

Joel B. Wolowelsky is an associate editor of *Tradition*.

OBSERVING YOM HASHO'A

Commemoration of the Holocaust has taken a firm hold in the American Jewish community. Holocaust studies have mushroomed and Yom HaSho'a (Holocaust Memorial Day) observances on 27 Nisan draw even many who otherwise avoid synagogue services. Indeed, such observances are taken so much for granted by a wide spectrum of Jewry (including the modern Orthodox community) that it surprises many that a significant part of the Torah community—those associated with Agudah and Hasidic circles—stand apart from these activities. An analysis of this phenomenon yields interesting observations about different basic assumptions that exist within the halakhic community otherwise united by a commitment to Torah and *mitsvot*.

One might try to argue that the extent to which a devout person is actively involved with the broader Jewish community creates a certain orientation towards Yom HaSho'a observances. The more one is insulated from committed Jews who observe Yom HaSho'a, the less likely one is to be drawn into even nonobjectionable observances. In a homogeneous and somewhat self-contained yeshivah or hasidic community, there is less tendency to go outside for memorials sponsored by others. In addition, social insulation provides protection from “negative reinforcement” to attend. People in these communities are no less committed to the broader Jewish community; but people evaluate their actions in a social context. Valuations regarding *kiddush ha-Shem*, for example, depend on who is watching. When non-observant laymen who have no anti-religious agenda—as, indeed, is the case with most non-observant people—see halakhically committed people absenting themselves from an otherwise unobjectionable memorial program for Holocaust martyrs (or fallen *Tsahal* soldiers), they cannot help but wonder why. The more one interacts on a day-to-day level with the broader Jewish community—a social reality not always present uniformly through-

out the halakhically observant community—the more one is sensitized to such possible misrepresentations. On the other hand (so this argument might run), the more insulated one is from such involvement—as is the case with many who live in the community which declines involvement in Yom HaSho'a programs—the more one is unaware of the negative consequences of such standing aside and the less one is inclined to act to avert such misinterpretation. In addition, committed Jews who join in these community programs generally see themselves as functioning within a wider community and are eager to fully participate in its legitimate activities. This is not a perspective shared identically throughout the Torah community.

Yet this analysis, perhaps applicable to some American Jewish communities, falls short of the mark, especially in Israel where there is much stronger daily interaction between all segments of the Jewish community. One must look for an explanation of this phenomenon which is based on principle, not simply sociology.

One might suggest that the opposition to Yom HaSho'a is based on the technical character of the suggested observances or its falling in the month of Nisan. *Hesped* (formal eulogy) is forbidden during the month of Nisan, as it is on Yom Tov and Hol HaMoed. Yet *Yizkor*—together with the *ma-le rahamim* prayer—is permitted on the holidays because it is only a memorial service and not the *hesped* which is said within a year of death.¹ Such logic should carry over to Yom HaSho'a. And aside from the fact that the *Shulhan Arukh* list 26 Nisan among the “days on which one fasts,”² Yom HaSho'a carries with it no specific obligatory fast, ritual or eulogy. In Israel, the theaters are closed—surely there can be no objection to this from Torah circles—and people stand silently for a minute when the siren is sounded. It has been noted that there is no issue of *hukkat ha-goyyim* here, and that there is likewise no halakhic objection to participating in the moment of silence, even standing and learning in silence during a *bet midrash seder*.³ Outside of Israel, there is even less formal structure. Some groups might create an inappropriate ceremony, but the same could be said about some particular community programs on, say, Purim. Nothing prevents a yeshivah from joining the wider Jewish community in focusing on the Holocaust by organizing an observance of Yom HaSho'a that is completely in accord with Torah standards and sensitivities.

It has been suggested that the opposition to Yom HaSho'a stems from a short letter of the Hazon Ish prohibiting the establishment of a fast day in commemoration of the European tragedy.⁴ Contemporary rabbinic leaders do not have the prerogative to establish an obligatory fast day for all of Israel, he wrote, as such authority expired with the end of the prophetic period.⁵ Yet this is problem-

atic as a true root cause of the opposition to Yom HaSho'a commemorations.

