

SHULY RUBIN SCHWARTZ

The Three Pillars of Ramah: Then and Now

RAMAH WAS A TRANSFORMATIVE EXPERIENCE for thousands of men and women fortunate enough to spend their formative years in its embrace. I count myself among those who benefited from the magic of Ramah and who sought to ensure that their own children also would be inspired by it. But as a graduate student in American Jewish history, I was determined to try and understand the nature of that magic, to contextualize the Ramah experiment, and to isolate those factors that made it unique. This interest culminated in my decision to write my master's thesis on the early years of Camp Ramah.

As I discovered then, Ramah was neither the first Jewish educational summer camp nor the largest. Earlier camps, such as Achvah, Cejwin, Modin, Yavneh, and Massad, had experimented with offering formal study, creating a Hebrew environment, fostering traditional Jewish living, promoting Zionism, and cultivating future leaders.¹ Ramah was not even the first incursion of the Conservative Movement into Jewish camping. Shortly after its founding in 1918, National Women's League had already looked into running a Jewish educational summer camp for girls. League officers wanted the next generation of Jewish girls to be better prepared than their mothers to establish Jewish homes, and they understood that a summer camp could be an ideal setting in which to model Jewish living. Women's League endorsed an existing camp, the Camp for Girls at Sylvan Lake, in return for assurances that the camp would be administered in accordance with Jewish law and that the counselors would be recommended by the League. Unfortunately, the camp functioned successfully for only one year. After a disappointing second season in 1921, Women's League withdrew its support.²

Ramah's uniqueness, then, did not stem from its role in pioneering the distinctive features of Jewish educational summer camping. What made Ramah work was the innovative way that it brought the aforementioned

SHULY RUBIN SCHWARTZ, Ph.D., is the Irving Lehrman Research Associate Professor of American Jewish History and the dean of graduate and undergraduate studies at The Jewish Theological Seminary.

elements together. At its founding, Ramah's success rested on three foundational pillars—Hebrew, Jewish living, and study—that reinforced each other to create the special Ramah ethos.

1. Hebrew

Beginning in the mid-1940s, several different stakeholders promoted summer camping as an ideal vehicle for increasing the Hebrew language competency of American Jewish children. For Jewish educators, camp offered the opportunity to maximize the number of hours a year that Jewish children who attended public school would be exposed to Hebrew and Jewish learning. Most American Jews embraced public school education as a vehicle for Americanization, and many Jewish educators shared this commitment. According to Moshe Davis, dean of the Teachers Institute of The Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS), the premise of Jewish educators

must be that the Jewish school system is complementary to, and not competitive with, public school education. This view is . . . taken out of a deep conviction that democracy and democratic living depend on an integrated as well as upon an enlightened citizenry. . . . The best means to such social integration is a system of common public education, for the public school system is the keystone of our democratic arch.³

Though Davis acknowledged that Jewish day schools would provide a better Jewish education than supplementary schools, he concluded that this would never be the answer for the majority of American Jewish children. Therefore, he felt it incumbent upon American Jewish educators to devise a way for public school children to receive an intensive Hebrew language-based Jewish education. For Davis and others, Hebrew proficiency was the essential foundation for intensive Jewish learning because it is the key to studying Jewish sacred texts in the original. To realize this goal, Davis and other Jewish educators latched on to the summer months as an untapped reservoir of time that could be devoted to intensive study of Hebrew language and Judaica.⁴

In their commitment to establishing Ramah as a Hebrew-speaking camp, Jewish educators were joined by Hebraists who saw the Hebrew language not only as the key to Jewish learning but also as the soul of Jewish culture. For them, teaching and speaking Hebrew in America was an affirmation of the yearning for the realization of the Zionist dream. Finally, others endorsed the centrality of Hebrew because they looked to Ramah to cultivate a learned elite for American Jewry, and they believed Hebrew competency to be essential for such leadership.⁵

