

Jewish Survival and The College Campus

IRVING GREENBERG

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN JUDAISM IS BEING shaped on the college campus. This is not a public-relations or alarmist statement but a literal, statistically descriptive fact. In 1964, Alfred Jospe estimated that 80% of eligible Jewish youth were attending college—up from 62% in 1956 and compared to 27% of the eligible non-Jewish youth.¹ The main forces making for college attendance are affluence, expectations linked to status seeking, and the desire for upward mobility through education. Since these forces trend steadily higher in the Jewish community, we can foresee, in the near future, a condition of “full college employment” among Jewish youth. (All but a hard core of “unemployables,” poverty-stricken, intellectually retarded, and emotional or psychological drop-outs will be in attendance.) It is not just the élite, or the leadership of the Jewish community of the future which will be shaped by the college experience but the rank-and-file foot-soldiers as well. This is a fact unprecedented in world history and is a reflection of the extraordinary achievement of the Jews in the modern, free society. But this also means that any effect which college has on the values of other groups is somewhat marginal or, at least, diluted. Although, since it is the élite of other groups which are in attendance, the effect is much out of proportion to the number involved. In the case of the Jews, the effect becomes overwhelming. A marginal, if significant, trend becomes decisive. In short, if college sneezes, the Jewish community catches pneumonia.

In light of the attendance figures, the question of the effect of college or university experience on Jewish values and loyalty becomes one of

1. Alfred Jospe, “Jewish College Students in the United States,” *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. LXV (1964), p. 133. Robert Shosteck’s survey, *The Jewish College Student* (Washington, D.C., B’nai Brith Vocational Service, 1957) found the ratio at 62%. On non-Jewish patterns, see also Donald J. Bogue, *The Population of the United States* (Glencoe, Ill., 1959), p. 704.

IRVING GREENBERG is rabbi of the Riverdale Jewish Center in New York City. He is also an associate professor of history at Yeshiva University. The present article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the Tenth Annual Conference of the Social Workers Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York. Rabbi Greenberg’s essay continues the discussion on Judaism and the university, initiated in the Winter 1968 issue by Milton Himmelfarb (“The Jewish College Student and the Intellectual Community”) and Leonard J. Fein (“Dilemmas of Jewish Identity on the College Campus”).

260 : *Judaism*

extraordinary importance to the Jewish community. It is all the more regrettable then that there has not been enough systematic or comprehensive study of this question. The studies that do exist range widely in quality, adequacy of research design, significance of sample, freedom from bias, etc. Nor were these studies undertaken as part of an overall design to achieve coverage of all types of colleges, types of Jewish students, etc. The analyses and conclusions of this paper should be taken as educated guesses then. They are also heavily influenced by the personal observations and experiences of the writer.

I

ALL OF THE STUDIES WE HAVE point to one fact. By and large, college is a disaster area for Judaism, Jewish loyalty and Jewish identity. From Marvin Nathan's study of 1500 Jewish students at 57 colleges and universities in 1931 to Meyer Greenberg's study of students at Yale in 1940 to the most recent studies by B'nai Brith, the trend is clear.² Whatever the nature of the student's commitment, observance or loyalty, it tends to decline in college. (There is a minority which responds to the challenge by deepening its Jewish commitment. But it is a very small percentage and it hasn't been studied. It should be.) Observance of the Sabbath and of *kashruth* declines. Zionist students tend to reduce their support of Israel. Weak Jewish identities tend to shrivel or falter. In Meyer Greenberg's study, a concept such as the Chosenness of Israel which calls for commitment in order to be believed and which seems to "flout" standard liberal norms, declines to where only 4% of the class is willing to affirm it.³ Readiness to interdate or intermarry rises sharply. Perhaps it can be summarized in the following statistics. Stanley Bigman's study of Washington, D.C. found the intermarriage rate to be 1.4% in the first generation (foreign-born), 10.2% in the second generation, (American-born), and 17.9% in the third generation. If we isolate out the third-generation college graduates, the rate leaps to 37%⁴. (This

2. Marvin Nathan, *The Attitude of the Jewish Student in the Colleges and Universities towards His Religion* (New York, 1932); Meyer Greenberg, "The Jewish Student at Yale: His Attitude toward Judaism," *YIVO Annual of Social Science*, Vol. 1 (1941), pp. 217-240; compare the *Harvard Crimson* survey of religious attitudes (issues of June 1959 and September 1959). The B'nai Brith studies have been reported orally and in the press but were not available to me at this writing. Indirect reflections of this trend can be seen in the famous *Commentary* symposium, "Jewishness and the Younger Intellectual," *Commentary*, Vol. XXXI, No. 4 (April 1961), pp. 306-359, and in Norman Podhoretz, *Making It* (New York, 1968), *passim*. See also Milton Himmelfarb, "The Jewish College Student and the Intellectual Community," *JUDAISM*, Winter 1968, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 3-9; and Leonard J. Fein, "Dilemmas of Jewish Identity on the College Campus," *ibid.*, pp. 10 ff. See also the evidence in footnote 4.

3. Meyer Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

4. Stanley K. Bigman, *The Jewish Population of Greater Washington* (Washington, D.C., 1958), pp. 124-132. This is confirmed by Fred Massarik's *The Jewish Population*

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 261

statistic is more alarming than it should be. Washington is a city which concentrates marginal and alienated Jews. But the trend is clear and true in cities where the percentages are less frightful.) Let us take the trend as granted, then, and turn to the question: Why?

The college years come during a key period of personality formation. Erik Erikson has suggested that it is one of the two crucial periods of personality integration of the individual. The first period is the first five years of life when the basic ego structure is formed. The second is the period of late adolescence when the social-cultural personality is formed.⁵ At this key period of life, the student comes to college. The search for self and self-definition, the establishment of loyalties and faithfulness, the trying of different roles and patterns—all characterize this phase. The student is highly suggestible and hungry for experience and influences. In the non-commuter college, the student goes into a setup where parental and family influence will be far away. He is most sheltered from the agencies of Jewish transmission—the parents, family, home, neighborhood and synagogue. He is really isolated from much adult contact in general. Contacts between students and faculty and administrators are notoriously marginal in most cases. As Dr. Seymour Halleck, director of student psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin, said recently: “A student can spend months on a large campus without having a conversation with a person over 30.”⁶ This means that the student is immersed in the group which is most suggestible, most willing to give up traditional values, most responsive to what is new as against what is continuous. The amount of personal supervision in most colleges is increasingly nil. The biological maturation of the sexual urge without official and legitimate ways of expressing it (such as marriage, which is out financially and emotionally for most students); the peculiar pressures and responsibilities of college which can determine lifetime careers or success yet are clearly unrelated to direct action in the real world; the relative affluence without personal effort of more and more students—all these create an emotional ferment and restlessness (and, in a growing number, the phenomenon of alienation) which make traditional com-

of San Francisco, Marin County and the Peninsula (San Francisco, 1959), p. 44. See also the studies cited in Irving Greenberg, “Adventure in Freedom—or Escape from Freedom?: Jewish Identity in America,” *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, Vol. LV, No. 1 (September 1965), pp. 5-21, especially pp. 6, 10, 14-18. Note also the evidence in David Caplovitz and Harry Levy, *Interreligious Dating among College Students* (mimeographed) (Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, September 1965).

