

JEFFREY S. GUROCK

Twentieth-Century American Orthodoxy's Era of Non-Observance, 1900-1960

During the first half of the twentieth century, if and when an American Jew attended a synagogue, he or she most likely prayed and socialized in an Orthodox house of worship.¹ However, most of these Orthodox synagogue-goers, drawn from among the masses of Eastern European Jews and their children—who then constituted the majority of America's Jews—were not especially punctilious in their adherence to the demands and requirements of Jewish law as prescribed in the *Shulhan Arukh*. Neither did these nominally Orthodox Jews attempt in any dramatic way to separate themselves from other Jews, nor to socialize their children away from general American society.

This fundamental gap between affiliation and observance was already evident within New York's downtown communities of the turn-of-the-century. There, on the High Holidays, a combination of nostalgia, awe over the Days of Judgment, and the desire to be among (and to be seen by) their fellow Jews in *shul* brought immigrants en masse to both storefront *landsmanshaft* and more established Orthodox synagogues in their neighborhoods. "On *Rosh Ha-Shanah*," one Yiddish newspaper writer recalled, "one could really see how the Jewish population had grown; all the big and little synagogues were packed." Indeed, the demand for seats was so immense that a cottage industry of "mushroom

JEFFREY S. GUROCK is Libby M. Klaperman Professor of Jewish History at Yeshiva University. The author of many scholarly works on American Jewish history, he is presently completing a book on the history of American Judaism between the two world wars.

synagogues” emerged each year as “the back rooms of East Side saloons and empty stores were transformed into prayer halls—[with] a *minyan* and a cantor. Yiddish theaters became synagogues too.” In all of these venues, the Jews’ devotions were so heartfelt and sincere that even a hard-boiled free-thinker like Socialist newspaper editor Abraham Cahan could not help but describe reverently “the sighs and sobs of the Days of Awe, the thrill that passes through the heartbroken *tallis*-covered congregation when the *shofar* blows.”²

However, these annual expressions of piety and involvement did not reflect year-round commitment to an Orthodox life-style. For example, the rank and file of downtown Orthodox synagogue members honored Shabbat observance in the breach. Indeed, most were at their places of work, and not in their seats, Saturday morning, when immigrant preachers excoriated them for not adhering to tradition. Probably Hebrew poet Ephraim Lisitsky captured the spirit of non-observance in these communities best when he remarked: “In the Jewish Quarter through which [the Sabbath Queen] had just passed they trampled with weekday shoes the train of her bridal gown.” In his immigrant home in Boston, he noted matter-of-factly, “very few Jews observed the Sabbath.”³ Rabbi Simon Greenberg has recalled similarly that as a boy in Brownsville, Brooklyn, “all of the stores on Pitkin Avenue were owned by Jews, but only one store was closed on the Sabbath.”⁴ Two concomitant sociological surveys of downtown New York Jews largely confirm these impressions. A 1912 study evidenced that only one-quarter of Jewish workers did not labor on Shabbat, as attendance in the shop took precedence over presence in the synagogue. A year later, in 1913, another report revealed that nearly 60% of the stores in a Jewish area of the Lower East Side were open on Saturday.⁵

By definition, those Orthodox Jews who worked and did not pray in the synagogue on Shabbat were not opposed to traditional teachings. Rather, the problem was their inability and unwillingness to integrate ancient religious values with their new ambitions and lifestyle. And it was not only the pursuit of affluence—the aforementioned and well-chronicled immigrants’ need to work on Shabbat—that moved them away from observance. Many of those who had begun to succeed economically, and who did not have to work, saw Shabbat as a day for shopping and recreation. If, as one historian has put it, “Hester Street storekeepers shamelessly exhibited their wares on the Sabbath,” they did so to attract Jewish customers. The Yiddish theaters were open both on Friday night and for the Saturday matinee, attracting hordes of “Orthodox Jews.”⁶

A Christian observer of the downtown scene, Hutchins Hapgood, reported on this interesting slice of immigrant religious life:

The Orthodox Jews who go to the theater on Friday, the beginning of Sabbath, are commonly somewhat ashamed of themselves and try to quiet their consciences by a vociferous condemnation of the actors on the stage. The actor, who through the exigencies of his role, is compelled to appear on Friday night with a cigar in his mouth, is frequently greeted with hisses and strenuous cries of "Shame, shame, smoke on the Sabbath!" from the proletarian hypocrites in the gallery.⁷

Some Orthodox theater-goers purchased their tickets before Shabbat to assuage their consciences. One theater devotee's attempt to find such a gray area within the Halakhah to accommodate his social calendar only earned him the consternation of his religiously observant father, who bitterly lamented "the symptoms of decay in my son's Jewish life."⁸ There were others who attended shows after services. And then there were those who frequented Orthodox *shuls* on Saturday with very different types of tickets in their hands. In describing the Lower East Side as "one of the biggest communities in the world filled with Jewish establishments [where] observing the Jewish Sabbath [is] more in the breach than in practice," a downtown synagogue leader unhappily observed:

the most visible sign of Sabbath observance, perhaps, is the stream of hundreds of Jews entering a synagogue, with a ticket of admission, the price of which was probably paid on Saturday.⁹

Non-observance of Shabbat among those who attended Orthodox synagogues continued apace as those of Eastern European stock acculturated further and moved from downtown neighborhoods to the second settlement areas of the pre-World War I period. There, in uptown communities like New York's West Side, even key board members of Orthodox synagogues could be found either oblivious to, or unconcerned with, halakhic strictures. When Mordecai M. Kaplan founded the Jewish Center in 1918, the vice president of his center's Building Committee openly let it be known that on at least one occasion, "he was called to the telephone" when he returned home from the synagogue and "rushed downtown to the Hotel Biltmore for a meeting." Indeed, Kaplan also related that at one memorable meeting held, not incidentally on a Saturday afternoon in a violation of the spirit of Shabbat, a supporter of his who never attended Shabbat morning services because he was at his office, was so moved by the rabbi's message that he attempted "to hand a thousand-dollar bill to the committee right out of his pocket."