2. Study

Like the element of the Hebrew language, educators hoped that formal study of Judaica in the summer would deepen and intensify the Jewish knowledge of public school children. Beginning with the first summer (1947), classes met five times a week for one and a half hours each day. For the first few weeks, lessons were devoted to teaching the Hebrew necessary for camp living. Later in the summer, classes included stories, discussions, poems, and geography—all focused on Palestine. The curriculum also included study of Bible, Talmud, Hebrew literature, grammar, and contemporary Jewish problems. Counselors made an effort to relate the formal study of topics such as Hebrew grammar, prayer, or rabbinic attitudes toward slander, gossip, or tale-bearing to the experiences that campers had in the bunk, during religious services, and on the ball field. This dedication to moral education and character building is as essential to the Ramah ethos as the commitment to recognizing in every camp activity—including music, arts and crafts, and drama—an opportunity to reinforce the Jewish educational lessons learned in classes.⁶

In addition to seeing formal study as a way to help campers progress more rapidly in their learning, Ramah's founders also saw regular classes as one way to demonstrate their philosophical commitment to Jewish study as an essential component of a full Jewish life. To demonstrate their devotion to study, Ramah required not only campers but everyone to study—from the director to the waiters. Engaging a full-time professor-in-residence was another way to model that dedication to Jewish learning. During the first summer, the professor-in-residence, Abraham Halkin, participated in general camp programming and also held regular and frequent discussions with the counselors. Because the counselors also served as teachers during that initial summer, Halkin's support proved invaluable. According to the director of the camp, Henry Goldberg, Halkin "inspired both campers and counsellors [*sic*] and more than anything else, contributed to the raising of the morale of the latter." Overworked counselor/teachers appreciated the support and encouragement that Halkin provided.⁷

3. Jewish Living

The third component of the Ramah vision—Jewish living—reflected the desire of Jewish educators to use the summer months to model Jewish living for those who did not grow up in observant families. Creating a vibrant Jewish community for campers would also foster pride in being Jewish and comfort in living as a Jew. As Gerson D. Cohen, a staff member and life-long supporter of Ramah who later served as Chancellor of JTS, recalled, Ramah "succeeded

in making us all proud and uninhibitedly Jewish in our behavior.” Ramah normalized Jewish living, enabling Jews who lived in isolation from one another during the year to feel comfortable with an observant lifestyle.⁸

The main outline of Ramah living had already emerged in the first summer. The camp was strictly kosher, and Shabbat was observed. Zionism was also an essential element of Ramah’s Jewish living, and knowledge and love of Palestine permeated the arts and crafts, drama, and music programs. Religious services were held every morning and Friday evenings. (Attendance at Shabbat *minhah* was voluntary.) Campers also vied with each other to lead the Grace after Meals. As Goldberg recalled, “We aimed to plant in the hearts of the campers a feeling for prayer and a desire to pray.” He noted that “at a glance one could tell that the camp was conducted under religious auspices.”⁹

Though promoting a traditional Jewish lifestyle, Ramah kept the definition of “Jewish living” vague. This attitude stemmed from Chancellor Louis Finkelstein, who did not want to define Jewish living too precisely because he felt that doing so would alienate Reform and Orthodox Jews. He wanted JTS to serve as an umbrella institution for all American Jews and to train leaders for the American Jewish community as a whole.¹⁰ Because Ramah fell under the auspices of JTS, it reflected this ethos as well. Moreover, in 1947, the leadership of the Conservative Movement had not yet fully defined Conservative Jewish living in a distinctive way. At this time, three years before the landmark *teshuvah* (rabbinic responsum) on riding to shul on Shabbat and decades before egalitarianism took hold, Conservative Judaism had yet to clarify a distinctive approach to Jewish living.

