

IDEAS FOR CLAL TALK/MARCH 1986

1. Differentiate between pluralism as a fact and as a value.

Perhaps also -- between legitimacy (i.e., legal permissibility, even in a social and not only juridical sense) and validity (in the sense of truth).

2. The acceptance of pluralism, whether as fact or as value, must not be equated with ethical or religious relativism, the proposition that because there are many kinds of "things" or points of view, and that all have an equal right in a democratic society, that they are necessarily equally valid. I accept pluralism as a religious value only within clearly circumscribed parameters. Otherwise, pluralism slides off into nihilism.

3. Many Orthodox Jews react all too predictably to issues of current controversy but the non-Orthodox have no monopoly on openness, thoughtfulness, and profound reflection. What is the prevailing view here, in this hall, on the following array of topics: "Who is A Jew?"/The Mormon Center in Jerusalem/Soccer Games in Israel on Shabbat/Civil Marriages in Israel/Interfaith Services in the United States/Abortion/Arranging Reform Services in a Synagogue in Cracow, the seat of one of the most eminent halakhas of all time whose rulings made the Shulchan Arukh acceptable to Ashkenazi Jewry, etc., etc. One of the not-so-unspoken themes of this conference is: Opposition to religious legislation in Israel. Other than pious rhetoric, I have heard

no clear formulation of how to keep Israel Jewish, no substitute for the wholesale rejection of all the profound thought that has gone into religious Zionism from the days of Reines, Kalisher, and Kook to our own day. If the Orthodox sin on the side of authoritarianism, vesting too much spiritual power in the decisions and judgments of the gedolim, their consensually accepted halakhic decisors, then too many non-Orthodox Jews, would deny authorities in matters spiritual to mere mortals, effectively endow popular liberal opinion with the same authority, and imagine that following the crowd instead of individual scholars is, somehow, a virtue.

4. I do not see "Judaism" as a basis of our unity: I cannot conceive of the unity of Sabbath observance and Sabbath desecration, of forbidden foods and kashruth, of the sanctity of marriage and intermarriage, of Judaism of divine revelation and a "Humanistic Judaism" which has read G-d out of Judaism"...

5. A few words about ethnicity: It plays a greater role, and should play a greater role in contemporary thinking than it did in the past. The Talmud teaches that, "An Israelite, even if he sins, remains an Israelite," but that did not automatically confer legitimacy on all Jews of all opinions. The war between the Hasidians and the Hellenizers was not exclusively a war between Jews and non-Jews; the enemies of the Hasmoneans were as much Hellenistic Jews as Hellenistic Gentiles. Their ethnic Jewishness did not convert them from foes to friends. The early Christians were Jews ethnically. Indeed, despite the fierce

opposition by our ancestors to them, they were accepted as Jews, albeit heretical Jews. But the critical break came when the Jewish Christians opened the gates to non-Halakhic conversions. Today, however, the situation is different. Emerging from the Holocaust, in which one of every three Jews was killed and in which the enemies of our people sought to destroy us, no matter what our opinions or perceptions, has given ethnicity a new value, a new significance, and a critical role in our thinking. I remember when my teacher, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, first ringingly declared what has since become a commonplace: In the ashes of Auchwitz and Treblinka, there are co-mingled loyal Jews and assimilated Jews, Hasidim and Mitnagdim, Orthodox and non-Orthodox, Eastern and Western Jews. Today we can no longer afford the luxury of untrammelled ideological debate taking its natural course and resulting, heaven forbid, in the permanent splitting apart of the Jewish people. That, I take it, is the purpose for which we are gathered.

6. Certain ground rules must be set, and included amongst them is the dialogic equivalent of the legal principle that the burden of proof lies upon him who wishes to make changes (ha-motzi me-havero alav ha-re'ayah). Orthodox Jews continue the tradition they have inherited from the past; those who make changes must be the ones ready to make substantive accommodations in order to achieve unity. This does not by any means excuse the Orthodox from real exertions to attain the integrity of the

wider Jewish community, but you cannot expect substantive -- and I emphasize that word -- changes to be made by a group whose very essence and definition is that they do not make substantive changes.

