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Modern Orthodoxy in the 1940s
This article examines trends in Modern Orthodoxy in North America in the 1940s. Canadian and American Orthodox rabbis and laypeople belonged to the same organizations, such as the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and the Rabbinic Council of America (RCA). The major Orthodox rabbinic seminaries were located in the United States, and many Canadian rabbis were trained there. One of the issues the article addresses is Modern Orthodoxy’s issues with Traditional Orthodoxy, which – while newer on the scene in the 1940s – was beginning to make its mark. Orthodox leaders also took an active role in the war effort; the role of Orthodoxy was enhanced on the American scene by the contributions that the RCA made in the area of military chaplaincy. Orthodox leaders also took on a major role in the attempt to rescue European Jewry. Finally, just as there was a new role for America in Modern Orthodoxy, there was a new role for Zionism and Eretz Yisrael.

Up to and including the 1960s, most scholars told the story of Orthodox Judaism in America from the perspective of decline, portraying it as a fossil, disappearing, in decay; it was out of date, a product of Eastern Europe, and un-American. However, Modern Orthodoxy especially became more important in the 1940s than it had been; it became more active, better known, and more influential. In that decade, Orthodoxy took on a more expanded, visible, and leading role, and its image improved. Fading was the image of the average Orthodox person being old, poor, uneducated, and uncultured.

The first half of the 1940s was marked with despair because of the unfolding Holocaust, accompanied by widespread discontent with the status quo, and the years after the Second World War were marked with hope because of the advent of the
State of Israel. World War II resulted in a call for societal changes that lead to a more important role for religion, a role that Modern Orthodoxy wished to play.

This article will look at trends in Modern Orthodoxy in the 1940s, mainly in the United States. Orthodox Judaism contains many groups that are far removed from one another. However, there are two broad groups that must be taken into consideration – Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy, the latter including the Yeshiva Orthodox and Hasidic groups. The Traditional Orthodox group seeks to exclude modernity, insists on meticulous observance of the commandments and, in some cases, on separate communities. Within the Orthodox movement in North America, Modern Orthodoxy prevails, although Traditional Orthodoxy, newer on the scene, is making its mark.

The story of the development of Orthodoxy in Canada and the United States in the twentieth century is broadly similar. Orthodox Canadian and American rabbis and laypeople belonged to the same organizations, such as the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and the Rabbinic Council of America (RCA). The major rabbinic seminaries, such as Yeshiva University, were located in the United States and many Canadian rabbis were trained there. The majority of pulpit rabbis in Canada were American.

**The War Effort: Role of the Modern Orthodox Chaplain and Its Significance**

In the 1940s, Orthodox leaders took an active role in the war effort, and that gave them both valuable experience and provided another avenue for them to get their message across. The role of Orthodoxy was enhanced on the American scene by the contributions that the Rabbinical Council of America made in the area of military chaplaincy. The RCA, founded in 1935, helped to define, defend, and represent Modern Orthodoxy and what it stood for, and in participating in the chaplaincy program, it added prestige to Orthodoxy and its rabbinate. Participation on the part of the Orthodox in the military chaplaincy meant that there were, when possible, Jewish programs and provisions of the Orthodox standard. Rabbis were there to solve halakhic problems, to guide, to influence, and to fight anti-Semitism, which existed in the armed forces.

The role of the Canadian rabbis was practically identical to that of their American counterparts. Working with the Canadian Jewish Congress, the chaplains were responsible for providing comfort, support, and religious leadership to the Jewish troops. In doing so, they performed many functions, including: arranging services on Jewish holidays, distributing prayer books and Jewish calendars, and ensuring that Jewish graves were marked with the Star of David. During the Second World War,
Canadian and American Jewish chaplains did everything they could to ensure that Jewish personnel could observe Passover. The Canadian Jewish chaplaincy hosted Passover seders during the Second World War through the War Efforts Committee of the Canadian Jewish Congress.⁴

Anti-Semitism made Jewish soldiers in the American and Canadian armies feel vulnerable. Some American Jewish servicemen were embarrassed and felt harassed because of a line in the Haggadah, the text read at the Passover seder: “this year we are here, next year may we be in the land of Israel.” Rabbi David de Sola Pool, head of the Chaplain’s committee, requested that the “embarrassing words” be deleted.⁵ This resulted from fear of showing dual loyalties to America and the Jewish homeland. In this sort of atmosphere, some Canadian Jewish servicemen hid their identity to avoid discrimination by Canadian troops, as well as the potential persecution and torture Jewish servicemen held in German POW camps faced.

