

Jewish GIs and the Creation of the Judeo-Christian Tradition

Deborah Dash Moore

“Fifty years ago last June,” Bernard Bellush recalled, “our naval vessel, *LST 379*, plowed through the choppy waters of the English channel under overcast skies. We were part of the vast Allied armada heading for the D-day invasion of Omaha Beach in France. Despite briefings,” he admitted, “not one of us was prepared for the cliffs bristling with German armament.” Raised in a socialist Jewish home, Bellush joined the army to fight in World War II like tens of thousands of other American Jewish men. His recollections deserve our attention not merely for the time and place that they recall—though the experience of the D-Day invasion is inherently interesting—but also for what happened on *LST 379* as it crossed the channel in 1944.

Despite his socialist upbringing, Bellush was “designated by the commanding officer to be acting chaplain, and directed to conduct services on a windswept deck.” So he drew upon what had become standard operating procedure in the military: since he was a Jew, he “had a Protestant and Catholic soldier read from the New Testament.” Then, Bellush continued:

By way of a sermon, I spoke about the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in 1943. Despite hopeless odds, these Polish Jews rose in rebellion against the military might of German occupiers. By then, Warsaw’s Jewish leaders knew that friends, relatives and neighbors were feeding the furnaces of Auschwitz.

We GIs, I said, were far more fortunate than the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto, who had fought from bunker to bunker and from sewer to sewer with a few rifles, machine guns and Molotov cocktails. We would have endless ammunition, food and water, along with waves of friendly airplanes to protect us. Their cause, however, was the same as ours—to free the peoples of Europe and the world of the fear, oppression, and destruction inflicted by Hitler’s Nazis. These were the goals enunciated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his January 1941 pronouncement of the Four Freedoms.¹

Bellush offers us a remarkable socialist sermon for a man who never

even voted for FDR. Its setting affirms a spiritual context of a common faith shared by Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. His reminiscence blends politics and religion as integral to America's fight against Nazism. It links the four freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom “of every person to worship God in his own way,” freedom from want, and freedom from fear—with the Jewish fight against fascism.²

Bellush's narrative raises a number of questions regarding American Jews and World War II, about issues of identity, faith, politics, and community. It challenges regnant interpretations of the war and of American Jews' responses to the war. These larger concerns involve not merely matters of method but also of context and point of view. Writing more than fifty years after the events he describes occurred, Bellush urges a reassessment of Roosevelt and his legacy to American Jews. As a professor of history at the City College of New York, Bellush recalls World War II, the D-Day invasion, and his own role to question contemporary emphasis on the Holocaust and American failure to rescue European Jews as the main interpretive prism to understand the war, especially where American Jews are concerned.

How should historians of American religion approach World War II? More specifically, is the Holocaust the proper point of departure, even though it is the critical—indeed, overwhelming—event that necessarily dominates historical consciousness? When we look at American Jews, do we see them standing in the shadow of their European brethren, ineffectual witnesses to the disaster of Nazism, unable to mobilize politically to rescue Jews or even to convince the American government to slow the pace of slaughter?

Virtually all of the substantial scholarship on American Jews during World War II accepts this image.³ Sometimes the failure of American Jews forms a starting point to ask why they were so ineffectual in their politics, and sometimes it emerges as a damning conclusion, contrasting the frivolity of Jewish life in the United States with the disaster overtaking European Jewry. If we do picture American Jews as provincial bystanders making Jewish history largely as a sideshow of the central drama taking place on the European stage, they certainly seem inadequate to the extraordinary demands of the moment.

If we switch our gaze from the home front to the front line, however, then another series of questions with their related perspectives appears. What should we make of Bellush's use of the military's standard operating procedure in conducting services on the deck of a landing ship tank (LST)? What kind of context do a Protestant and Catholic reading from the New Testament provide for his socialist ser-

mon? How should we interpret Bellush's sermon en route to Omaha Beach? Is it an inconsequential expression of Jewish fervor, a footnote in Jewish history? Or does it suggest that we need to rethink the dominant framework of American and Jewish historiography of World War II? Do we perhaps have here an overlooked response of American Jews to the murder of European Jewry? Bellush clearly thought he was risking his life—as were the other non-Jewish GIs on the landing craft—to fight the same battles as his European brethren. World War II was his war as an American, a socialist, and a Jew.

Reframing World War II as an American Jewish war encourages exploration of such previously ignored aspects of the military experience as the implementation of what subsequently came to be called the Judeo-Christian tradition as standard operating procedure. How did this policy making Judaism one of the three fighting faiths of democracy affect the more than half million Jewish GIs who served in the armed forces?

"The experience of the war years," historian Lucy Dawidowicz concluded, "had a transforming effect on American Jews and on their ideas of themselves as Jews."⁴ This was especially true for those who served in the armed forces. Military service gave a generation a common experience and encouraged them to identify the democratic ideals of the United States with their own Jewish values. "A new motif has entered our lives," declared Harry Essrig shortly after the war had ended.

It draws its inspiration from many sources: from our active and full-hearted participation in the anti-fascist war, from the depths of the Jewish tragedy in Europe, from the note of militancy sounded by the Jews in the ranks of Partisan and Underground movements, and from the spirit of defiance with which our brothers in Palestine are withstanding the threat to their independent national existence.

