To my husband, Stephen
With love always

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PREFACE

Before the 1980s and 1990s, there was a paucity of books on American Modern Orthodoxy. At that time, a new stirring of scholarly attention reflected that there was something interesting occurring. Jeffrey Gurock, Saul Bernstein, William Helmreich, Charles Liebman, Gilbert Klaperman, and Aaron Rothkoff-Rakeffet have written about some aspect of Orthodoxy. This book gives an expanded look at the phenomenon of Modern Orthodoxy, which will also be referred to as "American-style" Orthodoxy.[1]

1 Saul Bernstein, *The Orthodox Story: A Centenary Portrayal* (Northvale, NJ and Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997); Saul Bernstein, *The Renaissance of the Torah Jew* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1985); M. Herbert Danziger, *Returning to Tradition: The Contemporary Revival of Orthodox Judaism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989); Jeffrey S. Gurock, *American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective* (New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1996); Jeffrey S. Gurock, *Men and Women of Yeshiva: Higher Education, Orthodoxy and American Judaism* (New York: Colombia University Press, 1988); Jeffrey S. Gurock, ed., *Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1989); William Helmreich, *The World of the Yeshiva: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox Jewry* (New York: Free Press and London: Collier MacMillan, 1982); Gilbert Klaperman, *The Story of Yeshiva University* (New York: MacMillan, 1969); Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff, *Bernard Revel* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972); Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff, *The Silver Era in American Jewish Orthodoxy: Rabbi Eliezer Silver and His Generation* (New York: Yeshiva University Press; Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1981).

> Up to and including the 1950s, scholars told the story of Modern Orthodox history in America from the viewpoint of decline. Dr. Meyer Waxman, an editor for the Orthodox journal *Jewish Forum*, wrote in 1924: "In fact voices are being heard in the Jewish press and especially in the Zionist press—that Orthodox is disappearing, that whoever speaks in the name of Orthodox Jewry speaks in the name of fiction."[2] Many Socialist Yiddish newspapers actively participated in discrediting religion and Orthodoxy in particular, winning over huge numbers of religious Jews to their socialist cause.[3]

Mordecai Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionist Judaism, wrote in 1920 that Orthodoxy was out of keeping with the march of modern thought and that the fundamental doctrine of Orthodoxy was repugnant to the thinking man of the time.[4]

Oscar Fasman, a former head of Hebrew Theological College, remembered one of his confreres remarking (when he graduated in 1929) that he, as a rabbi, would be able to recite to a generation or so later the final *kaddish* for Orthodoxy.[5]

Marshall Sklare, perhaps the most influential exponent of this notion, saw Conservative Judaism as the only possible alternative for American Jewry, and saw Orthodoxy as alien to the American environment. He wrote in the 1950s that the history of Orthodoxy in America could be written in terms of a case study of institutional decay.[6] Amidst all the tales of woe and doom and gloom, this book presents an optimistic and positive view.

---

2 Dr. Meyer Waxman, "American Orthodoxy—The Fifth Unknowable," *Jewish Forum* 7, no. 5 (October 1924): 652.

3 Tony Michels, *A Fire in their Hearts: Yiddish Socialists in New York* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2005), 12.

4 Mordecai Kaplan, "A Program for the Reconstruction of Judaism," *The Menorah Journal* 6, no. 4 (August 1920): 182.

5 Oscar Fasman, "After Fifty Years an Optimist," *American Jewish History* 69, no. 2 (December 1979): 227.

6 Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955), 43.

Dr. Marc Shapiro, editor of the Academic Studies Press series on Orthodox Judaism and Professor at the University of Scranton, suggested that I make my doctoral thesis into a book; this is the result. The thesis, "Trends in Modern Orthodoxy as Reflected in the Career of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung" (which was completed in 2004 at Concordia University in Montreal), deals with Modern Orthodox Judaism in America from 1920 to 1960.

My thesis supervisor was Dr. Ira Robinson; in the many years since I have graduated, I have not stopped working with him, seeking his advice, his constructive criticisms, and helpful suggestions. He continues to share his wide knowledge base and experience with me, and I continue to think of him as teacher and mentor. His help in writing this book is greatly appreciated.