It remained for the synagogue's president, himself a devout Shabbat observer, to remind his colleague curtly that "we don't take money on the Sabbath."¹⁰

During the inter-war period, Orthodox Jews and their synagogues moved again to new settlement areas on the outskirts of cities, where they would remain until the end of the Second World War. There, synagogue-goers continued their now long-standing tradition of non-commitment to Shabbat observance.¹¹ Surveying an unhappy scene in 1920, Rabbi Henry P. Mendes, President of the Orthodox Union, honestly reported that "it is perfectly true that Sabbath desecration is painfully noticeable in the Middle-West, the West and the South, where Reform Judaism is so powerful. But it is also true of the East, where Orthodox Judaism has its strongholds."¹²

As in the past, economic constraints and pursuits led those who belonged to synagogues to work on Shabbat. So explained a leading New York rabbi, Herbert S. Goldstein, in a 1936 radio address to the Orthodox Union. There he declared that "most of my brethren who have broken Jewish unity did so because of the desire for social prestige or on account of the pressure of economic conditions." Defining those negligent in their observances as definitely within, and not without, his Orthodox community, Goldstein asserted that "just because a Jew thinks he is forced to give up this or that part of his faith is no reason for his retreating completely from the banner of tradition."¹³

Statistically speaking, a 1935 study of Jewish young adult males in New York revealed that only one in ten had "attended synagogue service in the week preceding the interview." Five years later, a communal examination noted that 72 percent of that cohort "had not spent anytime in religious services that entire year." And these same Jews rated synagogue "social activities" last among fourteen enumerated "social recreations and pastimes"—well behind "movies, shopping and visiting."¹⁴

Concomitantly, in an Orthodox synagogue in Stamford, Connecticut, a local sociologist found that "most of those who claim to observe the Sabbath or holidays are satisfied with little more than attending services in the synagogue." Rather, "their shops as a rule are open on these days and everyday activities are carried on as usual, although some of the more strict absent themselves . . . leaving them in the hands of their children or hired help . . . only three times a year [did] the synagogue fill all its pews."¹⁵ Similar patterns of non-observance and non-attendance obtained in "Easttown," a pseudonymous city situated some sixty miles from New York City. There, in 1931-1932, another sociologist observed

a “Jewish community [that] continues to be predominantly Orthodox in congregational affiliation . . .” but where “religion played a relatively small part in the life of the Jewish family as compared with the aspects of making a living, marrying and educating one’s children” secularly. In that community, two-thirds of all Jewish families were affiliated with the synagogues, but only 1% attended services regularly during the year. Typically, the High Holidays attracted 93% of families, mostly to Orthodox synagogues. A similar style study of Staten Island Jews completed during this same time period revealed comparable patterns of behavior. There, where “all but one of the six synagogues on the Island are Orthodox, on the whole they act as places of worship only on the High Holidays.”¹⁶

This rampant non-observance among members of Orthodox synagogues did not sit well with one lay leader of the Orthodox Union who traveled the country in 1940. Bert Lewkowitz took a jaundiced view towards “Jews who do not observe the Sabbath, who do not take their children to any Hebrew school and do not give them a Jewish home atmosphere [but] consider themselves Orthodox Jews because they have a seat on the High Holidays in an Orthodox Synagogue.”¹⁷

Essentially, Orthodoxy’s rank and file in new settlement areas led religious lives that were indistinguishable from those of their fellow second-generation Eastern European Jews who affiliated with—but did not regularly attend—Conservative services in their neighborhoods. For example, in 1936, a rabbi of a Conservative congregation in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania reported that in order to attract “a considerable number of men to Sabbath services,” he had to make sure that all devotions were completed by 11 A.M. “In the whole congregation of about 250 families, there are not one-half dozen men who are not compelled to go to business on Saturday.” This rabbi’s willingness to move through the services rapidly had much to do with the reality that his congregants were also not particularly interested in attending Friday night services after a long week of work and before going off to their jobs the next morning. Indeed, in surveying some 46 colleagues nationwide just a few years earlier, he discovered that in many places, the congregants, “tired from a day’s business and anticipating the Saturday business for which they prepare much of the week,” were happier sitting next to the radio on Friday night than attending services. For this generation of Jews, the Yiddish theater was passé and the television was yet to be available.¹⁸

Concomitantly, at a sister Conservative congregation in Brooklyn, worshippers at Saturday morning services reportedly “leave on time,

but all do not arrive on time. Some even straggle in about a half hour or so before the conclusion of the service. Some attend to their mundane business after services. Others transact their business during the services.” Indeed, many of these worshippers showed no compunction about violating Shabbat in getting to services. Adumbrating travel patterns that would become the norm in post-Second World War America, “some come to the synagogue,” it was found, “by subway or automobiles. Even some Bar Mitzvah boys are brought to the synagogue by automobiles.”¹⁹

Interestingly enough, as the inter-war period unfolded, the lines of demarcation in religious ritual, schedule, and architecture which differentiated Orthodox Union synagogues from their United Synagogue of America counterparts (and even from some Reform congregations) blurred increasingly. All denominations tried, almost desperately, to promote comparable formulas to attract the non-observant and those in the process of disaffiliating back to the synagogue.²⁰

Orthodox Union synagogues, situated both in their denominational hub of New York and nationwide, habitually sponsored late (that is, well after sundown) Friday night services as they, like their more liberal religious counterparts, accommodated the work schedules of their potential worshippers. Similarly, family pews and a myriad of non-*mehizah* seating patterns obtained widely in Orthodox synagogues even as they maintained daily *minyanim* and Talmud study classes for a minority of devout members; many synagogues and temples even sponsored ancillary social activities directed to the entire Jewish family. Actually, in some regions of the country, the Orthodox synagogue was virtually alone in attempting to reach the non-observant of Eastern European stock. In Charleston, South Carolina, for example, two Americanized Orthodox synagogues predominated through the close of the Second World War. Reportedly, that locality’s “conservative atmosphere and reverence for the past” bolstered the movement, even as younger members would ride to synagogue for the Saturday morning service, “but leave their automobiles a few blocks away out of respect for the orthodoxy of older members.”²¹

Similarly, in Detroit, Michigan, Congregation Shaarey Zedek was the United Synagogue’s sole representative in that Upper Midwest region. Possibly, there was no “need” for a greater Conservative presence because the handful of self-described Orthodox synagogues in Shaarey Zedek’s vicinity sat families together when they (infrequently) attended services; Friday night socials were standard fare.²² Elsewhere, of course, and most notably in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United

Synagogue affiliates led the way in seeking to reach the uninterested, even as some Reform congregations in the larger cities of America attracted a minority of scions from Eastern European families to services which were slowly becoming more traditional.²³

