to transpose, to transvaluate into Jewish terms all that he can receive from the rest of the world."\(^{144}\) This is what it means to benefit from cultural pluralism in one's life.

Another point at which Kaplan and Kallen differ concerns the former's idea of the organic Jewish community. The notion that each local Jewish organization and agency should be represented on a local Jewish community council which would coordinate that community's Jewish life\(^{145}\) seems to Kallen "far more a fantasy bred by justifiable doubts and anxieties regarding the future of the American Jewish community than the consequence of a scientific analysis and extrapolation of its actual dynamic trends."\(^{146}\) Admitting uncertainty as to what

\(^{144}\) "Dialogue With Horace M. Kallen: Philosopher of Minorities," \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 105, p. 37), p. 28. Of course Kaplan, too, urges the Jew to orchestrate the two civilizations. Kaplan uses the word "integrate" for "orchestrate."

\(^{145}\) Kaplan, \textit{The Future of the American Jew}, pp. 119-120.

will be the makeup and Jewish knowledge of American Jewry a generation or two hence, the formation of a Jewish community council along the lines that Kaplan wants would be to dream a near-impossible dream. In the organic community that Kaplan envisions "those institutions and agencies whose main function is to foster Jewish consciousness namely, synagogues, Jewish schools, and Jewish communal centers should occupy a position of primacy." Kallen argues that those institutions and agencies which would not occupy as high a position as those Kaplan has mentioned would not willingly participate in such a communal structure. Is it democratic to value one Jewish group or institution more than another?

Kallen is appalled, to cite another difference between the two, that Kaplan conceives of American Jewry interpreting its cohesiveness and communal status as similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church. To Kallen, the Catholic Church is the epitome of the anti-democratic. Although Kaplan

1\textsuperscript{47} Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew, p. 119.

1\textsuperscript{47}a Kallen, rev. of Nordecai M. Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew, 308.

1\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., pp. 99, 121.

1\textsuperscript{49} Kallen, The Structure of Lasting Peace, p. 68; Secularism Is the Will of God, pp. 65, 93; Letter to Robert J. Kohlitz, op. cit. (above, note 1\textsuperscript{46}, p. 49), pp. 1-2. Charles F. Donovan (b. 1912), a Roman Catholic priest and a professor of education at Boston College--in his review of Kallen's The Education of Free Men, in America, a Jesuit publication, Dec. 31, 1949, 391--refers to Kallen as having been dubbed "anti-Semitic against Catholics."
specifically says that his words should not "be taken to imply anything like the authoritarian or totalitarian character of group organization typical of that Church." 150 Kallen maintains that to want the Catholic Church's status is also to desire its hierarchical arrangement with the accompanying rigidity and undemocratic authoritarianism. 151

Consider, Kallen observes, the question of mobility. While the Catholic's mobility is dictated from above—he is told which parish he belongs to and which church he must attend, both being dependent on where he lives—the mobility of Jewish people in America is that of free persons who associate with whom they will. This freedom factor is the basic requirement for the "vital cohesion" 152 of Jews in America. Jewish Americans, moreover, have the freedom to relate to fellow members of the Jewish people for religious or non-religious purposes. Catholics are restricted, Kallen asserts, to the religious mode.

Kallen is also disturbed by Kaplan's apparent inconsistencies concerning democracy. Kaplan insists that membership in the organic Jewish community should be "voluntarist, democratic." 153 But then Kaplan asserts that Jews who decide not

152 Ibid.
to join that community should be denied certain Jewish religious services." Moreover, Kaplan contends that all Jews have the Jewish religion in common because the Jewish religion is "an inseparable part of our personality as a people."

To Kallen, it is illogical to demand that membership in the organic Jewish community should be voluntary and democratic and then require Jews to be Judaists and warn that those who don't agree with certain communal requirements or policies choose not to and/join are to be denied certain religious services. All this is "both tangent and contradictory to the spontaneous de facto pluralism" characteristic of America. In this country the individual Jew has the right to be a Judaist or not and he shouldn't be penalized by anyone for his choice. A democratic membership is a voluntary association with a group.

A major difference between Kaplan and Kallen has already suggested itself when Kaplan was quoted as considering the Jewish religion an indivisible part of the Jewish people's being. Kallen, as we have previously noted, considers even a convert to another religion as still a Jew. Such a person,

154 Ibid.

155 Ibid., p. 47.


158 See above, note 155.

159 See above, p. 69, especially notes 59 and 60.
in Kallen's opinion, remains a member of the Jewish nationality or people but is just not a Judaist. To Kaplan, even a so-called Jewish secularist still has the Jewish religion as his religion, even if he chooses to do nothing with it; a convert loses his Jewishness since Jewish religion is indispensable to Jewish civilization; peoplehood and religion, in Judaism, cannot be clearly severed and individually adhered to or not.

Which brings us to two final differences. Seeing the Jews as possessing a peoplehood, culture, and religion, which are "one and inseparable," 160 Kaplan declares that Jews will survive in the modern world as a distinct group only if their civilization is seen by Jews as having "religious significance." 161 Indeed, the political design of America is such that all ethnic groups must look upon their cultures in this way to survive here beyond the second or third post-immigrant generation. 162 Therefore, concludes Kaplan, for Jews and other groups it would "be illusory to plan a status based on the hope or expectation that the political pattern of this country will be modified to permit cultural pluralism." 163

160 Kaplan, The Future of the American Jew, p. 36.
161 Ibid., p. 99.
162 Ibid., pp. 98-99.
163 Ibid., p. 98.
Kallen, on the other hand, sees the Jews as an ethnic culture—a people with its distinctive culture. The third component of the triad of which Kaplan spoke, religion, is not an essential element. Furthermore, not only are the Jews a "world-wide cultural confraternity," but in the United States and elsewhere Jews "are likeliest to survive as one communion of culture among the multitudes of others which together orchestrate into the civilization of the nations."

Kallen calls for Jews to see themselves as a religious civilization; Kallen, as a cultural community.

Mordecai Kaplan is still very aware of the differences separating himself and Horace Kallen. When the writer of this dissertation, on March 16, 1970, wrote Mordecai Kaplan and asked if he had been influenced by Horace Kallen's ideas, Kaplan replied "that both Kallen and I arrived at our respective conceptions of Jewish life independently of each other. Our views are poles apart. His is a secularist, and mine a religious, version of what goes into the making of a Jew. Those of my students at the Jewish Theological Seminary who came in contact with Kallen would bring me the report that he regarded me as obstructing the acceptance of

164 See above, pp. 58-60.
his version, because of the apparent rationality of my version. It was only because in later years he became active in Jewish religious education that I wrote what I did in my letter to him to the effect that he "exemplified the art of living in two civilizations." However, he still operates with his cultural version of Jewish life, as is evident from his designation of you and me as "Judaists." 163

Without denying the very real differences separating Mordecai Kaplan's outlook from Horace Kallen's, and accepting Kaplan's recollection that he and Kallen "arrived at our respective conceptions of Jewish life independently of each other," 169 one still cannot help wondering if, perhaps unconsciously, some of Kallen's ideas were not orchestrated by Kaplan with his own. Especially startling and suggestive, as indicated, is Kaplan's understanding of democracy as a method together whereby different are enabled to live/fruitfully, and his advocating "a religion of democracy." 170

Summary

We began this chapter by indicating that Kallen speaks of Judaisms rather than a Judaism. 974 (Such an approach would be expected of a man who extols the American Idea of each man's

167 The words Mordecai M. Kaplan has put in quotation marks were contained in the letter of March 16, 1970, which the writer of this dissertation sent to Mordecai M. Kaplan. The words are a paraphrase of what Mordecai M. Kaplan had once written to Horace M. Kallen. See above (note 5, p. 1).


169 Ibid.

170 See above, pp. 255-256.
right to his difference.) Some of the teachings of the main Judaism were then discussed in the light of what Kallen had written and said about them over the years.

Some questions still remain. What should be the relationship of these Jewish--as well as other Jewish--groups to their own members, to other Jews, and to America? Is Jewish unity of some sort desirable? It is to such questions, and related matters, that we now turn.
CHAPTER VIII: JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS AND JEWISH UNITY

How the Concerns of Jewish Groups Are Determined

In a democracy each person has the right to join the groups he wishes. Jews, like other Americans, have that right. Like other people, members of the Jewish people join together in specific groups to realize certain purposes, religious (Judaist) and secular. The Jewish individuals who do form a Jewish organization or group choose one or more items from the total Jewish culture-complex that is Hebraism, and which all Jews have inherited, and decide that that item (or those items) shall be the concern(s) of their group.¹ For example, one group becomes concerned about fostering traditional Judaism and forms an organization to do so; a number of other Jewish persons want to raise money for a definite cause in Israel and band together in an organization they form for that purpose; some other individuals are desirous of promoting Yiddish language and literature and associate for attaining their goals.

What the item is that one group chooses for its main concern is often very different from the selection of another group of individuals. The choices have been influenced by several factors, such as what the persons know in the Jewish heritage. If, for example, they are not aware of the existence of the Jewish Publication Society of America or Dropsie University, the selectees couldn't choose either of those items for

¹ Kallen, "What Actually Is "Jewish Welfare" in America?" 201.
their organizational concern. In addition, how the Jewish heritage was presented to them could affect their choice. If, for instance, they were ineffectively taught about why the State of Israel is important to American Jewry it is not likely that Israel will be a subject chosen for their organization's interest. Other factors that could affect what they choose include: their personal disposition (e.g., a person who doesn't enjoy reading would hardly join a Jewish reading circle); their background--land of birth, country or countries of residence, and upbringing (e.g., a Jew who was born and raised in the United States, and who has only lived in that one country, would be more likely to join the B'nai B'rith organization than a Jew who was born, raised, and still lived in a land where that organization did not exist; a Jew raised in America will chant his prayers and utilize bodily postures which are different from Judaists raised in Iraq.2

The Programs of Jewish Organizations

Once a Jewish organization has been formed which concentrates on a specific item in the total Jewish heritage the question often arises as to what extent the organization should remain involved in that Jewish concern or should also devote some of its organizational strength to general issues. Kallen takes an interesting position on this matter. When a Jewish

group uses its resources in the struggle for equal rights for everyone, it is taking proper advantage of the opportunity and responsibility all American citizens have of struggling to implement the American Idea of equality and the right to be different. Since Jews have a special interest in democracy—for it is democracy which gives the individual Jew and the Jewish group the right to exist as equals in liberty and safety with other individuals and groups—Jews should feel a particular concern about the necessity of defending and insuring democracy. Individual Jews as well as Jewish groups should cooperate, for instance, with non-Jewish individuals and groups in advancing civil liberties and resisting totalitarianism. But the fact that Jewish-Americans share this opportunity and responsibility with all other Americans implies that groups other than Jewish groups—but groups which include Jews—could be the kinds of groups which should be most involved in such pursuits. Such is Kallen's feeling.

At the present time, Kallen says, when the particular Jewish elements in Jewish culture are becoming weaker and are often ignored by Jews, it might be wiser for the bulk of the efforts by Jewish groups to be devoted to Jewish matters. That way, moreover, the Jews would be concentrating on the specifically


4 Kallen, "The Tercentenary: Yomtov or Yahrzeit?" 10.

5 Ibid., 8.
Jewish items in America's division of labor. As Jewish-Americans focus on Jewish concerns and Japanese-Americans on their Japanese concerns, for example, there would be assurance that these concerns were being looked after by some people in America; otherwise, these concerns could be ignored or overlooked. The endeavors of all groups in America orchestrate into America's culture, and America's culture would be the poorer if, for instance, the fruits of the concerns that Jewish-American and Japanese-American groups had for their ethnic cultures and peoples were not in the American cultural union. This is cultural pluralism in action.

We see a concrete example of what Kallen would have Jewish groups do in his suggestion regarding which issues should be the major concern of the American Jewish Congress. The American Jewish Congress "first should deal with issues that have an immediate and definite relevance to the Jewish community as Jewish," Kallen declared in a letter to Justine Wise Polier (b. 1903), a leader of the American Jewish Congress. In his letter Kallen cites the issues of whether Communists should teach in the public schools and what should be done about the threatening hydrogen bomb. These issues, Kallen says, don't directly confront only the Jewish community. Therefore, the American Jewish Congress should not deal with them at the expense of more Jewish-related matters. As Kallen expressed his

6 Ibid., 10.

7 Letter from Kallen to Justine Wise Polier, Jan. 14, 1957, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 977.
judgment, "to enter them is to go looking for trouble and disregarding the troubles in and of the house of Israel itself." Rather than become deeply involved in defending the Jewish name and in "contingent activities that our energies are burned up in these, and the Jewish spirit gets diluted and ultimately liquidated in the more general libertarian spirit," concentrate on authentically Jewish matters.

Kallen would have Congress deal with the survival, growth, and organization of the Jewish community as well as how to preserve, enhance, and use the Jewish heritage so a better Jewish future is created in the modern world of freedom, science, and democracy. However, should the American Jewish Congress choose to concern itself with general questions, such as civil rights, let the questions be set "in the perspectives of Jewish law and history." That is, current Jewish concern for such an issue should be seen as an outgrowth of past Jewish concern with the matter, and what Jewish law and experience have to teach us regarding civil rights' questions today. Jews should engage in such learning, discuss what they have learned in terms of the problems of today, arrive at conclusions, and bring their recommendations to the attention of Jews and non-Jews.

8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Letter from Kallen to Sanford Solender (b. 1914), director of the Jewish Center division of the Jewish Welfare Board, Feb. 1, 1963, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 978.
Let the American Jewish Congress and other Jewish groups mainly foster, improve, and make known to all "the specifically Jewish part in the cultural division of labor, whose orchestrated production becomes the culture of the American people, shaping itself, in pluribus unum, according to the American Idea." 12 Who else will "play" the Jewish "notes" in the American cultural "symphony" if not the Jewish groups (and Jewish individuals)? How else will Jewish distinctiveness and Jewish survival be maintained, added to, and be a source of enrichment for Jews and others, if there is nothing specifically Jewish about Jewish groups, if they duplicate general liberal organizations?

Rivalry Among Jewish Groups

Unfortunately, too many Jewish groups don't want other Jewish groups to join with them in making the Jewish contribution to American culture. Such groups condemn others as not genuine Jews, not members of the one "true" Jewish group, or not members of the most important Jewish group (which is theirs, of course).

In implementing the live-and-help-live attitude, however, "Jew" must not be limited to one meaning. We must grant each person the right to decide for himself whether he is or is not a Jew, says Kallen. 13 "Jew" should stand for the orchestrated union of all meanings people give to their Jewishness. 14

12 Kallen, "The Tercsentenary: Yontov or Yahrzeit?" 10.
13 See above, note 63 (p. 70).
The same can be said concerning which Jewish group is "the" Jewish group. Each group has its own value system and will decide for itself what "Jewish" is and what is Jewishly correct. Judaist denominations must realize that there is no Judaist (or non-Judaist) group which is the "true" Jewish group. And secular Jewish groups must not denounce religious (or non-religious) Jewish groups other than their own as not truly "Jewish" in this world of science.

Moreover, leaders of Jewish organizations should cease proclaiming that their group alone is the most important Jewish group and should be embraced by everyone. In the present situation each organization opposes itself to the other organizations and tries to eliminate them. Should any one organization ever succeed in doing that a Jewish unity would be attained, but by force, by eliminating the different. This would be an undemocratic, un-American procedure and goal.

19 Kallen, "The Tercentenary: Yomtov or Yahrzeit?" 10.
This unhealthy warfare among Jewish groups should stop. Each person and group must come to acknowledge that there is no one "true" Jewish group. Each group has a right to its position and practices. 20 There are many Jewish religious and non-religious groups, each composed of individuals who have chosen for their special concern certain items from the total Jewish culture that all Jews have inherited and who have formed groups to realize their chosen purposes. Each group's choices are legitimate—as each Jewish individual's is—for there is not a Jewish view of life, only views. 21 Which group's views are better depends not on what claims a Jewish organization's leader makes but on the "consequences to the strength, the enrichment of Jewish life." 22 (Kallen's pragmatic "plumb-line" is evident here!) All these Jewish groups and all Jewish individuals, with the orchestration of their varying value systems and works, form the Jewish people, its beliefs and practices. 23 The important need is for each Jewish group to stop condemning other Jewish groups and to join in building a rich Jewish life in this country.

22 Ibid., p. 105.
23 Ibid., p. 191; "The Foundations of Jewish Spiritual and Cultural Unity," 113; Judaism At Bay, p. 84.
Jewish Groups Should Apply American Idea and Join In Union

The tragic truth, however, is that presently each Jewish group acts as it wishes. There is diversity, but also chaos and anarchy. Should nothing be done to correct the situation the American Jewish community might disintegrate. This would mean that the United States would lose the contributions which a vital American Jewish community could make.

To prevent such a loss, and to avoid chaos and anarchy as well, the situation calls for "applying the American Idea positively to the future shaping of the Jewish community." To make Jewish diversity beneficial to Jews, America, and world civilization, each Jewish group's "music" must be orchestrated with every other Jewish organization's "music" so a lovely, creative "symphony" will result. To help the Jewish groups produce such a "symphony," what is needed is Jewish unity via a representative, democratic, Jewish communal organization. Such Jewish unity is needed on the international, national, and local levels—and most Jews want Jewish unity.

When he speaks of Jewish unity Kallen is not suggesting that a single organization should take the place of the multitude of Jewish organizations now existing. Concerning an overall organization, Kallen wrote: "There have been many attempts

---


25 Kallen, "The Tercentenary: Yomtov or Yahrzeit?" pp. 9-10.

at the latter [i.e., an over-all Jewish organization], and I must say that I hope that none will be set up for long. What I know of over-all organization in any field, not alone Jewish, makes me afraid of them. Total organizations readily become totalitarian. They are foes of community."

In true cultural pluralist fashion Kallen advocates a Jewish community which is composed of different groups. But all the groups voluntarily unite--come together in unison--while retaining their individuality. The "unum" doesn't replace the "pluribus." Each group would continue to exist, but in friendly cooperation and competition; live-and-help-live would be the rule for each. Such togetherness would help avoid a dictated order, for each group would not seek to suppress the others; each would acknowledge the other's right to its position. Judaists and secular Jews would come to know, understand, respect, and appreciate every other group. An "intellectual free trade" would take place among the groups with each being enriched from the others' ideas and ways. Furthermore, each group would possess an equal opportunity to do better what another group is currently doing. If this enriching, equal-freedom kind of union were achieved, the Jewish community would be a model for how diverse organizations and individuals should live together in peace for the betterment of each and all.

30 Ibid.
Kallen notes that each Jewish group in a particular locality may join many Jewish associations—e.g., a community council, federation, conference, etc. Each such association is meant to serve as a common vehicle of action and communication. The practice of making many diverse "joinings" distinguishes Jewish groups in America from Jewish groups elsewhere. It is indicative of how "Americanized" Jewish groups have become, for such action exemplifies the pluralist society that is the America which sanctions multiple allegiances.  

Freedom and Authority

Although cooperative unions of Jewish organizations for the general Jewish welfare would advance the purpose of enabling Jewish groups to contribute to America and to the American Jewish community, and would also work to the advantage of each group (which could be enriched in ideas and practices by learning when in contact with the others), wealthy and influential Jewish groups remain aloof from such a union. Such groups


32 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 22. Although Kallen uses the particular instance as a basis for making his point about coming together with differences being very American and not undemocratic, the specific instance he utilizes as his springboard is the refusal of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League to join in implementing the 1951 recommendations of Robert M. MacIver that various aspects of Jewish defense work could be more effectively handled by certain groups and that joint planning and other coordinating practices should be initiated by the National Community Relations Advisory Council. See Robert M. MacIver, Report on the Jewish Community Relations Agencies (New York: 1951); Abrahan G. Duker, "The Significance of the MacIver Report," The Reconstructionist, XVII, 1b (Nov. 16, 1951), pp. 7-13; idem, "The Problems of Coordination and Unity," The American Jew: A Reappraisal, ed. Oscar I. Janowsky (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964), pp. 324-336.
practice "authoritarian anarchy"\textsuperscript{33} and call it liberty. The "organized liberty"\textsuperscript{34} of cooperation and democratic procedures in a communal organization they term servitude, undemocratic, un-American. But such an "organization of liberty"\textsuperscript{35} is democracy itself, answers Kallen. The American Idea is the voluntary and organized association of different for the individual and common good--and Jewish groups should adopt and practice the American Idea! What these "democratic" Jewish groups fail to understand is what the American Idea teaches concerning the relationship between freedom and authority.

A Jewish group's freedom is its ground for being itself, for its difference. The group's members can utilize that freedom to advance the group's cause in a friendly or unfriendly way. A group can freely choose to be part of (and make use of) an association of groups--i.e., a communal organization. It does so by having its members delegate agreed-upon authority to the communal organization and by voluntarily consenting to that authority. It does this in order that all participating groups may enjoy equal freedom and safety and serve their respective goals better than they could do alone.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 25.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}.