I thank the members of the Institute for Canadian Jewish Studies for their assistance and support. The institute encourages and enables research, publications, and educational programs for academics, students, and the community at large. In these areas, they have many accomplishments.

I also wish to thank Shulamit Berger, chief archivist at Yeshiva University, for her help and attention throughout many years.

My husband, Stephen, has been a fine example in his devotion to ongoing learning and professional excellence. He has always been patient, encouraging, and has taken pride in my accomplishments. My children, Edie and Allen, Natasha and Morris, Ronit and Avi, and Elka and Eitan, have also stood as additional stimulus to my work, as I admire their many achievements. I am grateful for their love and support.

INTRODUCTION

This work presents the issues—from the 1920s to the 1960s—of a particular Orthodox group in America that would become known as Modern Orthodox, by looking at the activities and involvements of one of its leaders, Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung. Rabbi Jung's career as a pulpit rabbi, community leader, and avid writer spanned over 60 years, beginning in the 1920s. This Orthodox group went from being a threatened entity on the American scene to a well-recognized, respected force in Judaism. The phenomenon of Modern Orthodoxy will be examined in the context of Orthodox invigoration and change.

The chapters appear in chronological order, beginning with the 1920s. Though time frames can be artificial and certain issues are ongoing, chronological treatment does give a full picture of the movement, its involvements, concerns, and achievements at a given time. The goal is to understand the issues and challenges that Modern Orthodoxy faced in each decade.

The chapters deal with progress in organizational activity, educational programs, and capable leadership as they are instrumental in developing Modern Orthodoxy and reflect progress in the movement. The chapters will also demonstrate how the economic, social, and political influences impacted Modern Orthodoxy and how they influenced Rabbi Jung's activities and philosophy.

Rabbi Jung's path crossed with some of the most interesting people of his time. He collaborated with Chaim Weizmann (the first president of Israel) on Zionist issues, and he worked with Albert Einstein to promote Yeshiva College. Herman Wouk, an American author and Pulitzer Prize winner, studied with Rabbi Jung, who exposed him to the classics of Judaism; Wouk claimed that Rabbi Jung was a profound influence on him. In Rabbi Jung's search for universal peace and a major role for religion, he planned a project with Pearl Buck, a Nobel Prize laureate and Pulitzer Prize winner.

Rabbi Jung is a fulcrum around which many issues can be explored. This book does not focus on him exclusively, but rather on the significance of his interests and activities and its impact on his surroundings. As noted by Samuel Heilman, "the notion of using the rabbi as an indicator of the Jewish state of being is useful as a tool for tracing the development of Orthodoxy."[1]

Rabbi Jung was one of the spokesmen for an American-style Orthodoxy; he combined the religious faith of Orthodoxy with the American way of life. He was involved in almost everything that was going on in American Orthodox Judaism, either in a major or minor way. He was involved in institutions that articulated the Modern Orthodox position; these organizations are part of the history of American Orthodox Judaism.

Modern Orthodoxy in the 1920s lacked hard lines and clear concepts, and was floundering as it tried to adjust to its new environment. These concepts became somewhat clearer over time. Modern Orthodox institutions were weak; there was a lack of adequate facilities necessary for an Orthodox community to exist and a lack of adequately trained educators. There was a widespread laxity in observance of the most basic Judaic laws among Jews espousing Modern Orthodoxy. For the most part, its adherents were transplanted Eastern Europeans, religiously uneducated, unobservant, and in awe of America and the modern world.

---

1 Samuel C. Heilman, "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy," *Modern Judaism* 2, no. 1 (1982): 26.

By 1960, a foundation had been laid for a movement to the "right," which was marked by the tightening of religious standards, more identification with the tenets of *halakhic* Judaism, stricter piety, and more distrust of the secular world. Though this pursuit of stringency rather than leniency, known as the movement to the "right," has been noted by scholars (such as Saul Bernstein, Haym Soloveitchik, and Jeffrey S. Gurock), this book will try to make clear some of the factors leading to this shift.[2]

What Is Modern Orthodoxy?

