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America’s Most Memorable Zionist Leaders

JONATHAN D. SARNA

* * *

Jewish Literacy, a widely distributed volume by Joseph Telushkin that promises “the most important things to know about the Jewish religion, its people, and its history,” highlights two American Zionists as worthy of being remembered by every literate Jew: Louis Brandeis and Henrietta Szold.1 Brandeis and Szold likewise are the only two American Zionists to make Michael Shapiro’s somewhat idiosyncratic list of “The Jewish 100,” a ranking of the most influential Jews of all time.2 In addition, they are the highest-ranking Zionist man and woman in the journal American Jewish History’s small scholarly survey of “the two greatest American Jewish leaders.”3 They have been the subject of more published biographies than any other American Zionists, and they dominate children’s textbook presentations of American Zionism as well. They are, in short, the best-known American Zionists by far.

Scholars may lament that other critical figures—people such as Harry Friedenwald, Israel Friedlaender, Richard Gottheil, Hayim Greenberg, Louis Lipsky, Julian Mack, Emanuel Neumann, Alice Seligsberg, Marie Syrkin, and so many others—have not achieved immortality in this way. Stephen S. Wise, Abba Hillel Silver, and Mordecai Kaplan may have come close, but they are neither as well known as Brandeis and Szold nor as universally respected. Kaplan, moreover, is far better known as the founder of Reconstructionism. Whether others deserve greater recognition, however, is not the question to be considered here.4 That would demand an extensive inquiry into what “greatness” in Zionism entails and how
it should be measured. Instead, our question is why Brandeis and Szold achieved special “canonical status” among American Zionist leaders, while so many others did not.

Existing studies of American Zionist leadership fail to consider this question. Taking their cue from social scientific studies of leadership, they focus instead on the sources from which Zionist leaders drew their authority, the strategies that they pursued, and the extent to which they preserved tradition or promoted change. Yonathan Shapiro’s well-known volume entitled *Leadership of the American Zionist Organization, 1897–1930* (1971), for example, follows Kurt Lewin in distinguishing between leaders from the center (such as Louis Lipsky) and leaders from the periphery (such as Louis Brandeis) and analyzes differences between the backgrounds, styles, and leadership methods of different American Zionist leaders. But questions of long-term reputation and popular memory—why, in our case, Brandeis and Szold won historical immortality while so many others were forgotten—go unanswered.

Here, I shall argue that the historical reputation of Brandeis and Szold rests upon factors that reach beyond the usual concerns of leadership studies. How they became leaders and what they accomplished during their lifetimes is certainly important, but even more important is the fact that both Brandeis and Szold became role models for American Jews: they embodied values that American Jews admired and sought to project, even if they did not always uphold them themselves. Brandeis and Szold thus came to symbolize the twentieth-century American Jewish community’s ideal of what a man and a woman should be. Their enduring reputations reveal, in the final analysis, as much about American Jews as about them.

What Louis Brandeis and Henrietta Szold accomplished in their lives is, in broad outline, widely known. Brandeis (1856–1941), born in Louisville, Kentucky, attended Harvard Law School and went on to become a successful and innovative Boston lawyer, achieving fame as the “people’s attorney.” During these years he maintained no formal Jewish affiliations, but in midlife, for reasons historians continue to debate, he became attracted to Zionism and in 1914 assumed leadership of the American Zionist movement, transforming its image and identity. He resigned in 1921, following a dispute with Chaim Weizmann, but remained a significant behind-the-scenes player. In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson nominated
Brandeis to the United States Supreme Court, the first Jew to be so honored. He survived a bruising confirmation fight, tainted by antisemitism, and served on the Court for twenty-three years, earning a reputation for “prophetic vision, moral intensity, and [a] grasp of practical affairs.”

Henrietta Szold (1860–1945), born in Baltimore, Maryland, was the eldest child of Rabbi Benjamin Szold and served as his amanuensis and aide. Graduating first in her class (and as the only Jew) at Western Female High School, she became a private school teacher, founded a night school for Russian Jewish immigrants, wrote essays for the Jewish press, and then worked for twenty-three years as editor (though without that title) of the Jewish Publication Society in Philadelphia. She was one of the founders of Hadassah in 1912, as well as its first national president; she traveled to Palestine in 1920 to supervise the organization’s Zionist Medical Unit; and she lived for most of her remaining years in Jerusalem, organizing social services and assuming (in her seventies) responsibility for Youth Aliyah, the immigration of Jewish refugee children to Palestine. Lauded as “Mother of Israel” for her tireless efforts on behalf of Jews in need, she believed in practical Zionism and invested every task that she undertook with a sense of spiritual purpose.