Therefore, the communal organization that comes into being is a democratic instrument of authority, not of authoritarianism. It is a way for different to unite. The authority exercised by the communal organization is that of the policeman directing traffic; the policeman does his job because people have freely consented to give him that authority and to obey him. Vehicles (groups) of all kinds (sizes and purposes) move on the road (exist together) without endangering one another (threatening one another). The policeman's (communal organization's) authority enables the different vehicles (groups) to do this. But success mostly depends on the participating members and groups being willing to relate to different in friendship and being willing to use and abide by democratic procedures.38

As Theodore Friedman (b. 1908), a Conservative rabbi, has correctly observed, Kallen's ideas on freedom and authority carry "palpable implications for a Jewish community whose organizational pattern must be voluntarism."39

37 Kallen, "Freedom and Authority," p. 452; also see above, pp. 33-34.


Democratic Procedures and the Fight for Democracy

Kallen linked the use of democratic procedures by Jewish groups with the fight for democracy in which Jews and Jewish groups should be in the vanguard.

Kallen hoped that the "willful blindness among the powerful" in American Jewry would soon be a thing of the past and that these leaders of Jewish organizations would soon see that the Jew's fate is inextricably linked with that of democracy's advance. That is why, in 1933, Kallen denounced the American Jewish Committee for urging that Germany be given financial assistance to ease its economic difficulties and that "impersonal secret influence" be used to impress American statesmen with the seriousness of the German situation, especially with what was happening there to the Jews. Kallen urged "unity in presenting the truth about Germany before the public opinion of our country, in mobilizing this opinion, in directing the attention of the elected officials of our government to this opinion." Kallen felt that such open action "is not only our right and our need, it is our duty as citizens of a free country with free institutions." He denounced the American Jewish Committee's approach as "contrary to American methods and American principles." As equals in America it is the Jewish right and obligation to speak up for the cause of democracy and to use democratic, open procedures in so doing.

Kallen, undated talk, probably delivered before the American Jewish Congress at a meeting in N.Y.C., Oct. (?) 1933, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
Kallen, "Hitlerism: What Can We Do?" a lecture at Carnegie Hall in N.Y.C., May 14, 1933, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

Footnotes:
40 1933, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
41 Kallen, "Hitlerism: What Can We Do?" a lecture at Carnegie Hall in N.Y.C., May 14, 1933, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
42 Idem.
43 Idem.
44 Idem.
As we see in this instance and elsewhere, Kallen called upon the Jews to advocate democracy everywhere since "the cause of the Jew cannot be separated from the cause of democracy and freedom everywhere, and that to fight for the latter is inevitably to fight for the Jew." 45a Nevertheless, in 1936, Kallen thought that "public opinion in this country is fatigued with Jewish complaints [concerning anti-Semitism in Poland]; they have heard so much about injustice to the Jews that they pay no more attention to the cries." 46 If pro-Jewish sentiment cannot be fanned now, perhaps anti-Polish sentiment can, suggested Kallen. As a matter of strategy, therefore, Kallen advised that instead of denouncing Poland for being anti-Jewish let the Jews condemn Poland on the basis that Poles are guilty of "doing things that run counter to American feeling and practice" 47 such as not paying debts, militarism, "exploitations through the Catholic church, etc., etc." 48

45 Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikopf, op. cit. (above, note 3, p. 262); Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion, p. 3.

45a Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikopf, op. cit. (above, note 3, p. 262).


47 Ibid.

48 Ibid.
Holding, therefore, that Jews, who are not penalized in a democracy for being Jews, should be in the forefront of democracy's fight (and against totalitarianism), Kallen pointed out that it would surely be inconsistent for Jews to advocate democracy everywhere except in Jewish life. As free and equal citizens of America, Jews should advance democratic principles in the general community as well as in Jewish life. Unfortunately, said Kallen, Jewish leaders seem intent on acting for people rather than with them. The leaders apparently fear the democratic way of having the mass of people participate in the making of goals and actions.

Among the democratic procedures that Kallen supports are free, open, public discussion of the issues and a realistic, scientific analysis of problems. In characteristic support of the freedom to speak one's mind although another may disagree with what has been said, and desirous of insuring a healthy opposition so as to minimize the possibility of dictatorial procedures, Kallen joined in welcoming Zeev Jabotinsky to America in 1940. Kallen said he hoped Jabotinsky would "bring into the structure of Jewish life that fundamental necessity of democratic organization which is lacking."

49 Kallen, untitled and undated talk, probably delivered before a meeting of the American Jewish Congress, Oct. (?), 1914 (above, note 40, p. 279), p. 3.


51 Kallen, "A Public Welcome to Mr. Jabotinsky" (title supplied, untitled in original), Mar. 19, 1940, p. 2, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. Jabotinsky (1890-1940) headed the dissident New Zionist Organization or "Revisionists."

52 Ibid.
Unity To Combat Anti-Semitism

To the non-Jews, Kallen observed, Jews are a united people; but Jews know that this is not nearly as true as the Gentiles believe. Indeed, "no people in the world is as disorganized as are the Jews - wherever they find themselves."53 Yet, Jewish unity is essential, Kallen maintained. 54

Kallen was well aware that too often Jewish unity was forged in the face of a threatened or actual resurgence of anti-Semitism.55 In 1916, he himself wrote of the urgency of Jewish unity for helping the suffering Jews in the Russian Pale as well as Jews living in more liberal lands.56 In 1933, Kallen said that what was taking place in Germany made it essential for the Jewish people to organize itself for common action.57 Jews, he urged, "have to look after themselves first, and it is a pity that they so often do it blindly. In the instance of Hitlerism I think the blindness has been quite apparent to anybody who is aware of the social process."58 (As early as 1933 Kallen accurately perceived that Hitler was holding the Jews not for ransom but for destruction.)59

53 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 152.
54 Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 16.
56 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 86.
58 Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikopf, op. cit. (above, note 3, p. 268).
While anti-Semitism tended to make Jews band together, Kallen noted, when the danger subsided Jewish unity dissolved. Kallen wanted Jewish unity to be based on more than just coping with anti-Semitism. Tragically, however, a number of Jewish groups, especially some Judaist ones, do not want to cooperate—even against the common foe of anti-Semitism.

Just as other groups come together to discuss common problems, so should the Jews—"for self-fulfillment, for service and for self-defence." These purposes, specifically, are: to maintain and develop Hebraic culture and Hebraic ideals as the Jewish people's contribution to civilization; to further the building of the Jewish homeland; to combat anti-Semitism.

Why Past Efforts At Jewish Unity Have Failed

Past efforts to effect Jewish unity have failed, Kallen asserted, because the organizations created—except for the Zionist organization—had several shortcomings. First, they did not have a minimal denominator which would include Jews of every inclination. Second, they did not appeal emotionally to the younger, progressive-minded Jews. Third, for young and old the previous organizations espousing Jewish unity lacked a creative program that would involve them in some activity in

63 Ibid.
addition to philanthropy. Fourth, the leaders of the organizations formed were too often assimilationist Jews who were mesmerized by the "security" Emancipation seemed to offer the Jew. Fifth, these leaders themselves usually operated as if they were authoritarian superiors dealing with stupid inferiors. 64

Kallen saw the Zionist Organization of America, which was founded in 1896, as the first successful attempt to unify the Jews in modern times around a cause that appealed to the Jewish masses. But since the Zionist movement had helped get Palestine's status defined under international law, Kallen felt it had fulfilled its job. 65 What remained was the building of the Jewish homeland, which Zionists and

64 Ibid., p. 12.

65 The mandate for Palestine was awarded Great Britain in April 1920 at San Reno, Italy, at the meeting of the main allied powers after World War I. The Council of the League of Nations, on July 24, 1922, approved the mandate and charged Great Britain with helping to establish the Jewish national home. By 1922, fifty-two governments had endorsed the Zionist movement's fundamental political aims. See Samuel Halperin, The Political World of American Zionism (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1961), p. 9.
non-Zionists could join in doing. To unify the Jewish people, Kallen felt, another movement—other than the Zionist movement—was needed. He hoped that on the international level the World Jewish Congress would be that movement; in America he hoped it would be the American Jewish Congress.

Unity By Means of the American Jewish Congress

In America, Kallen supported attempts to unite American Jews and their groups through the American Jewish Congress. The Congress idea was pushed by Zionist-oriented American Jews, including Kallen, as an endeavor to create a pro-Zionist, democratically elected and run, mass-based organization which would challenge the anti-Zionism of the American Jewish Committee, B'hai B'rith, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The latter three groups had arrogated to themselves the role of self-appointed spokesmen for American Jewry.

66 Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 11. In 1929 the Jewish Agency for Palestine was enlarged to include non-Zionists. Although this effort did not result in the large financial contributions hoped for, it was the beginning of real collaboration between Zionists and non-Zionists for the benefit of Palestine's Jews and, in actuality, the Zionist cause. See Halperin, The Political World of American Zionism, pp. 192-195.

67 Kallen, "Hitlerism and the American Jewish Congress," p. 16.

68 Halperin, The Political World of American Zionism, pp. 150-151. The American Jewish Congress was founded during World War I to help prevent anti-Jewish legislation and to obtain civil rights for the Jews in the post-war years; ibid., p. 150.
Kallen saw the positions of the eager supporters of the Congress idea and the reluctant participation of the other groups as evidence of the struggle between modernism (democracy, Americanism) and pre-modernism (authoritarianism), the desire to be self-respecting, open members of the Jewish people and the assimilationist-minded inclination to shun public Jewish action. 69

Popular elections chose 300 delegates who came together for the first session of the American Jewish Congress on December 15, 1918.

Soon after World War I the American Jewish Congress ceased being an instrument for uniting diverse Jewish groups and became another specific organization. Reorganized in 1922 it became, in effect, a pro-Zionist rival to the three anti-Zionist groups noted above, the American Jewish Committee, B'nai B'rith, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. 70

Kallen, nevertheless, continued to advocate and work for an all-inclusive Congress. Because American Jewry was not organized in such a Congress where its collective will could be evidenced, he felt that the world believes that American Jewry is seriously divided. The world gets that impression, Kallen said, because "we have in this country a

69 Kallen, Zionism and World Politics, p. 148.
little group of obstinate and willful men who speak for themselves alone, against the policies of the American Jewish Congress, which speaks for the decisions of more than two million Jews of all classes and shades of opinion."\(^71\)

With the coming of Hitler and the deterioration of the Jewish position in Germany, Kallen was especially eager that the views of the masses of American Jewry be put forward to the American and other governments as the will of American Jewry. In 1935, a report in a New Orleans newspaper concerning a speech Kallen had given locally quoted him as advocating a Congress "composed of delegates from the great mass of Jews in all parts of the country, in contrast to the present American Jewish Committee, which is made up largely of self-appointed rich and influential Jews, who cannot, as they presume to do, speak for all Jews of America."\(^72\)

Kallen recognized that the members of B'naï B'rith and the American Jewish Congress have a similar background and point of view. However, he warned, the attitude of the leadership of B'naï B'rith is more like that of the American Jewish Committee. Kallen did not refrain from advising B'naï B'rith members "to press in every direction for widening the scope of cooperation between the B'naï B'rith and the Congress and contracting it between the B'naï B'rith and the Committee."\(^73\)


\(^72\) New Orleans (La.) Item, Jan. 18, 1935, a report on Kallen's speech dealing with the "American Jewish Congress," at a luncheon at Le Louisiana in New Orleans, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

Kallen was disappointed in the inability of the Congress to implement its doctrines. He was also disappointed in the individual and organizational bickering which too often manifested itself. Nevertheless, he kept supporting the American Jewish Congress because he felt its ideals, methods, and policies for Jewish life were most consonant with the democratic philosophy of the American Idea and way. 74

Signs of Unity

Although American Jewry is not yet united in a democratic union of the diverse Jewish organizations, Kallen is aware that there has been some progress towards that goal. The National Community Relations Advisory Council unites—mostly in "defense" work—more than fifty local Jewish community councils as well as the main Jewish religious bodies and several national Jewish organizations. The democratically organized Jewish community councils sometimes deal with almost all aspects of Jewish group life. There exists the Synagogue Council of America wherein the national organizations of the Reform, Conservative, and (some) Orthodox Jews co-exist. 75 Periodic gatherings are held of Reform and Conservative (and sometimes, Orthodox) rabbis. Especially notable is the American Association for Jewish Education, which unites many different Jewish educational movements. 76


It remains to be seen whether these hopeful trends will increase and result in a truly national body, a Congress-like organization, wherein all Jewish organizations will come together in union, in equal liberty, and in safety, retaining their particularity but working with one another and communicating with one another for the good of each group and the betterment of Jewry, America, and mankind.

Whether Jewish cooperation for the common good is increased or not is partly dependent on whether a Jew's education, both general and Jewish, has helped him see the desirability of cooperation among the different and has given him the know-how to initiate and maintain a teamplay of the different. Let us consider next, therefore, what kind of Jewish education Kallen urges for American Jews.

Part Four

Jewish Education
CHAPTER IX: GOALS—THE "WHY" OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Introduction

In writing about Horace M. Kallen, Louis L. Ruffman (b. 1904), a Jewish educator, stated that "no field of endeavor is as deeply indebted to him as is that of Jewish education to which he has so generously devoted his rich gifts and dedicated effort." ¹ A 1962 editorial in *Jewish Education* referred to Kallen as "a valued friend and guide to many of us in Jewish education." ² Another observer felt that "it is in the field of education that Horace Kallen has perhaps made his greatest contributions to American and Jewish life." ³ Let us note, therefore, what Kallen has to say about Jewish education, with particular reference to Jewish education in the context of cultural pluralism.


What Education Is

In order to understand Kallen's views on Jewish education, let us first understand what Kallen means by education. Kallen, in an oft-repeated line, states: "Education is survival, survival is education." What Kallen means is that education is what we learn and use in our battle to continue living and to do so safely, freely, and responsibly. In order to live we must learn how to eat, wash, dress, talk, avoid dangers, earn a livelihood, etc. These are some of the specific acts involved in survival. When we learn we gain knowledge (the what) and know-how (the how, the skills or techniques) so we can survive. The education—the learning—we acquire and use helps free us from the fear of things and people (e.g., rain, lightning, new ideas, people who speak a language different from our own), and gives us the power to live with, and make use of, things and persons in our struggle to live safely, abundantly, and happily. Education, or survival, means to seek out, possess, and exercise the power of knowledge and know-how to free ourselves for living on in this way.


5 Kallen, A Study of Liberty, p. xiv; The Education of Free Men, pp. 326-328.

6 Kallen, Philosophical Issues in Adult Education, p. 21; The Education of Free Men, p. x.
extremely unlikely that all the persons, places, and things
which are the means of our education will be of the same
cultural background, each of us learns from many cultures
and faces the task of orchestrating what we have learned
for our education-survival-living in freedom, safety, and
responsibility. 10

Seen in this framework, therefore, when an individual
learns in his earliest childhood at home, and later in
school and elsewhere, his education is culturally condi-
tioned.

In school, which especially concerns us, he is educa-
ted in a specific culture. Each cultural group uses the
school to teach its history, literature, language(s),
songs, ideas, observances, symbols, etc.—its culture. 11
In teaching its beliefs and practices to the next genera-
tion, the group shows its desire to have the young learn
that group's culture and become committed members of that
group. 12 In the education it offers, each cultural group
tries to mold its young into the type of man or woman it
believes is best. 13

10 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 296; "Disen-
 thralment or Extinction," 41,


12 Ibid., pp. 225-226; Individualism, p. 49; "The Adult

13 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. x.
When the cultural group succeeds in transmitting its heritage to the young so that they learn it, digest it, apply it, and add to it, then the group has succeeded in its educational endeavor. If the cultural group does not succeed in teaching the young the ideas and ways of that group with the result that the young do not know the group's beliefs and practices, care neither to utilize them nor to add to them, nor to be willingly identified with the cultural group, then the cultural group is in danger of extinction. The facts of a culture must be taught or else they will be forgotten, will die and be unrecoverable. Cultures cannot be rediscovered and repeated exactly as they had once been. Clearly, therefore, education is not only a tool for the survival of the individual but also for the survival of the cultural group. Especially is this so for the cultures of peoples who have been discriminated against or persecuted. If such peoples do not succeed in capturing the hearts and heads of their young so that they willingly accept and make use of the culture they have learned, and identify with their group despite the afflictions which membership does (or may) bring, then that group's survival is endangered.

This is the challenge to the Jewish group, which has been a victim of discrimination and persecution in many lands and centuries. Fortunately, the Jewish people developed the school and synagogue as places for learning about and experiencing some aspects of Jewish culture; the Jewish people thereby saved Jewish culture (including Jewish religion) from extinction.17

I. Jewish Education for Jewish Survival

Like other cultural groups, the Jewish people's first goal in educating its members was survival of the group. Kallen points out that the makers and developers of Jewish culture made education their chief concern because they "recognized instinctively that education is survival, survival is education."18 Evidence for this, he says, is Deuteronomy 6:6-7, in which the Hebrews were bidden: "And these words which I command you this day shall be in your heart; and you shall teach them diligently to your children."19 If the Jewish tradition can be acquired other than by educating the young in it, why the commandment to teach it? The fact is that the Jewish tradition can't be acquired any other way—nor can the tradition of any other culture.20

17 Kallen, *Judaism At Bay*, p. 173.
18 Kallen, "Dissentralmment or Extinction," 36.
19 Kallen, of course, sees this statement not as a divine command but as a human idea ascribed to God. As a human statement, however, it indicates the value ascribed to education by the early Hebrews. Cf. Kallen, "American Jews: What Now?" 14.
The vital importance of Jewish education, then, becomes clear. Jewish culture is transmitted by Jewish education. By means of Jewish education a Jewish person learns what Jewish culture is and what a Jew is. Through appropriating some of that Jewish culture for oneself an individual makes the vast domain of Jewishness into his particular territory, his heritage. It is through Jewish education that one becomes a Jew by growing into his Jewish identity.

But if a Jewish individual or community does not communicate Jewish culture—the beliefs, practices, and history symbolized by the word "Jew"—to their young, then Jewishness will not survive in those young. To ensure the survival of Jews, therefore, children and adults must be Jewishly educated. "Education embodies both the means and ends of Jewish survival," for a good Jewish education is the means by which Jews are fashioned and voluntarily remain Jews, and Jewish education enables Jewish culture and the Jewish community to continue as growing, living entities, which enhance the lives of individuals, peoples, organizations, institutions, regions, countries, civilization. It is not to be wondered at, accordingly, that Kallen states that "the first and last condition of Jewish living is Jewish education."

25 Ibid., p. 117.
The basic goal of Jewish education, therefore, is survival—survival of the Jewish people and of a living Jewish culture.

II. Jewish Education for Freedom

In order for a person or cultural group to survive, however, he or it must have the freedom to seek the knowledge and know-how for survival. Without that freedom comes a slow death or extermination. Freedom is not only wanted now but it is the goal for which we are struggling—so we can continue to struggle, to live. 26 In calling freedom an "unalienable right" the signers of the Declaration of Independence were showing that they understood the indispensability of freedom for mankind's survival, Kallen declares. 27 It is a free person that democracy wants her young to become. 28

A second goal, therefore, of all education, including Jewish education, is to educate our young and old in a "fighting faith" 29 in freedom. All schools should emphasize freedom as a faith a person should hold dear and endeavor to practice throughout his lifetime. 30

26 Kallen, A Study of Liberty, p. 137; "Disenchantment or Extinction," 39.
27 Kallen, "Disenchantment or Extinction," 39.
29 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. xiii.
30 Ibid., p. xvii; A Free Society, p. 67.
So that he can be free, a person must do several things: liberate himself from dependence on his parents, other teachers, his religion, prejudices and other shackles which seem to have him only repeat a taught past; resist coercion, suppression, limitation. Each person wants the freedom to choose his own way in life.

In striving to translate the faith of freedom into the fact of freedom a person should seek to relate to that which is different from himself so he can possibly learn therefrom, orchestrate this new learning to his past, and thereby become a more responsible, courageous, knowing, fulfilled individual. An education that helps a person do this is a liberal, a liberating, education.

31 Kallen, A Study of Liberty, pp. 6, 24; Art and Freedom, vol. 1, p. 31; Individualism, p. 15; "Freedom and Authority," p. 44.


34 Kallen, "Dissentainment or Extinction," 27. Samuel Dinin (b. 1902), a Jewish educator, in criticizing Kallen's call for an education that liberates, asks from what is education supposed to liberate one. He also asserts that Kallen lacks an underlying educational philosophy. Dinin's criticisms—in his review of Kallen's Education Versus Indoctrination in the Schools (Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1922), Jewish Education, VIII, 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1926), pp. 40-50—do not appear well taken. Kallen has said—in Education Versus Indoctrination in the Schools, p. 22—that instruction should facilitate the learner's "growth in self-rule and self-help." The pamphlet's last sentence—ibid., p. 23—gives an underlying educational philosophy: "...releasing the immense energies of the spirit and powers of reason locked up in each personality, so that each right except many rules and live many lives as cultivated to one another that they nevertheless compose one happy and abundant growth from birth to death."
III. Jewish Education for Understanding and Implementing the American Idea

So that each person and group will have the opportunity to pursue his own survival in liberty and safety, and in as enriching a manner as possible, liberty must be organized. If it were not, the strong could destroy the weak. The organization of freedom which Kallen advocates, of course, is that which is implicit in the American Idea.