Essrig served as chaplain for three years with the Ninth Air Force, most of those years in Europe. As chaplain, however, he also credited "the status and prestige which was accorded to our faith in the armed forces" for changing Jewish self-perceptions and encouraging Jews to feel equal to other Americans. Essrig saw "an official recognition of our place in the spiritual pattern of America and an endeavor up and down the echelons of command to make this equality of status manifest in our lives."⁵ This recognition of a Jewish place "in the spiritual pattern of America" that would subsequently shape the identity of American Jews came to be identified with the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Emerging from the war, the concept of the Judeo-Christian

tradition acquired salience for many Jews and Protestants—and, to a lesser extent, Catholics—not merely as democratic platitudes but also as a viable progressive faith for Americans that gave them a sense of purpose and identity. Since the Judeo-Christian tradition constructs a framework of meaning for understanding World War II as an American Jewish war, it is worthwhile exploring how it developed. Such an examination also prompts us to pay attention to how elite thinkers and leaders translated their ideological politics into pragmatic lived reality. The war created an opportunity to test ideas regarding Judaism and its place within American society as well as providing a challenge to combat endemic American antisemitism. “The overwhelming Protestant spirit of America in the first decades of this century,” historian Benny Kraut contends, “confronted Jews with the need to find some conceptually coherent reasoning that would articulate and reconcile their American and Jewish identities, while concomitantly legitimating their place as equals in a Protestant-dominated country.”⁶ Many Jews found this coherence in the Judeo-Christian tradition, especially as mediated through the experience of military service. Although the term itself remained largely within the province of intellectuals during the war years and was not standardized until the 1950’s, the practice of the concept within the armed forces—its production and performance as standard operating procedure—reached large numbers of officers and enlisted men.

In the 1930’s, “fascist fellow-travelers and anti-Semites had appropriated ‘Christian’ as an identifying mark,” Mark Silk has argued. “‘Judeo-Christian’ thus became a catchword for the other side.” The “other side” included liberal Jewish and Christian religious and educational leaders as well as American communists, especially during the popular front years. The Jewish radical Joseph Freeman employed the term in his autobiographical *An American Testament* in 1936. Silk points out that, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, “what brought this usage into regular discourse was opposition to fascism.” Vice-Presidential candidate Henry Wallace affirmed such a position in a 1940 article on “Judaism and Americanism” in the *Menorah Journal*. “The Christians of this land share with the Jews the tradition of the prophets,” he wrote. “This tradition . . . is fundamental to American democracy, both political and economic.” Claiming the prophetic vision of economic justice for Americans, both Jews and Christians, Wallace then used that heritage to denounce those who stood outside of it. “There is very little in common,” he observed, “between the Prussian militarist spirit and the traditions of the Jews and Christians.” Wallace urged upon his readers the need for greater attention to economic democracy and concluded that “the Jewish tradition, the

Christian tradition, the democratic tradition and the American tradition are all one."⁷

The idea of a Judeo-Christian tradition increasingly attracted supporters after the United States entered the war. Wartime politics and the need for unity, coupled with a sense of urgency produced by deaths in battle, brought religion closer to universalist political ideologies. Reform leader Julian Morgenstern observed in his presidential address that opened the 1942–43 academic year of the Hebrew Union College that "today we realize, as never since Christianity's birth, how intimate are the relations of the two religions, so intimate and insoluble that they are truly, basically one." Morgenstern meant here "that they have a common descent, a common vision, hope, mission, face a common foe and a common fate, must achieve a common victory or share a common death."⁸ American mobilization hastened the popularization and legitimation of the Judeo-Christian heritage, as Morgenstern called it, by providing a venue to translate the concept into practice. Transformed from political and religious rhetoric into prosaic standard operating procedure in the armed forces, the military version of the Judeo-Christian tradition allowed American Jews to recast their self-perceptions.

What can we learn from what Bellush recalled took place on the deck of *LST 379*? I think the narrative limns the outlines of religious change that presages the inclusion of Jews within an American faith. Protestant, Catholic, and Jew not only shared the deck but also a common biblical source of inspiration in their struggle. The sermon, however, enunciated a political vision in a religious setting. It affirmed American solidarity with Polish Jews, not as victims but as contemporary heroes who had fought the same battle as the soldiers listening were poised to do. Despite the ghetto fighters' defeat at the hands of the overwhelmingly more powerful Nazis, they inspired emulation. Their cause, Bellush urged his fellow GIs, was our cause because their cause was also the cause of FDR, the beloved American president. Jews and Americans were joined in a bitter war to free Europe and the world from the scourge of Nazi oppression and destruction. In Bellush's account, opposition to the common enemy of fascism facilitated the convergence of a socialist vision of a unified world with a radical sense of the progressive movement of history. Set within the religious framework of the standard operating procedure, the sermon produced a universalist theological claim challenging traditional Jewish and Christian self-understanding.

Bellush was not alone in seeing the heroism of Warsaw's Jews as linked to American war aims. Arthur Szyk's war bond picture, "Self Defense in Warsaw," makes a similar, related point. It illustrates

a variety of types of Jews, armed and heroic, fighting for their lives. At the bottom, Szyk quotes Hillel's dictum: "*im ayn ani li mi li* [if I am not for myself, who will be for me]?" An internationally known cartoonist, miniaturist, and artist, the Russian-born Szyk considered himself a militant Jew, "proud of his Jewishness." A supporter of Zionism, Szyk's picture emphasizes self-defense rather than the universal battle against a common foe. "For Szyk," Mortimer J. Cohen has noted, "World War II was fundamentally a struggle between the Jewish values of life and resurgent barbarism."⁹

Bellush's sermon on the landing craft thus signals to us how World War II affected a generation of American Jews. Many of them, like Bellush, interpreted the war as a fight against fascism. In this attitude, they often differed from their fellow GIs. Ari Lashner, a socialist Zionist activist, wrote from the U.S. Maritime Training School in Huntington, Long Island, that "there was no sympathy for what I presented as the fundamental issue of the war: the defeat of Fascism. Such an attitude was branded as 'idealistic,' 'noble.' This skepticism is healthier of course than the naive faith in slogans with which our fathers went to war," he admitted, "but it is the skepticism of prejudices, not of reason."¹⁰ In some Jews' understanding of the war as a battle against fascism, American democracy and the Jewish impulse to make the world a better place coalesced. Acting on their vision, Jewish GIs helped to build a common American ground for all to stand upon, a new American creed.

As it came to be understood during the war years, this new creed expressed a distinctive and essentially pluralist American religious faith that underpinned political democracy. The opening "greetings" of the Jewish Welfare Board's *Book of Jewish Thoughts*, which was widely distributed to GIs, spells out the fundamental "common faiths." These included belief in a supernatural power and in the Brotherhood of Man, as well as in "the individual dignity of man." A shared "belief in the existence of positive ethical standards of right and wrong that exist apart from the will of any man" also characterized the common faiths.¹¹ This American creed placed Jews and Judaism—and, by extension, Jewish history and culture—at its center alongside Christians and Christianity. Jews and Christians were equally Americans; both were members of a Judeo-Christian nation. Their shared religious values actually strengthened their differences in religious belief, observance, and heritage because their common faith sustained both freedom of religion and religious diversity.

