

THE MASK JEWS WEAR

The Self-Deceptions of American Jewry

by EUGENE B. BOROWITZ

SH'MA
A JOURNAL OF JEWISH RESPONSIBILITY
PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.

©1973, 1980

CHAPTER 2

The Rise of the Modern Marrano

The split in the Jewish self is comparatively recent in the long record of Jewish history. The men of the Bible and the rabbis of Talmudic times asked why they were called to be prophets or why they had to suffer. They never demanded to know why they were Jews. Despite the persecutions of the Middle Ages, the normal Jewish question was not Why are we Jewish? but When will the Messiah come to save and redeem us? The new question arises only with a radically new social situation.

The old segregated pattern of Jewish existence in dispersion from the Land of Israel is justly symbolized by the ghetto. In its standard form, the Jewish residential quarter of a city was walled in and its gates were locked each sundown. Such ghettos came into being around the year 1500 and lasted only some three hundred years, before the advent of the Emancipation destroyed them. Many scholars think that the imposition of the ghetto may be traced back to the Jewish practice of living together in close

The Rise of the Modern Marrano

community for protection from the Goy. The ship in maintaining the Jewish way of Eastern Europe was not created by and the *mellahs* of North Africa were less, these Jews too lived in isolated and communities. So the image of the locked gates of Western Europe poignantly reflected the Jew for the fifteen centuries, from the time Christianity became the official religion to 1800 (the time of the Emancipation) the era of legislated disabilities among Moslems. The businesses Jews might not enter, the trades they might not engage in, the hats or badger marks of Jewishness they had to wear, the taxes they had to listen to, the riots and pogroms they were subjected to.

When we read of the conditions under which this extended medieval period, they are only trying and disturbing. That makes that, as far as we can tell, throughout the Middle Ages, the Jew lived with great integrity of self. In Babylonia or Poland, during the Moslem conquests or Cossack pogroms, the Jew knew who he was and was not in any ambiguity about his identity. His self-conception for him as a Jew, negative though it was, was a source of a vailing inner certainty of commitment to a life of great worth and deep significance. Though he had his own special problems; but, being firmly accepted, it obviated all questions concerning his identity.

As feudalism waned and cities rose, the commercial realities made a place for the Jew. He came to be tolerated for his usefulness and was admitted as a citizen. Thus, in the middle of the Middle Ages, as the Jew stepped out of the ghetto, he knew immediately where he stood.

community for protection from the Gentile and for companionship in maintaining the Jewish way of life. Thus, the *shtetl* of Eastern Europe was not created by an imposed physical barrier and the *mellahs* of North Africa were often unwallled. Nonetheless, these Jews too lived in isolated and relatively self-contained communities. So the image of the locked and guarded ghetto gates of Western Europe poignantly expresses the situation of the Jew for the fifteen centuries, from the year 300 (about when Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire) to 1800 (the time of the Emancipation). The ghetto sums up an era of legislated disabilities among Moslems and Christians alike: the businesses Jews might not enter, the social activities they might not engage in, the hats or badges or other distinguishing marks of Jewishness they had to wear, the conversionist sermons they had to listen to, the riots and pogroms to which they were subjected.

When we read of the conditions under which Jews lived during this extended medieval period, they strike us as extraordinarily trying and disturbing. That makes it all the more surprising that, as far as we can tell, throughout this period the typical Jew lived with great integrity of self. In Babylonia, Franco-Germany or Poland, during the Moslem conquests, the Crusades or the Cossack pogroms, the Jew knew who he was. He felt no conflict or ambiguity about his identity. His society had a definite place for him as a Jew, negative though it was, and he had a counter-vailing inner certainty of commitment which gave his Jewishness great worth and deep significance. The degraded status caused its own special problems; but, being firmly fixed and publicly accepted, it obviated all questions concerning identity.

As feudalism waned and cities rose to dominance, their commercial realities made a place for the energetic, capable Jew, and he came to be tolerated for his usefulness long before he was admitted as a citizen. Thus, in the millennium and a half of the Middle Ages, as the Jew stepped out of "the ghetto" each morning, he knew immediately where he stood in the world at large.

The continual denigration from without did not destroy him as a person, for he set the balance straight within: he was one of God's own people, chosen by Him for a separate existence and dispersed by Him among the nations; God loved him and his people. So, Jews possessed an inalienable dignity. Through those long centuries, as their Moslem and Christian rulers more intensively segregated and oppressed them, the Jews were not overwhelmed. To a surprising extent, they transcended the harsh cruelty of their social situation and lived with high human nobility. If anything, the venom of their defamers made evident for them the truth that they, not their persecutors, were being true to the image of God in man.