Thus, if the Orthodox Union could boast, as it did in 1937, that it was “the largest religious group numerically in the United States,”²⁴ what remained unsaid was that neither they, nor their competitors, were then particularly successful in halting the tide of disaffection away from synagogue life. Moreover, what was rarely acknowledged publicly, but was clearly evident, is that independent of the attempt to attract young people, many of the congregations had themselves deviated from prior halakhic standards. Probably, Orthodox Union Vice President Rabbi David De Sola Pool offered the most candid and self-revelatory assessment of the Orthodox community of his day when he wrote in 1942:

Today it is growing increasingly difficult to discern any essential organic difference between Orthodoxy and Conservatism. The main differentiae seem to be that conservative synagogues permit men and women to sit together, and make more use of English in the services than do most orthodox synagogues. Yet, some orthodox synagogues use some English in their services and seat the sexes, if not together, at least on one floor. No logical or clear line can be drawn today between American Orthodoxy and Conservatism . . . American Orthodoxy no longer mirrors Eastern European life. It is adapting itself to the American environment. Innovations like the late Friday evening service or the removal of the women’s gallery, or the confirmation of girls or a community seder . . . would have shocked the worshippers of a generation ago. Today such practices are accepted in numerous congregations.²⁵

In other words, and to reiterate, as late as the Second World War, if and when an American Jew attended synagogue, he or she most likely prayed and socialized in an Orthodox synagogue. But the number of Jews who were disposed to attend synagogues of any type was in decline. And the Orthodox synagogues that serviced the non-observant masses were themselves not especially punctilious in their adherence to the demands and requirements of Jewish law as prescribed in the *Shulhan Arukh*.²⁶

If, in the end, so few inter-war synagogues differed in any real way from one another, what ultimately moved individuals and families to affiliate with either “Orthodoxy” through its Union or “Conservatism” through the United Synagogue? We have pointed to the importance of local traditions as well as to the ability to be first on the scene as factors which bolstered the Orthodox synagogue—even if, as in the case of Charleston,

younger members might not be committed to Orthodoxy outside the congregation's precincts. We also noted the more idiosyncratic case of Philadelphia, where it was the prejudices and proclivities of a powerful Eastern European rabbi that helped the United Synagogue secure an early and enduring hold on the allegiances of so many second generation Jews.

For himself, Mordecai Kaplan, an on-the-scene observer who sorely wanted the Jews of his time to readily accept far more innovation and change in synagogue ritual, offered this particularly insightful suggestion to explain the inherent traditionalism of those who attended the synagogues of his time: "The non-observant 'Orthodox die-hards,'" he complained, possessed a "dualistic philosophy of living and making a living." While these Jews, he continued, "may permit (themselves) many a wrong in the process of making a living" (like working on Shabbat) "in that which constitutes living," namely, religious life, "they uphold Orthodoxy"—especially when their synagogue provides them with mixed seating and the late Friday night service.²⁷

Where were the Orthodox Jews who practiced what their faith preached amidst this half-century of religious decline? The search for immigrant piety and second generational commitment leads naturally and initially to the Lower East Side, where a cadre of Orthodox rabbis who trained in Eastern Europe, together with a small group of lay supporters, attempted to transplant the civilization they remembered from the Old World to these shores. For these individuals, personal observance of Shabbat and the other demands of Halakhah were a given. And they publicly expressed their religious values, during their early years here, through regular attendance in their immigrant Orthodox synagogues. These were the rabbis who excoriated the masses who were not in *shul* on Shabbat. Their lay backers were those who heard the religious leaders' plaintive cries. These men in the pews were also proud of their minority status as those who upheld religious principles, such as the inviolability of Shabbat, at all personal costs.²⁸

Although internecine jealousies and rivalries often set these immigrant leaders apart, by 1902, some, but not all, of these rabbis aggregated themselves into a national body, the Agudath ha-Rabbanim (Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada). With resistance to Americanization as their goal, they set out to influence and recruit a new generation of youngsters—largely from among the children of their modest minions of lay supporters—who, imbued with the spirit of Eastern European learning, would later choose to separate themselves from the lures of this new land. Thus, the Agudath ha-Rabbanim's most favored institutions were the elementary yeshivah, Etz Chaim, estab-

lished downtown in 1886, and the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, founded in the same neighborhood some eleven years later. At their inception, the deeply committed and observant students of these institutions were afforded the barest modicum of secular training; study of Torah and Talmud dominated their days. In the next two decades (1900-1920), this incipient yeshivah world would expand ever so slightly—geographically and numerically. So too the educational system would evolve to permit anxious students greater exposure to secular subjects, enabling them to compete with and against their fellow non-observant Jews in the American world around them. By the end of World War I, the crown of Orthodoxy's core committed constituency in America were the approximately one thousand young men who attended the six yeshivah elementary schools and the one high school (the Talmudical Academy, an extension of the Etz Chaim-RIETS community) that were situated on the Lower East Side, in Harlem, Brooklyn, and Baltimore, Maryland. Their educational and religious horizons differed fundamentally from those of their fellow Jews of Eastern European descent who had to be coaxed or attracted to synagogues.²⁹

To be sure, the practicing Orthodox community consisted of more than those aligned with this early American yeshivah world. To begin with, there were immigrant rabbis and their families who harbored separatist sentiments and practiced what Orthodoxy preached. But they were ensconced in communities removed from the metropolis. They had no access to this fledgling parochial school system—that is, unless they were prepared to send their sons to the great eastern city (it may be noted that thirty-seven of the fifty-nine charter members of the Agudath ha-Rabbanim lived outside the New York area). Then there were those separatist-leaning and highly-observant families, both in New York and elsewhere, who had only daughters and thus could not be counted within the yeshivah world. There were as yet no “girls’ yeshivahs” available. Finally, there were the many within the observant metropolitan area community who observed Shabbat and personally upheld the other strictures of halakhah, but who disdained the separatism from America then explicit in a yeshivah education. This cohort of laymen and rabbis, even including members of the Agudath ha-Rabbanim, probably constituted the largest segment of an ideologically-variegated observant community. These more modern New York Orthodox Jews, along with those of more traditional stripes who either had daughters or who lived outside the metropolis, sent their children to the public schools and then relied on communal or private Talmud Torahs to educate their youngsters.³⁰

Of course, when these children attended the supplementary schools, they invariably sat with other second generation Jewish children whose nominally Orthodox families were not as committed to maintaining the highest standards of personal observance. Thus, while schools like the Uptown or Salanter Talmud Torahs in New York, then among the most favored institutions of the Orthodox Union, could boast as late as 1917 of some 1,400 and 500 students respectively (with boys and girls in separate classes), far from all of these students came from observant homes. Likewise, when the most observant of these youngsters and their parents attended services in Americanized synagogues, such as the aforementioned Jewish Center, they counted among their *shul*-mates Jews of many varying religious dispositions.³¹