There was also public prejudice regarding rumours of Jewish non-participation in the army that had anti-Semitic overtones. The American Jewish Welfare Board therefore published detailed information about Jewish participation and the percentages of American Jewish servicemen. In Canada, the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC) provided similar statistics.⁶ CJC data showed that Jewish Canadians volunteered to fight for Canada during the Second World War and had a distinguished record of defending their country.

To combat anti-Semitism and to promote and present the Orthodox point of view of Judaism, Yeshiva College alumni went on radio with their program, “The Jewish Tradition.” The program raised the image of the Modern Orthodox rabbi in both the Jewish and non-Jewish community. This was important at a time when Father Charles Coughlin was still able to spread his anti-Semitic message on the airwaves. In Canada, Adrien Arcand, probably Canada’s most dangerous anti-Semite, was certainly a factor in the thinking of Canadian Jews.⁷

Most of the Orthodox rabbis in the United States armed forces were Modern Orthodox. The reason for this was that the armed forces required that chaplains have a secular as well as a religious education, and that the Jewish chaplains be able to work with Conservative and Reform rabbis as well as non-Jewish clergy on issues of mutual concern. This was a problem for many traditional Orthodox rabbis.⁸

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik headed the Halakhic Committee of the RCA and was influential with both Canadian and American Modern Orthodox clergy and laypeople. He wrote a responsum on the role of an Orthodox military chaplain. Rabbi Soloveitchik felt that it was not only permissible, but a duty of every Orthodox rabbi to enlist in the armed forces for the purpose of rendering spiritual guidance. There
were twenty-six Jewish chaplains in the First World War in the American forces; none were Orthodox. However, more Orthodox applications than Reform ones were received for the Second World War.\footnote{9}

American Orthodox rabbis such as Rabbis Leo Jung, Herbert Goldstein, and Joseph Lookstein played an important role in the Committee on Army and Navy Religious Activities (CANRA) created in 1942 by the Jewish Welfare Board. CANRA was made up of representatives of the three official rabbinic bodies – the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly (RA), and the RCA. Its chaplains' committee created seminar programs that took place in the Chaplain School at Harvard University. Orthodox rabbis lecturing at Harvard served as an example of successful Orthodox outreach, of getting their message out to a broader audience, and of image building. Some active Canadian Orthodox chaplains were Rabbis Abraham Price, Ephraim Mandelcorn, David Monson, Gedalia Felder, and Samuel Rosen.

Many servicemen rediscovered Judaism through the chaplains they had met. Both the clergy and the laypeople became better educated. The rabbi became a positive model.

The soldiers met Jews in other lands, and some were able to visit Palestine and/or experience the liberation of concentration camps; their experiences, at a very vulnerable time in their lives, made many of them rethink their Jewish commitment. The challenge was to maintain and keep up this experience and to sustain the “manifestation of foxhole religion.”\footnote{10}

The chaplaincy role provided a model for American Jewish religious life in the postwar era. It created a sense of interfaith rabbinic fellowship, working together with the Conservative and Reform movements, which spilled over into other areas of communal life, such as the New York Board of Rabbis and the Synagogue Council of America. Rabbi Soloveitchik acknowledged the importance of working with all Jews in joint social and political matters. It meant that Modern Orthodoxy was present in all aspects of Jewish communal life. Traditional Orthodox Jews continued to disapprove of this cooperation.

Orthodox leaders fought anti-Semitism and brought attention to the plight of European Jewry to the community at large. Reform Rabbi Stephen Wise, then president of the American Jewish Congress and the World Jewish Congress, was said to have failed in this area; his attitude was to “not to rock the boat.” He was not alone in this attitude. The community’s response to news of the Holocaust, both in Canada and the United States, was somewhat muted.\footnote{11}
In 1943, a performance was held at Madison Square Garden to inform the public about what was happening to European Jewry. Though Allied leaders had confirmed that two million Jews had been murdered, many did not believe this to be true. Ben Hecht, academy award screenwriter for the movie Gone With the Wind, wrote a play called We Will Never Die to inform the American public. Yeshiva College and the Orthodox community supported this play; Yeshiva College students were recruited for parts as extras. It should be noted that major Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Congress, would not cooperate. Eleanor Roosevelt attended, as did many American Supreme Court justices. This production had tremendous success.