5. Erik H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York, 1963), Ch. 7, especially pp. 261-263; Erikson, *Youth and Crisis* (New York, 1968), especially Part III. One might cite Erikson's interpretation of Martin Luther's life in the light of an identity crisis and reformulation in his *Young Man Luther* (New York, 1958).

6. *New York Times*, May 12, 1968. See Halleck's comments on the influence of the group in his study “Sex and Mental Health on the Campus,” *Journal of the American Medical Association* (May 22, 1967), Vol. 200, No. 8, pp. 684 ff., especially p. 688.

262 : *Judaism*

mitment vulnerable. It should be pointed out that different colleges have different effects. A typology of colleges might distinguish three special types of value atmosphere:

1) Those with a vocational-occupational orientation. These colleges with their matter-of-fact tendencies, their greater focus on conventional real life, their lesser intellectualism tend to have much less impact on their students' values. (These colleges tend to be less academic and they attract correspondingly fewer Jewish students.)

2) Those with an intellectual-academic orientation. Here the school's stress on intense high-level study, the tendency toward a research-directed cosmopolitan faculty, and the challenges posed by the humanities, etc. tend to create more impact on the student's values.

3) Those with a particularly strong value-orientating impact. These schools tend to be academic-intellectual (although teaching and student participation may be more highly rated on such a campus relative to research). However, the key kicker is the presence of a strong value concern and a tradition of faculty and student involvement in questions of value and meaning. Frequently, the student subculture is particularly strong in creating groups involved in the subculture's values. These may range from social-action involvement to Bohemian circles, etc. Examples of such schools are Oberlin, Antioch, Swarthmore. In the larger schools, Berkeley is a less pure form of this type. Needless to say, there are overlaps and cross-factors. Thus, Harvard probably straddles types 2) and 3). Commuter colleges, such as the City University of New York, tend to be academic-intellectual in orientation but vocational-like in their value impact—since the student spends most of his social life in the home and neighborhood setting. Catholic or church-related colleges tend to reinforce traditional values for students.⁷ Obviously, then, some colleges will have more impact than others. Still, the general trend is again clear. All tend to have some impact on the values of the student. Most of the impact is in the direction of unsettling traditional values.⁸

The college setting presents a challenge to all established consensual values, which has not yet been fully apprehended by society. Most of

7. See R. L. Sutherland, W. H. Holtzman, E. A. Koile, and B. K. Smith, eds., *Personality Factors on the College Campus* (Austin, Texas, 1962), especially C. R. Pace, "Implications of Differences in Campus Atmosphere," *ibid.*, pp. 43-62. See also Robert Hassenger, "The Impact of the Catholic College" in R. Hassenger, ed., *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education* (Chicago 1967). See also T. M. Newcomb and K. Feldman, *The Impact of College* (in preparation), cited in Robert Hassenger, "Values and Social Change," *The Barat Review*, Vol. 2. No. 2 (June 1967).

8. In 1957, Philip Jacob's book *Changing Values in College* (New York, 1957) achieved wide recognition with its claim that college had little effect on students' values. The burden of increasing evidence—and personal observation—is that a significant number of students are effected particularly in certain kinds of campus atmospheres. Cf. footnote 7.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 263

society's codes tend to perpetuate themselves by being taken for granted. Being taken for granted depends in part on the unavailability of alternate codes, models of behavior, etc. The scientific and social-scientific methods which dominate the college curriculum place great stress on challenging the given and the assumed. Moreover, the university atmosphere is like an exaggerated version of the modern cultural setting. It is a high-communication, opinion-forming and sharing situation. Many views and values are constantly being made available. This characteristic tends to undermine traditional patterns, which depend on consensus and rarely are prepared to justify themselves in a market place of ideas and alternatives.⁹ The relative affluence of the college creates a setting conducive to hedonism. The multiplicity of codes creates a strong secularist and universalist orientation. Such values as patriotism and moralism which are heavily saturated with particularist and authority assumptions come under heavy pressure. This general pattern has tended to attract people of a more alienated type or people with strong critical, hedonistic and secularist bents. Thus the academic community or "subculture" has a high concentration of personality types critical or antagonistic to authority and relativistic in ethics.¹⁰

It may be, of course, that these tendencies are intrinsic to the culture of modernism and that college atmosphere is like the rest of society—only more so. But the pure and highly concentrated form of these trends makes for exceptional impact on personality and ethical values of the students. There is also a built-in bias against the exercise of authority and discipline in the university. Thus the administrator is frequently on the defensive. Supervision tends to be steadily restricted. In effect, the student is left almost completely to the influence of his peer group and the faculty critics. It is no accident that the universities are bastions of anti-war sentiment as they are of anti-patriotic, anti-moralistic sentiment. There is no implication here that the universities are hotbeds of treason

9. Cf. Irving Greenberg, "The Cultural Revolution and Religious Unity," *Religious Education*, Vol. LXII, No. 2, (March-April 1967), pp. 98-100. Robert Jay Lifton has some acute remarks on the constant change in attitudes bred by the barrage of differing attitude and cultural models generated by the media in his "Protean Man," *Partisan Review* (Winter, 1968), Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 13 ff. See also the theoretical formulations of the impact of stepped up communication in Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society* (New York, 1964), especially chapter 2.

10. See Christopher Jencks, "The Academic Subculture," in Roger Hagan, ed., *Character and Social Structure in America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960, Harvard Printing Office, offset print), pp. 95-122, and the bibliography there cited. See Anne Roe, *The Psychology of Occupations* (New York, 1956) and Paul Lazarsfeld *et al.*, *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis* (Glencoe, Ill., 1958). See also Morris Rosenberg's "Occupations and Values" in Morris Rosenberg and Paul Lazarsfeld, eds., *The Language of Social Research* (Glencoe, Ill. 1955). The novelists have captured much of this flavor in such works as Carlos Baker, *A Friend in Power* (New York, 1959), Stringfellow Barr, *Purely Academic* (New York 1958), and Mary McCarthy, *The Groves of Academe* (New York, 1952).

264 : *Judaism*

or immorality. Opposition to the present war may indeed be the more moral position. What is unclear, however, is whether the college community would create a different attitude toward a more clearly justified war or moral code.