With the emancipation of the Jews, beginning about the time of the French Revolution, the lengthy medieval era of the Jews comes to an end. Imposed segregation ceased and careers were opened to talents—to use the symbol once again, the ghetto walls came down. The Jew was admitted into society as an equal and given full rights as a citizen. That, in theory was what the Emancipation meant.

Let me quickly state some qualifications. The Emancipation was not one dramatic event, but a long process, proceeding at best by fits and starts and with great regional variation. The United States, with little tradition to defend, gave the Jews freedom almost from the start. England, France, the German states, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, were much more liberal than the principalities and nations of Eastern Europe. There the Emancipation was tediously slow, to the extent, as some have argued, that it hardly took place at all. And in North Africa, it was only where the French took over at the beginning of the twentieth century that there was any equality for the Jews. In more backward Moslem countries there was none. Moreover, one can hardly say the emancipatory process has ever, anywhere, been completed. The dream of freedom and equality lives and in many places is somewhat realized, but many Jews in the freest of coun-

tries still find themselves facing. And some countries, notably I

The revolution in the social degradation, but ironically has itself. The form of the problem that promised the Jew a full : disastrous Catholic-Protestant relief was increasingly sundere signed to the area of private : to think of itself less as a Ch neutral to the private religious faiths. That is why Jews co Jews in feudal times had n could not swear the Christian ciety to another. In the mode as such, came to have in on vented or encouraged his be Napoleon, in full imperial g speak for the French Jewish them was assurance that Jewi not interfere with civic respo of Napoleon's dozen questio the Jewish notables: "No. 4. not of the Jewish religion co No. 5. What conduct does J men not of the Jewish reli France and treated by the l France as their country? Ar bound to obey the laws an code?" The Sanhedrin had li intermarriage) in giving Nap effect, that Judaism, like Pr to good citizenship and bei another way of being perso

tries still find themselves facing social walls and psychic gates. And some countries, notably Russia, are less free than before.

The revolution in the social status of Jews has ended their degradation, but ironically has also destroyed their sure sense of self. The form of the problem is set by the social reconstruction that promised the Jew a full and equal role in society. After the disastrous Catholic-Protestant religious wars, the question of belief was increasingly sundered from the political realm and assigned to the area of private activity. The European state began to think of itself less as a Christian entity than as a secular one, neutral to the private religion of its citizens and tolerant of all faiths. That is why Jews could properly participate in it. The Jews in feudal times had necessarily been outsiders, for they could not swear the Christian oaths which tied one level of society to another. In the modern world the only interest the state, as such, came to have in one's Jewishness was whether it prevented or encouraged his being a good and loyal citizen. When Napoleon, in full imperial grandeur, summoned a Sanhedrin to speak for the French Jewish community, what he wanted from them was assurance that Jewish religious faith, privately held, did not interfere with civic responsibility as publicly enacted. Three of Napoleon's dozen questions placed the issue squarely before the Jewish notables: "No. 4. In the eyes of Jews, are Frenchmen not of the Jewish religion considered as brothers or as strangers? No. 5. What conduct does Jewish law prescribe toward Frenchmen not of the Jewish religion? No. 6. Do the Jews born in France and treated by the law as French citizens acknowledge France as their country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they bound to obey the laws and follow the directions of the civil code?" The Sanhedrin had little difficulty (except for the issue of intermarriage) in giving Napoleon what he wanted. They said, in effect, that Judaism, like Protestantism or Catholicism, is a spur to good citizenship and being Jewish is only, like Christianity, another way of being personally religious. Judaism becomes, so

to speak, another church of Western man. As Christianity is welcome in the modern state as an expression of conscience, so Judaism could be welcome.

But this transformation of the Jewish position in society was also the beginning of the divided Jewish self. In the modern state, rights are given to individuals, not to groups. In the medieval world, Moslem or Christian, the Jews had a fixed place in society *as a community*. The individual Jew received his status only by virtue of being a member of the local Jewish community. If it did not acknowledge him, the larger community could treat him as an outlaw. So, Jewish communities until modern times were often quite zealous about who could immigrate into their midst or take up residence among them. Thus, too, the threat of excommunication from the recognized community was quite serious.