Unfortunately, the Hazon Ish cited no sources for his ruling. And, indeed, the tradition does have a well-known precedent for establishing a new fast day. In 1171, there was a blood libel in Blois, France that resulted in the torture and death of thirty-one Jews, including Torah scholars of note. Rabbeinu Tam, the great Tosafist, decreed that the anniversary of that date should be a fast day for Jews everywhere.⁶ Apparently, he felt no compelling need to mark the community's destruction by simply adding a *kina* to the 9 Av liturgy. Centuries later, the survivors of Chmielnicki's pogroms saw their suffering as a repetition of that earlier tragedy that had occurred on 20 Sivan and appropriately observed a fast on that date.⁷ *Magen Avraham* noted that it was the custom "to fast on 20 Sivan throughout the Polish kingdom,"⁸ in commemoration of the pogroms of Chmielnicki and his Cossacks (and other tragedies); *selihot* for this fast day can be found in some current *siddurim*.⁹ This, it has been argued,¹⁰ is a model for a special fast day in commemoration of the Holocaust.

In a brief comment, Rabbi Moshe Feinstein takes issue with the suggestion of accepting 20 Sivan as such a precedent.¹¹ New fast days can be established to commemorate *local* tragedies, he wrote, not *national* ones. The pogroms of that period, tragic as they might have been, were in the end local events without government sponsorship. But the Holocaust, he continued, was a government-sponsored program directed against all of *klal Yisrael*; communities were spared only because Hitler did not succeed in conquering the whole world. Such a national tragedy must be commemorated within the context of 9 Av, he concluded, the day set aside for mourning national catastrophes.

Again, no sources were cited, and it is not clear from Rabbi Feinstein's brief comment exactly what is the halakhic significance of the sponsorship of the oppression, what is the halakhic benchmark at which the sum of many local tragedies becomes a national one, or why the various optional fast dates noted in the *Shulhan Arukh*¹² should not serve as counterexamples. Also, Rabbi Feinstein's reasoning seems to be different from that of the Hazon Ish, which appears to focus on the authority to impose a national fast day, not the national character of the disaster.

Yet one need not question the authoritative nature of either of these rulings to realize that, in the end, neither applies to Yom HaSho'a. Both *poskim* spoke out against any attempt by rabbinical authorities to impose an obligatory fast day in commemoration of the Holocaust; but certainly no claim was ever made that the Knesset

established Yom HaSho'a as a halakhically obligatory fast day. Indeed, neither authority referred to Yom HaSho'a or published anything suggesting a halakhic prohibition to participating in such memorials.

There is, of course, a general reluctance to extend specific focus to the Sho'a on a day other than 9 Av. Thus, Rabbi Yitzhak Hutner, a member of Agudath Israel's rabbinical leadership and one of the seminal Torah thinkers of our period, noted in an article in Agudath Israel's *Jewish Observer* his objection to not only Yom HaSho'a, but to the use of the very term "Holocaust" to describe the destruction of European Jewry.

Is the term *Sho'a* acceptable? The answer is CLEARLY NOT. The word Sho'ah in Hebrew, like "Holocaust" in English, implies an isolated catastrophe. . . . The *churban* [destruction] of European Jewry is an integral part of our history and we dare not isolate it and deprive it of its monumental significance for us.¹³

(Generally, Rabbi Hutner's admonition to avoid the term "Holocaust" has not been accepted by his community, if only for practical reasons.)

