Thompson, who stood between American soldiers and the Vietnamese they were about to fire upon. To exonerate Calley would be to vitiate such moments of moral integrity.

Has the real victim been our moral courage
The Jewish people must know how empty the arguments are in favor of Calley. It is true that if Calley is imprisoned others must also be brought to trial—all the way up the chain of command. And if the finger of guilt does not stop pointing until it points at us—a society which would permit a policy of "free-fire zones" and the indiscriminate use of napalm—then we as Jews must be willing to point and be pointed at. For we are part of this country and share in its deeds.

But why, then, have we not spoken out? Why hasn't a single one of the major Jewish institutions issued a public statement condemning the pogrom, giving credit to the system which would not let such acts go unpunished and demanding that others responsible also be brought to justice? Perhaps Hitler has truly defeated us, for our Holocaust seems to have made us too frightened to stick our necks out for another people. If this is so, the Jewish people is dead. Ours may never be an existence of mere self-concern, no matter how legitimate that concern may be.

It is unsettling to listen to VFW generals, some of whom fought against facist Hitler, threaten to resign if the Calley verdict is not changed. But we also read that after the trial Senator Abraham Ribicoff hand delivered a letter to the White House asking the President of the United States to suspend Calley's sentence.

In 1933 Germany, 22 Hohenstein camp guards were charged with the torture and murder of prisoners. A German criminal court convicted them. Hitler suspended the sentence.

An apology

Several readers have called to my attention two errors in my article on Reform Judaism. Rabbi Joe Glaser's name was misspelled there, with a "z" instead of an "s." And I did not note that he had had a congregation of his own in Ventura, California before joining the U.A.H.C. staff. I am very sorry for these mistakes and I apologize to my readers and Rabbi Glaser publicly as I already have done to Rabbi Glaser by mail privately.

Eugene B. Borowitz

On criticizing the establishment

Trude Weiss-Rosmarin

Establishment are power structures which, as is natural and inevitable are intent upon holding on to and enlarging their spheres of domination and influence. Given man's aggressive instinct (Freud) and the quest to advance from a position of weakness-and-inferiority to a position of strength-and-superiority (Adler), Establishments are here to stay—and in all types of society, as history and the contemporary scene attest.

The danger inherent in Establishments is not their existence, but the absence of effective controls checking their monolithic absolutism. In a democracy, these controls are led into the field by public opinion—a free press and free media (radio and television). Nader's victory over General Motors was possible only because the press and the media reported the facts of his findings. The "Nader Raiders" could not operate—to say nothing of being *heard*—if the press and the media were to place "public relations" with their clients above the public interest of printing and publicizing "all the news that's fit to print."

U. S. democracy is far from being perfect and American politics *is* a two-party Establishment with the special increment of the power of the tangible rewards of patronage and sinecures. But the ruling party Establishment *knows* that *vox populi,* at the *next* election, will have not merely a say but the verdict. And always and ever, the President and our elected and appointed officials are under public scru:iny and surveillance by the press and the media —the usually faithful and incorruptible watchdogs of the people.

The calamitous problem of the Jewish Establishments is not their existence, which is natural, but their complete sovereignity in the absence of informed Jewish public opinion. The American Jewish press is a conglomerate of house organs (many of the Anglo-Jewish weeklies are owned by Federations) and publications which print handouts, i.e.,

publicity releases and not NEWS. Some years ago, William Frankel, editor of the London *Jewish Chronicle* put his finger on what ails the American Jewish press. He said: "A newspaper is only independent when it is financially independent." The small number of privately owned American Jewish papers, however, are financially dependent on patrons, organizations and advertisers who do not need their columns. They must please and appease the "powerful" organizations and the prosperous "Jewish leaders" in whose semantics *criticism* means *attack* and *reporting of facts* is adjudged as *subversion.* Unlike Mr. Frankel who told the 1968 World Conference of Jewish Journalists, "I am not afraid of advertisers and organizations," most American Jewish editors and writers for Jewish publications are *afraid* to dissent and to criticize the Establishments, especially the "powerful" Federations. And they are *afraid* to report the facts which, as is in the nature of facts, do not always tally with the stories of the public relations people.