There was no question in the mind of those French rationalists who fought for Jewish rights in post-Revolutionary France that the rights were given on a personal not a communal basis. In the National Assembly's great debate on this topic in December, 1789, Mirabeau denounced the idea that Jews or anyone else could be a nation within the French nation. But it was Clermont Tonnere, their other great defender, who put the thesis in classic form: "To the Jews as a nation we must deny everything. To the Jews as individuals we must grant everything." In the secular state, the Jew no longer had to be a member of the Jewish community in order to have a place in things. That was given one by virtue of his being a citizen. One had the right to be a Jew, of course, but that was a private matter, an additional commitment, something one added on to what society now recognized as one's essential identity. In actual practice, day by day, one learned that there were large and significant areas of existence where one's Jewishness was completely irrelevant. Society now taught the Jew that he was basically a citizen who might, in other areas of his life, be a Jew. The freedom granted was extraordinary by previous Jewish experience. Yet the conditions under which it was

given created a split in the Jewish self, increasingly distant due to the attractions and the handicaps involved in remaining Jewish.

The medieval Jew knew society. He had been emancipated, and in that sense he had seen an act of hospitality. He could not deny his Jewishness on the grounds of the new freedom. The Jew took advantage of the new freedom; as he wore the social language, attended its schools, mastered its economy, he could not help but find that the *goyim* were not so different. The world extended and fulfilled their obligations. They encouraged to work and study and one seemed concerned to live in harmony.

There were certainly problems. But they were solved slowly; but, by contrast to the ghetto, the new world by society was irresistible by personal efforts. Self-segregation no longer made sense. Life and the Jewish tradition seemed to merge into one another. Only some such as the Hasidim on the intellectual level, why Jews took advantage of the new freedom when there were pockets of resistance to it. Hasidim being the most obvious example. But masses, Jews sensed that there was a new world about Western civilization to enable them to live. But if the Gentile culture was so attractive, why bother being Jewish? The position had begun.

An equally difficult challenge came in asserting one's Jewishness. It mitigated one culturally and handicapped one in religion in the early decades of the new world. To affirm Jewishness was

given created a split in the Jewish soul. Its two parts became increasingly distant due to the attractiveness of the general society and the handicaps involved in remaining Jewish, even privately.

The medieval Jew knew society was hostile. The modern Jew has been emancipated, and in that act of emancipation he has seen an act of hospitality. He could not now easily justify his Jewishness on the grounds of the Gentiles' inhumanity. Rather the Jew took advantage of the opportunities offered by the Emancipation; as he wore the society's clothes, spoke its language, attended its schools, mastered its culture, benefited from its economy, he could not help but be impressed. Most Jews found that the *goyim* were not so bad, that the best of the new world extended and fulfilled their old Jewish hopes. People were encouraged to work and study and build a better world. Everyone seemed concerned to live in health and prosperity.

There were certainly problems and change was coming too slowly; but, by contrast to the ghetto, the richness of life offered by society was irresistible by personal and many Jewish standards. Self-segregation no longer made sense. The emancipated life and the Jewish tradition seemed somehow to fit very well into one another. Only some such sense of basic affinity explains, on the intellectual level, why Jews everywhere avidly took advantage of the new freedom when it was offered. Then as now there were pockets of resistance to modernity—the contemporary Hasidim being the most obvious example. In their overwhelming masses, Jews sensed that there was something sufficiently worthy about Western civilization to enable them to embrace it fully. But if the Gentile culture was so acceptable, one began to ask, why bother being Jewish? The positive pull of the Marrano role had begun.

An equally difficult challenge came from the realities involved in asserting one's Jewishness. It might be permitted, but it alienated one culturally and handicapped one personally. The Jewish religion in the early decades of the Emancipation still smelled of the ghetto. To affirm Jewishness seemed to mean committing

within. Without transforming Judaism to its new social context, there would have been little basis for remaining Jewish in the modern world. Yet the very act of adaptation acknowledges values in the general culture and thereby makes it difficult to have faith in the superiority, and thus the necessity, of being Jewish. Worse, to retain one's Jewishness became a special burden rather than a metaphysical privilege. The ideal of emancipation did not change certain social realities. Judaism remained a minority faith, scorned by the majority and marking as deviant all those who sought to practice it. The secular self seemed all that was needed. Thus, the old integrity of Jewish existence began to break apart. It is something of a wonder, under the circumstances, that so many Jews have insisted on remaining Jewish.