Many American Jewish GIs felt free to ignore the question of competing loyalties during the war because both parts of their identi-

ty were in harmony. Chaplain Joshua Goldberg found this a living reality in the navy: "I wear the uniform of the Navy with complete ease from within and without," he affirmed in the middle of the war. "My Judaism and my Americanism are here so organically interwoven and so complement each other that I enjoy peace of mind and peace of soul."¹² The historic basis of the Judeo-Christian tradition could be found in the Bible, sacred scriptures shared by Christians and Jews. (Proponents of the Judeo-Christian tradition overlooked the fact that Jews and Christians, not to mention Catholics and Protestants, disagreed on what texts constituted the Bible.¹³)

The rising crescendo of antisemitism during the war—with good reason Leonard Dinnerstein's recent history of *Antisemitism in America* titles the chapter on World War II "Antisemitism at High Tide"—only served to emphasize the continuing need for a joint Jewish-Christian affirmation of common faith. If Congressman John Flanagan of West Virginia insisted on the House floor that he did not want "any Ginsberg" to lead his son in battle, liberals and radicals required a Judeo-Christian tradition to expose such sentiments as contrary to American beliefs.¹⁴ The deaths of the four chaplains on the SS *Dorchester* in January 1943—two Protestants, a Catholic, and a Jew—provided a powerful antidote to such prejudice. The image of the four men of God heroically giving away their lifevests and lifebelts to save soldiers and sailors, standing together on the sinking ship and praying in three languages—English, Latin, and Hebrew—symbolized for many the essence of America's Judeo-Christian faith.¹⁵

Efforts to discriminate against Jews represented enemy tactics. Proponents of the Judeo-Christian faith repeatedly attacked such prejudice as designed to divide and weaken democratic solidarity. In their foreword to *Jews in American Wars*, sponsored by the Jewish War Veterans in 1942, the authors averred that "the world of tomorrow will remember the cruel suffering of the Jews under Nazi domination and also that Hitler selected the Jews as his first victim. It will realize that he was moved not merely by hatred but by the fear that Jewish ideals, which are an integral part of our Judeo-Christian civilization, are the greatest obstacle to the success of his barbaric 'New Order.'" A war bond campaign advertisement directly addressed the issue. Pictured above a medic giving aid to a wounded soldier, it yells: "Wait, Soldier! Don't give him aid if he's not of your faith!" And then, in larger type, it asks: "WHO SAID THAT?" The answer: "No one on the battle front. . . . Out where the bullets are flying, our boys—our *American* boys—do not care if a wounded buddy is Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, nor whether he is Negro or White." The ad concludes that "OUR BOYS . . . have risen above the spectre of religious or racial dis-

crimination" and cautions its readers to "take heed, lest you weaken their faith in the principles for which they are fighting."¹⁶

This willingness to emphasize similarities reached a kind of apotheosis in "An Epistle to the Christians" by the Yiddish novelist and playwright Sholem Asch. Written during the war, *One Destiny* argued that Judaism and Christianity, rather than being opponents, actually complemented each other and provided the foundation for a Judeo-Christian civilization of the West. According to Asch, "the mystery of the messianic idea has created a religious character which is common to both Jew and Christian. It created similar religious values in both faiths." Both religions accept the same moral postulates, both are messianic faiths that anticipate the establishment of God's kingdom on earth, both embody mysteries of salvation through suffering. Therefore, Asch concluded, Jews and Christians share one destiny as co-workers in a common cause. "It is my profound belief that only the Jewish-Christian idea contains in itself the possibility of salvation for our tortured world," he wrote. "The Jewish-Christian idea makes us equal partners in your Christian ideal, just as it make[s] you equal partners in our Jewish one, in spite of the fact that we belong to separate faiths." Asch's polemic went further than most Jews were willing to go. Yet, his sentiment that Jews and Christians shared the same fate resonated with many as a call to fight Nazism and fascism as false gods.¹⁷

Most evidence for the increasing salience of the notion of a Judeo-Christian tradition comes from materials produced for chaplains because chaplains represented the religious faiths of America. They crafted services for Protestant, Catholic, and Jew together; they usually gave sermons to inspire soldiers with reasons for fighting beyond the call of duty and patriotism; they buried the dead, trying to give meaning to this ultimate sacrifice. Through its Commission on Programs in Army Camps, Naval and Air Bases, the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) attempted to stimulate mutual understanding. An early proponent of goodwill and the American way of tolerance, the NCCJ, founded in 1927, developed the technique of roundtables and speaking tours of representatives of the three "culture groups" in the 1930's to foster interfaith cooperation.¹⁸ During the war, its educational program against racial and religious hate movements enlisted "flying squadrons" of chaplains that represented "all three faiths to speak to service men all over the country." The chaplains addressed meetings at military bases. "Attendance was made compulsory by commanding officers, and the men were told by the chaplains that they are fighting not only for military victory but also for racial, political and religious equality," reported one newspaper.¹⁹

Many Jews who entered the chaplaincy embraced this moral vision. Most of them came from Reform or Conservative seminaries. The military required a college degree as well as three years at a theological seminary in addition to ordination for the chaplaincy. The Jewish Welfare Board, which coordinated recruitment and then assisted Jewish chaplains, refused to challenge military standards to accept Orthodox rabbis trained abroad.²⁰ Nonetheless, the 311 Jewish chaplains represented a cross section of American rabbis.²¹ The experience of a month of intensive training at the Chaplains' School at Harvard University made a deep impression on young rabbis. It was, Meyer Goldman thought, "perhaps the outstanding demonstration of brotherliness." For Jews who may have had little, if any, intimate contact with Christians, the course introduced them to a new set of peers. "Here, perhaps for the first time, men of all different denominations live together, sometimes eight in one room, eat together, work together and often pray together," Goldman reported. "Never once has any denominational question been raised, other than for the purpose of asking information. The spirit of cooperation is indeed beautiful."²² Indeed, the military aimed to stimulate just these reactions. In February 1943, the school adopted a new plan of room assignment "as a means of promoting understanding among men of different faiths. At that time four men were being quartered in most dormitory suites. So far as it could be arranged, a Catholic, a Jew, a Protestant of one of the liturgical churches, and one from an evangelical body were billeted together."²³