In addition to fulfilling the loftier goals of its founders, these three pillars were also designed to serve more focused ends, for American Jewry broadly and for JTS specifically. The reality and enormity of the Holocaust intensified the sense of responsibility that JTS leaders felt to produce indigenous leaders for the post-war American Jewish community. But in the 1940s, JTS was painfully aware of its inability to meet this need. The Teachers Institute was in danger of being closed due to low enrollment; JTS discontinued its freshman class because of the war, and only two students graduated in 1946.¹¹ JTS desperately needed to increase enrollment in its schools if it was to thrive in the post-war era and meet the growing need for Jewish leaders throughout the country. To that end, JTS established both Ramah and the year-round youth organization for teenagers, Leaders Training Fellowship (LTF), to inspire young Jews to study at JTS and then to take on Jewish leadership roles in the American Jewish community.¹² As Max Arzst explained in 1944: “To train enough rabbis to help share the burdens . . . to educate teachers, to provide for

the development of scholars (who will raise future generations of rabbis and teachers), is a fundamental need of our time, and a principal obligation of the Seminary to Judaism.”¹³

The growth of Ramah was part and parcel of the larger growth of organized camping in America. As American Jews became more and more acculturated to the larger society around them, they too embraced camping as a natural part of the summer experience of American Jewish children. By the 1940s, American Jews had become more receptive not only to Jewish camps, but to ones that actively fostered Jewish values and identity.¹⁴ But the success of Ramah can be attributed not only to trends in the larger society. Its singular achievement lay first and foremost in the way in which each of its ideological pillars strengthened the other to create the exceptional environment that enabled the camp to reach its goals.

Several other factors also contributed to its enormous success. First, the establishment of Ramah grew out of the convergence of the interests and needs of lay leaders in Chicago and professionals at JTS. The yearning of Midwestern lay leaders for an intensive Jewish summer camp experience for their children matched the desire of the professional educators to provide such an experience. This led to the crucial collaboration of local lay leaders and JTS professionals that modeled the lay-professional cooperation essential to enduring institutional change.

Second, because JTS understood Ramah to be a “farm team” for its future leaders, it focused on recruiting the best students from the best communities and on hiring the most talented and dedicated adults for all of its positions—from professor-in-residence to kitchen staff. Rigorous requirements that included a minimum number of hours of formal study each week, facility with Hebrew language, and a commitment to Jewish observance, assured that only a highly selective population of campers and staff would be drawn to spend a summer at Ramah. The camp demanded a great deal from everyone in terms of study, observance, Hebrew speaking, and community building. In return, campers and staff were inspired by the mission of Ramah and felt privileged to be part of a pioneering cohort that believed it would make a difference in the future of American Jewry.

Third, in contrast to the other Jewish educational summer camps of the era, Ramah cultivated a rebellious stance vis à vis the predominant American Jewish ethos. According to Jonathan Sarna, Shlomo Shulsinger strove, through Camp Massad, to mold children to live a Hebrew-infused Jewish life. Through the Brandeis Camp Institute, Shlomo Bardin sought to transform college-age men and women into Jewish personalities.¹⁵ The success of Ramah stemmed

from its openly subversive goal of cultivating a Conservative Jewish elite that would “supplant everyday American values and behavior with authentic Jewish values and behavior but as well to change the mores of the Conservative movement.”¹⁶ The camp focused its efforts on pre-teenage youngsters and especially on teenagers, the age group most susceptible to role modeling and to rebelling against parental authority, to create a distinctive identity that would be reinforced by peers and role models. In this way, the leadership of Ramah hoped to invigorate Conservative Judaism by cultivating an elite that would be more dedicated, knowledgeable, and observant than their parents.

Finally, Ramah’s success also stemmed from a sense of desperate urgency about ensuring Jewish survival. In the post-war era, Ramah’s founders felt they could afford no margin of error. They believed that Conservative Judaism could not sustain itself without Ramah and that American Jewry would not be able to cultivate a rich Jewish life without Conservative Judaism. With such missionary zeal fueled by the haunting specter of failure, the founders had the motivation to fuel its success.

