On the Necessity and Impossibility of Being a Jew in the Academy

Author(s): Deborah Dash Moore

Source: *CrossCurrents*, WINTER 1993/94, Vol. 43, No. 4, The Once and Future University: ARIL 10TH ANNIVERSARY ISSUE (WINTER 1993/94), pp. 503-516

Published by: Wiley

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24459446

Deborah Dash Moore

On the Necessity and Impossibility of Being a Jew in the Academy

I've borrowed Jean Amery's title (slightly amended) less to suggest a shared philosophical posture than an existential one.[1] Amery, a Swiss Jew raised as a Catholic and deported by the Nazis to Auschwitz, turned to philosophy after the war. His philosophical meditations on existence in light of the Holocaust mix personal history with intellectual engagement.[2] In their articulation of the dilemma of Jewish identity in the diaspora, the situation out of which a Jewish vision must arise, they offer one possible reading of the relation of Jews to the academy. The contradictions inherent in the academy — at least from my perspective at a relatively small, elite liberal arts college — demand a Jewish presence on campus even as they make such a position problematic.

The American secular academy is for Jews like myself a peculiar kind of *galut*, exile. Its seductions differ from forms of *galut* that Jews have known since the first exile to Babylonia. The American secular academy holds out temptations of power and influence, security and welfare, fame and glory. These are positive attributes of exile that co-exist with recent memories of suffering, persecution, exclusion, and expulsion. Jews understand the lures of exile and its difficulties, both of which shape their relationship to life in an unredeemed world.

But the American secular academy also promises something more, a harbinger of a redeemed world: a taste of sacred pleasures, a commu-

---

DEBORAH DASH MOORE is professor of religion and director of the American Culture program at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. Her book *To the Golden Cities: Pursuing the American Jewish Dream in Miami and L.A.* will be published by the Free Press in February, 1994.

nity of scholars, the joy of intellectual discourse and study for its own sake. In these areas it trespasses on a critical mode of accommodation Jews made with the world to enable them to survive as Jews in *galut.* The life of the mind — study as a form of refuge and of worship — has sustained Jews for centuries and given them both a home and homeland in sacred texts. The world of the yeshiva flourished in exile as a foretaste of the world to come. As Abraham Joshua Heschel noted, Jews "believed that the existence of the world is conditioned not upon museums and libraries, but upon Yeshivas and Houses of Study. To them, the House of Study was not important because the world needed it; but, on the contrary, the world was important because the House of Study existed in it."[3] To the extent that the American secular academy freely offers Jews a life of the mind and a community of scholars, it threatens to rob them of their identity and usurp Judaism's meaning in exile. I would liken the academy's temptations in the United States today to the garden of mysticism of old. The rabbis tell of four who entered the garden of mystical knowledge: one lost his soul and became an apostate; one lost his mind and went mad; one lost his body and succumbed; and only one Rabbi Akiba, emerged unscathed with mind, body, and soul intact. Looking around at my Jewish colleagues in American colleges and universities today, I think that an average of one out of four surviving as Akiba did — that is, as a Jew with mind, body and soul intact — is fairly close to the mark.

Wherein lies the source of the academy's seductions? There are many ways to approach this question but since I am an historian of American Jews, I prefer an historical answer that emphasizes the role of American Jews as agents of change. (Others might chart the academy's growing secularization or its de-Christianization as enhancing its lure.) Jews projected upon the American university many of their dreams for America. They helped to endow the academy with its seductive powers by imagining it as an ideal American community with no boundaries except those demanded by the rigor of intellectual research. As a meritorious community of consent, the academy offered an alternative to what were seen as restrictive and parochial communities of descent.[4] Jews understood that it was only in a secularized academy that there would be place for themselves and for their Judaism. They required the creation of neutral space where one's family background or religious beliefs did not restrict one's participation. Hence Jews did their best to make a place for themselves and for Judaism within the American university.