The aforementioned incipient American yeshivah community, initially consisting of but six schools for boys, slowly expanded during the inter-war period as, arguably, a committed core of observant Orthodox Jews persisted through a new generation. By 1940, some 7,700 students were attending 34 Orthodox schools of varying stripes, with New York, and especially Brooklyn, continuing as the hub or heartland of intensive Jewish education. Twenty-nine of the schools and 95% of the students were situated in the metropolis. Elsewhere, as before, handfuls of punctiliously-practicing Orthodox families did their level best—through Talmud Torah education or private tutoring—to keep their children close to traditional religious values.³²

However, even as the New York-based yeshivah movement grew modestly, its constituency variegated somewhat. Now not every yeshivah boy, and with the establishment of a few female and co-educational schools, not every yeshivah girl, came from a strictly observant home. While it is safe to assume that the vast majority of pupils who attended such all-boy schools as Williamsburg's Torah Vodaath³³ or the Talmudical Academy in Manhattan or, for that matter, the girls' Williamsburg's Beis Yaakov, hailed from homes where Shabbat observance and other fundamental halakhic values were the norm, the same certainly cannot be said of the backgrounds of students who entered Boro Park's own Etz Hayim for boys, Williamsburg's Shulamith School for girls, the co-educational Yeshivah of Flatbush, or the Ramaz School. One early study of the three modern yeshivahs in Brooklyn revealed that many parents who were interested in these schools "do not want their children to be forced to wear a *talit katan*." Moreover, "while desirous of giving their children a nationalist Hebraic education, they do not want [such training] coupled with strict religious observances." And retrospective studies of Ramaz's

student body have revealed that “non-observance was clearly a known fact of life” among families “whose commitment to Torah education was by no means absolute.”³⁴

Those families who sent their children to these most modern of Jewish day schools “to engender in [them] a love for their people and its cultural heritage and a strong attachment to the Zionist way of life” possessed a decidedly higher level of Jewish consciousness than most American Jews of their time. But their dedication to Judaism, as well as their expressed willingness to separate their children from the secular world of public school education, did not translate into profound interest in upholding halakhic norms personally. Indeed, at least at Ramaz, the school’s goal was to convince parents of the value of “reconciling their practices with the school’s traditions,” essentially through adopting a more observant lifestyle. In other words, from inter-war days on, the American yeshivah community, once the pride of Orthodoxy’s core committed constituency, had its own less-observant cohort.”³⁵

The predominance of non-observance among American Jews who identified themselves as Orthodox continued to prevail during the early post-war years, as second and third generation families relocated to suburbia. Then and there, what might be described as a half-hearted revival of Judaism took place, as it became a good American value, in new neighborhoods, for second- and third-generation Jews to affirm religion through affiliation with a Jewish house of worship. It was also important to Jews who feared assimilation in varying degrees and abhorred intermarriages of all sorts to identify themselves and their children with the touchstone institution, the synagogue, in their religiously mixed neighborhoods. In this environment, Jews joined suburban Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform synagogues *en masse*.³⁶

However, interest in religious observance in no way paralleled increased levels of affiliation. And here, as in the past, the religious life styles of nominally Orthodox Jews paralleled those of their Conservative counterparts. For example, while membership rolls grew, congregants did not feel particularly obliged to attend services on a regular basis and Shabbat observance was still honored in the breach. “The size of a suburban congregation,” one on-the-scene Orthodox observer reported as late as 1961, “bears little relation to the number of worshippers actually at services. Membership in a synagogue is not translated into religious observance.” No less than those who infrequently attended Conservative synagogues, “members of Orthodox congregations,” he continued, “seem to be becoming lax in *kashruth*, Sabbath observance and other cardinals

of the Jewish faith.” In his view, “Jews in suburbia, whatever they called themselves, regarded their affiliation as a mark of *social identification*, not as an act of faith [emphasis his].”³⁷

Like their Conservative brethren, Orthodox Jews worked on Shabbat. As before, “the businessman’s observance of the Sabbath is a vexing problem,” reported the president of a fledgling Orthodox synagogue in New Rochelle, New York. “The retailer is liable to suffer tremendously by having his store closed on . . . the busiest day of the week.” Many of those who did attend services drove to synagogue on Shabbat. The only real difference between them and their Conservative fellow suburbanites is that Orthodox worshippers did so without the approval of their rabbis. And sometimes, more observant worshippers censured them. Some guilt-ridden Orthodox drivers “appease[d] their guilt by parking his (sic) car a few blocks away.” Others hid their violations “out of respect for the orthodoxy of the older members.”³⁸

Interestingly enough, some post-war Jews belonged simultaneously to both the Conservative and Orthodox congregations in their vicinities, blurring denominational lines further. Such was the case in New Rochelle, where that same synagogue president lamented that “a large percentage of the Orthodox group is at the same time affiliated with the Conservative congregation.” “They lose their scruples,” he angrily observed, “as the fashion of the day changes. Basically, such ‘Orthodox Jews’ in the modern suburban society comply with the ‘niceties’ of their new environment.”³⁹

Similarly, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a sociologist found that almost 15 percent of the members of that community’s Orthodox synagogue also “[retained] membership” in either a Conservative or Reform congregation.⁴⁰ Concomitantly, a Boston-based observer had his own problems defining who was Orthodox and who was not: “Some Jews,” he noticed, “go to non-orthodox temples but try to keep Shabboth [sic] and Kashruth. Others attend Orthodox shools [sic], but drive there on Shabboth [sic].” “Maybe,” he suggested, “the best practical definition of an Orthodox Jew is one who believes in the Divine origin of the Torah, tries to learn more about it and to observe the Mitzvoth and precepts more fully and who affiliates with an orthodox synagogue.”⁴¹

A contemporary young Orthodox rabbi defined the non-observant component similarly, even as he defined them as solidly within the Orthodox camp. In his view,

we must include in the category of orthodox Jew the one who, while of lesser or negligible observance in personal life retains spiritual allegiance to traditional Judaism. He is not a *practicing* Jew but rather a *preferring* Jew [emphasis his].⁴²