First, there was no agreement on the use of the term "Modern Orthodoxy"; the term itself has caused discomfort to many scholars and rabbis. Rabbi Jung pointed out that the term "Orthodox" had a Christian connotation, referring to those who clung to the official tenets and dogmas of their respective churches. He preferred the term "Torah-true Judaism," but it was never widely used and Rabbi Jung used "Orthodox" in some of his writings.[3] Rabbi Jung wrote:

> And in want of a better word in English we may use it [Orthodox], provided we know it as a means to designate the genuine Jew, the man or woman who lives in strict accordance with Jewish law.[4]

---

2 Saul Bernstein, *The Renaissance of the Torah Jew* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1985), 2–6, 54, 274–275; Herbert M. Danziger, *Returning to Tradition: The Contemporary Revival of Orthodox Judaism* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 1–3, 335–338; Ralph Pelcowitz, *Danger and Opportunity* (New York: Steingold Publishers, 1976), 20–26; Shlomo Riskin, "Conservatism and The Orthodox Resurgence," in vol. 8 of *The Alteration of Orthodoxy*, ed. Jacob Neusner (New York: Garland Publishers, 1993), 231–233; David J. Schnall, "Orthodox Resurgence," in vol. 8 of *The Alteration of Orthodoxy*, ed. Jacob Neusner (New York: Garland Publishers, 1993), 234–240; Haym Soloveitchik, "Rupture and Reconstruction: The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy," *Tradition* 28, no. 4 (Summer 1994).

3 Leo Jung, *The Path of a Pioneer: Autobiography of Leo Jung*, Jewish Library, Second Series, vol. 8 (London and New York: Soncino Press, 1980), 4.

4 Leo Jung, *The Essentials of Judaism*, Jewish Library, First Series, vol. 2 (New York: Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, 1924), 11.

Though Rabbi Jung spoke always of Americanization and tradition, he failed to give the followers of this type of Judaism a lasting name. One of the earliest uses of the term "Modern Orthodox" was found in a 1924 article in the *Jewish Forum*, an American, Modern Orthodox, monthly journal that was published from 1918 to 1962. It appears more prominently again in the *Jewish Forum* in August 1937, in an article entitled "Neo and Modern Orthodox Judaism" .[5]

Briefly, this group is fully committed to the Torah tradition and is open, at the same time, to the wider culture of the modern world. Rabbi Jung described Orthodoxy as *Torah im derekh eretz* (Torah along with the way of the world), offering all the intensity and true beauty of true Judaism plus decorum and a system of modern method; that was the goal to which he devoted his life. Rabbi Jung's response was not unique; his responses and attitudes are typical of a specific group, which today is widely known as Modern Orthodoxy.

Jacob Breuer, in his introduction to *Nineteen Letters*, by Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch, said that the term "Torah-true" had been used to refer to this group, and only later when their opponents called them "Orthodox Jews" was that term used.[6] Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, as well as others, used the term "Neo-Orthodoxy" because it was felt that Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's *Torah im derekh eretz* philosophy deviated from that of traditional, premodern Judaism. This conception of Judaism was, in fact, different from traditional practices of preceding generations. The term "Jewish Jews" was also used, but infrequently. The cover of Jung's book, *Living Judaism*, dated 1927, states that he is the rabbi of the Jewish Center, a synagogue for "Jewish Jews." Jung begins an article, "Modern Trends in American Judaism," written in 1936,

5 Isaac Marks, "The Phenomenal Growth," *Jewish Forum* 7, no. 4 (April 1924): 240–241; Joseph Barondess, "Achievement and Failings of Borough Park," *Jewish Forum* 7, no. 4 (April 1924): 243.Phineas Israeli, "Neo and Modern Orthodox Judaism,"*Jewish Forum* 20, No.8 (August 1937):140-141. Also mentioned in Jenna Weissman Joselit, *New York's Jewish Jews: The Orthodox Community in the Interwar Years* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990), 21.

6 Jacob Breuer, introduction to *Nineteen Letters*, by Samson Raphael Hirsch (Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969), 4.

with the motto for "Jewish Jews."[7] Jenna Weissman Joselit, author of *New York's Jewish Jews*, wrote that the term was used to show that this group was superior, as well as in a defensive way; therefore, its usage was private and not often found in print.[8]

The dilemma of the term "Modern Orthodox" has never been completely resolved. Norman Lamm, a former president of Yeshiva University (1974–2003), wrote in 1969: "…To use the two dreadfully inadequate words which describe us as a distinct group, we are both 'modern' and 'Orthodox.' I shall be using these terms only with the greatest hesitation."[9] Like his predecessors, he tried unsuccessfully to define this group.