Educators, including Jewish educators, should teach pupils to treasure and implement democracy and freedom by advocating and living the American Idea: that individuals and groups have an equal right to exist in their difference and to strive to realize themselves, but they should live together peacefully and in free communication with one another so that each lives freer, stronger, and more abundantly than he could by isolating himself or by attempting to force his beliefs/on other individuals and groups.35

Education for the American Idea is very much part of Jewish education, says Kallen, since Jewish education aims for "the safeguarding and enhancement of freedom through Jewish education of America's Jews."36

This, then, is a third goal of Jewish education: teaching the Jew to understand the American Idea and to carry out his role in implementing it.

35 See above, pp. 50-53.

In some situations the possibility exists that if Jewish pupils don't learn about the American Idea and cultural pluralism (which is part of that Idea) in the Jewish school, they may not get that knowledge and know-how elsewhere. It may happen that the public schools our Jewish children are attending do not practice and/or teach the American Idea and what it means in terms of the orchestration of differences in a free union of the diverse. Especially in that event "it may sometimes be necessary for the Jewish schools to correct the deficiencies of the public school."37

Jewish education in the American Idea, as well as in the details of his Jewish culture, should lead the Jewish pupil to see that he and his fellow Jews are the heirs and fashioners of a Jewish culture which is the equal of all other cultures. He should make the most of that culture for his own life and seek to understand, appreciate, and communicate with individuals and groups different from his own. Jewish "self-segregation" from other cultures is undesirable. Relating to and being enriched by communion with different cultures, the Jew also learns to bring his culture, his Jewish culture, into the non-Jewish world so others can benefit from it and so it can be orchestrated with the other cultures into the American and world cultural unions.38


38 Ibid., p. 226. In a letter to the writer of this thesis--the letter is undated but is c. June 27, 1969--Kallen mentions self-segregation as a "powerful" factor in alienating Jews from Jewish religion and Jewish culture.

Learning the idea and way of cultural pluralism as "a central dynamic in his image of himself," the Jewish pupil finds for himself and his Jewish culture a why and way of living. The individual and his culture aim to more fully realize themselves and others by orchestrating their being with different for their mutual benefit.

Sub-Goals of Jewish Education

In addition to the three main goals of all education which Kallen has suggested and which we have applied to Jewish education—Jewish education for Jewish survival, for freedom, and for understanding and implementing the American Idea—there are a number of sub-goals (we may term them) that Kallen has in mind for Jewish education.

1. Give "Jew" A Positive Meaning:

One sub-goal is to give the word "Jew" a positive meaning for today's Jews so they can live as affirming Jews despite anti-Semitism. Too often, Kallen observes, the word "Jew" is used by people, particularly by Gentiles, in a derogatory way. Unless he learns otherwise, the Jew will accept the negative connotations of the word and will identify "Jew" with something undesirable. He will ask if there is something wrong with him that makes so many non-Jews hate Jews. He will become a victim of Jewish self-hatred, viewing...

\(^{\text{h0}}\) Kallen, "Higher Education," p. 122.

\(^{\text{h1}}\) Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 1.
the label "Jew" he wears as a misfortune, a burden from which he would like to escape. Jewish education "is the most serious problem among Jews," because only a good Jewish education can help Jews learn why being Jewish is a blessing rather than a curse.

So many of today's Jews, lacking the Jewish knowledge which gave past Jewish generations the inner fortitude to maintain their Job-like integrity in an anti-Semitic world, seek to escape their "Jewish" designation. They try to live as human beings (instead of as Jewish human beings), or convert to a non-Judaist religion, or water down their Jewish commitment and practices. It is a goal of Jewish education, Kallen declares, to immunize against such feelings. Jewish education must provide the Jew with "armor of the spirit" so that he wants to live willingly, and can live happily, as a Jew despite the anti-Semitism still existing in the world. The ongoing educational endeavor to give the Jew the wherewithal to do so should begin at the nursery school level.


Ibid.


Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 44. Kallen says it should be expected that public schools also discuss anti-Semitism; Ibid.
Kallen is very much bothered by what he considers Jewish neglect of the effects of anti-Semitism on Jews. He insists that "an indispensable part of the education of Jews - young and old alike - must be a scientific insight into the intent, the way, the works of anti-Semitism." The spiritual armor with which Jews must be girded must include learning why some people hate Jews, how they show that hatred, and how to repel anti-Semitism.

But a negative defense against anti-Semitism is insufficient. To supplant the inferior image of "Jew" a positive image must be taught and learned. Just as Job did not passively submit to God's blows but resisted by making charges of his own, thereby holding fast to his integrity, so should the Jew who is the anti-Semite's target. Let the Jew counter-attack by examining, learning, and making the most of the Jewish values and Jewish culture that the anti-Semite condemns. In so doing, "Jew" will become a wonderfully varied, vibrant, and relevant "configuration of ideas, emotions, attitudes and values" that each Jew will prize.

50 Ibid., p. 54.
51 Ibid., p. 216.
52 Kallen may have had in mind such verses as the following: Job 9:22-24, 33-35; 10:2-3, 7-8; 21:12; 30:21.
54 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 179.
2. Learn the Many Meanings of "Jew"

A second sub-goal in Jewish education is to make it clear that the word "Jew" has many meanings and that a Jew is free to appropriate whichever meaning(s) he wants. "Jew" is a label which could be applied to an advocate of a Jewish religious denomination—the kind of person Kallen calls a "Judaist." The name "Jew," however, can also mean a non-religionist, an anti-religionist, a Zionist, non-Zionist, anti-Zionist, Hebraist, Yiddishist, B'nai B'rith member, etc. Let the pupil know the options he has with the name "Jew."

3. Learn About, Respect, and Cooperate With Other Jewish Groups

A third sub-goal of Jewish education is to sympathetically understand, respect, appreciate, cooperate with, and judge the other Jewish groups.

A good Jewish education should include learning the values, memories, beliefs, and practices of all Jewish groups. The Jewish school should help the student learn how the different Jewish groups came into being, why, what their programs are, how they relate to one another and to the general and Jewish communities, and what might be appropriated from them by individuals, groups, and nations for better, freer living.


Recognizing the equal right of all Jewish groups to their beliefs and practices, the student should be guided to want to have all Jewish groups respect, learn about and from each other, and cooperate with one another in a union of differences via an orchestration of their differences. 57

The wholeness of the American Jewish community, he should learn, consists in a union not only of different individuals but also of diverse local and national Jewish groups, institutions, denominations, organizations, communities, as well as the interactions among them. 58 The wholeness of the world Jewish community, the pupil should come to grasp, consists of the union of all the Jewish individuals, groups, communities, cultures, denominations, organizations, and institutions of every country. 59

Jewish education is challenged to have the Jewish child understand such wholeness and feel a loyalty to their totality. This loyalty is one whereby the individual Jew sees himself part of these larger wholes and wants to contribute to their growth. 60


60 Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikopf, Oct. 25, 1923, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research; letter from Kallen to Samuel M. Silver (b. 1912), a Reform rabbi and editor of American Judaism, Feb. 19, 1954, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2507.
4. Learn the Entire Jewish Heritage

Not only should a student learn the many meanings of "Jew" and the diverse groups existing in Jewish life, he should also be exposed to the totality of the Jewish heritage. This is a fourth sub-goal of Jewish education.

If the entire Jewish heritage—the religious and the secular—is not studied, not only is the organic whole of the Jewish heritage distorted and hurt 61 (as a human body would be if a hand were amputated), but the pupil is being deprived of knowing what the entire Jewish heritage is of which he might wish to make use. It is to this totality of individuals and groups (as well as institutions, organizations, etc.) that Kallen wrote of to Samuel M. Silver when Kallen declared that it is "the paramount necessity of the American Jewish community [to fashion a Jewish education which will]... impart the understanding of and loyalty to the totality of the Jewish being that will assure its growth and achievement." 62


5. Learn the Values of the Jewish Heritage

Because of the special emphasis Kallen places on the values in the Jewish heritage, we make the study of them a separate, fifth sub-goal of Jewish education.

Kallen calls for conducting "an inquiry into the values of the entire Jewish cultural heritage." 63 When the Jews learn these values, Kallen hopes they will do two things: (1) willingly accept the Jewish values and Jewish culture for their own; (2) make the Jewish values and Jewish culture (including Jewish associations) into "the most intimate center of their total and always expanding system of loyalties." 64

Kallen is making a key point here. While each person has certain fundamental values which "serve him as the prime dynamic of his free personal commitments, of his entire system of values, as the form of faith and works on which he ultimately bets his life," 65 Kallen would have the "vital root" 66 of values for the Jew be a cluster of Jewish values. It is on this base of values from his Jewish heritage that Kallen would have the Jew stand.

63 Kallen, "Of Then Which Say They Are Jews," p. 117.
64 Kallen, "Goals for Jewish Education," p. 176.
65 Ibid., pp. 175-176.
In learning and making use of the Jewish values of the Jewish heritage, Jewish children and adults are enabled to liberate their own powers to grow in freedom. They accept their Jewishness and use its values as vehicles for living more fulfilled lives. Though many Jews might think there is nothing Jewish about the public school classroom, the playground, or the place where the Jew earns his living, pupils should be taught that Jewish values should pervade whatever we do and the way we see the world wherever we happen to be. Although these values may be changed somewhat, or added to, as the results of contacts with peoples different from his own, for the most part these Jewish values should remain the nuclear center of living values for the Jew.

It is these values to which Jews should be committed as a unit in the value systems of America. It is Jewish values that Jews should contribute to the American cultural river. As Kallen put it in a letter to T. S. Eliot, Jews should "release into the nation's economy specifically Jewish insights and expressions that will serve and strengthen it" as well as world civilization.

71 Letter from Kallen to T. S. Eliot, op. cit. (above, note 121, p. 40).
system results from an orchestration of the Jewish, and other, value systems. Jews should feel a quiet pride as members of a group, the Jewish group, which is cooperating within the framework of the American Idea to promote and help fashion the democratic values of America.

In being charged with helping Jewish pupils to learn the Jewish values, accept them willingly as their own, live them as the vital core of their value system, and bring these values into a teamplay of different value systems so the American and world value systems might be better fashioned, Jewish education is being challenged with a very difficult but very important task.

6. Contribute to the American Educational Process

Not only Jewish values can be contributed to America by the Jewish group. The Jewish schools themselves can make specific contributions to the American educational process. This is a sixth sub-goal of Jewish education.


73 Cf. letter from Kallen to Howard A. Cowden (b. 1893), a business executive and the president of the Consumers Cooperative Association, Dec. 2, 1957, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 970.
Kallen suggests that since Jewish schools are often small in enrollment they could conduct experiments in the principles, methods, and subject matter of education and democracy; most larger public schools could not readily undertake such experiments.\textsuperscript{74} In line with the cultural pluralist idea of cooperation and learning from one another, Kallen urges the Jewish school to share its educational discoveries with the general American educational system and thereby contribute to the nation's educational progress.

Such contributions can also be made by large Jewish institutions. For instance, in a 1958 letter to Benjamin Fine, who became associated with Yeshiva University's then newly-established Graduate School of Education, Kallen stated that he was "very intrigued"\textsuperscript{75} at the idea of a non-sectarian graduate school/like Yeshiva University. He praised the establishment of such a graduate school at Yeshiva University as "a vindication of the American idea,"\textsuperscript{76} for the school becomes a Jewish contribution to the general American educational system. Kallen goes on to say that such a school is more likely to be successful "in a Jewish, even an orthodox Jewish, than in a non-Jewish setting."\textsuperscript{77} Presumably Kallen feels that Jews are more likely to permit free inquiry—untainted by religious prejudices—in such a school.

\textsuperscript{74} Kallen, "Prejudice - The American Way," 26.

\textsuperscript{75} Letter from Kallen to Benjamin Fine, March 2, 1958, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 972.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
The conducting of educational experiments, including the operation of Jewish-sponsored schools open to Jews and non-Jews, are but two examples of possible contributions to the American educational river that the Jewish educational stream can make.

2. Learn How To Live In Today's World

A seventh sub-goal of Jewish education is to help Jews live in today's scientific, industrial world. This not only means taking account of how to approach the prospect of living in a gadget-oriented and scientific-method dominated society, it also implies helping children and adults to see the classroom and the outside world as one area. When the child completes his or her formal schooling and goes out to make a living, there should be no chasm in his or her outlook and actions between the school and the job. A person's Jewish and non-Jewish educations—duly orchestrated—should help an individual understand that one's livelihood is not only for the purpose of earning money but, primarily, to enable one to lead an abundant, fulfilling life. And people must be educated, in the Jewish school too, to see the equal importance for society of all honest jobs.


In today's world, says Kallen, one's work and cultural pursuits are separate areas. 30 One result of this division among Jews is that a group of professional Jews has come into being whose work is in Jewish culture. They are the Jewish professors at Jewish schools, the rabbis, principals and teachers in Jewish schools, directors of national Jewish organizations, etc. These men and women become knowledgeable Jews while the other Jews, whose livelihood work is not in the Jewish field, have little time and desire to learn Jewish culture. An isolation consequently develops among Jews between the Jewish-professional Jews and the non-Jewish-professional Jews. The latter often are satisfied to let the former do the Jewish studying and Jewish living. Largely ignorant of their Jewish heritage, the non-Jewish-profession Jews tend to emulate Gentile ideas and ways. Some may even yearn to divest themselves of their "Jewish" label and become Christians.

Kallen asserts that Jewish education, beginning with the children, must struggle to orchestrate the worlds of work and Jewish culture for all Jews. Jewish culture must be made, and seen to be, relevant to the world of the public school, the job, the laboratory, and factory. 31


Summary

We have noted the three main goals Kallen suggests for Jewish education and have applied them to the Jewish school: Jewish education for Jewish survival, for freedom, and for understanding and implementing the American Idea. We have also outlined the seven sub-goals Kallen emphasizes: that the word "Jew" must be given a positive meaning; that the many options on what "Jew" means should be learned; that pupils should learn about, respect, and cooperate with all Jewish groups; that the entire Jewish heritage should be available for study in the Jewish school; that a special effort should be directed at learning the values of the Jewish heritage, making them one's own, and bringing them into the open society; that Jewish schools can make experimental and other contributions to the American educational process; that Jews must learn to live in today's world, a world where the increasing distance between work and culture, between the Jewish-profession Jew and the non-Jewish-profession Jew, must be lessened.

These goals of Jewish education are meant for children and adults who are being exposed to a Jewish education in a variety of places.

Let us now consider where Jewish education takes place.
CHAPTER X: PLACES--THE "WHERE" OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Introduction

Where does Jewish education occur? Which places are deliberately utilized by the Jewish group for the deliberate transmission of its heritage? Let us note what Kallen has to say about "where" Jewish education takes place in our day in America.

I. Family

A child's earliest Jewish education takes place in the family circle. The parents help give a child his Jewish identity by exposing him to certain attitudes, symbols, words, prayers, food habits, holiday celebrations, ideas, preferences, people, etc.¹ By age three, in Kallen's opinion, a person's "postures of the mind and qualities of feeling"² are more or less set. A child, therefore, whose early environment included Jewish experiences is on his way to "that organic union of inner peace and outer freedom which signify happiness in a Jewish community."³ He knows he is a Jew. He knows, to some extent, what it means to be a Jew. He is likely, therefore, to be sound in his Jewish health.

¹ Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, pp. 60-61; Judaism At Bay, p. 237; "American Jews, What Now?" 27.


A specific example of Kallen's advice to Jewish parents regarding early Jewish education may be read in a letter of Kallen's dated September 12, 1958. In replying to a woman who asked for help in raising her three-year-old son, Mark, in a Jewish way, Kallen answered that "the Jewish part of his Jewish being in his growth as a man and as a citizen is, of course, central." At such a young age there was little his parents could do for Mark, wrote Kallen, "except to keep exposing him to the positive Jewish influences of the home and community." He added that "in another year you will want to send him to an adequate [Jewish] nursery school."  

II. Nursery School

It is likely that Kallen does have a Jewish nursery school in mind for young Mark, for elsewhere he has spoken of the need to begin—at the nursery-school level—to give Jews the inner fortitude to live willingly and happily as Jews despite anti-Semitism. Moreover, Kallen has suggested that "infant education must become a Jewish charge on the Jewish community" because in those years there is no

4 Letter from Kallen to Mrs. Charlotte R. Kramer of Shaker Heights, Ohio, Sept. 12, 1958, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 974.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

7 Kallen, "Current Trends in America and Their Implications to Jewish Survival," p. 4; see above, note 48, p. 302.

8 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 232.
rivalry between the public school and the Jewish school for the child's time. (Since attendance at nursery school is not mandatory, it would be logical to assume that Kallen includes the period at nursery school as falling within the time-span of "infant education.") It is mainly because in the child's early years his Jewish education could be primary that Kallen argues for the Jewish community to become involved with the Jewish education of the very young. Let the Jewish community do what it can to see that the best job of Jewish education is done for the youngster during those relatively free, but very impressionable, years.

III. Jewish Day Schools

Although it is to the after-public-school-hours Jewish school that most of Kallen's remarks on Jewish education apply, he is well aware of the existence of Jewish day schools. Some of his views on Jewish day schools may be gathered from his inked notations on a three-page mimeograph statement entitled "The Jewish Day School." ⁹

⁹ This statement was based on a discussion by, and consensus of, the members of the Commission on Jewish Affairs of the American Jewish Congress, who met on Jan. 10, 1963, at Congress House, in N.Y.C. See: Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 973. For a detailed discussion of the Jewish day school movement in the United States, see Alvin I. Schiff, The Jewish Day School (New York: Jewish Education Committee Press, 1966).
Although Kallen believes that Judaism\textsuperscript{10} can survive in the United States without Jewish day schools,\textsuperscript{11} he favors the formation of additional Jewish day schools if Jewish parents feel a need for more of them.\textsuperscript{12} However, the Jewish day school is a "desirable...but not any essential"\textsuperscript{13} means for creative Jewish survival in the United States. He does not think it desirable that every Jewish child attend such a school.\textsuperscript{14} Nor, even if they were desirable for all Jewish children, does he believe that Jewish day schools are realistic possibilities for most youngsters; the financial burden, teacher shortage, and small student body would be but three problems too difficult for most Jewish parents and communities to overcome.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} In the Congress statement, "Judaism" is the only term used. Apparently, the religious and secular components are meant to be included in that word.

\textsuperscript{11} Kallen gave an affirmative answer to: "Can Judaism survive without any Jewish Day School?" Statement, "The Jewish Day School," p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 973.


\textsuperscript{13} Statement, "The Jewish Day School," p. 3.

\textsuperscript{14} Kallen ined "No" to this question: "Do we desire, as the Catholic Church does, that the ultimate objective is every Jewish child in a Day School?" Ibid., p. 1. Kallen had also said—in his talk at the 70th birthday celebration of Albert P. Schoolman, op. cit. (above, note 1, p. 3—that "my entirely objective and sympathetic studies of the Day School doesn't [sic] encourage me to believe that it is the solution of the problems of Jewish survival which the conditions of life set."

Two possible sources of funds for Jewish day schools are Jewish communal funds and the federal government. Kallen favors giving Jewish day schools some money from Jewish communal funds if the local Jewish day schools will coordinate their operation with their community's Jewish educational coordinating agencies. However, Kallen opposes using government funds to help finance any part of the program of a Jewish day school or any religious school.

16 Kallen wrote "Yes" to question 5: "Should such [Jewish communal welfare money] support be conditional upon the co-ordination of the operation of the Jewish Day School with the community educational coordinating bodies?" Statement, "The Jewish Day School," p. 3.

17 Ibid. Kallen opposes expending government funds for the so-called non-religious aspects of any Jewish or non-Jewish day school. He views such arrangements as "entering wedges that might turn the schools into sectarian instruments and make it end in the use of school funds for specialized religious instruction. They ought to be opposed on the general principle that religion is a matter of private conscience and should not in any way be a task or a burden on the necessary education provided for in the public schools, that any confusion of school and church is a danger to the position of the Bill of Rights, and with the highest respect and good will for religious interest, it has to be discouraged for the protection of those very interests." See the letter from Kallen to Hyman J. Ettlinger (b. 1889), professor of mathematics at the Univ. of Texas, Apr. 1, 1937, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. Desirous of keeping church and state separate, Jewish educational institutions, says Kallen, have not tried to impinge on the public school with the demand, for example, of less time for public school instruction and more time for Jewish school instruction; nor have Jewish schools made other demands on the public schools. See Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 205.
In the statement, "The Jewish Day School," question 3 is: "Does the Jewish Day School lead to ghettoization of the Jewish community?" As his answer Kallen wrote: "May or may not." Yet, in commenting on a section of part 3 of question 6—"The Jewish Day School should not lead to ghettoization of the Jewish community"—Kallen underlined the words "should not" and inked in "cannot."