Also in 1943, the famous rabbis’ march on Washington, to plead for European Jewry, took place. Most were from the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, the European, more traditional rabbis. Rabbi Stephen Wise worried that this march would stir up anti-Semitism. Four hundred rabbis, wearing black coats and black hats, marched. Orthodox Jews were active and visible. They received a cold welcome from President Roosevelt, who turned his back on them. Rabbi Soloveitchik would later say that Orthodox rabbis were betrayed by Wise, as he believed that he had forewarned President Roosevelt about the march. The march was the brainchild of Hillel Kook, known as Peter Bergson, as was the idea of the play at Madison Square Garden. He was the nephew of Chief Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook and had changed his name so as not to embarrass the family, as he was associated with the Irgun. Rabbi Stephen Wise said that Hillel Kook was worse than Hitler. Bergson made it difficult to sustain the mute response of America Jews and non-Jews to the destruction of European Jewry.

Orthodox leaders in the United States took on a major role in saving European Jewry. The RCA was involved and became active with the Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), the largest and most important organization of its kind trying to rescue Jews, rabbis, and teachers in Europe. Its program abroad was seen “as the greatest single effort recorded in Jewish history on the part of the Jewish people of one country for the welfare and rescue of Jews of other countries.”

The JDC inaugurated the beginning of a major role for American Jewry in world Jewish affairs. Modern Orthodox Rabbi Leo Jung’s involvement in the JDC raised the profile of Modern Orthodoxy, as he saw to it that Orthodox concerns were addressed. He also saw that Orthodox institutions received funding.

However, the more traditional Agudath ha-Rabbonim found it difficult to accept the leadership of the JDC, which included non-Orthodox Jews. In November 1939, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, founded the Va’ad Hatzalah, an organization to rescue yeshiva students and rabbis in Europe from the Holocaust. It was originally named the Emergency Committee for War-Torn Yeshivas.
Rabbi Aaron Kotler, who came to America in 1941, became an active leader in this movement. The relationship of the Va’ad Hatzalah with the JDC and Modern Orthodoxy was problematic, and it exemplified the conflict of Modern Orthodoxy and Traditional Orthodoxy. The establishment of the Va’ad Hatzalah was symbolic of the disunity in the Orthodox community.

The Va’ad Hatzalah did have Modern Orthodox supporters, such as Rabbi Herbert Goldstein, and some Yeshiva College students and faculty participated in a campaign to raise money for them. The phenomenon of Modern Orthodox leaders supporting the Va’ad Hatzalah is an example of Modern Orthodoxy being influenced by this more traditional group.

When the Final Solution became public knowledge, the attention of all Orthodox organizations went to rescuing the Jewish people. The Agudath ha-Rabbonim and the Modern Orthodox groups worked together for the purpose of rescue, though they still differed ideologically.

There were positive effects of the Orthodox presence in the war effort. After the war years, there was an upsurge in the status of religion in general. The Second World War demonstrated that modernity and pure secularism had serious flaws. The eighteenth-century European movement of the Enlightenment had challenged traditional authority. The new authority was science and reason. People had rights to life, liberty, property, happiness, and religious freedom; power came from the people. All of these were very attractive values. The flaws were that thinkers saw no role for religion. The Reform movement embraced the Enlightenment by reforming Judaism and abandoning most of halakha. On the other hand, some Orthodox Jews rejected all change in order to maintain the old ways exclusively. These groups of Orthodox turned their backs on secular thought and immersed themselves only in a religious milieu. It is only Modern Orthodoxy that welcomed modernity, but at the same time maintained Orthodox and halakhic Judaism, without changes. Modernity had not necessarily brought about a life of justice, righteousness, equality, or happiness.