All of these accomplishments surely earned Brandeis and Szold the accolades showered upon them, but they still leave open the question of why others, who also achieved a great deal, in the course of time have been totally forgotten. Why, in other words, has popular memory operated so selectively in the case of America’s Zionist leadership, to the advantage of Brandeis and Szold and the disadvantage of everybody else? No definitive answer to this question is possible, but five factors stressed by the biographers of Brandeis and Szold seem particularly revealing. At the very least, they help to explain why the lives of these two Zionist leaders took on special relevance to subsequent generations of Jews.

First, Louis Brandeis and Henrietta Szold both were native-born, second-generation Americans, children of Central European Jewish immigrants. As leaders, they stood in marked contrast to the vast majority of American Jewish adults (and the even greater majority of American Zionists) who were immigrants, born in Eastern Europe. This disjunction between leaders and led was common in the early decades of the American Zionist movement. Every national president of Hadassah until 1939
was American-born, and not one of the early presidents of the Federation of American Zionists or the Zionist Organization of America was born in Eastern Europe. The reason is that native-born leaders such as Brandeis and Szold helped to legitimate the Zionist movement. They understood American norms and mores, spoke English without a foreign accent, attracted other native-born Jews to join them, and made it more difficult for opponents to label Zionism “un-American.” No less important, they served as living proof that those born and bred in America could, through Zionism, preserve their Jewish loyalties. The life stories of Brandeis and Szold thus offered reassurance to immigrants that their own American-born children would not necessarily assimilate and be lost to Judaism. They also reinforced one of Zionism’s central claims—that it held the key to Jewish survival.

A second element stressed by biographers of Brandeis and Szold concerns the quality of their minds: their well-deserved reputation for broad learning and superior intelligence. Alfred Mason, Brandeis’s first major biographer, quotes a Harvard Law School classmate who recalled that “Mr. Brandeis, although one of the youngest men” in his class, “had the keenest and most subtle mind of all.” Brandeis finished first among his peers, received a special dispensation from the university allowing him to graduate at a younger age than the rules allowed, and was described as late as 1941 as “the most brilliant student ever to have attended the Harvard Law School.” Near the end of his life, his “outstanding qualities of great learning” were described by the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia in terms usually reserved for the greatest rabbis and scholars, including “keen perception, rare analytical powers, [an] orderly and constructive mind . . . and profound knowledge of the historical roots of institutions.”

Henrietta Szold’s reputation for brilliance was similarly stellar. She graduated top of her class at Western Female High School; commanded German, French, and Hebrew; studied Judaica and the classics with her father (who considered her his “disciple”); audited classes in rabbinics at the Jewish Theological Seminary; and was an omnivorous reader. One biographer described her as “the most learned Jewess in the United States.” Another recalled how Szold’s “probing mind” revealed facets of problems “that had occurred to no one else and plumbed depths unfathomed by the others.” Even Jerusalem’s doctors, we are told, “listened agape” while
Szold, who had no formal medical training, “expounded before them the interrelationships among the various fields of medicine with the clarity of one long conversant with problems of hospitalization.”

Even if exaggerated for effect, the reputation shared by Brandeis and Szold for wide-ranging learning and intellectual brilliance reinforced both a basic Jewish value and a long-standing tradition that rewards wisdom with status. Just as so many of the great heroes of Israel’s past were renowned for their genius, so too, according to Zionism’s followers, its contemporary heroes. For American Jews, the fact that Brandeis and Szold were smarter than their peers both explained their success and justified the adulation that their followers showered upon them.