The power and lure of Jewish visions for the academy can be found

in the history of Jewish studies in the secular university as well as in the personal life histories of those Jews drawn to pursue academic careers. I will not attempt a collective portrait of my Jewish colleagues but will offer a sketch of several paradigmatic figures whose varied Jewish visions of the academy helped to shape the American secular university and whose scholarship and values molded their disciplines. They are emblems of the critical importance of a Jewish presence in the academy. Let me start with a brief history of Jewish studies in American universities to understand what some particularist Jews — those identifying as Jews and encouraging academic study of Jewish religion, history, and culture for its own sake as well as for its contributions to Jewish and secular knowledge — hoped to find or make in the academy.

This history is relatively long, dating back at least a century when a half-dozen elite universities introduced Semitic studies as part of a program to reform the university.[5] "Semitic studies facilitated institutional transformation at a time when governing boards gradually shifted from ecclesiastical to lay control, presidents sported business suits instead of clerical robes, and faculty members espoused research over creed." As Harold Wechsler and Paul Ritterband point out, "Semitics coursework allowed university authorities, charged with 'Godlessness' by clergy, and colleges left behind by the academic revolution, to cite continued connection with religion."[6] Although some argue that Jewish studies extends back to the colonial era when Hebrew was part of the classical curriculum and was occasionally taught by converts to Christianity, such instruction did not bring Jewish studies into universities. The introduction of Semitic studies, by contrast, represented a coherent effort to explore aspects of Jewish culture as a legitimate subject worthy of scholarly attention. Further, the relationship of the ancient Semites to contemporary Jews was implicitly and explicitly acknowledged by early Jewish Semitics scholars, who often saw their research as helping to establish Jewish learning as integral to Western culture.

In that sense, Semitic studies was part of the Jewish project of emancipation that was launched in Europe in the eighteenth century and that absorbed some of the best minds of the nineteenth century. This emancipation project sought to redefine the Jewish position in Christian society and culture as both became secularized and modernized. It involved recasting the social structure of Jewish communities, reforming Judaism's religious rituals and norms, and revising the substance and method of Jewish education. Among the goals of emancipated Jews was the opening of universities to Jewish students, Jewish scholars, and Jew-

ish studies. The issue involved not just access but recognition, entailing a vision of the academy as the vanguard of emancipation, source of a new world order. Inclusiveness within the universities meant liberation. By the end of the nineteenth century, it was only through the establishment of Semitic studies in American universities that the educational aspects of the European project of emancipation seemed capable of realization. American Jews, however, turned to universities and supported fledgling Semitics programs less out of a desire to complete their emancipation — Jews were not emancipated in the United States; they had already effected their emancipation through emigration from societies that restricted them — than because as Americans they wished to contribute to the culture at the highest levels. They recognized, too, that Semitics helped to legitimate a Jewish presence on campus at a time when religious affiliation could still bar a candidate from an academic post.

But the promise of Semitics was shortlived. By the first decades of the twentieth century, it became clear that Semitic studies, increasingly marginalized by a new emerging curriculum, could not serve Jewish purposes. Semitics failed to attract younger Jewish scholars and succumbed to the growing wave of campus antisemitism.

A second initiative during the years between the two world wars — ironically the peak years of quotas restricting Jewish students and faculty in American colleges and universities — established Jewish history and modern Hebrew literature as alternatives to Semitic studies. Since few Gentiles were attracted to these fields, they gave both Jewish culture and Jewish scholars a place within the academy, however marginal. Jewish historians and philosophers taught Jewish history and philosophy to Jewish students. Leading Jewish scholars in other fields, especially the social sciences, took pains to steer their Jewish students away from studying Jews. Instead they taught their students to rephrase their questions about Jews and their culture into language appropriate for studying minorities so that they could examine other, more acceptable groups.[7] Hence the vision of the secular university as the vanguard of an inclusive universalism championed by early Jewish supporters of Semitics yielded to the limitations of a restrictive, narrow academic environment. The alternative to inclusive universalism proposed by Jewish advocates of Jewish history and modern Hebrew language and literature, namely, a consensual yet pluralist vision for the university, similarly failed to overcome prejudice in the academy.