Goldman thought that chaplains took that spirit of mutual understanding with them to their respective bases and then tried to transmit those values to individual soldiers. Certainly, that was the situation he described on his Base Field at Boca Raton, Florida, where a technical school for the Army Air Forces was located. There, "one Sunday the Jewish Chaplain conducted the services for colored troops; the Catholic Chaplain presided over the Protestant services, and, on the previous Friday, the Protestant Chaplain took part in the Jewish services."²⁴

Ordinary GIs occasionally contributed to the spirit of brotherliness that was claimed as a hallmark of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Jewish GIs regularly volunteered for service details and gave up their weekend passes over the Christmas holidays so that Christian soldiers could celebrate either at home or on or off the base.²⁵ Solly Landau, an Orthodox German Jewish refugee who became a GI fourteen months after he arrived in the United States, thought that "Jews taking over duties of Gentiles on Christmas, for the privilege of getting leave on their holidays, almost became an institution." Although such symbolic actions may seem to be mere gestures of goodwill, Louis

Gruhin, an Orthodox Jew from Jersey City, took seriously such aspects of his faith. "On Christmas, I volunteered to be a table waiter," he wrote home to his mother and siblings. "They gave me an apron, and everybody said I looked very funny, but I zipped up and down the dining room, filling up the cider glasses, and bringing up seconds on Turkey for the boys. Then I also helped with the cleaning up." Gruhin followed up his efforts on behalf of Christian soldiers with religious observance of his own. "Friday night I went to the Services," he reported in the same letter. "It's a real orthodox service, except that some of the paragraphs are read in English, and the chapel is too far from our barracks." Occasionally, a soldier who loved to sing or play the piano offered to do so during Protestant worship. Chaplain Earl Sidler thought that such gestures were "far better than all the books and lectures written on religious tolerance in the results it obtains."²⁶

Others took, in retrospect, a less serious view of such gestures. "In those days, a much simpler time, the Army used to regularly assign Jews to guard and kitchen patrol (KP) duties on Christmas and Easter. I used to tell people that we volunteered, but we really did not," Arthur Zirul recalled. "On Christmas Eve 1943 that policy resulted in having Jews staffing the guard complement at Fort Lewis' eastern gate—from the officer of the guard right down to the bottom-line private." Fort Lewis in Washington state, Zirul's first assignment, was a highly restricted camp where guards were given live ammunition. He then recounts a funny story of a Jewish-Christian encounter:

It was just about midnight when a car full of very drunk and very lost war-plant workers went barreling through the eastern gate without so much as a pause. On post at that gate was my friend Irwin. Irwin was one of those men who understood the military mind—follow orders first and let the officers puzzle it out later.

When the car shot past him, Irwin shouted "HALT!!" three times and then unlimbered his .45 revolver (1898 issue) and emptied all six chambers at the fast disappearing vehicle. The shots sounded like cannon fire in the nearly deserted camp. Irwin screamed for the corporal of the guard. I was the corporal of the guard. When I heard the shots and the alarm, I immediately alerted the sergeant of the guard, Sgt. Weinbaum, who in turn awakened the officer of the guard, Capt. Goodman.

We all rushed to the site of the incident and helped to round up the six trespassers. They had fled the car in an understandably disorganized rout. The car itself was up on the curb, all four doors were open and there was not a mark on it. Fortunately for the six workers (and the spirit of the season), Irwin would not hit the side of a barn with a bulldozer.

We managed to herd the intruders into a group in front of Capt. Goodman and awaited his orders. Goodman looked at his watch and sighed. "It's Christmas Day," he said. "Put them back in the car and let them go."

As the car drove slowly out of sight, Capt. Goodman leveled a hard eye at my friend Irwin. "Please," he said, "don't shoot any more *goyim* today."²⁷

Zirul's story suggests how Jewish camaraderie continued to define itself even within the military. Here, the army's implementation of the Judeo-Christian tradition confirmed among Jews a sense of their own separateness.

Military orders often forced Jews to observe holidays even when they did not care to signal their difference. On Passover 1945, David Jacobs "was aboard a troopship headed for the Marianas. While we were anchored for a few days in Pearl Harbor waiting to join a convoy, our commanding officer called Sgt. Abe Farber and me to his stateroom," he recalled. "I don't know much about this Seder thing," said the colonel, "but I'm sure you two do. Just before we shipped out, the Seattle Jewish Welfare Board delivered crates of things to be used at what you call Seder time. Get that stuff up from the hold and carry out a Seder." Jacobs and Farber reluctantly followed orders, with great discomfort, roping off tables in the mess hall for a seder that would interfere with the enlisted men's nightly poker games. After improvising a seder plate, they faced the dilemma of who would lead the seder, and, since neither felt "quite up to the mission, [they] got into a hassle over who should conduct the service." The ideal candidate in their eyes, "a child of the yeshiva," was "in sickbay, comfortably tucked in with terminal seasickness." To make matters worse, most of the Jews on board preferred watching the evening's entertainment on deck. So, after advertising the wine and salami, Jacobs "ran below to find the ship's chaplain."

"Would you please attend our Seder?" I asked him. "And sir, I know you're Episcopalian, but since there's no Jewish chaplain aboard, would you consider presiding?"

"Of course," he said, observing that the Last Supper was also a Seder.

He was superb. He put on a JWB [Jewish Welfare Board] yarmulke, walked over to the ropes, untied them, invited one and all to join the party, and then conducted the ceremony in flawless Hebrew, translating as he went.²⁸

Without the Protestant chaplain's leadership, the seder undoubtedly would have faltered, despite the colonel's orders. With his support, it became a memorable event.