In an editorial comment accompanying his article, the *Jewish Observer* noted "that those who originated the term Sho'a view the Holocaust as an event totally unrelated to Jewish history and therefore requiring a memorial for itself. In contrast, if the European Churban is seen correctly in the light of Torah, Tisha B'Av is of course the day for remembering all Jewish suffering."¹⁴ Indeed, Yaakov Feitman (one of Rabbi Hutner's interpreters) stated that the "Torah position" is that "the healthy corpus of *klal Yisroel* will ultimately reject the foreign body of an arbitrarily convened *Yom Hashoa* from its system."¹⁵

Yet this is hardly the definitive halakhic position. Indeed, one of the Torah giants of the post-war era, Rabbi Yehiel Yaakov Weinberg, wrote:

In my opinion, it is proper to establish a specific day of commemoration and mourning to memorialize the rabbis and martyrs who were slaughtered and burned *al kiddush haShem*. . . . We should do this not only out of respect for these martyrs, but also so that future generations not forget what was lost to our nation. . . .¹⁶

Thus, more recently, Rabbi Pinchas Teitz, a member of the presidium of Agudat HaRabbanim, felt comfortable in suggesting a separate Holocaust memorial fast day. (He proposed that it be observed on 17 Iyyar, the anniversary of Hitler's suicide. This is the day before Lag BaOmer, and so the fast day could appropriately end

in a celebration of Hitler's defeat and our survival.¹⁷ This calendar juxtaposition mirrors the current experience of moving from Yom HaSho'a on 27 Nisan to Yom HaAtzma'ut a week later.)

Indeed, given the halakhic permissibility of a separate Holocaust commemoration which is not an obligatory fast day, the question of establishing such a memorial day turns to some extent on whether the Sho'a has some unique standing in Jewish history or whether it is but a current and terrible example of all too frequent tragedies that befell the Jewish people.

R. Hutner himself had argued that the Sho'a, in this sense, had special significance:

The end-result of this period for the Jewish psyche was a significant—indeed, crucial—one. From trust in the gentile world, the Jewish nation was cruelly brought to a repudiation of that trust. In a relatively short historical period, disappointment in the non-Jewish world was deeply imprinted upon the Jewish soul.¹⁸

In fact, R. Hutner sees great significance in this shift. This repudiation, he argues, is the necessary first step for reaching *Aharit ha-Yamim*. "This the *Rambam* sees as the necessary prerequisite to the final stage of *teshuva* . . .," he concludes, and in fact explains the current *ba'al teshuva* phenomenon.¹⁹ For R. Hutner, there is weight to the Holocaust that is absent from other Jewish national tragedies; there is an additional new lesson to be learned from it that affects our national destiny. The Holocaust has become an "orienting event,"²⁰ one that changes the way we view the world.

For Eliezer Berkovits, the Holocaust has special significance for Jews and gentiles in that it marks the end of the "Christian Era." Christianity is no longer the decisive power or influence; Jews, he argued, have a special responsibility as the *am olam* to sum up the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of that era. For him, "a straight line leads from the first act of oppression against the Jews and Judaism in the fourth century to the holocaust in the twentieth. . . . This has been a moral and spiritual collapse the like of which the world has never witnessed before for contemptibility and inhumanity."²¹

No one can foretell what this new era holds in store for mankind. But we are here at the threshold of the new age. We who were there when the Christian era began; we in whose martyrdom Christianity suffered its worst moral debacle; we in whose blood the Christian era found its end—we are here as this new era begins. And we shall be here when this new era reaches its close—we, the *edim*, God's own witnesses, the *am olam*, the eternal witnesses of history.²²

This responsibility as God's witnesses in history cannot be fulfilled through the grieving of Tisha BeAv; the message would be

lost on a day devoted primarily to mourning the Temple's destruction. Such a "witness" would require a separate presentation, its own public declaration. A distinct Yom HaSho'a is the logical conclusion of this position. Indeed, it is not insignificant to note that some churches have adopted parallel Yom HaSho'a services and that the United States government has adopted a Holocaust Memorial Day that corresponds to Yom HaSho'a on the Jewish calendar. Both of these phenomena would have been unthinkable had a distinct Yom HaSho'a not been established. Christians in general have quite naturally not been quick to draw Berkovits' conclusions regarding their religion; but, for some of their religious thinkers, their theologies have been "ruptured" to the extent that the Christian mission to the Jews has been called into question.²³ The reverberations of the Sho'a within the Christian world is not irrelevant to us. It parallels to some extent the impact of the re-establishment of the State of Israel on Christian theology—a jolt which Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik noted in his classic exposition on Religious Zionism to be one the six "beckonings" of the *hakamat ha-medinah*.²⁴ An annual Yom HaSho'a keeps uncomfortable questions before the Christian community and forces us to reevaluate our place in Western society.