The Holocaust had given the Modern Orthodox movement, as well as all other Jewish movements, a new role. The Holocaust was the ultimate example that modernity had failed; for many, it meant that they were open to a new, more positive look at religion. The Orthodox message was that the compromises of Reform and Conservative Judaism had accomplished nothing. Jews could not escape the consequences of being Jewish. The spiritual failures of modernity were cited by Orthodox leaders as confirmation that Orthodoxy had been correct in its uncompromising stand for the observance of Torah laws.
Image Change

The tragic but heroic story of the Beth Jacob (Bais Yaakov) “martyrs” in America shows Orthodox Judaism in a new light. The story appeared in the New York Times on January 8, 1943. It was the story, in Poland, of ninety-three Beth Jacob girls, fourteen to twenty-two years old, and their teacher, who preferred death to being forced into prostitution and who thus committed suicide. It was an occasion in which an Orthodox group was not popularly seen as passive and inactive. The story’s authenticity was questioned from the start. It has never been conclusively proven to be true or not true, though most scholars today see the story as legendary. The story was presented as a heroic Orthodox story, one which portrayed Jews in a good image and lent prestige to Orthodox Jews at a time when it was needed and when, significantly, Bais Yaakov schools were being founded in North America. Rabbi Leo Jung was founder of the Bais Yaakov in New York, and Rabbi Pinchas Hirschprung was founder of the Bais Yaakov in Montreal.

Accent on Renaissance and the Future –
New Role for American Jewry

There was a new role for Orthodoxy within American Jewry. Orthodox resistance to Americanization by Jews broadened after the War. The general Jewish community matured; many Jews in America were no longer new immigrants, and therefore, Americanization was no longer so prominent a theme. In the 1940s, the third generation was becoming more interested in its history and religion. This was good for the development of Orthodoxy.

The centre of Judaism had been transferred to America, and a number of famous Jewish religious academies from Europe were relocated in the United States. In Orthodox circles, an event of importance was the transfer, in April 1941, of the world executive centre of Agudath Israel from London to New York. Before the Second World War, Poland had been the centre of Jewish education, and also of scribes who wrote Torah scrolls. Before the War, there were twenty-seven Jewish dailies in Poland, over 100 weeklies, and dozens of periodicals. There were Jewish museums and archives, all of which were destroyed. In the 1940s, America began its transformation from a “Jewish wasteland” to a reservoir of Jewish life.
Yeshiva College

Yeshiva College took firm leadership of Modern Orthodoxy after the War in presenting Modern Orthodoxy with a more defined ideology and in working to provide better Jewish education.20

However, Yeshiva was in trouble at the start of the 1940s; it was plagued with financial woes. As well, two of Yeshiva’s great leaders died, leaving it in a precarious situation; however, this situation ultimately resulted in strengthening Yeshiva and, therefore, in strengthening Modern Orthodoxy. President Bernard Revel died in 1940; two months later, Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik (the Rosh Yeshiva), died as well, leaving the institution weakened. Until the death of Revel, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim had somewhat contained its antagonism toward the board of RIETS, as they respected Revel. Also, Moses Soloveitchik had a long-established and admirable reputation as a Talmudic scholar among all the rabbis. However, with the death of Revel, there was an attempted takeover on the part of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim; a turbulent reorganization took place. Rabbi Eliezer Silver of Cincinnati, on behalf of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, appointed a committee of seven to assume leadership of the school. Yeshiva’s directors rejected this. An executive board of seven members, which had full authority over the administration of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College, was formed. The board was set up to prevent another attempted takeover by the Agudath ha-Rabbonim.

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, supported by the Agudath ha-Rabbonim and many students, was appointed as the Rosh Yeshiva in 1941, succeeding his father; he was the Rosh Yeshiva until 1984. He became known as “the Rav” and the ultimate spiritual guide for Modern Orthodoxy. Under his leadership as the senior Rosh Yeshiva, Modern Orthodoxy’s reputation was greatly enhanced.21

Dr. Samuel Belkin was made head of Yeshiva after the death of Revel. With Belkin’s appointment, the Modern Orthodox leaders were firmly in charge. The new leaders had to take up the new responsibility and try to fill the gap of the loss of Talmudic leadership in Europe.

The gap widened between the Agudath ha-Rabbonim and Modern Orthodoxy, as the latter became even more distinct an entity.