One might have expected that Szold, as a woman, would have been held to a different standard. Her formal academic achievements, after all, fell well below those of Brandeis. He held a graduate degree from America’s finest university; her highest earned degree was a high school diploma. Moreover, Jews traditionally considered higher education more important for men than for women. Szold herself, however, often condemned this double standard and from an early age championed women’s higher education. Through her writings and career, she demonstrated that women were as intellectually able as their male counterparts. Her editorial work at the Jewish Publication Society, in fact, made clear that she was actually more able than many of those whose books she tacitly improved. The image of the brainy Miss Szold underscored this feminist lesson by showing that learning and wisdom were no less important for Jewish women than for Jewish men.

Third on the list of revealing characteristics stressed in popular presentations of the lives of Brandeis and Szold is meticulous efficiency. Both leaders, according to their biographers, hated to waste time and championed order and precision—values central to America’s ethos, but not to Zionism’s. Szold sought to bring efficiency to Zionism as early as 1910. Charged with the task of clearing up what she described as the “almost hopeless condition” into which the Federation of American Zionism’s affairs had fallen, she labored “night and day” as “honorary secretary” and within four months was able to report that “the muddle had been cleared.” Brandeis, when he took over as leader of American Zionism in 1914, made a similar thrust for efficiency. He installed a time clock in the
Zionist offices, introduced a file-card system for names, and even proposed fines “for absence or tardiness.”

Both leaders also personally embodied the values that they preached. Szold, according to those who knew her, led a “systematic, well-ordered life.” “One hesitates,” one biographer writes (with obvious didactic intent), “even to hint to our somewhat careless younger generation just how meticulous Henrietta Szold really was in all things, whether great or small.”

Brandeis, according to his biographers, was no less punctilious. Philippa Strum speaks of his “organization,” “efficiency,” “energy,” and “concern for detail.” Alfred Leif, writing a half century earlier, reported simply that “he made efficiency a household word.”

The meticulous efficiency that these leaders personified and preached reflected modern business values, alluring yet still somewhat foreign to immigrant Jews from Eastern Europe. Traditional rabbis may have taught the virtue of wasting as little time as possible on pursuits other than Torah, but the secular idea that time should be husbanded for productive labor was new. Benjamin Franklin popularized this idea in America, and Frederick W. Taylor transformed it into a “scientific” management technique with his time-study experiments of the 1880s and 1890s, aimed at eliminating waste and inefficiency. Something of a “cult of efficiency” developed in early twentieth century America, and American Zionism’s main followers, success-oriented Eastern European Jews and their children, stood among its most ardent disciples. To them, Brandeis and Szold appeared as “priests and priestesses” of this new faith, the very antithesis of “Old World” habits. In this, as in so many other ways, Brandeis and Szold served as role models, projecting a vision of Zionism fully consonant with modernity and suffused with values that followers sought to incorporate into their own lives.

Closely akin to meticulous efficiency was a fourth characteristic stressed by biographers of Brandeis and Szold: the commitment to hard work. Szold rose early—often at five and rarely after seven—and labored long into the night. In her forties, she sometimes complained about the “crazy orgy of work” to which she subjected herself. Later, at Hadassah, friends recalled that “she worked harder and longer than anyone else on her staff.” Even when she was eighty-three, she wore out her companions. Norman Bentwich, who was twenty-three years her junior, recalled a day with her
at that time as “an experience of physical and intellectual vitality.” It involved meetings in different parts of Israel and lasted for seventeen hours, interrupted only by catnaps. Long hours and hard work were for Szold a permissible way for her to compete successfully with her peers—male and female alike. Into old age, she delighted in her victories: her ability to outlast men and women much younger than herself.

Brandeis too was known for working hard, but his secret was efficiency. He once claimed that he “could do twelve months’ work in eleven months.” He then spent the twelfth month, usually August, on vacation. His days began early, just as Szold’s did, but they generally ended at five. “He knew his health limited his work hours,” Philippa Strum explains, “so he organized his time to accomplish all that he wished to do.” In the time allotted, he completed an astonishing amount of correspondence and legal writing and kept up with a wide array of interests. His secret, as his colleagues noted when he retired, was “vigor,” “devotion,” and “intensity.” One biographer reports that he was happiest “working for leisure and using leisure for work.”

This passionate embrace of work as a calling, rather than simply as a means of earning a living, calls to mind the Protestant work ethic, as described by Max Weber, and serves as yet another reminder that this ethic scarcely was confined to Protestants alone. Through their success, Brandeis and Szold demonstrated that for Jews, too, hard work pays off. Again, they served as role models that others sought to emulate.