7. Let the Reform and Reconstructionist groups marry, but explain to the people they are marrying explicitly that they do so according to their understanding of marriage law, and that that is their interpretation of the operative phrase ke'dat Mosheh ve'Yisrael, and that, by clear implication, it is not done so as to accord with Orthodox law, i.e., Halakhah. This is so so that those Orthodox Jews who follow the ruling of Rabbi Moshe Feinstein will then be able to accept the progeny of the remarriage of people so married without fear of mamzerut.

8. Let the Reform and Reconstructionist (and Conservative as well) refuse to remarry one who was married with Orthodox kiddushin and without an Orthodox Get.

9. When I ask for an Orthodox Get, this should not be misunderstood as a plea for cornering the market on writing Gittin... There is no self pleading here. I tell you here and now that I have never written a Get or officiated at a divorce proceeding nor will I ever do so. The reason is not taste; it is competence. My training has not been in this area, and therefore I consider myself totally incompetent to do these things. There are no more than half a dozen to a dozen individuals in this country whose Gittin I would accept as valid.

That they are Orthodox does not imply the automatic disqualification of one who belongs to another group, provided that such a person fulfills all the qualifications necessary for a Dayyan. Indeed, there was one man, the late Rabbi Boaz Cohen, who officiated at Gittin and who was affiliated with the Jewish Theological Seminary, whose Gittin were widely accepted in the Orthodox community, including by Rabbi Soloveitchik and myself.

10. Intolerance from the Left: I oppose threats against the State of Israel and/or the UJA if Israel will not grant "recognition" to Reform/Conservative rabbis. Orthodox Jews fought for the State of Israel, with their blood and their means, even when they knew that their holy vision of "the Land of Israel according to the Torah of Israel" would not be accepted, certainly not fully, in a variety of ways: observant Jews were never given a diplomatic post under the early labor governments, etc., etc. -- yet, the only Orthodox Jews who withdrew their support of the State of Israel because of religious objections were... the Netorei Karta...

Yes, there is a fear in Centrist Orthodox circles of hostile criticism by less moderate wings of Orthodoxy. But before any self-righteousness sets in on the part of those who are non-Orthodox, consider your own reactions to those very few of your leaders who believe abortion is wrong or prayer in public schools is right, that egalitarianism in the synagogue is wrong and the Orthodox position on "Who is A Jew" is right, that pluralism is

wrong and the Moral Majority is right. And if you affirm any of these items, and are part of a non-Orthodox "establishment," how brave and courageous are you in advancing your thesis, especially when you have other items on your agenda to which you assign even greater priority? King Solomon said, Divrei hakhamim be'nahat nishma'im -- the words of the wise are heard in quiet, not by manifestos or press releases or public posturing.

11. There has been a great deal of talk for the past several years about Orthodox rabbis withholding "recognition" from non-Orthodox rabbis, and the latter, in turn, angrily demanding to know who authorized the former to grant or withhold recognition. So heated has the debate become, so inflamed the personal and political passions, that cool and disinterested analysis has become virtually impossible. But we are not going to make any headway unless we stop simmering for a while, separate our collective egos from the issues, and try to listen to each other and then argue calmly and dispassionately.

12. Now, one premise and three categories:

The premise is that Orthodox Judaism is, by its very nature, tied to a transcendent vision, to a Being which is beyond us; and that vision includes the revelation of Halakhah -- a way of life, formulated in terms of legal norms and discourse, which we accept as authoritative. It is the word of G-d, transmitted from Sinai down through the ages, and it is the backbone of the Jewish tradition. This Halakhah is given over to man to apply to his daily life, but he is not authorized to

dispose of it according to his personal whim. The Halakhah, like the United States Constitution, has rules that govern its change, amendment, and application. The central point is this: the Halakhah obligates us, it is above us; we are bound by it and must live within its perimeters even if doing so proves personally, politically, and even spiritually uncomfortable. It is, after all, the Word of G-d.

13. The three categories to consider in the "recognition" or legitimation/delegitimation issue are:

- a. Functional validity
- b. Spiritual dignity
- c. Jewish legitimacy or authenticity.