The Movement Today

Ramah has undergone an enormous transformation in the sixty years since its founding, growing from one camp in Wisconsin to a movement that currently serves over 6,500 campers and 1,500 college-aged staff members, both here and in Israel. Ramah has touched tens of thousands of lives over the past six decades, and during this time, American Jewry has changed dramatically in size, scope, and constituency. The community has become more secure economically and more fully integrated into American society on every level—economically, socially, culturally, demographically, and politically. At the same time, the maturation of the Zionist vision, the influence of Mordecai M. Kaplan’s expansive view of Judaism as a civilization, and the influx of refugees and survivors both before and after the Holocaust, have all led to a deepening of American Jewish life. The growth of Jewish day schools and Hebrew high schools, the burgeoning of Jewish studies on college campuses, and the flourishing of artistic expressions of Judaism, including art, music, and literature have contributed to a richer Jewish life in the past thirty years. Jews also have mirrored the concerns of Americans at large as they became involved in such reform movements as feminism and civil rights. To meet the growing needs of this evolving community, Ramah has been challenged over and over again to rethink its initial mission.

For example, as the Ramah movement grew to include several summer camps, its leaders had to rethink the elitist orientation. Should the benefits of Ramah be extended to as many campers as possible, or ought it remain

as exclusive as it was in its early years in order to stay focused on leadership cultivation? Religious school principals debated this very issue in 1964. In an educators' forum, seven principals whose schools sent large numbers of students to Ramah reflected on its impact. Six out of the seven praised Ramah's impact on the viability and success of their Hebrew high school programs. They were elated that returning campers infused their religious schools, junior congregations, and teen groups with new vitality. But one of these educators, Jay B. Stern of Temple Beth El in Rochester, New York, mused that:

Jewish educators . . . have often been heard to deride Ramah successes by noting that only the best pupils get into the camps. Our schools, too, would be fabulously successful if we could limit enrollment to the top five percent of pupils who are highly motivated, of above average intelligence, and from the most positive homes. . . . One wonders, therefore, whether the camps should not accept a limited number of unmotivated and even untrained campers, especially on the upper teen age level. . . . [W]e tend to feel that a minority of such campers among the majority of carefully selected top students would be carried along with the group.¹⁷

Stern suggested that Ramah's wild success depended on its exclusivity, and he challenged Ramah to loosen its standards so that even the "unmotivated" could be influenced by it. Both lay and professional leaders of Ramah shared the desire to make the Ramah experience available to more and more Conservative Jewish children. The establishment of the National Ramah Commission (NRC) in 1951 provided the organizational infrastructure for realizing this goal, and the opening of several additional Ramah camps in Nyack, the Berkshires, and Palmer in the 1960s made this possible. In fact, Camp Ramah in Wingdale, New York (Ramah in the Berkshires) was the first camp acquired under a ten-year plan adopted by the NRC in 1962 that called for the acquisition of five new camps before 1972, "in order to meet the growing demand for admission." Again, the increasing interest in summer camping on the part of middle-class American Jewish families mirrored the steady rate of growth of organized camping in the United States. In 1963, more than 2,000 children attended five Ramah camps or teen seminars, "but for each child served, another, fully qualified, had to be rejected for lack of space." That Ramah had moved away from a focus on recruiting only the most motivated students is evident in its desire to meet the growing demand and offer its summer experience to all those children who wanted to attend. Tellingly, the 1963 Berkshires press release does not mention cultivating an elite Jewish leadership as the overall objective of the "Ramah program." Rather, the goal of Ramah "which has attracted large numbers of youngsters from the American Jewish community, is to help the child relate the Jewish tradition to his own life in an American community."¹⁸

The dreams of the national leadership of Ramah in the 1960s exceeded even this expansion. Going beyond Stern's gentle challenge, one of Ramah's long-range thinkers noted that "If we can ever establish twenty Ramah camps throughout the country, we will succeed in virtually reshaping the very nature and character of the American Jewish Community."¹⁹