After World War II, American Jews initiated a sustained attack upon

university quotas and other forms of discrimination based on race, religion, and national origins, and they established a model liberal arts college that would embody a Jewish vision for the academy. Brandeis University, founded in 1948, countenanced no quotas for students or faculty. It embraced scholars, artists, and intellectuals — including men and women without doctorates but with demonstrated intellectual rigor and competence — long excluded from the American academy. It created a secular community of scholars where the study of Jewish culture was part of the curriculum and Jewish modes of learning, including aggressive styles of questioning, were acceptable. Its goal was to be a Jewish Harvard, an excellent and prestigious institution embodying engaged scholarship along with Jewish values.

While Jews were building Brandeis to reflect their vision of the academy, they were also pressing suits and legislation to delegitimate discrimination in higher education. This two-pronged attack, along with federal support for universities and a vast program of expansion in public, state schools, radically changed the character of the American academy. In the postwar decades, many Jews entered the academy as scholars and students and Jewish studies — especially Hebrew language and literature, invigorated by the establishment of the State of Israel — gained a foothold in undergraduate education.

Following the Supreme Court's 1963 Schempp decision supporting religious studies even in state-supported institutions, a new home was found for Jewish studies on campus, one quite different from that provided by Semitics, history, philosophy, the social sciences, or Hebrew language and literature. In religious studies Judaism achieved a centrality that it previously lacked; desiring to converse with their colleagues, Jewish studies scholars discovered that a common interest in religion formed the best basis of dialogue, with the result that issues regarding Jewish religious particularism and its relationship to Jewish scholarship became explicit. Debates in the hallways of the annual meeting of the Association of Jewish Studies inevitably touch upon the intersection of Jewish scholarship and personal religious commitment (which means for most Jews less what they think in public than how they act). What level of observance is appropriate for scholars of Jewish studies? And on a collective level, what religious posture is appropriate for a secular association of Jewish studies' scholars? The responses have ranged from a universalist perspective emphasizing the privatization of religion to a pluralist one encouraging diversity within commonality to a particularist view legitimating exclusivist alternatives. For example, the AJS board

has repeatedly discussed the issue of whether the organization should recognize the Hanukka holiday (its December meetings often overlap with the eight-day festival) at its formal dinner. The proposals (including lighting candles, blessing the lights, offering a time before the dinner for those who wish to light and bless candles, ignoring the holiday) are always tentative and underline the necessity and impossibility of being a religious Jew in the academy today.

Representative Scholars

This brief account of Jewish studies in the academy needs to be complemented by that of Jews in other disciplines whose Jewishness influenced their scholarship, interpretation of their discipline, and vision for the academy. Since I must be brief, let me focus on three diverse and representative figures: Franz Boas, Louis Wirth, and Oscar Handlin.

Franz Boas (1858–1942), for many years a professor of anthropology at Columbia University (one of the six schools that introduced Semitic studies), immigrated to the United States in 1887 because he reportedly did not feel he could submit to German academic requirements that he declare his religious affiliation. A Jew by birth, he grew up in a household "in which the ideals of the revolution of 1848 were a living force." His parents rejected Judaism and Boas embraced their worship of intellectual freedom. The "ideal of American democracy" attracted him, and Boas became an American citizen and the founder of American anthropology.[8] Through his pioneering studies on race and immigrants, Boas founded a tradition of relativist anthropology that emphasized the need to understand each culture on its own terms.[9] He and his students used their anthropology to illuminate political and social controversies. As cultural critics, they inveighed against racism and national chauvinism and championed intercultural tolerance. Their scholarship helped to deprovincialize both its practitioners and many Americans, influencing how they came to see their own and other cultures. Not a cloistered scholar, Boas campaigned actively against the ostensibly scientific racism used to justify the Immigration Exclusion Act of 1924. His studies of immigrants' changing physical characteristics argued for the impact of environment over birth, culture over inherited traits, communities of consent over those of descent.