The impact of Jewish chaplains on Jewish GIs varied enormously.²⁹ Some wrote with scorn and derision of the misplaced priorities of the Jewish chaplains they encountered, especially their inability to reach out to ordinary GIs. Others gained a new sense of their own Jewish identity from the chaplains. Chaplains' standing as officers also produced mixed responses. Some nourished powerful resentments that spilled over into articles that appeared shortly after the war's end. Harold Ribalow, a Zionist who grew up in the Bronx in a home where Hebrew and Yiddish were spoken, enlisted in the army. After the war, he penned a rather bitter attack on Jewish chaplains in the labor Zionist monthly, *Jewish Frontier*. Although he argued "that the American Jewish soldier became more intensely aware of his heritage of Judaism than did, perhaps, the average Jew," Ribalow thought that, "to the GI who saw the chaplain as just another officer, who saw that the chaplain cannot act as a friend in a case where the Army and GI clash, who saw that chaplains never spoke out against discrimination against the enlisted man, the chaplain and his church was not taken seriously."³⁰

Yet, officer rank could also produce respect and admiration. Another New York Jew with ambitions to be a writer, Harry Gersh, served both in the army and the navy. Gersh, who had worked as a union organizer, grew up in a secular home. He had not had a bar mitzvah and rejected religion, accepting his parents' values. During his stint in the army, Gersh never found a chaplain he liked. But things were different in the navy. There, on "Sunday morning at 0900 all Catholic boots were mustered and marched off to services. At 1000 Protestants and Jews were marched off to their respective services. By this time," he reflected, "I was tired of being a boot and looking for a good issue to fight about. Like a bored Communist looking for a protest picketing. I found it in the Sunday services. I refused to go."

Gersh defended his action on the grounds of freedom of worship. Older than many of the men (he was in his thirties), the training officer decided to send him to the chaplain, a captain and experienced navy chaplain. "He asked me wasn't I proud to be a Jew and didn't I believe in God. Then he tried the one about older men and company commanders being examples to the young boys. Finally he gave up and said I could do as I pleased about services but to watch my step," Gersh reported. But it took less than two weeks for Gersh to change his mind about attending services. What prompted the change in heart was an indoctrination session for the entire battalion, given by another chaplain, a lieutenant. Gersh describes the scene:

The lieutenant rose, walked forward, and said, "I am a rabbi."
My reaction was similar to that of every boot in the battalion.

I sucked in my breath and sat forward. Then I sat back and listened hard.

The speech was unimportant. It was the standard chaplain's spiel to new servicemen. But the man was smart. His first sentence proved it. Most of the boys had never seen a real, live rabbi before. Most of them had never even thought of one. If they had run across the word it had evoked a mental picture of some anti-Semitic stereotype. And here was a man, an officer, the senior officer present, the man whom the chief and jay gees made way for and said "sir" to, a man who calmly walked forward and said, "I am a rabbi." I loved him.³¹

Chaplains made analogous discoveries in the military. They learned first how little they knew of American Jews and how few Jews were touched by the many organizations of American Jewry. Conservative Rabbi Morris Adler recounted one incident that brought home to him the unrepresentative character of his own Detroit congregation: "The same day brought to my office a Wac and an enlisted man," he wrote during the war, "both from large populated Eastern cities, impelled by curiosity to gaze upon the first rabbi whom they had ever met."³² Such marginal Jews came from diverse backgrounds, but they shared a common religious and cultural illiteracy. The minority of Jews who actually attended the GI synagogue usually came from Orthodox homes.

Regular Jewish chaplains and not just acting ones like Bellush preached the Judeo-Christian tradition whenever they got a chance. Louis Gruhin went to services regularly and often reported home to his mother, who worried about his religious observance. Writing from Camp Claiborne, Louisiana, in 1942, he described the organization of religious life in the military. "Last Sunday morning we dedicated our Chapel with a new Sefer Torah which was donated to us. The general came and made a pretty speech, and the ceremonies were beautiful, altho [*sic*] a bit strange." Recessionals and processionalists, which might have been more familiar to Reform Jews, struck Gruhin as odd. Yet, he noted the significance of the occasion.

The general said he was glad to see that services were going on, and he joined in the services himself. The Rabbi made a beautiful speech about nowhere on the broad earth could there be one building in which every faith could worship. The Rabbi from town made the benediction in Hebrew and the Chaplain of the 71st Infantry said it in English. "May the Lord bless you and keep you, May the Lord make His countenance to shine upon you, and grant you peace."

"Altogether," he concluded, "it was really an inspiring service."³³

Gruhin clearly got the message of the distinctive Americanness of the Judeo-Christian tradition, as well as how it was expressed in terms of shared sacred space and dual blessings in Hebrew, spoken by a Jew, and English, spoken by a Christian.

Not all champions of the Judeo-Christian tradition in the armed forces faced easy acceptance of their values and equal opportunities to present their views. Many also confronted considerable antisemitism even as they tried to implement rituals representing a common American creed. Artie Kolin, a Brooklyn Jew who enlisted in the Army Air Corps, recalled one Passover seder in the States where sitting on the dais was a colonel and a priest. The message delivered, however, diverged significantly from the Judeo-Christian tradition. When the priest got up, "he started to talk about [how] the young will help the old going over the mountain, in other words, implying that the Jews were old, dottering people, that the younger Christians were helping to get over the hump." But the Jewish officer did not let the Christian message pass uncontested. "What ever gave you the idea that we were old and dottering?" he said. "We are young and virile and we'll prove it to you." The priest apologized.³⁴

Perhaps the most significant example of the hurdles faced by those attempting to implement the Judeo-Christian tradition in the military can be found in the situation surrounding one of the preeminent sermons invoking that tradition: the sermon given by Reform rabbi Roland Gittelsohn on the occasion dedicating the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery on Iwo Jima. The sermon itself was powerful, equal perhaps to the difficult situation. "This is perhaps the grimmest, and surely the holiest task we have faced since D-Day," he began. The battle for Iwo Jima took 36 days and claimed 6,000 deaths and 17,000 additional casualties. The Fifth Marine Division suffered the most with 2,265 dead and 1,640 wounded.³⁵ Burying the dead had been extraordinarily difficult during the battle, and the dedication of the cemetery was a solemn and disturbing occasion. "Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the sides with us as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us." Gittelsohn's opening invoked what any chaplain might have said.