14. **Functional Validity:** Because Orthodox rabbis consider those movements not bound by the traditional Halakhah as heretical, they refuse to accord these rabbis any credibility as leaders of Jewish religious communities. Now, I consider this an error. Facts cannot be wished away by theories, no matter how much they are cherished. And the facts are that Reform and Conservative communities are not only more numerous than the Orthodox community, but they are also vital, powerful, and dynamic; they are committed to Jewish survival, according to their own lights; they are an invaluable part of Klal Yisrael; and they consider their rabbis as their leaders. From a functional point of view, therefore, Conservative and Reform rabbis are valid leaders of Jewish religious communities, and it

is both fatuous and self-defeating not to acknowledge this openly and draw the necessary consequences, e.g., of establishing friendly and harmonious relationships, in mutual respect and in honesty (not hiding the profound religious differences which divide us), and working together, all of us, towards the Jewish communal goals that we share and which unite us inextricably and indissolubly.

15. As an Orthodox Jew, I not only have no trouble in acknowledging functional validity to non-Orthodox rabbinic leadership, but also in granting that non-Orthodox rabbis and laymen may possess spiritual dignity. If they are sincere, if they believe in G-d, if they endeavor to carry out the consequences of their faith in a consistent manner -- then they are religious people. In this sense, they are no different from Orthodox Jews who may attain such spiritual dignity -- or may not, if their faith is not genuinely felt and if they do not struggle to have their conduct conform with their principles. Phonies abound in all camps, and should be respected by none, no matter what their labels. And sincerely devout people exist everywhere, and deserve the admiration of all.

16. But neither functional validity nor spiritual dignity are identical with Jewish legitimacy or rabbinic authenticity. "Validity" derives from the Latin validus, strong. It is a factual, descriptive term. "Legitimacy" derives from the Latin lex law. It is a normative and evaluative term.

17. Validity described the fact of one's religious

existence. Dignity refers to the quality of one's religious posture, not its content. It is the latter which, to my eyes, determines what we are terming Jewish legitimacy. Here I have no choice but to judge such legitimacy by my own understanding of what constitutes Judaism and what does not.

18. These commitments, which Orthodox Jews consider as mainstream Judaism from Sinai through the Talmud and down to our own day, are not so monolithic that they deny authenticity to any and all other claims. Indeed, as our tradition has it, there are "70 facets to Torah." G-d speaks in many accents. But such latitude is not infinite. It is clearly defined in Halakhah and in Jewish tradition. G-d may speak in many accents, as we have said, but -- His message is the same. And then, there are many areas which are gray, and one can make a case for or against authenticity.

19. But, at bottom, any vision of the truth excludes competing visions. And so does the Jewish commitment. Under no circumstances can an Orthodox Jew, for instance, consider as Jewishly authentic a view of Judaism which excludes faith in G-d -- such as "Humanistic Judaism"; or one which condones marriage of Jew with non-Jew; or one which rejects the halakhic prescriptions for Sabbath observance or the laws of divorce or the laws of kashruth. To ask that Orthodox Jews accept such interpretations as Jewishly legitimate in the name of pluralism, is to ask that we stop being Orthodox. If that is what pluralism

means, the price is too high, and the sacrifice simply not worth it.

20. If pluralism is just the newest name for what to my mind is a discredited ethical or religious relativism, I for one will have none of it.

21. Question of integrity vs. unity.

22. I do not at all deny that non-Orthodox groups have principles, deeply cherished ones. But as an Orthodox Jew I come to this forum with special problems; my principles, no less and no more firmly than others hold theirs, are by their nature more formalized and less flexible. I regret if my normative position makes me at times appear as less than the most eager participant in such discussions. It is not really my eagerness that is in question, as much as my essential inability to move beyond the perimeters of Halakhah, as far as I may be able to stretch them. Such boundaries encompass a certain latitude, but by no means can they be stretched to include any and all theories and practices, including antinomian ideas and conduct clearly violative of the Halakhah.

22. I understand, from a recent newspaper report, that the Rabbinical Assembly has abrogated the marital restrictions on mamzerim. How the abolition of the whole category of pesulei kahal can be reconciled with an avowed commitment to Halakhah is beyond me.

23. The Talmudic dictum, "both these and these are the words of the living G-d" can no more be stretched to cover all

current "interpretations of Judaism" than "Twinkle twinkle little star" can subsume as legitimate all competing astronomical theories -- including the one that the moon is made of green cheese.

24. What is even more serious, is the problem of gittin and mamzerut. The present prediction is that one out of two Jews now married will be divorced in 1990. The majority will not end their marriages with a get. This could lead to the astounding figure of one-third of the Jewish people being mamzerim and, by halakhic definition, unable to marry non-mamzerim.

