



The Jewish Component

The deep concern of Brandeis for Jewish values was demonstrated by the many special projects it undertook and, of course, by its emphasis on a strong Judaic curriculum. Yet it was clear that the Jewish component of Brandeis included an intangible—a unique atmosphere, an atmosphere that had been developed by the nature of its sponsorship and the students and faculty it attracted. One thinks of cities in this country with a special personality that distinguishes them from the hundreds of others so much like them. But New Orleans or Boston are *sui generis*, and so are St. Louis or Miami Beach, San Francisco, New York or Chicago. There are colleges as well whose history and sponsorship give them a unique personality, perhaps undefinable but pervasive. They defy catalogue description because their characters do not depend exclusively on the courses listed. They are vitally influenced by the lifestyle or the culture of the students and the faculty, the subjects that engage their interest, the causes they espouse, even the adversaries who stir their reactions.

Chemistry is chemistry, or at least its basic matter is the same wherever it is taught, as is mathematics, physics, anthropology, or modern languages. The academic difference from one school to another comes through primarily in the quality of the teaching and research. But no one will mistake Harvard for Swarthmore or Fordham or for several other equally singular universities whose academic climate is as distinctive as their history. I do not refer to the old wheeze: “You can always tell a Harvard man—but you can’t tell him much.” It would be more perceptive to quote John Marquand’s rueful view: “If you’ve ever gone to Harvard, you can be sure of one thing. You will never be allowed to forget it.” Behind Marquand’s self-deprecating irony lurks a somewhat larger truth. Too many Harvard men

have been absorbed in the public service of our country for there not to have been some mysterious stamp put on its sons, and now its daughters, by the university. Harvard today is rarely thought of as a Congregationalist stronghold; it long ago shed its Puritan image. Yet the impression of the religious commitments of Congregationalists, who brought Harvard into being and protected its welfare against many odds, still continuously surfaces. Walking quietly in its beautiful yard, studying in tradition-enveloped buildings, passing the portraits on every public wall of those who molded the patterns of American life will compel a moral responsibility, regardless of one's ultimate calling. Reading Van Wyck Brooks's *The Flowering of New England*, one begins to understand the impact of this unspoken pledge of noblesse oblige. And for all of Henry Adams's slighting remarks in his *Education* about his alma mater in the nineteenth century, the Harvard seal was left on him and on later generations of Adamsses, as on the Roosevelts and Kennedys.

Then there is the phenomenal impact of the Quakers on higher education. The entire Quaker group in the United States even today has little more than 120,000 adherents, one of the smallest in the roster of denominations. Yet this group has made the building of small, quality colleges one of its major objectives, and schools like Haverford, Swarthmore, and Bryn Mawr are a crowning glory. No one can mistake their unique character. It reveals itself in more than their high academic standards, as attested to by the fact that every responsible survey of schools their size invariably places them close to the top of the list. It goes beyond such academic pioneering as the honor system, which was the brainchild of the distinguished Swarthmore president Frank Aydelotte, who lived to see this pragmatic incentive established in most of the major colleges of the land. Over and above the passion for excellence—although in roguish off-moments, students refer to themselves as Swarthmorons—is a climate of simplicity and modesty, often approaching austerity, in action and thought, a search for what Quakers call "the inner light." There is nothing ornate, neither in its instructional buildings, its residence halls, nor its unpretentious chapel. In the same vein, I remember a quiet aside made by one of our museum staff who was a graduate of Haverford: "We were called 'Mister' on the first day we arrived, seventeen and foolish. It had an effect."

Just as the Quakers are America's smallest religious group, the Catholics are the largest. They have fully met their responsibilities in the area of higher education and have created more than two hundred American colleges. They vary from the parochial school on the college level in institutions like Loyola, which combines Catholic orthodox indoctrination with secular learning, all the way to Fordham and Boston College whose Catholic identification is largely limited to official sponsorship and financial

support. Many Catholic-founded institutions have removed all course requirements in theology, and there is wide latitude for those who choose this concentration. The level of teaching varies, of course, but their finest schools have a commitment to learning and scholarship that makes them prime assets in American life. Special character in such schools is quickly sensed. Here you find deep religious reverence, a sharp restraint upon the boundless sweep of pragmatism, a resistance to the acceptance of reason as the sole guide to the conduct of life. The utilitarian is rarely permitted to crowd out the sacred. Perhaps this is why there is so much respect for pageantry and the mystical elements of faith.

When we turn to Brandeis, founded in mid-century, we may ask whether there has been time, after only a few decades, to develop a special character. I believe there has been, and I would say the character is built around a sense of social consciousness, a concern for the underdog, and resistance to any kind of discrimination. Some of it comes from the prophetic tradition, which has woven the passion for social justice into the warp and woof of Jewish life. Some of it comes from the precarious economic stratum out of which most first- or second-generation immigrant groups emerge. Whatever the genealogical background, the result is plain to see. The student body is unusually activist and very much concerned with rights. The faculty, brought together for its special skills in diverse academic areas and with no thought of personal temperament or outlook, have somehow quickly demonstrated a more than average concern for the protection and advancement of progressive social values. Indeed, many of them may have been attracted to Brandeis because it afforded a hospitable climate for such concern. I cannot believe it is altogether accidental that the main writing and research going forward so early at Brandeis had to do with restraints on freedom, restraints that threaten the fullness of life. An unusual succession of articles and books still stream from faculty who are often involved in resisting the abuse of power. There must also be some subtle relationship between these writings and the orientation of research in the laboratories that seeks to sustain and enrich life and attracts the support of such agencies as the National Institutes of Health and the American Cancer Society. There is a similar relationship in the fervent concern of the young people with racial integration, their sense of outrage with South African apartheid, and the demonstrations against the American involvement in the Vietnam War. As one of the student yearbook editors put it: "At Brandeis the status is certainly not quo."

Of course, Brandeis is not alone in such concern. Fortunately, many other universities are in the forefront of the battle to link truth with justice, and Brandeis gravitated naturally to this doughty band. It was not always easy for the administration to remain unperturbed when the student news-

paper, probing into every area, often far beyond normal student jurisdiction, scolded, sniped, and pontificated. It would have been much more comfortable to deal with a conforming student leadership, quietly deferential. But these were youngsters who had cut the umbilical cord of filial obedience, and they continued to question and oppose when they reached a college where the environment was favorable for challenging all credentials and sanctions. At any rate, the educational process is expected to inflict pain, to cavil, demur, and defy. The trustees have asked only that the spirit of criticism be constructive and respectful, even during the most divisive contention. All such strife is in the spirit of the reforming justice for whom the university is named. "Brandeis and Holmes dissenting" was appended to scores of majority decisions reached in the Supreme Court. The seal of the university reads *Emet* (Truth), and its motto comes from the Psalmist who demanded "the search for truth, even unto its innermost parts."

Every care was taken to make sure that what I have called the special personality of Brandeis, though intangible, did not affect our academic objectivity. This impartiality undoubtedly was misunderstood by preparatory and high school counselors who, in discussing college choices, often advised non-Jewish students not to consider Brandeis, or encouraged intensely Jewish-oriented youngsters to apply there because it was a "Jewish university." Few such advisors could know that there was no intention to develop Brandeis as a parochial school.

Nevertheless, by virtue of its sponsorship, it was appropriately expected that there would be unique strength in the Judaic curriculum (which belonged in the academic structure of any good university), in the library, and in the study of foreign countries, especially Israel. In planning for Judaic studies, high priority was assigned to the classical aspects of Bible, Jewish philosophy and literature, and Jewish history and archeology. Three outstanding scholars helped give distinction to this specialization: Nahum Glatzer, Simon Rawidowicz, and Alexander Altmann.