By the 1960s, then, the national leadership of Ramah was committed to offering a Jewish educational summer experience to the masses of Conservative Jewish children. However, as Ramah has come closer to achieving this goal, it has found itself faced with new challenges. The increased number of Ramah camps, with their larger facilities, has created continuing financial pressure to fill each camp to capacity.²⁰ This has led to a further diminution of educational standards for acceptance, leading Ramah directors today to focus on issues such as, "what are the minimum acceptable educational policies and standards of any Ramah camp."²¹

Such concerns have led Ramah directors far afield from the goals of their predecessors. Does the original goal of fostering an elite group of leaders remain desirable, and if so, can Ramah still achieve that aim when it recruits thousands of campers each year? Even if these campers were all dedicated toward this goal, the camp leadership is faced with the impossible challenge of recruiting sufficient staff with the background, skills, and motivation necessary to realize this vision. Ironically, another factor that complicated achieving this goal is the flourishing Solomon Schechter Day School movement. More and more of the most motivated Ramah campers, who would be logical targets of elite training, come to camp with much of the background that Ramah initially was designed to provide. For these campers, "formal study, Hebrew language, and Jewish living" are not a subversive challenge to their year-round routine but rather a continuation of it. As the Ramah directors have noted with regard to the strong Hebrew language skills of day school campers, this reality is

a double-edged sword. On the one hand, there is greater Hebrew competence. On the other hand, it becomes more difficult to associate Hebrew usage with fun at camp, as so many campers associate Hebrew language with their academic lives at school."²²

This poses an immense challenge to the staff to find novel ways to motivate and excite their campers Jewishly. Moreover, this reality also places additional pressure on the camp to recruit staff members with the rich Hebrew and Judaic backgrounds necessary to fully engage with and challenge such campers. Finally, the increasing numbers of Conservative Jewish children in day schools has created an additional challenge for recruiting campers. The parents of

these children already are paying substantial tuition for their children's Jewish education during the year. Choosing day school education for their children has led some parents to opt to use the summer months to expose their children to "real world pursuits outside the Jewish orbit."²³

Related to these concerns are those of how to continue to engage Jewish children in their teenage years. Even those campers who are positively influenced by Ramah as youngsters often seek other venues for summer activity when they reach adolescence. Louis Newman, one of the early Ramah directors who deeply influenced the ideology of Ramah, felt strongly that Ramah must challenge its older campers with meaningful and exciting activities that tap into adolescent creativity, energy, and growing maturity.²⁴ Newman developed several successful ways for older campers to do this, including having them engage in meaningful work in camp and volunteer for service projects in neighboring communities. In his day, there were few competing programs to lure American Jewish teenagers, and Ramah offered a compelling alternative community for American Jewish teens. Today, the population of Ramah campers includes more preteens than teenagers, because teenagers are tempted by a myriad of other summer programs that offer them alternative ways to stretch their minds, bodies, and spirit. Opportunities for teen travel around the world abound as do service and learning programs and unpaid internships in areas of potential career interest. A myriad of pre-college programs attract students interested in strengthening their academic credentials to give them an edge in the college admissions process. What must Ramah offer to maintain its edge as the premier environment for influencing teenagers to dedicate themselves to becoming forces for change within the Conservative Movement, American Jewry, and the world? And, beyond this, how can Ramah help its teenagers transition successfully to adult leadership roles so that we might all reap the benefit of their creative thinking to help invigorate the Conservative Movement and beyond?