No society can operate without some consensual values. If it feels pressed enough by the undermining of these values, society will tend to bring counter-pressure. Thus, the severe parental backlash against drugs has forced the universities to reverse their general tendency to reduce supervision or enforcement of moral codes. But the general problem, that in the college, society has created a subculture generally dissolving of traditional values, has not yet been fully perceived or weighed. It may be that society will decide that it is beneficial for traditional norms to be dissolved. This certainly has become the new American consensus toward the old virtues of the Puritan ethic. The needs of the production and distribution system as expressed in advertising particularly have led to the steadily more apparent destruction of traditional norms of asceticism, work orientations, etc.¹¹ However, this may be a more serious problem when it comes to questions such as the existence of the family, honesty as a code, and so on. Be this as it may, this is the setting to which the Jewish student comes at a particularly impressionable age. The amazing thing is not so much how much undermining of traditional patterns there is, but how much there isn't. Despite all the factors operating for change a substantial number—probably a majority—go through college passively with a minimum of long-term effect on their central concerns. Nevertheless, the trend and the influence of the minority who are affected are the stuff out of which massive cultural shifts are made.

II

THE EFFECT OF COLLEGE on the newly arrived Jewish student is clearly an exaggerated version of the problem of Judaism in a free and open society. Until recent times, Judaism survived in a closed cultural setting with sharp distinctions between Jews and Gentiles. The Jewish codes were self-evident and the alternate codes were culturally inferior and identified with the persecutors. Jewish existence was seen as ascribed by birth. It was a diffuse commitment reflecting itself in every area of life and behavior. The particularist norms in Judaism became ever more prominent—in part as a necessary survival measure. Despite the transfer to the American setting (and the massive bleeding of Jewish loyalties and values which resulted) much of the surviving Jewish commitment and

11. Cf. Jules Henry, *Culture Against Man* (New York, 1963), David M. Potter, *People of Plenty* (Chicago, 1954) and others. Cf. also Irving Greenberg, "Jewish Values and Changing American Culture," *Tradition*, Vol. 9, No. 5 (Summer 1968), forthcoming.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 265

loyalty is still saturated with these tendencies.¹² The universalization of Judaism and the weakening of traditional observance has left the surviving Jewish loyalties even more dependent on ethnic ties and tribal feeling. Parents have hoped to keep a nominal Jewish identity for their children going by concentrating in Jewish neighborhoods.¹³ But the further decline of discrimination and the open social setting of the university in particular have destroyed that possible escape.

The universal, secularist life-style of the university is highly destructive of the remaining particularistic, ethnic loyalties of the student. The normative tone of much of religious life and teaching is undermined by the critical style of the college. The ethnic tribalism is seen as atavistic and as logically unjustifiable in the universalist atmosphere. Thus interdating and intermarriage are no longer seen as evil. It may be a blow for a better world where all men are equal. It has been pointed out by some observers that whereas intermarriage tended to be associated with character disturbances and emotional problems in the partners, this is no longer so true.¹⁴ Many of the couples now may be quite normal and even idealistic types who approach intermarriage with little of the old inner conflict. The life-style of the Jewish community is still warm and sentimental in tone. Its organizational and fund-raising life is dominated by *koved* considerations, effusive and emotional situations and language and a generally saccharine medium. But this tone and quality is highly vulnerable to the cool, emotionally understated and highly critical style of the university. (Compare the style of a synagogue bulletin and a college student newspaper.) The "acids of modernity" create an "acidic" medium which is highly caustic in its effect on the Jewish student's feelings for Jewishness. The Jewish setting is seen as unsophisticated, bourgeois—and there is an emotional recoil.

The net effect of the clash of the two life-styles is to set up a pair of contrasting polarities in the mind and heart of the Jewish student. Judaism is identified with the group and ethnocentrism; secularism, with the universal concerns. Jewish society's tone is warm and lush; the academic style is cool and spare. The Jewish society is bourgeois; the academic, swinging. The Jewish community is the culture of organiza-

12. I have discussed the life-style divergences in two articles cited above in footnotes 4 and 11.

13. Erich Rosenthal, "Acculturation without Assimilation: The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXVI, No. 3 (November 1960), pp. 275-288. Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk, *The Riverton Study* (New York, 1957), p. 37.

14. I. Greenberg, "Adventure in Freedom," *op. cit.*, pp. 15-17. See Rabbi Henry Cohen's study quoted in Marshall Sklare, "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future," *Commentary*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 4 (April 1964), p. 50. Cf. also Richard Rubenstein's comments in Werner Cahnman, ed., *Intermarriage and Jewish Life* (New York, 1963).

266 : *Judaism*

tions; college society is the scene of privatism and self-expression.¹⁵ Not surprisingly, the student tends to opt for the secular alternative. In this connection, perhaps a word might be said about the much bruited (and possibly exaggerated) sexual revolution on the campus. The change in sexual values not only may lead to a shift away from Jewish standards and, incidentally, reflect itself in interdating and intermarriage; it also tends to associate the new personality and identify with a swinging and more personal-satisfaction-oriented way of life. The Jewish identity remains equated with the more staid and conventional. For those who opt for the new values there is, then, the reward of this kind of performance being permitted. Even for those who do not fully identify with greater freedom or even promiscuity, there may be a fashion-image created. If you will, Judaism is the old "Yiddishe momma"; the secular, the mini-skirted swinger.

In addition to choosing the secular alternative, the student also withdraws from the Jewish community. It is true that this withdrawal may not be permanent, but intermarriage very likely may make it so, and intermarriage is rising in the college-educated population. However, even if the student does go back to a more normal pattern and rejoins the Jewish community after marriage he is likely to have incorporated negative emotional, as well as intellectual, orientations towards Jewish values. Thus, the quality of his Jewish life and the kind of community he is likely to create or participate in is probably going to be flawed or marred by serious ambivalence and even hostility to Jewishness. Thus, the weakening of values will lead to a weaker community and even more vulnerable offspring.

The emotional recoil of the Jewish student is intensified by the impact of the intellectual challenge of college. In the curriculum at the present time are a host of areas whose working assumptions and findings of fact are contradictory to traditional religions—and to Judaism in particular. Psychology, anthropology, sociology are obvious examples of this. Thus psychology may be operating with behaviorist assumptions or with psychoanalytic axioms. Both challenge traditional religions and Judaism's moral assumptions. The chances are that if religion is studied in this area, it is as a human fulfillment (or repressive) system or through the eyes of Sigmund Freud in *The Future of an Illusion*, which sees religion as a neurosis to be outgrown by man. The approach to religion in the history curriculum is likely to be far more historicist and relativist than that which the student has heard before. Sociology and anthropology offer highly relativistic orientations toward religion and moral

15. Harold Weisberg's comments on the Jewish "culture of organizations" are found in Oscar Janowsky, ed., *The American Jew: A Reappraisal* (Philadelphia, 1964).