The first major appointment, in 1951, went to Nahum Glatzer. He was an Austro-German émigré who had come to the United States in 1938, having earlier taught at both Frankfurt and Haifa. He had established a commanding reputation in Jewish philosophy and literature and was considered an authority on the life and thought of the theologian Franz Rosenzweig and the philosopher-historian Leopold Zunz. In this country Glatzer had held a number of fill-in positions at the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago, at the Hebrew Teachers College in Boston, and at Yeshiva University in New York. But he had been engaged mainly as editor-in-chief for Schocken Books, publishers of Hebrew and German classics in English translation. He was a quiet, modest, low-keyed man. Meeting and working

with him, one thought immediately of old-world dignity, but the impression never connoted pomposity. His dry humor was always surprising, because it usually emerged from such a serious façade. During his long research career, he carried on a correspondence with Judaic colleagues around the world, and, upon his passing, his invaluable papers were bequeathed to the university's archives.

One of Glatzer's early coups was to bring Simon Rawidowicz to Brandeis, a Russian-born, German-trained émigré whose erudition had earned him full honors among Jewish scholars. But before the postwar expansion of Jewish studies in American universities, positions worthy of his background were very difficult to find. When Glatzer invited him to Brandeis, he was filling a modest post in a struggling little college in the Middle West. This move to Brandeis brought him into a long, ideological controversy with the prime minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, who believed that there could be no creative Jewish life outside of Israel and who therefore regarded the Diaspora as vestigial. The highly publicized ideological debate with Ben-Gurion reinforced Rawidowicz's international scholarly visibility. I remember a reception at the White House in honor of the president of Israel, the late Zalman Shazar. When Thelma and I were presented to Shazar, he exclaimed, "Brandeis—that's where Rawidowicz is," and held up the receiving line to explain to President Johnson what a seminal scholar Rawidowicz was! Tragically, Rawidowicz was lost to the university and to the world of scholarship by his early death. He was barely sixty when he died in 1957. In a foreword to some of his later essays that were gathered by his son into a posthumous volume, I wrote: "Simon Rawidowicz was more, much more, than an incandescent teacher and a vigorous polemicist. He was one of the architects of Brandeis. The initial faculty was small, virtually an intimate family. The department leaders met frequently for other than their technical responsibilities. Often they had lunch together in the university dining halls, and Dr. Rawidowicz's wry wit, never malicious or mordant, his felicitous turn of phrase, his original insights made these sessions memorable. In this early period there were major policy decisions that had to be reached, with the sober understanding that they would influence the future."

Alexander Altmann was also a German-born scholar. Ordained as a rabbi, he had held one of the most distinguished pulpits in Berlin until the country was engulfed by the Nazis. He found refuge in England, where he became the chief rabbi of Manchester. When he was recruited for Brandeis, he brought with him a superb reputation for his writings in Judaeo-Arabic philosophy, rabbinical literature, Jewish mysticism, and the eighteenth-century enlightenment. As a "supplement" to his teaching, he began editing a series of classical texts and climaxed his incumbency with a definitive

two-volume work on Moses Mendelssohn. In 1963, on a special grant, he made a tour of important Italian libraries and brought back, for the Goldfarb Library, microfilmed duplicates of ten thousand items, including Biblical commentaries, philosophical treatises, Kabala texts, and other documents of major historic value.

Some younger men were added to round out our offerings. In 1965, we brought British-born Nahum Sarna from the Jewish Theological Seminary where he was serving as librarian. He was later chosen by the Jewish Publication Society to edit a new multivolume translation of the Bible. He was joined by Naftalai Brandwein, a versatile Hebrew poet who had also come to us from Israel and who assumed responsibility for courses in medieval and modern Hebrew literature. Dwight Young, who might have considered himself a lion in a den of Daniels, was nevertheless very much at home among the Jewish savants in the Department of Judaic Studies. He had received a solid grounding in Hebrew and Semitic language studies at Dropsie College, and his seminars in the Aramaic portions of the Bible added depth to the courses in linguistics.

Even as the department grew in numbers and distinction, pressure mounted to supplement classical studies and research with training for contemporary Jewish affairs. It was of no small significance that it had been necessary to build our Judaic faculty almost exclusively with scholars from abroad. The American Jewish community had not yet produced many native-born savants. Until mid-century, there had been little call for them; only a few universities offered courses related to contemporary Jewish life. The upsurge of interest was undoubtedly stimulated by the enlarged role of Jews in the political and economic life of the United States and Western Europe, by their changing fate in the Soviet Union, by the tragedy of the Holocaust, and, above all, by the emergence of a sovereign Israel. Scholars with this specialization were now very much in demand. Each year there were many offers from institutions where newly established positions now promised dignity and security. But the posts went unfilled except where rabbis were tempted away from their pulpits; they were virtually the only reservoir of competence.

The time was therefore ripe to expand the curriculum in classical studies with offerings in contemporary affairs to help, among other objectives, meet the need for qualified faculty. It was also important to provide a training center for service in Jewish communal life. Of course, these areas had not been left altogether unattended. Marshall Sklare, who had written widely and authoritatively on the sociology of the American Jewish community, and Leon Jick, later to head the subdivision in contemporary Jewish affairs, formed an effective team to interpret the developments in contemporary Jewish life. But without broader financial support for fac-

ulty, fellowships, and library resources, the amplification of curricular offerings could be given no priority.

The fulfillment came in 1965 through the generosity of a New England shoe merchant, Philip Lown, whose basic communal interest had always been the training of Jewish leadership. He had played a large role in the development of the Boston Hebrew Teachers College and had served as its president for many years. Early in the life of Brandeis, he had established the chair in Jewish philosophy that was held by Altmann. Now Lown provided the seed money to launch the School for Contemporary Jewish Affairs. A major gift followed from Benjamin Hornstein and Maurice Cohen, two Boston philanthropists who helped endow the school. A whole new component was thereby added to the service the university could render. Additional faculty were brought in to give the departments full curricular and research coverage.

The honorary degree that was conferred upon Lown in his eightieth year was well earned for his role in this achievement. However, he was not so sure that a humble shoe merchant deserved such an accolade, and, at the dinner where the recipients spoke informally, he professed concern about his inclusion among the elect who were to be honored the next day. "In 1952," he revealed, "Dr. Sachar hinted that I should sponsor the first chair in Judaica at Brandeis. Who could resist his hypnotic charm? Thus my tale of woe commenced. Before committing myself, I should have remembered the story told by a wealthy society matron, who was anxious to have a family tree and history prepared. She went to an outstanding genealogist to have this done, but told him that there was one stumbling block: her family, like most, had an ancestor who had blemished a proud tradition. Indeed, his final crime was punished by the electric chair at Sing Sing. Said the genealogist, 'Don't worry, Madame, I'll take care of Uncle Charles,' and he came up with a masterpiece of equivocal ambiguity. 'C. D. occupied a chair of applied electricity in one of the government's great institutions. He died in harness, and his death came as an extreme shock.'"

The summer of 1964 included the twentieth anniversary of one of the most moving experiences in modern Jewish history, the secret flight to Sweden of the approximately seven thousand Danish Jews through the intercession of King Christian of Denmark. They were marked as certain victims of Hitler's extermination camps after the Nazi occupation of Denmark. The dangerous evacuation, with the cooperation of the Norwegian underground, was one of the few heartening episodes of the Holocaust period.

We had long dreamed of paying tribute to the royal family and people of Denmark who, almost alone of the European nations, had acted in unison to save their Jewish communities from the Nazis. Before our 1964

commencement, we approached, through appropriate diplomatic channels, the reigning monarch, King Frederick IX, the son of Christian X. The reply of the Danish embassy posed a quandary. In general, royalty does not accept honorary degrees. In this case, the king may have been persuaded to make an exception, although he believed the tribute belonged to his people. But his younger daughter was betrothed to Prince Constantine of Greece, and the wedding date fell during the weekend of the Brandeis commencement. However, an alternative was tentatively proposed. A national society of Danes and Danish-Americans held an annual festival in Rebild, in the northern province of Jutland, every Fourth of July. The American Independence Day had assumed the status of a Danish national holiday, and the royal family often attended the ceremonies in Jutland. Word came to us that, were it convenient, the king would be pleased to accept the Brandeis tribute on that day on the hillside where the celebration was always held.