In the nearly two hundred years the emancipatory process has been under way, that interplay of pressures has been fundamental to Jewish existence. For American Jews, however, the emergence of a divided identity has been more recent. My own family history is, I think, rather typical. My grandfather, probably then in his twenties, left Sokolow, Poland (then Russia), before the turn of the century and immigrated to New York's Lower East Side. He spent the rest of his life there amidst a community of fellow immigrants. He never learned English. He didn't have to. Everyone in his environment spoke Yiddish. Though he was an American citizen and lived the greater part of his life in this country, he remained essentially a man of the *shtetl*. And he never had a problem of Jewish identity.

My grandfather finally managed to bring my father and my grandmother to this country about 1910. My father had just been *bar mitzvah*. Since my grandfather was working—\$2.50 a week for cleaning up a factory loft six days a week, twelve hours a day, with a short Friday afternoon and Shabbos off—he wanted my father to go to public school, get an education and become a doctor. My father, an activist and for some years already accustomed to looking after my grandmother, went instead and got a job. He never did get to school, though he taught himself the

arithmetic and systems analysis he came to need as he became involved in supervising mass manufacture. Though English became his primary tongue, he never gave up his Yiddish newspaper and, on several occasions when he became quite aroused in the hectic days of the 1940's, he insisted on the right to address the Columbus, Ohio, Jewish Community Council in Yiddish. My dad lived most of his life in the essentially non-Jewish environment of the American Middle West. He can hardly be called a *shtetl* figure. Yet he carried with him such rich and living memories of his youth in his own grandfather's house that he never had a problem of Jewish identity.

I was born in New York but grew up in Columbus, Ohio. Two of my earliest memories are of the Heyl Avenue Elementary School. One concerns being called to the principal's office for starting a fight with a boy named Fred on the playground. He had called me a "Christkiller." The other one is of my going to the principal's office to complain that it wasn't right to ask us to sing, as we marched into the auditorium for assembly, "Onward, Christian Soldiers." I could match those stories with others, good and bad, from Hebrew School and Sunday school and synagogue—but the point should by now be clear. I grew up in a Gentile community, essentially hospitable, occasionally hostile, but always distant from the Jewishness of my family and close community. Symptomatically, I understand Yiddish well, but never wanted to speak it. In my family the problem of Jewish identity begins with my generation. For many American Jews it is as recent as that.

The historical record of our community makes that easy to understand. The overwhelming proportion of American Jews derives from the countries of Eastern Europe that never achieved stable democracy or otherwise permitted Jews to integrate into their life freely. As a result, the great mass of world Jewry, 80 percent of which was in those countries as recently as 1880, barely participated in the Emancipation. One must not under-

estimate, then, the cultural shock our forebears from the *shtetl* to "grandfathers or fathers who materially segregated, almost medieval of the most technically advanced countries in the world. It was a time and culture, and we still slip phase of American Jewish life. pated Western Jewries, largely thousands of Jews to these shores 1880. This established a well-accipinning with the 1880's, found its pean Jews who arrived at the rate more each year (the war years) these immigrants had tasted the here. A minority had been educated. Others had made their way general literature or politics. None ters fleeing Anatevka at the end of its sentimentality, an appropriate families generally did not come Europe but, so to speak, fresh from

The immigrant generation before United States with such a weight c so bound up with Jewish values, Jewish memories, that no matter became, it was still quite patentl looking back at the various forms ism that some of them adopted as of their Jewish youth, we see them than as secularized Jewish types. alist socialists who were passionate Yiddish-speaking. And if they we language was Hebrew. Their Jew

estimate, then, the cultural shock involved in the emigrations of our forebears from the *shtetl* to "the Golden Land." Most of our grandfathers or fathers who made that transition left an essentially segregated, almost medieval, way of life, to come to one of the most technically advanced and democratically organized countries in the world. It was an incredibly long leap ahead in time and culture, and we still show its effects in almost every phase of American Jewish life. To be sure, the more emancipated Western Jewries, largely the German, had sent tens of thousands of Jews to these shores in the period from 1840 to 1880. This established a well-aculturated community that, beginning with the 1880's, found itself inundated by Eastern European Jews who arrived at the rate of a hundred thousand and more each year (the war years excepted) until 1924. Some of these immigrants had tasted the new freedom before arriving here. A minority had been educated in *gymnasias* or at universities. Others had made their way on their own into the world of general literature or politics. Nonetheless, Tevyeh and his daughters fleeing Anatevka at the end of *Fiddler on the Roof* is, for all its sentimentality, an appropriate depiction of our plight. Our families generally did not come to America from emancipated Europe but, so to speak, fresh from the ghetto.