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 267

codes.¹⁶ Not the least of the effect of these studies on the student is the powerful emotional psychic gain of having been “wised up.” Once the traditional assumptions have been exposed or undermined, the student may tend to identify everything he has been taught earlier as “kid stuff” or phony or outdated. There is thus a moral and emotional recoil from it and from the authority of those who transmitted these teachings to him. Indeed, the college does not present itself as authoritarian. But the secular and relative orientations are quite ubiquitous. Thus the student tends to accept them as indisputable, particularly when his sense of intellectual sophistication and discovery is being appealed to. This is the truth—and not the existence of a liberal conspiracy— which William Buckley was trying to get at in his lugubrious book, *God and Man at Yale*. What Buckley also failed to grasp is that all systems tend to perpetuate themselves by creating such an atmosphere. Still, it is a piquant development that, under the cover of no values and openness, so homogenous a cultural atmosphere has been created. Religion and religious education will have to learn how to live in this atmosphere and develop commitment through such techniques if they are to survive in the new medium. This creates a crisis for Jewish education—of which I will write more below.

III

IF THE COLLEGE ATMOSPHERE AND CULTURE are subversive of all religious traditions and consensual values, it must be said that Judaism suffers from double jeopardy. The university and its curriculum are secular and non-sectarian by its own definition. Thus the student is apt to take its presentation of Judaism at face value. Judaism and Jewish history is presented in passing in many areas of the college curriculum—such as the ubiquitous Social Science I or Humanities I courses. However, the presentation here turns out to be essentially a secularized version of traditional Christian stereotypes of Judaism.¹⁷ The God of Wrath of the Old Testament and the God of Love of the New, the legalism and petrification of Rabbinic Judaism and the Faith and Love of Paulinian Christianity, the particularism and henotheism of Judaism and the universalism of Christianity—these are a few of the shorthand images of Judaism

16. I believe that these comments apply to Reform and Conservative as well as Orthodox curricula. It is true that in these movements teachings and textbooks are more likely to be influenced by and closer in spirit to these secular intellectual valuations. However, they are generally far more half-hearted or mild in their incorporation of these values. They are generally done in a liberal rationalist spirit which hardly copes with or prepares for the radical and beyond-rationalist challenge of sociology, anthropology, etc.

17. It is interesting to note that Arthur Hertzberg has traced the incorporation of the old stereotypes and negative attitudes in the very founders of the Enlightenment in his recent *The French Enlightenment and the Jews* (New York, 1968).

268 : *Judaism*

which are transmitted in the secular course. The fact that Judaism tends to get no serious attention after the birth of Christianity comes through as a tacit confirmation of the Christian claim that Judaism comes to an end with its birth. Christianity is the warp and woof of Western culture, art, music, etc., and the comparative absence of Judaism tends to confirm the negative image. Moreover, the few Jews who do rate in the college curriculum—such as Spinoza, Freud and Einstein—are models of alienation from traditional Jewish values and a kind of universal, non-specific existence as men in general.¹⁸

These stereotypes are particularly devastating because the student is unequipped to challenge them. At the recent peak of enrollment in Jewish education, only 55% of Jewish children eligible were engaged in any Jewish education. Even if we add a certain percentage who may have been enrolled at one time and then dropped out, a large number of Jewish children have never had any Jewish education. (Many who are enrolled have only the most primitive and elementary kind of schooling.) Therefore, the only source of images and understanding of Judaism are the devastatingly negative stereotypes described above. The secularist world is not engaged in a conspiracy to undermine Judaism. But in all knowledge systems, there is much that is inherited or simply taken for granted. This information tends to persist until experience or new sources of knowledge or alternate images are encountered or provided. What has made the current cultural situation so explosive is that so many traditional stereotypes are vulnerable to the increased flow of information which breaks down presumptions and stereotypes.¹⁹ Unfortunately, however, a Jewish scholarship has been lacking to challenge these circulating clichés. I am not speaking of apologetics or defensive scholarship either. But Jews of any loyalty or deep understanding of the tradition have been in the modern situation only a short time. Many of the first scholars and faculty of Jewish background tended to be those who were alienated from the Jewish community and leaving it. Not surprisingly, they have been unable or unwilling to correct the image. (See the brilliant polemics of Walter Kaufmann as cultural critic of Christianity for an example of how the traditional stereotypes can be challenged or corrected.²⁰) Even if such a scholarship and such scholars were to be intensively developed it would probably take centuries before their circulation and currency caught up to the prevalent notions. Indeed, one is reminded of the American-Jewish-Committee-sponsored study of

18. I. Greenberg, "Adventure in Freedom," *op. cit.*, p. 15. See the frequent references to these men in the *Commentary* symposium cited in footnote 2 above.

19. Cf. references in footnote 9 above. See also Kenneth Boulding, *The Image* (Ann Arbor, 1961), *passim*.

20. Most notably in his *Critique of Religion and Philosophy* (Garden City, N.Y., 1961), pp. 245-255, 268-284, 287-313, and 373-396.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 269

other religions and groups in religious textbooks.²¹ Considering how many more students—Jewish and non-Jewish alike—read and absorb the secular textbooks in many different disciplines, it should not be considered ironic to suggest that the money would be better invested in a study of secular textbooks with an eye to speeding up the process of revision. Even if such a study were done, the overcoming of the negative images would be more difficult. The Christian community (and the secular) see the religious textbooks as inherently unscientific and subject to informed revision. And the leadership of the more liberal religious groups are in a paroxysm of guilt for the tragic anti-Semitic consequences of the negative images. By contrast, the secular scholarly community would tend to suspect the motives of such a study as apologetic and to assume the scholarly and unbiased nature of the texts. Thus again the more liberal view would be more resistant to genuine openness.²² One need not add perhaps that there are extant many works of great and widely disseminated scholars which perpetuate these distortions.²³ But the textbook clichés are probably far more devastating than the scholarly work.

The other side of the coin is the absence of serious works of a positive Jewish content and, in particular, the almost total dearth of college-textbook-level books in various Jewish areas. There is not a single first-rate one-volume treatment in English of Jewish history, Halachah, Bible or even theology.²⁴ Despite the growth of Jewish publication, any visitor to a well-stocked paperback bookstore cannot but be struck by

21. The material on Protestant curricula has been well treated and summarized in Bernhard E. Olson, *Faith and Prejudice: Intergroup Problems in Protestant Curricula* (New Haven, 1963).