Boas also offered a critique of American culture, especially the genteel Christian tradition dominant in the academy during the first decades of the twentieth century. He understood that Jews like himself could only work in an academic environment open to new ideas, to questioning re-

ceived knowledge, to individuals whose claim for a hearing came from their scholarship and not their parentage. He envisioned a university in which the pursuit of knowledge was not hampered by preconceived traditions handed down by descent communities. Though he received support for his research on racism from such Jewish organizations as the American Jewish Committee, Boas articulated a vigorous assimilationism, seeing in it the solution to racism. "Antisemitism will not disappear until the last vestige of the Jew as a Jew has disappeared," he declared.[10] Perhaps he can be likened to one who got lost in the garden since he could not bring the same empathy to Jewish culture that he brought to his studies of Eskimos and other cultures. In the 1930s under the heightened racism of the Nazis, Boas embraced cosmopolitanism and popular front politics.[11] Like a significant minority of Jews, he saw in the proletariat an international brotherhood that promised to erase all distinctions of race in the solvent of class solidarity.[12]

A fellow immigrant from Germany, Louis Wirth (1897–1952), made his academic career at the University of Chicago (another of the six schools that introduced Semitics). He is intimately associated with the Chicago School of urban and immigrant sociologists. Wirth's parents, farmers in a small German town, were observant Jews and gave their son both secular and religious training. As a teenaged immigrant, Wirth also studied in Omaha's public schools before winning a scholarship to the University of Chicago. For several years prior to his doctoral studies, he worked as director of the division for delinquent boys at the Jewish Charities of Chicago.[13] During a wide-ranging and influential career he never ceased to participate in Jewish social welfare and intellectual concerns.[14] Unlike Boas, Wirth chose to study Jews. His pioneering book, *The Ghetto,* took the history of Jewish urban settlement in Europe and the United States as a model of minority group behavior, transforming the ghetto from a descriptive and prescriptive form of Jewish residence into a sociological concept of universal significance. "The institution of the ghetto," he concluded, "is not only the record of a historical people; it is a manifestation of human nature and a specific social order."[15] Wirth emphasized the importance of values in sociology, arguing that they "determine our intellectual interests, the selection of problems for analysis, our selection and interpretation of data, and to a large extent our generalizations and, of course, our application of these generalizations." His vision of the secular academy stressed consensus; he regarded the study of consensus as "the central task of sociology."[16]

The issue of how peoples could live together in a democracy engaged

Wirth throughout his life. Like Boas, he used his scholarship to influence American public policy, particularly New Deal policy regarding cities. Having grown up in a small town, Wirth never romanticized rural life; rather he saw cities as liberating, places where one was free to pursue intellectual interests. Again like Boas, Wirth fought American racism. As a founder and director of the American Council of Race Relations he led its efforts to prepare a brief against restrictive residential covenants. He believed in engaged scholarship and defended that vision as critical to the secular American academy. As a staunch integrationist, Wirth included Jews as Jews within his understanding of consensus; they were part of the democratic social fabric. He valued his minority group identification as crucial to his scholarship and thought that Jews and other minorities deserved a place within the academy because of the insights they brought. Yet ultimately Wirth assumed that Jews would be integrated into the modern city as he had been assimilated into the secular university subculture of liberated and liberal professionals. Fred Matthews argues that Wirth saw the process of becoming human as one of "leaving the narrow community with its sharply defined characters and customs, limited by historical constraint, and moving out into the large, dynamic world of modernity and competition...." Here Matthews sees "an echo of Christian come-outerism in this belief in the liberating power of the new milieu and the new faith."[17]

Oscar Handlin (1915), a second-generation Jew born in Brooklyn, arrived at his future academic home, Harvard University (another of the Semitics institutions), in the midst of the Depression after graduating at age nineteen from Brooklyn College. At Harvard, Handlin studied with Arthur Schlesinger, one of the few Jews teaching American history and a scholar who did pioneering work on immigration. Unlike Wirth and Boas, Handlin never personally experienced the dislocation of immigration.[18] Yet he empathized with the anguish and alienation of the immigrant experience, seeing in it the central formative experience shaping American society and culture. His Pulitzer prize-winning account, *The Uprooted*, still serves as a touchstone for debate on the character and meaning of immigration for Americans.[19] Handlin subsequently argued that "immigrants experienced in an extreme form what other modern men have felt — the consequences of the breakdown of traditional communal life." Even those native-born sons and daughters who stayed in the places of their birth were "often themselves made aliens in the world about them" because migrants so changed their society. Handlin saw the tragedy and not just the success in American immigration: "Even those

who earned all the exterior measures of success nonetheless carried forever the marks of the losses they suffered from migration."[20] Through his writing and his many students, Handlin not only shaped immigrant and ethnic history but American social and urban history.