The immigrant generation before World War I came to the United States with such a weight of Jewish experience, with lives so bound up with Jewish values, Jewish emotional patterns and Jewish memories, that no matter how American their life style became, it was still quite patently Jewish at its roots. Today, looking back at the various forms of humanism or cosmopolitanism that some of them adopted as a substitute for the narrowness of their Jewish youth, we see them less as modern universalists than as secularized Jewish types. Thus, if they were internationalist socialists who were passionately anti-Zionist, they still were Yiddish-speaking. And if they were antireligious Zionists, their language was Hebrew. Their Jewish identity went so deep in

them that even when they took a stance in radical defiance, they thought, of Jewish tradition, it showed itself to be somehow authentically Jewish.

What was true of that first generation largely did not carry over to the second. They could not transmit the genuineness of their accommodation to America to their children. They, the infant immigrants or the American-born, usually did not grow up living a rich and impressive Jewish life, one whose style had been created over many generations and by now fitted in well in the social order in which it functioned. The second generation tended to regard Jewishness in America as the remnants of a European life style that was poorly adapted to the American scene. For them, to be a Jew smacked of clinging to the immigrant status they were most eager to leave behind.

The primary movement of young American Jews in the generation before World War II took the form of a cultural exodus. There was continuing flight from the ghetto and its mores, and a passion to be fully American. This country seemed to offer the opportunity, unique in centuries of Jewish history, of full-scale human dignity. The possibility of being a man among men and the promise of economic and social advancement to those who would earn it made Jews love this country dearly. Even its negative features made them eager to blend into the majority. They saw the anti-Semitism around them and even felt it function in their lives with a power that is rather different from anything the present generation of Jews knows. But they responded to it by strategies of invisibility and protective camouflage. They gladly abandoned the Judaism and Jewish style that they felt stigmatized them. Their generation had a goal: to transform themselves quickly and expertly into proper Americans. That is, to become Marranos.

To recapture their mood, to try to jump the distance to their pursuit of escape from Jewishness, it will help to note the changed significance of certain acts. If a Jew has his nose straightened today, it is a matter of cosmetics. Then it was in

hope of not being identified as a Jewish name today it was a matter of convenience. Then it was an effort to greet an occasional ghetto intonation in a peculiar, perhaps charming way, discrimination, or at least so one carefully trained oneself to speak. All the old Jewish skills at discipline American Jews to become indistinguishable from genuine Americans having perfected their self-denial. Other Jews who, by their clumsiness might implicate them in their alienation they could of their evident Jewishness. In their best efforts at retraining they repudiated their connection with this country they came at too high a price or with too much measure to be untrue to their heritage.

We need to understand this style still lingers among us. We can make it by recalling how three famous men, Leonard Bernstein, New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra conductor. At the turn of the century he made his way into the cultural life of America, at least nominally. A German Jew, Walter no longer felt it necessary to repress it almost to the point of self-hatred. He was honest enough to say, at a press conference, that he was born a Jew. That as he could admit or assume. The result was that, Walter never participated in the Jewish life, that if he avoided everything Jewish. He forgot that he was a Jew—the sort of people like Admiral Hyman Rickover, or Jews like Leonard Bernstein. He

hope of not being identified as a Jew. If one of us Anglicizes his Slavic or Germanic name today it is almost certainly a matter of convenience. Then it was an effort to remain undetected. We greet an occasional ghetto intonation or gesture as part of your peculiar, perhaps charming way. Then it was an invitation to discrimination, or at least so one thought, and therefore one carefully trained oneself to speak without a Yiddish lilt or movement. All the old Jewish skills at survival came into play to discipline American Jews to comport themselves so that they might be indistinguishable from genuine, Protestant Americans. Once having perfected their self-denial, they were careful to avoid other Jews who, by their clumsiness with the new disguises, might implicate them in their alien ways. They destroyed what they could of their evident Jewishness, and what resisted their best efforts at retraining they repressed or denied. In their enchantment with this country they could not ask whether its good life came at too high a price or why they were expected in some measure to be untrue to their heritage.