As a result of this silence, a silence of fear not unlike that of Soviet Russia's "Jews of Silence" of yesterday, the American Jewish Establishments, i.e., the national organizations, do as they please. They set their *own* priorities instead of the priorities dictated by the demands and the *needs* of changed times. Their leaders are a self-perpetuating clique because there are no elections but merely slates for whom "all those in favor" are expected and do say "I." There are the "Jewish civil servants," who *know* that they *are* servants and subordinates expected to be "submissive" to the top-manager—the Executive Vice President, who *governs* on behalf of those who rule and in accordance with their *personal* ambitions, uninformed notions and a total absence of *responsibility.*

Rabbi Seymour Siegel's suggestion "to invite all the critics to join those who are trying to make our Jewish life creative and effective" is well taken. American Jewry is not bereft of critics and those whom I know do want to make our Jewish life creative and effective. But where, I am asking Rabbi Siegel, can these critics *criticize* so that they will be *heard*?

. . . but others say about reform judaism

One man's anger

Venting one's personal frustrations and angers against others is a time-honored technique of self-therapy. It can be both delusive and damaging, however, when based on gross distortion of fact. I wish Rabbi Eugene Borowitz had cooled it a bit before writing his recent rancorous piece on the alleged friction among the national agencies of Reform Judaism. My respect and affection for him through the years make it extremely painful to see him trapped by his own pique into perpetrating harm on himself as well as on the movement of which he forms an important part.

I am in a unique position to sift fiction from fact in Dr. Borowitz's account. As current President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, a long-standing member of the Executive Committee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations' Board of Trustees, and an ex-officio member of the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion Board of Governors, I suppose I have been exposed to the maximum balanced perspective. It is from this triple vantage point that I find the recent diatribe so distressing.

Just what is the point of rehearsing at this late date the record of a turbuelent relationship which admittedly existed a decade or two ago between Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath and the late Rabbi Nelson Glueck? Especially since their antagonisms were resolved to the point where in recent years a spirit of harmonious cooperation has marked the interaction between them as individuals and—far more important—between the institutions they headed. The ironic fact is that Rabbi Borowitz raises an ancient issue precisely at the time when the personal friendship and broad vision of Rabbis Glaser, Gottschalk and Schindler augur the greatest era of harmonious cooperation in the Reform movement that we have ever known.

The charge that the organized Reform rabbinate "has been dwarfed by the growing activity of the Union" can be justified only on a purely quantitative comparison of the Conference and Union budgets. Both the President and Vice-President of the UAHC are rabbis, members of the Central Conference. So are the directors of all the Union regions and the operating heads of most of its major depart-

ments. The Commissions which carry on the business of our movement are Joint Commissions, with equal involvement of both organizations. While it is true that the professional directors of these Commissions are, with one exception, officially appointed and their salaries paid by the UAHC, all such selections are made in collaboration with the President of the CCAR. It is in no sense an exaggeration to say that the Union could not continue to operate for sixty days without "the organized rabbinate" and that the Central Conference would be a voice crying vainly in the wilderness without the sinews of the Union.

Rabbi Borowitz to the contrary notwithstanding, the Conference does no "fishing in the troubled waters between the Union and the College." Members of the Conference played no small part in resolving the tensions which once existed; their present role is to provide leadership and counsel to both organizations.

From what arcane source did Rabbi Borowitz obtain his lurid information that the Union Board is contemplating a "power grab" to control the College–Institute? Or that the Union is plotting to reduce the proportion of Reform Jewish Appeal funds contributed to the HUC–JIR? The fact is that the names of nominees representing the UAHC on the College Board of Governors are always cleared with College authorities—more often suggested by them in the first place. Far from attempting to domineer, if anything, the Union has been too submissive in this respect. Through the years I have sat in on scores of meetings discussing the collection and distribution of funds for both institutions. The first reference I ever heard to altering RJA allocations in favor of the Union was from Dr. Borowitz!