Obviously we could not "hood" King Frederick. This would have been difficult in any case, even on a Brandeis platform, for the king was one of the tallest of his subjects, an authentic Viking. Fortunately, we had on hand a few of the gold medals struck by the United States Mint on the occasion of Justice Brandeis's centennial. One of these, along with the university's citation, in an artistically designed presentation case, went along with Thelma's and my luggage on the mission to Denmark.

July 4, 1964, was a beautiful day. Denmark itself looked as if it had been delivered straight from F. A. O. Schwartz's toy emporium. There were tens of thousands of celebrants on the hillside when King Frederick received and acknowledged the university's tribute. Later the king directed that the medal and citation be permanently displayed in the window of an elegant Copenhagen shop. It read: "Ours is a young university, named for Louis Dembitz Brandeis, distinguished American jurist, himself the son of refugees. We humbly claim kinship with a people whose tradition of sovereignty is 900 years old, whose respect for individual liberty was codified in 1814, whose cities have never known the shadow of a ghetto, and whose bright islands and pleasant pastures are truly 'the land of the free and the home of the brave!'"

When the American Jewish Historical Society decided in 1966 to establish its national headquarters on the Brandeis campus, it further validated the symbolic central position the university had achieved in the American Jewish community. The action was following the precedent of the Virginia Historical Society and many other cultural agencies that had linked up with college campuses. There were natural, mutual advantages. The Brandeis and the society libraries functioned virtually side by side, each amplifying the other's resources. The university's lectures and colloquia usually drew their audiences from constituencies of similar scholarly in-

terest. Yet the action did not come easily. The headquarters of the society had bounced around for many decades in New York City, in rented or donated quarters. Successive administrations were reluctant to consider other locations both because there were no funds available and because there was no agreement on which city would best serve the interests of the society. Philadelphia disputed the claim of New York, and New York disputed the claim of any other community.

Suddenly in 1965, the funds for adequate headquarters became available in a multimillion-dollar bequest to the society from Lee M. Friedman, a well-known Boston lawyer whose devotion to the society went back half a century and who had served as its president for a number of terms. Brandeis offered a place on its campus after the proponents of New York and Philadelphia had canceled out each other's bids. The advantages offered by Brandeis appealed to some of the officers of the convention of 1966 that was held in Charleston, South Carolina, primarily to Leon Obermayer of Philadelphia, a highly respected lawyer, Dr. Abram Kanof, president of the society, a New York physician and bibliophile, and Frank Kozal, Friedman's law partner and closest to him in friendship and professional association. In a slim majority, the decision was reached at the convention. The vote was close because many of the New York delegation were convinced that the center of Jewish historical scholarship should remain in the largest Jewish populated city in the world, where there was easy access to the basic leadership in American and world Jewish life. After the vote was taken, suit was brought by some of the unreconciled dissenters. The court ruling sustained the board's action.

The move brought new life to the society, whose membership rolls increased rapidly and whose scholarly acquisitions soared. Indeed, much of the archival material on American Jewish history that had been contributed to the Brandeis library was transferred to the newly established headquarters. The arrangement was permanently validated after a seven-year trial experience.

It was to be expected that close relationships would be established between Brandeis and the universities of Israel and that every encouragement would be offered to make student and faculty exchanges. Such exchange by American universities with foreign counterparts had longstanding precedents. Already at the beginning of the twentieth century, Yale had sponsored what became a university branch in China, Yale in China. Many American universities had junior-year-abroad programs linked with selected foreign institutions. Hence Brandeis encouraged qualified students to spend a year abroad, and it was natural for large numbers to choose Israel. Faculty exchange was a keenly sought experience. At virtually every convocation or commencement, Israeli statesmen and scholars were welcomed as recipients of honorary degrees.

Many of the visiting Israelis could not resist the temptation to chide students for not emigrating to Israel. In an early convocation in June 1951, when thousands of students converged on the Brandeis campus from more than twenty-five New England colleges to greet Ben-Gurion, the prime minister scolded them for not settling in Israel. "What are you doing here," he exclaimed, "when there is a *Maase Bereshit*, a work of creation, with so much exhilaration and pioneering adventure waiting for you in a land that you can help build and fashion!" Ben-Gurion was only half serious, for, as a realist, he knew that Israel needed a strong and loyal American financial and diplomatic backstop and that Jewish cultural values would be enriched by a continuing relationship with Israel. Dr. Rawidowicz expressed the relationship graphically by the geometric symbol of the ellipse with two foci.

In 1961 a special study and research project in Israel was developed by my son, Howard, who had earned his doctorate at Harvard in Middle Eastern studies. He had begun annual visits to Israel and concentrated most of his writing on its relationship to the Middle East and the Diaspora. His proposal to Brandeis was to establish a traveling university, with its base in Jerusalem, from where the teaching and travel would be coordinated. This venture was to be no junket; the courses would be subject to the usual high standards the Brandeis faculty maintained at home. They would relate to the social, economic, and political structure of Israel and to the history and politics of the Middle East. These would be supplemented by attendance at sessions of the Knesset, the law courts, and local and rural councils. Students would visit cooperative farm settlements, agricultural research stations, newly created industrial areas, irrigation and desalinization projects, mineral drilling outposts in the Negev Desert. Observation sessions would also be arranged, by special permission, at military training centers. Under the guidance of the late Dr. Johanan Aharoni of the Hebrew University, the study of Biblical history would be reinforced by sessions at the archeological digs in the Byzantine ruins of Ramat Rachel. In an almost literal sense, all Israel would become the classroom and the seminars.

To acquire at least a working proficiency in the Hebrew language, it was planned that the students arrive early in the summer for an intensive eight-week *ulpan* training before the regular school term. It was expected that the enrollees could acquire at least a manageable conversational ability to communicate with the Israelis and to understand the Israeli press. The enrollees were not limited to Brandeis students; they were drawn from universities across the country, credit to be transferred for all work certified by the Brandeis Institute.

The funding for this ambitious program came from Jacob Hiatt of Worcester, Massachusetts, then a member of the Board of Trustees and later its chairman. Hiatt was a native of Lithuania who had completed his

studies there at the national university and who had become an assistant district attorney and a circuit court judge. He emigrated to the United States in 1936 and achieved success as a paper box manufacturer. He shared his good fortune by complete involvement in Jewish and community causes, Brandeis among them.

The early days of the traveling university required persistence to cope with the physical impediments of a pioneering country. My son recalls that in the first year, 1961, on a drive to Sodom, six students were jammed into the director's tiny Ford, and the rest were crowded into a beat-up Peugeot driven by an "honorary" member of the group, a Canadian who had settled with his family in Israel. The Jewish Agency had assigned him to the Hiatt program because of the excellent orientation it would give him about the land and its economic and social climate.

Pounding along the rutted road back from Sodom, the Ford suddenly coughed to a stop. The gas tank had been punctured by a boulder. The party was miles from anywhere. The Canadian was able to siphon some of his gas into the Ford, but how could he plug the leak in the tank? The problem was solved by one of the girls, an inveterate gum chewer. Her gum went into the hole, the gas went into the tank, the caravan drove off with a prayer. Miraculously, the gum held until the car reached Beersheba and a garage.

There were other adventures that were not foreseen in the original prospectus. Typical was a visit to the Bedouin camel market in Beersheba. Two of the Hiatt girls, clad in shorts, made the rounds, "oohing" and "aahing" in fascination as they watched the Arab sheikhs bidding and counterbidding. Only belatedly did they realize, with mock horror, that the leading sheikh of the district was bidding with Howard—for their purchase.

But such episodes soon faded into table conversation. Jacob Hiatt kept augmenting his support, broadening the program so that, though there were no luxuries, the food, living quarters, and travel were tolerable. Howard obtained supplementary support for the project from the State Department, which assigned annual grants of \$25,000 for several years. Hiatt purchased a home in Jerusalem that became the institute's headquarters. It was remodeled and enlarged every few years as the program expanded, and, by 1970, it had become a much admired symbol of the Brandeis presence in Israel. At a special dedication ceremony, Hiatt outlined, in limpid Hebrew, his hopes for the institute. Israel was represented by the deputy prime minister, Yigal Allon, who jested in English that he would not dare compete with Hiatt by speaking in Hebrew. He hailed the institute for its original approach and for its ambassadorial service.