There is an apparent contradiction in his answers. We venture an explanation. Kallen's answer to the third question means that in his eyes the teaching in the Jewish day school may or may not result in some Jewish pupils--and in some other members of the Jewish community--choosing to isolate themselves from as much contact with Gentiles and non-Jewish cultures as they could ordinarily have.

Kallen's comment on that section of question six means that we live in a country whose citizens are mostly non-Jewish and where contacts with Gentiles and non-Jewish cultures are virtually inevitable. Moreover, as a cultural pluralist who holds that the United States is a democracy which encourages the mingling of diverse peoples and cultures for their mutual benefit, Kallen would insist that it is un-American for the Jewish community to bury itself in a hole of only Jewish concerns and contacts.

---

18 Statement, "The Jewish Day School," p. 3.
19 Ibid.
In the statement, "The Jewish Day School," question 3 is: "Does the Jewish Day School lead to ghettoization of the Jewish community?" As his answer Kallen wrote: "May or may not."\(^{18}\) Yet, in commenting on a section of part 3 of question 6—"The Jewish Day School should not lead to ghettoization of the Jewish community"—Kallen underlined the words "should not" and inked in "cannot."

There is an apparent contradiction in his answers. We venture an explanation. Kallen's answer to the third question means that in his eyes the teaching in the Jewish day school may or may not result in some Jewish pupils—and in some other members of the Jewish community—choosing to isolate themselves from as much contact with Gentiles and non-Jewish cultures as they could ordinarily have.

Kallen's comment on that section of question six means that we live in a country whose citizens are mostly non-Jewish and where contacts with Gentiles and non-Jewish cultures are virtually inevitable. Moreover, as a cultural pluralist who holds that the United States is a democracy which encourages the mingling of diverse peoples and cultures for their mutual benefit, Kallen would insist that it is un-American for the Jewish community to bury itself in a hole of only Jewish concerns and contacts.

\(^{18}\) Statement, "The Jewish Day School," p. 3.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.
Part of this "ghettoization" matter is the question of teaching for Jewishness and Americanness in the Jewish day school. Kallen, who opposes isolating oneself and one's home-taught culture from contacts with other peoples and cultures, wants "no intellectual segregation" inside or outside the Jewish day school between one's Jewishness and Americanness. They should be so orchestrated as to enable a person to live in an integrated, union-ized wholeness.

IV. Public Schools

Kallen was an early proponent of Jewish studies in public high schools. Decades ago he observed that Irish history was introduced into Boston's public high schools because many Irish lived in Boston; Scandinavian languages were in the public schools of Minnesota because many Scandinavians resided there. Likewise, Kallen argued, if many Jews reside in a certain geographical area Jewish subjects could also be taught in public schools.

20 Ibid.

21 An intriguing proposal for a pluralistic, non-parochial, bi-cultural day school—put forward by Benjamin Hollander and Judith Hollander, in "Proposal for A Pluralistic Day School," Reconstructionist, XXXVI, 2 (Mar. 27, 1970), 23-25—would surely win Kallen's support as a fine attempt to orchestrate the American and diverse ethnic cultures. The proposal suggests general courses for everyone in the morning; in the afternoon there would be special religious and ethnic subjects (e.g., Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, Black, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Italian), formulated and administered by each of the religious or ethnic groups for its adherents. Courses and programs designed to foster appreciation of cultures and religions other than one's own would also take place. Arthur J. Abrams—in "A Pluralistic Day School," Reconstructionist, XXXVI, 6 (May 29, 1970), 27-28—tells something about San Francisco's Multi-Cultural Institute, where such a school functions.

22 Kallen, speech at the Second Menorah Convention, 85.
Even if no Jews live in the community a school should include elements of the Jewish heritage in its regular course of study, as part of the humanities. They should be treated on an equal basis with the other subjects that comprise Western culture and world civilization.

V. Colleges

At the undergraduate and post-graduate levels of college one can also pursue Jewish studies. It is easy to understand that Kallen, an advocate of diverse peoples and cultures learning from each other and living together in harmony, would also call for intellectual (and social) variety in our colleges. Since Jewish culture is one of the cultures comprising world civilization, and a culture from which everyone has the possibility of learning something that could enrich his life, Kallen wants part of the program of studies in a general school of learning to be the history and culture of the Jewish people.


26 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, p. 186.
Kallen is particularly concerned that Jews and non-Jews should have the opportunity of studying the Hebrew language and literature in schools of higher learning. Kallen states that the Hebrew language and literature are not being studied in such schools or are segregated from the other classical languages and literatures studied and read in the humanities by being placed in a Religion department. This is done because many Jews and non-Jews have associated the Hebrew language with religion. But why should Hebrew classics like the Jewish Bible be ignored, or isolated, or studied less than the classics of ancient Greece and Rome?²⁷ Considering its influence on American and European history and thought, Kallen argues, Hebrew is as much a Western language as it is a Near Eastern language and should be regarded "as European as Greek and Latin."²⁸

Kallen would have those who are devoted to Hebrew and/or Jewish culture try to change the situation by making Hebrew language and literature equal subjects of study with other languages and literatures that have helped form Western culture. Hebrew can then become a living possibility again for the person of culture. Hebrew can become a living source, with other sources, for enriching an individual and society.²⁹

²⁷ Kallen, "Address By Prof. Horace M. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," p. 5.

²⁸ Letter from Kallen to Max Kleinbaum (b. 1913), of Brandeis Univ., Mar. 13, 1958, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 97b.

When colleges and universities do not include Jewish studies as part of Western culture, they are not only saying that the Jewish people and Jewish culture have played no significant part in the formation of Western culture, but they are also denying the existence of a Judeo-Christian heritage. Surely any person desirous of knowing that Judeo-Christian heritage—and its existence is another obvious proof that Jews are part of the Western world—must study the Jews and Jewish culture.

Because Kallen sees Hebrew and other Jewish studies as part and parcel of Western, Judeo-Christian culture, and because he opposes isolation of anything, while favoring interrelationships among different, he is against segregating Jewish studies in a special department.

30 Kallen, "Address By Prof. Horace M. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," p. 5. Kallen also wrote—in a letter to Max Kleinbaum, op. cit. (above, note 28, p. 322)—that the rebirth of the State of Israel did not change the fact that the most important part of the Jewish experience for today "is what happened to Jews and what they accomplished after they left the Mediterranean area."


32 Kallen, "What Actually Is "Jewish Welfare" in America?" 204; letter from Kallen to Philip W. Lown (b. 1890), philanthropist and vice president of the American Association for Jewish Education, Nov. 28, 1960, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2502.
exults in the fact that at the New School for Social Research, with which he has been associated since its founding in 1919, Jewish studies are incorporated into the regular course of studies as an equal part of world culture. Whatever period of Western culture is studied, the Jewish and non-Jewish elements are learned as part of the orchestrated whole. 33

VI. Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning

Turning from general institutions of higher learning to Jewish institutions at this level, Kallen wrote of what role education should occupy in them. In 1957, he wrote to Abraham A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College, that all Jewish institutions of higher learning should make educational theory and practice their major concern. 34

While Kallen did not say this specifically of rabbinical schools, his remarks about Jewish theological seminaries make it clear that he is very much concerned with also making them more effective educational institutions. In a letter to Jacob Billikopf, Kallen did contend that although rabbis have only rarely demonstrated the kind of "spiritual leadership" 35 needed

33 Kallen, "Memorandum on the New School," four typewritten and undated sheets, p. 2, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2515.

34 Letter from Kallen to Abraham A. Neuman (1890-1970), Mar. 29, 1957, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2504.

35 Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikopf, op. cit. (above, note 60, p. 305). In "Retrospect and Prospect, 1932," Kallen wrote that increased contact with rabbis had convinced him, among other things, that the idealism of young men entering the rabbinate is soon disfigured by what they must deal with as they practice their profession. See Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 249.
in the face of the problems confronting American Jewish communities, he believes that the rabbinate is "one of the most significant agencies for service to the Jewish spirit which is available in this country." 36 To help improve its standards and personnel, he adds, is a task in which all should share. 37

Kallen made several suggestions for improving rabbinical training. A rabbi's job, he said, is "to minister religiously to the modern Jews." 38 Rabbinical school students, therefore, should concentrate on the Jews and Jewish communities of today and the recent yesteryear. Less attention should be given to the Jewish past and more to the Jewish present. 39 Moreover, not only the Judaist elements in the Jewish tradition should potential rabbis study but also the

36 Letter from Kallen to Jacob Billikof, op. cit. (above, note 60, p. 305).

37 In the same letter to Jacob Billikof, ibid., Kallen said that he was glad that Billikof was actively participating in an endowment campaign for the benefit of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. One might ask how Kallen, himself not a Judaist, could endorse a drive for funds that would benefit a Judaist institution. His position should not come as a surprise. In seeing the Jewish community as a union of diverse groups and institutions, Kallen would support any group or institution which makes a positive contribution to the welfare of some Jews or Judaists, for the Jewish people and Jewish culture are enriched thereby. As Kallen phrased it in the letter: "Every institution which tends to intensify the intelligent loyalty of Jews to what is significant in their own cultural inheritance and to correlate what is important and noble in the Jewish tradition with what is most vital in modern trends of thought, should receive the utmost support."

38 Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 217.

non-Judaist elements as well as American matters (i.e., what Jews and Jewish culture can learn from America). The students should also learn how Jewish organizations, institutions, and communities are structured, how they function, and how they interact with other people, groups, and institutions. The rabbis-to-be should study the makeup, hopes, and fears of American Jews and how rabbis can utilize Judaism—and suggest that others use it—so that American Jews become happier, freer people. Rabbis must help contemporary Jews become creative users of the Jewish past so as to live on in a more fulfilled way.

An interesting proposal is that rabbinical school students spend two years in the field under the supervision of qualified teachers. In the real world they would see how Jews actually live and behave. They would also have the opportunity to discover how Judaism could affect Jews for the better (or worse), and they could try to make Judaism a more effective means for Jewish fulfillment.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., pp. 213-214.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p. 217.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 218.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 214.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 218.
Another suggestion of Kallen's, made in 1925, still seems to have relevance: instead of rabbinical schools trying to give Jewish clergy-to-be a course of study designed more for Jewish scholars, separate the training of rabbis from that of Jewish scholars. Let there be rabbinical schools for potential rabbis and other schools for the training of scholars in Judaica. Rabbinical schools, of course, would make available to their students the results of Jewish scholarship; the emphasis, however, in the rabbinical schools should be not on how the scholarly findings were arrived at but what their implications are for rabbis who want to help today's Judaists and Jews.

VII. Jewish Clubs and Youth Groups

For those who wish, and are able to take advantage of the educational resources at each level, the usual progression of schooling is from the family home through the postgraduate school. During these years and later, however, there are also some informal Jewish educational opportunities. Let us consider what Kallen has to say about them.

Kallen is familiar with the variety of Jewish clubs and youth groups available in America. He sees them as creations of sponsoring organizations desirous of winning adherents among the new generations and thereby assuring the continuity

\[45\] Ibid., pp. 218-219.

\[46\] Ibid., p. 219.
of their groups or organizations. They are examples of the free-enterprise doctrine applied to Jewish life. If they enable the Jew to learn something of his Jewish heritage and to mesh that learning with his past for a better tomorrow, if they enable the learner to rejoice in his Jewishness, then they are worthwhile.

VIII. Jewish Summer Camps

As for Jewish children's camps, Kallen sees them as potentially excellent vehicles/bettering Jews and the Jewish tomorrow. Such camps—if they are based on the approach of free inquiry, learning with a minimum of adult guidance, giving Jews opportunities to experience being Jewish as a delight, bringing together Judaists and Jews of varied religious and secular loyalties in a common venture, emphasizing a live-and-help-live orchestration of Jewish, American, and other interests—are a precious blessing. Such camps constitute "the most reliable solution that we have at this moment" for dealing constructively with the problems of Jewish survival in the modern world.

Kallen states that Jewish camps will hopefully generate the commitment of the Jewish young to "the Jewish Idea," the voluntary orchestration of all Jewish individuals and groups in a live-and-help-live way for the equal liberty, safety, and abundance of each and all.

48 Kallen, talk at the 70th birthday celebration of Albert P. Schoolman, op. cit. (above, note 1, p. 216), p. 3.
49 Ibid.
IX. *Hillel Foundations*

Another possible place of Jewish learning is the Hillel Foundation on many college campuses, which serves the Jewish needs of the Jewish college students. The fact that Hillel is predicated on uniting Jews of diverse secular and religious backgrounds in common endeavors—without ignoring the differences among the individuals—obviously appeals to the union-despite-diversity outlook of Kallen.

In Hillel activities, too, Kallen is interested in Jews having opportunities to experience the delights in being Jewish. We see this in a letter he sent, in 1963, to Jack J. Cohen, director of Bet Hillel in Jerusalem. Kallen wrote that Hillel programs should "accent the Simsha rather than the Torah in the perennial Simchat Torah that belongs to the life of the mind." 50 In other words, Kallen does not want those who are charged with suggesting, organizing, and directing Hillel programs to make them into more classroom-like experiences. At the college level and elsewhere, Kallen wants Jews to experience the fun and freedom of learning and living their Jewishness.

50 Letter from Kallen to Jack J. Cohen, Jan. 6, 1963, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 270.
X. The Jewish Center

These two points—Jewish union-with-diversity and experiencing joy in one's Jewishness—are very much why Kallen was an early proponent of the Jewish potentiality of the Jewish Community Center movement. The very name, Jewish Community Center, suggests to Kallen a union of the many Jews and non-Jews in a community for common activities. Since the Center attracts Jews of every age and outlook, it is best suited, in Kallen's opinion, to "provide a common roof for every Jewish interest." The Center is to be praised for it does not attempt to propagandize for a special denominational or factional position but strives to welcome all Jews and to have Jews orchestrate their Jewish education with their other education.

In 1910, Kallen stated that the Jewish Center, "of all Jewish institutions seems to me best fitted to sustain and vindicate" a faith in the "democratic cultivation of positive \[Jewish\] values." The end purpose, of course, is to better enable Jews to integrate these Jewish values with, and to play their Jewish part in, "the total interplay of community values in the democratic orchestration of communities and cultures which is our country."

52 Ibid.
55 Ibid., p. 52.
56 Ibid., p. 53.
While this should be the basic orientation of Jewish Centers, said Kallen, it is regrettable that they, like other Jewish institutions and organizations, seem bent on doing things with no thought-out philosophy of Jewish life undergirding and pervading their activities. So many Center programs consciously or unknowingly ignore Jewish values and emulate non-Jewish values, ways, and programs. Moreover, instead of specifically Jewish activities—such as classes in Jewish subjects, prayer services, and celebrations of Jewish holidays and Jewish literary events—being integrated into the Center's regular programs, they are segregated into a special Jewish department. 57 It is unfortunate that more programs of general content than of Jewish content are being held in Jewish Centers, Kallen lamented. 58 What Kallen had hopefully described, in 1930, as a change in direction by the Center movement—from an institution aiming to Americanize (= de-Judaize) the American Jew to one aiming towards his "Judaization"— 59 was not coming to pass.

Not that Kallen opposes programs of general content. On the contrary. He advocates offering Jews, under Jewish auspices (as in the Jewish Center), what they are getting or could get under such Christian auspices as the WCA

57 Ibid., p. 52; cf. above, note 32, p. 323.
58 Letter from Kallen to Sanford Solender, op. cit. (above, note 11, p. 270).
59 Kallen, Judaism At Play, p. 229.
(Young Men's Christian Association). Kallen approves of sports and general cultural courses, for example, being offered in the Jewish Center. 60 To Kallen, even when a Jew goes to a Jewish Community Center for an activity he can enjoy elsewhere, he is going as a Jew. 61 If sports, classes in typewriting, or whatever, are conducted in a Jewish Center, says Kallen, a Jewish content is automatically given these activities. At least in these programs the Jew is with other Jews and has the opportunity of fellowship with them. 62 Whatever programs they join in as Jews become thereby experiences of Jewish life. 63

Kallen holds that there will be a special emotional and intellectual emphasis on an activity taking place in a Jewish Center which would not be the same if offered elsewhere. Each ethnic group possesses a distinctive "posture of mind...personal attitude, which colors the activity, which imparts to it a certain timbre. There is an emotional tone that distorts the material much or slightly, that throws it into a different perspective." 64 In essence, Kallen is referring here to the cultural differences among people: the Jewish culture may emphasize certain approaches

60 Ibid., p. 228.
61 Ibid., p. 229.
62 Ibid., pp. 227, 229.
63 Ibid., pp. 227-228.
64 Ibid., p. 230.
(e.g., the intellectual) and emotional reactions (e.g., a special degree of distress at an act of disrespect towards an aged person) that are somewhat different from those generally found among people reared in the English, Scandinavian, or Chilean cultures, for instances.

To have Center activities become enriching experiences of Jewish group life, Jewish Center workers should provide programs and ways of doing things which will make for a beneficial Jewish group life. It is not sufficient, therefore, for the Center to be satisfied with housing programs for Jews. Nor is it sufficient to unite all family members (grandparents, parents, and children) in a common activity. All programs must be set in a Jewish perspective, suffused with the particular intellectual and emotional nuances from the Jewish cultural heritage, so that these programs can be seen, experienced, and utilized for strengthening the Jewish commitment of Jews, vitalizing the Jewish heritage, and contributing to improving America's national life. Center personnel must help Jews view their Center activities as links related to other Jewish and general interests, orchestrating with them in their making of the

---

65 Ibid., p. 227.
67 Letter from Kallen to Sanford Solander, op. cit. (above, note 11, p. 270); Judaism At Bay, p. 229.
Jewish and American cultures, taking from as well as con-tributing thereby "to the Cultural Pluralism which consti-tutes the spirit of civilized mankind."  

Kallen mentions two specific ways in which the Jewish Center could have Jewish culture contribute to the enriching cultural pluralism of the United States. One way is through the arts (music, dancing, dramatics, painting, etc.); the other way is through cooperating with non-Jewish groups on common issues.

Kallen holds that the arts most easily communicate a culture's content and spirit. Essential to the Center's program, therefore, is for Jews to work in the arts. Their artistic endeavors will help both Jews and Gentiles to learn about and appreciate aspects of Jewish culture. Furthermore, work in the arts is often fun. Thus, such activities will enable Jews to be associating Jewish expression with something pleasurable. Jewishness will be a


69 Ibid., p. 56. Kallen declares that Jews have expressed Jewish ideas in the arts throughout history. He avers that the Jewish style in the arts is conveyed only by a person who knows Jewish culture, or who uses designs commonly recognized as Jewish, or who expresses moods which Jewish people think of as being Jewish. See Kallen, "Appraisal of A. Raymond Katz," unpublished, four typewritten pages, undated (c. Dec. 1, 1962), p. 1, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2501.

70 Ibid., p. 56. Kallen, himself an amateur painter of modern art, is enthusiastic about Jews utilizing painting and sculpture as a means of expressing themselves Jewishly. With supernaturalism diminishing in Judaism, he sees art not as religion's handmaiden to advance religion's cause but as an item of life in its own right, one which can make for greater fulfillment and liberation of the human spirit. See Kallen, Liberty, Laughter and Tears, p. 32; Art and Freedom, vol. 1, pp. 25, 31; Ideals and Experiences, p. 41.
source of rejoicing—not disaster—in their minds. In addition, when the results of these Center artistic endeavors are made available to the general community, as in concerts, dramatic productions, exhibits of painting and sculpture, the non-Jews will be impressed with this Jewish enrichment of their personal—as well as the community's, state's, and nation's—culture. The Gentiles will be influenced to favor maintaining and improving Centers which make such positive cultural contributions. 71

A second way for the Jewish Center to contribute to American and world culture is for the Center to join other Jewish and non-Jewish organizations in furthering democratic causes such as civil rights. 72 Jews, who are especially obligated to democracy for giving the Jewish group and the Jewish individual freedom and equal rights, should be among the leaders in the struggle to defend democracy.

Whether a particular Center program involves working only with Jews, or also with non-Jews, the Center's activities must all be geared to affirming Jewish culture and urging the deliberate relating of Jewish cultural endeavors to the general American mainstream. This will result in an enrichment of the Jewish and general cultures; it will also help to transform—at least for the Jews participating in the programs—a possible negative view of "Jew" to a positive, self-respecting one.

71 Kallen, "Of Those Which Say They Are Jews," p. 56.
72 Ibid.; also see above, pp. 267-271.
Summary

We have noted some of the certain (e.g., the family) and possible (e.g., Jewish camp) places where the Jewish child or adult might have the opportunity of extending and deepening his or her Jewish education. Beginning with the family we have indicated some of Kallen's observations on the Jewish education that is currently—and that should be—offered in the Jewish nursery school, Jewish day school, public school, college, Jewish institution of higher learning, Jewish club and youth group, Jewish summer camp, Hillel Foundation, and Jewish Center.