But he soon veered from what might have been expected: "They have paid the ghastly price of freedom," he proclaimed. "If that freedom be once again lost, as it was after the last war, the unforgivable blame will be ours, not theirs. So it is we, the living, who are here to be dedicated and consecrated."

We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way they fought and are buried in this war. Here lie men who loved America because their ancestors generations ago helped in her founding, and other men who loved her with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and Whites, rich men and poor—together. Here are Protestants, Catholics and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination, no prejudice, no hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

Any man among us, the living, who fails to understand that will thereby betray those who lie here dead. Whoever of us lifts his hand in hate against a brother or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow, mockery.

. . . We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last battle has been won, there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our backs in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here: We will not do that! We will join hands with Britain, China, Russia in peace, even as we have in war, to build the kind of world for which you died.

When the last shot has been fired there will still be those whose eyes are turned backward, not forward, who will be satisfied with those wide extremes of poverty and wealth in which the seeds of another war can breed. We promise you, our departed comrades: This too we will not permit! . . .

When the final cross has been placed in the last cemetery, once again there will be those to whom profit is more important than peace, who will insist with the voice of sweet reasonableness and appeasement that it is better to trade with the enemies of mankind than, by crushing them, to lose their profit. To you who sleep here silently, we give our promise: We will not listen! We will not forget that some of you were burnt with oil that came from American wells, that many of you were killed by shells fashioned from American steel. We promise that when once again men seek profit at your expense, we shall remember how you looked when we placed you reverently, lovingly, in the ground.³⁶

Gittelsohn's powerful religious sermon evoked similar political concerns as Bellush's impromptu address on the LST. Although each man came to his task from very different Jewish backgrounds, they shared similar attitudes toward the war and its meaning.

Contrary to widespread coverage given Gittelsohn's sermon, it was not preached at a common, interdenominational service. Such a service had been planned by the division chaplain, a Protestant. "As an eloquent expression of his own devotion to the teachings of Christianity and the high truths of democracy," the chaplain, Gittelsohn later explained, "invited me, as spokesman for the smallest religious minority in the Division, to preach the memorial service." He subsequently learned that this decision sparked an immediate protest by two Protestant chaplains, who objected vigorously to a Jewish chaplain "preaching over graves which were predominantly those of Christians. His answer was that the right of the Jewish chaplain to preach such a sermon was precisely one of the things for which we were fighting the war. When that approach failed," Gittelsohn continued,

the six Catholic padres with us on Iwo sent their senior representative to the Division Chaplain to speak for all of them. They were opposed in general to any joint Service of Memorial, and they were opposed in particular to a sermon preached by the Jewish chaplain! Furthermore, if he insisted on carrying out his original intention they would refuse to participate or attend!

The division chaplain yielded to the "objection of an entire church," and the sermon written for the combined service "was actually delivered at our own little Jewish Service."

Reflecting on the affair two years later, Gittelsohn admitted that he could not remember "anything in my life that made me so painfully heartsick. We had just come through nearly five weeks of miserable hell. Some of us had tried to serve men of all faiths and of no faith, . . . Protestants, Catholics and Jews had lived together, fought together, died together, and now lay buried together. But we the living could not unite to pray together!" Gittelsohn concluded that another Jew would have been equally unacceptable to his fellow chaplains, even though they preached in his name. Ironically, Gittelsohn's sermon received wide attention because three Protestant chaplains were so incensed at what had happened that they boycotted their own service and came instead to the Jewish service. One of them circulated the sermon and distributed it throughout the island.³⁷

World War II provided an arena not only for implementing in pragmatic terms the Judeo-Christian tradition as America's faith but also for translating that religious vision into a commitment of Ameri-

can Jewish GIs. The impact of their transformation of self-understanding registered beyond the camps and battlefields in civilian life. Military service turned half of all American Jewish men, aged eighteen to forty-four, into fighters, a goal of many of the prewar Jewish secular political movements. "To be a fighter," Irving Howe has written, "testified to the forging of collective selfhood."³⁸ As soldiers, Jews became normal Americans and men; like other normal American men, they returned to civilian life ready to struggle for their just deserts, including programs for liberal social change. Their common military experience helped spur Jewish political activism by changing their self-perceptions.

In that transformation, the creation of the Judeo-Christian tradition fostered a distinctively American religious worldview that embraced and sustained Jewish difference. In 1954, in a belated coda to the triumph of the Judeo-Christian tradition, the U.S. military changed the initial it stamped on the dogtags of Jewish soldiers from "H" to "J."³⁹ The switch from "Hebrew" to "Jew" reflected the acceptability of Jewish identification and the legitimacy of Judaism. It also may have marked the integration of Jews as whites into an America racially divided along color lines. Ironically, "Hebrew," as it was used in Congressional immigration law, suggested racial differences (along with "Semite"); in contrast, "Jew," by the 1950's, implied religious separation.⁴⁰

During World War II, a new understanding of American Jewish identity crystallized.⁴¹ This understanding drew upon important historical precedents, both intellectual and religious trends, but it received its definitive shape by the American armed forces. At its core lay a powerful concept: what came to be called the Judeo-Christian tradition.⁴² This notion legitimized Jewish American identity by making American Jews equal partners with Christian Americans. Articulated as a unitary idea, it turned Jews into almost identical twins of Christians, both sharing a common American heritage and democratic faith. As an American concept, its universal dimensions were assumed while its particularist roots were overlooked.