The Hiatt students' experience in Israel was, of course, not confined to the Jewish population. Every effort was made to bring the group into con-

tact with Israel's Arab citizens. A three-day visit to Nazareth was planned to explore the special problems encountered by the Arab minority in the Jewish state. Hiatt students were the guests of Arab host families, and warm relationships often developed and were maintained.

Howard directed the institute for three years and then, with the program safely launched, resumed his teaching career as a professor of history at George Washington University. He was succeeded as director by Ernest Stock, who had earned his doctorate at Princeton and then settled in Israel. The popularity of the Hiatt program grew steadily, and the colleges that accepted the courses for credit included Yale, Princeton, Stanford, Wellesley, Vassar, Swarthmore, Clark, Cornell, Holy Cross, Oberlin, New York University, Rutgers, Boston University, Barnard, Pennsylvania, and many others.

Fifteen years later, there were over five hundred alumni of the institute, many of whom indicated that the direction of their lives had been changed as a result of their exposure to Israel. Several entered the rabbinate or returned to settle in Israel, and there were many romances among the participants that were climaxed by marriage. In time, the institute was expanded into a two-semester program that included the humanities as well as the social sciences. After twenty years, the institute outgrew its uniqueness. Several of the other universities in Israel introduced models of the program, and Hiatt transferred his endowment to an innovative career center at the Brandeis campus itself.

In 1969, the Benjamin Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service was founded to train graduate students for leadership positions in the community. The program has graduated hundreds of men and women who have gone on to work for Jewish communal organizations around the globe. The program was directed by Bernard Reisman until his retirement in 1993. Until his death in 1987, Benjamin Hornstein was a generous benefactor to the university. The Maurice and Marilyn Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, directed by Gary Tobin, has added to our knowledge of the trends within the Jewish community through the many studies it has conducted.

A few years after I became chancellor, a major expansion in the development of our science curriculum and a research institute devoted to the study of Nazi desolation were planned and developed. They were brought to fruition by the action of Dr. Laszlo Tauber, a distinguished neurosurgeon who had survived the atrocities. He had arrived penniless in the United States in 1945 and had built a remarkably successful career in medicine and in real estate investments. In August 1977, he set up a million-dollar endowment at Brandeis for chairs and fellowships in science and, soon after through another major gift, funded a research institute to probe the

background and to seek understanding of the tragedy of Hitler's "Final Solution."

Behind the grants was a dramatic story that predated the creation of Brandeis. When the Nazi terror was overcome, the fate of those who survived became a priority concern for Albert Einstein who had lost many of his science colleagues. He had come to the United States in 1934 to accept a post at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton after the Nazi government had deprived him of German citizenship. I was then national director of the Hillel Foundations and had earned Dr. Einstein's friendship in the early years of his incumbency at Princeton. He wrote to me in 1945, "Can't we do something to rescue and give new significance to the lives of some of the children who were hopelessly trapped in Europe?"

I had already been involved in a program to bring students and faculty to this country. My Hillel post had established working relationships with scores of universities. I had been helpful in obtaining an offer of admission to some of them: The offer qualified them to receive the precious visas to emigrate. Many of the university administrators cooperated further by offering tuition remission; campus fraternities and sororities provided housing and board, and the Joint Distribution Committee underwrote travel expenses. I had also located some faculty posts for well-qualified scholars who had been encysted in Displaced Person's camps in Central Europe. With Dr. Einstein's cooperation, this intermittent effort turned into a major organized emigration program under Hillel auspices. Within two years, more than 120 youngsters had been brought to American universities, and twelve scholars had been invited to accept faculty posts.

Laszlo Tauber, an uprooted Hungarian, was among these selected scholars. His parents and most of his family had died in the extermination camps. He had escaped at the end of the war and settled in Sweden, having obtained a state fellowship for neurosurgery research. But he was desperate to turn his back on the nightmare Europe had become. The Hillel-based program secured a faculty position for him at the University of North Dakota. He remained in the West only briefly, relocating to establish a highly successful medical practice in Washington. His side ventures in real estate investment made him a multimillionaire. During the next thirty years, he reached out to subsidize surviving relatives, teachers, and science colleagues.

In 1979, some years after I had become chancellor, Dr. Tauber arranged for a personal meeting with me. It was an emotional reunion and was climaxed with a million-dollar gift to the university that established two endowed chairs in biochemistry, supplemented by a fellowship fund. They were to be identified as memorials to his parents, other members of his family, and his martyred teachers. He explained that he was making this "initial . . . gift through my respected benefactor, Dr. Sachar, who brought

me to America, and to acknowledge the special debt I owe to this beloved land.”

As noted in the section on the sciences at Brandeis, the chairs were assigned to two internationally respected scientists. The chair in biochemistry and molecular pharmacodynamics went to Professor William Jencks who had come to Brandeis in 1957. The other in biochemistry and molecular pharmacology was assigned to Dr. Robert Abeles, who had joined the faculty in 1964. As fate would have it, Dr. Abeles shared a common bond with the émigré who had endowed his chair. He and his family had escaped the Nazis in 1939 by fleeing their native Austria.

A warm personal friendship had now been established with Dr. Tauber, and, inevitably, his interest in the university itself was steadily deepening. It reached beyond the superb research work that came from the laboratories of Dr. Jencks and Dr. Abeles. I began sharing with Dr. Tauber the university's plan to establish an institute whose research would relate the Jewish genocide to the forces that contributed to it. Dr. Tauber was impressed with the university's plan for such research. He offered to add \$1.6 million to his earlier contributions for the launching of the institute. He hoped that the institute could be named for his parents.

No time was lost in organizing an advisory conference, drawn from a broad range of institutions, to offer guidance in identifying the special role the institute could undertake. Those who gathered in April 1979 for the three-day sessions included our own faculty specialists and scholars and academic administrators, Jewish and non-Jewish, from the western world and Israel.

The consensus of our conferees was that Brandeis would be helping to fulfill a historic mission if it cooperated with the Jerusalem-based *Yad Vashem*, organized by a sovereign Israel in 1953 for just such a serious academic undertaking. Its leadership were key figures at our conference, and they heartily welcomed such a collegial relationship. Indeed, Professor Yehuda Bauer, who was associated with *Yad Vashem*, agreed to offer our institute copies of its vast duplicate material.

The institute, its objectives now heartily endorsed, was formally announced in the late summer of 1980, and its director, Professor Bernard Wasserstein, a native of Great Britain, assumed his post in September. He came to his pioneering duties with a superb background. He had received his undergraduate and doctoral degrees from Oxford and had been named as a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of Britain. He had taught at the University of Sheffield, at Oxford, and at the Hebrew University. He had written a well-acclaimed volume on *Britain and the Jews of Europe*.

One of the director's first decisions was not to use the phrase “holocaust studies” in the title of the institute. He declared, “The word ‘holocaust’ is

inappropriate as applied to the mass murder of European Jewry. The literal meaning of the word is 'a wholly burnt offering.' The notion of a 'Jewish holocaust' is alien to Jewish tradition, which is opposed to human sacrifice. The term is not only offensive to religious tradition; it is also inaccurate. For the Jews of Europe did not perish as part of a sacrificial rite." Wasserstein also noted that "the phrase conveys much too narrow an impression of what must be our mandate if the institute is to undertake serious work. Its focus should not be restricted to the process of destruction. A real understanding of what happened in Europe between 1933 and 1945 must be based on an appreciation of the general historical context. Without a constant stress on such a broad approach to our tasks, the research would run the risk of degenerating into the mere chronicling of tragedy."

In 1983 Wasserstein became chairman of the history department, and soon thereafter the directorship of the Tauber Institute was placed in the able hands of Jehuda Reinharz, an Israeli sabra who had come to the United States at the age of seventeen. Reinharz did his undergraduate work at Columbia and at the Jewish Theological Seminary. He earned a master's degree from Harvard and, in 1972, his doctorate from Brandeis. Following ten years as a professor of modern Jewish history at the University of Michigan, he joined the Brandeis faculty in 1982 as the Richard Koret Professor of Modern Jewish History. In 1992 he became the university's provost and senior vice-president for academic affairs.