Although Handlin initially wrote on Boston's Irish immigrants, he did not ignore American Jews. In May 1948 he organized, under the sponsorship of *Commentary*, a conference on American Jewish history that drew together American historians, historians of American Jews, sociologists (including Louis Wirth), and thinkers concerned with contemporary problems facing American Jews. Assessing the outcome, Handlin noted that there were few Jews among professional historians and that the young men "who have entered the field in recent years have often been unwilling to strengthen an identification that might retard professional advancement."[21] The results — a low level of scholarship on American Jews — needed to be remedied, a task Handlin himself undertook in the mid-1950s. His history, *Adventure in Freedom*, contextualized Jewish history as part of the fabric of American history. Like Wirth and Boas, Handlin also addressed racism and antisemitism, explicitly writing on immigration restriction during the 1950s when Congress debated quotas and exclusion. Together with his wife, Mary Flug Handlin, he increasingly wrote for a larger American audience. He clearly envisioned the academy as a place to pursue engaged scholarship, where committed Jews could move easily from writing the history of their own group to the history of other Americans, precisely because the former did not stand outside of the latter.[22] Handlin assumed that ethnic groups existed to serve their members; indeed, "the very provisions of American society that permitted the ethnic group to exist freely also permitted its members to adjust their identification to the needs of their own personalities."[23]

A Personal Journey

My own odyssey to the study of American Jewish history follows some of the same paths, though it ends at quite a different point. I came of age as a member of the baby-boom generation born after World War II. My parents are third-generation American Jews. (I have great grandparents buried in American graves.) My parents went to college, an experience typical of their generation, but unlike their peers, they never moved to the suburbs. I grew up in Manhattan — on the streets, riding busses and subways, playing in parks — taking in the city's culture, its

art, theater, music, dance. I loved growing up a city girl — a New York City Jewish girl.

I went to a left-wing, multicultural, integrated, progressive, private, parent-teacher cooperative elementary school that owed much to one of Boas's students, Margaret Mead, and to the vision of interculturalism. I date my interest in urban history from a third-grade field trip to see the Third Avenue El being torn down. And I relate my interest in American history to my grandfather, at whose suggestion I received the entire American landmark history series for children. (I remember it vividly because that year I had asked for, gotten, and worn to my birthday party a pink tutu with silver tiara — I was the only one so attired.) But I am an American Jewish historian, so I must introduce another element of the story.

My Jewish odyssey ran parallel to the American one, but was not intimately connected with history. I went to afternoon Hebrew school at the Society for the Advancement of Judaism (SAJ). I remember hearing Mordecai Kaplan preach on special occasions when older children were allowed to stay in precious seats, and finding him awesome and terribly difficult to understand. Jack Cohen, who was the rabbi at SAJ when I was growing up, was more approachable and a fantastic teacher. I became Bat Mitzvah, something I did not realize was not the norm in 1959 until I got to camp and volunteered for an *aliyah* to read Torah. My request triggered an enormous debate among the male campers who ran the Sabbath services. Finally, the counselor decided in my favor and when I walked up for my *aliyah,* half of the boys walked out in protest.

I went to a Reconstructionist Hebrew high school after school, and here I first made the connection between history and Jewishness. In a class on American Jews, I wrote a paper on the Jewish labor movement — over twenty pages long — more than I had ever had to write for public high school and far more than was required for class. But this first foray into American Jewish history remained an isolated effort until I reached graduate school.

I initially resolved the matter of being a Jew in the academy to my satisfaction by attending Brandeis University. At the "Jewish Harvard" I majored in history, drawn especially to American urban and black history. My honors thesis, on African-American politics in Baltimore and St. Louis during Reconstruction, reflected my intellectual and political commitments. Of course, I also studied Jewish texts and philosophy, as well as Hebrew language and literature, as part of a well-rounded liberal arts education, but they were not central to my concerns. Brandeis

projected a Jewish vision for the academy that embraced the goal of liberal learning, intellectual community, personal search and commitment, and engaged scholarship, that is, a scholarship that mattered and just might change the world. Questions of religious observance and belief were conspicuously absent (i.e., they were neither called into question by contradicting practices nor required or encouraged): Brandeis closed for Jewish holidays, following the rhythm of the Jewish calendar; neither classes nor exams were scheduled on Saturdays. If the academy was *galut*, I, as an undergraduate, was oblivious to its signifying features, for I was comfortable in my Brandeis *galut*. I was conscious that Brandeis wasn't Israel — the real Jewish homeland and center of Jewish intellectual life — but it offered a creative corner.