The *Torah im derekh eretz* philosophy is associated with Rabbi S. R. Hirsch, one of Rabbi Jung's influences. *Torah im derekh eretz* was a novel and influential approach to Torah-true Judaism in the nineteenth century, when the emancipation of Western European Jewry confronted Jews with unprecedented challenges and dangers.[10] Emancipation meant that Jews could partake in the general society. This change was either welcomed or rejected to some degree, which divided the Jewish community.

Only in response to the Reform movement did Orthodoxy, as a whole, have to think about defining itself and its response to Emancipation.[11] The Reform movement was the first to embrace the Enlightenment by reforming classical Judaism and abandoning most of *halakhah*, or Torah-based Jewish law. It became a powerful force to contend with by the end of the nineteenth century in Western Europe. Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's book, *Nineteen Letters*, first published under the pseudonym "Ben Uziel" in 1836, was written in defense of Orthodox

7 Leo Jung, "Modern Trends in American Judaism," in *Harvest: Sermons, Addresses, Studies*, ed. Leo Jung (New York: Philip Feldheim Inc., 1956), 219. "Modern Trends in American Judaism" first appeared in Mizrachi Jubilee Publication in New York in 1936 and is available at the Jewish Center Synagogue Archives in New York.

8 Personal interview with Jenna Weissman Joselit, November 11, 1996.

9 Norman Lamm, "Modern Orthodoxy's Identity Crisis," *Jewish Life* (May–June 1969).

10 S. R. Hirsch, *The Nineteen Letters* (Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers, 1969), 112–116.

11 Jung, *The Essentials of Judaism*, 11.

Judaism and was addressed to those who were turning to Reform. In this book, Rabbi S. R. Hirsch showed how modernity could be reconciled with Judaism and he welcomed Emancipation; at the same time, however, he defended Orthodox Judaism. The *Nineteen Letters* offered an alternate to the Reformers' approach with the *Torah im derekh eretz* philosophy, which stated that Jews must not only live among gentiles, but with them, and that they must learn the language and adopt the culture of the land while keeping intact the *halakhic* tradition.[12]

Rabbi S. R. Hirsch introduced changes in the synagogue, including aesthetic changes, in keeping with some of the modern demands, which had been attractive to Reformers. He felt that isolation from worldly activities was not a Torah precept and was therefore unjustified.[13] The philosophy applied to an educational system established by Rabbi S. R. Hirsch; Jewish studies could exist alongside secular studies.[14] The Hirschian philosophy of Modern Orthodoxy is that interpretation of *halakhah* is nourished when drawn from life's experiences.

Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's Orthodox group abandoned special Jewish dress, speech, and mannerisms. In Frankfurt am Main, Rabbi S. R. Hirsch had a devoted following, who remained loyal and apart from other Modern Orthodox groups, even when they came to America as refugees in the 1930s and became known as the Breuer Community. Rabbi Jung befriended this group when others did not.

Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's philosophy was a new interpretation of tradition, reflecting bourgeois norms, universal aspirations, and a worldly emphasis. This type of Orthodoxy was presented as compatible with the modern values of individualism, autonomy, and tolerance. Rabbi S. R. Hirsch had a Kantian understanding in keeping with nineteenth-century moral sensibilities. He thus affirmed free will, and he felt that humans had the ability to decide between good and evil.[15] He negated the virtue of pure literalism; the words were open to different

12 S. R. Hirsch, *The Nineteen Letters*, 107–111.
13 Ibid., 107–110.
14 Ibid., 123, 127.
15 Ibid., 45.

interpretations.[16] For him, Judaism was fully up to the most advanced standard of modern thought. Rabbi S. R. Hirsch affirmed the need for the rejuvenation and reformulation of Judaism while maintaining the Jew's commitment to *halakhah*.