Since coming to Brandeis, Reinharz has completed a series of volumes, chief among them a definitive biography of the Israeli statesman, Chaim Weizmann, published by Oxford University Press. The first volume of the biography, published in 1985, won The Present Tense Literary Award, the Kenneth Smillen Literary Award, the National Jewish Book Award, and the Shazar Prize in History from the Israel Historical Society. The second volume of the biography was published in 1993. Among his many other distinctions, Reinharz was the first recipient of the President of Israel Prize, awarded by the Knesset for his work on the history of Zionism. He has also served as editor of several studies of contemporary affairs, notably *Israel in the Middle East* and *Living with Antisemitism*.

When he became director of the Tauber Institute, Reinharz reconstituted the Board of Overseers to provide ongoing supervision. Its prestigious membership, headed by the British scholar, Professor Walter Laqueur, added confidence in its mission. The institute was renamed "The Tauber Institute for the Study of European Jewry" to confirm its broadest objectives.

Reinharz undertook as a priority the expansion of the conferences that had been launched by Wasserstein in May 1982 on "Terror in the Modern Ages," followed, in 1983, by another on "The Jews in Modern France."

In April 1986, "The Jews of Poland Between Two World Wars" was organized by Reinharz with an eye toward a reexamination of this most dynamic period in Polish-Jewish history, unencumbered by the mythologies that had emerged in the postwar period. The revised analyses were continued in the conference of February 1988, co-sponsored with the Jerusalem Center for Research on the History and Cultures of Polish Jewish Studies. The papers delivered and the discussions they generated made it ever clearer that the massacres perpetrated by the Nazi invaders of Poland had destroyed not only millions of Jews but a rich historic culture. The proceedings of the conferences, published in the spring of 1989 and issued in paperback in 1991, provided new assessments of the nature of Christian-Jewish political and cultural relations.

Another major conference was held in April 1990 in collaboration with the Historical Society of Israel and the Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History (Israel) on "Zionism and Religion." The history of the Jewish national renaissance movement is inextricably bound with a complex relationship to the Jewish religious tradition. The conference examined this historical legacy in a series of ten sessions, with the participation of scholars from Israel and the United States. The year-long symposium on "Modern European Jewish Literature," 1990-1991, reviewed the breadth and scope of Jewish literary creativity, especially in Yiddish and Hebrew, and its place among the literatures of modern Europe.

The institute also organized a publication series not only to include conference proceedings but to commission volumes undertaken by leading scholars in twentieth-century Jewish history. Many of the publications have become standard for courses in colleges and universities in the United States and beyond. Above all, central to the institute's mission was the training of a new cadre of Jewish scholars. The institute provided graduate students the opportunity to work alongside visiting scholars, while fellowships to promising young graduate and postdoctoral students encouraged them to pursue careers in the field of Jewish studies.

The institute, in less than fifteen years, had gone far beyond, in program and influence, the expectations of the launching period. Dr. Reinharz proved to be a resourceful interpreter of the impact the institute was having. "Seeking support for a vital cause," he jested, dead-pan, "is not mendicancy. I enjoy helping a donor to give richer meaning to his good fortune." He generated major grants from foundations and philanthropic families. One of the largest endowments, to underwrite the international conferences and symposia, came from Max Ratner, a Cleveland industrialist and realtor, whose devotion to the university reached back to its founding years. His whole family had been involved; he as a Fellow, two of his children as alumni, and his wife, Betty, as a member of the Women's Committee.

In 1956 I was approached by Erwin Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, who informed me that the state of Israel was eager to launch a major project for the codification of Israeli law. The newly created state had to cope with a multiplicity of legal systems and practices that were hopelessly snarled. There was Talmudic law, American law, British law, Arabic law, Turkish law, and the law practices that had evolved in an ad hoc way during the influx of immigrants from nations around the world.

An Israeli commission had been appointed to study the inevitable social and cultural changes that had taken place in recent centuries and to recommend a legal system that could then be submitted for enactment to the Israeli legal authorities and to the Knesset. It was hoped the project could be as sweeping in its scope as the Justinian Code of ancient days and the Napoleonic Code of the last century. The Harvard Law School was quite willing to cooperate with the state of Israel and to place its faculty resources at the disposal of the commission. What was needed was the research money, an initial grant of \$100,000, and Dean Griswold hoped that Brandeis, with its access to imaginative and generous supporters, could approach some of them in the interest of a Harvard-Brandeis-Israel legal codification enterprise. It could become a significant model not only for the development of a consistent and efficient legal code for Israel but for many of the developing Third World countries.

I responded cordially to Dean Griswold's proposal, for it seemed especially appropriate for Brandeis to cooperate. The university was named for the justice who was a son of Harvard, one of the two or three most outstanding alumni, and whose interest in the development of Palestine had been climaxed by leadership in the Palestine Economic Corporation. I promised to approach a few of our donors and to have some of our faculty join in a consultant's role with whoever was appointed by the state of Israel to direct the research.

Within the next few months, I obtained the assistance of Judge Joseph Proskauer, one of our board members who had been a justice of the Supreme Court of New York, and James Rosenberg, who had had a long and successful career as a New York lawyer and was deeply interested in the university. They in turn brought into the project a number of their friends. The funding assured, a research director was appointed, Joseph Leifer, an Israeli with an excellent legal background. By the end of three years, draft codes were ready in several areas. The data was sent on to the authorities in Israel, who submitted the drafts to Knesset committees, leading to enactment.

Another instance of useful cooperation came in 1960 after several years of strained relations between Israel and the American State Department that grew out of the Suez War of 1956. It was deemed critical for Prime

Minister Ben-Gurion to meet with President Eisenhower on a man-to-man basis to seek better understanding, but there was no initiative from the White House. The Israeli ambassador, Avraham Harman, approached me in the hope of using a ceremonial occasion at Brandeis to provide Ben-Gurion the opportunity to visit the United States for a special mission. Diplomatic courtesy would then dictate that, as a visiting prime minister, he be received by the president. Using university occasions as the instrument for accomplishing diplomatic missions was not unprecedented; the Marshall Plan had been announced at a Harvard commencement in 1947. Brandeis was a natural intermediary for Ben-Gurion's purpose, and its good offices were quickly made available. In March 1960, a special convocation was planned. The invitation from the White House was extended to Ben-Gurion as soon as it was announced that he was to receive an honorary degree. The meeting between Ben-Gurion and Eisenhower was cordial and effective.

Apparently, Ben-Gurion also had confidence that the university could offer guidance in an educational project that was close to his heart. After he had completed his incumbency as prime minister, he became deeply interested in establishing a university in the Negev, building upon the nucleus that already existed in Beersheba. Early in 1967, he asked me to set up a conference with academicians and administrators to discuss some of the problems that a desert university would have to face and ways of coping with them. I welcomed the opportunity to have him return to the campus. I asked some of the most knowledgeable men in the area to join the prime minister for lunch at the Faculty Center. There was our own trustee, Milton Katz, head of international legal studies at Harvard, James Killian, president of MIT and science advisor to President Johnson, Jerome Wiesner, provost and later also president of MIT, and senior members of our faculty and administrative staff. It was fascinating to watch Ben-Gurion as he interpreted his dream of a university that would join with other great institutions in bringing fertility to the deserts. Only about one-third of the world was blessed with fertility. The rest was desert or barren mountain rock or ocean salt water. Ben-Gurion hoped that specialists in desert ecology who applied themselves to the desalinization of brackish and sea water could convert the Negev into what the Bible termed, "a place of springs." And the Sinai and the Sahara and the deserts of the rest of the world?

As the dreamer talked on, all practical problems seemed trivial. Milton Katz, one of the behind-the-scenes architects of the Marshall Plan, broke the spell. Gently, he asked what table of organization Ben-Gurion had in mind, the scope of the university's faculty and research personnel, the necessary facilities, the sources of funds—all practical questions. Ben-Gurion looked startled. What table of organization? What funds? What blueprint?

"Do you think," he asked, "that there would have been an Israel if we had worried about such matters before moving into action?"