22. I trust it will not be considered even more ironic to suggest that the most promising way of getting such a change would be to use the kind of student demonstration and pressure now being used with increasing success by Afro-American students seeking to regain their cultural identity and to obtain proper and unstereotyped treatment of the black heritage in the university curriculum.

23. Nathan Rotenstreich's book, *The Recurring Pattern* (New York, 1964) is an interesting study of anti-Judaic strands in the work of Kant, Hegel and Toynbee. But on Hegel, see Emil Fackenheim's comments in his *The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1967), especially chapters 5 and 6. Note his comments on pp. 157-158.

24. There are some fine one-volume treatments of the Bible written by Christians which are good but for obvious reasons they do not get all the flavor that a positive Jewish scholarship would get. However, one should note Moshe Greenberg's translation and abridgement of Yehezkel Kaufmann's *The Religion of Israel* (Chicago, 1960). It might be parenthetically said that one of the purposes of the volume was to make Gentile scholars aware of the work and theses of Kaufmann. It is hard to speak of scholarship as "pro" or "con" but clearly Kaufmann's work gives more credit to the primary originality of Israelite monotheism. In the field of philosophy, one should also note the recent translation of Guttman's *Philosophies of Judaism* (New York, 1964). In theology, my remark refers to treatments of the field not to the work of individual theologians.

270 : *Judaism*

the melancholy contrast of the range and depth of Christian works as compared to Jewish material. Of course, one factor is that Christianity has been working in the medium of Western philosophy and culture for centuries and a series of outstanding geniuses, at least in Western languages, have given it great literary and philosophical resources—certainly more than Judaism has. But part of the problem is that Jewish classics languish in neglect, untranslated and unavailable. Similarly, the excellent scholarship of some of the modern French Jews—Neher, Ashkenazi, Baruch—has not been translated.²⁵ The other part of the problem is the failure to recruit and develop more positive Jewish scholarship or to underwrite the writing of the necessary textbooks. A constructive development is the program of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture. It is bearing some fruit already. However, its scope and budget are restricted.²⁶ In any event, there is a need for a program comparable to that of the Danforth Foundation and that of the Carnegie Foundation—of which see more below.

Judaism *per se* is not taught in the average college curriculum. Here, too, we have a combination of the traditional reticence in teaching religion, the liberal-secular flavor of the college, and the double jeopardy of Judaism's minority status. There has been a most promising growth of Jewish Studies chairs in the last decade.²⁷ However, the number of the chairs is still a drop in the bucket. The Jewish community should engage in a systematic double-barrelled program—to underwrite such chairs and to get the private university and the state university to set them up from their own funds. While such chairs cannot be sold to administrations in the same way the U.J.A. operates, it should be possible to recruit the kind of people and set up the kind of approach needed to get more of these chairs. The real problem is that there is no center or office that is systematically interested, let alone working, in this area. Such chairs not only make more Jewish scholarship likely, but their holders can, without serving as apologists, by their very presence stimulate the process of correction of the negative stereotypes circulating in the scholarly community. They raise the level of Jewish literacy of the student and they

25. Neher's *Moses* has been published by Harper and Row (New York 1960), but the bulk of his and the other French scholars work is not available in English. There is of course a great body of Jewish scholarship in the current Israeli literature which is also only marginally available in translation.

26. The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture (an outgrowth of reparations funds) and other foundations operate in this area. However, with the exception of personal benefit through a recent grant from the Memorial Foundation, the author has not become aware of the benefits and areas of operations of the foundations involved.

27. Arnold J. Band, "Jewish Studies in American Liberal-Arts Colleges and Universities," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 68 (1967), pp. 3-30.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 271

may make available positive models of Jewishness on campus—which I will discuss below.²⁸

A critical note should be added on the operations of the three leading Jewish theological seminaries: Hebrew Union College, Jewish Theological Seminary and Yeshiva University. On the whole, they have failed to make Jewish scholarship sufficiently attractive in financial and working conditions and sufficiently mainstream intellectually to attract the best students. Therefore, they have failed to train sufficient scholars for the growing demand. The leadership of these institutions has been too parochial in its concern for institutional needs rather than those of the entire community. Thus, they have tended to see the university as competitor rather than as a theater of operations. Perhaps, they need to be transferred to a university setting to be stimulated. This is something which many Christian seminaries are doing. One may cite Harvard and Yale Divinity Schools which have a far closer relationship to their university's scholarship than does the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary have to Yeshiva University. One might note the decision of Woodstock College (Catholic) to move to Morningside Heights in New York to be near to Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary, etc. This might serve as a paradigm for Hebrew Union College. Ironically enough, the failure of the three institutions has created a situation where new chairs in Jewish studies are competitive with these seminaries. There has been a noticeable bleeding of the few younger scholars which they have produced to the universities.²⁹

IV

THE FAILURE OF JEWISH IDENTITY on campus must also be seen as a further revelation of the insufficiency and irrelevance of much of Jewish education in America. I have elsewhere made some evaluations of the failures of Jewish education.³⁰ We can summarize the situation briefly. The last national count found over 600,000 students in some form of Jewish education. Of these, probably 85% are in elementary education. Of the total registration almost one half are in Sunday School. Sunday School means a maximum of one or two hours a week for a very few childhood years. This is not to mention the wastage, absences, etc. The curriculum is primitive and weak conceptually. The personnel tend to be less com-

28. For a study of the Jewish professor as a negative model of Jewishness, see Irwin Borvick's study of Jewish faculty at Franklin and Marshall College, "The Professor as Model: A Study in Jewish Identity," unpublished manuscript in my possession.

29. Jewish Theological Seminary has noticeably lost several promising young scholars in recent years.

30. See "Jews or Zombies: A Hard Look at Jewish Education," *Jewish Advocate*, September 30, 1966. An earlier draft was mimeographed in the proceedings of the American Association for Jewish Education Annual Convention 1966.

272 : *Judaism*

mitted or concerned for Jewish education. (The sheer limits of the medium suggest that more motivated people will seek out other forms.) About 40% plus of the students are registered in Talmud Torahs. Many Talmud Torahs have rabbis of synagogues as their principals. Since there are dozens of higher priority items in the rabbi's daily burden, supervision and planning tend to be nil or worse. The standard of professional principals tends to be lamentably low. This is hardly surprising in light of the historically low salaries, the absence of tenure and the politics of synagogues. Indeed, the qualified few are the miracle of Jewish education. The schools have been underfinanced and lacking in communal support and leadership as well as support from Federation.³¹ While the situation and salaries are improving, they are far from competitive with the public-school systems. The caliber and support of Federations and the Bureau of Jewish Education leadership vary widely from city to city.