Indeed, the Israeli Chief Rabbinate did establish 10 Tevet as a Yom HaKaddish HaKelali to commemorate those who died on unknown dates during the Holocaust. (This was a separate date of observance without the creation of a new day of commemoration on the Jewish calendar.) It has been argued that the Jewish community—including Religious Zionists who recognize the authority of the Chief Rabbinate—"voted with its feet" against this arrangement by ignoring it for the most part.²⁵ But this day was not really set up as a Yom HaSho'a; it was never meant to be a permanent day of national observance. Individual people who went through the Holocaust needed a *yahrzeit* date to commemorate the death of relatives killed on unknown dates. The rabbinate responded to this *personal* need with a "Yom HaKaddish," a designation that would "self-destruct" when the last survivor died and no specific day for personal *yahrzeit* would be needed. Tisha BeAv, the day for national rather than personal observance, would have been inappropriate for such an individual "Yom HaKaddish." No other day had claim for such a designation, so a day which already had communal attention was chosen. Thus the Chief Rabbinate at the time was actually maintaining silence on the national issue while meeting the needs of the individuals affected. The Yom HaKaddish HaKelali was not really ignored by the Jewish people, as it was never directed to the nation as a whole.

On the surface, there is one objection to observing Yom

HaSho'a (27 Nisan) that should have been appealing to all segments of the halakhic community. The Jewish calendar is part of *netsah Yisrael* and no part of the Torah world would be quick to hand it over to a secular authority, even a benign one. This Yom HaSho'a is a construct of the Knesset, an admittedly secular non-halakhic body. As such, it should have no standing of note within a Torah society.

But it is this very objection which underscores a significant division within the Torah community. For a weighty segment of that world, the State of Israel is not simply a secular state. As the Rav poignantly noted in *Kol Dodi Dofek*,²⁶ Religious Zionists maintain that it was not some anonymous United Nations president whose gavel brought forth the State of Israel, but God himself. As the Almighty's gift to us, it and its organs have a standing and claim on all committed Jews. To be sure, this is not to argue that Knesset legislation has the halakhic status of *din* (except to the extent that all civil legislation in a democratic society might have halakhic consequence). But the State sometimes transcends itself, reaching out to represent *klal Yisrael*. If there is a massacre in Lebanon, we realize that we face a potential desecration of God's name; when *Tsahal* liberates Jerusalem, we sense a *kiddush shem shamayim* and a mark made in the eternal history of world Jewry. Exactly when the State reaches out beyond itself is an unaddressed question; but the reality of the possibility is a basic (if perhaps unstated) assumption for Religious Zionists. In giving form to the legitimate need to create a memorial day for the Holocaust, one might maintain, the State has indeed fulfilled this potential. From this perspective, observing Yom HaSho'a on 27 Nisan is more than simply compatible with basic Torah allegiance.

On the other hand, if the State of Israel is seen simply as a secular entity, there is certainly nothing compelling about participating in its constructs. All the more so for those who see the State as an anti-Torah phenomenon.

R. Hutner does not share the Satmar valuation of Zionism²⁷ *in toto*, but he certainly feels that Zionism had a share in increasing the suffering of Jews during the Sho'a period. In fact, for R. Hutner the current push for focus on the Holocaust is actually part of a campaign against the Torah community.