25. The problem of a growing schism in the Diaspora is far more serious than the "Who is a Jew?" legislation. Because of non-Halakhic conversions and the lack of gittin, a growing number of Jews will be unacceptable marriage partners for a segment of the Jewish population. Rabbi Reuven Bulka's research on American Jewry indicates that 40% of Reform rabbis would preside at mixed marriages and 60% would refer interfaith couples to rabbis who would. The current rate of intermarriage in the United States is 40% and even higher among younger couples. Those who had not converted, and their children, would not be recognized as Jews by those committed to Halakha.

26. I question whether the law of Return has actually outlived its usefulness; if, instead of being a symbol of unity, it has actually become a source of national infection and divisiveness. However, the right of all Jews to come and live in

Israel should not be abolished.

27. Along with some distinguished and learned colleagues, I would not be opposed to an arrangement whereby the substantive halakhic problems in gittin and conversions were properly covered while the conversion took place under Reform or Conservative auspices. The question is whether this is really possible and whether there are people on each side who could deliver their side of the agreement.

28. On the matter of conversions, I propose the setting up of a qualified, unified Bet Din which would require tevilla and hatafat dam brit or Brit Milah and would require acceptance of mitzvot according to the fairly simple text of the Shulkhan Arukh. The prospective convert would be asked a general question about his/her intention to observe mitzvot.

29. I know that it may sound arbitrary and capricious, but ha-emet yoreh darko, truth must find its own way, and it has its own claims. Orthodox Jews are often told: If we recognize your divorces and conversions, why do you not reciprocally recognize ours? There is a surface plausibility to this argument, but -- only on the surface. The fact is that the overwhelming majority of non-Orthodox conversions are simply not in conformity with the Halakhah, whereas no Orthodox conversions violate any sacred principles of the Reform movement. There are, practically speaking no Reform gittin, and by no stretch of the imagination can any Orthodox rabbi recognize the validity of a remarriage when the first marriage, if it was valid, was not formally

severed by means of a get. There is nothing in the Orthodox, i.e., Halakhic, divorce procedure that makes the principals unmarriageable according to Reform or Conservative doctrine. This is very much akin to what Ben Gurion once said: An observant Jew cannot eat non-kosher food, but there is nothing in kosher food that militates against non-observant Jews eating it.

30. The call for Jewish unity is an earnest one -- and it is as important to Orthodox Jews as it is to Conservative and Reform and unaffiliated. But I regret the impression abroad that it is Orthodox Jews who are responsible for shattering Jewish unity. Remember that it was not the Orthodox who changed the ground rules of Jewish identity and Jewish marriage...

31. No matter how skeptical one is of the statistics about a major rift in the life of the Jewish people as a result of contested conversions and divorces, clearly it seems that such a catastrophic cleavage is inevitable. But inevitability should not deter us. When Justice Louis Brandeis was once asked what he thought of the inevitable he said, "I am opposed to it"... Well, we have to try our very best, within the limits of our integrity, to promote unity and to avoid disconcertingly inevitable disaster that looms before us.

32. I am not exclusively concerned about unity per se; Jews really have lived without unity since the days of our Father Jacob. Rather, I am deeply troubled that our intercommunal strife is distracting us from a common danger. There is a

social and communal and moral chaos that results from a gaping void, a noetic vacuum that gnaws at the innards of our young, that aggitates the minds and hearts of a whole generation of our people who have not been exposed to the G-d of Israel and to Torah, and who no longer have as a substitute what the assimilating Jews of a generation and two and more ago had, namely, a national consensus of a secularized "Americanism." Since Vietnam, this secular religion has become unstuck and undone. Hence the proliferation of cults, one crazier than the other, into which a disproportionately larger number of Jewish young people have been sucked. In this phenomenon of unconnected Jewish souls, searching for some transcendent anchor in a universe of values and meaning, lies our great promise -- and our great danger. It is for this reason as well as any other that Jewish unity is so particularly vital in our times. If we turn away from each other, if we allow ancient rivalries and ossified jealousies and institutional envies to determine our policies, we shall be fighting the wrong enemies; we shall be tilting against windmills while the earth opens up and swallows the best, the finest, and the most sensitive of our young. We have a sacred responsibility for all Jews, no matter where they belong or what their perceptions.