Having pointed out what Kallen considers the goals of Jewish education to be and where this education might take place, let us consider what should be taught, how teachers should teach, and how pupils should learn. Indeed, as Kallen maintains, whatever Jewish future there is for the Jewish people in the United States is likely to be decided in these areas of what and how in Jewish classrooms.73

Let us proceed to look into what Kallen has to tell us about what should be studied.

CHAPTER XI: CURRICULUM--THE "WHAT" OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Introduction

Before considering Kallen's comments on specific items in the Jewish school's course of study, let us take note of three points that Kallen touches on which are related to what should be taught. The three items are: the effects of modernity; whether certain subjects are more effective than others in shaping character; the importance of satisfying children's needs in the course of study.

The Effects of Modernity

When the Jews were physically and culturally discriminated against and, often isolated, in most countries of Europe before the nineteenth century, the course of study in Jewish schools remained basically the same. Chumash was the stepping-stone to the more difficult Talmud. But with the granting of more physical and cultural freedom to Jews, changes took place in the Jewish curriculum. The rise of Reform Judaism and other Judaist sects, the spread of modern Zionism with its emphasis on the Hebrew language, the espousal of Yiddish by diaspora nationalists, these and other movements of modernity among the Jewish people affected the Jewish classroom. ¹ If these groups controlled Jewish schools, they brought their doctrines and deeds into the

¹ Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," pp. 169, 211.
course of study. Whoever the school's sponsor was he was likely to make time for trying to convince the pupils of the superiority of the sponsor's way and the absurdity of the opposition.

With the smashing of the ghetto walls and the advance of secularization among the Jews, not only did the new religious and secular Jewish groups push their particular educational programs but the amount of material available for study increased. It became necessary to make decisions concerning what to teach and what to ignore. The disintegration of the cohesive Jewish communities of Europe with their Jewish educational establishments, and the start in the New World of poorly staffed and equipped Jewish schools, made for further restrictions on what the teachers should teach, indeed were capable of teaching. 2 Subsequent improvements—if and when made—in the quality of teachers and the available equipment (books, desks, spacious rooms, etc.) did not alter the fact that with little time now given to Jewish studies those charged with deciding what should be taught had to determine which subjects to teach in the limited hours of instruction.

2 For the Jewish educational situation in the United States during the years of large Jewish immigration to America, see Haïr Pen-Norin, "From the Turn of the Century to the Late Thirties," A History of Jewish Education in America, ed. Judah Pilch (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1969), pp. 51-118.
Then, too, with the diminishing number of Jews speaking Yiddish at home, reading Jewish books, and participating in Judaist rituals, pupils entered the Jewish school with an increasingly poor Jewish background. The result was that more time had to be spent on what had previously been omitted (because everyone knew it), or on what had formerly been covered at the very elementary levels. "Customs and ceremonies," "religion," "current events," "history," discussions on intermarriage and why be a Jew—such subjects came into the Jewish school at the expense of Chumash, Rashi, and Talmud.

Such were modernity's effects.

Character and Subject Matter

Another effect on which subjects should be studied in the Jewish school was (and is) whether the school's directors believed (believe) that certain subjects fashion good character better than other subjects do. Kallen challenges the claim of those who assert that only a so-called religious education is an effective shaper of character and that only such subjects as Bible foster the virtues.

Kallen maintains that moral conduct is bound neither to religion in general nor to a specific religion. Where children have been educated to believe and practice a certain religion there is no guarantee that they will be highly moral individuals nor, if they had not been so educated, that they would be morally weak. Indeed, Kallen believes that the

3 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 220.
the crimes of fraud and violence are committed mostly by individuals who have had a fundamentalist training, specifically Catholic. This would tend to indicate "how ungrounded in the record is the claim that "religious education" is a preventative to crime."

As for the claim concerning the Bible's effectiveness, Kallen states that every subject has the potentiality for building character. Character is a certain way of thinking and acting—in a live-and-help-live way. Character results not from what is learned; it is developed by responding in a democratic, scientific, and responsible way to any subject in one's experience.

Children's Needs and the Course of Study

Just as some persons concerned with education want(ed) to impose the Bible and other religious subjects on pupils for their supposed character-building qualities, so do adults impose their will on students in regard to what the curriculum shall be even when non-religious subjects are selected. In both instances the children are not consulted. Their needs are ignored.

4 Letter from Kallen to Ferdinand Lundberg (b. 1902), of New York, a sociologist and economist, Dec. 2, 1939, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

5 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 225.

6 Ibid.
Kallen states that what the child needs and what the school teaches rarely coincide.\(^7\) (Although most of these comments by Kallen concern the public school they are obviously applicable to the situation in the Jewish school.) The student's hopes and fears, his needs and problems, his curiosity—all are mostly ignored in the courses given him.\(^8\) Being irrelevant, the course of study is not likely to be one of the items the student orchestrates as he grows in his struggle to live on meaningfully.\(^9\)

The curriculum reflects mostly the interests of adults, not children.\(^10\) The courses are almost always those which have been taught in years past regardless of whether or not they are relevant to the needs of the children.\(^11\) Yet, relevancy is at the heart of all education. Those responsible for which subjects are taught must ask themselves what significance the subject to be studied is likely to have in the pupil's life.

Addressing himself to the situation in the Jewish school Kallen says that unfortunately most Jewish educators think of Jewish education not in terms of relevancy to the students' needs in the modern world but in terms of indoctrinating the pupils in certain texts, doctrines, and

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 69.
\(^8\) Ibid., pp. 64, 98; The Decline and Rise of the Consumer, p. 453.
\(^9\) Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 316.
\(^10\) Ibid., p. 83.
\(^11\) Ibid., p. 84.
rituals of the past. These items have no real relevance to
the pupils' lives now nor to their making of a vibrant
future for themselves and the Jewish people. The irrele-
vancy of the content of Jewish education has helped alien-
ate the best Jewish minds. What must be done is that the
Jewish curriculum must be changed so as to win the willing
commitment to Jewishness by the young and alienated intel-
lectuals.

The curriculum in the Jewish school should emphasize
that which has relevance for Jewish survival in today's
world. Our Jewish educators must select from the Jewish
past that which is of most significance for today's Jews,
make that the course of study, and thereby have the Jewish
past serve the Jewish present and Jewish future. True,
there are few teaching hours at the disposal of the Jewish
school. Because of that much will have to be omitted from
the vast Jewish heritage. But the limited time available
makes it all the more imperative that the most relevant and
essential material be selected for the course of study in
the Jewish school.

13 Kallen, ""Heritage," "Heradity" and "Jewish Living"," 9; "Jewish Education and Jewish Survival," 223.
14 "Dialogue With Horace N. Kallen: Philosopher of Minor-
ities," op. cit. (above, note 105, p. 37), 99; Kallen, ""Her-
itage," "Heradity" and "Jewish Living"," 9.
Keeping in mind the three items we have touched on—what modernity has done to the Jewish curriculum, that no one subject is the magic wand which will produce a good human being, and that the curriculum must be relevant to the children's needs—let us see which subjects Kallen suggests be in the school's course of study.

I. Jewish Groups

One of the items Kallen would have the Jewish schools teach is factual information concerning all Jewish groups. The school should arouse the child's curiosity concerning how these groups came into being, why, what their values and programs are, how they relate to one another and to the general and Jewish communities, and what can be appropriated from them for better, freer living as a Jewish individual, Jewish organization, institution, and people. 18

Too often a Jewish school's course of study ignores learning about Jewish organizations, institutions, denominations, and movements which differ from the school's sponsor. 19 Kallen understands each Jewish group's desire to survive by struggling to teach its ideas and practices to the next generation. But he does not want a Jewish group to ignore or eliminate other Jewish groups and their teachings. 20 Each Jewish group should teach the beliefs and practices of all Jewish groups. 21 Kallen urges each group to make a deliberate

18 Ibid., p. 172.
20 Kallen, "Disenrollment or Extinction," 41.
and continuing attempt to understand, appreciate, respect, and cooperate with the other Jewish groups as equals in the union which is Jewish culture. 22

After the pupils in a Jewish school understand the sponsoring group's desire to live in a friendly union with diverse Jewish groups—"in the American sense of union"—23 then each school can teach its particular ideas and practices to its pupils. 24

This concern of cultural pluralism and the American Idea for living with differences in an enriching way is obviously what is behind Kallen's insistence that all Jewish groups be the subject of study. They all have a right to exist and to have their position heard without bias. They should all be lived with, possibly learned from, and helped to reach their particular excelldences.

This same concern for an enriching union of the diverse also helps explain Kallen's enthusiasm for the Springfield (Mass.) Plan and his recommendation that it be adapted and applied in Jewish schools. 25 In brief, the Springfield Plan called for educating the pupils to live in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-religious democracy. 26 In the main this goal was striven for by introducing

22 Ibid.
23 Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 239.
24 Ibid., pp. 239-240.
units of study on every school level (i.e., elementary, intermediate, and high school) which aimed to help the students and their parents to understand, appreciate, and respect the life, ideas, history, and hopes of the different peoples comprising the Springfield community. In regard to the Jews, the Springfield Plan not only resulted in more understanding of Jews among non-Jews but also in Jews learning more about their non-Jewish neighbors and having some Jewish stereotypes about others smashed. 27

Kallen urged that the Springfield Plan be applied let to Jewish schools; the many Jewish religious and non-religious groups in America be studied and seen as helping to comprise in their union the American Jewish community. 28 Let the pupils learn, too, of the desirability of all Jewish groups working together in a live-and-help-live manner.

Jews must not isolate themselves from one another. The attempt to prepare children for accepting different Jews as equals with oneself and for living with them in a mutually enriching way is a task of the Jewish school. A complete education must include the study of all Jewish groups and institutions. 29

27 Ibid., p. 36.
II. Jewish Communities

Related to a study of all Jewish groups, yet important (and somewhat different) enough to warrant a separate listing, is a second subject for the Jewish course of study: Jewish communities.

Kallen maintains that Jewish education should deal first with the local Jewish community, the one in which the pupils and their parents live.30 This study would include the community's history—that is, when and why Jews and non-Jews settled there, how they earned a livelihood, their accomplishments, how they related to one another and to others (i.e., other peoples, organizations, the country, etc.), and other facts. The community's institutions and organizations would also be studied. The students would seek to discover when the institutions and organizations came into being, why, how their purposes have changed over the years, how they are governed, what they have achieved, how they relate to one another, to the general community, to Jewry in the United States and elsewhere, to America, and the world. The pupils should discuss if they—the pupils—would be interested in joining such organizations or institutions, and why.

After studying the local Jewish community the students should proceed to learn about other Jewish communities in America and other places. The same kind of information as was sought when studying the local community should be investigated.

Students must get to know Jewish communities, why they are important to the Jewish individual and others, and how to make them better means of enriching Jewish and non-Jewish lives.

III. Jewish History

In studying Jewish communities the pupils, of course, are also learning Jewish history. It is Jewish history--what we shall label the third subject for study in the Jewish school--that Kallen emphasizes in the Jewish school's curriculum. Whereas he believes that "the study of the past, as the Bible or Talmud, is entirely inadequate" for sparking the Jew to commit himself to remain a Jew and struggle for Jewish survival, he does believe that Jews "need more than anything else, contemporary history."

31 Kallen, "Heritage," "Heredity" and "Jewish Living."

32 Letter from Kallen to Abrom Opher (b. 1911), of New York, a teacher of Bible and Hebrew literature at the Jewish Institute of Religion-Hebrew Union College School of Education and Sacred Music, Aug. 11, 1933, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.
Regrettably, Kallen noted as early as 1916, our Jewish scholars, rabbis, and other leaders, too often do not encourage the study of Jewish history past the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{33} They seem to delight only in the distant past, as if the study of the last seven centuries were not of great interest or importance. Yet, Kallen asserts, it is more important "to know the last hundred years of the Jewish story than the first thousand, for causes lose in significance in proportion to their remoteness from effects."\textsuperscript{34}

The problems with which today's Jews are struggling originated mostly in the 17th to 19th centuries.\textsuperscript{35} It is, therefore, the study of Jewish history in modern times which can best help us understand the problems of the Jewish present and give us a background for deciding how to act today and tomorrow. Study of the Jewish present in terms of the recent past should be emphasized far more than learning the Jewish distant past.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Kallen, "From A Menorah Address," 64.

\textsuperscript{34} Kallen, Judaism At Bay, p. 218.

\textsuperscript{35} Kallen, "From A Menorah Address," 64.

\textsuperscript{36} Kallen, "Of Them Which Say They Are Jews," p. 179.
Although stressing the present and immediate past, Kallen is not saying that the distant past should not be studied. It should be, but for the purpose of shedding light on the Jewish present and helping Jews create a better Jewish tomorrow. Thus, Kallen suggests that the Judeo-Hellenic parts of Jewish culture—especially the rise of Christianity and the New Testament period—should be studied by Jews so they will know why Christianity and the New Testament were rejected by the Jewish mainstream. 37

Furthermore, in studying modern Jewish history it is of most importance to study the lives of contemporary and recent American Jewish heroes, men like Louis D. Brandeis and Albert Einstein. Heroes like these exemplify for the students what their (the students') goal should be: the harmonious orchestration of Jewish and non-Jewish values, of Jewishness and Americanness. To talk about such orchestration is not as effective as reading about, and discussing how, real individuals succeeded in orchestrating their Jewish and American cultures. 38

37 Ibid., p. 234.
38 Ibid., p. 179.
IV. Languages

Although history should be the main subject in the Jewish school's course of study, according to Kallen, language-study is also important. It is a fourth item in the curriculum.

Kallen reminds us that language is a group's main instrument for communicating its culture to its young. Although the Hebrew language is not all there is to Jewish culture, much of Jewish culture has been—and is being—written in that language. He who would know that culture most intimately would do well to know it in the language in which so much of it was first written.

But it is not only the Hebrew language and literature that Jews should study. Since Kallen is interested in relationships, he urges pupils also to learn how this language and literature came into being, how they interrelated with other languages and literatures used and fashioned by the Jewish people, and how they have helped make the language, literature, and life of Europe and America.


If Jewish culture were equivalent to the products of "Judaism," then only the Hebrew language--the language of the Jewish Bible and prayerbook--would need be the language that Jews should study. But since Jewish culture also includes non-Judaist elements, languages in addition to Hebrew are also deserving of study.41 Such languages include Aramaic, Arabic, Hellenistic Greek, Spanish, Ladino, Yiddish, and English. These, and other languages, have been spoken by some Jewish people in the course of the centuries.42 These languages have been vehicles for the expression of the Hebraic spirit and have helped shape Jewish personalities.43 These languages can be studied, therefore, so that one could know at first hand what some Jews who used those languages thought and did, at least as recorded in their books.

Yiddish, for example, Kallen deems "a precious part of the Jewish inheritance."44 Yiddish, he said, has taken on the Hebraic spiritual qualities of the Jews who spoke and wrote it.45 True, the language is spoken today by fewer Jews than

41 Kallen, "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," 1.
43 Kallen, "Menorah Address," 131; "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," 1.
in generations past, and as its speakers decrease the num-
er of Jews increases who ascribe to Yiddish a sanctity of
sorts.\footnote{Kallen, "On Being Jewish Today," p. 318.} But Kallen himself learned the language in order
to become more familiar with the thinking and writing of
the Jews who spoke (and speak) and wrote (and write) in
Yiddish.\footnote{Pen, "Horace M. Kallen, Jewish-American Philosopher,
75 Years Old," \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 12, p. 317).} Not only does Kallen favor Yiddish language and
literature being included in the course of study for pros-
pective rabbis, but he also favors introducing it in addi-
tion to Hebrew, when feasible, in lower Jewish schools.
\footnote{Letter from Kallen to Jacob Katzman, General Secretary
of the Farband-Labor Zionist Order, Dec. 23, 1966, Kallen
Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2828.}

Kallen observes that as the number of Yiddish-speaking
Jews has diminished in America, no other language has re-
placed Yiddish as a second language for American Jews. He
thinks it is a pity for "much of the intellectual distinc-
tion of the Jews is due to their having necessarily to be
bi-lingual."\footnote{Letter from Kallen to Jack J. Cohen, Dec. 16, 1962,
Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 970.}

Knowing more than one language, Kallen stated, has
been part of the Jewish way of life for centuries and one
reason why Jews have achieved so much.\footnote{Untitled statement by Kallen in Jewish Teacher's
Seminary and People's University, undated, Kallen Files,
American Jewish Archives, Box 973.}

\footnote{Letter from Kallen to Jacob Katzman, General Secretary
of the Farband-Labor Zionist Order, Dec. 23, 1966, Kallen
Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2828.}

\footnote{Letter from Kallen to Jack J. Cohen, Dec. 16, 1962,
Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 970.}

\footnote{Untitled statement by Kallen in Jewish Teacher's
Seminary and People's University, undated, Kallen Files,
American Jewish Archives, Box 973.}
lower percentage today of Jews in the top academic level of public and private high schools and colleges. Kallen suggests that if Hebrew could become a second language for as high a percentage of Jews as Yiddish once was then perhaps Jewish students could regain their intellectual prominence.

In this connection it is of interest to point out that Kallen praised the Jewish Teachers Seminary and People's University for its "design to develop in students an orchestrated competence in English, Yiddish and Hebrew." Kallen felt it might "serve to restore the intellectual stature of Jewish students in our colleges and universities."


Ibid.

Untitled statement by Kallen in Jewish Teacher's Seminary and People's University, op. cit. (above, note 50, p. 352).

Ibid. Kallen--in "Address by Prof. Horace M. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," p. 5--made this astounding statement: "Jews are intellectual. The stupidest Jew is more intellectual than any non-Jew." Assuming that Kallen let the occasion or his oratory carry him to a verbal excess in the statement quoted, he might have had in mind that a higher percentage of Jews than Gentiles are intellectually bright. This is largely due, in Kallen's opinion, to the bi-lingualism of many Jews.
V. Bible

A fifth subject in the course of study for the Jewish school is Bible. Kallen states that the Jewish Bible has been "the matrix, the center of reference" in the fashioning of the Jewish personality. More than any other book the Bible has helped the Jew achieve his Jewish identity. Later Jewish literature has only been, in a sense, a commentary to the Bible.

Although the Bible contains the main statements of the Jewish values with which Jews should want to identify, the Bible is too often not read voluntarily. The Bible is frequently read because some are "addicted" to it, as to liquor or cigarettes, or because some think that what is read will offer protection now or after death.

Judaist denominations, as well as the Jewish secularist organizations, usually select for study in their schools those parts of the Bible that each group thinks important. The verses and chapters selected for study are meant to serve the choosing group's interests; alternative verses and chapters are selected by alternative groups.

55 Kallen, "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," 1.
57 Ibid.
58 Kallen, "What Actually Is "Jewish Welfare" in America?" 201.
59 Kallen, Liberty, Laughter and Tears, p. 33. Although Kallen wants the Bible to be read by Jews he would like them to become "addicted" to reading other Jewish books as well. Jews should use some of their living-time for reading Jewish books so as to extend and deepen their Jewish knowledge. See Kallen, "The Library in Jewish Life," 83.
chapters are belittled or ignored. However, the Jewish cultural heritage includes the whole Bible. A Jew cannot fully understand what it means to be a Jew without knowing the entire Bible. Jews should study the entire Bible. The knowledge gained therefrom should be utilized for the same end as the other knowledge they acquire in the Jewish school: applying their learning to insure a better personal and communal Jewish future.

Summary

After noting some factors to be reckoned with in deciding what shall be studied in the Jewish school—the effects of modernity, the fact that no specific subject is more effective than another in helping to fashion goodness in a pupil, the necessity of selecting subjects which are relevant to the children's needs—we discussed the particular subjects Kallen mentions as deserving of inclusion in the curriculum: the study of all Jewish groups, the local and other Jewish communities, Jewish history, Hebrew and other languages used by Jews, and the Bible. Although Kallen has not given us a detailed statement of the subjects he would like to see included in the Jewish school, from what he has said we know what he considers the most important subjects. The rest is commentary—but also learned.


61 Kallen, "Prof. Horace M. Kallen, At 80, Sums Up His Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism," 1.

62 Kallen, ""Heritage," "Heredity" and "Jewish Living","
CHAPTER XII: TEACHING AND LEARNING--THE "HOW" OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Introduction

Having discussed what our goals are in Jewish education, where Jewish education takes place, and what specific subjects should be in the course of study, we are ready to discuss the means of achieving a good Jewish education: teachers who can teach and pupils who learn. Since "the means enter into the end they are employed for,"^1 what the teachers and pupils do in the Jewish classroom either helps or hinders the ends we have in mind for Jewish education. Let us see what Kallen has to say about the teaching-learning situation in Jewish schools.

Importance of the Teacher

Teachers are the means by which a culture is transmitted to the next generation.^2 If there were no teachers to guide children in their learning, it would be extremely difficult for a culture to be learned by the young. Teachers know what the facts (or some of the facts) of a culture are; they know some of the places (e.g., books) where facts of the culture may be found; they are trained to help the pupil, at his level of intellectual and emotional maturity, to find the facts, understand them, and perceive their possible significance for his own life.