Jews discovered that the Judeo-Christian tradition allowed them to assert an identity not rooted in historical oppression, an ironic achievement considering the murder of European Jewry. Perhaps even more important, it gave the considerable number of nonreligious Jews, whose identity was largely ethnic or informed by political ideology, a convenient universalist rubric that accommodated their secular ethnicity and politics. The common enemy of fascism contributed to both its formulation and its efficacy. Because the first serious enactment of the Judeo-Christian tradition occurred within the Amer-

ican military, it contained a Jewish ecumenical dynamic. Mobilization made military experience commonplace for a generation of American Jews. In the American armed forces, Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, nonobservant Jews, and secularists (including Labor Zionists, Socialists, and Communists) all came together under a Jewish religious framework. The military recognized no other separatist formations than the religious.

The American armed forces recognized Judaism as one of the three faiths of democracy and provided Jewish chaplains and religious services in all theaters of war and all branches of the service. Serving as chaplains stimulated a spirit of cooperation among Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox rabbis that endured for decades after the war ended. Rabbi Philip Bernstein, who headed the coordinating Committee on Army and Navy Religious Activities of the National Jewish Welfare Board during the war, considered its abridged Jewish prayerbook to be one of the committee's most important accomplishments. "In its final war-time revision it represents a remarkable achievement," he wrote, "namely the agreement of the responsible Reform, Conservative and Orthodox rabbinate on a common prayerbook."⁴³

Were there losses involved in accepting the common ground of the Judeo-Christian tradition, especially as it developed out of a military experience that defined masculinity as well as Jewishness and Americanism? Most certainly there were, but few were able to recognize them in the postwar decades.⁴⁴ Even now, when the Judeo-Christian tradition is more often attacked than defended by American Jews, a sense of its value endures. The Judeo-Christian tradition challenged historic Jewish religious self-understanding, especially Jewish pietism and the idea of the chosen people, even as it strengthened modern Jewish liberalism and nationalism. It posited more restrictive gender roles for Jewish men even as it brought them closer to American norms. It built its pluralism upon consensus, a concept that now suggests hegemony though at the time it appeared to many Jews as opportunity. The subsequent history of the Judeo-Christian tradition in America has obscured its roots in World War II, when it gave a generation of Jewish GIs a way to understand themselves and the sacrifices they made.

Notes

I appreciate the comments, suggestions, and criticisms of earlier versions of this essay, particularly those of Ava Chamberlain, Aryeh Goren, Jeffrey Gurock, Roger Horowitz, Kathleen Joyce, Laura Levitt, Elizabeth McAl-

ister, Leonard Primiano, Jennifer Rycenga, Mel Scult, Jeffrey Shandler, Daniel Soyer, Russell F. Weigley, and Beth Wenger.

1. Bernard Bellush, "Roosevelt's Legacy," *Forward*, March 12, 1995, 7.
2. Four Freedoms quoted in James MacGregor Burns, *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom, 1940–45* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1970), 34.
3. See, most notably, David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941–1945* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); and David S. Wyman, *Paper Walls: America and the Refugee Crisis, 1938–1941* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1968). See also Yehuda Bauer, *American Jewry and the Holocaust: The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1939–1945* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1981); Monty Penkower, *The Jews Were Expendable* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983); Richard Breitman and Alan Kraut, *American Refugee Policy and European Jewry, 1933–1945* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust* (New York: Free Press, 1986); and Aaron Berman, *Nazism, the Jews and American Zionism, 1933–1948* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990). Henry Feingold's work is an exception, although his first book, *The Politics of Rescue: The Roosevelt Administration and the Holocaust, 1938–1945* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1970), places the issue of rescue at center stage.
4. Lucy Dawidowicz, *On Equal Terms: Jews in America, 1881–1981* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982), 129.
5. Harry Essrig, "The Jewish Chaplain Views American Living," *Reconstructionist*, April 5, 1946, 10–11.
6. Benny Kraut, "A Wary Collaboration: Jews, Catholics and the Protestant Goodwill Movement," in *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900–1960*, ed. William R. Hutchison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 194.
7. Mark Silk, "Notes on the Judeo-Christian Tradition in America," *American Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 66; Henry A. Wallace, "Judaism and Americanism," *Menorah Journal* 28, no. 2 (July–September 1940): 127, 123, 137.
8. Julian Morgenstern, "Judaism's Contribution to Post-War Religion," Hebrew Union College pamphlet, quoted in Silk, "Notes on the Judeo-Christian Tradition," 68.
9. Arthur Szyk, "Self Defense in Warsaw," *Jewish Forum*, January 1944, 21; Mortimer J. Cohen, "Arthur Szyk—Artist and Jew," *Reconstructionist*, June 14, 1946, 10–11.

10. However, "with the Japs it's different. They hate the Japs." Ari Lashner, "An Evening's Discussion," Correspondence Section, *Furrows*, June 1943, 30.

11. Frank L. Weil, "Greetings," in *A Book of Jewish Thoughts*, by Joseph H. Hertz (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1943), vii–viii.

12. Joshua L. Goldberg, "A Jewish Chaplain in the Navy," *Jewish Forum*, January 1943, 7.

13. In his history of the Jewish chaplaincy, *Rabbis at War: The CANRA Story* (Waltham, Mass.: American Jewish Historical Society, 1971), 36, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein notes that the Jewish Welfare Board's Committee on Army and Navy Religious Activities protested the inclusion of the sentence "Jews are the Synagogue of Satan" in the Catholic version of the New Testament distributed to soldiers.

14. Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 128–49, Flanagan reference on 136.

15. Alex J. Goldman, *Giants of Faith: Great American Rabbis* (New York: Citadel Press, 1964), 312–29, has a standard account of Rabbi Alexander D. Goode, the Jewish chaplain. Goode was a champion of brotherhood, eager to serve in the military. In January 1941, the navy rejected his application to serve as chaplain. After Pearl Harbor, the army accepted him. Bernstein, *Rabbis at War*, 9–10, notes that navy physical requirements were more demanding than the army's and that the navy also insisted on personal interviews to weed out "subversive elements." As a result, the navy rejected some outstanding rabbis who had been active in liberal causes.

16. J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk, "Foreword," in *Jews in American Wars* (New York: Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 1942), n.p.; see full-page advertisement in the *Jewish Forum*, January 1944, 23, emphasis in the original.