By the time I got to graduate school — despite my mentors' best efforts to encourage me to take an MAT since, they thought, women didn't get PhD's — I was committed to studying American history, black and urban, and I wrote an MA thesis on a Black Reconstruction politician from the Sea Islands. But then I discovered Jewish history. So after a terrifying interview with Gerson Cohen, I took a minor in medieval and modern Jewish history. However, other than the Jewish labor movement — and Moses Rischin's pioneering work on the Lower East Side (done under Handlin's guidance), which I read in an American history class — I still had no idea that there was a field of American Jewish History. My Jewish history courses focused on Europe, the Middle East, North Africa; my American history courses rarely mentioned Jews (Rischin was the exception). Eventually, however, I decided to study New York City — a return to my early urban interests — and to research the period when my grandfather was raising his family. By the time I arrived at Vassar College to teach Jewish Studies, the only Jew in the religion department and one of the few visible Jews on campus, *At Home in America*, my first book, existed in draft, though it was not published until 1981.

Forging the Links

The reader may have noticed by now my tendency to link intellectual community with a Jewish vision of the academy, a bias that stems from my personal history; I discovered Judaism by tasting the spiritual pleasure of intellectual community at Hebrew high school. For many years I thought that to be a Jew meant simply to be an intellectual embedded in a community of other Jews, that is, other intellectuals. Indeed, when I go to synagogue, I seek spiritual stimulation and intellectual community in discussion of Torah rather than in prayer. Hence the linkage, and

hence, too, my interpretation that Jews who enter the academy often do so from a desire for the kind of intimate fellowship that grows from sharing a passion for ideas; for living the life of the mind not in isolation but together with others; for the type of scholarship that explores the relation of self and society, and that transforms behavior. The collective dimension is crucial here; one cannot be a Jew alone. Although Judaism mandates a *minyan* of ten as the critical number for worship, I found that for my spiritual purposes six or seven would be adequate. Yet to find that handful, one needs a critical mass of Jews on campus, especially if one assumes that only one in four survives "the garden" of the secular academy with mind, body and soul intact.

Herein lies the dilemma for someone like myself: on the one hand, the promise of the academy and on the other, the contradictory demand that one choose between being a scholar or being a Jew, between following the university's calendar or observing the Jewish calendar, between speaking in quiet, nuanced, polite tones or raising disturbing questions spoken with passion, between blending in or standing out. Many Jews are willing to sacrifice aspects of their personality and identity to participate in a secular community of scholars. Their Jewish identities matter little to them; they dislike those aspects of their personality that they associate with their Jewish upbringing and desire to substitute the secular academy for their spiritual world. Yet their Jewish background does influence their approach to their disciplines and their presence on campus signals a university's openness to diversity. A university without secular Jews pursuing scholarship in the humanities, arts, and sciences is a university that is afraid to have certain questions asked. Secular Jews of necessity embrace either a universalism or a pluralism that frees intellectual inquiry from personal background, that allows for individuals to remake themselves and imagine not just their future but also their past. These Jews see in the academy a promise of freedom, a consensual community open to all who wish to share and shape its values. They do not see, as I do, both the necessity and impossibility of being a Jew in the academy.

Notes

1. Jean Amery, "On the Necessity and Impossibility of Being a Jew," *New German Critique* 20 (1983): 15–20.

2. Jean Amery's work available in English, *At the Mind's Limits* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

3. Abraham Joshua Heschel, "The Eastern European Era in Jewish History," *East*

European Jews in Two Worlds: Studies from the YIVO Annual, ed. Deborah Dash Moore (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 18.

4. I borrow Werner Sollors's terms and their distinctions. See his *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

5. I rely upon the important forthcoming book by Paul Ritterband and Harold Wechsler, *Jewish Learning in American Universities: The First Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).