Yet, miraculously, the University of the Negev came into being, although, it must be added, it required some hard-nosed administrators to give it shape and form. They were sensible enough, however, in their procedures never to allow the dream to be eclipsed. They remembered that dreams often produce substantive support but that support alone is never enough to sustain a dream. And they remembered, too, that when Ben-Gurion moved into the desert and settled with his Paula in the village of Sde Boker, his farewell speech was just one word: "Follow." Thelma and I visited the university in 1969. Though the facilities for study and research were then still nominal, the esprit de corps of the pioneering faculty and the grim determination of the students were clear evidence that Ben-Gurion's spirit had enveloped the project. Twenty years after its launching, the university already had an international reputation, especially for its pioneering desert ecology.

Sometimes, because of the respect that Brandeis evoked in the academic world, much more was expected of it than could possibly be delivered; thus, in 1965, I was again approached by Avraham Harman, who expressed grave concern at the increasing unfriendliness of the government of India toward Israel. India had never recognized the sovereignty of Israel, and there were no diplomatic relations between the two countries. There was widespread admiration for Israel's democratic institutions, its service to the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia, but, with eighty million Moslems in its population, India's diplomatic dilemma was understandable. In Nehru's last years and during the incumbency of his successor, Shastri, the diplomatic coolness had turned into outright hostility. Israelis were now continuously denied visas to attend international scientific and cultural conferences in India, even when they were specifically invited by their Indian colleagues.

Harman knew that Brandeis's contacts with Indian academic and political figures had been cordial. At the fifteenth anniversary convocation ceremony in 1963, Nehru's sister, Madame Pandit, had been the featured speaker and had received an honorary degree. There had been a good opportunity to review with her not only the frustrating relations between Israel and India but also the growing anti-American influence there. When Nehru died in the fall of 1964, the memorial to him, in cooperation with the Indian Students' Association of Greater Boston, was planned at Brandeis, and the Indian ambassador, B. K. Gandhi, flew in for it. His visit was dramatized when he landed in the Three Chapels area in a chartered helicopter that brought him from the Boston airport. With such excellent rapport, strengthened further by the continuous stream of Wien students from India,

it seemed practical to explore ways in which the university could mitigate the alienation between India and Israel. I consulted with John Kenneth Galbraith, who had returned to Harvard after his post as American ambassador to India. He indicated that one of India's most influential diplomats, M. J. Desai, who had directed the foreign office under Nehru, had now retired and was eager to write a volume on the foreign policy of India during the first decades of Indian independence. He could do much of his research and writing if he were attached to a university, and Galbraith offered to be the intermediary if Brandeis invited Desai to accept a visiting professorship. This seemed like an excellent approach, and the invitation for a Ziskind Visiting Professorship was extended and promptly accepted.

Desai spent the 1965-1966 school year on the Brandeis campus, teaching several advanced courses in the history and politics of contemporary India and the Southeast Pacific and pursuing his own research. When Israeli officials visited the campus, they conferred with Desai, who offered confidential advice. Unfortunately, the times were not propitious for any diplomatic progress. The continued exacerbation of relations between Israel and the Arab states led to the Six-Day War in 1967 and arrayed the entire Arab and Moslem world against Israel. Though the intellectual community of India and many of its leaders remained personally friendly, there was no diplomatic improvement with Israel.

It was primarily in promoting academic exchange with Israeli institutions that Brandeis was most influential. When I retired as president in the fall of 1968 to become chancellor, the trustees established in Thelma's name and mine a special fund for sending selected Brandeis students and faculty to other parts of the world, and each year a number fulfilled their objective through study and research in Israel. We also invited advanced graduate students and faculty to come to us. We offered fellowship support to a young Israeli Arab, Sami Geraisi, who received technical training in public polling at our Heller School so that the views and the reactions of the Arab communities in Israel could be better understood and evaluated. He became one of the department directors in the Israeli Ministry of Social Welfare. Among our visiting professors on the Tribute Fund were the outstanding Jewish historian Shemaryah Talmon and Benjamin Mazar, the former president of the Hebrew University and world-famous archeologist, each of whom taught at Brandeis for a year. Another special fund was created by Joseph Foster of Leominster, a plastics manufacturer, who early in the history of the university established an endowed chair in Mediterranean studies, held by Cyrus Gordon. Foster agreed to create another million-dollar trust whose income would provide an exchange so that our students and faculty could go to Israel to fulfill educational objectives and their students and faculty could come to us.

The special relationship with Israel was continuously strengthened, and I was glad to serve on the board of governors of the Hebrew University, the board of the University of Haifa, and the board of the University of the Negev, now renamed Ben-Gurion University. Some of our trustees were urged to share their generosity with Israeli institutions, and a number of exchange programs were instituted in addition to those already described. Joseph and Abraham Mailman of New York and Florida commissioned me to develop a major fellowship program for the Technion, which they established with a grant of half a million dollars. This sum was matched by the Israeli government's budget for higher education, and it provided for about twenty fellowships each year to help in the training of engineers for the growing technological needs of Israel. Before one of our trustees, Edward Rose, died, I worked out with him and his wife Bertha a very generous bequest to Ben-Gurion University to further its research in desert ecology.

The promise had been given at the inaugural exercises in 1948 that Brandeis would always remain a school of opportunity, that there would never be any restrictions on the basis of creed or color or ethnic origin. This pledge was meant as more than a commitment to avoid quotas in enrollment or employment. It was meant to emphasize that Brandeis was created for learning and scholarship, not for indoctrination. In reviewing the special emphasis and activities that gave the university its "Jewish character," I hope it is fair to conclude that the pledge was never in jeopardy. The Jewishness of Brandeis was in its climate, not its orientation. In the classrooms and laboratories, it functioned in the highest tradition of other denominationally supported universities that protected and encouraged the components that linked them with ancestral traditions without impinging on the completely nonsectarian quality of their academic contribution. It was by meticulously maintaining this sensitive balance that it was possible for Brandeis to earn a reputation for excellence in its studies and research, while it also was sought out as an influential center of Jewish learning and communal responsibility.

Religious Diversity: The Three Chapels

From the outset, Brandeis had been set squarely in the framework of the nonsectarian schools and had meticulously striven for complete impartiality in the choice of faculty and staff, in the enrollment of students, and in the development of curriculum. Yet it did not follow that the religious experience, so basic in our lives, should be ignored. It was believed that young people on a college campus should have some opportunity to confirm their faith, to link themselves with the enduring values of their tradition.

There were many historic models for religious expression on privately sponsored campuses. The most common was to build the chapel in the image of the host group. At my own school, Washington University in St. Louis, the Graham Memorial Chapel reflected the Episcopal tradition of the founding and supporting groups. Hospitality was gladly offered to students and faculty of any denomination who wished to use the chapel for their own religious purposes, but there was never any doubt that Graham was an Episcopal chapel. Since worship is largely intertwined with mood and sentiment, it was difficult for other than Episcopalians to evoke the ethos of their own tradition, however gracious the hosts. A Jew, away from home, could not enter fully into the mystique of the sacred Yom Kippur liturgy when he worshiped at Graham amid the Christological symbols that mellowed the Episcopal ritual. Fordham's Catholic chapel was at the disposal of all groups, but though its austere symbolism breathed reverence, an alien quality clung to the worship of students reared in other traditions. The model, therefore, of creating a Jewish chapel and offering its use to all other groups, was not followed at Brandeis.

Some attention was given to the concept of the chapel at Cornell, a gift

to the university from Myron Taylor, a distinguished Quaker diplomat who had spent many years as the ambassador of the United States to the Vatican. Behind the altar wall, each denominational group arranged its own symbols for worship. The chapel was equipped with special electronic controls that spun these symbols into place as they were needed. When the Jews gathered for worship, a button was pressed, and an Oren Kodesh and its Torahs hove into view. When Protestant communicants came for worship, they could command the appropriate religious symbolism by the touch of another appropriate button. Catholics rarely use facilities that are shared by other religious groups; hence at Cornell, as elsewhere, they attended the Catholic churches in Ithaca itself. The Cornell pattern held little inducement for us.