17. Sholem Asch, *One Destiny: An Epistle to the Christians*, trans. Milton Hindus (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1945), 70, 83.

In a review in *Commentary*, Theodore H. Gaster wrote: "In all of this Mr. Asch is, of course, merely echoing a philosophy which has, unhappily, gained an all too wide currency through the misguided, irrational and irresponsible zeal of interfaith partisans. Going to any length to promote concord between Christians and Jews—and that as a defense mechanism against anti-Semitism rather than as an urgent and inevitable expression of faith—exponents of interfaith amity have been perfectly willing to bolster their cause by the fiction of an ill-defined and actually non-existent 'Judeo-Christian civilization.'" Theodore H. Gaster, "A Judeo-Christian Civilization?" *Commentary*, March 1946, 91.

18. Kraut, "A Wary Collaboration," 204–6. Kraut characterizes the 1933 cross-country tour of the Reverend Everett R. Clinchy, Father John Ross, and Rabbi Morris Lazaron as "revolutionary" (217). Lazaron and Clinchy both served as chaplains in World War I, which suggests an interesting connection between the two wars. The NCCJ began as the National Conference of Jews and Christians and changed its name in 1938–39 (196).

19. "Anti-Hate Campaign Taken to War Plants," *New York Post*, December 31, 1943.

20. See Roy J. Honeywell, *Chaplains of the United States Army* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army, 1958), 222, 227.

21. Of the 311 Jewish chaplains commissioned, slightly less than half were Reform, around 30 percent were Conservative, and a quarter were Orthodox. The number of Jewish chaplains in the army was established by the War Department at 2 percent of the total Chaplain Corps based on the number of Jews in the army in 1928. It did not accurately represent the needs of those serving in World War II. By January 1945, the quota was raised to 3 percent to reflect the larger number of Jews in the army; in May 1945, it became 3.7 percent. See Alex Grobman, *Rekindling the Flame: American Jewish Chaplains and the Survivors of European Jewry, 1944–1948* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993), 9.

22. Chaplain Meyer J. Goldman, "War Experiences and Post-War Equality (A Symposium)," *Jewish Forum*, January 1944, 3.

23. Honeywell, *Chaplains of the United States Army*, 247–48. Perhaps the deaths of the four chaplains influenced this decision.

24. Goldman, "War Experiences and Post-War Equality," 3.

25. The Jewish Welfare Board and chaplains urged Jews to do this as an interfaith gesture of goodwill. See Bernstein, *Rabbis at War*, 37.

26. Solly Landau, essay number 1 in YIVO Essay Contest on the topic "My Experiences and Observations as a Jew and a soldier in World War II," p. 6; Louis A. Gruhin to Sophie Gruhin, Fort Dix, N.J., Sunday, December 28, 1941, collection of Peter Schweitzer, New York; Sidler quoted in Fredman and Falk, *Jews in American Wars*, 113.

27. Arthur Zirul, "Silent Night?" *International Jewish Monthly*, December 1991, 14.

28. David J. Jacobs, "Seder at Sea," *International Jewish Monthly*, December 1991, 40.

29. See the report of a veteran-chaplain conference in the *Reconstructionist*, April 5, 1946, 9–31.

30. Harold U. Ribalow, "The Failure of Jewish Chaplaincy," *Jewish Frontier*, June 1946, 10, 12.

31. Harry Gersh, "Chaplains on Land and Sea: A One-Man Survey," *Commentary*, August 1948, 172–73.

32. Morris Adler, "The Chaplain and the Rabbi," *Reconstructionist*, April 6, 1945, 10.

33. Louis A. Gruhin to Sophie Gruhin, Camp Claiborne, Louisiana, February 9, 1942, collection of Peter Schweitzer. Gruhin also observed his father's yarzeit and was careful to report how he observed it. In this case, he was able to get a minyan together three times during the week because there was another soldier who also had a yarzeit to observe.

34. Artie Kolin, interview with author, July 23, 1995.

35. Donald F. Crosby, *Battlefield Chaplains: Catholic Priests in World War II* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1994), 225.

36. Speech of Roland B. Gittelsohn on Iwo Jima at the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery in "Chaplain Gittelsohn on Iwo Jima: Kappa Frater Delivers Memorial Address," *Deltan of Phi Sigma Delta*, May 1945, 3.

37. Roland B. Gittelsohn, "Brothers All?" *Reconstructionist*, February 7, 1947, 11–12.

38. Irving Howe and Kenneth Libo, *World of Our Fathers* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976), 306–7.

39. Conversation with Rabbi David Lapp, director, Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy, National Jewish Welfare Board, June 11, 1986, in "Identifying Ourselves: The Historical Consciousness of American Jews," by Arthur A. Goren, paper presented at the American Jewish Historical Society annual meeting, 1986, 4, 23, n. 6.

40. Matthew Jacobson, "Jewishness, Justice, and Difference in Laura Z. Hobson's *A Gentleman's Agreement*," paper delivered at the American Studies Association annual meeting, November 10, 1995.

41. The concept of "identity" did not really enter American discourse until after the war, introduced by Erik Erikson's *Childhood and Society* (New York: Norton, 1950), 244–83, as Philip Gleason has shown in "Americans All: World War II and the Shaping of American Identity," *Review of Politics* 43, no. 4 (October 1981): 485–518, Erikson reference on 509.

42. The role of the American military in putting into operation the Judeo-Christian tradition probably helps to account for Eisenhower's famous remark to Marshal Zhukov: "In other words, our Government has no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious faith and I don't care what it is. With us of course it is the Judeo-Christian concept, but it must be a religion that all men are created equal." See Patrick Henry, "'And I Don't Care What It Is': The Tradition-History of a Civil Religion Proof-Text," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 49, no. 1 (March 1981): 41.

43. Bernstein, *Rabbis at War*, 18.

44. The attacks on the Judeo-Christian tradition in the 1950's, most notably by Will Herberg in *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1956) and Arthur A. Cohen in *The Myth of the Judeo-Christian Tradition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), focused on theological issues, not social ones.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.