For this and other suburban-based rabbis, Orthodoxy's communal agenda was twofold: to make their synagogues as socially attractive as the Conservative and Reform temples with whom they were in heated competition for the masses of the non-observant; and to try to find ways of convincing those who opted to join their synagogues to adopt traditional forms of behavior. However, in the 1950s through early 1960s, Orthodoxy was only marginally successful in both parts of its campaign. This era marked the beginning of the winnowing out of Orthodoxy of the masses of occasional synagogue-goers, and their comfortable repositioning into a growing and now numerically predominant Conservative movement. Likewise, spiritual retrieval work within the Orthodox synagogue was then only starting to take its first fledgling steps.⁴³

Essentially, the second half of the twentieth century opened with Orthodoxy in numerical decline. By 1970, only 11% of American Jews identified with Orthodoxy, as compared to 42% affiliated with Conservatism and 33% with Reform. Fourteen percent had no denominational affiliation. A pattern was established, beginning slowly in the 1950s, that has continued to this day. For the most part, "the nominally Orthodox" fell "by the wayside and more of those who define themselves as Orthodox really are committed or want to be."⁴⁴ In other words, those who persisted were primarily that hardy breed who practiced what their traditional faith preached. Orthodoxy was observed punctiliously first by descendants of the inter-war early yeshivah community, those native-born and third-generation Jews who, as we have indicated, had managed, now over several decades, to maintain their fidelity to the fundamental strictures of Halakhah even as they acculturated and rose economically in America. Then, after the Second World War, a new generation continued family and halakhic traditions in their own enclaves in suburbia. For example, by 1960, Far Rockaway, New York had become one such mecca for observant Orthodox Jews, as it earned for itself the proud reputation of a "Torah-Suburb-by-the-Sea." It boasted of being home to between four and five thousand "observant Jews . . . in the 35-45 age range . . . part and parcel of the American milieu [who] migrated to Far Rockaway from such nurturing grounds of American Jewish Orthodoxy . . . as Manhattan's Lower East Side, Washington Heights and Brooklyn's Williamsburg and Boro Park." One booster of this community described it as

a community adjacent to a major metropolis, whose residents earn their livelihoods in the city—and who, being imbued with the spirit of Torah, cheerfully and zestfully relish the pure joy of Torah living. They are American-born, most of them, educated in American yeshivah; they

study Torah constantly and use it as the guide to complete, “*shlaimusdik*” (complete) Jewish living.⁴⁵

The early post-war period also opened a new brighter era for those observant families situated in many cities and regions remote from the metropolis who previously had had no access to yeshivah education. Those who had relied on Talmud Torahs and private tutoring to educate their children were now the beneficiaries of the efflorescence of day school education nationwide. In the generation between 1940 and 1960, day school enrollment rose from 7,700 to approximately 56,000. Equally significant, by 1960, there were more day schools outside of New York and its environs than there were within, though the metropolitan area schools generally were larger than those out-of-town. Still, there was a sturdier base than ever for the observant family to maintain its religious identity through the succeeding generations.⁴⁶ Of course, in time, day school education would become synonymous with, if not a *sine qua non* for, membership in the Orthodox community, despite the fact that many of these schools were religiously heterogeneous. The inter-war trend that we noted previously, of non- or less-observant youngsters being exposed to yeshivah education, continues to this day.⁴⁷

While the descendants of the early yeshivah community—and those who emulated their educational policies—continued to make their way within early post-War America, a second group of even more committed immigrant Orthodox Jews was arriving on these shores. These refugees and survivors, primarily from Hitler’s terror, but also later from Stalin’s tanks, sought this country because the Europe they were once part of had been, or was in the process of being, destroyed. These were the Jews who, during the period of mass migrations, had heeded the words of those Eastern European rabbis who had declared America off-limits to those who wished to serve God properly. Brought to America by the tragedy of their times, they were zealously dedicated to reconstituting the religious civilization they had seen burn before their eyes.⁴⁸

Actually, this new breed of self-segregating newcomers began settling here as early as the mid-1930s. Their presence was felt first within the incipient yeshivah communities, as the newcomers’ youngsters swelled their meager ranks, while their views of the general and Jewish world around them challenged the stances taken by some early American *yeshivot* towards educating their pupils. For example, in 1937, the aforementioned Beis Yaakov school movement, which had been founded a generation earlier in Eastern Europe, sank its first American roots in Williamsburg. The school would soon rival the Shulamith school for the

enrollment and allegiances of girls from observant families. Interestingly enough, Williamsburg, long the epicenter of the core of committed Orthodox Jews, provided the first American home for many of the Hasidic sects that made up a goodly part of this new migration, even as their degree of commitment to old ways exceeded even that of the most resolute of the inter-war Orthodox Jews. Other Lithuanian “yeshivah world” types would settle in their own closed suburban, almost rural, communities such as Lakewood, New Jersey. Over the succeeding decades, these groups’ influence and impact would be increasingly felt within both the larger Orthodox group and American Jewry in general. But that story belongs to a subsequent, and the most recent era, of Orthodoxy in the United States.⁴⁹

Notes

1. Essentially, through this analysis, we are attempting to categorize the synagogal choices of the masses of immigrant Eastern European Jews—by 1900, clearly American Jewry’s majority—over two or three generations. Unquestionably, the new arrivals, the immigrant generation, were religiously based in the hundreds of *landsmanshaft* synagogues in America’s major cities or in the *hevrahs* that were established in smaller towns. These transplanted European-style *shtiebls*—to be somewhat rhetorically anachronistic—outnumbered the Americanized synagogues that affiliated either with the liberal-leaning Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC), organized in the 1870s, or the more traditional Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (OU), founded just before the turn of the century. Statistically speaking, as of 1900, the UAHC recorded that it had 99 congregations, serving approximately 10,000 Jews. The OU’s founding convention brought together only fifty synagogues. Obviously, these figures are dwarfed by the immigrant-driven numbers that populated the *landsmanshaften*. Twenty years later, circa World War I, the patterns remained basically the same. In 1917, the UAHC reported some 200 synagogues and almost 21,000 members, while the OU suggested fewer than 180 synagogues. The fledgling United Synagogue of America (USA), founded in 1913, had, at its outset, twenty-two synagogues. See on these synagogue statistics, Marc Lee Raphael, *Profiles in American Judaism: The Reform, Conservative, Orthodox and Reconstructionist Traditions in Historical Perspective* (San Francisco, 1985), 138, 197. For a frame of reference, these numbers should be compared with the literally hundreds of *landsmanshaften* listed and other statistical data offered for New York Judaism as of 1917 in the *Jewish Communal Register* (New York: The Jewish Community [*Kehillah*] of New York, 1918).