We need to understand this style of Jewish self-denial, for it still lingers among us. We can make its changing nature clear by recalling how three famous men, each a conductor of the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra, treated their Jewishness. At the turn of the century, Gustav Mahler, in order to make his way into the cultural life of Vienna, converted to Catholicism, at least nominally. A generation later his disciple Bruno Walter no longer felt it necessary to leave Judaism formally. He rather repressed it almost to the point of completely denying it. He was honest enough to say, at the beginning of his autobiography, that he was born a Jew. That was as much Jewish identity as he could admit or assume. Though a victim of Nazi persecution, Walter never participated in any Jewish activity. He hoped that if he avoided everything Jewish, people would eventually forget that he was a Jew—the sort of strategy that I sense in many people like Admiral Hyman Rickover. However, we also have Jews like Leonard Bernstein. He seeks neither to escape nor to

evade. Rather, it has seemed quite natural for him to utilize Hebrew texts and chant in his First Symphony, and though he wrote a Mass for the dedication of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, no one accused him of apostasy.

Bernstein's mode of accommodation is healthy. Mahler's is clearly inauthentic. Walter's, however, is the most disturbing, for he is a walking lie. He lived in perpetual, self-created illusion, that he was not a Jew—when everyone knew that were he not a Jew he would not have been in the United States. Walter, typical of that generation, absorbed into his personality the dominant culture's distinction between public rights for persons and its ambivalent tolerance of Jewishness as a private though peculiar identity. He let the society teach him that his origins defiled him, and then he built his life on that judgment. He became a great conductor, but he paid a high human price to become and to remain accepted.

Bruno Walter's disciplined repression of his Jewishness is a transparent instance of a phenomenon frequently observed by sociologists in minority groups. They call it self-hate. Because it is generally quite unconscious, it is even more effective than conscious adaptations. Self-hate arises when the minority-group member, who takes so many of his values from the majority group, learns to think of himself in its terms. Because his group is strange in their eyes, he comes to believe himself strange. Since they look down on him, he begins to look down on himself, particularly on that which differentiates him. So, among Jews it was truly a compliment not to "look Jewish." Similarly, in the black community until recent years, the lighter one's skin, the higher one's social status was likely to be. Mahler is a somewhat healthier figure than Walter, for he and his friends have no qualms about the expediency of his conversion. But neither Walter nor others dare mention his Jewishness.

For children of ethnic and racial minorities, self-hatred comes as a natural part of growing up. As the child adopts the idioms,

the styles of dress and behavior, and he also internalizes its stereotypes, conversion does not suddenly stop merely hurting him by what he learns. He buries it deep within him. It can come out inverts, Negroes "pass." Or one can ingratiate himself into a group by turning it against the society. Progressively Jewish, or Indian, or Chinese, the professional question is turned into one begins to suspect that self-hate has been transformed into hostility against the majority. Self-hatred takes the form of disengagement from the community, often by seeking a subculture in which one might be identified. Years back, the American Culture, Christian Science or Unitarianism, the stigma of Jewishness. Secularists promote the primacy of international socialism or the primacy of human reason and culture. The forms of self-hatred was the same. The general society, in integrating into that society, sought to

There is something of the Bruno Walter in us. For some, even today, it is the secret they deplore the fact that they resent being thought odd, even though it is a direct handicap in their lives. Anybody can even be neutral toward things Jewish, but not anything that differentiates Jews from the majority group. It is futile to speak to him of the nobility of the Jewish tradition or of the nobility of the Jewish people, because he cannot be. He is not about Jewishness at all. His resistance is not a man who in his depths hates his Jewishness. A man who in his depths hates his Jewishness is not a therapeutic, not intellectual, help.

I do not think that Bruno Walter

the styles of dress and behavior, and the outlook of his society, he also internalizes its stereotypes of his people. This socialization does not suddenly stop merely because he finds himself being hurt by what he learns. He buries this negative self-image deep within him. It can come out in dramatic ways. Mahler converts, Negroes "pass." Or one can invert the devaluation of one's group by turning it against the society itself and becoming aggressively Jewish, or Indian, or Chicano. When every social or professional question is turned into an issue of minority rights, one begins to suspect that self-hate is the true motive, only now transformed into hostility against the society. More conventionally, self-hatred takes the form of dissociating oneself from one's community, often by seeking a substitute group through which one might be identified. Years back, Jews sought out Ethical Culture, Christian Science or Unitarianism as an escape from the stigma of Jewishness. Secularists preferred the alleged universalism of international socialism or the campus universality of human reason and culture. The forms varied, but the motive power was the same. The general society denigrated Jews, so they, in integrating in that society, sought to flee from their Jewishness.