Evaluation of the textbooks used shows a general pattern: immature and inadequate concepts, little or no sensitivity to the intellectual challenges which college will offer and, in general, little scholarly or research depth. Perhaps it is not really possible to have it any other way, in light of the fact that most students spend so few hours in Hebrew school and drop out by Bar Mitzvah. But even with this allowance, the material is shallow. The high-school student today does research in primary sources. Even junior-high-school and elementary-school children are capable of independent reading and projects that far transcend the depth and relevance of the Jewish curriculum. To engage in an unfair generalization: many of the Bureau consultants and textbook experts are like the educationist masters of the public-school system who are increasingly being ousted by the university-linked "new math," new textbook groups, the disciples of the Bruner approach, etc. What is needed then is a centrally-financed, university-level or university-linked center for research, evaluation and textbook and course construction. The Melton Institute is a good forerunner of what we are looking for. We need a number of such centers if we are to break through in this area.

Given the limited number of hours, the Jewish school system must be considerably more efficient than the public school in transmitting knowledge and values. For the most part, it is less efficient. The failure of the Jewish Federations, by and large, to give priority funds for Jewish education precludes the existence of the kind of centers here proposed. The Talmud Torahs and other Jewish schools are financed by tuition, users fees and synagogal underwriting. The key to the quality achievements of the top universities is the large increment of foundation and government and private support—particularly unrestricted funds. The

31. See Jacob Neusner, "Jewish Education and Culture and the Jewish Welfare Fund," *The Synagogue School* (Winter 1967), Vol. XXV, No. 2, especially pp. 18-29.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 273

time has come for the Federations to give this top priority; the survival of their givers is at stake. There is a significant misreading of the future in the Federations' lack of support. It is true that the bulk of their funds—in particular, big gifts—comes from people who have little, if any, Jewish education. Many of them have significantly ambivalent or negative attitudes toward various Jewish values and even Jewish identity. The Federations feel then that they can ignore Jewish education which, in any event, has little appeal to these big donors.³² But Federations count on continued mastery of the status and prestige-giving channels of the Jewish community to keep the gifts coming. This may indeed persist for a long time despite a decline in the Jewish community and religion. The fallacy is that ultimately the power to utilize prestige and status concerns depends on a residual consensus of the Jewish community that charity is an important and aristocracy-bestowing virtue. There is good evidence that this consensual ethic is hurt by the same factors on the college campus which weaken Jewish commitment. It is true that when they settle down into the Jewish community, people can be gotten to conform more in this area than in the cultural or religious areas of Jewish life. But when they do, the inner identification is considerably weaker. At some point—such as the presence of an entire college-trained community—the inner weakening could lead to a massive breakdown of the charity consensus. In addition, there is the possibility of greater shifts to “pure” non-sectarian giving.³³

V

THERE IS ANOTHER MAJOR FACTOR in the negative influence of the college experience on Jewish identity: the absence during those years of positive models of committed and relevant Jewishness. The student is often away from home and his parents as well as his synagogue and his rabbi (if he has one to begin with). In any event, the parent and the rabbi are likely to be saturated in the old ethic and style which is undercut by the college experience. Few rabbis are free enough in time as well as capable enough intellectually to match the various challenges posed by colleges anyway. (Here the American “edifice complex,” which guarantees that only one or two rabbis will have to service a huge congregation and

32. There has been a significant upsurge in talk at recent Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds conventions. Recently an associate director was appointed to specialize in the education area. The question is whether action will follow. The second question is whether the funds will go to established approaches to do more of the same—or whether new tacks will be underwritten. The fact is that \$100,000,000 is currently spent annually on Jewish education but the results don't show it.

33. Marshall Sklare seems to detect some such incipient trends in his article, “The Future of Jewish Giving,” *Commentary* (November 1962), Vol. XXXIV, No. 5, pp. 416-424.

274 : *Judaism*

building in order to make financial ends meet, is also to blame.) On campus the student finds few if any images of Jewishness that he can respect and identify with. The traditional heroes and thinkers of Jewish history and tradition are not available in light of the curriculum and course conditions described above.

As far as living models of Jewishness are concerned, the first and foremost model is likely to be the Jewish faculty member. He is overwhelmingly likely to be a model of Jewish alienation. He tends to be a member of the liberal establishment on campus or even a radical. He is usually a confirmed member of the Enlightenment faith—longing for and living in a post-Jewish world where humanism, science and universal brotherhood shall reign supreme. Despite his own increasingly affluent circumstances, he is likely to be scornful of the bourgeois, organization-minded Jewish community. Intermarriage is highest among such people.³⁴ The Jewish faculty member is concentrated in the style-setting and pioneering fields of the university. His intellectual and academic achievement may be outstanding. His commitment to idealistic causes tends to be higher than that of non-Jews. It is small wonder that he can attract identification. Of course, in his own field, he is likely to work with assumptions which contradict the students' traditional views. Each of these men is a specialist in highly developed intellectual fields. Against this model, the Jewish community offers as an alternative—on many, but far from all, campuses—a Hillel director.

Hillel has long made a valiant effort and been a pioneer for Jewishness on the college campus. However, there are some obvious limitations to it. On most campuses, there is, at most, one full-time man—usually a rabbi. There may be thousands of Jewish students around. The Hillel man has to run the Foundation, supervise the physical facilities, counsel with students, arrange religious services, possibly provide kosher food, plan dances, invite speakers, teach classes, etc. It is obvious that his time is highly limited for each student and cannot begin to compare with the time which individual students can spend with individual faculty members. Moreover, Hillel salaries are competitive only with the Orthodox rabbinate—and not with its best positions. (Of course there are offsetting advantages in not having to deal with laymen.) But the fact is that Hillel has not succeeded in attracting the best people on the average. In particular, the intellectual adequacy of the Hillel man is not infrequently in doubt. And even the intellectuals among Hillel directors could hardly be expected to meet the challenges of so many different fields. The academician, moreover, has the prestige of the college status.

34. I. Greenberg, "Adventure in Freedom," *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17. See Milton Gordon's perceptive and original chapter on the intellectual subculture in *Assimilation in American Life* (New York, 1964), pp. 224-232.