6. Ritterband and Wechsler, 27.

7. Recently, Jewish scholars have scrutinized the subtexts of these studies, exploring their Jewish meanings and agendas. See, for example, Suzanne Klingenstein, *Jews in the American Academy, 1900–1940: The Dynamics of Intellectual Assimilation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), which examines professors of philosophy and literature. She argues (p. xvii) that the interplay between bondage to the law and American freedom "is the single most important dichotomy in the complex response of Jewish academics" to their transition from Jewish intellectuality to American elite university culture. Her focus is on the dichotomizing structure of their thought, their "intellectual grammar."

8. Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History of an Idea in America* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), 418–25, quotes on 418, 420.

9. The account of Boas's anthropology is drawn from Richard Handler, "Boasian Anthropology and the Critique of American Culture," *American Quarterly* 42 (1990): 252–73.

10. Quoted in Naomi W. Cohen, *Encounter with Emancipation: The German Jews in the United States 1830–1914* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1984), 278. Cohen notes that Boas stood aloof from the Jewish aspect of the race question until after World War II, when he saw the connection to Nazi doctrines. On the funding of his research see Naomi W. Cohen, *Not Free to Desist: A History of the American Jewish Committee 1906–1966* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1972), 176.

11. Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), 74–75.

12. Sidney Hook, *Out of Step: An Unquiet Life in the 20th Century* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 257–59. Hook writes (258) that "I remember how shocked I was in 1940 when I met him [Boas] sporting a large lapel pin with the device 'Roosevelt is a warmonger.' "

13. Elizabeth Wirth Marvick, "Louis Wirth: A Biographical Memorandum," in *Louis Wirth: On Cities and Social Life,* ed. Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 333–40. Wirth's daughter notes (337) that he married a social worker from Kentucky, whose fundamentalist Baptist father encouraged her to study at the University of Chicago. "Wirth's assimilationist inclinations and principles, like those of his wife, partly derived from their common reaction against dogmatism and provincial ethnocentrism. Their two daughters were to be encouraged in agnosticism with audible atheistic overtones, at the same time that they were to acquire a 'generalized minority' ethnic identification."

14. See, for example, Louis Wirth, "Education for Survival: The Jews," *American Journal of Sociology* 48:5 (March 1943): 682–91.

15. Louis Wirth, *The Ghetto* (1928, rpt.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 287.

16. Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Introduction," *Louis Wirth: On Cities and Social Life,* ed. Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), ix–xxx, quotes on xiv, xvii.

17. Fred Matthews, "Louis Wirth and American Ethnic Studies," subtitles his essay "The Worldview of Enlightened Assimilationism, 1925–1950," *The Jews of North* America,

ed. Moses Rischin (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 123–43, quotes on 132, 133.

18. Handlin's biography is drawn from Barbara Miller Solomon, "A Portrait of Oscar Handlin," and Richard L. Bushman, "Introduction," in *Uprooted Americans: Essays to Honor Oscar Handlin,* ed. Richard L. Bushman, Neil Harris, David Rothman, Barbara Miller Solomon, and Stephan Thernstrom (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1979), 3–8, ix–xvi.

19. Maldwyn A. Jones, "Oscar Handlin," *Pastmasters,* ed. 239–77.

20. Oscar Handlin, "Immigration in American Life: A Reappraisal," in *Immigration in American History: Essays in Honor of Theodore C. Blegen,* ed. Henry Steele Commager (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961), 8–25, quote on 12, 24.

21. Oscar Handlin, "New Paths in American Jewish History: Afterthoughts on a Conference," *Commentary* 7 (April 1949): 388–94, quote on 389.

22. This comes across very clearly in an essay Oscar Handlin wrote initially in response to an essay by Dorothy Thompson arguing that "America Demands a Single Loyalty," *Commentary* 9 (March 1950): 210–19 on "Israel and the Mission of America," in *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1957), 193–200. He concludes: "The best hope of a sound and creative relationship between Israel and the Jews of the United States, therefore, is that which rests upon faith in the traditional democratic mission of America."

23. Oscar Handlin, "Historical Perspectives on the American Ethnic Group," *Daedalus* 90 (Spring 1961): 220–32, quote on 231.