^1 Horace M. Kallen, "Responsibility," The International Journal of Ethics, LII, 3 (Apr. 1942), 375.

If Jewish culture is not taught well, the Jewish pupil may become disenchanted with Jewishness. He may be influenced to do little or nothing with his Jewish culture, or seek to flee it.3 (This applies, of course, also to the situation in other schools and cultures.) No wonder that Kallen insists that what takes place in the classroom when teacher and student confront one another is the most important part of education.4

Teacher-Pupil Relationship

Kallen suggests that there are three ways in which teacher and pupil can associate.5 (Actually, these are possible ways of relating not only in the classroom but in almost every place of life.) One possibility is the authoritarian relationship. Here, the teacher is boss; he commands and, if necessary, coerces the students to do his will. A second way is the laissez-faire relationship in which the teacher and students do what they want with little or no control or direction by either party. The third approach is the democratic relationship. It is to be preferred.

3 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
Unlike the authoritarian relationship, democratic order is achieved without coercing anyone. The laissez-faire way is avoided because the teacher and pupils do care about teaching and learning. Teacher and pupils feel themselves part of a common endeavor to discover the truth. There is a cooperative teamplay between teacher and pupils. Each person recognizes the other as an equal human being, entitled to respect and the freedom to grow in learning. Teacher and pupil deliberately try to communicate with one another so the teacher can effectively share the knowledge and know-how he possesses and the student can obtain them. The teacher wants to help the pupil learn and strives to be patient in order to achieve that goal; the pupil is eager to listen and to do what he must to learn. Rules of class procedure are agreed upon by all, after free discussion, so as to enable the teacher to teach and the learners to learn in the best ways possible with no one being in a privileged or endangered position. In this democratic relationship, with the teacher and pupils being cooperative teammates on a learning team, we have exemplified what genuine education is: "a free association of minds in a common enterprise of living and learning."  

6 Kallen, "Black Power" and Education," 14, 16.  
7 Ibid., 15.  
This democratic relationship between teacher and pupils is, of course, the way of cultural pluralism and the American idea whereby different groups agree to live together in peace, freedom, and communication with each other in order to assure to each the opportunity to grow as best he can and to reach a common goal. There is, however, one difference: the acceptance of the teacher's authority. The teacher, not the teammates (pupils), ultimately determines what the relationship will be as well as how the teacher will teach. 

The Teacher's Function

In discussing the teacher-pupil relationship we have touched on what Kallen says is one of the two main problems in the classroom; the other is how to get the pupils to become passionately absorbed in learning. As for the second problem, it is obvious that no one can learn for another. The teacher cannot learn for the student. But little can be accomplished in the classroom if the pupil does not want to learn.

What the teacher's function is Kallen makes clear in an analogy: just as a cook can prepare food for a person to eat but only that person can do the eating, so a teacher can bring the subject matter to the student but only the student can do the learning. Moreover, even as a skilled cook can


10 Letter from Kallen to Walter D. Cohn of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, Oct. 20, 1939, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

prepare the food in such an appetizing manner that it is more likely that a person will want to eat the food, so can a skilled teacher arouse the student's curiosity, make the subject matter come alive, and inspire the student to go and learn. 12

The teacher's function, therefore, is "to facilitate learning." 13 The teacher has to "cook" the subject "food" so well--i.e., he has to arouse and sustain the learner's hunger for learning--that the pupil, with relish, will "eat" (learn) and go on "eating" even without the teacher. 14

Whether the pupil learns, therefore, and whether his learning liberates him to go on learning by himself, is not dependent on what is taught but how it is taught. 15


15 Ibid., p. 56. This helps explain Kallen's words: "I should not myself be inclined to permit any activity to fall into the status of "extra-curricular"." While Kallen, when he wrote these words to Donald G. Tewsbury (b. 1894), Dean of Bard College--Jan. 12, 1935, p. 1, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research--was talking about the general college, he assuredly holds the same position regarding the Jewish school. Whatever the subjects be--the usual items of Bible, history, prayers, Hebrew, or the "extra-curricular" items of Israeli dancing, a Jewish play, Jewish music, or cooking Jewish foods--most important is not what the subject is but how it is taught and whether the learner orchestrates that new knowledge so as to make himself freer and more responsible.
What Teaching Has Often Been

Kallen asserts that too often teaching has been synonymous with indoctrination, repeating the doctrines and practices of the past in order to have them believed in and repeated in an unchanged way by the pupils. This has been the situation in Jewish education, declares Kallen. 16 Too many teachers are told, or decide themselves, to teach the past of the Jewish tradition with the goal of having the pupils repeat—and not vary from—that past. These teachers would not have the transmitted material discussed freely. There is to be no free, unhampered investigation and evaluation of the origin, development, reasons for, and possible alternatives to the subject matter presented. The material given is to be accepted unquestioningly by the students, and their acceptance is demonstrated by their repeating it as given.

Kallen furnishes an example of indoctrination in the Jewish school: when students affirm prayers, such as the "Shema" and the "Amidah," by saying them regardless of whether or not they know, have discussed, and agree with the ideas in the prayers. 17


Kallen's condemnation of indoctrination should not be taken to mean that he condemns all indoctrination. One kind of indoctrination he wants--indoctrination in the scientific method of how to learn. This method involves encouraging students to inquire freely, to doubt, dissent, discuss, consider alternatives, test the workability of alternatives by experiments, and thereby find the truth themselves. It will be a truth more easily seen and accepted because they have struggled to attain it. With such indoctrination in the scientific method the student is equipped to deal with other indoctrination, to know how to determine whether a "truth" he is told is indeed truth. It is surely with "the methods of free inquiry" that Jews, who have previously been repelled by the method of indoctrination in Jewish schools, will be won to remain Jews and to deepen their Jewish commitments.

What Teaching Should Be

Instead of trying to make the child confirm by repetition certain beliefs and practices that the teacher wants him to affirm, the teacher should concentrate on the how of releasing the student's curiosity so he will consider alternatives, study alone (if desired), rule himself,


19 Kallen, "Goals for Jewish Education," p. 177.
and come to truths in a reasoned, scientific way. Curiosity comes, says Kallen, when the teacher adopts the democratic way of relating to his pupils and when the teacher has abandoned indoctrination for the scientific method. When a pupil feels that the teacher wants him to join in the search for truth as an equal, the student will want to know.

The pupils are more likely to develop curiosity, too, when the teacher is good-natured and has the other personal qualities that go into a positive personality. Unfortunately, the negative personalities of too many Jewish teachers, Kallen contends, have prejudiced many Jews against their Jewish heritage. With a teacher of pleasant personality the students are more likely to listen and want to learn.

The curiosity that Kallen wants the teacher to elicit from the students is to be used to examine alternatives. The alternatives to a belief or practice—all the alternatives, if possible—are to be examined. None is to be condemned as heretical. All—following the outlook of science, democracy, freedom, the American Idea, cultural pluralism, and Secularism—are to be seen as equal possibilities, with each being given an equal opportunity to make good.


22 Kallen, "Address By Prof. Horace M. Kallen at the Meeting of Father and Son, Held at The Jewish Club, June 6, 1951," p. 4.


24 Kallen, Education, the Machine, and the Worker, pp. 35-36.
Jewish education should be predicated upon an "impartial examination of alternatives." When it is, and when many ideas and practices are examined for their workability rather than on the basis of authoritarian claims for their rightness, then the individual Jew becomes more capable of living in freedom. To achieve this goal our Jewish educators must remove their "intellectual blinkers." Although to doubt means to deliberately make oneself insecure, for the sake of truth and freedom our teachers must open the Pandora's box of free inquiry to all that Jews hold dear. For the sake, too, of progress—for how do new ideas come unless the old is challenged?—alternatives must be examined and made use of if they approximate Truth more closely than the way of the inherited past.

As for this past which Jewish (and other) teachers too often want the students to repeat unchanged, it must be studied and made use of to help us live more fully in the present and future. Kallen concretizes what he means by a creative use of the past when he writes that "the education uses the past as a food or as a soil or as an instrument by


26 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 145.


which to nourish, or grow, or create something different that the past is not." Kallen calls on Jewish educators, therefore, to have the pupils look at the past not as "inert remembrances" to be contemplated, mastered, and repeated without change, but as "living roots of future growth." The lovely "tree" of Jewish life that/Jewish individual raises for himself and helps make possible for the Jewish people, is fed, in part, from the enriching "food" of the Jewish past—but other "food" (from the past and present of Jewish and other cultures) also goes into its growth. The past is learned, digested, absorbed, orchestrated with other knowledge, and thereby used to deal with the present. In being used in this way, the past is changed. But when the Jewish past is utilized in this manner, to help fashion an affirmative Jewish life today and tomorrow, then the Jewish heritage is truly a living one.

It is a challenge for a Jewish teacher to try to make the study of the Jewish past live in this way. To make the study of the past something other than "imposed drudgery"

30 Ibid., p. 118.
31 Ibid.
33 Kallen, ""Heritage," "Heredity" and "Jewish Living"," pp. 8-9.
34 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 63.
for the pupils, Jewish teachers, like other teachers, should utilize good pedagogical techniques. These include: lecturing as little as possible and, instead, guiding the pupils to learn for themselves; avoiding the mechanical method of question-answer; asking the class to what use the subject being studied can be put; involving the pupils in such activities as "looking, listening, handling, peeking, prying, breaking up, putting together, imagining, consuming, producing." Kallen is especially enthusiastic about visiting places that are related to what one is studying. Upon returning from their trip (e.g., to another synagogue or to a church, to watch a Sofer at work, to the headquarters of a Jewish organization) the students could discuss what they saw and experienced, relate this to what they already knew, and recall the trip in song, picture, poetry, clay, a playlet, etc. Such trips and subsequent activities help narrow the gap between school and the outside world.

37 Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 43.
40 Ibid.; The Education of Free Men, p. 309.
41 Narrowing the gap between the school and the outside world does not mean making them the same. By itself, there must be education (in the sense of learning from books, etc.) so as to know how to view the world and what to do in it. This is Kallen's idea of education being used for survival, for living in the world. See p. 291.
Very much part of closing the gap between learning and living is to teach students to see Jewish matters "in their dynamic connection with things not Jewish." For example, in studying Moses Maimonides one should not only learn what he wrote and what significance his ideas may have for us. The student must also be guided to ask and seek to find out what Jewish and Gentile factors influenced Maimonides to write on the topics he did and as he did, wherein did his ideas and practices differ from other Jews and non-Jews of his day and other times, what effect his work has exercised on Jews, Christians, and others. Understanding Maimonides in this way places him in a real setting and also shows how, as cultural pluralism stresses, the efforts of one individual or group may be influenced and/or emulated by other persons and groups for their enrichment and the common good. This approach should be utilized in whatever one teaches.

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed: the importance of the teacher as a "middle-man" in the transmission of a culture to the next generation; the democratic relationship that should prevail between teacher and pupils; why the teacher should abandon unsound indoctrination in favor of the challenge of facilitating learning though a free, scientific inquiry into the past and into all alternatives for the purpose of liberating oneself and other persons, one's more abundant, culture and other cultures for/safe, and free living.

43 Cf. ibid., pp. 178, 227.
CHAPTER XIII: ADULTS, ADMINISTRATION, ASSOCIATION--THREE "A's" IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Introduction

Having noted Kallen's comments concerning the teaching and learning of Jewish children, let us investigate what he has to say about the Jewish education of adults, the administration of the Jewish school, and what associations Jews might establish to further the cause of Jewish education.

I. The Jewish Education of Adults

If, as Kallen holds, "education is survival, survival is education,"¹ then education is a life-long process. It continues as long as an individual survives. It stops not at age thirteen, nor at any other specific year of life, but when a person gives up the struggle to survive, which means soon before (or at) the moment of death.

1. Differences Between the Education of Adults and Children

Kallen suggests a number of differences between education for adults and education for children. First, there is a difference in regard to why one studies. In a public school situation the child attends classes because he is obligated by law; the adult who studies in an adult education class does so voluntarily.²

¹ See above, note 4, p. 291.
² Kallen, Philosophical Issues in Adult Education, pp. 16-17.
A second difference is that with non-adult learners the teacher's goals take precedence; with adults, their goals should overrule the teacher's. Adults should decide—not the teacher—what they want to study. Since they will continue coming to class only as long as they want, courses should be offered that the students say interest them and to which they'll come regularly.3

A third difference is who gets more credit for the learning that does take place. If children learn, Kallen says, no small measure of credit is due the teacher; if adults learn, it is overwhelmingly their own accomplishment.4

A fourth difference is that while learning is the main substance of a youth's education, unlearning is a very significant part of an adult's education. The adult has to be guided to eliminate his unchanging ways of thinking and working, as well as his fixed attitudes. The adult should replace them "by a viable configuration of self, society and nature that will nourish and channel curiosity instead of starving it." 5 Since the adult's culture, job, home, and place of worship are among the agencies which have set the adult in more rigid ways than more a child of limited years, for an adult to attain such a "viable configuration"6 is a decided accomplishment.

4 Ibid.
5 Kallen, Philosophical Issues in Adult Education, p. 17.
6 Ibid.
2. Purpose of Adult Education

The purpose of adult education, as of all education, is, in Kallen's opinion, to help the person think and act in such ways as will make for his own, and his descendants', survival in equal liberty, safety, and abundance.\(^7\)

The adult's education should help him attain a basic outlook on life, "a vision of existence and destiny"\(^8\) which will give significance to even the most routine of his daily acts. This outlook should be based on a faith in freedom, in the knowledge of what dangers confront freedom, and how to overcome these dangers.\(^9\) In sum, the adult must get a liberal education—one that stimulates him to regain and maintain his curiosity, that frees him from needless fears, and gives him more power over those aspects of his life with which he can wrestle.\(^10\)


\(^8\) Kallen, Philosophical Issues in Adult Education, p. 20; cf. idem, "Text of an Address by Horace M. Kallen at Louis S. Weiss Memorial Dinner," May 17, 1951, p. 3, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 983.


3. **Jewish Education for Adults is Essential**

Kallen believes that Jewish education for Jewish adults is essential, first, for the survival of the American Jewish community. Kallen maintains that "without Jewish education of American adult Jews the education of Jewish children is a cry in the wilderness followed by silence of adulthood." Since "the elders determine the atmosphere and set the tone for youth," if parents are not interested in Jewish culture, it is very difficult to convince their offspring of its importance. If parents and other adults remain unconcerned about Jewish education—as would be shown by such acts as ignoring Jewish study at home or elsewhere, and not supporting local, national, and international Jewish educational institutions—then Jewish teachers may likely confront a wall of indifference to Jewish education in the children. Such children, when they become adults, may well endeavor to escape their Jewishness or be even more indifferent to it than their parents. With such adults, Jewish survival is threatened.

11 Letter from Kallen to Bernard Frank of New York, Feb. 14, 1961, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 2497.

Second, even more than for Jewish children, Jewish education for Jewish adults is vital for "mental hygiene and self-defense." Jewish adults need a philosophy of life which will make it clear to them how the Jew fits in to democracy, retaining his Jewish identity while remaining an American. Moreover, since Jewish adults have usually encountered more anti-Semitism than children have, they are more likely to wonder whether it is worthwhile continuing to remain a Jew and thereby continuing to expose oneself to anti-Semitism. Jewish adults, therefore, need what a good Jewish education provides—the Jewish knowledge and attitudes which will enable them to accept themselves willingly as Jews, to live with integrity and self-respect despite the anti-Semites and anti-Semitism, and to want to enrich and communicate their Jewish culture to their children, to the Jewish community, and to the non-Jews.

Of course, the Jewish education which Kallen is advocating is one based on his philosophy of cultural pluralism. Adult Jews, like other Jews, must be educated to understand that as Jewish individuals and members of the Jewish group they are an equal part of America; they must learn that they can serve America best by making the most of their Jewishness, by helping Jewish

13 Letter from Kallen to Walter Cohn of Los Angeles, May 5, 1939, Kallen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

culture mold for the better individual Jews as well as the Jewish community, and by enriching the stream of Jewish culture so it can play a more vital role in the union of diverse cultures which come together and form the great American cultural river and are part of the orchestration of mankind's cultures.

4. What Adults Should Study

Those persons involved in planning adult education programs must keep in mind the great importance of motivating adults to want to study. Since attendance at Jewish classes is voluntary for adults, the adults must become convinced of the value of Jewish study; otherwise, the adults will prefer doing something else than attending a Jewish class.15 Surely, says Kallen, the learning and enjoying of one's Jewish heritage can be as enticing as studying music, literature, or art, or watching a sport contest.16 But this remains the challenge since the adult can choose where and on what he will spend his leisure time.

15 Kallen, "Toward A Philosophy of Adult Education," p. 54.

As for the curriculum it should basically be determined by what interests the adult students themselves.\textsuperscript{17} It is not desirable to have a pre-determined, fixed course of study when teaching adults.\textsuperscript{18} The adults should not have their courses mapped out for them years in advance. Both a particular course and a specific lesson plan should meet the present needs of the students, who are there voluntarily.

If preliminary planning for courses is engaged in, as will probably be the case, the problems that Jewish adults confront should be borne in mind.\textsuperscript{19} Let the subjects to be studied be fitted to the problems bothering the pupils. Having said this it must be added, however, that Kallen would have some attempts made at exposing the adult pupils to areas of life with which they have had little or no previous contact. So many adults come to an adult education class with set habits, prejudices, and interests. Something in his adult education should shake him from his rigidity. Furthermore, even if the adult possesses a great deal of knowledge about one area of life that expertise has been attained by not giving time to learning about other areas. The teacher of adults should try to expose students to one or more of

\textsuperscript{17} Letter from Kallen to Walter Cohn, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 13, p. 372).

\textsuperscript{18} Kallen, \textit{Philosophical Issues in Adult Education}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{19} Letter from Kallen to Walter Cohn, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 13, p. 372).
these other areas and thereby endeavor to defreeze the adult pupil's character and behavior. Although there is no magic method for getting adults to think and act anew, an attempt must be made.

5. The Teaching of Adults

Kallen views the teacher of adults as "the captain of a voluntary team going out upon an intellectual exploring expedition." The team is engaged in a "mode of cooperative inquiry" whose goal is truth. Although the teacher endeavors to communicate to the adults what he has discovered, an unfinished quality should remain to his teaching. There is more to be known; the teacher's facts are always open to challenge and the possibility of being proven incorrect; the teacher's interpretations are not the only possible ones. Instructor and pupils are seeking truth. Both should welcome truth even if it necessitates revising what one thought was fact or what one gave as an opinion. The give and take among teacher and pupils that should be part of their common search for truth should result in a consensus of opinion on debatable issues. Consensus, or orchestration of differences, is the best peaceful way of resolving diverse opinions.


23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.
The methods which the teacher of adults should utilize in leading the search for truths are those that would also be employed if teaching children: free inquiry and discussion, trying to create a better future by building on (rather than repeating) the past, comparing alternatives, etc. 25 In dealing with adults, however, Kallen is more amenable to the lecture method. Many adults have experienced an exhausting day of work before coming to an evening class. They may not, therefore, be physically up to a method other than lectures. 26

Some ideas that Kallen has about other methods that could be employed in teaching adults may be gathered from a letter he wrote to Simon Noveck, a Conservative rabbi, then the religious leader of Park Avenue Synagogue in New York City. 27 Kallen commented on the congregation's adult education program brochure for 1955-1956. Kallen observed that their program of adult studies, as most others, was largely confined to reading a text, talking, and occasionally singing. To shape attitudes that have a greater chance of enduring, and to develop an atmosphere of Jewish concern, Kallen advocated supplementing the classroom talking and outside reading with much doing.

25 Cf. Ibid., p. 20.
26 Ibid., p. 18.
27 Letter from Kallen to Simon Noveck (b. 1914), Dec. 22, 1955, Kallen Files, American Jewish Archives, Box 976.
Specifically, in his letter to Noveck, Kallen suggested that perhaps an equivalent of the project method of learning could be devised, such as socio-drama. If that were done, Kallen thinks, the learning would include enjoyable and meaningful activity.

Kallen especially recommends that adults produce and act in plays. Putting on a play could involve researching the play's historic background, making costumes, constructing scenery, learning the roles, playing and/or hearing music from the period of the play, etc. Such activities help adults gain insight into, and knowledge of, their cultural and historical past. Kallen adds that if a Biblical-period play is wanted, the book of Job "presents the best opportunity for such a learning project." It is Kallen's The Book of Job As A Greek Tragedy that sets down each actor's part as well as suggests staging details for the Euripidean-like drama that Kallen thinks that Biblical book originally was.

28 The project method involves the solving of problems by students through the utilization of scientific procedures. The problem selected should be of social significance. The problem is "solved" by students and teacher discussing which questions are to be answered and how to solve the problem by reading, interviews, trips, experiments, etc. The results are gathered, interpreted, and formulated. See Marie A. Mehl, Hubert H. Mills, Harl R. Douglass, Mary-Margaret Scobery, Teaching in Elementary School (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950), 3rd ed., pp. 439-441.