However, according to the historian and rabbi Zev Eleff, Rabbi S. R. Hirsch never set out a clear program of how to achieve the goals of *Torah im derekh eretz*, and for many reasons, his disciplined, scientific, and Germanic approach never resonated with great success in America.[17] First, American Jews were emancipated from the start, thus had no need to respond to Emancipation. Most German Jews that came to the United States turned to Reform Judaism, and Reform leaders condemned Rabbi S. R. Hirsch.[18] In America, a large percentage of Jews were from Eastern Europe, where Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's work was relatively unknown; hence, many of the Eastern European rabbis were not interested in spreading his work. As America's Orthodox Jews were too illiterate to access Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's writings on their own, his work remained largely unknown.[19] Among the exceptions were Rabbis Bernard Drachman, Bernard Revel, Leo Jung, Phillip Klein, and Shraga Feivel Mendelovitz.[20] Rabbi Drachman translated Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's *Nineteen Letters*, hoping it would help stem the tide to Reform. Bernard Revel, the president of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS) and the founder of Yeshiva College, wrote about Rabbi S. R. Hirsch but had reservations about his teachings for American Jews, and Revel's seminary differed from Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's philosophy. Rabbi Jung wrote about Rabbi S. R. Hirsch and cited his work as a model message for Orthodox Judaism; he championed the legacy of Rabbi S. R. Hirsch in the 1920s and 1930s with his sermons, publications, and Jewish Library series.[21] Rabbi Jung learned of Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's

16 Ibid., 83–87.

17 Zev Eleff, "American Orthodoxy's Lukewarm Embrace of the Hirschian Legacy, 1850–1939," *Tradition* 45, no. 3 (2012): 36.

18 Ibid., 37 and 41.

19 Ibid., 40 and 44.

20 Ibid., 40 and 48-49.

21 Leo Jung, "What is Orthodox Judaism?", in *Essentials of Judaism*; Leo Jung, *The Path of a Pioneer*, 20; Leo Jung, ed., Preface, *Guardians of Our Heritage: 1724–1953*,

message when he was a student at Hildesheimer Rabbinical Seminary; he came from Moravia, the birthplace of Rabbi S. R. Hirsch, and Rabbi S. R. Hirsch had had an influence on Rabbi Leo Jung's father, Rabbi Tzevi Jung, therefore on Rabbi Leo Jung himself.[22]

Rabbi Ezriel Hildesheimer had much in common with Rabbi S. R. Hirsch; yet there were also significant differences between Rabbis S. R. Hirsch and Hildesheimer.[23] Both men were strong opponents of Reform, and both felt that without adjustments and innovations in Orthodox practice, Orthodoxy would not survive the onslaught of modernity. However, for Rabbi S. R. Hirsch, secular and religious studies could only exist side by side. Unlike Rabbi S. R. Hirsch, Hildesheimer integrated or synthesized secular and religious studies.[24] Rabbi S. R. Hirsch advocated coexistence, not synthesis. In other words, the Modern Orthodox individual lives in two civilizations by either synthesizing secular and Torah learning or by assigning each to a specific area of thought and action. Since Yeshiva University, which represents Modern Orthodoxy in America, strives to synthesize secular and religious studies, Hildesheimer is a more accurate model for Modern Orthodoxy in America than is Rabbi S. R. Hirsch.[25]

Rabbi S. R. Hirsch was an anti-Zionist; from the start, American Jews had misgivings about such a stance. In light of recent history, few Jews would identify with this anti-Zionist philosophy.[26]

Jewish Library, First Series, vol. 7 (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1958).

22 Leo Jung, *Jewish Leaders: 1750–1940*, Jewish Library Series, First Series, vol. 6 (Jerusalem: Boys Town Jerusalem Publishers, 1953 and 1964); Leo Jung, *Guardians of Our Heritage*.

23 Jacob Katz, *A House Divided: Orthodoxy and Schism in Nineteenth Century European Jewry* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 1998), 125–126 and 128.

24 Ibid., 97-100; Michael K. Silber, "The Emergence of Ultra Orthodoxy: The Invention of Tradition," in *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 31–32, 36–37.

25 Marc Shapiro, *Between The Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy: The Life and Works of Jehiel Jacob Weinberg, 1884–1966* (Oxford, UK and Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999), 76-79, 130, and 140.