In the narratives of Brandeis and Szold, hard work was not only rewarded, it also yielded financial independence and freedom—goals that many an American Jew fervently desired. Brandeis, we are told, had nothing but pity for the man without capital who had “to slave and toil for others to the end of his days.” Reputedly, he sought to avoid that sad fate himself by always living carefully and by accumulating from a young age a fortune substantial enough for him to be his own master, free to select the clients and the causes in which he believed. Henrietta Szold gained financial independence in a different way at age fifty-five when a group of wealthy admirers rewarded her with an annuity. Like Brandeis, she too was now able to devote herself fully to the causes in which she believed. Shrewdly, if all too modestly, she once credited her monthly checks with being “the whole secret” of her success in Palestine. Had she worked equally hard and
not been financially independent, she recognized, her devotion would “at best” have gone “unnoted.” Freedom and financial independence were magical terms to hardworking, upwardly mobile American Jews of that time; they represented, for them, the essence of the American Dream. This explains, in part, the allure for Jews of occupational choices such as law, medicine, and accounting, which promised to make this dream come true faster, and was reflected too in the allure of Zion, which at least in its American version offered brawny pioneers something of this same dream on the soil of Palestine. Brandeis and Szold served, in a sense, as poster children for this dream. The freedom and financial independence that hard work brought them amply validated America’s promise, and they made the Zionist promise seem that much more credible.

The value of hard work went along with the fifth characteristic pointed to by all biographers of Brandeis and Szold: their penchant for spartan living and their commitment to social justice. In an age characterized by materialism and hedonism, both leaders represented “traditional values”; they firmly opposed the conspicuous consumption so frequently witnessed in their day. Brandeis, for example, was said from a young age to have “limit[ed] his wants to the barest minimum.” A biography written in his lifetime spoke of the “Stoic simplicity of his needs.” He was known to abhor ostentation and personal debt and to shun the kinds of luxuries that most men of his class indulged in; his ideal instead was to be “economical.” His friend, the Catholic social reformer Monsignor John A. Ryan, went so far as to describe his tastes and manner of living as approaching “the standards of an ascetic.” Philippa Strum reminds us that this was something of an exaggeration, for Brandeis indulged in horses, canoes, summer homes, servants, and private schooling for his daughters. The image he cultivated, however, did border on the ascetic: he never owned a car, his dinners were “spare in provision,” and his office “was furnished with austerity. There was no rug or easy chair.” Where others spent more than they earned, he did the opposite and donated the excess to causes such as Zionism in which he passionately believed. This was a deeply held value lived out in life and at the same time a silent polemic, an attack on the materialism of American society in general and particularly, one suspects, on the “crude, materialistic Boston Jews” of whom he was so very contemptuous.
Henrietta Szold displayed similar values and ideals. “For decades she had been frugal,” her biographer reports. She preached simple household virtues—“economy, order and system.” Philanthropy was central to her life, and like Brandeis she preferred to give rather than to receive. Her own home in Jerusalem was described as “simple [and] tastefully furnished,” while she herself, according to her longtime secretary Elma Ehrlich (Levinger) was “unbelievably straitlaced in all matters great or small.” “Scrupulous about the use of public funds,” her friend Rose Zeitlin recalled, “Miss Szold rarely indulged in any but second-class travel (third when second was not available). . . . On the Palestine roads her travel was by bus and third-class rail, unless a taxi was indispensable. ‘I am no more than one of the people of Israel,’ she said, when found waiting for a bus on a windy corner. . . . At the hotel where she lived for years a tablemate could not help noticing that invariably she chose the least expensive foods.” To Szold, as to Louis Brandeis, crude materialism and conspicuous consumption were anathema. At twenty-seven she lamented the “rampant materialism” that afflicted “our co-religionists in Europe.” Late in life, she deprecated, in a letter to her family, “America’s business greed.”