For the inter-war and wartime period (circa 1920-1945), the chronological focus of our study, our assertion that synagogued Jews of Eastern European descent most likely attended some sort of Orthodox synagogue challenges some long-held assumptions about 20th century denominational

life. Sociologists, such as Nathan Glazer and especially Marshall Sklare, have posited that second generation Eastern European Jews who were disaffected from *landsmanshaft* Judaism (and who were still interested in synagogue life) found their way, during the 1920s and 1930s, and within third settlement areas, into the then growing Conservative movement, identified with the USA. That movement grew in strength of synagogue affiliates, from 22 affiliates at its outset to 229 by 1929, making it almost equal in number to the UAHC, which boasted 281 member congregations. Sklare, for example, has argued that when Orthodoxy existed in these regions, it was “found in it, but not of it,” and did not adapt itself to meet the pressures Jews faced. Conservatism, on the other hand, characterized by its mixed pews, decorum, non-commercialism, late Friday night services, and Jewish center-style activities, captured the allegiances of the many marginally observant Jews—the objects of our study—who, in the first generation, attended immigrant Orthodox synagogues. See on this conceptualization Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement* (Glencoe, IL, 1955), 72-73, 84-86. See also Nathan Glazer, *American Judaism* (Chicago, 1957), 91-92. On the persistence of this viewpoint into more contemporary historiography, see Henry L. Feingold, *A Time for Searching: Entering the Mainstream, 1920-1945* (Baltimore and London, 1992), 104-107.

I am suggesting, here and elsewhere, that a close examination of the ritual practice, denominational self-identification, rabbinic staffing patterns, and the range of ancillary synagogue activities of the United Synagogue reveals that in the inter-war period, many of the USA affiliates behaved and were led in precisely the same way as were the OU congregations. Both the USA and OU were home, in some areas, to synagogues where *mehizah*-style seating obtained and no deviations from Halakhah were countenanced. Elsewhere, in a very fluid environment, both USA and OU congregations accepted mixed seating during services and adopted the popular late Friday night service. And very often, these synagogues were served by graduates of either the Jewish Theological Seminary or the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary. And everywhere, Jewish center style activities were in vogue, at least nominally, in USA and OU congregations. See below for examples of USA and OU congregations behaving comparably. For a full exposition of the commonalities in ritual behavior of these congregations see my “From Fluidity to Rigidity: The Religious Worlds of Conservative and Orthodox Jews in Twentieth Century America,” *David W. Belin Lecture in American Jewish Affairs* (University of Michigan, 2000).

It is not possible to ascertain precisely how many congregations in the USA called themselves “modern Orthodox” and behaved accordingly. Nor is there exact data extant on the number of OU congregations that mixed the genders and promoted late Friday night services, yet called themselves Orthodox. Still, it is reasonable to assume that when these types of synagogues are combined with the OU congregations who adhered closely to halakhic standards, even as they too reached out to the non-observant, together with the residual group of immigrant synagogues that remained for the unacculturated, that more Jews attended the different varieties of Orthodox synagogues than other denominational groups. For more on the mystery of how many Orthodox Union congregations had mixed seating during the inter-war period see note 26 of this study.

This study closes chronologically in 1960, during the period when the numerical efflorescence of Conservative Judaism became a reality. For the record, the size of the USA grew from 350 congregations in 1945 to 800 two decades later. Orthodox leaders began to openly characterize themselves as a minority denomination during this same time period. On Conservative Judaism's growth, see Jack Wertheimer, "The Conservative Synagogue," in *The American Synagogue: A Sanctuary Transformed*, ed. Jack Wertheimer, (New York, 1987), 123. On Orthodoxy's "minority stance," see Leo Jung, "A Plea to Organized Orthodoxy," *Jewish Forum* (hereafter *JF*) 42, 1 (February, 1959):6. I am suggesting, finally, that Sklare *et al* projected back into the inter-war period patterns of denominational behavior and affiliation that obtained in the 1960s.

2. *Morgan Zhurnal*, April 3, 1950, republished in Irving Howe and Kenneth Libo, eds., *How We Lived: A Documentary History of Immigrant Jews in America, 1880-1930* (New York, 1979), 117. See also, Abraham Cahan, "The Commercial Advertiser," republished in Howe and Libo, 104. It should be noted that many of these mushroom synagogues were run by unscrupulous entrepreneurs who sold tickets before the holidays and then absconded with the revenues. See, on this long-standing problem, "A Remedy for Disgraceful Synagogues," *American Hebrew* (October 17, 1902), 608.
3. Ephraim Lisitsky, *In the Grip of Cross Currents*, republished in Howe and Libo, 96.
4. Interview with Simon Greenberg conducted by Paul Radensky, August 29, 1989. Tape on file at the Ratner Center, Jewish Theological Seminary.
5. Moses Rischin, *The Promised City: New York's Jews, 1870-1914* (Cambridge, 1962), 146-147. See also on the patterns of non-attendance and non-observance among immigrant Jews, Ray Stannard Baker, *The Spiritual Unrest* (New York, 1910), 117-118.
6. Rischin, 146. For an important detailed examination of Jewish consumerism, including on Shabbat and holidays, as a function of the acculturation of Jews, see Andrew Heinze, *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption, and the Search for American Identity* (New York, 1990).
7. Hutchins Hapgood, *The Spirit of the Ghetto: Studies of the Immigrant Quarter of New York* (New York, 1902), 125-126. See also on this subject, 92, 121-122.
8. Irving Bunim, "A Father's Appreciation of Young Israel," *JF* 9, 10 (October, 1826): 540-541.
9. Max Oxenhandler, "The Jewish Youth of the East Side," *JF* 6, 1 (January, 1923): 61.
10. For a discussion of Shabbat observance and non-observance patterns in these communities, see Jeffrey S. Gurock and Jacob J. Schacter, *A Modern Heretic and a Traditional Community: Mordecai M. Kaplan, Orthodoxy and American Judaism* (New York, 1997), 91-92, 93, 115.
11. For a contemporaneous demographic and ecological definition of these inter-war areas of residence see Uriel Z. Engelman, "Medurbia: The People," *Contemporary Jewish Record* 4, 4 (August, 1941): 339-348; *idem.*, "Medurbia: the Community," *Contemporary Jewish Record* 4, 5 (October, 1941): 511-521.
12. Henry Pereira Mendes, "Orthodox Judaism (The Present)," *JF* 3, 1 (January, 1920): 35.
13. *Orthodox Union* (hereafter *OU*) 3, 6 (June, 1936), 1.