To cover its own contribution to the final catastrophic events, those of the State [of Israel] in a position to influence public opinion circulated the notorious canard that *Gedolei Yisroel* were responsible for the destruction of many communities because they did not urge immigration. . . . [And] at the same time as the State made certain to include this charge as historical fact in every account of the war years, it successfully sought to omit any mention of its own contribution to the impending tragedy.²⁸

It is clear that those who subscribe to such a view would find it inappropriate to participate in Yom HaSho'a observances that are—to their mind—aimed at undermining their own Torah position.

It was Zionism, argued R. Hutner, that drove “*Yishmael*” (headed by the Mufti of Jerusalem) and “*Eisav*” (headed by Hitler) together. “There can be no doubt that through their symbiotic relationship, Hitler and the Mufti each helped the other accomplish his evil goals.”²⁹ R. Hutner is quick to point out that he is not saying that the Sho'a is a punishment for any particular sin. But for him it is an historical fact that Zionist activities contributed to increased Jewish suffering during the Holocaust. For him, we understand, to participate in a Zionist-sponsored Holocaust Memorial Day would be inappropriate, to say the least. Yom HaSho'a might fall in Nisan, but it is really an “Iyyar event” tied to Israel as a political reality.

Of course, this would argue only against a “Zionist” Holocaust memorial day; but as a practical matter, as things stand now a separate day for Yom HaSho'a means 27 Nisan and no other date. We would suggest that this accounts for much of R. Hutner's reluctance to follow through on his logic and endorse a separate memorialization. For him, the lesson to be learned from the Sho'a was that we could not trust the gentiles and therefore should turn to Hashem. But the bulk of world Jewry concluded that because we cannot trust the world powers to protect us we had better organize ourselves politically to look after our interests—and this conclusion appealed not only to secularists. The Rav counts among the six “beckonings” of the State of Israel the fact that “Jewish blood is no longer *hefker*.”³⁰ Better to avoid focusing on the Holocaust, would go the argument of those opposed to Yom HaSho'a commemorations, than to focus on it and lead people to the wrong conclusion.

Lawrence Kaplan has already argued against the historical validity of R. Hutner's interpretation of the inter-relationship of Zionism and the destruction of European Jewry.³¹ And most Jews—including those who share R. Hutner's commitment to Hashem and His Torah—probably feel that, even putting theological or religious considerations aside, the establishment of the State was of important *practical* value. Perhaps not all would go as far as Rabbi Aaron Soloveichik in saying that “after the experience of the Nazi holocaust, the Jewish people could not survive any longer without a state”³²—but most would come rather close. It seems reasonable to suggest that it is an unwillingness to grant the State of Israel religious legitimacy (as opposed to a most positive commitment to its practical security which is shared throughout the Torah community) which is a primary consideration in understanding the rejection of 27 Nisan as Yom HaSho'a on the part of some Torah circles.

This is not to say that Religious Zionists who commemorate Yom HaSho'a are oblivious to a very serious problem in the selection of this particular date. It would be fair to say that the choice of 27 Nisan as Yom HaSho'a grew out of a sense of *shelilat ha-gola* [a negative approach to the *galut* experience]. Burdened with a why-didn't-they-fight-back neurosis and a disdainful view of a *galut* that left Jews to suffer as victims, some members of the Knesset tried to "redeem" the character of European Jewry by creating a Yom HaSho'a VehaGevura, a day commemorating victim and resister, one that focused on the Warsaw Ghetto uprising as much as (if not more than) it took note of the destruction and which was observed on the anniversary of that revolt.

Religious Jews reject this approach outright. They rightfully feel that European Jewry's character needs no defenders. Faced with unspeakable barbarism, Jews never lost sight of their commitment to live as human beings created in God's image. Faith is a form of heroism, though not necessarily the *gevura* appreciated by secularists. This unfortunate history of 27 Nisan as Yom HaSho'a no doubt accounts for much of the negative attitude maintained towards this day of solemnization.