29 Letter from Kallen to Simon Noveck, op. cit. (above, note 27, p. 376).

30 Ibid.

31 See above, note 4, p. 96.
II. The Administration of the Jewish School

A teacher and his pupils—be the students children or adults—form a union of different individuals who have joined together to enable the pupils in particular to grow in freedom. That union of a teacher and his pupils is duplicated in other classrooms of a school. Each such classroom unit may be thought of as something like a state of the United States: each comes together with the other classroom units to form the school (the "United States"), a union of many different with the common purpose of giving Jews a Jewish education.

In addition to the teachers and pupils, however, some "machinery" is needed "for combining teachers, pupils, space, materials, and books in such a fashion as to be conducive to learning." 32 Those fundamentally responsible for overseeing, servicing, and operating that "machinery" are the leaders whose job is school administration. 33 The usual chief administrator of a school is the principal.

As Kallen sees it, an administrator's underlying objectives in working with the school "machinery" should be "freedom, diversity, initiative," 34 enabling teachers and pupils to grow in freedom; encouraging a diversity of ideas, subjects, and methods in the classrooms; fostering the initiative of teachers and students to work together as well as individually.


33 Ibid., pp. 12-14.

34 Horace M. Kallen, "We Must Have Teachers!" The Saturday Review of Literature, Sept. 14, 1946, p. 10.
To enable these underlying objectives to be implemented in the "machinery" of the school, some authority must be exerted. If there were no authority, the school could not be an effective center of learning. Authority describes the ways in which individuals act together through an agreed-upon agent, e.g., a principal.\(^{35}\) The authority is given the person who possesses it by a free consensus or vote of those who hire him.\(^{36}\) Those who work with him, such as teachers and students, voluntarily assent to his authority so that all may better live together in the school and more effectively reach their learning goal. How the administrator exercises his authority is a vital factor in increasing or decreasing the inherent freedom of those in the school. Unfortunately, educational administration has traditionally been authoritarian; people in the school have not been helped to grow in freedom.\(^{37}\) The principal has usually tried to administer the school by consulting no one and by issuing orders to get things done.\(^{38}\)


\(^{37}\) Kallen, The Education of Free Men, pp. xvi, 258.

Authority should not mean the imposition of irrevocable directives by a dictator-like school official. A team idea and relationship should prevail regarding school matters. Administrators should discuss the problems and plans of the educational system with the teachers, pupils, parents, and others. Teachers should be encouraged to participate in the making and carrying out of educational policy. Not only teachers, but also pupils, supervisors, parents, and others should feel free, and be encouraged, to give their opinions on administrative matters; they should also be urged to join in carrying out administrative decisions. Just as in industry every attempt should be made, through democratic procedures, to have the worker feel himself a welcome.


41 Cf. Kallen, The Liberal Spirit, p. 65. Regarding the role of pupils, Kallen has stated that students have been practically ignored in the administration of America's schools from the elementary school through the university. (See Kallen, The Education of Free Men, p. 82.) We can readily apply to Jewish education his statement--ibid., p. xviii--that most students at the high school and college levels are ready for the opportunity to exercise social responsibility and self-rule. (Written in 1949, The Education of Free Men may have been left behind in this respect by the march of events, especially at the college level. However, what is of interest is that Kallen advocated this role for students more than 20 years ago.) When Kallen writes specifically--as he did to Donald G. Tewksbury, op. cit. (above, note 15, p. 360), p. 1--that the physical administration of grounds, dormitories, dining rooms, and standards of conduct should be handled as much as possible by the college students themselves, we see some implications for Jewish education. In a sentence, Kallen would have the administration of the Jewish school let the students exercise as much control of their own destinies as possible--for example, in formulating and carrying out discipline and dress codes (if any), sharing in the care of the school building, and helping to decide open-hours for the dormitories and dining rooms.
important part in that business and a partner in the whole business economy, so in education: each individual (pupil, teacher, supervisor, janitor, secretary, parent) should be encouraged by the administration to look upon himself as a welcome, important part of that school and a contributor to the overall Jewish and general educational enterprises.  

A cooperative spirit should be fostered.

School administration should be conducted in this way, with the authority being authoritative but not authoritarian. This is a democratic authority that serves rather than rules.

It is difficult for the different people in the Jewish school (or any school)--the pupils, teachers, secretaries, and administration--to self-orchestrate their needs, interests, and relationships so that each contributes his skills, plays his part, and works peacefully with the others for the better education of each and all. It is difficult, but this should be the administrator's goal.

As two educational experts have written: 'The chief responsibility of administration is coordination, that is, developing relationships among persons within a group which

---


44 Kallen, *The Liberal Spirit*, p. 27.

will enable that group to function at its best." This is not only the administrator's responsibility. It is also the function of democracy to enable and encourage differents to relate peacefully to one another for the individual and the common good. It is, of course, the method of association of cultural pluralism.

III. Associations for Jewish Education

While effective learning for growth in freedom is what a school's administration should be aiming to achieve, it is not enough for one school to be successful in this goal. All Jewish schools in a community are educating Jews. He who is concerned with the present and future welfare of the Jewish people is interested in what kind of Jewish education each Jew is getting. Since Jewish education is "the first and last condition of Jewish living," everyone who wants the Jewish people to continue and the Jewish culture to live on for the enriching welfare of Jews and Gentiles, should want each Jew to receive the best Jewish education possible. The cause of Jewish education is of such paramount importance that it should transcend differences and rivalries among Jewish individuals, institutions, and organizations. Whatever one's Jewish affiliation or religious interest, all Jews should associate together for the improvement of the Jewish education of all Jews.

46 Burton and Brueckner, Supervision, p. 91.

Kallen observed that one reason why the Jewish education of all American Jews has become the concern of many Judaists and non-Judaists is the strong competition of the public schools for the time and attention of the Jewish child. It was this competition, Kallen declares, that caused some Jews to suggest that it might be advantageous to each Jewish educational establishment, as well as to the overall cause of Jewish education, for Jews of every (or no) denomination and group to meet together to discuss the problem and how to deal with it. A union of the diverse individuals and organizations resulted in the establishment of the New York Kehillah's Bureau of Jewish Education as well as in later local and national efforts to further Jewish education. This is cultural pluralism's philosophy applied to Jewish education: cooperation of the different for the common good.

Seeing Jewish education, then, as a communal responsibility Kallen would urge the Jews of New York and every other community to try to convene a community-wide Committee on Jewish Education to plan and coordinate their community's Jewish educational endeavors. If the community were large enough to afford a Bureau of Jewish Education, one should be

established with a professional director. 49 The Bureau would then promote, service, and coordinate the community's diverse Jewish schools and other Jewish educational activities. In Kallen's words: "Every new Bureau, every community-wide committee on education, represents a positive step forward in the direction of the spiritual service which the Jewish school must perform for every Jewish child and should perform for every Jewish adult." 50

The establishment of a Committee and/or Bureau of Jewish Education gives diverse Jewish individuals and groups the opportunity to replace their isolation from others by an open communication with others. While recognizing the legitimacy, inevitability, and benefits of Jewish diversity, Jewish differents have chosen thereby to cooperate for improving the standards and teaching of each school. They also give all the community's Jewish children the opportunity to join together as Jews in community-sponsored programs, irrespective of their individual affiliation or interest. A feeling of being part of one Jewish people is engendered when this is done.

The national organization that coordinates and services the different Bureaus of Jewish Education is the American Association for Jewish Education. 51 That organization is

49 For an account of the development of communal agencies for Jewish education in America, see Abraham P. Gannes, Central Community Agencies for Jewish Education (Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1954).


based on Kallen's idea of the "cooperation of the different on equal terms." Its purpose is to have the different Jewish organizations interested in Jewish education understand, appreciate, and learn from one another in the common endeavor to orchestrate their diverse approaches to Jewish culture, Jewish religion, and Jewish education for the betterment of Jewish education. The result, if Jewish education is indeed improved by such an association, would be Jews who are freer, more secure as Jews, and more knowledgeably committed to being a Jew and to their Jewish culture in the plurality of cultures which comprise and nourish America.

Kallen has evaluated the work of the American Association for Jewish Education as "vital to the formation and survival of an American Jewish community." Having a philosophy which calls for exactly what the American Association for Jewish Education is trying to accomplish, it is not a cause for surprise that Kallen, who has frequently participated directly in movements he believed in, should

have become personally and deeply involved in the work of the A.A.J.E. He has held its office of national vice pre-
sident. He has praised the A.A.J.E. for having "recruited
the most sincerely committed, understanding and least
self-regarding fellowship of men and women." Although
Kallen did not, of course, have himself in mind when he
commended the Association's devoted workers, if his own
name does not lead all the rest it is near the top of any
list of the most dedicated, loyal teamworkers of the
A.A.J.E.

Summary

Having noted the vital importance Kallen assigns to
adult Jewish education, the cooperative authority he would
like to mark the administration of Jewish educational ac-
tivities, and his advocacy of communal educational agen-
cies for the better Jewish education of all Jews, let us
turn finally to an overall summary and evaluation of
Kallen's philosophy of cultural pluralism in respect to its
bearing on Jewish life.

56 Kallen, "American Association for Jewish Education and
Part Five

Conclusion
Summary

In rejecting the Americanization theories of "Anglicization" and the "melting pot" in favor of cultural pluralism, Horace M. Kallen furnished a philosophical justification for each cultural group in America to maintain, express, and develop its heritage. That justification is the American Idea that each individual and group is equal to every other in rights, including the right to exist in its particularity in equal liberty, safety, and abundance. But the ethnic cultures, Kallen went on to say, should not dwell in isolation. Even as the individual states in our country come together in a peaceful union for the betterment of each state as well as for the good of all and form the United States as a result of their association, so with the diverse cultural groups: each should seek out the others, communicate with them, be enrichingly transformed themselves by the live-and-help-live relationship established to abandon any hopes for special privilege but to participate instead in a friendly give-and-take of insights and practices, and join in fashioning the American culture that emerges from the union of all the cultures.
In the pluralistic democracy that is America, Kallen saw Jewish culture as one of the many diverse cultural entities entitled to the unalienable right to keep its equal difference while it is utilized, primarily by its members, for struggling to attain more life, liberty, and happiness. American Jews would be untrue to the American Idea, Kallen maintained, if they tried to escape their Jewishness; they would then be seeking an un-American uniformity rather than living with natural difference, and they would also be depriving America of the enriching Jewish instrument in the American cultural orchestra.

While Jews can assist in making the culture of every country in which they live—if the government is democratic enough to let them—it is especially in Palestine (later called Israel) that Kallen urges Jews to participate in developing a thriving Jewish culture. To Kallen, a reborn, free, and thriving Jewish homeland is necessary in Palestine-Israel so the Jewish people can again make its maximal contribution to world culture. Each nationality, he insists, can make its best contribution to world civilization only when its people is free in its own land to develop its life as it will.

While American Jews who choose not to live in Israel can be citizens of the United States and part of the American people (created by the union of diverse peoples here), the American Jew also always remains part of the Jewish nationality or people. However, Kallen asserted, he is not
always a member of the Jewish religion. Indeed, he may never care to choose the Jewish religion for himself, or he may abandon it for another religion or no religion. Whatever the Jew does about religion, Kallen maintains, he always remains a Jew by nationality or peoplehood.

Religion, of any variety, Kallen views as an anachronism in this age of science and democracy. However, since religions satisfy needs that some people have, it is unlikely that religion will be eliminated in even the not-so-near future. The best that can be hoped for, in Kallen's opinion, is that each religion's adherents will surrender their yearning to force everyone else to adopt their religion. Kallen declares that individuals of diverse religious beliefs can live together peacefully and abundantly if they embrace Secularism as their common live-and-let-live or, better, live-and-help-live religion.

Those who, in addition to or instead of Secularism, identify themselves with or embrace any aspect of "Judaism" (which designation Kallen limits to the Jewish religion), he calls "Judaists." But "Judaism," Kallen expounds, is only one aspect of the total Jewish culture which he labels "Hebraism." A member of the Jewish people can take the Jewish religion or other components from Hebraism to aid him in his life-struggle. Kallen hoped that more and more members of the Jewish people would turn to the non-religious or secular elements in Hebraism, such as Zionism, non-religious Jewish literature, Jewish languages, Jewish art, and Jewish music.
Kallen looked forward to a vibrant Jewish culture whose organizations and institutions would be democratically operated and part of a Congress-like union for the common Jewish good. He hoped that the motifs of the Hebraic spirit would permeate these organizations and institutions as well as all other facets of Jewish cultural life.

Although Kallen holds that Jewish religion, Jewish organizations, and Jewish institutions are important for those who want them, the truly essential item in the Jewish cultural "bag" is that which enables the Jew to discover, know, and utilize his Jewishness: Jewish education. Kallen consistently urges that the entire Jewish heritage must be studied in a scientific way so that Jews will know the range of Jewish options available to them, will orchestrate their Jewish and non-Jewish knowledge and other experiences, will live willingly as Jews, and will make the best contribution possible to the American cultural orchestra.

Since a sound Jewish education is basic to the creative survival of the Jewish people and Jewish culture, all Jews should cooperate, Kallen said, in such organizations as their local Bureau of Jewish Education and the American Association for Jewish Education in order to insure the best possible Jewish education for each Jewish child, teenager, and adult.
Comment

Kallen's great contribution to American thought was (and is) his reasoned philosophy of cultural pluralism. Correctly pointing out that America's democratic principles do not require the ultimate disappearance of any ethnic group, his approach supplied ethnicity with a philosophic, American rationale. It was fortunate that he developed his philosophy of cultural pluralism when he did, for in the World War I period of huge immigration the vocal movement for "100% Americanism" was demanding an end to the "hyphenated" American.

Kallen's cultural pluralism was an obvious boon for many Jews who were seeking a philosophic rationale that would enable them to try to be good Jews and good Americans. In teaching that an American Jew could vigorously and openly hold on to his Jewishness and Americanism, Kallen must have kept a number of Jews from abandoning their Jewishness in the name of loyalty to America.

Especially in intellectual circles, where some Jews feel particularly embarrassed by their being Jewish, Kallen's personal example of successfully orchestrating Jewishness, Americaness, and liberalism must have impressed some bright Jews to conclude that Jewishness is not incompatible with devotion to America and the scientific, this-worldly outlook of humanism. His support of Zionism in the name of the American Idea and democracy
at a time when many Jews and Gentiles viewed Zionism as a regression to nationalistic particularism, also must have won many supporters for the Zionist cause.

Whether or not one agrees with his strictures against religion, Kallen's pointing out that Jewish religion is not the sum and substance of Jewish culture must have encouraged many Jews who were disenchanted with Judaism and thought there was nothing left in the Jewish heritage that could appeal to them not to abandon their Jewish ties. He must have motivated many Jews to turn for personal enrichment to the secular side of Jewish culture. He can still do that for those who want a non-religious Jewishness. Kallen has provided a philosophic underpinning and sanction for secular Jewishness.

The challenge Kallen hurls at Jewish educators is to fashion a Jewish education which will be so meaningful and enjoyable that American Jews will voluntarily embrace and utilize their Jewishness, and will knowingly base their life-struggle on a core of Jewish values which they will orchestrate with all the education they experience in life.

Actually, cultural pluralism gave (and gives) Jewish educators a "patriotic" reason for calling upon American Jews to provide themselves and their fellow Jews in the United States with a topnotch Jewish education: the American Jew must be Jewishly educated not only for his own mental health, self-respect, and personal enrichment, but also in order to help fashion the best possible American culture (which is a union of the nation's ethnic cultures and the diverse culture-based efforts of individual Americans).
Very much aware of the inroads of secularism (modernity, Americanization) as the ways science and democracy affect the American Jew's ideas and practices, Kallen urges the Jew not to retreat from the world but to go out into it retaining his integrity as a Jew. Self-ghettoization is not the answer for free men.

In urging Jews to reach out to the different, Kallen is not only being realistic—for how many can isolate themselves against today's diversity?—but he is calling upon Jews to communicate their culture to people different from themselves, to learn from these people, and to join them in creating American culture. The how and why of this peaceful, fruitful coexistence of differences Kallen applies to differences among Jews: let all Jewish individuals and organizations join in a peaceful union with one another for the greater safety, liberty, and abundance of each individual and organization as well as for the welfare of the Jewish people whose sum is the union of all Jewish individuals and groups.

To achieve this, Kallen has provided us with a democratic, workable, relevant, live-and-help-live approach. How? By consistently urging Jews to endorse: the right to be different in Jewish life; the desirability of learning about, understanding, appreciating, cooperating and communicating with the different for the good of all; the importance of recognizing "e pluribus unum" (that despite Jewish diversity in beliefs, practices, lands of residence, languages spoken, etc., there is one overall, "unionized" Jewish culture which is fashioned by one Jewish people).
Kallen's live-and-help-live, democratic Jewish Idea is being implemented today in such areas as intrafaith meetings, community-wide fund-raising drives for Israel, Jewish community councils, and the American Association for Jewish Education. It underlies the structure of central community agencies in Jewish education, such as the local bureaus of Jewish education. Kallen's approach has influenced some Jewish principals and teachers to expose the children in their schools not only to the views and practices of the school's sponsor but also to the ideas and actions of many other Jewish groups. It has spurred Jewish schools to conduct joint programs (e.g., Israel Independence Day celebrations) with children in schools sponsored by diverse Jewish groups. It has helped (and can) make for a feeling of Jewish solidarity despite the diversity in Jewish ideas and practices.

Pluralism (the right to go one's way in peace) and the need for voluntarily knowing and cooperating with equal differents--these are the cornerstones of Kallen's still relevant how and why of peaceful union-with-diversity for the increasing realization of each individual's and group's life, liberty, and happiness.

This much being said in praise of Kallen's ideas, let us note a few questions and disagreements.¹

¹ A number of criticisms have already been made; see pp. 69 (note 60), 84 (note 125), 97 (note 6), 105 (note 34), 160 (note 163), 188 (note 77), 240 (note 79), 242 (note 87), 252-253, 353 (note 54). The critical remarks below will be on items related to Kallen's main points concerning cultural pluralism, religion, Judaism, and Jewish education.
Criticism

Impressive as Kallen's doctrine of cultural pluralism is, we must ask to what extent cultural pluralism is being practiced in today's America and how feasible it is likely to be in the America of tomorrow.

It is certainly true that these last few years have witnessed a resurgence of ethnic identity, pride, and concern. Thus, at the 1969 tenth annual Pennsylvania-Delaware-Maryland regional conference of the American Jewish Committee, Dr. Murray Friedman, the American Jewish Committee's regional director, and Dennis Clark of Temple University's Center for Community Studies, insisted that "rather than melting into one homogeneous mass, ethnic groups in this country are experiencing a new awareness of their identities and differences."²

At the same conference, M. Leo Montgomery, of Temple University's Office of Urban Affairs, was reported as having said that "the goal should not be an integrated society... but one in which each ethnic, racial and religious group respects the others' life style and culture."³ This is a sentence that could have come from any of Horace Kallen's works on cultural pluralism:

³ Ibid.
The resurgence of ethnic identification among America's blacks and, to a lesser degree, among Puerto Rican-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians, has affected the ways some other people in the United States look at their ethnicity. In the refusal of the blacks to affirm that only white is beautiful, other peoples in the United States are also asking themselves whether they too have not been modeling too much of their outlook and behavior on the false "gods" of the White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASPS). In some circles there is a turning inward to one's ethnic group in search for better values and a better way of life.

Then, too, when one young Jewish radical, Marc A. Triebwasser, spoke of "the paramount need for belonging" that most people feel, his words get a sympathetic nod of agreement from persons at various points on the economic, social, and political spectrums. The ethnic group does offer relatively an individual the opportunity of being part of a/small, colorful, more person-concerned group with whom to "belong" in what appears to many persons to be the large, impersonal, unwieldy, increasingly homogeneous society of current America. The ethnic group can give an individual a sense of belonging which will help counteract his feeling of loneliness.

---

4 See, for example, The New York Times, Mar. 7, 1971, p. 80, where mention is made of the Chinese Center of Long Island, started in 1960, "with the specific intent of perpetuating Chinese culture among Chinese children born in America."

and of not being part of a community. At least as a focus of one's relaxed, leisure-time social life and, for some, of their concern for personal recognition and "doing-good," service endeavors, the ethnic group has an attraction. Indeed, in the opinion of Milton M. Gordon, an American student of ethnicity, Americans today "live within ethnic sub-societies criss-crossed by social class." 6

While they have undergone changes, as does everything, ethnic groups are not ready to fade away and die merely because some persons believe such groups have no future. What seems to be occurring, since the late 1960's especially, is a leap forward in ethnic interest. While the full, vibrant, ethnic life that Kallen wants is still not lived in by most Americans in this day of ethnic revival, ethnicity is still a factor in the lives of many individuals. 7

Nevertheless, in the opinion of this dissertation's writer, despite its present resurgence in certain circles ethnicity is continuing its long-range decline in America and the future does not look favorable to a significant rebirth of ethnic pluralism in the United States. Several factors seem to be contributing to the present, and probable future, long-range decline in ethnicity in America.