26 Eleff, "American Orthodoxy's Lukewarm Embrace of the Hirschian Legacy, 1850–1939," 52.

Hildesheimer was an active supporter of the idea of Jews working for *Eretz Israel*. For Rabbi S. R. Hirsch, Jews were exiled from the Holy Land to enable them to perfect themselves and to fulfill the mission of the "chosen people" by remaining faithful to the Torah and God. He felt that this mission could only be accomplished when Jews were dispersed throughout the nations.[27] Rabbi S. R. Hirsch would not meet with non-Orthodox Jews to discuss issues of concern to all, as he felt that this accorded them legitimacy; Rabbi Hildesheimer thought that such engagement was necessary.[28]

The differences between the two men are mentioned because the dilemmas they adumbrate persist and are examined throughout the book. For example, Orthodoxy's relationship with non-Orthodox Jews has never been completely solved. The problems concerning how to integrate Judaism and modernity and how to integrate sacred and secular studies likewise have never been completely resolved.

Modern Orthodoxy has no main authoritative body. It has been argued that, because it lacks a clear authority structure, it may not in fact be a movement.[29] Rabbi Emanuel Rackman pointed out that there are certain freedoms in Modern Orthodoxy because of its lack of a central authority.[30] Rabbi Rackman described Modern Orthodoxy as a coterie of rabbis in America and Israel whose interpretation of the tradition has won approval of Orthodox intellectuals, who are knowledgeable in both Judaism and Western civilization. Jenna W. Joselit said: "Modern Orthodoxy was a less coherent ideological or intellectual statement than a system of expressive religious behaviors."[31]

There is no agreement in the contemporary sources on the use of the term "Modern Orthodoxy." This term will be used for the purposes

27 S. R. Hirsch, *The Nineteen Letters*, 62–64.

28 Ibid., 104; Katz, *A House Divided: Orthodoxy and Schism in the Nineteenth Century European Jewry*, 103.

29 Chaim I. Waxman, "Dilemmas of Modern Orthodoxy," *Judaism* 42, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 59.

30 Emmanuel Rackman, "Orthodox Judaism Moves With The Times: The Creativity of Tradition," *Commentary* 13, no. 6 (June 1952): 547.

31 Jenna Weissman Joselit, "Of Manners, Morals, and Orthodox Judaism: Decorum Within the Orthodox Synagogue," in *Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy*, ed. Jeffrey S. Gurock (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1989), 28.

of this work, as it is the most descriptive of the dilemmas that will be discussed and because it is most commonly used and recognized. The combination of words conveys the potential tension between the will to maintain Jewish integrity and the will to play a full part in the world. "Modern" and "Orthodox" seem to be a contradiction in terms, because Orthodox bespeaks traditional values and therefore not modernity.

The Modern Orthodox Jew has been pulled in two directions: the direction of the secular world and the direction of the religious world. Opposing sides, the religious and the modern, were both critical of Modern Orthodoxy: one side felt that it was not religious enough, the other side that it was not modern enough. Rabbi Jung reported: "…As we proceed to the right, we will be told that Torah-true Judaism is dead, and on the left that it is not fit for modern life…"[32] The word "modern" evokes negative reactions for traditionalists, as modernity negates the traditional worldview; the absolute status of religious norms and values are challenged. The concept of divine revelation of Torah and Oral Torah, which is to be accepted without debate, without empirical proof, can be a problem for "moderns," who are also Orthodox.

Orthodoxy contains many groups that are far removed from one another. However, there are two broad groups in Orthodoxy, Modern Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox, which include the Yeshiva Orthodox and Hasidic groups.[33] The Ultra-Orthodox, also referred to as Haredi, reject any change to Judaism on the grounds that all new things are forbidden by Torah law. They believe that secular learning is a waste of time and dangerous, as secular ideas are incompatible with Jewish beliefs. For these groups, individual autonomy is denied and decisions rest with the religious leaders. Ultra-Orthodoxy emphasizes the glorious past and its own leaders' interpretation of Torah. Within the Orthodox movement in America, Modern Orthodoxy prevails,

---

32 Leo Jung, "Jew and Jewishness in America," *Jewish Forum* 9, no. 3 (May 1926): 132.

33 Samuel Heilman, "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy, Part I," *Modern Judaism* 2, no. 1 (February 1982): 26. Heilman identified two trends in Orthodoxy, Modern Orthodoxy and traditional Orthodoxy, though he is not the first or only one to do so.

although the Ultra-Orthodox—newer on the scene—are increasing in numbers.