(Regretfully, it must also be acknowledged that the entire religious community bears some responsibility for this history. The observation made by the Rav regarding the general secular nature of some aspects of Israeli society³³ rings true with regard to Yom HaSho'a: had the Torah community stepped in at the beginning and initiated proper observances—even if it had been only the *kinot* for 9 Av that were recently suggested³⁴—the tone of observances would have been radically different.)

But this unfortunate secular attitude of *shelilat ha-gola* is certainly not an intrinsic part of the commemoration. Indeed, we would argue that this date of solemnization has taken an increasing hold on American Orthodoxy because this negative secular attitude has never taken root here. Certainly there is significance to the fact that recent Agudah and Hasidic rabbinical calls for Sho'a memorials—if only extra *kinnot* on Tisha BeAv³⁵—have come from America, where *shelilat ha-gola* has not been a major theme of Jewish discourse. Few people would characterize Yom HaSho'a programs that they have attended as reflecting this negative outlook; indeed, the healthy corpus of *klal Yisrael* is ultimately rejecting this foreign perspective.

In America and in Israel, there is currently increased focus on the spiritual heroism of the victims of the Nazis and an appreciation of the richness of the European Jewish experience. Perhaps the steadfast resistance of some rabbinical authorities contributed to this

awareness; perhaps it simply came naturally from a more balanced stance that comes with the passage of time. In any event, *ein danim et ha-adam ela lefi ma'asav be-oto sha'ah*. Decades ago, 27 Nisan might have been an "arbitrary" date chosen, perhaps for less than lofty reasons, to commemorate the Sho'a. Now it is a date recognized *de facto* by the bulk of world Jewry, not to mention the United States secular society. State and city chief rabbis participate in Israeli commemorations because there is nothing intrinsically secular or anti-religious in current observances. The only factor that has remained constant regarding 27 Nisan as Yom HaSho'a is its Zionist sponsorship. That, we suggest, is why those who reject Religious Zionism as a Torah *hashkafa* cannot accept Yom HaSho'a even though its contemporary expression need not be otherwise offensive in the least.

(This is not to say that attitudes towards commemorating the Sho'a have not changed in Agudah circles in the last forty years. In his letter, the Hazon Ish had characterized contemporary Jewry as a "*dor she-tov lo-ha-shetika*, a generation for whom silence is best." This phrase, noted an editorial in *Hapardes*³⁶ that objected to an Agudath Israel conference on exploring ways of commemorating the Holocaust, precluded focusing on the Sho'a in any way. Indeed, for three or four decades much of this segment of the Torah world remained loyal to this interpretation. The Chief Rabbinate of the British Commonwealth, for example, had long ago authorized a *kina* for 9 Av commemorating the victims of the Holocaust.³⁷ But it is only recently that we have heard calls from the rabbinical leadership of Agudath Israel (Rabbis Moshe Feinstein, Mordecai Gifter, Yaakov Kaminetsky, Yaakov Ruderman and Israel Shapira) and others to actively commemorate the Holocaust with such a *Tisha BeAv* elegy³⁸. This phenomenon, while certainly not an endorsement of Yom HaSho'a, is in fact a quiet reversal of a long-standing policy. As the State of Israel continues to emerge as the world center of Torah study and as more students from yeshivot committed to Religious Zionism grow into positions of leadership in the Torah community, perhaps attitudes towards matters like Yom HaSho'a will begin to shift as well.)

In establishing Yom HaSho'a, the Knesset did not make claim to establish a ritual or halakhic obligation; it simply suggested a day of community focus, leaving everyone to decide on his or her own approach to the day. This is borne out in the listing of Yom HaSho'a in the liturgical calendar published by the Chief Rabbinate's Heikhal Shelomo. Yom HaZikkaron, the memorial day for *Tsahal's* fallen soldiers promulgated as a religious day along with Yom HaAtzma'ut, has a suggested liturgy of Psalms and memorial prayers. 27 Nisan

simply carries the note that this is the day established for commemorating the Holocaust and that memorial prayers should be said. Similarly, the *Tsahal siddur* mentions Yom HaZikkaron but not Yom HaSho'a, even though the chaplains regularly participate in that day's activities.