Jewish ideals of social justice and American Progressivism underlay many of these attitudes and life patterns. Brandeis and Szold, like other Jewish and Christian social reformers of their day, believed in a better world and conducted their lives according to its values, rather than those of their surroundings. For them, Zionism served as an extension of this vision. Both strongly supported the 1918 Pittsburgh Program of the Zionist Organization of America, which set forth a social justice agenda for Palestine, and both were fired up by the ideals of “Social Zionism,” which in its American garb advocated the creation of “a model state in the Holy Land—freed from the economic wrongs, the social injustices and the greed of modern-day industrialism.” Zionism for them took on the aura of a sacred agenda, at once lofty and prophetic. Indeed, it was their semblance to the Prophets that led so many to revere them—in their own lifetimes and thereafter.

As these shared images illustrate, those who portrayed Brandeis and Szold transformed them into larger-than-life symbols embodying the values, aspirations, and ideals that American Jews cherished and hoped to pass on to their children. In their eyes, Szold and Brandeis served as living
proof that those who were smart, efficient, hardworking, and righteous could rise to positions of prominence in America and still find time to improve the world—without hiding their faith or abandoning commitments to Jews in need. Through them, American Jews validated some of their fondest hopes concerning the land that they now called home. Szold and Brandeis thus came to function as beau ideals in American Jewish life, akin to venerated rabbis, scholars, and philanthropists. No wonder Jews carefully tended the memories of their two native “saints,” even as they allowed the memories of so many other American Zionist leaders to fall into neglect!

Beyond serving as role models, however, Brandeis and Szold also came to symbolize future directions for American Jews in an era of changing religious identities and new communal challenges. For one thing, they validated alternative modes of Jewish identification. Brandeis was an avowedly secular Jew who displayed no interest in Jewish religious rituals and never belonged to a synagogue. Szold was something of a Jewish seeker: kosher, Sabbath-observant, and deeply spiritual, yet fiercely unorthodox in many of her beliefs and practices. Neither fit comfortably into the community’s standard religious categories. As a result, both conveyed to American Jews the reassuringly latitudinarian message that they could find their own way in Judaism, for there were many ways to be a good Jew. In marked contrast to those who resisted religious change fearing assimilation, they extended Zionism’s embrace to all who sought to join them. In so doing, they paved the way for the movement’s emergence as part of the common-faith “civil religion” of American Jews, and gave added legitimation to the optimistically pluralistic and broadly inclusive model of American Jewish communal life that took shape during the interwar years.

Brandeis and Szold reinforced this sense of inclusivism by showing how, in America, Jews of Central European descent could work harmoniously with their counterparts from Eastern Europe for the betterment of Jewish life. While scarcely a new message—the leadership of the Federation of American Zionists had included “uptown” and “downtown” as well as Orthodox and Reform representatives even before 1900—tensions between the two communities continued to divide American Jews well into the twentieth century. Through their Zionist efforts, Brandeis and
Szold helped to bridge these divisive tensions by serving as exemplars of intracommunal cooperation. Szold felt particularly strongly about this point. Her friend Alice Seligsberg recalled that she would not permit Hadassah to have more than one chapter in a city, and “that chapter had to include rich and poor, Americanized socially elite and foreign born.” In this way, she worked to redirect the agenda of American Jews away from differences rooted in the Old World past and toward the common (if ultimately no less divisive) goal of shaping the Zionist future.

Finally, and perhaps most important, Brandeis and Szold symbolized and projected a message of cultural inclusiveness, personally embodying the grand synthesis—Judaism and Americanism, Hebraism plus Hellenism—that so many aspired to but so few actually achieved. Brandeis, compared in his own lifetime to both Isaiah and Lincoln, was known to be a devotee both of fifth-century Athens and of Puritan New England. Szold too embraced both Jewish and secular culture. In addition to her much-celebrated Judaic learning, as a young schoolteacher in Baltimore, she taught subjects as diverse as French, Latin, mathematics, history, botany, and physiology; and throughout her life she maintained an absorbing interest in plants and nature.

In an era when many doubted the ability of American Jews to negotiate both sides of their “hyphenated” identity, Szold and Brandeis served as prominent counterexamples. They provided reassuring evidence that the ideal of inclusiveness could be realized, and that Judaism, Zionism, and Americanism all could be happily synthesized. For this, as much as for their more tangible organizational contributions, American Jews revered them and remembered them. Perhaps at some level they also understood that through them they saw their own aspirations and ideals reflected backward.
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