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 275

There is an additional and subtle problem, too. The Hillel man must be a *kol-bo-nik*. But this may cramp the particular personal specialty which he is truly best at and which could move and inspire students. Thus a natural scholar may have to spend much or even most of his time arranging a dance or a program of various sorts. A social-action activist may have to do much counseling or teaching. The same problem shows up in another area. Hillel has been non-denominational in its approach. This is a very fine and laudable stress. It has kept the college campus free of some of the pathological institutionalism which besets American Jewish life. But there are real tensions in this approach. The idea of servicing all groups and not imposing one's own standards may lead to the suppression of the particular commitment which the man has to offer at his best. Try as he will to do justice to all, the man may end up doing least justice to the unique quality of his own mind and life. There is a need for exploration of the complexities of this dilemma. (This may include the imposition by the Hillel director of his own approach by a systematic blocking of students seeking to express their own particular commitments—this in the name of preserving the “community” atmosphere.) Here, the developing and partly student-engineered particular religious groupings such as Yavneh (Orthodox), Atid (Conservative), NFTY (Reform) could make a real contribution in enriching the manpower and pluralism on campus without breaking up the community. In general, Hillel has responded with suspicion and covert obstacle-making to these new developments. Hillel has legitimate concerns of incipient sectarianism and muscling in of outside organizations. This biased observer feels, however, that Hillel's reaction reflects lack of thinking through the complexities and, sometimes, just plain insecurity.³⁵

In any event, the key to a breakthrough for Hillel's effectiveness is the development of teams of Hillel men on every campus. This would enable specialization—a teacher with a social-action man with a counseling type, or an Orthodox, Conservative and Reform, or a religious with a Zionist and a Yiddishist or secularist. Needless to say these men should not be recruited as institutional representatives but with concern for maximum effectiveness and exemplary life qualities. The Hillel leadership is somewhat aware of the need for broadening but it pleads the limited budget and thinking of the laymen. This can be appreciated. This article is written, in part, in the hope that it will make the community more aware of the level of support needed to solve the problem.

35. Readers should be informed that the author was deeply involved in the setting up of Yavneh. However, past service as a Hillel director and continued loyalty to it combined with a *Klal Yisrael* approach which insisted that Yavneh function by national agreement within the Hillel framework, may offset this influence. My views may be unconsciously biased but I believe that they are reasonably objective.

276 : *Judaism*

But one is reminded of others who felt that they could only work within a given framework to save a few individuals. The moral criticism we have of them is that when the mortality rate passes a certain point, working within the system becomes a form of collaboration. It makes what is saved a thin cover which helps continue the system which makes the losses so high. The demand must be posed for an immensely higher level of support and financing, or else the Hillel leadership will be convicted of being too small for the necessary job.

In the meantime, the fact is that whatever is being done on the college campus is far from stemming the great erosion in Jewish loyalty and values.

VI

MANY READERS MAY HAVE NOTED that steps have begun along the lines of some of the proposals outlined above. In particular, there is a noticeable, if glacial, drift of the Federations toward greater involvement in Jewish education. But these steps are individual and uncoordinated. Nor have they been drawn up with a view to systematically identifying the problem and then filling the need. If this is the major arena of Jewish survival, then we are engaged in nothing less than a battle for Jewish survival—and flowering. What is needed is a central location and center to develop and coordinate strategy. In light of what is at stake I would propose that a Center for Jewish Survival be established to work on this problem.³⁶

The task of this Center should be to give central direction, financial aid and to develop a unified comprehensive program for a massive effort on the campus. It could initiate or encourage efforts wherever possible. At the same time, it could direct efforts to the neglected areas or those where the most fruits would be forthcoming. It should also draw up a comprehensive research program to evaluate the problem, different types of response and their success; what types of students are effected in which ways and which backgrounds resist the negative effects of college best. One of the major advantages of having such an address for people to turn to, is that the work in the field done by others becomes more efficient, overlapping and duplication are cut down, and the most productive approaches are identified and spread. Most of the people and agencies working in the college field for the Jewish community are besieged by day-to-day problems, limited financing and personnel, and, frequently, deficient imagination and conceptual apparatus. The Center would provide the setting for long-range planning, freedom of experimentation and

³⁶. One reservation about such a name for the center is that it is not mere survival but the capacity to contribute and create that is at stake.


JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 277

conception. It should be pointed out that the freedom of Rand Corporation or Hudson Institute or other such "think tanks" has led to developments that have revolutionized American defense efforts—and saved money too! In addition, the personnel of the various agencies now involved on the campus could be brought to the Center for "refresher" training and experiences. In time, the Center could build up consultant services to further improve the evaluation and the actual performance of the operating agencies. The evaluation function could be of tremendous importance. One of the great problems in the field is the absence of evaluation and, correspondingly, of recognition and reward of those who do better. A great upgrading of achievement could take place just by the natural process of recognition and advancement for the individuals and the approaches that work best.

The financing of such a Center would demand Federation or major philanthropists' participation. Perhaps a group of Federations could participate as "shareholders" in the Center. Such a move would signal a shift in the attitude of neglect which has marked Federation policies until now. Moreover, such a Center could be evaluated and would not be tainted by the ineffectiveness of the past which is cited by Federations in justifying limited efforts in the field of Jewish education. It should be added that the nature of the problem (intellectual-spiritual, "life-style" problems, etc.) suggests that the Federations should allow maximum freedom of policy and approach to the personnel of the Center while checking carefully its productivity and results. The current Jewish organizational style and ethos would not be suitable for transfer to the college area intact. I would also venture a guess that the personnel needed are less likely to be in the established organizations. They might be best sought in the academic or academic-borderline fields where they would have developed a quality approach unaffected by the current financial and intellectual poverty of the Jewish educational field.

There are a number of major approaches that the Center should concentrate on. The first would be the enrichment of the Jewish content and experience on the college campus. One program would be modeled on that of the Danforth Foundation program. Correctly sensing that the high percentage of secular faculty has created the atmosphere and impact negative to religious values, the Danforth Foundation set up a fellowship program to attract religious people to the field of college teaching and research. The fellowship aids the religiously committed. It also attracts to the field of teaching people who were marginal and might otherwise have gone into other professions. It gives recognition to bright, talented and religiously alive (rather than conventional) people. Another advantage of the Danforth program is that fellows meet annually in a camp setting and continue to do so after becoming scholars and teachers.

278 : *Judaism*

Thus they are strengthened and reinforced in their commitments even as they are broadened by contact with a wide spectrum of religious attitudes and approaches. A similar program should be launched to recruit and attract Jewishly committed people to the field of college teaching. It must be stressed that it is not purely religious or traditional Jews that should be sought. Any model of commitment to Jewishness would be helpful and desirable. An advantage of such a program is that, once recruited, these people would be on the college campus with the financial support coming from the university and would not be a further charge on the resources of the Jewish community. Moreover, they would have the status and prestige of the university as well as the freedom and time to specialize and compete intellectually in the open academic atmosphere. Their very presence and attitudes would be a big step toward the demolition of the larized Christian stereotypes which characterize the college scene.