This having been said, we should note a legitimate objection to the direction that some Holocaust commemorations have taken. The popular quip is unfortunately telling: "There's no business like Sho'a business." Talking about the Holocaust has all too often taken the place of real Jewish education. Focusing on the destruction has become for too many a substitute for building a solid Jewish foundation. One can appreciate the reluctance of serious Torah educators to become involved in what they perceive to be a distraction from growth in Torah.

But surely this is not a compelling objection. Programs are what people make of them. The willingness of masses to attend Yom HaSho'a programs is an opportunity to reach them with a true and lasting message. In fact, one might argue that the involvement of large numbers of halakhically observant people in community Yom HaSho'a programs have in fact turned these observances into a positive *hinnukh* vehicle, for both its own constituents and the broader community. And not to focus on the Holocaust in yeshivot, one might well continue, is simply to deprive students of the serious lessons they must learn from this tragic national experience.

Thus, in the end, the question of observing Yom HaSho'a takes us back to old issues that divide, to some extent, the Torah community. They are not respect for the Hazon Ish, loyalty to the encompassing nature of 9 Av, commitment to the halakhot of the month of Nisan or a dedication to the security of the State of Israel. On all of these, everyone is agreed. Rather, they involve two issues: an appreciation of the State of Israel as a legitimate focal point of religious consciousness; and, to a lesser extent, a practical day-to-day involvement with the broader Jewish community. These differences do not cancel the mutual loyalty to Torah and to the security and well-being of the State of Israel that overwhelmingly unites the halakhic community; but they exist and should be acknowledged and confronted. There are a number of opportunities to do so as we count the days from Passover to Shavu'ot. Yom HaSho'a is but the first opportunity.

NOTES

1. *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 547:5, *Mishnah Berurah* n. 8; *Yoreh De'ah* 394.
2. *Shulhan Arukh Orah Hayyim*, 580:2.