14. Nathan Goldberg, "Religious and Social Attitudes of Jewish Youth in the U.S.A.," *Jewish Review* 1(1943): 148; Nettie Pauline McGill, "Some Characteristics of Jewish Youth in New York City," *Jewish Social Service Quarterly* 14 (1938): 266.
15. Samuel Koenig, "The Socioeconomic Structure of an American Jewish Community," in Isaac Graeber and Stuart Henderson Britt, *Jews in a Gentile World: The Problem of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1942), 227, 229.
16. Langer, "The Jewish Community of Easttown, 1931-1932," (unpublished abstract of thesis written at the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, New York, 1932, files at the American Jewish Historical Society). See also, Abraham Fleischman, "A Study of the Jewish Population of Staten Island, New York with Special Attention to Several of its Individual and Group Aspects," (unpublished abstract of thesis written at the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, 1937).
17. Bert Lewkowitz, "The Future of Judaism as a Layman Visions It," *JF* 23, 10 (December, 1940): 177; See also, Meyer Waxman, "American Orthodoxy—The Fifth Unknowable," *JF* 7, 10 (October, 1924): 651.
18. Louis N. Levitsky, "The Story of an Awakened Community," *The Reconstructionist* 1, 20 (February 7, 1936): 9; "Conduct of Religious Services," *United Synagogue Recorder* 7, 4 (October, 1927): 11.
19. Samuel P. Abelow, "Eastern Parkway in Jewish Life," *JF* 28, 8 (September, 1945): 199-200.
20. See note 1 and below for a discussion of the similarities in lifestyle among Jews identifying with Orthodox Union and United Synagogue congregations before 1950. For a study of the emergence of Eastern European Jews as a factor in Reform constituencies and congregations, see Commission on Research, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, *Reform Judaism in the Large Cities* (Cincinnati, 1931).
21. Aaron Solomon, "Tradition in Charleston," *Jewish Life* (hereafter *JL*) 24, 3 (January-February, 1957): 17-20. See also Charles Reznikoff and Uriah Z. Engelman, *The Jews of Charleston: A History of an American Jewish Community* (Philadelphia, 1954), 215-216, 237-238.
22. On the history of Detroit Jewry and its synagogues, see Robert A. Rockaway, *The Jews' Detroit: From the Beginning, 1762-1914* (Detroit, 1986); Sidney Bolkosky, *Harmony and Dissonance: Voices of Jewish Identity in Detroit, 1914-1967* (Detroit, 1991), 98-99, 104-109; Eli Grad and Bette Roth, *Congregation Shaarey Zedek 5622-5742 1861-1981* (Southfield, MI, 1982), 56, 62; Ruth and Eiga Hershman, "Rabbi Abraham M. Hershman," *Michigan Jewish History* 21, 2 (June, 1981): 16-32. As far as my description of Shaarey Zedek's competitors as "self-described" Orthodox, it should be noted that these synagogues were late joiners of the Orthodox Union, mixed seating and all—and some never did gain the national affiliation. See *Inventory of the Church and Synagogue Archives of Michigan* (Detroit, 1940), 18-40.
23. Much of the success of the United Synagogue in Philadelphia reportedly has to do with the checkered career of Rabbi Bernard Levinthal, an old-line Orthodox rabbi who craftily kept Orthodox Union congregations and American Orthodox rabbis out of his town. See my discussion of Levinthal in *American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective* (Hoboken, N.J., 1996), 26, 367. For sources on the impact of Eastern European Jews upon traditionalism in the Reform Movement, see *Yearbook of the Central*

Conference of American Rabbis (1920-1945). Noteworthy here are, *inter alia*, discussions on late Friday night services, as opposed to Saturday or Sunday mornings, as the time to attract these potential worshippers.

24. The Orthodox Union claimed in 1935 that it had some 2,300 member congregations. And two years later, as noted, it claimed to be the largest Jewish religious group in America. Raphael has suggested, I believe convincingly, that these numbers were exaggerated and that the number of OU congregations grew from 180 in 1925 to some 300 two decades later. Raphael also suggests that sometimes the OU included in its calculations all Orthodox synagogues, providing one way of comprehending the difference between 2,300 and 300. See Raphael, 138, 229. See also *OU* 4, 7 (July 1937), 2. In all events, as suggested in note 1, when OU synagogues of varying ritual stripes are combined with the residual immigrant synagogues that still survived in the 1920s and 1930s as well as with the “modern Orthodox” members of the USA, in total, Orthodox synagogues clearly outnumber their Conservative and Reform counterparts. Hence, although the assertion cannot be proved to an exact, quantified certainty, the likelihood continues that as late as the end of the Second World War, it was more likely that an American Jew would attend an Orthodox synagogue than any other type of house of worship.
25. David De Sola Pool, “Judaism and the Synagogue,” *The American Jew: A Composite Portrait*, ed. Oscar Janowsky (New York and London, 1942), 50-54. See also Lewkowitz, 177, who in reporting on his travels throughout this country observed that “men and women sit in Orthodox as well as so-called conservative congregations.”
26. While it is clear that many Orthodox Union congregations had mixed seating and the late Friday night service—so common to the United Synagogue—the absence of any self-study or extant documentation from the Orthodox Union makes it impossible to determine how many of their synagogues displayed those “deviant” characteristics. De Sola Pool surely gives us the sense that such behavior obtained widely, but precisely how pervasive it was cannot be determined. After the Second World War, debates within congregations which previously had had *meḥizot*, but were then moving towards mixed seating led those who advocated such a move to allege that the numbers of Orthodox congregations so disposed still numbered in the 200s. It is not clear whether these numbers are accurate. See on this subject, Jonathan D. Sarna, “The Debate over Mixed Seating in the American Synagogue,” in Jack Wertheimer, ed., 381-386.
27. Mordecai M. Kaplan, unpublished “Journals,” volume 4 (December 31, 1928): 203 on file in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary.
28. For an example of a member of the committed laity who wrote proudly of his adherence to tradition, even if in his memoir he hyperbolically overestimated the degree of piety that existed downtown, see Herbert S. Goldstein (ed.), *Forty Years of Struggle for a Principle: The Biography of Harry Fischel* (New York, 1929), 12, 13, 18, 19.
29. For a discussion of the founding of the Agudath ha-Rabbanim and its advocacy of RIETS, see my “Resisters and Accommodators: Varieties of Orthodox Rabbis in America, 1886-1983,” in my *American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective*, 7-11 and *passim*. For statistics on the slow growth of day school education during this time period, see Alvin Irwin Schiff, *The Jewish Day School in America* (New York, 1966), 28-37.