Today, Ramah meets this challenge in many ways by focusing its efforts on staff development. For example, the Weinstein Institute brings together younger staff members for several days in a learning and training program. This experience not only motivates them to return to camp with new energy and ideas, but it also fosters a shared sense of commitment to the goals of Ramah; and in so doing, it helps foster an elite nucleus within the Ramah system.²⁵

Finally, Ramah must also accommodate the needs of a more affluent American Jewish community that is more integrated into American life than ever before. Summer camp is no longer the exotic and special treat that it was for Jewish children in the 1950s and 1960s.²⁶ Potential campers are lured by

well-equipped summer homes and competing summer camps offering first-rate facilities in gorgeous settings that provide enrichment in the arts, sciences, and sports. Even those campers who choose to return to Ramah year after year face the new reality of an electronically connected world that inexorably has altered the camp experience. Campers who can check email regularly are no longer able to shut out their home life in order to fully immerse themselves in the camp experience. With these compelling pressures and opportunities, how can Ramah compete? How can we translate the magic of Ramah into the contemporary idiom so that it can have the same impact in the next sixty years that it had in its first sixty?

One example of innovative programming that models this translation is the Beit Midrash and Northwoods Kollel at Ramah in Wisconsin. The Beit Midrash, founded in 2000 by Josh Cahan and Aryeh Bernstein, offers intensive Talmud study

as an alternative to standard camp classes in Judaics and Hebrew. . . . [M]ishmar . . . draws campers from all backgrounds. It has grown in popularity to the point that this summer our library could barely hold the 150 participants. The singing is intense, the *divrei torah* simple and provocative, the atmosphere one of deep connectedness to God and to each other. . . . It has fostered a kind of powerful spiritual awakening. . . . Participants have come to see camp as a place of serious intellectual and religious growth. . . . Camp has thus become an avenue for increasing the presence and the level of Torah study not only in the Northwoods but in our feeder cities as well.²⁷

This is precisely what Ramah accomplished in the 1950s and early 1960s. By insisting that its campers engage in intensive Jewish study and Jewish living in a Hebrew-speaking environment, Ramah raised the level of religious school education, Jewish religious life in small communities, and Hebrew high school education. The Kollel today does not emphasize the original three pillars of Ramah in the same way. It does not, for example, stress spoken Hebrew language, and it focuses on Talmud study rather than on the study of a broad array of literary texts, including Hebrew poetry, Bible, and Israeli literature. Nevertheless, the Kollel has successfully translated the magic of Ramah's distinctiveness for a new generation. As Josh Cahan reports, the

Kollel and Beit Midrash have also been part of a flowering of higher-level programming throughout the camp, from more serious study in regular text classes to professional-quality opportunities in the performing and visual arts. . . .

Through this spiritual engagement we create the potential for these teenagers to be the foundation of engaged, spiritually connected, and thoughtful communities in college and beyond.²⁸

And the influence on participants is palpable. As one expressed:

Kollel for me meant not only a place where I could learn an incredible amount in a short period of time, but also a place where I could live, become, and grow into a more refined self through the company of peers and teachers alike. . . . The most valuable gift that the Kollel granted me was a sense that I am not alone, that there are other Jews out there who share my vision of a profoundly passionate, committed, intellectually open, and spiritually energizing Judaism.²⁹

This is the same kind of leadership cultivation—the modeling of an authentic, spiritual, and learned Conservative Judaism—that Moshe Davis, Mordecai Kaplan, Sylvia Ettenberg, Henry Goldberg, Simon Greenberg, and others strove to provide through the establishment of Ramah sixty years ago. The Beit Midrash and Northwoods Kollel exemplify contemporary Ramah programming that captures the essence of the magic of Ramah for the twenty-first century.

May we nurture many other programs like it. And may we continue to be inspired by the legacy of the past sixty years to help us develop ways to transmit the magic that is Ramah to the young Jews of this new century.

Notes

¹Jonathan D. Sarna, “The Crucial Decade in American Camping,” in *A Place of Our Own: The Rise of Reform Jewish Camping: Essays Honoring the Fiftieth Anniversary of Olin-Sang-Ruby Union Institute, URJ, in Oconomowoc, Wisconsin*, ed. Michael M. Lorge and Gary P. Zola (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006), 27–40; and Shuly Rubin Schwartz, “Ramah: The Early Years, 1947–52,” *Conservative Judaism* 40 (Fall 1989): 17–20.