Perhaps the unkindest cut of all in Rabbi Borowitz's tirade was his charge that, in selecting Dr. Glueck's successor, the College–Institute faculty "effectively vetoed any strong personality." As a member of the Selection Committee, I am in a good position to correct this part of the record on two counts. First, Rabbi Alfred Gottschalk, the Committee's unanimous choice, is "a strong personality." Second, there was, in fact, only one "strong personality" vetoed by the faculty. Since Rabbi Borowitz has seen fit to wash everyone else's dirty linen in public, he should have no valid objection to this disclosure.

Roland B. Gittelsohn
Boston, Mass.

Another man's calm (title submitted by E.B.B.)

Strangely enough, I find Roland Gittelsohn's letter confirming my views. Not by its manifest content, to be sure, but by its tone, its stance and its goal. An analysis on that level will show that in Reform Judaism, as elsewhere, it is more important to know the impersonal structuring of power than the intentions of good men.

As to Gittlesohn's substance, I believe that any open reader who will consult my text with a little care will quickly see that Gittelsohn consistently misreads me and responds inappositely. But he may find Gittelsohn's climactic "fact" more substantial so I must respond to it.

As an HUC–JIR Presidential Selection Committee member, Gittelsohn discloses that the HUC–JIR faculty vetoed only one man rather than every strong personality. Since I had no knowledge of what went on in the committee deliberations, I wrote about something else. I said (italics added here) that the faculty "*effectively* vetoed any strong personality." I had reference to a process and its result. Dr. Eugene Mihaly represented the faculty on the Selection Committee. In May '70 he came to New York and told us that the Cincinnati faculty felt it should not back any candidate but only play.the role of "spoiler." The New York faculty, concurring, then followed the Cincinnati procedure. It made a long list of possible candidates and the professors cast ballots against those men to whom they objected. (I absented myself from this part of the meeting.) Fifteen men were thus blackballed in New York; Mihaly said a similar number had been ruled out in Cincinnati. So when Mihaly went to the Selection Committee meetings some months later, he had in his pocket a long list of names, any one of whom the faculty had declared to be unacceptable. That was what I described as: the faculty had "effectively vetoed any strong personality.

Official explanations of official actions never disclose much, directly, about the realities of power. They tell the public only what those in power think it will be good for the public to hear. The truth is likely to be found on another level. Thus with regard to Reform Jewish operations, already in March '70, weeks before the Board of Governors was informed, some of us in New York were told privately of the plans for Glueck's retirement—and that his successor would almost certainly be Fred Gottschalk or Sam

Karff. Similarly, right after the June '70 CCAR meeting, months before its Selection Committee was appointed, I heard from several diverse and usually reliable sources that Joe Glaser "had" the job.

To understand Gittelsohn's behavior here we must move to the level of power-structure analysis. For over a decade, Gittelsohn has been Maurice Eisendrath's strongest rabbinic ally. With Eisendrath retiring, he will be the non-staff rabbi with the greatest influence on the Union. He will also soon be, not only a distinguished past-president of the CCAR, but the man who brought its new director, Glaser, to power. By all normal standards Gittelsohn is thus the most powerful rabbi in Reform Judaism. But his preeminence depends on his status in these organizations. To maintain it he must not only promote their glory but hide their defects. With the greatest power goes the greatest stake in our not being told any truth deeply critical of our institutional structure.

So we have here a clear example of what functional, impersonal power can do to the men it employs: even a Roland Gittelsohn gets to the point where he does not see that he has become the official apologist for organizational power rather than its prophetic critic.

Eugene B. Borowitz
New York, N. Y.

A student's hope

Eugene Borowitz deserves tremendous credit for his perceptive and frank analysis of the organizational structure of Reform Judaism. I was particularly interested in his remarks on HUC-JIR, and would like to add some comments of my own.