3. R. Yehudah Herzl Henkin, *Responsa Benai Banim* (Jerusalem, 1981), number 10, p. 40 ff. See also his "*Kima li-Khavod ha-Nofelim be-Yom ha-Zikkaron* (Standing in Honor of the Fallen on Memorial Day)" in *Tehumin 4* (Jerusalem: Zomet, 5743 [1983]), pp. 125–129; and "*Od be-Issur be-Hukkoteihem Lo Teileikhu u-ve-Kimah li-khavod ha-Nofelim be-Yom ha-Zikkaron*" in his *Responsa and Letters in Halakhic Matters, Second Series* (mimeographed), number 22 (63), dated 2 Shevat 5743 (1983).
4. R. Sh. Greineman, ed., *Kovetz Iggerot Hazon Ish (R. Avraham I. Karelitz)* (Jerusalem, 5715 [1957]), part one, letter 97, pp. 113 f.
5. R. Aryeh Leb Shpitz, "*Al Devar Keviat Yom Ta'anit . . .* (Regarding the Establishment of a Fast Day in Memory of the Victims of the Destruction)," *Ha-Ma'or*, 33:5 (262), May-June 1981 / 5741, pp. 13–17, argued that there is a serious error in the transcription of this letter—or that in fact the Hazon Ish never signed it—and that its position should not be taken as authoritative halakhah. The authenticity of the letter is, however, generally taken for granted.
6. Ephraim ben Jacob, *A Book of Historical Records*, in Jacob R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World—A Source Book: 315–1791* (New York: Harper Row, 1965), pp. 127–130.
7. Shabbetai Katz, *Megillat Efav*, quoted in Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1982), p. 50.
8. *Shulhan Arukh Orach Hayyim* 580:2, *Magen Avraham*, n. 5.
9. For example, *Otsar ha-Tefillot*, vol. 2, pp. 130–143.
10. R. Shpitz, p. 15.
11. R. Moshe Feinstein, "*Bi-Dvar Keviat Yom Ta'anit li-Kodshei ha-Sho'a* (Regarding Establishing a Fast Day in Commemoration of those Killed in the Holocaust)," *Am ha-Torah*, 2:10, 5745 [1985], pp. 17 f; reprinted in R. Moshe Hershtler, ed., *Halakhah u-Refu'ah* (Halakhah and Medicine) (Jerusalem: Regensberg Institute, 5748/1987), vol. 5, p. 74.
12. *Shulhan Arukh Orach Hayyim*, 580.
13. R. Yitzchok Hutner, "Holocaust," *The Jewish Observer*, XII:8, October 1977 / Cheshvan 5738, pp. 3–9.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
15. Yaakov Feitman, "Rabbi Hutner's 'Holocaust' Seminar," *Jewish Observer*, XII:10, January 1978 / Shevat 5738, p. 12.
16. R. Yehiel Yaakov Weinberg, *Responsa Seridei Esh* (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1977), vol. 2, p. 53, no. 30, n. *.
17. Personal communication with Rabbi Teitz. He originally made this suggestion on one of his *Daf ha-Shavu'a* radio broadcasts.
18. R. Hutner, p. 5.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
20. The phrase is Irving Greenberg's. See his "The Third Great Cycle in Jewish History," in *Perspectives* (National Jewish Research Center, 1981). Note also Michael Wyschogrod's critique of Greenberg's position that the Holocaust is a "revelational event" in his "Auschwitz: Beginning of a New Era? Reflections on the Holocaust," *Tradition*, 16:5, Fall 1977, pp. 63–78. We need not make the theological claim that the Holocaust is a "revelational event" to note that functionally it has become an "orienting event."
21. Eliezer Berkovits, "Judaism in the Post-Christian Era," *Judaism*, 15:1, Winter 1966, p. 77.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
23. Emil Fackenheim, "Holocaust," in Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes-Flor, eds., *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1987), p. 404.
24. R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, *Kol Dodi Dofek*, in Pinhas Peli, ed., *Be-Sod ha-Yahid ve-ha-Yahad* (Jerusalem: Orot 1976), p. 356.
25. Irving (Yitz) Greenberg, *Yom HaShoa* (National Jewish Research Center, 1982).
26. R. Soloveitchik, *Kol Dodi Dofek*, p. 355.
27. See, for example, Norman Lamm, "The Ideology of the Neturei Karta According to the Satmar Version," *Tradition*, 12:2, Fall 1971, pp. 48 f.
28. R. Hutner, p. 7.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
30. R. Soloveitchik, *Kol Dodi Dofek*, p. 359.

31. Lawrence Kaplan, "Rabbi Isaac Hutner's 'Daat Torah Perspective' On the Holocaust: A Critical Analysis," *Tradition*, 18:3, Fall 1980, pp. 235–248.
32. R. Aaron Soloveichik, "Israel's Day of Independence: Reflections in Halacha and Hashkafa," *Gesher*, 4:1, 1969, pp. 7–23.
33. R. Soloveitchik, *Kol Dodi Dofek*, pp. 362 ff.
34. Pinhas Hertska, ed., *Kuntrus Divrei Derisha . . . (Collection of Calls and Encouragements for Saying a Kina on Tisha BeAv in Memory of the Martyrs Who Were Destroyed in Europe in 1939–1945)*, n.d., unnumbered.
35. *Ibid.*
36. R. Simha Elberg, "Zikkaron la-Sho'a—Ma ve-Eikh? (A Memorial to the Holocaust—What and How?)," *Hapardes*, 59:3, November, 1984, pp. 2–3.
37. Abraham Rosenfeld, *The Authorized Kinot for the Ninth of Av, With the Sanction of the Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie* (London, 1965), pp. 173–175.
38. "Gillui Da'at . . . (A Public Statement from the Members of the Rabbinical Council of Agudath Israel of America)," dated 7 Tevet 5744 (1984), in Hertska, ed., *Kuntrus Divrei Derisha . . .*, unnumbered.