30. On the geographical distribution of the founders of the Agudath ha-Rabbanim see the Constitution of that organization published in Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff, *The Silver Era: Rabbi Eliezer Silver and His Generation* (Jerusalem/New York, 1981), 324-325. On the lack of “girls’ yeshivahs” during this time period see my *The Men and Women of Yeshiva: Orthodoxy, Higher Education and American Judaism* (New York, 1988), 186–191. On the interest immigrant rabbis had in sending their own children to the public schools, see my “How ‘Frum’ was Rabbi Jacob Joseph’s Court: Americanization within the Lower East Side’s Orthodox Elite,” in *American Jewish Orthodoxy*, 103-116.
31. For the numbers of students attending these modern Talmud Torahs, see *The Jewish Communal Register*, 374-376.
32. Schiff, 67-69.
33. It should be noted that even at an institution like Torah Vodaath, which has been referred to, almost hagiographically, as “the mother of American yeshivah,” the student body was heterogeneous in its level of Orthodox observance. As one sociologist observed about that school during the inter-war period, “many of these yeshiva students from the *less Orthodox homes*” (emphasis mine) left after their graduation from elementary school, “even as some” fifty percent would continue “into high school and beyond.” Unfortunately for our analysis, the author does not characterize or describe what is meant by “less Orthodox.” See George Kranzler, *Williamsburg: A Jewish Community in Transition* (New York, 1961), 143.
34. Noah Nardi, “A Survey of Jewish Day Schools in America,” *Jewish Education* 16, 1 (September, 1944): 22-23; see also my “The Ramaz Version of American Orthodoxy,” in *Ramaz: School, Community, Scholarship and Orthodoxy*, (Hoboken, N.J., 1989), 47, 51.
35. Nardi, 25; Gurock, *The Ramaz . . .*, 52-53; see also, Ben Zion Toback, “*Ha-Yeshivah de-Flatbush*,” *Shevilei ha-Hinukh* 21, 4 (Summer, 1961): 246.
36. For contemporaneous accounts of the so-called “Jewish revival,” see Glazer, 107-128, Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Jewish Sociology* (Garden City, New York, 1955) and Sklare. For statistics on the growth of the United Synagogue, see Wertheimer, 123, derived from the *Biennial Convention Reports of the United Synagogue of America* from 1952-1965.
37. Gershon Jacobson, “Inside Jewish Suburbia, U.S.A.” *JF* 44, 6 (December, 1961): 32. On the Conservative synagogue’s growth and their own problems with non-attendance, see Dr. Emil Lehman, “The National Survey on Synagogue Leadership,” *Proceedings of the 1953 Biennial Convention, United Synagogue of America* (November 15-19, 1953): 36-37.
38. Bert Lescot, “Orthodoxy in Suburbia,” *JF* 41, 2 (February, 1958): 21. On the issue of driving to synagogue on Shabbat, see also Julius M. Hurst, “Sabbath Riding,” *JL* 20, 1 (September-October, 1952): 36-37. On Conservative moves to increase synagogue attendance by making riding to services halakhically acceptable, see “Responsum on the Sabbath,” *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly* 14 (1950): 112-188.
39. Lescot, 21.
40. Howard W. Polsky, “A Study of Orthodoxy in Milwaukee: Social Characteristics, Beliefs and Observances,” in Sklare, *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group* (Glencoe, IL, 1958), 328.

41. Philip K. Isaacs, "Orthodox Jewry in Boston: A Survey," *JL* 26, 1 (October, 1958): 48.
42. Ralph Pelcovitz, "Who is the Orthodox Jew," *JL* 32, 2 (November-December, 1964): 16.
43. On the processes leading to non-observant Jews leaving the Orthodox fold, see my "The Winnowing of American Orthodoxy," in *American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective*, 299-312.
44. Bernard Lazerwitz and Michael Harrison, "American Jewish Denominations: Social and Religious Profile," *American Sociological Review* 51, 2 (August, 1979): 662. See also Daniel J. Elazar, "How Strong is Orthodox Judaism Really," *Jewish Action* 50, 2 (Spring, 1991): 63-64.
45. Michael Kaufman, "Far Rockaway—Torah Suburb by the Sea," *Jewish Life* 27, 6 (August, 1960): 20.
46. Schiff, 68-69. It should be noted that not all of these schools were under Orthodox auspices. Still, at this point, the number of schools and proportion of students who studied under Conservative Jewish or other types of ideologically Jewish institutions was a very small percentage of the total day school constituency.
47. On the connection between day school education and belonging to the contemporary Orthodox community, see Mayer and Waxman, 99-100; Samuel C. Heilman and Steven M. Cohen, *Cosmopolitans and Parochials: Modern Orthodox Jews in America* (Chicago and London, 1989), 195-197; William Helmreich, "Old Wine in New Bottles: Advanced Yeshivot in the United States," *American Jewish History* 79, 2 (December, 1979): 243. As we have noted, not all day school students came from observant homes. Moreover, there are sub-categories of non-observance in the day school community. Helmreich has identified cohorts who send their youngsters to day school who are Shabbat-observers, but who are not intensely engaged in the Orthodox resurgence. See on this Helmreich, "Trends within Contemporary Orthodoxy," *Judaism* 36, 4 (Fall, 1981): 381-382.
48. On one of the admonitions of a nineteenth-century Torah great in Eastern Europe, the *Hafez Hayyim*, see Rabbi Yisrael Meir ha-Kohen Kagan, *Niddehei Yisrael* (Warsaw, 1894), 129-130, as quoted in Rakeffet-Rothkoff, 18-19.
49. On the founding of Beis Yaakov schools in America and their ideological differences with Shulamith, see Zevi H. Harris, "Trends in Jewish Education for Girls in New York City," (Ph.D. dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1956), 30, 128ff. On the transformation of Williamsburg into an immigrant, heavily Hasidic community, see Kranzler, 25-44 and *passim*. See also, on the sociology of that Hasidic community, Solomon Poll, *The Hasidic Community in Williamsburg* (New York, 1962). See also, on the history of the Lithuanian yeshivah world in America, William Helmreich, *The World of the Yeshiva* (New York, 1982).