There is something of the Bruno Walter syndrome in each of us. For some, even today, it is the basis of their being Jewish. Secretly they deplore the fact that they were born Jews. They resent being thought odd, even though their Jewishness is no direct handicap in their lives. Anyone who feels this way will not even be neutral toward things Jewish. His self-hatred will invest anything that differentiates Jews from the majority and especially those activities that call public attention to Jews as a separate group. It is futile to speak to him of the beauties of the Jewish tradition or of the nobility of the Jewish religion. He will not be impressed, because he cannot be. One cannot reason with him about Jewishness at all. His resistance is emotional, not logical. A man who in his depths hates himself for being Jewish needs therapeutic, not intellectual, help.

I do not think that Bruno Walter's self-denial is typical of

most American Jews in recent years. Most of us are, in this regard as in so many others rather "normal neurotics." Yet only a few years ago there occurred one of the most dramatic instances of Jewish inner self-conflict since the Emancipation.

Daniel Burros seemed only another peculiar youngster who devoted time and energy to the activities of the American Nazi Party. When he committed suicide, a study of his background revealed that he had been born and raised as a Jew. He so desperately wanted to stop being an outsider, he was so frantic to be part of the general culture, that he overidentified with its hatred of the Jews. He sought to obliterate his Jewish upbringing and joined wholeheartedly with those who hate Jews and wish to see them destroyed. He was a devoted Nazi until he found that he could not keep his origins secret. Then, more loyal to his ideology than to his very life, he killed himself—surely the ultimate in self-hatred. One would rather die than be Jewish. This feeling, I take it, is the Jewish version of the psychoanalytic death principle. If, then, there is some self-hatred in most modern Jews, we carry within us a pressure, great or small, toward self-annihilation. Until we overcome it—and that means, first, facing up to it—we cannot hope to live wholly and well.

I therefore have much sympathy for the concept of Black Power. As a Jew, I know personally that one can never truly be a person as long as he looks at himself with the eyes of those who hate him. I do not see how Jews can dodge the fact that, religious and social traditions aside, much of the best of Western literature from Marlowe to T. S. Eliot sees the Jew as intruder or enemy. So, every Jew appropriating even the best of this civilization must sooner or later come to terms with the scandal, the disgrace of his Jewishness. And this is one reason why we wear Marrano masks with such fixity—they enable us to escape from our stigmatized inner selves; they proclaim us to be just like everyone else.

If that is the primary dynamic behind our Marranohood no amount of intellectual analysis will persuade us that we are more

Jewish within than we, on our self-hatred prompts us to deny ourselves as purely universal men, I see where, in fact, our values fit Marrano makes analysis impossible will always defeat it. To those than self-acceptance as a Jew, that you are still reading probably positive attitude toward your Jewish element of self-hate in you, you've to a book dealing with the problem: one source of Jewish inner conflict have to see as we move on to other psyche still resists identification. Walter and others—like Bernard and Bennett Cerf—who have in putting to do with their heritage are of previous generation. We are, I accepting, and that can give us the to terms with what remains Jewish gained that more positive stance and ent search demands full treatment

Jewish within than we, on our surface, lead people to believe. If self-hatred prompts us to deny our Jewishness by identifying ourselves as purely universal men, we will not permit ourselves to see where, in fact, our values find root. This basis for being a Marrano makes analysis impossible. The need not to be Jewish will always defeat it. To those in whom self-hate is stronger than self-acceptance as a Jew, this book cannot say very much. That you are still reading probably means that you have a fairly positive attitude toward your Jewishness. But if there were no element of self-hate in you, you would probably not be attracted to a book dealing with the problem of Jewish identity. It remains one source of Jewish inner conflict for all of us, and you will have to see as we move on to other problems how much of your psyche still resists identification with things Jewish. But Bruno Walter and others—like Bernard Berenson, Walter Lippmann and Bennett Cerf—who have in public life preferred to have nothing to do with their heritage are typical not of our time but of a previous generation. We are, I think, far more Jewishly self-accepting, and that can give us the strength to look at and come to terms with what remains Jewishly negative in us. How we gained that more positive stance and what it implies for our present search demands full treatment of its own.