²“Early history” file, National Women’s League Archives, New York.

³Moshe Davis, “The Ladder of Jewish Education,” *Proceedings of the Second Annual Rabbinical Assembly Conference on Jewish Education* (December 22–23, 1947), 5.

⁴Davis, “Ladder,” 7–8.

⁵Schwartz, “Ramah,” 18; and Gerson D. Cohen, “Religious Education in Ramah,” in *The Ramah Experience: Community and Commitment*, ed. S. C. Ettenberg and G. Rosenfeld (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1989), 40.

⁶Henry R. Goldberg, “Report on Camp Ramah, Summer 1947,” 3–4, Files of Camp Ramah in the Poconos, Philadelphia; and Neil G. Gillman, “Camp Ramah: An Idea Has Come of Age,” *United Synagogue Review* (Summer 1957): 10–11.

⁷Goldberg, “Report,” 17; and Gillman, “Camp Ramah,” 11.

⁸Cohen, “Religious Education in Ramah,” 45.

⁹Goldberg, “Report,” 5–10.

¹⁰Michael B. Greenbaum, “The Finkelstein Era,” in *Tradition Renewed: A History of The Jewish Theological Seminary*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1997) 1:206–7.

¹¹ Schwartz, "Ramah," 14.

¹² Schwartz, "Ramah," 15–16; and Michael Brown, "It's Off to Camp We Go: Ramah, LTF, and the Seminary in the Finkelstein Era," *Tradition Renewed* 1:826.

¹³ "The Seminary in Expansion Program," *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly: 1941–44*, (June 1944) 8:302–9.

¹⁴ Gary P. Zola, "Jewish Camping and Its Relationship to the Organized Camping Movement in America," in *A Place of Our Own*, 3.

¹⁵ Sarna, "Crucial Decade," 37–39.

¹⁶ Brown, "It's Off to Camp We Go," 832.

¹⁷ Jay B. Stern, "Camp Ramah in the Congregational School," *Synagogue School* 22 (Summer 1964): 17.

¹⁸ Zola, "Jewish Camping," 3; and press release, Camp Ramah in the Berkshires, October 17, 1963, JTS Archives, RG 28–34–18, New York.

¹⁹ Simon Greenberg, "The Ramah Movement: Its History and Place in the Conservative Movement," unpublished manuscript, JTS Archives, RG 28–34–20, ca. 1966–70, New York.

²⁰ Mitchell Cohen, "Directors' Meetings— Some Follow Up," e-mail message to Ramah directors, September 18, 2006.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Mitchell Cohen, "Update on Hebrew at Ramah Camps," from the files of Mitchell Cohen, March 2006.

²³ David Soloff, "The School," in *The Ramah Experience*, 170–71; and Mitchell Cohen, "Report on the Shapiro Fellowship Seminar," Files of Mitchell Cohen, Fall 2006.

²⁴ Schwartz, "Ramah," 16; and Burton I. Cohen, "Louis Newman's Wisconsin Innovations and Their Effect upon the Ramah Camping Movement," in *Studies in Jewish Education and Judaica in Honor of Louis Newman*, ed. Alexander M. Shapiro and Burton I. Cohen (New York: Ktav, 1984), 31.

²⁵ Mitchell Cohen, "National Ramah 2006 Weinstein Institute," e-mail report, February 13, 2006.

²⁶ Daniel J. Elazar, "The Changing Realities of the North American Jewish Community," in *The Ramah Experience*, 140.

²⁷ Joshua Cahan, "Reclaiming Piety," Files of Mitchell Cohen, ca. 2007.

²⁸ Cahan, "Reclaiming Piety."

²⁹ Sigal Samuel to Mitchell Cohen, personal communication, Files of Mitchell Cohen, August 2007.