33. My conception of pluralism in the Jewish religious community can best be summed up by reference to a famous dictum in the Jewish tradition -- that there are "shiv'im panim la-Torah," there are seventy faces or facets to Torah. No one is

more valuable or significant or legitimate than the other sixty-nine. However -- there are only seventy, and not an infinite number of such faces or facets. A pluralism which accepts everything as co-legitimate is not pluralism, but the kind of relativism that leads to spiritual nihilism. If everything is kosher, nothing is kosher. If "Torah" has an infinite number of panim, then, to go to the Yiddish, "es hat bi'khelal nisht kein panim," it has no face at all, no value, no significance.

34. The predictions which we have heard about in the forthcoming cataclysm of an unbridgeable rupture within the Jewish community, leaves me deeply distressed and, of course, is probably the main reason that I am here this evening. Of course, I have -- as a suppose to all of you a healthy -- a healthy skepticism about statistics. I am always mindful of what Samuel Goldwyn used to say, "Never make forecasts, especially about the future." Nevertheless, for the issues are so fateful and enormously consequential, that we must pay attention to such forecast, even about the future.

35. A distinguished Conservative/Reconstructionist rabbi, writing in a Jewish periodical (Harold Schulweis, "Jewish Apartheid", in Moment, December 1985) wrote the following:

In the name of the unity and continuity of my people, I acknowledge the right and privilege of Jews of diverse schools of thought to build their own institutions of learning, to support the rabbis they elect to follow, to entrust their children to these rabbis for instructions.

These are words that I adopt as my own. I too acknowledge such

right and privilege, and have no argument with that statement in praise of unity. But the rest of the paragraph is one with which, unfortunately, I simply cannot go along. It reads as follows:

For the sake of Zion, I may criticize their methods of conversion or their interpretations of the law, but I am pledged to recognize their authority, to accept their marriages, their divorces, their conversions...

No, I am afraid that I cannot remain a Halakhic Jew and make such a blanket statement. Nor, indeed, can I see how a Conservative Jew can make such a statement. Are Conservative Jews ready to accept the authority of Reform rabbis when and if they marry Jews and unconverted Gentiles? Is he ready to accept Reform divorces when there are no divorces other than civil documents? Is he ready to accept Reform conversions in which there was no circumcision, no immersion in a mikvah, no kabbalat ha-mitzvot? If Conservative rabbis are not ready to accept such acts, Orthodox rabbis certainly cannot. And if they are prepared to legitimize them, then I confess that I do not know what Conservatism is or purports to be, or what indeed distinguishes the two movements from each other.

36. The issues of Jewish identity and the legitimacy of our line, i.e., mamzerut (especially the latter, because it is irreversible), are so fateful, so potentially devastating to the future unity of our people and the happiness of our children and grandchildren for generations to come, that we must rise above our denominational pride in an act that defies the normal rules

of institutional politics and reverse those policies that can well destroy our people. We Orthodox have not always conducted our polemics with mutual respect, the finest manners, or adequate sympathy for others. But these ought not prejudice those others against co-responsibility for the common future of all the House of Israel. Ki yishalkha binkha machar -- for some day our children will surely ask us: Why did you ignore our machar, why did you not take into account our Tomorrow, our future? That is a terrible question -- if one doesn't have an adequate answer.

37. I have come here much against the wishes of my fellow Orthodox Jews to the right of me, to plead for a process that will lead to avoiding the impending rift in the House of Israel, to avoiding personal and familial tragedy for thousands upon thousands of unborn children. I have come in a spirit of openness and frankness, ready to admit that not all justice lies with the Orthodox, that we have erred and overreached on this issue or that, we have often been insensitive and inadequately respectful of contrary views. Such an attitude has not endeared me or other Centrist Orthodox leaders to the rightest Orthodox camp.

But let me make this clear: if at the end of this process, taking place at this forum and elsewhere over the world, we remain with no change sufficiently substantive so that we can agree on the fundamental issues of Jewish identity and, even more, Jewish legitimacy and the right for our progeny to marry

each other; if, after we reach the ratio limits of halakhic flexibility, we are still at an impasse -- then we stand with the halakhic community, with those who share our basic vision of Torah, Halakhah, and Am Yisrael.