Modern Orthodoxy has core beliefs that distinguish it from Orthodoxy generally. The goal of Modern Orthodoxy is to harmonize the secular and religious aspects of life in ways that are compatible to both. The Ultra-Orthodox group seeks to exclude modernity. At one end of the spectrum is the insistence on the meticulous and punctilious observance of the commandments in the context of separate and segregated communities. Unlike Modern Orthodoxy, the Ultra-Orthodox usually avoid cooperating with other Jews. For these Jews, there is conflict between commitment to Torah and full participation in the scientific and cultural activities of modern society. Most traditionalists believe in the self-sufficiency of the Torah, written and oral, and the observance of *halakhah,* or Jewish law.

Historically, there have always been some Jewish scholars opposed to the comingling of sacred and secular learning. The lines of the division between groups are not so simply marked, as there are degrees, in each group, as to how much modernity is accepted or rejected, and as to how much coexistence or synthesis there should be between the secular and the sacred.

In America, the traditionalist "right" coalesced organizationally in 1902 and was originally represented by the Agudath Harabbonim (Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada). It spoke mostly for first-generation European rabbis, who found it harder to acclimate to the American environment. The Agudath Harabbonim tried to curb the influence and growing power of the American Orthodox rabbinate. The Agudath Harabbonim felt that American Modern Orthodox rabbis were not up to the required standards of Judaic knowledge that they themselves had acquired.[34] Modern Orthodox Judaism is very much worldly, with its validity determined by its personal and social significance in the here and now, but conversely with the premise that all the Torah law is God's revealed will. Rabbi Jung thus addressed real and rational issues such as honesty in business,

34 Jonathan D. Sarna, *American Judaism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 191-193.

ritual food, sexual purity, industrial fairness, and commercial integrity.[35] He said that Judaism even promised prosperity.[36] There is a respect for human reason along with the acknowledgment of faith. There is acknowledgment of personal autonomy, human responsibility, and activity rather than passive submission and fatalistic resignation. Rabbi Jung thus presented Modern Orthodoxy as a religion of reason, and he denied that it conflicted with the findings of science.[37] He wrote that superstition was opposed to the meaning of Judaism.[38] One had to take every advantage of science and the ingenuity of the human mind.

Openness to new interpretations is one of the things that separate Modern Orthodoxy from other groups within Orthodoxy. Rabbi Jung's message was that "on every occasion we must contribute our own endeavour first and only after we have done all in our power to get well, should we beseech God to aid our work."[39] Rabbi Jung wrote: "Human history is the plan of God for the perfection of man by his own free will."[40] He also said: "When practice is not undermined, interpretation is a religious duty."[41] No interpretation is definitive, and as he said, any worthwhile interpretations that shed new light on the scriptures are "welcomed by modern rabbis as long as they are based on the unchanging foundation of Jewish life—the belief in *Torah min ha-Shamayim*, or the divinely revealed Torah."[42] This helps to keep the Torah "a Book of Life" relevant to all ages, young and dynamic.[43]

A key issue in Modern Orthodoxy is the belief that Jewish studies can exist harmoniously with secular studies. This facilitated the possibility of integrating Jews into secular society. For many Orthodox Jews,

35 Leo Jung, *Towards Sinai: Sermons and Addresses* (New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1929), 27.
36 Ibid., 218.
37 Ibid., 23.
38 Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1—letter to Albert Einstein, April 15, 1943, in German.
39 Leo Jung, "Judaism and Health," *Jewish Forum* 7, no. 5 (May 1924): 304.
40 Leo Jung, *Foundations of Judaism*, Jewish Library, First Series, vol. 1 (New York: The Jewish Center, 1923), 40.
41 Leo Jung, *The Path of a Pioneer*, xvi-xvii.
42 Yeshiva University Archives, Jung Collection, Box 41, Folder 4—letter from Leo Jung to Isaac Rosengarten (editor of the *Jewish Forum*), March 16, 1937.
43 Ibid., Box 1/4—a letter to Albert Einstein, April 15, 1943, in German.