There was an adaptation of the Cornell pattern by the Air Force Academy, newly established in Colorado to complement West Point for the army and Annapolis for the navy. There was but one chapel building, a stunning and commodious edifice. The entrance led into a beautifully designed sanctuary that could seat more than one thousand worshippers, intended primarily for the Protestant cadets and officers. One flight down was a smaller allocated area, designed in the Catholic tradition. Since the Jewish cadets numbered only a few hundred, about 3 percent of the total enrollment, a small chapel on this lower floor, in one of its corners, was constructed for them and their visitors. Each denomination therefore had its own facility, its size and position determined by the approximate proportion of the enrollment. Though some of the shortcomings of the Cornell pattern were not present here, the general concept offered little appeal in the planning stages for the Brandeis religious needs.

It seemed more appropriate for the first Jewish-sponsored university to be especially sensitive hosts. The architects Harrison and Abramovitz were commissioned to develop a plan that would include three separate chapels, one for each of the great western faiths, to stand side by side, none to cast shadows upon the others, all linked within an interdenominational area that could be used when general university purposes were to be served. Each group was to have its own chapel, designed to fulfill its own tradition, with no need for electronic devices, space allocations, or time schedules. What went into the chapel would be there permanently to sustain the religious climate each group counted uniquely as its own.

It was also determined that the costs for construction were not to come from the general funds of the university. Each group would seek support from its own co-religionists for its chapel, and its officials and student leaders would remain in charge of their own affairs. Since the campaigns to finance all three chapels might stretch out inordinately, it was at first suggested that the Jewish chapel be built forthwith, with the others to follow

as soon as their funding was assured. Here the student leadership interposed. There were protests in the Student Council and in the columns of *Justice*. The students expressed concern that the Jewish chapel might stand by itself for a long period. It was better to wait until all the funding had been assured, then the three chapels could rise on their sites together. The students' arguments prevailed, and the architects were instructed to draw the plans according to their original assignment. The appeal for construction and supporting funds proceeded simultaneously.

As expected, the campaign for the Jewish chapel was completed first. It took the form of a tribute to one of New England's most beloved surgeons, Dr. David Berlin, a thyroid specialist. Scores of his grateful patients undertook to finance the construction of the Jewish chapel to celebrate Dr. Berlin's fiftieth birthday by honoring the memory of his parents, Leah and Mendel Berlin.

For the design of the chapel and its equipment, the architects studied the plans of some first-century synagogues that had recently been discovered by the Israeli archeologist Elizzer Sukenik and his son, Yigael Yadin. The design that emerged won the coveted Award of Merit of 1956 of the American Institute of Architects. The eternal light and the menorah were modeled on those that had been unearthed in the dig in Israel. The window curtains took the form of a *tallit* (a prayer shawl), the ark was a replica of the tabernacle that was carried by the Israelites in the desert. An especially woven cover was created for it by Mitchell Siporin of the Brandeis art department, who studied the directions for the *parochet* (the ornamental cover for the ark) described in the Second Book of Chronicles. Several Torahs were contributed for the ark. One had been retrieved from a burning synagogue in Germany during the Black Thursday of November 1938, when Hitler launched one of his first pogroms. Another was purchased in Israel as the gift of Nate and Frances Spingold, who later funded the Spingold Theater. Other families competed for the privilege of contributing the facilities to be used in the chapel—furnishings for the chaplain's study, an organ for the services, an alternate outdoor altar. A symbolic sculpture by Elbert Weinberg, representing the Biblical Jacob wrestling with an angel, was commissioned by a devoted patron of the university, Mrs. Harry Cline. It was placed at the entrance to the chapel.

Simultaneously, campaign plans were launched to obtain the funds for the Catholic chapel. The former governor of Massachusetts, Paul Dever, gladly accepted the honorary chairmanship. Louis Perini, one of New England's most respected building contractors, took the active chairmanship, and many of the Catholic lay leaders of New England were brought into the campaign committee. The architecture and the symbolism in the sanctuary were planned with the cooperation of the highest Catholic au-

thorities. The vestments were the personal gift of Archbishop, later Cardinal, Cushing. The organ was a memorial tribute from the family of William Callahan, a courageous young man who had given his life during World War II. Archbishop Cushing compared the architectural restraint and unpretentiousness of the chapel to the one in Assisi where the Franciscan Order was born. With fine sensitivity, he named the Catholic chapel Bethlehem, to link the traditions of the Old and New Testament.

Some early problems developed, even before the dedication, because of the opposition of some fanatic dissidents. A fundamentalist group in Boston, the Feeney sect, disavowed by the Catholic Church, was greatly disturbed that there should be a Catholic chapel on our campus. How could Catholics permit the Savior to be captive to the Jews whose ancestors had crucified Him! There were many ominous warnings that there would be an "invasion" of the campus to disrupt the dedication. The threats were not treated as the zealotry of fundamentalists. The Fenians, founded in the mid-nineteenth century to fight pontifical control of Ireland, were a well-organized brotherhood, with branches in many parts of the world. More recently, it had become part of the Irish Republican Army, and its major weapon was terrorism. That its threats did not materialize was due almost entirely to the instant action of Archbishop Cushing. The projected Fenian invasion was, he assured me, *his* problem. He announced that he would himself bless the chapel and conduct its first mass. So he did, and the united service was held in peace and dignity.

The Protestant chapel, like each of the others, was built in the form of a Bible, an open Bible, as eloquent a sermon in stone as the imagination of the architects could devise. Its symbolism reached back to the noblest models of the Protestant tradition. Its funding was made possible by the goodwill of Protestant families in every part of the country, whose generosity was spearheaded by the leadership of C. Allen Harlan, a Detroit communal leader. He was a kinsman of Justice John Marshall Harlan, whose grandfather had sat on the Supreme Court of the United States in the late nineteenth century. The elder Harlan, in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896, was the lone dissenter from the decision to establish separate facilities in public educational institutions for blacks and whites; "separate but equal," the writ had decreed. His grandson had the satisfaction, sixty years later, of sitting on the Warren court, which, in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, unanimously overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson* and mandated integration "with all deliberate speed." Allen Harlan agreed to take the chairmanship of the campaign for the erection of the Protestant chapel, which was to be named for his distinguished forebear.

As the construction of the three chapels was nearing completion, offerings poured in from families everywhere, not only altarcloths, candlesticks,

prayerbooks, skullcaps, chalices, and flowers, but major gifts such as organs, a communion table, and furnishings for the lounges and chaplains' offices.

Leading from the three chapels that stood in a circle, an interfaith area was developed, its many acres of immaculately tended lawn stretching a quarter mile across the inner campus up to the science cluster. It had an outside altar that was to be used for occasions when all groups came together, usually for baccalaureate services, convocations for international visitors, or similar all-university functions such as Thanksgiving Day. Its construction and maintenance became the project of the alumni of a New York high school fraternity, Mu Sigma, through the persuasion of General Bernard Barron, who had served with distinction in World War I and World War II. He was joined in leadership by fellow officers he had met in wartime and by the Kriendler family, who were the proprietors of the renowned "21" Club of New York.

The relationship with Mu Sigma was a fortunate one beyond the interfaith project. The friendships that emerged from the reunions resulted in major future gifts when the lawyers, the accountants, and the tax specialists in the group served as friendly interpreters to their clients of the university's concept. Many of the members came for visits to the campus, especially those whose children had enrolled as students. Invariably, they made their pilgrimage to the interfaith area of the three chapels to be reminded again of the unusual way in which a high school fraternity's reunion was made to serve the long-range interests of the university where they had all become foster alumni.

Several years before the interfaith area was funded and developed, a combined dedication of all three chapels was held. It took place on a beautiful fall day in 1955, and it was much more than a Brandeis event. It stirred national interest, for the three chapels had become a dramatic symbol of practical interfaith amity. The *Boston Herald's* lead editorial eloquently summarized the significance of the occasion: "The magnificent thing we seem to have partly achieved here is a comfortable coexistence of diverse faiths, cultures and individualities. There have been a lot of failures and there will be more. But the ideal we mostly practice, the ideal that is embodied in the protection of the Constitution, is the ideal of a communion of diversities. . . . We have not the strength of conformity on which the totalitarian nations rely. We ought not to put our trust in any attempt to match it. Our strength is the far greater strength of accepted diversity."