Another needed program is the development and publication of textbooks and college-level courses in Judaism. Such courses would be suitable for inclusion in the college curriculum. Others might be useful for Hillel and other extra-curricular Jewish educational experiences. The development of textbooks should go hand in hand with further establishment of chairs of Jewish studies at universities. Although the Jewish community might well provide seed money for such chairs, the goal would be absorption into the regular university budget and departments. This is important because, again, it would free Jewish community funds for other work. In general, there is a need for maximum utilization of self-sustaining techniques which function and compete in the open society. The other great advantage of chairs and courses in Jewish studies is that the student can take the courses for college credit. At the present time, even if the Hillel Foundation provides a course that is college level, the student cannot or will not do the necessary homework or research because he cannot afford the time on top of regular college courses. Naturally he will get less out of the course and will tend to take it less seriously. The same course given for credit will involve the student more and he will get correspondingly more out of it. Finally, we need some experimental colleges of Jewish studies to be set up on college campuses. There are colleges of Jewish studies in existence now, but they generally are isolated from the universities. They do not meet university standards of personnel qualifications (Ph.D.'s, research and publication, faculty teaching loads) and are sparsely attended. Bringing such colleges on campus would make them live at (and force them to meet the standards of) the universities. The result would be a boon to Jewish scholarship. It would drive it toward development of an intellectual openness and an end to parochialism which would enable it to speak

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 279

more effectively to students and college-educated adults.³⁷ The arrangement between the Jewish Theological Seminary and Columbia University under which courses can be taken at the Seminary for college credit is a good prototype of what is needed. It has led to some students getting a degree in Jewish studies simultaneously (or for one extra year's work). A great advantage of having a college of Jewish studies is that it would provide a pool of scholars, a community, dormitory and religious facilities on campus—all of which would raise the Jewish presence considerably.

Another major response to the challenge of college lies in the upgrading of Jewish education. The Center could well include a center for Jewish education. This involves developing a curriculum which can eliminate the overlapping, repetition, puerility and conceptual poverty which marks much of the Jewish educational system. The most desperately needed are curriculum sequences which are graded and non-repetitious. Most Talmud Torahs testify that students are successful, responsive and highly motivated during the first two years. During the third and fourth years there is a terrible drop-off as repetition and lack of depth take their toll. Children in junior-high school and high school today do things once reserved for college courses. Jerome Bruner's work has shown that the most advanced ideas can be broken down to basic components and taught to children.³⁸ The work of the Physical Sciences Study Group led by Zacharias in the new physics and work in the new math or the upgrading of the social sciences must be matched in the field of Jewish education. The professionals and the Bureaus are too swamped by day-to-day problems as well as intellectually and financially limited to do the necessary job.

There is a need for research in Jewish education to weigh effectiveness, evaluate different types of school and upgrade teacher training. Textbooks at high-school level must be upgraded conceptually and, in particular, related to the intellectual challenges which college will pose. Materials for rabbis and educators are also needed. Few rabbis are equipped to handle the challenges in advanced areas without help and guidance. The technology of Jewish education is still relatively primitive. Yet such techniques should be more utilized in light of the shortage of hours and qualified personnel. The Center would link in to the work of establishing college chairs of Jewish studies or the development of textbooks. Undoubtedly, personnel developed in one program could be

37. On these Hebrew teachers' colleges of Jewish studies, see Robert Alter's fine article, "Teaching Jewish Teachers," *Commentary*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (July 1968), pp. 60-65.

38. Cf. Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960); Bruner, *On Knowing* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); J. S. Bruner, J. J. Goodnow, G. A. Austin, *A Study of Thinking* (New York, 1956); and the Physical Science Study Group series in science—among others.

280 : *Judaism*

utilized for the other. Universities are playing a greater and greater role in urban education and urban problem-solving. The same techniques could be used in Jewish education and Jewish community work. The Center should try to draw upon the resources of Yeshiva University, Jewish Theological Seminary and the Hebrew Union College, too. It could help these institutions grow internally in service of the Jewish community.

Another major approach area is the realm of mass media. Mass media are even more effective than schools in shaping values and attitudes. Magazines, films and television reach more people and set styles and values. There have been notable individual efforts in this area, such as the Eternal Light programs on radio and television. However, most of the television time made available to Jewish sources still are static and often cliché-ridden talk sessions. A Center could develop materials which could be shown on mass media as well as adapted for classroom and adult educational use. Films particularly appeal to the current college generation. The recruitment and support of efforts in this area can now be done on a financial shoestring. It would repay itself many times over.

Since the goal is commitment as well as intellectual growth, there is a need to utilize "total environmental experience" situations. A few hours in a total environment situation have more impact than days in marginal settings. Examples of the total environment setting are summer camps, living in Israel and Hebrew Day School education. Apparently, the reason for the great impact is that Judaism and Jewishness is experienced in these settings as a natural, even normative, highly respected, equal quality component. The figures who exemplify Judaism or Jewishness are the élite of the environment. In short, believability and willingness to identify with the Jewish go up sharply. Moreover, total environment experiences create a living Jewish community which the student identifies with emotionally and intellectually. Such experiences coming during or parallel to those of college give emotional and intellectual reinforcement which equips the student to withstand counter-challenges. There has been a significant rise in the number of Jewish young people participating in such total environments. However, the number is still a drop in the bucket. It would be a great investment to step up scholarships and underwriting of costs to get more Jewish young people involved. We should not overlook the particular dynamic of Israel as a Jewish image at this time. Living in Israel can affect a lifetime. And there are many different possibilities available there—university, kibbutz, etc. Similarly, the Jewish community will have to overcome its stereotyped rejection of responsibility for Day Schools on the ground that they are "parochial" or "sectarian." The solution is upgrading of quality

JEWISH SURVIVAL & THE CAMPUS : 281

and greater openness, not neglect. The very neglect and financial stringency of these schools frequently leads them to greater sectarianism. In addition, the Center could help enrich their effect by providing better textbooks, teacher training, etc. Day Schools work. It is time for appreciation and utilization of anything that works.

These last paragraphs have been examples of the kind of work and development that the proposed Center could do. It could do all or some of these. It could go considerably further in many areas. But stress should be placed on what is assumed as underlying all these proposals. We will have to develop a new style of Jewishness. It would have to be considerably more open yet committed, more intellectually sophisticated and critical. It will have to be less organizational and more individual. It will demand greater self-fulfillment in Judaism and Jewishness and less working so that others can be Jewish. We will have to be more willing to concentrate our efforts on committed Jews and on particularistic activities. This does not mean exclusion or narrowness. But it means an end to mindless non-specific Jewish loyalty and activity. Such a deepening would make Jews more capable of participating constructively in American society without thereby assimilating.

The Jewish community has been depending on a nominal Jewishness combined with neighborhood and social concentration to carry it through. College is destroying this possibility socially and culturally. Only a major upgrading in informed Jewish commitment and deepening of Jewish knowledge can save the day. It has been said that the British Empire was lost and won on the playing fields of Eton. The crown of Judaism and Jewishness will be won or lost on the campuses of America.