In addition to critical alumni reaction, the College in recent years has also been faced with mild but persistent student dissatisfaction. As president of the student association of the small New York branch of HUC, I have become increasingly convinced that the traditional student tendency of finger-pointing at the administration is no more than partially justifiable. While the responsibility of the administrative officers to lead is undeniable, an increasingly self-assertive faculty must assume the obligation of providing badly needed educational direction and curricular creativity. We have had, however, only occasional flickers of faculty activism.

This sluggishness is attributable in part to the Cincinnati environment, the effects of which Dr. Borowitz described. Also responsible is the isolation which results from the fact that we are a small, highly specialized institution which must try to be both a professional and a graduate school at the same time. These factors inevitably lead to an unhealthy degree of faculty in-breeding.

Dr. Borowitz mentions the desirability of "urban, great university contexts." The specific nature of these "contexts" is important; our New York school, located near the UAHC in the middle of Manhattan, somehow succeeds in cutting itself off almost completely from the city around it. In addition to an urban setting, I believe that formal affiliation with a top-flight university is necessary. While there is no reason why rabbis should be required to have Ph.D.'s, such an arrangement could provide resources which are currently lacking and at the same time reinvigorate both student and faculty attitudes.

For all our difficulties, I am encouraged by Dr. Borowitz's prediction of a public debate with the UAHC and the CCAR. I shudder at the number of times that students have been deterred by the "dirty linen" argument from discussing their grievances with concerned Jews outside of the College. A debate of this nature, of course, might lead to results which I would find objectionable. At the very least, however, it is likely that fundamental questions which have long been avoided would finally be considered.

Eric Yoffie
New York, N. Y.

. . . but others say about marxism

Misreading prophetic marxism

The division Rabbi Trepp makes (Sh'ma 1/10) between "materialistic messianism" (his italics) and "Jewish messianism" is, to my mind, thoroughly artificial. He is paying the word "materialism" two cents extra, to make it mean what he wants it to mean. If he means by "materialism" the concern with food, clothing and shelter, a demand for socio-economic equality, then would he call Amos 5:11-12

a "materialistic" statement? True, the difference is that Amos speaks in the name of God, a God that demands justice, whereas Marx, like La Place, "has no need of God," but what is significantly similar is the demand itself, not the verification of the demand . . .

The trouble is that there is no attempt to understand Marx; one is conceived to be either an apologist or an enemy. When the Biblical *Neviyim* assailed the current practices of Jews, were they less bitter than Marx? The *Neviyim,* criticizing the enslavement of the widow and the orphan, the exorbitant taxation for the maintenance of an imperialistic kingdom, the substitution of ritualistic piety for moral conduct, directed all of their arguments *against* Jews. They did not hesitate to speak against them when they saw what Jews were doing to other Jews.

It is monolithic thinking that dismays me; there must be *one* type of Jew; preferably, a lineal descendent of the Prophets, including Moses. There must be only one type of Jewish *thought* presented, extracted from a mass of literature that reflects varying types. Aren't some Jews exploiters in our long history? Weren't there *baale-battim* in Eastern Jewish life who deliberately sent young Jewish radicals to the Czar's army, and who "excommunicated" Jewish socialists?

In my studies of Jewish radicalism, from 1790 to 1920, I have seen the potential anti-semitism in such radicals as Fourier, Proudhon, Marx, the early Hess, Bebel, Kautsky, even Luxembourg, Leibnecht and Trotsky. Silberner has documented this aspect of socialism well enough, yet even he doesn't plunge into vituperative denunciations of such tendencies. They are to be understood by being put into proper context, as reflecting a reaction to Jewish "capitalists," of whom the Rothschilds were symbolic.

Ours are days of verbal hysteria. We blame Soviet anti-semitism on Marx, whereas it has its independent origins in the Kievan period, through Czarina Elizabeth to the present (witness the condemnation of the more "orthodox" Bundist Marxists by Lenin himself, during the Iskra period). No wonder it is difficult to deal with Marx as a Jew. One could almost assume that, if the situation permitted, Marx would be put in *cherem* as Spinoza was, for precisely the same reason: he treated the Jewish people as a *people,* in black *and* white colors.