7 America's first multi-ethnic newspaper, PM, has appeared, in Los Angeles. As Frank Stanley, the publisher, was quoted as saying: "We want to be a good community newspaper, providing a positive-role model for the blacks, Mexican-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Indians in Los Angeles." See The New York Times, Mar. 7, 1971, p. 50.
First, with the sharp drop in immigration to America after the mid-1920's there has been a decline in ethnic distinctiveness. When compared with the high percentage of foreign-born in the population thirty and more years ago and the much smaller proportion today, it is understandable why fewer present-day Americans speak a second language. Fewer "East Side" ethnic concentrations exist, mostly especially for white groups. The "Jewish street" is now a rarity. The "Italian neighborhood" is less common than even a generation ago. Ethnic churches are not nearly as numerous as in the decades of large immigration. Fewer residents of this country seem to practice Old World folkways. Fewer turn to their ethnic cultures for life enrichment or to ethnic organizations for social contacts or personal assistance. Indeed, the number and membership of ethnic organizations and institutions have sharply declined when compared with the figures of earlier decades in this century. Moreover, the new immigrants of the last almost-fifty years have not revived, for a sustained period of time (a generation), the ethnic concern of most earlier settlers or of their acculturated children and grandchildren.

Second, the immigrant and native-born American have come to realize that most Americans expect persons who live in this country to embrace American culture (the English language, American history, American literature, and American
values) and to look upon their previous ethnic culture as a very secondary culture only supplementing the primary American pattern. Although most Americans tolerate differences in culture as "colorful," they do not approve of persons making their ethnic culture primary.

Third, while frowning on a serious commitment to ethnic culture, ethnic cultural diversity, and ethnic separatism, most Americans approve of religious distinctiveness and diversity. There is a willingness to sanction and even encourage religious pluralism, especially of the three-faiths' variety—Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism. These faiths are often looked upon as the "safe," "American" religions.

Fourth, as immigrants and their descendants advance economically and in social assimilation they often tend to drop that which differentiates them culturally from the "approved," high-status, "American" group. Ethnic interests are frequently difficult to maintain in mixed-ethnic business and social circles. Usually, a strong ethnic identity is deemed a liability by most members of the high-status "in-group," and therefore also by "climbers" of the economic and social ladders. A "climber" senses that he is expected to become an unqualified "American," unblemished by "parochial," "questionably-American," ethnic concerns.


No wonder that C. Bezalel Sherman claims that "the fate of ethnic groups in the United States is sealed." Many others agree with him. Ethnic ties have decreased drastically in the native-born generations. This is not due to open, verbal demands for "100% Americanism." It is largely the result of an unspoken social pressure, of conforming to what most Americans "naturally" expect of an American.

Certainly when compared with the rich ethnicity of their immigrant ancestors, there is little evidence of ethnic cultural influence in the lives of most fourth-generation English, French, Irish, or Russians in America. A "guess-estimate" we offer is that no more than 10% of white, fourth-generation Americans—except Jews—think of themselves as members of an ethnic group other than "American." For perhaps 90% of these people their ethnic identification is limited to a once-a-year ethnic parade, dance, meal, meeting, or wearing of an apparel-object (as the Irish-Americans wear green on March 17, St. Patrick's Day).


11 One example is Philip Hauser (b. 1909), professor of sociology at the Univ. of Chicago, who holds that almost all ethnic groups diminish in a few generations; see Community Relations Components in the Work of Other Jewish Communal Services, ed. Arnold Aronson and Samuel Spiegler (New York: National Community Relations Advisory Council, 1962), p. 86.
Even most of those whites who revolt against American culture, denouncing it as racist, corrupt, bourgeois, or with skewed priorities, do not turn to their ethnic culture for alternate values or a different life-style. They turn, instead, to ideas propounded by black extremists, by writers, by the latest hero or "in" cause on the college campus, or to other sources.

Although differences presently exist in the pattern of values and life-style of many descendants of one/ethnic group when compared with the descendants of another immigrant-ethnic group, these differences are slowly narrowing.12 As the years go by, and if prejudice and discrimination against Jews and colored peoples decline, the ethnic differences in the pattern of values and life-style will probably decrease even more. American culture will—regrettably in the writer's view—become even more homogeneous in values and manifestations. Significant differences in values and life-style there will be; but they will be found in a fewer percentage of persons, and these differences will not be primarily due to what the individuals have learned from their ethnic heritages. It is suggested that the differences will mainly stem from various emphases by religious groups, by traditional non-conformists (e.g., commune members, some college students and intellectuals), by the still prejudiced-and-discriminated against.

The sharp decline in ethnic identification since the immigrant generations, and the predicted slower decrease in future years, do not, as noted, hold as true for non-whites and Jews as for white Gentiles. Why? The non-whites, especially the blacks, are still victims of a particularly strong prejudice and discrimination. They often continue to turn, therefore, to their ethnic or color community—as Kallen has stated immigrants are wont to do—for refuge from the hostility encountered in the outside world, for consolation and reassurance, encouragement and help, protection and the regaining of self-respect. Their values and way of life are therefore likely to be more influenced by their ethnic or color community to which, because of prejudice and discrimination, they turn more frequently than do most white Gentiles.

As for Jews, most of them are white-skinned. Nevertheless, even in the fourth generation they want to retain their Jewish identity along with their Americanism. Because most Americans frown on making one's ethnic culture primary but do not object to religious diversity, Jews in America have largely redefined themselves as a religious group.

13 See above, p. 400.

14 Ibid., pp. 14-17.

15 For a recent study of Jews in another land, Australia, who desire to retain their membership in the Jewish ethnic minority while participating as a Jewish community and as Jewish individuals in the country's national life—cultural pluralism at work!—see P. Y. Medding, From Assimilation to Group Survival (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1969).
most
But/Jewish-Americans as well as Gentile Americans see
the Jews as constituting mainly a religious group, not an
ethnic group. (To the writer this is an erroneous and re-
grettable description but it is the most common current
designation given Jews.) The ethnic character of the Jews
is viewed as stemming from the fact that Judaism (i.e., the
Jewish religion) is the faith only of Jews.16 As C. Bezalel
Sherman has written: "The new Jewish generation accepts the
concept of Jewish peoplehood, but it cannot comprehend a
Jewishness that is completely divorced from the Jewish re-
ligion. Jews regard the Synagogue as the center of Jewish
identification and see it as the institution in which Amer-
ican patterns of living and the search for Jewish self-ex-
pression converge."17

It is fact that more Jews than ever before in America
have become members of a synagogue, probably because the
synagogue exemplifies Jewish religion to Americans (Jews and
Gentiles) and readily gives the Jew an approved Jewish iden-
tity. Religion has become the Jew's mark of identification
and the acceptable, American way of expressing his Jewish
difference.18

16 See C. Bezalel Sherman, "Demographic and Social Aspects,"
17 Ibid.
To non-Jewish and Jewish Americans diversity of religious groupings has largely supplanted the earlier ethnic diversity as the approved means of social identification. A strange situation has therefore come to pass. Although they identify themselves to their fellow Americans (Gentiles and Jews) as a religious group, many Jews feel and/or know that they are not only a religious group like the Protestants and Catholics. An obvious proof is that to most Jews an atheist Jew is still a Jew, but there is no such creature as an atheist Protestant or an atheist Catholic. Furthermore, a high percentage of Jews—including those who are members of synagogues—have surrendered many of the traditional Jewish religious beliefs, practice little Jewish ritual in their homes, and attend synagogue prayer services infrequently. Nevertheless, most Jews label themselves a religious group. Their problem seems to be that if they are not a religious group they cannot rationalize their desire to continue as Jews in non-ethnic-centered America. The religious face, most American Jews believe, is necessary for their Jewish survival in America—and Jews wish to continue in this country as a distinct group.

Even many Jewish secularists acknowledge that in the current American climate they "have no alternative but to function as a community within a religious framework." 19 To do this a number of Jewish secularists now observe such Jewish

religious practices as kindling the Sabbath and holiday candles, but as folkways not religious rituals. Kallen did not object to the secularist chalutzim who refrained from eating pork; he saw their act as expressive of the Jewish national way of life. One wonders if Kallen would approve the somewhat similar actions by some of today's Jewish secularists in America. One suspects he would.

After all, Kallen is cognizant of the changing ways in which an individual may show his ethnic concern. He has reminded us that cultural pluralism does not postulate "merely an ethnic past repeating itself." As each ethnic group and individual confronts the America of its/day, reactions vary. The ethnic group's ideas and practices change, and so do the individual's. Kallen would therefore probably understand the "religious" actions of Jewish secularists of today's America as changes that some members of the Jewish ethnic group have chosen to make in order to survive as a distinctive group.

Will this religious "front" continue to be deemed necessary for Jews to survive as a distinct group in this country? Although no one knows for sure, Mordecai M. Kaplan

20 See above, note 183, p. 166.

has written that in his opinion "the only kinds of groups likely to remain permanent within the political pattern of this country are those that have religious significance for their adherents." Because America is a nation wherein most ethnic cultures have decreased sharply in significance for their members while most religious groups have retained the loyalty of a high percentage of their adherents, and because in the United States most of the country's citizenry do not favor attaching meaningful loyalty to one's ethnic culture but approve such loyalty to a religion like Judaism or Christianity, it does seem likely that for the bulk of present-day Jewry in America to survive in the foreseeable future they--and more likely their descendants--will have to see their Jewish culture as a religious culture.

To view Judaism in this way should not be difficult. The individual Jew can take from Jewish culture its basic value-complex, religious beliefs (denial of idolatry and the affirmation of the one God), and way of life. For him, they can be his religion--that to which he gives ultimate loyalty and/or that from which he gets the most wherewithal to find meaning in life and to continue his


23 Jewish secularists can easily assent to denying idolatry, be the object of supreme loyalty a god-man deemed divine, or money, power, physical beauty, sex, or whatever, Even "God," when interpreted in certain ways--for example, as a symbol of 100% goodness, or of all worthy ideals perfected, or of man's highest worthy aspirations--can be accepted by most, if not all, Jewish (or non-Jewish!) secularists.
life-struggle. For Kallen himself, the Jewish ethnic culture largely serves that purpose now, except that whereas Hebraism is the core of his "religion" there are items from other cultures which orchestrate with Hebraism to form his "religion." But the same orchestration would hold true for most other Jews, even for "Judaists" who are more traditional religionists than Kallen.

It is the dissertation writer's opinion, however, that Jewish values, Jewish religious beliefs, and a Jewish way of life that do not differ significantly from those held by liberal Christians or humanists will not suffice as adequate reasons for remaining Jewish to many fourth-generation American Jews who lack a strong attachment to the Jewish folk. Nor will Kallen's argument suffice, namely, that one must/add the Jewish difference to the American cultural river; to many such Jews (i.e., fourth-generation American Jews) the "differences" in ideas/would be slight and the obvious distinctions in such matters as languages, music, dances, and food preferences, would not be worth the price of still being a real or potential victim of anti-Semitism. So, it is here suggested, would many such Jews reason.

With the likelihood of greater economic opportunities for Jews in the United States, more social contacts and friendships with non-Jews, greater acceptance of Jews as social equals by Gentiles, a lessening of overt anti-Semitism, the tendency of

\(^{24}\) See above, p. 83.
most Americans to look askance at post-immigrant generations taking seriously their non-religious ethnic backgrounds, and the lack of a sufficiently strong reason for continuing as secular Jews in this country—for all these causes it is this writer's opinion that most American Jews must come to see their Jewish ethnicity as providing them with a religious culture which contains enough distinctive values (or value-emphases), important religious beliefs, and a worthwhile way of life, which make it very meaningful and desirable for an American Jew to retain his Jewish identity willingly. 25

The conclusion proposed, therefore, is that while cultural pluralism was a fine rationale for Jewish survival in the immigrant generations, in the present clime (and likely future) Jewish continuity in America is seriously threatened unless Jews see Jewish culture as a religious culture, that is, as having religious meaning for them. In the long run, a secular rationale for Jewish life will hold a decreasing number of American Jews within the Jewish fold.

25 J. Milton Yinger—in Anti-Semitism: A Case Study in Prejudice and Discrimination (New York: Freedom Books, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1964), p. 70—has written: "The assimilationist forces, however, if we may hazard a prediction, are likely to grow stronger. The result will not be to eliminate a separate Jewish community in the United States. What seems more likely will be continuing identity with a group which becomes less and less distinctive." For an interesting description of some forces making it difficult for Jews to be part of American society and to retain their Jewish identity, see Marshall Sklare, "The Forces Shaping American Jewry," Jewish Frontier, XXVI, 5 (May 1969), pp. 21-24.
Speaking of Judaism as a religious culture, questions can be asked concerning Kallen's insistence that "Judaism" is a religion only, with no secular elements, and that a "Judaist" is one who limits his Jewish concern to "Judaism." Probably all denominational groups in "Judaism"—with the possible exception of the American Council for Judaism—see secular matters as part of their Judaism. These secular issues include such matters as helping to achieve civil rights for all human beings and encouraging the spread of Hebrew and Yiddish (regardless of the "secular" elements therein). For most followers of "Judaism" these are not "secular" items, because, they maintain, the Jewish religion is applicable to every area of life. 27 As for the "Judaist" designation, Kallen himself has admitted that a "Judaist" can also be a "Jew" if he accepts secular items along with religious elements in Jewish culture. 28 But which "Judaist" does not accept some "secular" Jewish interests? It is questionable whether there is such a person as a pure "Judaist."

26 See above, pp. 63-64.

27 Cf. Bernard Heller's criticism of Kallen, above, note 44, p. 65. To cite one area of life, the Bible deals with the "secular" matter of business in such passages as Ex. 20:3-11, Lev. 19:35-37, Deut. 23:16-17, 20, 24:10-15, 19-22, Jer. 22:13, and Is. 5:8.

28 See above, note 60, p. 69.
Also regarding religion it should be noted that to most Jews, including the writer of this dissertation, Kallen's position that a Jew who converts to a religion other than Judaism remains a Jew by nationality is unacceptable.\footnote{Ibid.} Nationality and religion are intertwined in Jewish historical experience. While an agnostic or atheist may even be acceptable as a Jew to most of his fellow Jews, a Jew who becomes a Catholic, for instance, is no longer a Jew, even in nationality. Contra Kallen, once a Jew converts to another religion he is no longer a member of the Jewish people. This is the "gut-reaction" of the average Jew.

Furthermore, is it really true, as Kallen asserts,\footnote{Ibid., pp. 67-68.} that a person cannot change his nationality? If a person's parents are Jews or Englishmen, for example, does that mean the individual must always be a Jew or Englishman? If he or she was never raised in that ethnic culture, or was, but consciously repudiates it, in what/sense is the person a Jew or Englishman by nationality? To claim that one is so nevertheless, seems dangerously close to racism. Nationality is not comparable to a human being's skin pigmentation: for a black person to claim he is white is contradicted by obvious fact, but for a Jew or Englishman to proclaim that he is no longer\footnote{Ibid.} an adherent of that ethnic group need not be/contradicted by an obvious outer or inborn mark of nationality identity.
Another point concerning religion. Kallen does religion an injustice, in this writer's view, when he characterizes all religious belief as belief in the supernatural. Most Reconstructionists, for instance, have surrendered a belief in the supernatural; yet, to most Jews, Reconstructionism is a legitimate religious Jewish position. Moreover, it is probable that some individuals who see themselves as adherents of Reform Judaism or Conservative Judaism also reject the supernatural.

As Sidney Morgenbesser, a philosophy professor at Columbia University and then also an associate editor of The Reconstructionist magazine, has observed, "It is unfortunate that he {i.e., Kallen} did not consider how a religious development of American Jewry might fit in with his philosophy." It seems that Kallen's identification of religion with the supernatural, the superstitious, the anti-scientific, prevented him from such a consideration. Yet, especially since it is religious pluralism (and not cultural pluralism) that most present-day Americans are willing to live with indefinitely, Kallen's failure to delineate how his philosophy would be applicable in a religiously oriented America and American Jewry is regrettable.

31 Ibid., note 19, p. 175, and note 38, p. 180.
Undoubtedly, Reconstructionism would be most sympathetic to Kallen's emphasis on the socio-cultural aspects of Jewish culture. The other "Judaist" denominations might also be receptive, even if less enthusiastic. With the synagogue symbolizing Judaism and American Jewry to most non-Jewish Americans, and perhaps also to most of today's Jewish Americans, what takes place inside the synagogue building could stress the "folk" as well as the "faith." A whole range of Jewish activities—from prayer services to planning trips to Israel, from gatherings for lovers of Yiddish to the staging of a play on the book of Job or about Louis Brandeis, from learning to cook Jewish food specialties to preparing books for the Jewish blind—could take place within the synagogue structure's walls. At least the synagogue building could become an ethnic "community" for America's Jews.

Perhaps the direction most of American Jewry must take—and, in time, most of Israeli and other Jewry as well—is that which is suggested by Nathan Glazer, professor of education and social structure at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education: "We must try to give new validity to ethnic attachment and to liberalism, both humanized, or spiritualized, if you will, by association with an old religion."

Philip Arian—in "Needed: Emotional Relevance in Jewish Education," Conservative Judaism, XXIII, 1 (Fall 1968), 51—has suggested that the synagogue should be expanded "from narrow houses of religion into socio-cultural-religious complexes."

Whatever be one's primary Jewish attachment—to the "folk" aspects of Jewish life and culture or to its "faith" side—Horace Kallen wisely perceived that Jewish education must become the focal point of Jewish concern. Jewish education helps make or break Jews. If Jewish education is experienced as relevant and exciting, then Jews are likely to remain Jews. If the pupils are exposed to the totality of Jewish culture in the Jewish school, as Kallen wants them to be, then surely somewhere in that culture or in the Jewish historical experience Jews could find enough sustenance and satisfaction to provide a solid philosophical and emotional base—in addition to the American Idea—for voluntarily retaining their Jewish difference.

However, it is hardly practical, as Kallen wants,\(^{35}\) for Jewish educators to teach Jewish children and adults all the ideas and practices of all Jewish groups. There isn't time enough in the Jewish school to do that and to study Jewish history, literature, customs, Hebrew, etc. A minimum could be to teach Kallen's outlook of the right to be different, to understand and cooperate with (as well as learn from) the different Jewish groups, and to acknowledge the union in Jewish peoplehood and Jewish culture of the diverse individuals, ideas, experiences, and groups comprising the Jewish people. Also, the history, beliefs, and activities of the major religious and secular groups among Jews could be taught, with books and other material being available for students to learn more about these and other groups in Jewish life.

\(^{35}\) See above, pp. 304-306, 343-345, 363-364.
Of course new paths of Jewish thought and action will be charted. As Jewish youth, especially, seek new ways to express their Jewishness, Kallen's encouragement of free inquiry and the right to differ, as well as his depiction of the Jewish people as an aggregation of sub-groups (each with its viewpoint and practices), could serve as a philosophic validation of what the youth are doing and of what they come up with in their struggle to survive as Jews. Jewish educators would do well to bring this outlook of Kallen's to the attention of the young and old so that the youth and the older generation will learn that new views, practices, and life-styles can and should find expression within Jewish life. Such teaching may also help keep the searching, innovative young within the Jewish fold. Moreover, in the years ahead, when secularism (in or out of a religious "mask") is likely to advance at traditional religion's expense, Jewish educators might find it wise to teach and to spell out Kallen's insistence that Jewish secularism is a legitimate option for Jews and that Jewish secularists are very much part of the Jewish people.

Whether the Jewish future in America be in the direction of an intense secular, ethnic Jewish life or as a religious-cultural experience, to ensure there being Jews concerned about that question and Jewish living at all, Jews of every inclination must join in union in order to advance a common cause: the best possible Jewish education for each American Jew. This is a challenge which includes reckoning with the thinking and deeds of Horace M. Kallen.

Recommendations

In addition to Kallen, or someone else, spelling out how union-with-diversity, equality of the different, live-and-help-live, emphasis on the whole Jewish heritage, and the orchestration of what one learns, could be living realities for a Jewish life in which religion is a significant force, it is recommended that many future scholarly endeavors be devoted to uncovering the ideas and deeds of Horace Kallen. A biography is needed. More collections of his articles should be gathered and published. His huge correspondence with Jews and non-Jews should be culled; a collection of Kallen's letters would prove of great historical interest and, since his writing is absorbing sprinkled with memorable phrases, entertaining and literature.

More must be done to bring Kallen, the father of cultural pluralism, to the attention of Jews and Gentiles in America and elsewhere. His work warrants such attention. And, if we chose to limit ourselves to Jews, we could surely conclude that in the rush and ebb and rush again of life, Horace M. Kallen's ideas and way in the world could influence many Jews of future generations to live with integrity as Jewish human
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