We invited Justice Harlan and three internationally distinguished religious leaders representing the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths to receive honorary degrees at the dedication. Rabbi Leo Baeck, who had been the chief rabbi of Germany all through the Hitler period and had refused

to flee the country, sharing concentration camp horror with his people until the collapse of the Nazi regime, was invited to bless the Jewish chapel. Unfortunately, he became seriously ill on the eve of the convocation and died soon afterward. Jacques Maritain was invited to honor the consecration of the Catholic chapel. He was considered the profoundest interpreter of the scholastic system of St. Thomas Aquinas and had been former ambassador of France to the Vatican, teaching at Princeton since his arrival in the United States. Paul Tillich, the erudite theologian, represented the Protestant tradition. He had taught in the great universities of Europe and was now in a joint appointment at Union Theological Seminary and Harvard.

In the dedicatory address, I summarized the rationale for our chapels: "Our concept was developed after patient introspection and exploration. It came out of the consciousness that a campus experience must be a preparation for the tasks of life. Our world is tragically fragmented, disrupted by bitter ideological disputes, nationalist rivalries, racial antipathies, religious bigotry. When we say that the world is crazy we are using the word in its very literal sense, for crazy stems from the French root, *ecrasé*—broken, shattered. And the illness of our world comes from the fact that it has been so broken and shattered. The great task of the religious experience is to help restore cohesiveness by rechanneling the forces which break and shatter. . . . Here at Brandeis we shall each respect our own faith, draw strength and meaning from its survival values, and carry this respect with pride in the presence of each other."

Through the years, the chapels served the Brandeis family in their worship, their glad days and their sad ones, their weddings, confirmations, and funerals, their study groups, and their conferences. We were especially pleased with the large number of student romances whose weddings were often planned for the college chapels. There was scarcely a week without such a joyous occasion, and on some weeks, all three chapels were exuberantly busy. They became a model for other universities that were ready to abandon the tradition of a single denominational chapel. Hardly a year passed without a visiting committee that came to explore the Brandeis example. LaGuardia Airport and the West Point and Annapolis academies adopted the Brandeis three chapels pattern. In recent years, Brandeis has enrolled a significant number of students from lands with large Islamic populations—Pakistan, Indonesia, Turkey, India, Israel, and others. Are our visionaries already beginning to plan a chapel concept that will include a mosque?

The programmatic influence of the chapels depended in great measure, of course, on the caliber and personalities of the individual chaplains. In the main, I believe, we were fortunate in the perceptiveness of our repre-

sentatives. Most were young men, often not long ordained and almost as often involved in doctoral or advanced-degree study at Brandeis or some nearby seminary. Whether their predominant youth was a deciding factor or not, in general our chaplains identified themselves in each college generation with prevailing student interests. I think particularly of the combined involvement of students and chaplains in the civil rights movement of the 1960s and of the adverse reactions to the Vietnam War and South African apartheid.

A later Hillel chaplain, Rabbi Albert Axelrad, beginning in the sixties, directed many community projects most resourcefully. He organized teams of students to visit the Hebrew Rehabilitation Center for the Aged once a week in a kind of "adopt a grandparent" program. Another program organized visits at hospitals, mental institutions, and prisons. Still another involved students as assistants to the part-time Jewish chaplain at Massachusetts General Hospital. Some of the students began corresponding with handicapped youngsters at the residential Alyn Orthopedic Center for Crippled Children in Jerusalem. Others conducted Jewish holiday parties and services at the pediatric and adolescent wards of mental institutions and hospitals, as well as at the Perkins School for the Blind. Clusters of students and the Hillel Singing Group paid Jewish holiday visits to nursing homes in the area. Students and faculty came together for weekly letter-writing sessions to Soviet Jewish activists ("Refusniks") and their families. They reached out to befriend and assist Soviet Jews who had been resettled in the Greater Boston area. Rabbi Axelrad has made the Brandeis Hillel a model of its type.

There were many other experiences, some related to me by others, that I have cherished over the years: The Sunday morning when the Protestant chaplain, a tall, commanding young man, rushed around the pond shouting, as the wings of his gown flapped wildly, "Father, Father, can we borrow your organist? Ours didn't show." Or the day a distraught student burst into my outer office with the alarming report that the menorah was gone from Berlin Chapel. My assistant, Larry Kane, himself a Catholic alumnus of one of our earlier classes, strolled in and said, "It's all right, Dr. Sachar, Rabbi loaned it to Father until Friday for the Advent Wreath in Bethlehem." There was the Jewish graduate student in our Department of Music who composed a Catholic liturgy as part of her doctoral studies, which was given its premiere performance in Bethlehem chapel.

Two memories remain most vivid. One was the chapels' tenth anniversary rededication in the autumn of 1965. There was a reunion of former chaplains, and the program included panels and symposia involving our faculty and distinguished visitors drawn from various fields. The day-long affair culminated in a major banquet that was so well attended it had to

be held in the Athletic Center. The speakers were men of international repute. I cannot remember any of their remarks now. Neither, I am sure, can they. But none will forget what was to be one of the last appearances of Cardinal Cushing at Brandeis, when he agreed to help us climax our celebration. He arrived quite late, and we could all see the ravages of the cruel disease that would erode all but the courage of his faith. He was both unusually subdued and apparently extremely tired. He merely played with his food, for he had already begun to experience difficulty in swallowing. Nevertheless, he listened patiently to the three internationally prominent speakers. At last, he rose to deliver the briefest speech any of us could remember. He professed an admiration for the previous speakers and their theological insights. His own theology, he insisted, had barely gone beyond that taught to children via the catechism. "And what," he asked, "have I been doing all day?" Dramatic pause. "I've been giving away *fish*." There had been a strike that had left tons of fish in danger of rotting on the wharves. Someone had called the cardinal's residence and said he might have the fish for his poor if he could find ways of giving it away. He had attended to this mission and then come, exhausted but eager, to participate in the interfaith reunion.

The other remembrance is of the tragic afternoon when young President Kennedy was assassinated. That crisp November day had begun pleasantly, outwardly at least. I still recall, incongruously, how green the playing fields were across the road from the president's office, how unusually mild it was. I had a particularly difficult faculty meeting scheduled for three o'clock, however, which I was not anticipating with any delight. I was at lunch when news was brought me of the shots in Dallas, and I immediately hurried back to my office. There I found my staff in various stages of bewilderment. Crowds congregated around radios. When we heard through the static that the priests had left the hospital, one of my assistants said, "Then he's gone, sir," got up, and walked away weeping, bumping into the furniture on the way.

Somewhere in the ensuing confusion I directed that someone get in touch with all three chaplains. I need not have done so. All were at their posts. As the word spread, students, faculty, and staff began stumbling and streaming up the hill toward the chapels. Hastily we prepared an order of service. The chapels were not only filled to overflowing with sorrowing members of the Brandeis community—groundsmen, students, kitchen helpers, and faculty—but with neighborhood folk who came, clotting in grief-stricken groups on the lawns and pathways leading up to the chapels. As all, in their hundreds, went reluctantly on their way, I reflected how, in such moments of unspoken grief—now for a fallen president, but equally for a stricken faculty member or a youngster scarcely past his teens—it

seemed so natural to make one's way to the chapels, where only hearts need speak.

To add to the spirit of diversity on campus, in 1991 Myra and Robert Kraft and Jacob Hiatt donated funds for a professorship at Brandeis and Holy Cross. The program is designed to heighten the awareness of shared values among students of diverse backgrounds. It provides for the appointment of a scholar of Christian studies at Brandeis and a scholar of Jewish studies at Holy Cross. The first appointment at Brandeis for this professorship was Krister Stendahl, dean of the Harvard Divinity School and former bishop of the Church of Sweden. Stendahl is a noted biblical scholar and authority on relations between Christians and Jews.