Modern Orthodoxy and Zionism

The RCA and the UOJCA recognized and welcomed the State of Israel without reservations and were committed to religious Zionism. The majority identified with Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi; only a small number identified with the non-Zionist Agudath Israel.22
Just as there was a new role for America in Modern Orthodoxy, there was a new role for Eretz Yisrael. The advent of the State of Israel itself infused more energy and passion into Zionism. The RCA and the UOJCA, Modern Orthodoxy’s main organizations, were committed to religious Zionism. Rabbi Soloveitchik ridiculed as false the theory that the establishment of Israel was not in keeping with Jewish law, and he felt that Torah would be fruitful in Palestine even if a majority of secular Jews ran the state.

Rabbi Avraham Yeshayahu Karelitz, known as the Hazon Ish, one of the great sages of modern times – an authority on Jewish law and a strong influence on religious life and institutions in B’nai Brak – requested that North American Rabbis encourage Aliyah. This represented a new approach; it was the “age of the pioneer.” In America, before the 1940s, it was rare to hear of Aliyah in Orthodox circles. Yeshiva University established scholarships to send rabbis to Israel, feeling that they would get inspirational training at the source of Torah. The message was that Yeshiva students must form the backbone of religious pioneering; that is what Modern Orthodoxy began espousing.23

**Increased Attention to Halakhic Concerns**

Toward the end of the Second World War and in the postwar period, there began a demand for ideological consistency as well as for strict observance of halakha by the Modern Orthodox movement. This contrasted with the fear of demanding too much observance that had been prevalent in the 1920s and 1930s. Rabbis then had referred to their congregants as a “working society,” not a “learning society.” In the 1940s, rabbis began demanding more observance from their congregants.

The State of Israel brought to the fore many halakhic complexities and the rediscovery of special injunctions. The 1940s also saw an expansion in technology and in medical and scientific knowledge. This led to new questions that required careful halakhic examination. The rabbi, in short, had to become more learned. There was more halakhic activity in the 1940s than before.

Clearer policies served to broaden the gap between the Orthodox and Conservative movements. The Modern Orthodox and Conservative movements were moving further apart; Orthodox leaders were no longer calling the Conservative movement “the other Orthodoxy,” as they had done in the 1920s, but instead were advocating that Conservatives “conserve” Judaism. An issue of importance was the meḥiṭza. In the 1920s and 1930s, some Conservative synagogues had a meḥiṭza; some Orthodox synagogues were without a meḥiṭza. The Orthodox Rabbis’ duty, however, was to try to have a meḥiṭza installed if his synagogue was without one.
Big changes on this issue began in the 1940s. Dr. Samuel Belkin denounced mixed pews in 1947.\(^{24}\) That same year, Louis Ginzberg (a Conservative rabbinic leader) came out in favour of mixed seating. In the 1920s and 1930s, Ginzberg had been against mixed seating. The difference between Orthodox and Conservative would no longer be one of degree of actual observance but of ideology. Modern Orthodoxy was defining its stance on issues in a clearer, more definite way.

The issue of the use of the microphone in an Orthodox synagogue on Shabbat and holidays was also raised. The discussion and background work on this issue was ongoing in the 1940s and resolved in the 1950s.

In the area of kashrut, questions posed by the consumer lessened as there was more packaged food; this meant more reliability. The fight with those who issued individual hekhsherim continued as serious altercations arose from this situation, but in the 1940s, there were fewer private hekhsherim. Uniformity and consistency in kashrut supervision were desired. The RCA and the UOJCA refined and made more definite policies regarding applications, endorsements, and supervision of kashrut with their OU symbol.

In conclusion, there was a new, improved image of the rabbi, of religion itself, and of the Jewish people. The 1940s saw a new and very capable leadership for Orthodoxy in North America and Israel. Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik emerged as leader, which was a sign that there would be some unity and direction in Modern Orthodoxy. In Israel, the Chief Rabbinate, which was Orthodox, served to centralize, unify, and provide leadership for Orthodoxy in Israel, as well as in North America. Observant Orthodox newcomers coming from Europe to North America made Orthodoxy more visible; they provided examples of dedicated religious living.

There was an interest and demand for more Jewish knowledge on the part of the layman, and the clergy began to demand more observance from their congregants. This interest in Jewish learning and education, along with a resurgence of a prideful Jewish identity, led to a return to religion. Clearer policies served to broaden the gap between the Orthodox and Conservative movements. The rise of Hitler had prompted a new anti-Semitism that caused Jews to feel not quite so at home in America. This also led to a return to religion. All these happenings boded well for Orthodoxy. American Jewish life was being reshaped with more traditional values.
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