38. The easing of standards on entry into Judaism -- which is at the heart of the "Who is a Jew" problem can best be evaluated by viewing the natural development of such a step in the past. I refer to the attitude of the Tannaim to Christianity. As long as Christians were Jews who went astray after one they regarded as the Messiah, but otherwise kept their yichus (geniology) inviolable, they were regarded as minnim -- heretics, apostates, but still Jews. It was when the Jerusalem Church lost power and the Gentile Church gained ascendancy, when Christianity decided to abandon the halakhic standards for determining Jewish status and declared that effectively one could join the religion by self-declaration, that they were regarded by the Tannaim as a separate religion.

A rising young scholar, a professor N.Y.U., has recently studied the issue and came to the following conclusion:

In retrospect, the halakhot we have studied were what maintained the identity of the Jewish people. Had the rabbis relaxed these standards, accepting either the semi-proselytes or the earliest Gentile Christians into the Jewish people, Christians would quickly have become the majority within the expanded community of "Israel." Judaism as we know it would have ceased to exist even before reaching its codification in the Mishnah and the other great compilations of the Tannaitic tradition. Christianity would have been the sole heir to the traditions of Biblical antiquity, and observance of the commandments of the Torah would have disappeared within

just a few centuries. In short, it was the Halakhah and its definition of Jewish identity which saved the Jewish people and its heritage from extinction as a result of the newly emerging Christian ideology.

The ultimate parting of the ways for Judaism and Christianity took place when the adherence to Christianity no longer conformed to the halakhic definitions of a Jew. As these Gentile Christians, never converted to Judaism, through the legal requirement we have discussed, became the dominant stream in the Christian communities which the rabbis confronted, even in Palestine, the rabbis ceased to regard the Christians as a group of Jews with heretical views and Christianity as a Jewish sect. Rather, the rabbis began to regard the Christians as members of a separate community, and their teachings a perversion of the Biblical tradition... -- (Lawrence H. Schiffman, Who Was A Jew? {KTAV: 1985})

39. **Jewish Authenticity.** When I speak of authenticity or inauthenticity I refer to philosophies, policies, points of view, patterns of conduct -- but not to institutions, organizations, denominations. What Orthodox Judaism regards as authentic may be found in its own ranks but also amongst individuals identifying with other groups. The Shulchan Arukh knows of no tripartite division of Jewry, and the "Orthodox-Conservative-Reform" formulation is not part of the great Torah tradition. Authenticity, from this point of view, is the result of attitude and conduct, not official membership or formal affiliation.

40. **Patrilineal.** I am troubled by this revolutionary doctrine not only because of its obviously distabilizing effects upon Jewish unity, but also by another phenomenon: the requirement that a half-Jew -- whether the mother or the father is the Jewish parent -- is accorded Jewish status not by birth but

on the basis of performance. The requirement that such a person "prove" his/her Jewishness by some act of Jewish loyalty or commitment -- let us say, membership in a Temple or going to a School -- leads one to wonder: who will set the standards of such commitment? Who will judge and enforce such a "loyalty test?" Moreover, a marvelously paradoxical result is immediately evident: a child of a Jewish mother and a non-Jewish father who does not observe such minimal standards will fail to be recognized as Jewish by Reform standards, but will be considered Jewish by halakhic law!

41. Let us test our pluralism on only a few following items: How many Conservative rabbis would accept a Reform conversion? How many right-wing Reform rabbis would accept as valid a marriage with a non-Jew performed by left-wing Reform rabbis? And how many Conservative rabbis who co-officiate with their Reform colleagues at a totally Jewish wedding, would join in a non-Kosher wedding meal for fear of offending their colleagues' sensibilities and creating disunity in the community?

42. Another puzzling element in the Patrilineal Fallout: if half-Jews are accepted as full Jews without special consideration of the mother's status, why then there is no need for conversion! Hence, we no longer have to talk about immersion, circumcision, or acceptance of the mitzvot with regard to Reform Jews. The problem is only to find common ground on conversion between Orthodoxy and Conservatism, since Reform will effectively consider conversion superfluous in most cases, with

Conservative as well as Orthodox rejecting the Reform patrilineal doctrine and thus not recognizing children of Jewish fathers and gentile mothers as Jewish. Has Reform leadership really thought this matter through properly?

43. Senator Everett Dirksen: "I'm a man of unbending and fixed principles, and the first fixed and unbending principle is -- to be flexible."

44. Professor William Haber tells of Catholic labor leader who would pray before entering negotiations: "Lord, make me conciliatory -- but unyielding."

45. Mark Twain -- "Moderation in all things -- including moderation."