When we criticize our own

The point Larry Ginsberg misses is that the infighting of Jews with other Jews is bitter, but differs profoundly from an external attack against the group as a whole. Condemnation of a group by one of those "in" is quite different from condemnation of that same group by someone "out," as any family-relations counsellor can verify. The fact that such denunciations are later used by more formidable non-Jewish opponents is no reason to denounce the original. We do not reject the Biblical phrase that the Jews are a "stiff-necked people" because enemies have used it against us.

All of the above is not to argue that there is a "right" *weltenschauung* in any one of the writers mentioned. It is simply a plea for sober discourse rather than denunciation *per se.* Polemics is to be revived, for only in reasoned argument can we suggest perspectives. We have already witnessed the denuding of Zionism of its truly radical implications by making it solely a "friends of Israel" project. What a shame that Borochov and A.D. Gordon have had their dreams reduced to some welfare slogans that won't interfere with fund-raising. The world and the Jews need an authentic Jewish radicalism, one that stems from the *Neviyim,* carrying their demands for positive Jewish survival so as to create a kingdom of God on earth, and with the Jews (including Marx) as its vanguard.

Irving Levitas
New York, N. Y.

We need to face marx, but without our ideologies

Your recent controversy on antisemitism in Marx, the Soviet Union, and a possible relation between the two has been in my view inadequate on both sides. The subject is as serious practically (for Jewish survival and liberation) as it is subtle theoretically (for philosophical and historical thought). The first is obvious: we must recognize our enemies but dare not and cannot simply write off what Prof. Wyschogrod calls "the Marxist-Communist world" unless the case is overwhelming. As to the second, the question is far too baffling and complex to permit an unequivocal answer. Why was Christian Denmark immune to Nazism when virtually none of the rest of Christian Europe was? The extent to which theories and ideas determine governmental action (not to speak of the life of a whole people)

is a question which permits no easy answer even when the theorist is Marx and the government and people are vowedly Marxist.

Much to his credit Prof. Wyschogrod only asks and does not answer his question. At the same time, he vitually predetermines an answer when he gives us what surely are too few alternatives. "Is the anti-semitism of the Soviet Union an accidental aberration, explainable if at all only by calculations of political self-interst (Arab oil etc.) or is it something that is deeply rooted in the nature of Marxism? Surely there are more alternatives, such as the possibility that the Russian revolution did not overthrow traditional Russian antisemitism.

But if Wyschogrod is inadequate Rabbi Wolf's rejoinder is downright absurd. He writes: "It is not, says Marx, that Jews are evil, but that capitalism is evil and that it subverts Jews to do its nastiest and most marginal dirty work." This, to put it mildly, is less than half the story. Wolf does not tell us that Marx *equates* Judaism with capitalism, and holds Judaism responsible for the evils of capitalism. Nor does he tell us that while Marx wants to liberate Jews along with all other men, he considers the Jews a non-people, whose liberation will be their disappearance. If this is not anti-semitism, what is? Now it is of course entirely possible that these elements in Marx's thought are inessential aberrations. But what on earth do people like Erich Fromm, Arnold Wolf and a host of others hope to gain by pretending they are not there? This is, on the contrary, most dangerous, for only by facing the truth can we live through the present radical crisis in the history of our people.

Emil L. Fackenheim
Toronto, Ontario

WE INVITE YOU to send your tax deductible contributions to Rabbi Eugene B. Borowitz, Secretary, Sh'ma Inc., 19 Reid Avenue, Port Washington, New York 11050. Then join us in either Chicago or New York on Sunday, May 23, at our annual meeting for dialogue with our editors.

MARK S. GOLUB *studies for the rabbinate at the H.U.C.-J.I.R. in New York.*

TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN *edits the non-establishment magazine The Jewish Spectator.*